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-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

priate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a telegram which has just reached me from the Wichita (Kans.) Chamber of Commerce concerning price-control legislation.

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

WICHITA, KANS., *June 30, 1946.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Wichita Chamber of Commerce still favors principles embodied in OPA bill passed by House on April 18, H. R. 6042. We strongly oppose any effort to reinstate OPA for any considerable period of time in its recent form. We are sending following telegram to President Truman, which will also acquaint you more fully with our views: "Speaking the sentiments of many thousands of businessmen and other citizens of this city and area, the Wichita Chamber of Commerce most respectfully opposes your request that Congress pass price-control bill more stringent than vetoed bill. We have the firm conviction that OPA should be continued for a few more months in greatly modified form in order to encourage maximum production and help fight off inflation. We strongly favor the principles embodied in bill the House passed April 18. If Nation is to get full production and defeat inflation, and if the American people do not want Government to gradually take over and operate all business and industry, then price ceilings must cover increased costs and allow reasonable profits, and ceilings must be removed when supply and demand are balanced for any commodity or article. Complete elimination of Government subsidies must be accomplished as rapidly as possible, in the interest of economy and to be honest and fair to posterity. Reduction of customary discounts, which force smaller profits for dealers than the established practices have allowed in the various lines of business, must be prohibited, because the standard, prewar profit margins are fair, equitable, and necessary to sound business operation and to employment of returning veterans and war workers. These principles are recognized in bill passed by House in April. Government should not reach for more power or cling tenaciously to wartime powers. Unrealistic OPA policies have tragically delayed reconversion ever since VJ-day and have hindered production and seriously increased inflation. OPA must be greatly modified, or its continuance would cause untold injury to every person in the United States. It is vitally necessary that any price-control bill passed by Congress shall restrict OPA in very definite ways to accomplish the objectives mentioned and prevent the repetition of its foolish policies of the past."

LLOYD A. WILSON,
General Manager,
Wichita Chamber of Commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The introduction of bills and joint resolutions is in order.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS OF 1942

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I offer for appropriate reference a joint resolution extending the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I object to the introduction of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On objection, the introduction of the joint resolution will be postponed under the rules for one legislative day.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. WHEELER):

S. 2396. A bill to grant to the city of Miles City, State of Montana, certain land in Custer County, Mont., for industrial and recreational purposes and as a museum site; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 2397. A bill to provide for the payment of a disability retirement annuity to Joseph J. O'Loughlin; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 2398. A bill for the relief of Senzo Usui; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 2399. A bill for the relief of Epifanio Lucero; and

S. 2400. A bill for the relief of Solly Manasse; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2401. A bill to amend the act of May 4, 1898 (30 Stat. 369), as amended, to authorize the President to appoint 250 acting assistant surgeons for temporary service; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. 2402. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the acquisition, establishment, and development of the George Washington Memorial Parkway along the Potomac from Mount Vernon and Fort Washington to the Great Falls, and to provide for the acquisition of lands in the District of Columbia and the States of Maryland and Virginia requisite to the comprehensive park, parkway, and playground system of the National Capital," approved May 29, 1930; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

(Mr. BYRD introduced Senate Joint Resolution 171, extending the rent-control provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, until June 30, 1947, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. SMITH (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WILLIS, Mr. HART, and Mr. McCLELLAN) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to 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, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS—AMENDMENT

Mr. WALSH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6407) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS FOR FLOOD CONTROL—AMENDMENTS

Mr. WILEY submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6597) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXTENSION OF SUGAR ACT OF 1937—AMENDMENTS

Mr. OVERTON submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6689) to extend, for an additional year, the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and the taxes with respect to sugar, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INVESTIGATION OF EVENTS RELATING TO SETTLEMENT OF RAILROAD STRIKE—AMENDMENT

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent to submit a substitute for Senate Resolution 278 to investigate events leading up to the settlement of the railroad strike on May 25, 1946. The substitute resolution is identical with the original resolution save and except it adds subpena powers on the part of the committee, and an expense item of $10,000.

There being no objection, the amendment was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORTS ON THE MERMENTAU RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, LOUISIANA (S. DOC. NO. 231)

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of War transmitting a report dated April 16, 1946, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on and a preliminary examination and survey of the Mermentau River and tributaries, including Bayou Queue De Tortue, La., and of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and connecting waters in Louisiana between Bayou Sale Ridge and the Calcasieu River, in the interest of navigation, flood control, irrigation and drainage, and for the prevention of stream pollution and salt water intrusion, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be referred to the Committee on Commerce and printed as a Senate document, with an illustration.

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

LABOR FACT-FINDING BOARDS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from the previous day which will be read.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the resolution (S. Res. 215) proposing to discharge the Committee on Education and Labor from the further consideration of S. 1661, the Labor Fact-Finding Boards Act.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let the resolution go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will go over.

REORGANIZATION OF THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the resolution (S. Res. 249) creating a

special committee to consider matters relating to the reorganization of the legislative branch of the Government.

Mr. BARKLEY. That having been done, I move that the resolution be indefinitely postponed.

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

PROPOSED EQUAL-RIGHTS AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, for the information of all Members of the Senate, a comprehensive legal opinion, with supporting statements, showing the serious legal implications of the so-called equal-rights amendment, the subject of Senate Joint Resolution 61, now pending on the Senate Calendar.

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

These lawyers and legal scholars regardless of party and regardless of political or economic views, oppose the so-called equal-rights amendment and endorse the statement set forth herein, on the legal implications of the proposed amendment, prepared by Prof. Paul Freund, of the Harvard Law School.

Clarence Manion, dean of the College of Law, University of Notre Dame, Indiana.

Silas Strawn, former president, American Bar Association.

Charles Warren, constitutional lawyer and author of The Supreme Court in United States History, Washington, D. C.

George Maurice Morris, former president, American Bar Association, Washington, D. C.

Marion J. Harron, judge, Tax Court of the United States.

Walter Gellhorn, professor of law, Columbia University Law School.

Glenn A. McCleary, dean of the Law School, University of Missouri.

Dorothy Straus, lawyer, New York City.

D. W. Woodbridge, acting dean, department of jurisprudence, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va.

Marvin C. Harrison, lawyer, Cleveland, Ohio.

M. R. Kirkwood, professor of law, Stanford University Law School, California.

Joseph Padway, general counsel for the AFL, Washington, D. C.

Leon Green, dean of the Law School, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

Dorothy Kanyon, lawyer and former judge of municipal court, New York City.

E. Blythe Stason, dean of the Law School, University of Michigan.

Morris Ernst, lawyer, New York City.

William Draper Lewis, former dean, University of Pennsylvania Law School, Philadelphia.

Charles C. Burlingham, lawyer, New York City.

Patrick O'Brien, probate judge of Wayne County, Detroit, Mich.

Godfrey Schmidt, professor of law, Fordham University, New York City.

Robert H. Wettach, dean of the School of Law, University of North Carolina.

Isabel Simons, lawyer, Highland Park, Ill.

Patrick Nertney, lawyer, and chairman Detroit chapter, National Lawyers Guild, Detroit, Mich.

Walter Frank, lawyer, New York City.

Harry R. Trusler, dean of the College of Law, University of Florida.

Douglas B. Maggs, professor of law, Duke University School of Law, and former Solicitor, United States Department of Labor.

George Burke, former general counsel, OPA, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Gerard Reilly, lawyer, and member National Labor Relations Board.

William H. Holly, United States district judge, Chicago.

Roscoe Pound, former dean, Harvard Law School.

Everett Fraser, dean of the Law School, University of Minnesota.

Monte M. Lemann, lawyer, New Orleans, La.

Albert J. Harno, dean of the College of Law, University of Illinois.

Lowell Turrentine, acting dean, School of Law, Stanford University, California.

Willard Hurst, professor of law, University of Wisconsin Law School.

Francis Swietlik, dean of Marquette University Law School, Milwaukee, Wis.

N. Ruth Wood, lawyer, St. Louis, Mo.

Henry B. Witham, dean of Law School, Indiana University.

C. M. Finfrock, dean of the School of Law, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.

Sayre MacNeil, dean of the School of Law, Loyola University, Los Angeles.

Frank Donner, counsel for the CIO, Washington, D. C.

E. Merrick Dodd, professor, law, Harvard Law School.

Harry Shulman, professor of law, Yale University Law School.

The following statement on legal implications of proposed federal equal rights amendment has been endorsed by deans and professors of 21 leading law schools and by eminent attorneys, jurists, and constitutional lawyers, including former presidents of the American Bar Association and the general counsel for the two great labor organizations:

"The proposed amendment to the Constitution reads as follows:

" 'That equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

" 'This amendment shall take effect three years after the date of ratification.'

"If anything about this proposed amendment is clear, it is that it would transform every provision of law concerning women into a constitutional issue to be ultimately resolved by the Supreme Court of the United States. Every statutory and common law provision dealing with the manifold relation of women in society would be forced to run the gauntlet of attack on constitutional grounds. The range of such potential litigation is too great to be readily foreseen, but it would certainly embrace such diverse legal provisions as those relating to a widow's allowance, the obligation of family support and grounds for divorce, the age of majority and the right of annulment of marriages, and the maximum hours of labor for women in protected industries.

"Not only is the range of the amendment of indefinite extent, but, even more important, the fate of all this varied legislation would be left highly uncertain in the face of judicial review. Presumably, the amendment would set up a constitutional yardstick of absolute equality between men and women in all legal relationships. A more flexible view, permitting reasonable differentiation, can hardly be regarded as the object of the proposal, since the fourteenth amendment has long provided that no State shall deny to any person the equal protection of the laws, and that amendment permits reasonable classifications while prohibiting arbitrary legal discrimination. If it were intended to give the courts the authority to pass upon the propriety of distinctions, benefits, and duties as between men and women, no new guidance is given to the courts, and this entire subject, one of unusual complexity, would be left to the unpredictable judgments of courts in the form of Constitution decisions.

"Such decisions could not be changed by act of the legislature. Such a responsibility upon the courts would be doubtless as unwelcome to them as it would be inappropriate. As has been stated, however, the proposal evidently contemplates no flexibility in construction but, rather, a rule of rigid equality. This branch of the dilemma is as repelling as the other. It appears to be accepted by what is currently the most authoritative statement on this amendment—the report of the House Judiciary Committee (H. Rept. 907, 79th Cong., 1st sess., on H. J. Res. 49, dated July 12, 1945). The majority of the committee appears to recognize that under the amendment the many laws protecting the safety and welfare of women in industry would necessarily fall. The committee states: 'To say the least of the matter, many of the large organizations of women represented in hearings before the committee have expressed a sincere desire to waive the so-called preferential benefits now accorded to women by various laws so as to permit them to follow economic activities from which they are now excluded.'

"It would not be feasible to attempt to enumerate the wide variety of laws and rules of the common law which would fall under the impact of the amendment. Some conception of their scope may, however, be given by recalling the variety of relationships in which women stand in the community. These relationships may be summarized as (a) wage earner; (b) member of a family; (c) citizen; (d) individual. The law has recognized and attempted to deal with these relationships in a concrete way. Doubtless there are difficulties and anachronisms in the law which should be remedied. But the method adopted by the amendment is to ignore the basis for all that has been at the foundation of these measures, and to substitute an abstract rule of thumb. The practical effect of such a course can be suggested by referring briefly to each of the four categories mentioned above.

"(a) As wage earners: One of the most familiar forms of legislation is that which confers special protection on women in industry through the prohibition of employment in hazardous occupations and through regulation of night work and maximum hours of labor. Presumably the long struggle to place these protective measures on the statute books would be set at naught by the adoption of the amendment. Specifically, such statutes would apparently have to be held invalid as denying to women the equal right to work or as denying to men the equal right of protection under the law, for, it is be noted, the amendment requires equality of rights under the law, permitting either men or women to claim exact equality. How the problem would be met can only be left to conjecture. If a State legislature failed to revise the laws giving special protection to women in certain industries, it is left uncertain whether the entire pattern of industrial legislation would be torn apart by judicial decision or whether a court would undertake to legislate by raising the same protection for men. Surely the work of generations ought not to be left to this blind hazard.

"(b) As members of the family: Legislation in the latter part of the nineteenth and early part of the twentieth century commonly known as married women's acts fairly universally in this country removed the disabilities which the common law had placed upon married women with respect to the right to sue and be sued, the right to own separate property, and the right to engage in commercial transactions. It is true that in

some States certain remnants of these disabilities have persisted. In a few States, for example, a married woman may not become a surety for her husband's debts on the theory that she might otherwise be imposed upon; if the reason which had led some States to retain this disability is not a sufficient one, the disability should, of course, be removed by further legislation.

"Similarly, in a few States a married woman's earnings, while belonging to her if they result from work outside the home, are held to enure to the husband if they are produced by working inside the home. Whether this is a fair adjustment in view of the husband's primary duty to support the family may be a fairly debatable question, which again can be resolved by further legislation if further reform is thought desirable. The proposed amendment would leave no room for legislative experiment along these lines, but would impose a requirement of absolute equality in the property rights of husband and wife.

"More seriously, it would presumably abolish the common rule whereby a husband has the primary duty of support toward his family, and whereby in many jurisdictions failure to render such support is a ground for separation or divorce. Precisely how the law of support is to be transformed as a result of the amendment is by no means clear. The concept of a primary duty does not lend itself to a rule of equality.

"The very least that can be said is that the complex and delicate field of marital relationships and divorce, into which Congress has sedulously declined to enter in the past, would now be gravely affected by the tangential force of a constitutional amendment, which would not even rest on a study of the manifold problems involved.

"It is worthy of note that the community property systems of eight Western States, which have evolved differently from the common law systems and which, in general, have recognized for a longer period the coordinate status of husband and wife, nevertheless contain inequalities which would doubtless be rendered invalid under the amendment. Thus, the husband is generally regarded as a kind of managing partner with special powers not possessed by the wife in respect of community property. Legislation would doubtless be required to produce conformity with the dictates of the amendment, and the ramifications of such legislation, particularly with respect to the special tax status of persons owning community property, cannot be predicted with certainty.

"(c) As citizens. While the suffrage amendment and other legislation have generally guaranteed to women an equality of civil and political rights, there remain some gaps which it is undoubtedly one purpose of the amendment to close. One of these is the distinction drawn in some States between the obligation of men and that of women for jury service. But whether the amendment would in fact require a change in this field is itself uncertain, since it is fairly arguable that jury service is not a right but a duty, and hence not within the scope of the amendment. Indeed, the amendment opens up a whole field of potential controversy turning on distinction between rights and duties.

"(d) As individuals. A common legislative difference in the treatment of men and women concerns the age of majority, which is generally lower for the latter. This difference has long been accepted as reflecting physical realities. Presumably the distinction would no longer be valid. But if a legislature failed to change the law, the outcome would present something of a legal puzzle. If the age of majority for men is 18 and women 16, it can hardly be foretold whether equality would require a lowering of the former or a raising of the latter. If the standard be that of the greater right, it could be asserted that the lower age for women provides a greater right to marry but at the same time a more restricted right to annul on the ground of minority. How a court would solve the conundrum is, like most problems created by the proposed amendment, a matter purely of speculation.

"The basic fallacy in the proposed amendment is that it attempts to deal with complicated and highly concrete problems arising out of a diversity of human relationships in terms of a single and simple abstraction. This abstraction is undoubtedly a worthy ideal for mobilizing legislative forces in order to remedy particular deficiencies in the law. But as a constitutional standard, it is hopelessly inept. That the proposed equal rights amendment would open up an era of regrettable consequences for the legal status of women in this country is highly probable. That it would open up a period of extreme confusion in constitutional law is a certainty.

"PAUL FREUND,

"Professor of Law, Harvard Law School."

Among the views expressed on the so-called equal rights amendment, the following are of special interest:

Joseph P. Chamberlain, professor of law, Columbia University Law School: "The passage of the amendment will create uncertainty and confusion in the wide fields of the law of property, of personal status, of marriage. It may destroy all labor legislation protecting women. Existing evils can and should be met by legislation aimed to cure them, such as the equal pay bill now before Congress. This proposal is a leap in the dark and has no place in the Constitution."

Silas H. Strawn, former president of the American Bar Association: "The amendment would inevitably invalidate many of the State laws protecting the American home and which protect women in industry."

E. Blythe Stason, dean of the University of Michigan Law School: "Physiological facts create the absolute necessity of numerous instances of differentiation in the law between the sexes affording protection for women not required for men. The proposed amendment would certainly throw the bulk of such legislation now on the statute books into a state of confusion and uncertainty, if it did not, in fact, result in complete elimination of such legislation from the statute books."

Judge William H. Holly, United States district court, Chicago: "If the proposed 'equal-rights amendment' to our Federal Constitution should be given the interpretation of which it seems capable, it would destroy the work of the years that have been given to secure the passage of the laws for the protection of women in industry. I fear that back of those who are openly advocating the amendment are the interests which desire to be rid of those laws."

Thurman Arnold, former associate justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia: "I am opposed to the so-called equal-rights amendment to the Constitution. There is no necessity for a constitutional amendment on this subject. The proposed amendment would confuse existing law to an intolerable extent and lead to endless litigation."

Judge Marion J. Harron, The Tax Court of the United States: "If adopted, the so-called equal rights amendment will cause chaos in 48 States in the status of all laws relating to women. It will wipe out many laws which have established standards for the employment of women in industry."

The following organizations oppose the equal rights amendment:

American Association of University Women; American Civil Liberties Union; Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America; American Communications Association; American Federation of Hosiery Workers; American Federation of Labor; American Federation of Teachers; American Federation of Women's Auxiliaries of Labor; Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders and Helpers Union; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express, and Station Employees; Congress of Industrial Organizations; Congress of Women's Auxiliaries of the CIO; Food, Tobacco, Agricultural, and Allied Workers Union of America.

Girls' Friendly Society of the United States; Glass Bottle Blowers' Association of the United States and Canada; International Coordinating Committee, UAW Auxiliary; International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union; International Union United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America, CIO; League of Women Shoppers, Inc.; National Citizens Political Action Committee; National Consumers League; National Council of Catholic Women; National Council of Jewish Women; National Council of Negro Women; National Farmers Union; National Federation of Post Office Clerks; National Federation of Settlements, Inc.; National League of Women Voters; National Maritime Union, Women's Auxiliary.

National Women's Trade Union League of America; Service Star Legion, Inc.; State, County, and Municipal Workers of America; the National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations of the United States of America; Union for Democratic Action; United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America, CIO; United Federal Workers of America, CIO; United Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers International Union; United Office and Professional Workers of America, CIO; United Packinghouse Workers of America; United Rubber Workers of America, CIO; United Steel Workers of America; Women's National Homeopathic Medical Fraternity; National Committee To Defeat the Unequal Rights Amendment, Washington, D. C.

WARTIME PETROLEUM POLICY UNDER THE PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that the sixth series of the hearings held by the Senate Special Committee Investigating Petroleum Resources entitled "Wartime Petroleum Policy Under the Petroleum Administration for War," at which time the Petroleum Administrator for War, the Deputy Administrator, and several principal members of the staff of the Petroleum Administration for War presented detailed testimony, is being released today for publication by the United States Government Printing Office.

Listed among the subjects included in this historical record are the following:

(a) Mobilizing the Oil Forces.

(b) Wartime Petroleum Requirements and Programming to Meet Them.

(c) Wartime Petroleum Production in the United States.

(d) World Production of Crude Petroleum in Wartime.

(e) Petroleum Refining in the United States During the War.

(f) World-wide Refining in Wartime.

(g) Natural Gas and Its Products During the War.

(h) Wartime Distribution and Marketing of Petroleum Products.

(i) Wartime Foreign Petroleum Supply.

(j) Wartime Petroleum Supply and Transportation.

This volume also includes a statement submitted by the Director of the Naval Petroleum Reserves with respect to the Navy's views regarding a national oil policy.

The Superintendent of Documents advises me that this book, containing approximately 300 pages, together with numerous colorful charts, will be placed on sale at $1.25 per copy.

Inasmuch as the committee is furnished with a limited supply, it would be advisable, particularly for persons desiring extra copies, to place their order with the Superintendent of Documents, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., immediately.

CONTROL AND DEVELOPMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY—LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a short note written to me by the Secretary of the Navy bearing upon the passage in the Senate of the atomic energy bill, Senate bill 1717. I think it is particularly appropriate to insert this letter in the RECORD now, because there seems to be some misapprehension as to the Navy's attitude regarding the passage of the bill.

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

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washingon, June 4, 1946.

Hon. BRIEN McMAHON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BRIEN: Please accept my congratulations on the passage Saturday of your bill for the control and development of atomic energy. It is well drawn and accomplishes what I know you were after from the beginning—a proper balance between civilian and military control.

This is not merely my own view but that of the professional people in the naval service.

Your long and painstaking work has not been in vain.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

OVERSEAS OUTPOSTS—ADDRESS BY FOSTER HAILEY

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Overseas Outposts," delivered by Foster Hailey, member of the editorial board of the New York Times, before the National Security Committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, which appears in the Appendix.]

LET'S FACE THE FACTS—ADDRESS BY EDWARD R. PLACE

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Let's Face the Facts," delivered by Edward R. Place before the Washington (D. C.) Northeast Businessmen's Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

BIG BUSINESS, IT'S UP TO YOU—EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA RECORD

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Big Business, It's Up To You!", published in the Philadelphia Record of June 30, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

EUROPEAN EXPERIENCES WITH INFLATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a portion of an editorial entitled "Folding Money," published in the New York Times of June 30, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed. The calendar under rule VIII is in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with.

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

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

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

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

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

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 Senators from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO and Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] 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 senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

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] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] are absent by leave of the Senate.

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

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

CITATION CONFERRING DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF LAWS ON LESLIE L. BIFFLE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on Saturday afternoon, at its annual commencement exercises, Dartmouth College conferred the degree of doctor of laws upon our good friend and able and devoted Secretary of the Senate, Mr. Leslie L. Biffle. I should like to read the citation conferring the degree. It is as follows:

Leslie L. Biffle, you, by the common consent of those best qualified to know, are the outstanding, nonelective servant of the legislative process of our Federal Government. For more than 35 years you have been associated with legislative affairs in the Nation's Capital and since 1923, first as secretary to the majority in the United States Senate and more recently as Secretary of the Senate you have rendered public service the effectiveness and fidelity of which are counted great by those of contrary as well as like political persuasion. In tribute to you and in recognition of the place of such largely unheralded service in the working of American democracy, Dartmouth confers upon you the degree of doctor of laws.

Mr. President, I am sure that I voice the sentiments of every Member of the Senate in warmly congratulating Leslie Biffle upon the receipt of this richly deserved honor. I rejoice that this honor

has come to so loyal, so able, so faithful, so devoted, and so distinguished a servant of our country.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, after hearing the kind words just spoken of our Secretary, I am sure that all Senators on this side join with those on the other side in congratulating our good friend, Leslie. We also congratulate Dartmouth for having the good sense to confer this degree, doctor of laws, upon a real worker and a devoted public servant.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I wish to add a word of compliment and praise to what has been said by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] with respect to the recognition recently given Mr. Biffle, Secretary of the Senate, by Dartmouth College. Mr. Biffle is one of the most efficient and capable men I have ever known. With it all he is painstaking and courteous to each and every Member of this body, whether he be on the Democratic or on the Republican side of the aisle. I feel sure he has the respect and the affection of every Member of this body. I believe he is one of the few men I have ever known concerning whom those who know him have only words of praise to utter.

Leslie Biffle is a man of splendid intellect. He has unlimited energy. The honor which has been paid him by the great Dartmouth College is certainly highly deserved and most fitting.

I join the other Senators in saying that I am extremely happy that our Secretary, the kind, capable, courteous, upstanding young man, Leslie Biffle, has had bestowed upon him the great honor of which we were just informed by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I take occasion to express my great pleasure on learning that Dartmouth College, of New Hampshire, has seen fit to honor Mr. Biffle, a distinguished son of Arkansas, by conferring on him the degree of doctor of laws.

Mr. Biffle has served as the Secretary of the Senate for a substantial time, and was associated with the Senate for many years before his elevation to his present office. He is amazingly alert mentally, he is indefatigable in the performance of his duties, is courteous always, is considerate, and he has a profound and intimate knowledge of the practices of both the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Mr. President, I am personally greatly indebted to Mr. Biffle for many courtesies, and I wish to express satisfaction that this New England college has seen fit to bestow its highest honor upon a worthy son of Arkansas. I extend to him my good wishes and my warmest congratulations.

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 defense health and welfare, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. What is the present situation in the Senate? Has the Senate completed the morning hour?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate has completed the morning hour, and, by unanimous consent, consideration of the calendar was dispensed with.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Do I understand, then, that the unfinished business before the Senate is the consideration of Senate bill 1850?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No. The unfinished business will not be laid before the Senate until the Senate reconvenes, after returning from the Hall of the House of Representatives. The Senator can move that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate if he wishes to do so.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, on Saturday the Senate passed the appropriation bill for the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency. At that time I had received a telegram from Hon. Millard F. Caldwell, Governor of Florida, who, up to 4 years ago had for a period of 3 or 4 years been a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives. I ask unanimous consent that the telegram may be printed in the RECORD at this point so that Senators may know the attitude of at least one governor on the question of the return of the employment service to the States. The governors have to look into these matters, shoulder these problems, and determine what they think is best to be done.

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

TALLAHASSEE, FLA., *June 26, 1946.*

Hon. CHARLES O. ANDREWS,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

Am informed that Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill passed the House providing return of employment service to States as of October 1, 1946, without Federal regulation and is now pending in Senate with action contemplated this week. Am extremely interested in early return of service unemcumbered with Federal regulations not in existence at time employment service loaned to Government at commencement of war. Your assistance in passage of appropriation bill with above provisions intact will be appreciated.

MILLARD F. CALDWELL,
Governor.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE DEPARTMENTS AND THE JUDICIARY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following 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 15, 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 18, 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 appropriation '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.

PAT MCCARRAN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
STYLES BRIDGES,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
BUTLER B. HARE,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
KARL STEFAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

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

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I desire to speak very briefly on the conference report.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, inasmuch as the House of Representatives has asked that we be in the House Chamber at not later than a quarter to 12, if the conference report is to take any time it had better be passed over until we reconvene.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I will agree to confine myself to less than 5 minutes.

Mr. President, I raised no serious opposition to this bill while it was before the Senate. The House appropriated approximately $10,000,000 for the State Department's international short-wave broadcasting service. The Senate increased that amount from $10,000,000 to $19,000,000.

There is a serious question as to whether there is any legal authority whatsoever for what the State Department is doing. In my own opinion, for whatever it may be worth, there is no substantive law upon which the action of the House, the action of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, or the action of the Senate itself can possibly be justified.

Passing by this question, I wish to have it known that I think the whole procedure is utterly unwise. I think it gives promise of great difficulties and troubles for us if we turn the State Department loose to broadcast to the world the material which the State Department has indicated it is to make known to the world. I have before me a statement made by a representative of the Department who has urged this appropriation. What is the Department proposing to do? Let me read two paragraphs from the statement of Mr. William Benton, who is to have charge of this work:

> Hardly a day passes without some important decision or action being taken by Americans here or in London, Paris, Tokyo, Nanking, or elsewhere—and each individual action poses a problem in world information. Our actions and attitude toward Spain, the Balkan countries, Germany, Palestine, Japan, China, Russia, Indonesia, Siam, Iceland, and a host of other countries need to be known by the people of those and other countries not only in terms of current decisions, but in terms of reasons for them.

In further explanation of this program of the State Department it is stated:

> A strike in coal mines, an increase in living costs, a tornado in Kansas, a decrease in locomotive production, the color of the bread we eat—all have a direct impact on the economic and living conditions of other peoples.

It is perfectly obvious that it is the purpose of this agency of the State Department to present to the peoples of all the various nations such questions arising in the countries to which I have referred. It is desired to tell the people of the world about a Kansas cyclone, the color of the bread we eat, and various matters of one sort and another.

This is even more significant. Speaking of Liberia, the statement contains this language:

> The department considers this mission—

That is, the transmission of news to Liberia—

> essential to the success of economic progress in Liberia. A broad program of political, social, and economic reform in Liberia is being supported by this Government, and this project is considered as of far-reaching importance to both governments.

It is perfectly clear that the State Department is to undertake to instruct the world with respect to social, economic, political, and governmental matters. I merely wish to say that we are asking for trouble all over the world, because no nation anywhere, to which the United States may send this information, will welcome within its borders the official pronouncements of the State Department of the United States as to social, political, economic, and governmental problems. I can see nothing but trouble. I can see nothing but friction. I can see nothing but resentment resulting from this effort of the State Depart-

ment. I wish to have it known that I am definitely and affirmatively against it, and I wish I might speak at length on the subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 6056, 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 2, 26, 39, 40, 56, 58, 65, 73, and 81 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, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum of $7,000,000 named in said amendment insert "$6,000,000";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum of $2,874,000 named in said amendment, insert "$2,500,000";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: "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 Administration which cannot be performed within the foregoing limitation shall be done on contract after submission of bids";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: "(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)"; and

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum of $2,000,000 named in said amendment insert: "$1,750,000."

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 46, 50, 57, and 74.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 152, I move that the Senate proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives; and the Senate reassemble upon the call of the Chair immediately following the ceremonies in the House Chamber.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the Senate, headed by its Secretary, its Sergeant at Arms, and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Senate returned to its Chamber at 12 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

PRESIDENTIAL VETO OF OPA BILL—ADDRESSES BY THE PRESIDENT AND SENATOR TAFT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the radio address delivered by the President on last Saturday evening, following his veto of the OPA bill.

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

My fellow countrymen, the crucial situation which confronts our country requires that I report to the people this evening.

Today I returned to the Congress without my approval the extension of the price control law which it presented to me for my signature.

I returned it with a long message stating my reasons. I hope that you will all read that message in your newspapers.

I assure you, my fellow countrymen, that before I vetoed this bill I gave the subject long days and nights of consideration. I consulted with practically every top official in the Government. Either personally or through representatives I obtained the views of people in agriculture, industry, and labor, as well as many others.

You have all heard a great deal about inflation. Its seriousness cannot be overestimated. It would affect every individual in our country. Inflation would cause an increase in the price of every article you buy. As prices soared with inflation, your money would buy fewer and fewer of the necessities of life. Your savings, your insurance, your war bonds—all would decrease in value.

For 5 years we have proved to this country and to the world that inflation can be prevented. Those of you who remember the First World War will recall the wild inflation and the collapse that followed. You will remember how farmers were ruined, how businessmen went bankrupt, how wage earners suffered.

This time we have succeeded in preventing such a calamity. We have done this largely through price control. It was not done by a miracle. It was done because the American people had the wisdom and the courage and the restraint to know that they had to submit to restrictions and controls or be overcome by the force of inflation. We must continue to prevent inflation. This is as important now and in the months to come as it was during the war. Time and again I have stated and restated this proposition.

I wanted to sign a price-control bill. I gave this bill long and careful study. I came to the conclusion that the bill which the Congress sent me was no price-control bill at all. It gave you no protection against higher and higher prices.

Having reached that conclusion I was faced with these alternatives. I could sign the bill on the plea which had been made to me that for the immediate present at least, it might be a little better than nothing. Or I could disapprove the bill, and call upon the Congress to give the American people a real, workable, price-control law.

If I had taken the first course and signed the bill I would have encouraged the false impression that you were going to be protected for the next year against excessive price increases. But, sooner or later, all of you would have awakened to a bitter realization of the truth.

You would have soon begun to see thousands and thousands of price increases, adding billions and billions of dollars to our cost of living. It is hard to see how people could continue to pay higher and higher prices without requiring higher wages or salaries. The tremendous advances that we have made toward the settlement of labor-management disputes over wages would have been wiped out. The mad chase to inflation would soon have been under way.

I could not permit that to happen.

I took the second alternative, knowing full well all the dangers which would come with it. I knew that there was danger that the Congress might not pass a resolution which would give us some kind of protection after midnight tomorrow, when the present price-control law ends. I knew, therefore, that it was very possible that for a few days at least we might be without any price-control law.

I could not bring myself to believe, however, that the Representatives of the American people—your Senators and Representatives in the Congress, would permit such a condition to continue long. And I was sure that when this issue was presented to the American people and to the Congress there could be only one answer. That answer is that the Congress should immediately pass a resolution continuing present price and rent controls until the Congress can pass a workable bill.

It would have been much easier for me to sign this bill. But the American people would have soon realized that real price control was at an end in spite of the law. If I had signed the bill the people would have seen their prices going up, day by day. You would have realized soon that the bill which had been passed and called a price-control law was not price control at all.

What I have done is to call a spade a spade. I must now rely upon the American people and upon a patriotic and cooperative Congress to protect us all from the great pressures now upon us, leading us to disastrous inflation unless we have the means to resist them.

I know how weary you all are of these restrictions and controls. I am also weary of them. I spend a good deal of my time listening to complaints. I know how eager everyone of you is for the day when you can run your own affairs in your own way as you did before the war. I know, therefore, how strong the temptation is to remove too quickly the safeguards which we have built up for ourselves and our children.

The bill which the Congress sent me yielded to that temptation.

It is certainly most unfortunate that the Congress kept delaying and delaying action on this bill for so many months when they knew that the price-control law was going to expire tomorrow.

I am sure that all of you know of the efforts which I made to get the Congress to

act on a price-control extension far in advance of the date when the old law was going to expire. As far back as September, last year, in a message to the Congress, I urged it to pass an extension of the price control act at an early date.

I did not rest with that message of last September. In later communications to the Congress I repeated my request four times to extend price control. In addition to these direct communications, I stated publicly many times how important it was to our safety that a price-control extension bill should be passed right away.

"IMPOSSIBLE" BILL PASSED

But I could not persuade the Congress to act. Instead, just 2 days before the expiration of all price control, this impossible bill was sent to me.

In my veto message to the Congress which I sent this morning I discussed the various provisions of the bill.

I do not have time this evening to comment on all the provisions of the bill. There are many objections to it, but my most fundamental objection is to the price-raising amendment for manufacturers which was introduced by Senator TAFT.

Under this amendment there would be thousands of needless price increases amounting to many billions of dollars. The Taft amendment provides that the manufacturer shall receive for each article the profit which he made on that article in 1941 and that he may add to the 1941 selling price all increases in cost which have occurred since that time. In 1941 the manufacturer received a much greater profit out of each dollar of sales than at any time in the five preceding years or in any of the five following wartime years. In fact, profit margins in 1941 were 50 percent greater than in the banner year 1929.

Volume of sales is much greater today than in 1941, so that manufacturers would have received a bonanza. In addition, Senator TAFT'S fellow Republicans, Senator WHERRY and Representative CRAWFORD, put amendments into the bill which made sure that not only would the manufacturers' price increases be borne by the public but that such increases would be pyramided by generous wholesalers' and retailers' mark-ups.

As you sit in your homes this evening your interest in this bill and my interest in this bill are exactly the same. The question is: What effect would this bill have had on you—the people of our country.

I believe in the profit system and desire that profits should be ample to provide the incentive for full production. The Taft amendment, however, provides for higher prices and higher profits even where production is already going at full blast and profits are wholly satisfactory.

We have been through five difficult years. We are looking forward to buying the things we need. Let us examine this problem together.

AUTO-PRICE EFFECT STRESSED

Do you need a new low-priced automobile? If so, what effect would the Taft amendment have had on the price of your new car? It would have increased immediately the prices of the popular makes of automobiles by two hundred and twenty-five to two hundred and fifty dollars per car.

Are you a veteran planning to build a home for yourself and family? The Taft amendment would have added immediately a minimum of 20 percent to the cost of your building materials. The program recently approved by the Congress to provide veterans' housing at reasonable cost would have been completely disrupted by this Taft amendment.

Are you a housewife who has been waiting for years for that new washing machine or refrigerator? The Taft amendment would have made it cost one-third more right away.

Are you faced with the responsibility of clothing your family? Under the Taft and other amendments the already high clothing prices would have been increased 15 percent right away. For clothing alone the American people would have paid at least $3,000,000,000 more a year.

Are you in a business in which you need to buy steel? The price of steel would have gone up under the Taft amendment between $4 and $8 per ton right away.

Are you a farmer? Under this bill the price of farm machinery would have gone up 13 percent right away.

Those are only a few examples of the first round of increases the Taft amendment would bring. But that is only the beginning. Price increases in one industry are cost increases in another. By the time, for example, that the automobile industry had got its Taft increase based on present costs, it would be hit by the Taft increases in steel, tires, safety glass, and other materials. So automobiles would go up still more.

In this way increase would follow increase. The bill had no stopping place in it.

"CONSUMER WOULD PAY"

In addition, these increases would have been passed right down the line. You, the consumer, would pay it all.

All of us agree that what this country needs is production. Production brings jobs, good wages, moderate prices. Perhaps the most vicious effect of the Taft amendment would be to slow up production.

The only possible justification urged for all of these Taft price increases is the claim that they are necessary to encourage production. Even if they did encourage production, that would still be a terrific price to pay for that increased production—a price measured in suffering and distress among people of moderate and low incomes.

The fact is, however, that production would not be stimulated by the Taft amendment, but would be greatly impeded. Nobody wants to sell his goods this week if he can get a better price for them next week. This is no mere theory. You have seen it working day after day for the last month or so, as people began to believe that price control might soon come to an end.

CATTLE AND HOGS "HELD BACK"

People who had cattle and hogs to sell for slaughter for food have decided to hold them for higher prices. People who had clothing for sale have decided to do the same thing. So have people with innumerable other commodities which we all need so badly now.

Incidentally, I have asked the Attorney General to make an investigation of some of the factors involved in our present shortages to determine whether anyone is criminally responsible for them and to place the responsibility where it belongs.

These instances of withholding goods from the consumer would be multiplied thousands of times under the Taft amendment; production and deliveries would be slowed down waiting for price increases. This would create bottlenecks of essential materials and essential parts which would bring production lines to a halt. By the time they started up again there would be new applications for price increases and additional waiting for greater profits.

Labor would be penalized by loss of employment. Consumers would be penalized by lack of goods and ever-rising prices. Farmers would be penalized by higher prices for what they buy and reduced markets for the things they sell.

It is a cruel jest to say that the Taft amendment would aid production. As I also pointed out this morning in my veto message, the Taft amendment would wholly destroy our program of wage stabilization which has been built up since VJ-day. It would destroy the usefulness of the Wage Stabilization Board.

WARNS OF "INEVITABLE SPIRAL"

The result would be the beginning of an inevitable spiral of uncontrolled inflation—a race between rising wages and rising prices. Far-sighted leaders of both labor and management know that nothing can be gained—and everything lost—by simply letting prices and wages chase each other.

Despite the total impossibility of stabilizing other prices under this bill, I would have hesitated to disapprove it if I had thought it gave some real protection against soaring food prices and rents. We have learned, however, that higher prices for the things that farmers and landlords buy would inevitably force up food prices and rents.

In both instances, serious increases would be forced upon us by the hard facts of business and economics.

I realize that the great majority of our people do not have the facts and figures that must be considered in order to know what a bill like this would do. That is why I am speaking to you this evening. You are entitled to have the facts before you.

I want to make clear that my decision to veto this bill does not mean any lack of appreciation of the sincere and tireless efforts of the leaders and many other Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives to pass a workable price control bill. I know that many Members of both Houses who voted for the bill which was sent to me did so with regret and only because they had, at that time, no opportunity to vote for a good bill. Now every Member has a clear-cut opportunity to show whether or not he wants effective price controls.

PLAN SUGGESTED TO CONGRESS

I have submitted to the Congress in my veto message a plan for price control legislation for the comparatively short period of time that it is still needed. The will of the people is still the supreme law of our land. Your determination to retain price controls and so prevent inflation must be made known to the Congress. The Congress is the only branch of our Government which has the power to pass a law providing for proper price control.

Now because of congressional delay we are faced with a brief period in which legal restraints on price increases will be lacking. I have urged the Congress to act immediately and to adopt the kind of bill which can be made to work.

But, in the event of delay, I know that the United States can depend upon the patriotism and good sense of its citizens. Therefore, I call upon every businessman, every producer, and every landlord to adhere to existing regulations, even though for a short period they may not have the effect of law. It would be contrary to their own interest to embark upon a reckless period of inflation. It is to their own interest to exercise self-restraint until some action can be obtained from the Congress.

I also request every employee of the OPA to stay at his battle station. The fight is not over. I am counting on all employees of the OPA to continue to serve in the future as they have in the past and to finish the job. I urge these loyal civil servants and the thousands of volunteers who are giving their time to make price control a success to see this fight through.

And, finally, my fellow citizens, I say to you that we as a Nation have it within our

hands to make this postwar period an era of the greatest opportunity and prosperity in our Nation's history. But if short-sightedness and impatience, if partisanship and greed are allowed to triumph over the efforts to maintain economic stability, this grand opportunity will have been sacrificed.

That must not happen.

With your help and understanding it will not happen.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I hold in my hand the original manuscript used by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in his radio address last evening on the subject of the veto by the President of the OPA bill. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

BROADCAST OF ROBERT A. TAFT, MUTUAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM, SUNDAY, JUNE 30, 1946

Yesterday President Truman vetoed the bill to extend his own power to fix prices and rents, so that OPA expires at midnight tonight. Last night he defended his curious action by what amounted to a long personal attack on me, because I had some part in drafting one of the various amendments to the bill. His whole broadcast had the aspect of a partisan political attack and apparently was drafted by the Office of Price Administration, the chief of which is Mr. Paul Porter who was the publicity chief for the Democratic National Committee in the last campaign.

Mr. Truman omitted to state that this bill was adopted by a Democratic Congress. There are 236 Democrats to 190 Republicans in the House of Representatives, and 56 Democrats to 40 Republicans in the Senate. He was strongly urged to sign the bill by the Democratic Speaker of the House, the Democratic floor leader of the House, the Democratic leader of the Senate, and the Democratic President pro tempore of the Senate. He disregarded their advice and followed the advice of Chester Bowles and the Political Action Committee. The personal attack on me is merely a smoke screen to conceal the real political reasons behind his action.

As a matter of fact, I have always supported price control as essential in the war period. I believe we would be better off to continue it for 6 months longer, although like every other person who believes in the American system, I think it should be ended at the earliest possible moment. I assisted in drafting the original Price Control Act and all the amendments.

I find a letter in my files from this same Chester Bowles, dated June 27, 1944, after a bitter fight on extension very much like the present one, in which he said, in part:

"DEAR BOB: I want to thank you for your courteous, friendly, and intelligent efforts to work out the Stabilization Extension Act. I know how hard it was and the amount of patience it required."

Only last week I argued strenuously for the passage of this bill against those who desired to end price control altogether, or at least end it with reference to meats, dairy products, and poultry.

No Price Control Act is an easy measure to pass through Congress, and I doubt whether any extension can now be put through again. The cross currents of economic interest from different sections of the country are almost impossible to reconcile. The vetoed bill was only put through Congress without specific decontrol of many important foods by the adroit management of Senator BARKLEY. A great majority of the people west of the Mississippi desire the immediate termination of price control, and so do their representatives in Congress. Many others east of the Mississippi are disgusted with the complete breakdown of OPA in meat control, lumber control, and a number of other vital commodities. They point to empty shelves, bread lines, butter lines, deserted production lines, and black markets and argue that anything is better than the kind of price control we have.

My own position and that of Congress is perfectly logical. We think the time has not quite come to take off basic price controls, but we do think the administration of OPA must be improved. The bill provides for the gradual liquidation of OPA over the next 12 months, the ending of subsidies on April 1, 1947, and reasonable pricing in the interval so that we can stimulate production and get rid of all the shortages and injustices that exist today.

The PAC really want price control continued indefinitely. It is in line with their idea of the totalitarian state. Apparently, the President now agrees with their philosophy. He objects in his message to the provision that there shall be decontrol of any commodity when the supply equals the demand. If we can't get rid of price control when a sufficient supply is produced, will we ever get rid of it? He wants subsidies continued until July 1, 1947. It would then be easier to renew them again at that time. He uses the price admendment as a whipping post, but he is really demanding the indefinite continuation of the whole outfit and every single power which he now has. He does not, apparently, accept in good faith the policy which is universally accepted in Congress by all parties and stated in the bill that "the general control of prices and the use of subsidy powers shall be terminated as rapidly as possible."

The President's attack on the amendment which I offered in the Senate is utterly unfair. All that the Taft amendment provides is that producers, including farmers, mining concerns, and manufacturers, shall be allowed to charge prices which reflect the increased cost of labor and material which they now have to pay. This is done by permitting them to charge for each major product a price equal to their 1941 prices plus the average increase in the cost of labor, materials, et cetera since 1911. After all, this is peacetime again. Why shouldn't the producer be placed in the same position he was in before the war? No producer is guaranteed any profit. There is no question of a freeze any more, because the OPA itself has put over 500 price increases into effect since March 1. All we want to prevent during the next 6 months are the speculative rises in price over and above the increase in costs. The danger I am concerned about is taking the roof off, as the President does by his veto. But how can anyone hope to get production if we don't allow the producers to charge enough for their products to pay for the increased cost of labor and material? Even the President admits in his message that this principle has a superficial reasonableness. There is nothing superficial about it except to the master minds among the New Deal economists at the OPA.

As a matter of fact, there is nothing new in the principle. The original Price Control Act of 1942 expressly provided that the Administrator should start with the prices prevailing between October 1 and October 15, 1941, and should make adjustments for general increases in costs of production, distribution and transportation, among other factors. The language was pretty general, and the OPA never paid any attention to it. Then, in 1944, we passed a law which expressly provided that "modification shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity and for commodities processed or manufactured from any agricultural commodity" (and that means nearly all food and clothing) "in any case where, by reason of increased labor or other costs incurred since January 1, 1941, the maximum prices so established will not reflect such increased costs." As usual the OPA didn't pay much attention to Congress, but they did use almost exactly the formula of the Taft amendment in pricing canned vegetables in 1944 and 1945. Furthermore, the so-called Bankhead amendment for several years has compelled them to follow more or less the same formula as to all cotton textiles.

In many fields, however, the OPA has by express regulation, forced manufacturers to sell some products at cost or at a loss, because some members of the industry were making profits on other products. Of course, nobody makes the things which have to be sold at a loss. This is the reason for the shortage of butter, of many standard types of clothing, of building materials and many other articles. The President's figures on possible increases are wild guesses and for the most part dead wrong. I was called today by the Association of Washing Machine Manufacturers who said that the President's estimate of one-third more for washing machines was a gross exaggeration, that the manufacturers hoped there would be no price increase at all, even if price ceilings were removed entirely. Any steel increase would be less than half that stated by the President. You can judge from this how accurate his other figures are. Any increase in manufactured goods brought about by the Taft amendment would be of minor importance compared with the importance of actually being able to buy them.

Furthermore, the President deliberately misrepresented the effect of my amendment when he said six times that price increases would result immediately or right away. Under the amendment no increase can occur until the Industry Advisory Committee has presented complete figures to prove its case. This would take from 30 to 60 days. Then the Price Administrator is given 60 days in which to examine the figures and fix the amount of the increase. The burden of proof is on the industry. If the Administrator refuses to admit any increase, there is an appeal to the Emergency Court of Appeals, which would take several months more. Long before that, I hope we would be well on the way to the end of all price control. I hope the Administrator would act more promptly, but there is nothing immediate about it. Whereas the President's veto removes all controls of every kind at midnight tonight.

It is significant that the President admits that the Taft amendment would have no direct effect on food or rents. He argues that because other prices would go up food and rents would be bound to rise. I admit that ultimately there would be some effect if other prices rise, but the effect would be about one-tenth of the effect on food and rents of the wage increases already stimulated by the President. Of course, it was impossible to keep price control much longer after the President removed all wage control on VJ-day. Of course, an increase of about $10,000,000,000 in wages and salaries will produce billions of dollars of increase in prices. But the ultimate and unavoidable break-down of price control will result directly from the President's policy, not from act of Congress—certainly not from the minor requirement that manufacturers be allowed to reflect their increased costs in prices.

In short, in the act passed by Congress, the President received complete power to prevent

speculation and speculative increases in price and all increases in rents. We merely reaffirm more vigorously the original principles of the Price Control Act to secure production, yet the President has chosen to plunge the economy of this country into chaos. In such a controversial field where feelings already run high, we cannot hope that the Senate will act without debate, and it should not do so, because the issues to be settled are vital to the welfare of the country. I hope price control will be continued, and I should vote to reenact the bill the President has vetoed, but I am afraid the bill which he will get the next time, if he gets any, may go further toward decontrol than the one he has vetoed. In the meantime there are no price controls. No businessman knows what he should do or what price he should charge. I hope that everyone will exercise the reasonable restraint which Americans always exhibit in a crisis.

The President had a choice between a reasonable transition from price control back to the free enterprise system, on the one hand, and the ending of all OPA powers by veto, on the other. He chose to take all the chances of chaos, followed by speculative rises in price. He chose this course, having been warned by his own Democratic leaders of the necessary result of his policy. He has repudiated their leadership and assumed to write a law for Congress, although the Constitution of the United States gives the Congress power to state the conditions on which price control shall be continued.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the 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. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I had intended to let the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] proceed with the opening statement and explanation of the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the importance of this bill and the Senator's explanation of it, we should have a quorum. I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

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

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

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

The Senator from Washington is recognized.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, Senate bill 1850, commonly called the scientific research bill, is now pending before the Senate.

I wish to invite attention of the Members of the Senate to the fact that the bill has received the endorsement of James B. Conant, president, American Association for the Advancement of Science, president, Harvard University; George F. Zook, president, American Council on Education; Morris Fishbein, editor, Journal of the American Medical Association; Thomas P. Cooper, president, Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, dean, College of Agriculture, University of Kentucky; Isaiah Bowman, chairman, Committee Supporting the Bush Report, president, Johns Hopkins University; Boris Bakhmeteff, chairman of panel on science legislation, Engineers Joint Council for American Institute of Chemical Engineers, American Institute of Electrical Engineers, American Society of Civil Engineers, and American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers; Arthur A. Hauck, president, National Association of State Universities, president, University of Maine; Willard A. Givens, executive secretary, National Education Association; and Harlow Shapley, president, Scientific Research Society of America, and cochairman, Committee for a National Science Foundation.

These men, on behalf of their respective organizations, and after those organizations had held executive committee meetings, unanimously endorsed the pending bill. Their executive committees held conferences on the matter and thereafter, the endorsements were given. I say advisedly that this was done after the conferences were held, because since the joint endorsements were given I have received numerous telegrams from heads of various smaller groups within those organizations, one of which I should like to read. It is directed to me, and states:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 26, 1946.*

Hon. Senator HARLEY KILGORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Referring to the joint statement respecting legislative bill, S. 1850, signed by Dr. Isaiah Bowman and other scientists and which Dr. Boris Bakhmeteff is signing as chairman of Engineers' Joint Councils Panel on Scientific Research Legislation: I wish to advise that this statement reaffirms the views of engineers' joint council respecting S. 1850 and the engineers' joint council maintains its attitude that passage of S. 1850 is urgent and of paramount national importance.

JAMES E. JAGGER,
Secretary, Engineers' Joint Council.

Mr. President, that is a sample of numerous telegrams which I have received, showing that the endorsements to which I have referred are not merely endorsements of individual heads of organizations, but that they are endorsements of the organizations themselves.

I have had the privilege within the past 12 months of being present at numerous of our great State universities, and other educational institutions, at all of which I have spoken personally with members of the faculty, and especially the members of the scientific groups of the faculties. They have all endorsed the principles embraced in the bill, and have stated that they would like to see the bill enacted into law in the form in which it is now before the Senate.

Mr. President, the bill is the outgrowth of more than 4 years of work. It started in the early part of the war when there was the utmost need for research. The research work then undertaken culminated in the atomic bomb, the proximity fuse, and various other inventions. However, in the use of those inventions, and in the research which was carried on in connection with them, we were merely applying the basic studies which had been made, some of them even prior to World War I, which were carried on by our laboratories and the scientists in our universities and elsewhere all over the world. All we did during the last war was to exhaust the reservoir which had been built up. If we will accept the word of many of the men who fought in the Pacific and in other places, we will know that many of the results of our research did not reach them until too late to be of the greatest effect. At that time we had no central body capable of carrying on and coordinating the necessary work involved.

During the Civil War there was created a national organization known as the National Academy of Sciences. As will be recalled, the Civil War was fought with probably a minimum of scientific effort on both sides. It is true that the ironclad ship came out of the Civil War. It is also true that, to some extent, balloons were used for observation purposes. But, in the main, the war was a rehash of the old war of man against man, with very little scientific ruffles added thereto. The Spanish-American War was a rehash of the same situation.

World War I eventually started and we had to create a new scientific organization in order to take care of this country's cause, and do the work which was originally outlined to be done by the National Academy of Sciences. The great difficulty with the National Academy of Sciences was, first, that it had no appropriations; second, it grew to be an honorary group, and, shall I say, self-perpetuating, because its membership, though appointed, had to be composed of men selected from the National Academy itself to replace those who had passed out of the Academy by reason of death or other causes. The work which was performed by the members was purely voluntary and—I say this in no derogation of the Academy—was naturally slow and somewhat cumbersome. So we created a scientific organization for World War I which was really the first scientifically waged war. Other nations built up scientific organizations. Germany had them. England attempted to build up one, and eventually even Russia started to build up a national defense scientific organization. None of those countries realized that the greatest defense of a nation lies in the welfare of the people of

the nation. I care not how many generals and admirals the Nation may have; we cannot have an Army or Navy without men—seamen, privates, sergeants, warrant officers, and others. The strength of a nation lies in its manpower, and its will to accomplish the objective set forth by the nation. Therefore, one of the greatest defense measures which can be advanced is that of building up a strong manpower with the will to defend the country's institutions.

Finally there came World War II. On that occasion we set up several scientific agencies, the chief of which was the Office of Scientific Research and Development. In each case, however, all the scientific agencies were merely using the basic information which had been developed during time of peace.

Mr. President, allow me to suggest that we are going to hear a great deal about industry and its scientific research. Industry—I do not blame it—must look to returns in connection with scientific research from the sale of the results of such research. That naturally precludes many basic research problems which are taken up only by public institutions such as universities, colleges, and government laboratories of various types.

A private industry can only justify itself to its stockholders when it can show results from the research work it conducts. Therefore we have become the greatest nation in the world in applied research, which is the research relating to things which can be sold, but we have become a somewhat backward nation in the case of basic research. We have listened to the siren song, "Business will take care of this." We listened to that siren song in various other forms, and it led us to destruction in basic research lines.

It is my firm conviction that we can no longer afford to delay action on a national science program. The strength of a nation, for peace as well as for war, depends today as never before on the strength of its scientific resources. During the titanic struggle of the past few years, we learned well the lesson that modern warfare is a battle waged in the laboratory as well as in the field. Tanks cannot be met with bare hands; battleships and carriers and submarines cannot be met with rowboats; the atomic bomb cannot be met without scientific research, and, so far, the scientists say that they have not found any way to meet it. We must keep abreast and ahead of all such developments, and, above all, we must remember that it is impossible to have a nation without people. Some seem to think that this Nation of ours is a collection of corporations; some seem to think that it is merely an area of land; some seem to think that it is a group of farmers; some seem to think it is a collection of coal mines; but let me tell you, Mr. President, this Nation of ours is a collection of free individuals and their welfare is of paramount importance to the welfare of the Nation as a whole, because a nation which does not have strong individuals, healthy, well-nourished individual citizens, with something to look forward to, is a very poor nation.

We also know that in time of peace, science presents endless possibilities for advancing the health and welfare of our people. I call attention to the fact that penicillin was discovered 29 years ago, but no practical application was made of it because nobody had the financial backing to go ahead with it, until the war made something of that kind imperative. We have built up resistance to the sulfa drugs to such an extent that we had to have something else to go along with them. Not only must we have adequate research related to military defense, but we must assure a strong, healthy growth of scientific knowledge in all areas, particularly in fundamental research, which has too much been neglected in the United States. Military research cannot flourish alone. Neither can industrial or medical research grow in isolation. All must be based on a well-rounded development of scientific investigation in all fields. No area of science is unrelated to other fields, and out of seemingly useless, theoretical knowledge come the practical inventions of tomorrow.

The failure to have well-rounded research development was one of the difficulties of this war. I well remember one instance which was brought out before the committee. We were importing mica from India by airplane, at a cost of $3,500 a ton when we had thousands of tons of mica in the United States, which we could get almost for the cost of mining plus a little profit. That was because we had never related science to anything else. We developed machines in the course of 3 months to test spotted and clouded mica, and as a result it became unnecessary to import mica for electrical resistance purposes.

Moreover, I point out that we must not place undue emphasis upon military research. Research that might improve the eyesight of our young men is health research, and, as we found out in this war, it is also military research. Research that will develop their strength while we call it health research, is military research. Research that makes for strong groups of individuals is military research. We do not wish to be a Nation of soldiers, nor have we any desire but to live peacefully with our fellow nations of the world. Defense research is essential for our security. But the real purpose of the scientist is to bring our Nation peace and prosperity. Science has created new inventions and processes out of which have grown the great new industries which in turn have created more jobs, comfort and plenty. Science has brought medicine out of the dark ages of a hundred years ago with its ever increasing victories over disease and pain. This is the real task of science—to make a better life for all of the peoples of the world. But, unfortunately, there has been no coordination.

I well remember a surgeon, a friend of mine, who spent 5 years perfecting an operation on the spine for spinal meningitis, and just when the technique had been worked out he ascertained that a serum had been discovered which obviated the operation. Had there been a central agency of some kind with knowledge to advise others that work was going on in the other line, my surgeon friend might have contributed to that work instead of spending his time inventing instruments.

Our task here in the Congress is to provide the best possible legislative framework for a program that will assure the full development of scientific research for our national security and welfare. They are indissolubly linked.

No one will disagree with the objectives of the bill now before the Senate. There may be some disagreement as to the best way to implement these objectives. The National Science Foundation bill, S. 1850, represents a very considerable amount of thought and effort to arrive at the best possible bill to do the job. I believe that S. 1850 will do the job and will do it well.

The present bill is sponsored by eight Senators, two of them Republicans, six Democrats. They are MAGNUSON, JOHNSON of Colorado, PEPPER, FULBRIGHT, SALTONSTALL, FERGUSON, THOMAS of Utah, and myself. All of us worked on the preparation of the bill. Last summer both Senator MAGNUSON and myself introduced legislative proposals for the promotion of scientific research. Those bills were based on extensive studies conducted by the Subcommittee on War Mobilization into the Government's research and development activities during the war period and the needs for the postwar period, and on the recommendations of Dr. Vannevar Bush who, at the request of President Roosevelt, directed a study of the Nation's research needs. Since the objectives and scope of those two bills were similar, joint hearings were held during the month of October and early November of 1945 by the Subcommittees on Science Legislation of the Military Affairs Committee and of the Commerce Committee. Over 100 witnesses were heard, representing the sciences, medicine, education, government administration, and public-interest groups. Many divergent points of view were presented in regard to specific provisions of the bills. Nevertheless, the witnesses agreed all but unanimously on the urgent need for a national science foundation. After these hearings, further joint meetings and discussions with scientists and others led to the preparation of the present bill, S. 1850. This bill was reported out of the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs on February 27, with a concurring report by the subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce.

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

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. HART. Will the Senator advise the Senate how the witnesses who appeared before the joint committee were chosen? Was everyone who requested to be heard called in?

Mr. KILGORE. So far as my knowledge goes, every scientist and everyone else who asked to be heard had an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. HART. May I also ask the Senator if the committee sent out over the Nation a request for scientists or anyone else to come before the committee?

Mr. KILGORE. We communicated with all groups that were listed and also with individual scientists and universities. In other words, the various scientific societies, various scientific committees, and colleges and universities were all advised of the hearing. More than a hundred appeared and testified. I may say also there was only one dissenting voice in the hundred, and that was Dr. Jewett, at that time president of the National Academy of Sciences, vice president of A. T. & T., and president of the Bell Research Laboratories, who felt that there should be no research of any kind, even military research.

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

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say to the Senator from Connecticut that not only did 110 appear at the hearings, but many scientists and laymen interested in this matter, presidents of universities and others, who could not come to the hearings sent long statements. There are two full volumes, and, as the Senator from West Virginia has pointed out, the only dissenting voice was that of one man.

Mr. KILGORE. Let me say, Mr. President, in further explanation to the Senator, that after all the hearings were concluded a committee was formed, consisting of leading scientists, to study the bill. I think the committee was headed by Vannevar Bush and Dr. Isaiah Bowman as cochairmen. We met with Dr. Bowman and Dr. Bush in a conference in which all points in dispute with reference to the bill itself were ironed out, and we departed from the conference with both sides satisfied as to the details of the bill.

Mr. HART. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield further to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. HART. The Senator has mentioned having received testimony from Dr. Jewett. Did the committee ask the other large commercial laboratories, such, for instance, as General Electric and Westinghouse, to present evidence?

Mr. KILGORE. Dr. Langmuir, head of the General Electric Laboratory, testified before the committee, as did Dr. Kettering, of the General Motors Laboratory. I do not know of a single large laboratory which did not have a witness before the committee, and all were in agreement on the need for the enactment of the bill.

Dr. Langmuir was the second witness to appear at the last group of hearings we held, and he had just returned from Russia, where he had been going over the Russian scientific activities, and he testified in a very interesting way on the bill before the committee.

Mr. HART. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KILGORE. On April 9 the Committee on Military Affairs reported favorably and recommended the passage of Senate bill 1850 without amendment, and submitted a report thereon. I hope Senators will read the report because it contains a very detailed explanation of the implementation of the bill.

I can assure Senators that this bill, S. 1850, represents the best efforts of my colleagues and myself, working closely with the Nation's leading scientists and educators, and with the administrative officials of the Government's research agencies.

Let me say, for the information of the Senator from Connecticut, that we had before us the head of the Patent Office, and also leading patent attorneys. In fact, one of the leading patent attorneys, Mr. Will Davis, sat in with the committee in the drafting of the bill, and assisted us in framing a bill which would not amend or affect in any way the patent laws of the United States.

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

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. HART. I thank the Senator for his last statement. Of course, I am probably the least capable Member of the Senate to understand the patent laws, but I should like to ask the Senator concerning the national defense feature of the bill, referring to subdivision (f) on page 19, which embodies reservations which are obviously inserted in the bill to satisfy the military about the publication and dissemination of information.

At another place in the bill there is a statement that all divisions of the foundation shall have full access to all information, scientific or otherwise, which the entire foundation possesses. Does the Senator think that section 5 modifies that provision?

Mr. KILGORE. I think the words "notwithstanding any other provision of this act" constitute a positive prohibition in the act against the dissemination of any information which the President or any person designated for that purpose shall seek to protect.

Mr. HART. Let me further ask the Senator, if it is habit and routine that everything which develops within the foundation shall be immediately known to everyone will not the secrets be out before the necessity for keeping them secret becomes manifest?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I believe what the Senator is speaking of is knowledge being made known to the members of the Board. I think that is the provision the Senator has in mind, which might conflict.

Mr. KILGORE. That national science foundation is proposed "to promote the progress of science and the useful arts." It will do this in several ways.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe the Senator from Connecticut had reference to line 3, on page 8, where the bill reads, "The Board and each such committee shall have full access to all information in the possession of the foundation." Is not that the provision to which the Senator had reference?

Mr. HART. Yes. It says "The Board and each such committee," which seems to include about 150 people.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that is the provision which the Senator felt was in conflict. I merely wanted to identify what the Senator had in mind.

Mr. HART. I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, there has been a gross misunderstanding of the foundation's purpose. In the first place, the foundation is not a research organization within itself. It is a supplementing organization. It is contemplated that the various agencies of Government will proceed with their own research as they have in the past, and when they encounter a situation in connection with which they need further money in order to go ahead with something else which has developed in their research, it will not take an act of Congress to get the money. It will merely have to be shown to the Board that it is in the general interest of the public welfare, of national defense, or health and medicine, and the Board, just as in the case of any other foundation board, may grant the money.

I repeat, Mr. President, the National Science Foundation is proposed "to promote the progress of science and the useful arts." It will do this in several ways. First, by supplementing funds privately and publicly available for scientific research through contracts and agreements with research organizations. The foundation will not operate laboratories. It will not interfere with or supplement existing public or private organizations. We have found, however, that universities and foundations are finding it increasingly difficult to support original work, particularly in the basic sciences.

We have found that only 5 percent of the huge industrial research budget in the coming years will be devoted to fundamental research. Thus the foundation will fill a vital role in supplementing the funds available for research in fields important to our national welfare, but which provide no incentive for private investment or for which private foundations have insufficient resources.

The National Science Foundation would also naturally cover certain fields of applied science. That would particularly apply, I may say to the Senator from Connecticut, to the military phases which are largely applied science. These are principally the fields of medicine and of national defense. The public interest in these fields is evident. Furthermore, the war has shown what tremendous strides can be made in health and medicine when concentrated research effort is made possible by adequate funds and facilities. We cannot afford to ignore the vision which wartime medical research has brought to us of new and greater victories over pain and disease.

Provisions for military research follow the recommendations of the Wilson committee and the bills S. 825 and H. R. 3440 in setting up a mechanism by which the Army and Navy research men can

work closely with civilian scientists in exploring new areas of military importance. This method of operation worked very well in the Office of Scientific Research and Development during the war; and the armed forces, as well as the civilian scientists, feel that a similar body should be continued.

In addition to direct support of research through contracts and other agreements, the foundation would help assure that talented young men and women would have opportunities for education. I may say at that point that we are 5 years behind in our crop of young scientists at the present time, and it is going to take some time and considerable concentrated effort to catch up with that 5-year lag. We were woefully behind even 5 years ago.

The foundation would provide a number of scholarships for undergraduate work, to be granted on a State quota basis and probably administered by the States, as well as a number of graduate fellowships for advanced work and research. I think the undergraduate scholarships are highly essential. We spend tremendous sums of money for scholarships in the Military Academy, sums that I blush to think of. We spend tremendous sums for scholarships in the Naval Academy and in the Coast Guard Academy. Yet, on the basic matter on which those academies may reach this success, the Federal Government spends no money with respect to undergraduate work. Therefore it is highly necessary that we subsidize—and I use that word without apology—the crop of young scientists in this country.

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

Mr. KILGORE. I yield for a question.

Mr. HART. Does the Senator know that the so-called scholarships for West Point and the Naval Academy obligate the men who accept such educational benefits to serve the Government for a considerable number of years after graduation? May I ask if in this case it is the intention to impose any obligation whatsoever upon the recipients?

Mr. KILGORE. None whatsoever, I may say. The recipients are subject, as they always have been, to furnishing themselves as the cannon fodder in the event of war. I think that is enough of an obligation. Every time we get into trouble we call the young men out to fight the war.

As I have said, the foundation would provide a number of scholarships for undergraduate work, to be granted on a State quota basis and probably administered by the States, as well as a number of graduate fellowships for advanced work and research. This provision is particularly important in view of the fact that we now have a deficit of thousands and thousands of trained scientists due to our shortsighted wartime draft policies. By inducting many thousands of young science students into general military service, we have lost a whole generation of chemists, doctors, physicists, engineers, and biologists.

I may say along that line, Mr. President, that one of the most amazing incidents I ever knew of occurred in 1941, when the dean of a very fine scientific institution in the United States recommended to the Army that certain of his scientific students go into certain branches of the service upon induction, and was told, "Well, the infantry trained them and the infantry is going to get them," despite the fact that they had been specially trained by the dean for service in the Signal Corps.

Another important function of the National Science Foundation is the work of the information division. The aim of the foundation will be the fullest possible dissemination for use of scientific and technical information. People like ourselves who are not professional scientists, do not realize the great handicap under which the scientist and technician work due to inadequate and slow publication of new discoveries. Our Nation has too few good technical libraries. Translations and abstracts of foreign scientific literature are completely inadequate. The National Science Foundation, working in cooperation with existing libraries and scientific organizations could do much to remedy this situation, and be of tremendous assistance to the working scientist and the industrial engineer.

I may say, Mr. President, that one of the most astounding things I learned in the investigation was the fact that one corporation, a German trust, I. G. Farben Industrie, had the most complete library on invention of any organization in the world. It was much more complete than that of our own Patent Office. The I. G. Farben knew more about our Patent Office than our own scientists knew. They kept close track of every patent filed and every invention made in every country of the world.

An aspect of the foundation's work which I believe most important is the furtherance of scientific collaboration between nations. The language of science is truly international. The United States, as well as other nations, will benefit greatly from closer relations among the scientists of the world. Exchange of scientific information, exchange of teachers and students, cooperation on research projects of international importance, and closer contact through international scientific meetings and congresses are some of the ways by which this can be achieved.

Now that I have outlined the principal objectives of the National Science Foundation bill, I believe it would be helpful if I briefly summarized its chief provisions.

SECTION 3. NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Subsection 3 (a) establishes the National Science Foundation as an independent agency of the Federal Government. It provides that the foundation be administered by full-time Government officials, the Administrator to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Attention is called to the provision requiring that, before appointing an Administrator, the President shall consult with and receive the recommendations of the National Science Board. While not necessarily binding on the President, who must accept final responsibility for his appointees, this provision is included as a means of assuring harmony between the Administrator and the Board and to emphasize the necessarily high qualifications essential in the Administrator. I may say, Mr. President, it is my conception that the administrator of this fund must not only be a scientist but he must be an administrator of top rank. He will not do research work; but he will have to administer a fund. Although a review of the history of appointments to scientific posts in the Government gives no basis for believing that a President is likely to use this appointment as a political reward, I regard the Administrator of the foundation to be so important as to merit this provision of the bill. I may add, that one does not have to be a member of the bar to be a justice of the Supreme Court of the Nation or of the courts of any State in the Union, so far as I know.

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

Mr. KILGORE. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. I understand that one of the big issues in the preparation of this bill was as to whether there should be an administrator with wide power, which this bill provides for, or whether the ultimate authority should be vested in a board. I understand that that issue represented the difference between the original so-called Magnuson bill and the bill which was introduced by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia on behalf of himself and other Senators. I should like to have the Senator tell me how that difference was resolved, as it has been in this bill, because my scientific friends, who are reflecting their views through me, from Princeton University and other institutions of that kind, are still insisting that they would like to see authority in the Board as it is provided in the amendment in the nature of a substitute which I have offered. I have taken that approach. I think it is most important for us to have all the information possible on that subject, because it seems to me that this point is fundamental in the whole picture. I shall be glad to hear from the Senator on that point.

Mr. KILGORE. Let me ask the Senator from New Jersey if he would like to have this country governed by a board of part-time officials rather than by a President as Chief Executive.

Mr. SMITH. The plan in terms of which we are thinking is that of having a large foundation, which will choose a board of nine who will make the ultimate decision, rather than one administrator to make decisions on these important scientific questions.

Mr. KILGORE. Speaking of foundations, does not the Rockefeller Foundation have a director?

Mr. SMITH. It does.

Mr. KILGORE. Is not he the man who looks after everything? There is a board which meets with him.

Mr. SMITH. He is subject entirely to the board. That is one of the illustrations which my scientific friends point out. They believe that that kind of a

board is essential. They do not feel that Senate bill 1850 in its present form presents that picture. They believe that the Administrator has too much power.

Mr. KILGORE. Who constitutes the board of the Rockefeller Foundation?

Mr. SMITH. As I recall the organization, its board of directors is chosen by the foundation.

Mr. KILGORE. Who controls the foundation?

Mr. SMITH. The Rockefeller Foundation.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes. Who controls the selection of the board?

Mr. SMITH. The members of the foundation, I assume.

Mr. KILGORE. Who are the members of the foundation?

Mr. SMITH. I cannot answer. I do not know who they are.

Mr. KILGORE. I think it will be found in connection with all foundations that those who furnish the funds have representatives who control the selection of the governing board. Is not that correct?

Mr. SMITH. To a certain extent; yes.

Mr. KILGORE. I am speaking about the major foundations, such as the Mellon Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, and others.

Mr. SMITH. I had experience for several years at Princeton University, and I know that the Rockefeller Foundation looked to former President Hibben and others in Princeton for advice as to appointments to the foundation.

Mr. KILGORE. Certainly they look to them for advice.

Mr. SMITH. They use those experts to tell them what kind of people they need.

Mr. KILGORE. We do not want to insult the man whom the people of the United States elect as Chief Executive by saying that he is any less reasonable than the Rockefeller Foundation, which consults with experts. Do we wish to insult the man whom the people of this country chose to be their Chief Executive by saying that he would utterly disregard the scientific people of this country by going contrary to their wishes? The taxpayers are the ones who are putting up the money. It seems to me that the final selection should be with some representative of the taxpayers, just as it is in connection with other foundations. That was the basis upon which the bill was written, to the satisfaction of Dr. Bush and Dr. Bowman in conference. They agreed that they would be satisfied if we required consultation, or at least an opportunity for consultation, with the board of directors prior to appointment. We must realize that there is a slight difference between a private foundation and a public foundation. There is a difference in who puts up the money, in the ultimate aim, and in those who should be selected to head it.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. HART. Coming back to the question which the Senator asked the Senator from New Jersey, I think it would be helpful if we all kept in mind that the general principle upon which such foundations operate is the old one which is very familiar in this country, of a board of directors who really control the administrator, who is the president of the company.

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

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Let me add a word in answer to the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia that this plan of board control has the approval of all these scientists. I have talked with Dr. Bush about this subject, and I have before me a statement which he has made. I quote from Dr. Bush's statement:

> There are several objections in my opinion to this second proposal.

That is, the proposal for a one-man administrator.

> In the first place, all powers are centered in one man as director. This may lead to efficiency in an operating agency, but it is a kind of autocracy which holds grave dangers to the full development of science. As former chairman of the National Advisory Commission for Aeronautics and as director of the OSRD, I have participated in, and been the responsible head of, both kinds of organizations, and I can testify without reservation that a national science foundation will be on a far sounder basis if its policy is determined by a board rather than by one man.

I could quote further from Dr. Bush. I talked with him during the past week. I have been at Princeton University, and have talked with the leaders there.

Let me say to the proponents of the bill that I am entirely in sympathy with what they are seeking to attain. I am merely discussing the best way to make it most effective. It is my own feeling that we are in danger of stultifying the activities of our scientific people if they feel that they are to be hide-bound and governed by someone in Washington who can tell them what the area of their research shall be. That is why I feel that because this is a bill to develop basic research, it requires a different approach than a program for Nation-wide education. This involves research in basic science. The only place applied science is brought in is in connection with military and naval activities, which my friend from Connecticut [Mr. HART] has discussed with me quite fully. There we enter into the area of applied science. I am collaborating with the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who has studied the military and naval aspects of the question, with a view of offering a revised bill, which will take into consideration the field of applied science as it relates to military and naval use.

I have in mind encouraging the scientific man to put forth his best endeavors on special problems. I do not think he will work under a plan headed by one man with as much authority as this bill seems to call for. I am raising that question because it is involved in the debate. I believe that we should deal with it as we go along. It may be that some modification should be made of my plan, or of the plan of the Senator from West Virginia; but we cannot overlook the important question of board control.

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

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me say to the Senator from New Jersey that originally there was the bill which I introduced, providing for scholarships and fellowships. It was very limited. The program was to be administered by a board appointed by the President, following the old normal procedure in universities and foundations. The board was to appoint an administrator. After much research on this problem for many months and years, the Senator from West Virginia introduced a bill providing for a full-time director and a sort of advisory board. Most of our scientific friends, as well as educators, have the feeling that the highest type of men cannot be persuaded to serve on a so-called advisory board, because they would have very little to say about what the administrator or the director should do. This question being so vital, it was felt that some authority should be placed in the board. That was one of the bones of contention in the original hearings, as the Senator from West Virginia has pointed out.

The statement by Dr. Bush, which has just been read by the Senator from New Jersey, is a correct statement. There are several other statements on the question. But because of the fact that we became involved in many broad problems of science affecting the public itself, and because of the fact that we have now embarked upon a program which may call for a great deal more of the taxpayers' money than originally contemplated, it was thought that the President of the United States, whoever he might be at the time, should have some authority, inasmuch as he would have the responsibility.

Therefore, after many meetings with scientists, as well as laymen, who, like the Senator from New Jersey, are basically in favor of such a program, and after much testimony from the Director of the Budget, Bernard Baruch, and several others, we finally agreed, because of the scope of this bill, that this method would give the Board a great deal of authority, and would enable the Executive to feel that he would have some authority, within his responsibility for the expenditure of the taxpayers' money. I believe that the mechanics would be that under the pending bill the Board would give to the President five or six names, and it would say to him, "Here are the names of those whom we suggest to be the Administrator." Of course, the President would not need to follow their suggestions. But I cannot conceive of a situation in which a lay President would not want the advice of the great scientific and lay leaders who would compose this board.

It was felt that such an arrangement would be sufficient and would create a good liaison. Some testified later that perhaps the arrangement now proposed would be even better, because in the beginning we had only the tools.

In the present situation we find ourselves confronted with somewhat the same predicament as that which confronted us the other day in connection with the OPA bill, namely, that we must either accept all of the proposal or reject all of it. However, some feel that the system now proposed would be even a better one. So far as I know, most of these eminent men have endorsed the principle of administration laid down in Senate bill 1850.

I hope that explains the matter to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I am glad to have that explanation. I shall not delay the Senator from West Virginia further at this time. We shall have the subject before us again.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, at our committee meetings the suggestion was that the President should consult with and receive the recommendations of the National Science Board. While not necessarily binding on the President, who must accept final responsibility for his appointees, this provision is included as a means of assuring harmony between the Administrator and the Board and to emphasize the necessarily high qualifications essential in the Administrator, as I stated before. Although a review of the history of appointments to scientific posts in the Government gives no basis for believing that appointment to this post is likely to degenerate into a political matter, I think it would be an insult to the people of the United States to say that a man whom they elected as President of the country would make an appointment of that sort.

We also considered the alternative proposal of vesting the powers of the foundation in a board or commission of full-time Government employees, but we believe that the organization recommended in this bill represents a more efficient form of administration, and that by utilizing the part-time services of larger numbers of scientists on the National Science Board and on the divisional scientific committees, and on other advisory bodies, it makes for an even fuller participation of the Nation's scientists in the program of the foundation.

Let me ask the Senator a question at this point. Three alternatives were available: A board composed of full-time Government employees or directors; a board composed of part-time directors; or an administrator. Realizing that on a full-time basis we could not get the type of men whom we had to have as members of the board of directors, but that we would have to take them as part-time directors, and realizing that the ramifications of this matter were so great that some executive would have to carry it on, we agreed upon having a single administrator who would serve with a board of directors.

Let me call attention to the fact that on the board of directors will be the chairman of all the divisions, and those divisions are to be composed exclusively of scientists. All the planning and all the detailed scientific work is to be done in the divisions. They prepare and submit the plans. The board of directors does not do that. The heads of the divisions or chairmen of the divisions draw up and present the plans for their own divisions. Those men are composed exclusively of scientists, either part-time or full-time. The head of each division can call in anyone he wishes to call in to build up his program. Then the chairman of the division goes on the board of directors and advises with the Administrator. That is the solution which we finally have worked out as the best working way to handle the matter on a governmental basis. We cannot handle it exactly as we would handle a private foundation and fix responsibility. The great weakness of the OEM, for instance, was divided responsibility. That has always been a serious weakness of every Government agency headed by a board of executive power. A board is a good means of obtaining a cross section of views; but for administrative efficiency a single head is desirable. We never yet have seen a commission successfully handle a department.

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

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I do not visualize the particular problem which is faced here as something like the problem faced by the Interstate Commerce Commission or a board of that kind.

Mr. KILGORE. No.

Mr. SMITH. I wish to see the basic policy determined by the Board which represents the scientific groups. In my proposal I am taking the National Academy of Sciences as the basis, and that academy would suggest to the President what the scientific group should be. Sixty people are in it, I believe. They would select a board of nine. Now the Senator from West Virginia is suggesting that there be an administrator appointed by the President to give them orders.

As I read the bill, the Administrator would have wide control in respect to setting up committees and determining what should be done. I do not think any one man can be a proper means of determining what shall be done in the way of scientific research in America.

A number of prominent men have made this criticism of the bill. Their criticism of this bill is simply based on their fear that the natural and inevitable result of such an arrangement would be to stultify the advancement and development of scientific research.

Mr. KILGORE. I wonder whether the Senator from New Jersey will submit their names for the RECORD, because in view of all the endorsements of the bill which we have received, I should like to know who are the persons who take a different view. Before the committee adjourned, an agreement was worked out completely to Dr. Bush's satisfaction. He expressed himself as perfectly satisfied. So did Dr. Bowman and various others.

So I should like to know who are the persons who are dissatisfied.

Mr. SMITH. I have talked at some length with Dr. Bush, and I talked to Dr. Luther P. Eisenhardt, of Princeton, last week. He is on the board of the National Academy of Sciences. I have also talked to Dr. Hugh Taylor, of the National Academy of Sciences, who now is dean of the Graduate School of Princeton University, and formerly was head of its department of chemistry.

Mr. KILGORE. How many of those men are members of the National Academy of Sciences?

Mr. SMITH. Practically all of them are.

Mr. KILGORE. I thought so. Did the Senator from New Jersey know that a poll was taken by the National Academy of Sciences? Does the Senator from New Jersey know about that?

Mr. SMITH. No; I do not.

Mr. KILGORE. They said they felt that the National Academy of Sciences should handle this matter through an agency of its own. According to my recollection, only about six scientists said that should be done, but a great number of scientists said it should not be done.

Mr. SMITH. I agree with that. I am not claiming that they should manage this matter. But I thought we should give consideration to the source from which will be obtained the names of the men who shall be the fundamental determinants of policy in this matter. That is what I am referring to. I am afraid to leave the matter in the hands of an administrator with as much power as this bill gives.

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

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, men of the kind we have been speaking of—Dr. Bush and Dr. Bowman, and most of the witnesses—would prefer a board-type of administration. But at the time when we made the suggestion, we were dealing with only scholarships and fellowships. We were not then dealing with the military and Government branches, and we did not anticipate the scope of scientific research and grants-in-aid.

Although the men of whom we have been speaking would prefer a board-type of administration, they feel that in other circumstances, such as those which now exist, possibly a combination of a board and an administrator would be better. It is rather hard to write the exact terms.

I will say to the Senator from New Jersey that after many hearings, both the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and I were stuck. My original proposal was for a board. We eventually went to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, and he sat with us and finally worked out this language for us, which was agreeable to all sides because of the fact that the matter has developed into other fields.

It is true, as the record will show, that on the basis of the original concept they would prefer to have a scientific program for the Nation conducted by a board of their own scientific, established people. But under this bill we go beyond that field a great deal, and they realized that, and they are in favor of it. They think the arrangement now proposed will take care of the matter.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, perhaps my difficulty is that it seems to me this bill goes further than we should go at this time. I am simply seeking aid for basic science or pure science. I am not thinking of applied science at all. Aside from the military needs, applied science can be taken care of by the industries and plants. I do not wish to help that at all. I wish to help basic science. That is what needs help.

Under the second part of the bill, I wish to help our military and naval program. The distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has prepared and introduced a bill of that nature, and we are incorporating it as part 2 of the bill which I shall present.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I think that will be unnecessary, because since the hearings were held representatives of the War Department, the Navy Department, and other interested agencies have testified that they are in favor of this plan, and they have testified that this plan will take care of the problem.

Mr. KILGORE. A certain scientist, working for the Rockefeller Foundation on cancer research, discovered a new serum. It did not at that time affect cancer. But that scientist insisted on working on the new serum. Therefore, he was compelled to seek aid from some other source, because the Rockefeller board would not allow him to pursue his research while working for them. Incidentally, that scientist developed his serum which is of immense value.

I conceive the Administrator's job to be of an administrative nature. He does not direct the scientific committees. In the first place, XYZ university lays out a program, which is not submitted to the administrator, but to the particular division to which the program applies. That division goes over it and examines it. It is composed utterly and entirely of scientists, most of whom have been gathered from the colleges, universities, and various laboratories of the country. They decide whether or not the program has merit. If it has merit they send it up, and the available funds are divided on the basis of the program submitted by the various scientific divisions. The top picture is largely one of enforcement. That is, they must see to it, for example, that military secrets are not involved, and that the information is properly disseminated. They must decide also when public facilities may be used, and when private facilities may be used on the recommendation of the scientists below. They must also decide what is the best contract that can be worked out.

I may say to the Senator that the Administrator's job is largely a business one. It is similar to the job of a business manager of a large hospital. He has an advisory board with whom he consults. The real work is done at the scientific level. That is how we finally convinced the scientists that we were on the right track. They are to pass on the question of programs, fellowships, scholarships, and what should be done and what should not be done. They constitute the funneling process. The big question at the top is, How much money can we devote to this program, how much must be spent, and how shall it be administered? Secondly, the information developed must be disseminated through proper sources.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I presume that the fundamental difference between the Senator and myself is that he would have the administrator appointed by the President.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes; to handle all the public funds.

Mr. SMITH. But that still does not make him independent of the scientific board. My program calls for the board to be nominated by the National Science Foundation. There would then be a sub-board to be composed of nine, and they would choose a director as their employee.

Mr. KILGORE. Why have the President appoint the board?

Mr. SMITH. Because it is the foundation that controls the research.

Mr. KILGORE. No. That is a policy which has been pursued in this country too much of late. That would require the President to be responsible for a group of persons over whom he had no discretion or control. If we are going to make any provision of that kind, why not let the National Science Foundation run the show? Why go through a formality? Why use a cloak or smokescreen by having the President nominate someone who has been selected by someone else, and then hold him responsible for the activities of the person whose selection he had nothing to say about?

Mr. SMITH. He appoints the persons who have been nominated by the foundation. What we are trying to do is to encourage the scientific people of the country to pursue research which they believe is essential to the proper welfare of the Nation as a whole.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes; but under the program which the Senator suggests, the President would have nothing to say or do except to sign on the dotted line.

Mr. SMITH. I believe that in all similar cases the President takes the advice and judgment of others.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes; but he is not bound by it.

Mr. SMITH. I believe that he would be bound by it no more under my plan than under any other plan.

Mr. KILGORE. Does not the Senator think that we get away from one picture, one phase? We assume the attitude, for example, of a certain distinguished railroad president who, at one time, said "The public be damned." We are perhaps too apt to think this program is merely for the benefit of the scientists alone, and forget the fact that the public is also being considered. The people are the ones who put up the money.

Mr. SMITH. If the Senator will yield——

Mr. KILGORE. Wait until I finish, please. We get completely away from the fact that there is a public to be considered in connection with this matter. The scientists gain the rewards of their labor from the same public, and at the same time they are seeking to benefit the public; at least, that is true if they are good scientists. We must realize that this entire picture involves not only one side but two. There is the side of the public, the citizenry for whom the program is established; and there is the side of the scientist who is necessary in order to make the program operate successfully. Both sides must be taken into consideration, and I believe that both must be represented.

I would be more inclined to go along with the Senator in his theory with relation to the National Academy of Sciences if it were not a self-perpetuating board, as one might say, or a scientific oligarchy. In other words, if the board were composed only of men who had attained certain standards among scientists, and if every scientist who had attained those standards were a member of the board, I should look upon it more favorably. But we must realize that the membership is limited in number, and it elects its own members, although again we go through the farcical procedure of having the President appoint them even though he does not have a thing in the world to say about them. I may say that there is a distinct schism in the scientific field with regard to that one point.

Mr. SMITH. I do not know of any abuses by the scientists in the academy, I am trying only to suggest a way in which the results which we are seeking may be achieved. But I cannot overlook the fact that the paramount interest must lie in the public.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes; the public pays the bill.

Mr. SMITH. There would be no purpose in having the proposed research work done if it were not for the public.

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct. But if I may interrupt the Senator again, we must also agree that a responsibility must be fixed at some place. Am I not correct?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. The responsibility must be fixed for proper performance. Has the Senator ever seen responsibilities placed upon a nine-man board without some member ducking his responsibility and saying, "I am not to blame." I believe that it is necessary to have one man do the administering and pin responsibility and authority upon him for seeing that the results are accomplished. Responsibility and authority must go together. Since the President is the Chief Executive of the Nation, he is the man who should have the responsibility and authority of seeing that the man under him, the man who is to have charge of this work, is just like the head of a Government department. He must perform properly. In order to do that under this bill, the scientists must be satisfied or, because of a lack of cooperation, the whole venture will fail.

Mr. SMITH. I agree with the Senator, but, in my judgment, we cannot give one man authority and responsibility in a field where circumstances are too intangible. If we want to get the maximum results, we must allow the most remote scientist to explain, through his colleagues, that he has something of merit.

Under this bill it is my judgment that the Administrator has too much power to prevent an outcropping of the inventive genius which we should encourage.

Mr. KILGORE. He does not handle that except through a committee.

Mr. SMITH. Who controls those committees? We have in our bill committees which perhaps have the same function, but I think they are appointed under a different system. But I do not wish to delay the Senator. I just presented the issue to show where we differ.

Mr. KILGORE. We have discussed this very thoroughly.

Most essential to a National Science Foundation program is the active participation in its direction by as many of our scientists as possible. Section 3 provides for a full-time operating staff which will necessarily consist chiefly of scientists working as full-time Government employees. Section 4 provides for a parallel structure of advisory boards which will make possible participation in the work of the Foundation by large numbers of scientists who cannot give full time.

In this manner the regular staff of the Foundation will be continuously stimulated by contact with working scientists who would be regularly consulted. To prevent these advisory groups from becoming perfunctory bodies, regular and frequent meetings are required and their recommendations will be made public as they desire.

The National Science Board will advise the Administrator in regard to over-all policies and programs. The Board is composed of nine persons appointed by the President, with the advice of the Senate, from among persons who are especially qualified to promote the broad objectives of the Foundation. In addition, the Board will include the chairman of the eight divisional scientific committees, who will be particularly familiar by virtue of their position with the specialized problems of the Foundation.

At the divisional level the divisional scientific committees serve a function comparable to that of the Board for the Foundation as a whole. Members of these committees are to be appointed by the Administrator with the advice and approval of the Board. This administrative set-up will result in the activities of the Foundation being subjected to the critical and public scrutiny of the Nation's scientists.

I want the Senator from New Jersey to hear this. He was talking about the Board. The members of the divisional committees are to be appointed by the Administrator, with the advice and consent of the Board. They must have the approval of the Board, just as Presidential appointments have to have the approval of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH. What does advice and approval of the Board mean?

Mr. KILGORE. They must vote to approve them. The names must be submitted to the Board, and approved by the Board.

Mr. SMITH. They are appointed by the Administrator.

Mr. KILGORE. We go back to the constitutional language, practically, as to the appointment of all executive officials, except instead of using the words "advice and consent," we say "advice and approval." The names are submitted to the Board for approval, after they have been advised with.

I repeat, this administrative set-up will result in the activities of the Foundation being subjected to the critical and public scrutiny of the Nation's scientists. I believe that this provision will give scientists as a whole greater voice in the affairs of the national science program than would result from any proposed alternative form of administrative organization.

Section 5 authorizes the Administrator to enter into contracts or other financial arrangements to finance in whole or part research and development activities to be carried on by universities, colleges, public or private research laboratories, and other Government agencies. The nature of scientific research requires that the Foundation be free to support research under a variety of financial arrangements and be granted considerable flexibility with respect to the nature of the financial arrangement employed. Thus, the Administrator may enter into contracts for highly specific projects or make relatively nonspecific grants for the support of broad programs of research in a particular field.

In authorizing the Foundation to support research and development in other Government agencies, it should be understood that such support will be supplementary to the regular research budgets of these Government agencies.

Subsection 5 (b) guarantees a minimum allocation of funds for medical research and for research in fields essential to national defense. The obvious importance of these two fields of applied science to the welfare and security of the Nation justifies this provision.

Let me say, Mr. President, that the reason for inserting that provision was the experience we had prior to the war just ended and the experience we have had in peacetime, when research, particularly in the case of national defense, was starved by the Congress. By inserting this provision we could give the Foundation additional financial nourishment, which would help it carry on in its fields, in spite of any sudden economy program of Congress.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senator, but I wish to make a note here that I propose to comment later on subsection (c), page 11, as to distribution among the States. I am one of those who are heartily in favor of the educational program which has been proposed in Senate bill 181. I helped to prepare that program, and I heartily agree with it. That is a matter which should assist the cost of education in the States. I am seeking to give help in matters of basic science which may come to us from the remote corners of the country, may come from the East, West, North, or South. I cannot see any point whatever in a provision of this kind for spreading this all over the States of the Union as though it were an education-help program. I am in favor of the education-help programs, but not through this bill. That should be handled in our educational program, which is covered in different legislation.

Mr. KILGORE. Then the Senator's argument is that we should have a number of programs, instead of trying to have a central reservoir from which we could help existing programs. Is that the idea?

Mr. SMITH. I wish to make this perfectly clear. I say that when we have a foundation set up, it is not a case of scattering fire all over the Nation, it is a question of giving out projects to the experts, and following through with the projects. It is not a matter of providing educational funds, for they are provided for in a totally different bill, and I think we are confusing our whole picture by providing them in a science bill.

Mr. KILGORE. Let me ask the Senator a question along that line. What does the Senator conceive as scientific progress in this country? How would he define adequate scientific progress?

Mr. SMITH. I suppose the Senator means the researches of scientific men in their respective fields, conferring together to determine what those researches should be, determining what are the best lines to follow in pursuit of national defense, the best lines to follow in medicine, in health, and so on. It is when we find the work being done we are satisfied, and we should not scatter the funds. We have not enough in the way of funds to scatter all over the Union and say, "Start some scientific progress." We are getting at a totally different problem. I am in favor of spreading education all over this country, but that has nothing to do with the pending bill. It is not an education bill, it is a scientific-research bill. That is my point.

Mr. KILGORE. How is it possible to carry on scientific research without scientists? Does the Senator believe that Dr. Bush, Dr. Jewett, and others will live forever?

Mr. SMITH. No. As to the scholarship program, I might suggest that we start at the fellowship level, where we can develop real scientists. I do not think we can subsidize them as scientists when they are still in their school life, because the boys in school have not gone far enough for us to see whether they are individuals we should support. It is when we get to the fellowship level, the advanced students, that we find the real scientific prospect whom we can support. We cannot have a Nation-wide program in science. We cannot afford to pay for that, and the Federal Government should not be asked to do that. Private institutions are doing it. We have just introduced a bill, Senate 181, to give grants to States which are following that line. But that has nothing to do with the particular problem before us.

Mr. KILGORE. Senate bill 181 applies to high schools, does it not, and to the grade schools?

Mr. SMITH. It applies to education.

Mr. KILGORE. It applies to the common schools, the public schools?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. And does not apply to the colleges or universities in any way, shape, or form?

Mr. SMITH. No; we start with the public schools.

Mr. KILGORE. Let me call the Senator's attention to a statement in the RECORD made by Dr. Jewett and a statement made by Dr. Bush—I cannot now name the others—who said the only real research ever made that accomplished anything was made by scientists prior to reaching the age of 35. They admit it is the youth among scientists who produce. A man who passes 35 has either made his mark or has settled down to drudging. It is the young man who forges ahead. He is not too set in his ways, as we are here. He will go into new fields and discover new things, and is willing to have the reputation of making a mistake, as he is gambling for the reputation of being a success. If we do not help that type, science languishes, basic science to the contrary notwithstanding. Those are the men who understand basic science.

Mr. SMITH. I regret to say the Senator misunderstands my position entirely. I say that the educational institutions have been sifting students of the high school level and sifting students of the scholarship level. I do not think the Federal Government is called upon to send boys to colleges in every State in this Union to get their undergraduate work. That is being done by the State institutions, by the foundations, by the public school systems. We are getting that foundation laid through the whole public school system. We are in a different field when we get into scientific research. The boys have gone through their undergraduate courses, they have demonstrated that they are scientists of promise. It is then as graduate fellows that we should help them. It is the boy who is 21, not the man who is 35, that I am talking about. It is the boy 21 to 30 who has become a greater student that I refer to, rather than the boy 18 to 21, who is only an undergraduate scholar that the Senator has put in his bill. There is the real difference. I have discussed this matter with many scientific men. They say there is no formula by which the young budding scientist of 18 can be marked. There may be some geniuses, but what I am getting at is that we should funnel these people during the undergraduate years, and when we find those who are recommended by our universities and State colleges and schools throughout the country, then those are the ones we should mark for further advances. They cannot be covered by any other formula that may be made.

Mr. KILGORE. Has the Senator from New Jersey checked the Department of Agriculture record on research; how they carry on their program?

Mr. SMITH. No.

Mr. KILGORE. I would suggest that the Senator look into that.

Mr. SMITH. They have a definitely different program. I know what the Senator is referring to.

Mr. KILGORE. No; it goes extensively into basic research and also into scholarships and the promotion of such things. True, the Department of Agriculture does not go into the matter to the extent which we propose. But I think the Senator misunderstands the purpose of the bill also. I think probably the Senator has not carefully read it. The real way to produce scientists, regardless of whether scholarships are being paid or not—and I am not talking about scholarships now—is to give them research work to do. Scientists cannot be taught out of a textbook at the upper level, particularly in colleges. There is not any scientific teacher that is worth his salt who is not a research worker, who does not do his own research work. I think the Senator from New Jersey will agree with me on that.

Mr. SMITH. I agree.

Mr. KILGORE. No lawyer is worth his salt who is not a good research man. A teacher and a leader cannot rely on the research of others. The purpose of spending this money in the educational institution is not simply with the idea of providing scholarships, but with the idea of eliciting from the institutions what projects they are particularly embarking upon and what facilities they have to enable them to pursue the projects. They may be projects attendant upon health and medicine. They may be projects dependent upon other general welfare work. That is the subdivision we propose. It is not the subdivision of educational funds. It is the subdivision of money provided for the allocation of projects to States and institutions in such a way that the greatest possible opportunity will be given not only to the students but to the faculty to carry on original research and to work on original research programs. Not only that, but it was believed that the best results could not be obtained by putting only one laboratory to work on a problem. By having three or four laboratories working better results are obtained, as was found during the war and as has been found to be true in the past. So by spreading these problems into publicly owned and nonprofit institutions we will get the best results for the money spent in building up that absolutely essential ingredient to our scientific progress, namely, the scientist himself, by giving scientific students something on which to do research work.

Mr. SMITH. My feeling is that the program the Senator is presenting here will simply give us the opportunity and the obligation to subsidize what may be a lot of second- and third-class work, when the purpose of the bill is simply to get going the basic things that must be done right away. Perhaps in the course of time we will get to the elaborate program that the Senator's bill suggests. But my guess is that it is definitely wrong to do them now. My guess is that it is wrong to try to include all the States and educational institutions. To do so is entirely outside of what we are trying to do, which is to provide a basis for scientific research. I have talked it over with many individuals in the educational field, and they think that should not be done now. The only reason for support of such provision is because it may obtain votes for the bill, because every State will receive a portion of the fund, and will help the passage of such a bill. That is not a worthy motive, and the Senator will admit it is not a worthy motive.

What we want to do is to support basic scientific research, and such should not be located in every one of the States of the Union, should not be located here, there, and everywhere, but should be concentrated to get first-rate results. It should be concentrated in the hands of a scientific group which must take care of this problem, and they will not care whether the work is located in Oshkosh or somewhere else. Scattering the fire will cause second- and third-rate results, and I am afraid it will result in the spending of a great deal of money uselessly.

Mr. KILGORE. Does the distinguished Senator know the present dean of the College of Engineering of the University of Chicago?

Mr. SMITH. I am sorry I do not.

Mr. KILGORE. No one else did until the university hired him. He was a teacher of engineering at an absolutely unheard of little college in the State of Colorado. Yet he has been an outstanding success as dean of the College of Engineering of the University of Chicago. No one can tell what is in the package by the paper wrapped around it. I venture to say that if we go back in the history of the—shall I called it Ivy League?—we will find that those colleges were at one time third- or fourth- or second-grade institutions of learning. But the opportunity to go ahead has built them up. Would the Senator deprive other sections of the country of this opportunity, simply to build up a few institutions?

Mr. SMITH. Certainly not.

Mr. KILGORE. That is the Senator's attitude.

Mr. SMITH. It is not my attitude at all, because as a member of the administration in Princeton we looked all over this country to get men to fill our faculty, men of promise. That is what my measure would do. It is not an attempt to build up a so-called Ivy League. I regret the Senator has said that.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator is objecting to the distribution of money among the educational institutions of the United States on an equitable basis, on the ground that by so doing some of the money might get into a third- or fourth-rate institution.

Mr. SMITH. No; I am not doing that at all.

Mr. KILGORE. I beg the Senator's pardon. I misunderstood him, then. My whole argument was based on that assumption.

Mr. SMITH. I said we would obtain second- or third-rate results if we simply scattered our money, when it ought to be concentrated to get first-rate results. That is the point of my remarks. Some of the very best men will be gotten in the smallest institutions of the country. We know them and we can find them and subsidize them. There is no discrimination against them whatever. But that

does not mean that in order to get those few stars we have to subsidize every State and every institution in the country. We cannot afford to do it. It is not a sound Federal policy. The thing to do is to be discriminative. That is the way to deal with the problem.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator again misunderstands me. I am not talking about the development of the teachers. I am talking about the development of the students. I will admit that money has been wasted in the past, and there will be money wasted in the future, and there is money being wasted in the largest institutions of the country right now, by holding students in line because papa has a lot of money and may make a nice donation to the fund. Bed space is being wasted in that way. But I maintain that if we get down to selectivity we depart from democracy, we depart from the principle on which this Government is founded, we create a scientific oligarchy, and we wreck the whole purpose of the measure.

Mr. SMITH. I am not afraid of the good faith and the devotion of the scientists of this country. I am only asking that the thing be centered through them, and that there not be a Nationwide scattering of funds just to cover every corner of the country.

Mr. KILGORE. I agree with the Senator with respect to the scientists. I am willing to trust to the good sense and the honesty and integrity of the scientists of this country. But does the Senator confine that expression of confidence to the group in the National Academy of Sciences, to which reference has been made, or does the Senator's expression apply to all other scientific groups? I may say there are hundreds of them, and there are among them very capable and able men. Are we only to pick out one group and say "You are the arbiters of the scientific destiny of all the rest of us"? When the Senator is giving his expression of confidence is he talking about the scientists of the National Academy only, or is he talking about the vast body of other capable scientists who have not been so lucky as to have been selected to that august body?

Mr. SMITH. I am talking about all of them, and they can all be located. There is no problem in connection with that.

Mr. KILGORE. I may say that the Senator is more of an optimist than I am, because I have testimony in my hands that after 3 years of intensive work by the National Roster of Scientists they admit that they did not have listed more than 30 percent of the scientists of the United States. They have been unable to list any more of them. When the Senator says they can all be located, I think the statement is somewhat in conflict with the statement of the eminent college presidents who headed the National Roster for 4 years.

The future development of science in America depends in large measure on the strength of the laboratories of the Nation's universities and research institutions. Therefore, section 5 (c) provides that at least 50 percent of all research funds expended by the Foundation shall be used to support research in nonprofit organizations—25 percent to be distributed on a geographical basis and an additional 25 percent irrespective of location of the organization submitting the research proposals. This should result, not only in furthering the development of science but also in general strengthening of our institutions of higher education. The provision that 25 percent of all research funds—excluding national defense—expended by the Foundation shall be apportioned to each State on the basis of an automatic formula is included in order to assure an equitable geographic distribution. Many of our smaller institutions located in the less populous States and Territories are in serious need of support for their scientific work. Many of them are strategically located to carry on unique and greatly needed types of research, for example, research in tropical diseases in Puerto Rico, meteorological studies in Alaska. I had the pleasure and privilege of going through the University of Alaska, and I know the handicaps under which they work, and the funds they need for the work there. The junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] was with me on that trip.

It would be a serious mistake for all of this financial aid to be concentrated in a few large institutions, since such maldistribution would result in a serious imbalance in the quality of higher education available in various parts of the country.

Some witnesses at the hearings feared that Federal support of science would place restrictions on the traditional freedom of scientific research. Such development would be a disaster both to science and the Nation. Subsection 5 (e) directs the Administrator to take steps to eliminate any restraints on scientific freedom.

Constant complaints were made that scientists in Government bureaus were not permitted to express their views. I may say to the Senator from Connecticut that such complaints were not limited to the Army and Navy. They came from all bureaus. So subsection 5 (e) allows every scientist who uses the foundation's funds to go about his work in any manner he sees fit with the sure knowledge that the foundation will stand behind his right to freedom of expression and research. Furthermore, the investigator is permitted to publish his personal views and conclusions, except on projects restricted in the interests of national security. This subsection will encourage the development of new ideas and scientific methods. It is in keeping with that tradition of freedom which is the very lifeblood of science. It was placed in the bill at the request of leading scientists, both those in the Government and those connected with other public institutions, as well as those in private laboratories.

SECTION 6. SCHOLARSHIPS AND FELLOWSHIPS

The success of any program of scientific research is dependent on the availability of adequate numbers of well-trained personnel. Almost every witness urged the provision for a broad program of scholarships and fellowships.

Section 6 would provide not only for undergraduate scholarships but for graduate and postdoctoral fellowships. Recipients of these awards are to be chosen solely on the basis of aptitude for scholarly pursuits.

It has not seemed wise to include specific provisions governing the procedure for selecting recipients of scholarships and fellowships nor to specify the mechanics by which this program would be administered. Again, to assure an equitable geographic distribution of funds, provision is made to permit the establishment of State quotas.

SECTION 7. REGISTER OF SCIENTIFIC PERSONNEL

The experience of war agencies has demonstrated the importance of placement facilities for scientific personnel. The success and usefulness of the National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel and of the Office of Scientific Personnel suggest that the foundation should maintain an up-to-date register of trained personnel which would be particularly useful—

First. In meeting the personal needs of its own programs.

Second. In placing the scientific personnel trained through the foundation's programs of scholarships and fellowships.

Third. In selecting scientific personnel to meet the Nation's need in time of war or other national emergency.

SECTION 8. USE AND DISSEMINATION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

Evidence presented at the hearings indicated that the progress of science is largely dependent on the full availability and the prompt dissemination of scientific information. Subsection 8 (a) directs the Administrator to maintain a control file of all federally financed research projects and research findings, to publish all useful materials, and authorizes him to cooperate with libraries, other governmental agencies, and scientific publications in a broad program designed to further the dissemination and use of scientific information.

We regard it essential that any legislation involving the expenditure of public funds shall include assurance that such expenditures be used for the general welfare and not reserved for the benefit of any special group. There has been no uniform policy with respect to the commercial rights to patents arising out of federally supported research. I am convinced that a uniform basic policy must be established in the national interest: Dedication of all fruits of Federal research to the public which has paid for the development. This policy is in accord with the traditions of free exchange of information among scientists and it seems to be the most logical and business-like solution to the problem.

The first sentence of subsection 8 (c) provides that all patent rights now held by the United States Government shall be made available to the public on a nonexclusive, royalty-free basis to the extent that the Government is entitled to do so under the rights held by it. This provision will have an important immediate effect because it will enable the making available to the public of the benefits of

many important inventions made under Government contracts and by Government employees during the war.

For example, under contracts of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, the Government has received title to many patents in the field of microwave radar, rocket propellants, proximity-fuze developments, devices that were important in antisubmarine warfare, and in other important fields. Except for any such inventions that remain classified for security reasons and are, therefore, exempted under section 8 (f) from the requirement of public dedication so long as that classification remains, all such wartime inventions owned by the Government can now be made available for use by the general public. It must be remembered that such inventions may remain classified.

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

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. When the Senator was engaged in a colloquy with the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART] he referred to subsection (e) on page 13, relative to elimination of restraints upon free expression of scientific views. I understood the Senator to say that there was a provision in the bill for national security.

Mr. KILGORE. There is.

Mr. FERGUSON. What section is that, so that the RECORD may be clear?

Mr. KILGORE. I will say to the Senator from Michigan that we discussed that question previously. It is subsection (f) of section 8, on page 19.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator feel that that is sufficient protection?

Mr. KILGORE. Unquestionably. We have discussed that question. Subsection (f) of section 8, on page 19, reads as follows:

> (f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the President, or any person designated for that purpose by him, may exempt from the requirements of this act relating to dedication to the pubic, publication, dissemination, making available, or reporting information, data, patents, inventions, or discoveries relating to or produced in the course of federally financed research or development or in which the United States holds any rights, if and so long as the President or such designated person determines that such exemption is essential in the interest of national security.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would it not be well, in subsection (e) of section 5, on page 13, to refer to subsection (f) of section 8, on page 19, so that there might be no question about the national security?

Mr. KILGORE. I feel that the words "notwithstanding the other provisions of this act" superimpose that subsection over subsection (b) of section 5, on page 13, but I am perfectly willing to accept an amendment in some such language as "except as provided in subsection (f) of section 8."

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what I have in mind, so that there may be no question about it.

Mr. KILGORE. I do not think there is any question about it; but, in order to avoid any question, I am perfectly willing to agree to an amendment to that effect. This provision was inserted at the request of the scientists themselves who wanted—except for national defense—the ability to discuss their findings among themselves. They said that they had been handicapped in expressing their opinions.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree wholeheartedly, but I think there is one exception, and that is national defense.

Mr. KILGORE. I agree with the Senator. The scientists also accepted that limitation. They said, "We do not want to discuss national defense; but with regard to everything else, we believe that we ought to have the right to discuss it publicly or privately."

In addition, all other patents to which the Government has title through the operations of other governmental agencies will be made freely available to the public. Therefore, there will be provided for the first time by statute a policy for the administration of Government-owned patents by all governmental agencies.

Although patents in the field of atomic energy now owned by the Government are covered by the provisions of section 8 (c) and thus would be available to the public, it is assumed that all such inventions will be exempted under section 8 (f) until legislation is enacted covering the field of atomic energy.

The provision of the subsection 8 (c) should not deprive research organizations or private industry of their just property rights in inventions developed in the course of Government contracts. Section 8 (d) attempts to provide for an equitable distribution of patent rights resulting from such cooperative projects and allows for contractual exceptions to the basic policy of public dedication in those cases where an invention is the result of a substantial private investment. This provision will maintain the basic policy of public dedication, while at the same time provide for the utilization of private research facilities, whenever it is in the public interest.

Since the general provisions of this section give preference to nonprofit institutions in the expenditure of research funds, certain additional restrictions have been included with respect to the retention of commercial patent rights by nonprofit institutions. While it is not anticipated that most nonprofit organizations will be interested in the retention of commercial rights to patents resulting from federally supported research, it seems wise to make provisions for such exceptional cases as may arise, thus assuring the Foundation of the possibility of utilizing research facilities which might not otherwise be available. In such cases, the basic policy of full utilization is assured by providing that any commercial patent rights retained by nonprofit institutions shall be made generally available through nonexclusive licenses and at a reasonable royalty.

Although recommending the adoption of the basic policy of full publication and free dedication of findings growing out of research and development supported by Federal funds, it is recognized that occasionally the demands of national security will demand exemption from the general provisions of this section. Therefore, subsection 8 (f) provides that the President, or any person designated by him, may make such exemption if he determines that it is essential in the interest of national security.

SECTION 9. INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

Section 9 authorizes Government agencies to enter into agreements with foreign governments for interchange of information and for cooperation in research projects, with presidential approval and through the Department of State. Wartime experience has shown the value of such collaboration, which was permitted under emergency legislation. This bill would continue that power, subject, of course, to security controls. Section 9 also permits the Foundation to defray expenses of American scientists to international congresses and meetings, a provision strongly urged by witnesses at the hearings who pointed out that American scientific groups were very badly represented at those meetings due to lack of funds.

SECTION 10. INTERDEPARTMENTAL COORDINATION

Approximately 40 Government agencies are at present engaged in scientific and technical activities. The need for coordination of this work in the many fields vital to the public interest has been hitherto met in many ways: By informal personal contacts among scientists, by impromptu meetings and, in some cases, by standing interdepartmental committees. Witnesses agreed that a more thorough coordination of this work is essential to an efficient Government and that the Foundation should assist in the integration of such programs. They emphasized, however, that this coordination must be by voluntary cooperative effort, not by arbitrary direction from one agency.

The discussion of information among the agencies will accomplish the necessary cooperation, because no agency wishes to work upon something which another agency has already accomplished.

Section 10 also provides for an Interdepartmental Committee on Science which, we believe, is a distinct improvement over the present ad hoc arrangements without hindering the independence or initiative of the various Federal research organizations.

SECTION 11. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Among the further provisions of the National Science Foundation bill is authorization for a 4-year carry-over of research funds to permit long range planning of projects. This provision would apply to all Federal agencies and is badly needed for many types of scientific work. The bill would also permit contracts without competitive bids and other restrictions, necessary for most public contracts but impossible to apply to scientific research.

The bill would also transfer to the foundation, the remaining functions of the Office of Scientific Research and Development and of the National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel. This was done at the request of the heads of those two organizations.

Before concluding, I wish to place in the RECORD, as a part of my statement, a partial list of witnesses who appeared before the committee.

Among them were scientists such as Dr. Irving Langmuir, Dr. Harlow Shapley, Dr. Vannevar Bush, Dr. J. R. Oppenheimer, Dr. A. N. Richards, Dr. K. T. Compton, Dr. Harold C. Urey, Dr. Wesley Mitchell, and Dr. Lewis H. Weed. I mention these names in response to the questions which have been asked with respect to whether certain men participated. I submit for the RECORD a list of the names of the prominent scientists who participated, and the list gives their titles, as well. For the benefit of some Senators who have been asking questions, I should like to read a few of the other names on the list. We also had there Dr. C. F. Kettering, Dr. H. J. Curtis, Dr. Robert Wilson, Dr. Robert P. Fischelis, Dr. Morris Fishbein, Dr. Henry B. Richardson, Dr. John M. Gauss, and Col. Bradley Dewey.

There are many other names on the list, and I now submit it for the RECORD, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point, as a part of my remarks.

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

Prominent scientists: Dr. Irving Langmuir, associate director of the laboratory, General Electric Co.; Dr. Harlow Shapley, director, Harvard University Observatory; Dr. Vannevar Bush, director, Office of Scientific Research and Development; Dr. J. R. Oppenheimer, former director, New Mexico laboraties, Manhattan project; professor of physics, University of California; Dr. A. N. Richards, chairman, Committee on Medical Research, Office of Scientific Research and Development; Dr. K. T. Compton, president, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Dr. Harold C. Urey, Nobel prize winner, professor of physics, University of Chicago; Dr. Wesley Mitchell, Social Science Research Council; Dr. Lewis H. Weed, chairman, Division of Medical Sciences, National Research Council.

Leaders of scientific organizations: Dr. C. F. Kettering, president, American Association for the Advancement of Science; Dr. H. J. Curtis, Association of Oak Ridge Scientists; Dr. Robert Wilson, Association of Los Alamos Scientists; Dr. Robert P. Fischelis, secretary, American Pharmaceutical Association; Dr. Morris Fishbein, editor of the Journal of the American Medical Association; Dr. Henry B. Richardson, Physician's Forum; Dr. John M. Gaus, president, American Political Science Association; Col. Bradley Dewey, president, American Chemical Society.

Leaders of national organizations: Lewis S. Hines, American Federation of Labor; Russell Smith, National Farmers Union; R. K. Lamb, Congress of Industrial Organizations; Morris Cooke, Independent Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Science, and Professions; Dr. Kirtley Mather, American Association of Scientific Workers.

Educational leaders: Dr. Isaiah Bowman, president, Johns Hopkins University; Rev. J. C. O'Donnell, president, University of Notre Dame; Dr. Edmund E. Day, president, Cornell University; Dr. Leonard Carmichael, president, Tufts College; Dr. Henry A. Moe, secretary-general, Guggenheim Foundation; Dr. James B. Conant, president, Harvard University; president, American Association for the Advancement of Science; Dr. George F. Zook, president, American Council on Education; Dr. Ralph McDonald, executive secretary, National Education Association.

Industrial leaders: Bruce K. Brown, vice president in charge of development, Standard Oil Co.; Edwin H. Land, president, Polaroid Corp.; R. E. Gillmor, president, Sperry Gyroscope Co.

Government officials: Dr. J. C. Hunsaker, chairman, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Commerce; Robert P. Patterson, Secretary of War; James V. Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy; Harold L. Ickes, former Secretary of the Interior; Howland H. Sargeant, Chief, Division of Patent Administration, Alien Property Custodian; Casper W. Ooms, Commissioner, United States Patent Office.

Other prominent citizens: Watson Davis, director, Science Service; Bernard M. Baruch.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I also have received letters or petitions from the American Society of Biological Chemists; the Austin Community Forum, of Oak Park, Ill.; the West Virginia Chapter of Sigma Xi Scientific Fraternity; the Still Memorial Research Trust, of Kirksville, Mo.; the University of Texas Chapter of Sigma Xi Scientific Fraternity; the Connecticut Chapter of the Sigma Xi Scientific Fraternity, at the University of Connecticut; the members of the graduate school and the faculty of the Department of Biology of Harvard University; the Society for Expermental Biology and Medicine; the American Council on Education; the Buffalo Section of the American Society of Civil Engineers; the Central Ohio Section of the American Society of Civil Engineers; the Mid-Missouri Section of the American Society of Civil Engineers; the faculty of Albion College; Dr. Karl Compton, president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology; the South Carolina Academy of Science; the National Research Council of the Young Men's Christian Associations; the Union of the American Biological Societies; and the members of the faculty of the College of Letters and Sciences, University of California. I submit the petitions and letters, and ask to have them printed at this point in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

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

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF BIOLOGICAL CHEMISTS, INC.,
Albany, Calif., June 12, 1946.

Mr. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KILGORE: I understand that Senate bill 1850, creating a National Science Foundation, is presently on the calendar of the Senate.

I am instructed by the Council of the American Society of Biological Chemists to advise you that the Society wishes to record itself in favor of the bill.

The Council of the American Society of Biological Chemists is impressed with the importance of Federal support for research and education in science, particularly at this critical time in our history. The Council believes that bill S. 1850 provides a satisfactory way to accomplish this.

I therefore take the liberty in the name of the American Society of Biological Chemists to ask your support for this measure.

Sincerely,

ARNOLD KENT BALLS,
Secretary.

P. S.—I am sending similar letter to Senators THOMAS, DOWNEY, KNOWLAND, and a copy of this letter to Dr. Detlev W. Bronk, University of Pennsylvania.

OAK PARK, ILL., *April 21, 1946.*

Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Washington, D. C.:

Austin Community Forum well attended meeting at Third Unitarian Church heard Dr. David P. Boder, of Illinois Institute of Technology, tell of great value and importance of Magnuson-Kilgore bill and voted unanimously to wire you, urging committee recommend its passage, including provision for social sciences.

REV. EDWIN T. BUEHRER.

MORGANTOWN, W. VA., *May 1, 1946.*

Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

West Virginia Chapter Sigma Xi, representing more than 100 research scientists, urges prompt consideration of Kilgore-Magnuson bill, S. 1850, and its passage without essential change or crippling amendments. The State of West Virginia, its people, industries and institutions, particularly West Virginia University, will gain greatly needed support of research and scholarship through the provisions of this nonpartisan bill. We feel, as do American scientists in overwhelming majority, that Federal support must be given to scientific research to retain our present position in comparison with England and Russia, where science received generous state support, and to make the epochal progress to be anticipated under Federal support.

T. L. CARTLEDGE,
Secretary, WVU, Morgantown.

THE STILL MEMORIAL RESEARCH TRUST,
Kirksville, Mo., March 19, 1946.

Senator H. M. KILGORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KILGORE: Thank you for sending me the report of the science legislation from the subcommittee on war mobilization. You and the others who are interested in the National Science Foundation are doing a splendid job.

A few days ago I attended the meeting of the Federation of Biological Sciences at Atlantic City. You will probably be interested to know that the people with whom I talked, without exception, spoke highly of the cooperative attitude that you and your subcommittee have shown while this proposed legislation has been under discussion.

At the same time there was much concern over the legislation which affects the control of atomic energy. Without exception the people with whom I talked (and throughout the group discussions that were held) expressed very deep convictions that the control of atomic energy research must be in the hands of civilians and not in the hands of the armed forces.

Thank you again for sending me the report, and I hope you will keep me on the mailing list for future material of this kind.

Sincerely yours,

J. S. DENSLOW.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS,
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY,
Austin, April 8, 1946.

The Honorable HARLEY M. KILGORE,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Last December the Texas Chapter of the Society of Sigma Xi instructed me to submit to you a resolution pertaining to the chapter's desires for legislation on Federal aid for the support of research.

The society now wishes to go on record as favoring Senate bill No. 1850 as a close approach to what it had in mind as to adequate legislation on this subject.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS F. HATCH,
Secretary.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT,
Storrs, Conn., May 3, 1946.

Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KILGORE: The following resolution regarding legislation on a National Science Foundation for the promotion and support of scientific research and education was passed, and is herewith submitted, by the Connecticut Chapter of the Society of the Sigma Xi:

1. We strongly endorse the principle of the establishment of a National Science Foundation for the promotion and support of scientific research and scientific education.

2. We feel that a National Science Foundation will serve to stimulate research and science education as well as to increase the dissemination of scientific knowledge.

3. We believe that the Kilgore and Magnuson bill, without essential change or crippling amendment, sets up a workable and desirable organization for the direction of the activities of a National Science Foundation.

Therefore it is resolved that this group wishes to urge our Government to take all steps necessary for full passage of this bill.

We urge you, personally, to do all in your power to attain these ends.

Respectfully yours,
HAROLD M. SCOTT,
President, the Connecticut Chapter of the Society of the Sigma Xi.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
THE BIOLOGICAL LABORATORIES,
Cambridge, Mass., May 18, 1946.

Hon. Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The enclosed statement is signed by members of the graduate school and of the faculty of the Department of Biology of Harvard University.

As scientists who will probably be directly affected by your bill to create a National Science Foundation, we wish to express our sincere appreciation of your efforts to aid scientific endeavors.

We feel the attempt to make the encouragement of the scientific spirit a part of Government interests should be wholeheartedly supported, since the accomplishments of scientists are ultimately of such wide social import.

We have also sent to the committee concerned a signed statement indicating approval of S. 1717, the atomic energy control bill and of the Acheson-Lilienthal report.

We respectfully solicit your support of these documents.

Yours truly,
DEXTER M. EASTON,
Teaching Fellow in Biology
(For the Graduate Committee).

In order that the benefits of scientific investigation may be enabled more effectively to promote the welfare of the people of the United States and of the world, and

In order that the efforts of scientists may be integrated more effectively and aided to advance the progress of science.

We do urgently ask that you devote your most earnest efforts to securing passage, before the end of the present congressional session, of S. 1850, the Kilgore-Magnuson bill to create a National Research Foundation.

Harold T. Gordon, Dexter M. Easton, Janet Vivian, A. Carl Leopold, Rhoda Garrison, Mauritz Anderson, James E. Canright, Robert M. Paige, Roy V. Talmage, Helen F. Simpson, David Kaufman, G. Edgar Folk, Jr., Robert St. George, Ruth Hubbard, Mary Ishimoto, George A. Edwards, Charles E. Jenner, Edmund R. Brill, Eliot B. Spiles, Gordon Allen, Jean Allen, Virginia L. Senders, B. L. Boyle, Jr., George Wald, Ernest Ball, Carroll M. Williams, William P. Jacobs, Eliot Landsman, Glenn N. Yanagi, C. W. S. Sparrow, Charlotte S. Pratt, Lewis H. Kleinlohr, Irving P. Delappe, Rhoda C. Sparrow, James W. Carnevon, Sidney Soloway, John W. Senders, Charles J. Bishop, Karl F. Grethe, William L. Whitting, John T. Bonner, Kenneth V. Kleinam, Edward S. Carter, James E. Gunckel, John H. Welsh, F. M. Carpenter, George L. Clarke.

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
SOCIETY FOR EXPERIMENTAL
BIOLOGY AND MEDICINE,
New York City, May 22, 1946.

Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Society for Experimental Biology and Medicine is a national organization dedicated to the furtherance of the highest standards in experimental medicine and biology. Its proceedings, published monthly, is read by leading scientists in all lands. Its membership, over 2,000, includes all the leading investigators in medicine, pathology, physiology, biochemistry, etc. It has 14 branches in the chief medical centers of the country.

Its executive body or council includes the chairman of each section and other elected officers. This council, by almost unanimous vote, earnestly requests that in the best interests of medical and biological, as well as other sciences, and in the best interests of our country, you use your best efforts to help in the adoption of the compromise bill known as Magnuson-Gilgore bill S. 1850.

On behalf of the council, listed below, and authorized by them,

Respectfully yours,
A. J. GOLDFORB,
General Secretary.

A. Baird Hastings, president, professor biochemistry, Harvard University; E. M. K. Geiling, vice president, pharmacologist, University of Chicago; A. J. Goldforb, general secretary, biologist, College of the City of New York; A. J. Carlson, physiologist emeritus, University of Chicago; G. R. Cowgill, physiologist, Yale University; E. A. Doisy, biochemist, St. Louis University; C. A. Dragstedt, physiologist, Northwestern University; L. P. Gebhardt, bacteriologist, University of Utah; R. G. Green, bacteriologist, University of Minnesota; I. Greenwald, biochemist, New York University; P. J. Hanzlik, pharmacologist, Stanford University; L. R. Jones, bacteriologist, St. Louis University; C. D. Leake, pharmacologist, University of Texas; R. D. Manwell, zoology, Syracuse University; R. F. Parker, medicine, Western Reserve University; H. P. Rusch, cancer research, University of Wisconsin; H. Stevens, agricultural chemistry, United States Department of Agriculture; A. van Harreveld, biological science, California Institute of Technology; E. D. Warner, pathologist, State University of Iowa; C. J. Wiggers, physiologist, Western Reserve University; W. F. Windle, medicine, Northwestern University.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION,
Washington, D. C., April 23, 1946.

Hon. HARLEY H. KILGORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KILGORE: The Committee on the Relationships of Higher Education to the Federal Government has followed with deep interest the legislation to provide a national research foundation. The committee was gratified when the compromise legislation, S. 1850, was reported out favorably by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. It was our earnest hope that this bill would be acted upon promptly by the Senate.

It is a matter of keen disappointment that the Senate passed over S. 1850 when it was called up on the calendar Friday, April 12. The bill has far-reaching implications for all education and especially for research and scholarships in institutions of higher education. It is in our judgment an extremely important piece of legislation in the national interest and one which has the almost unanimous support of education.

May we, therefore, urge that every effort be made by you to get the bill back on the calendar at an early date and that you support the legislation. Time is an important factor since the bill must yet be introduced into the House and acted upon by this body also before adjournment.

The American Council on Education is, as you know, a nonprofit organization; its membership is composed of 115 national educational associations and some 800 college and universities. It is because of this large and representative membership that the council is deeply interested in the passage of S. 1850. If you care to discuss the bill with a representative of the council, we shall be most happy to do so.

Sincerely yours,
George F. Zook, President; Harry W. Chase, Chairman, Chancelor, New York University; James B. Conant, President, Harvard University; Carter Davidson, President, Union College; Edward V. Stanford, Rector, Augustinian College; Raymond Walters, President, University of Cincinnati; Herman B. Wells, President, Indiana University; Roscoe L. West, President, State Teachers College, Trenton, N. J.; Francis J. Brown, Secretary, American Council on Education.

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS,
BUFFALO SECTION,
Buffalo, N. Y., April 23, 1946.

The Honorable HARLEY KILGORE,
United States Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KILGORE: As you know, there is before the Congress of the United States proposed legislation to establish a national science foundation. The engineers joint council, composed of representatives of the American Society of Civil Engineers, Engineers, American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers, American Society of Mechanical Engineers, American Institute of Electrical Engineers, American institution of Chemical Engineers, took the following action at a meeting held on March 7, 1946:

"Voted, that copies of Dr. Bakhmeteff's letter to council dated March 4, 1946, respecting legislative bill S. 1850, be forwarded to constituent societies with the recommendation that they forward copies to their respective local sections recommending support of legislative bill S. 1850."

At a meeting held April 1, 1946, the board of directors of the Buffalo section of the American Society of Civil Engineers recorded their support of this legislation and authorized the secretary of the section so to inform you.

By order of the board of directors,
Very truly yours,
A. STUART COLLINS,
Secretary.

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS,
CENTRAL OHIO SECTION,
Columbus, Ohio, April 27, 1946.

The Honorable HARLEY KILGORE,
United States Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

SIR: You will be interested to know that the central Ohio section, American Society of

Civil Engineers, in formal action has indicated a favorable attitude toward legislative bill S. 1850, which provides for a national science foundation.

Respectfully yours,

CLARENCE D. BOWSER,
Secretary-Treasurer.

MID-MISSOURI SECTION,
AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS,
Jefferson City, Mo., May 24, 1946.

Hon. HARLEY KILGORE,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KILGORE: The Mid-Missouri Section of the American Society of Civil Engineers, gave its endorsement at its meeting of May 3, 1946, for legislation to establish a National Science Foundation as covered by Senate bill 1850.

It further ordered that the secretary notify you to this effect and also express its appreciation of your efforts on behalf of this bill.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM J. SCHULTEN,
Secretary.

ALBION COLLEGE,
Albion, Mich., May 29, 1946.

Senator H. M. KILGORE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KILGORE: At a recent meeting the faculty of Albion College voted to go on record as approving the passage of Senate bill 1850. I was instructed, as secretary, to notify you of our feeling in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

DOROTHY ENGLE,
Secretary of the Faculty.

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE
OF TECHNOLOGY,
March 7, 1946.

Senator H. M. KILGORE,
Subcommittee on Military Affairs,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KILGORE: It seems to me that the new bill, S. 1850, offers the possibility of getting together on a workable scheme which should enlist sufficiently general support to permit the program for a National Science Foundation to go ahead. I should like to express my appreciation of the manner in which you and your colleagues have worked to perfect the legislation, and to try to find mutually acceptable compromises on points where your ideas and those of Senator MAGNUSON and Dr. Bush have diverged.

As you know, I should personally prefer still to see a few changes made, but my guess is that S. 1850 represents about the best approximation which can be made to a plan which would receive rather general support by both the scientists and the public administrators. I hope therefore that there may be sufficiently general backing to put this through.

Very cordially yours,

KARL COMPTON,
President.

MEDICAL COLLEGE OF THE
STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
Charleston, S. C., May 22, 1946.

The Honorable HARLEY M. KILGORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KILGORE: The South Carolina Academy of Science, comprising a membership of 300, at its first postwar meeting held in Charleston, S. C., April 27, 1946, voted unanimously as being in favor of Federal support of scientific research and development in the United States and Territories. It was felt that this step is necessary because of dwindling resources of endowed foundations, in order to keep scientifically abreast of other nations, to meet the needs of the national welfare and to provide proper scientific training for young students of ability irrespective of need. Of the various bills presented in the national legislative houses, our academy favors the majority of ideas embodied in S. 1850 (Kilgore-Magnuson bill), especially the following features: the creation of a National Science Foundation, a Board of nine members selected from the field of science, the equal division among the States of certain shares of funds which may be appropriated to the Foundation, the provisions for scholarships and fellowships for qualified students and the widest latitude in permitting unhampered research.

In case of subsequent modification from its present form it is further believed by us that due consideration should be given to any changes which may restrict traditional free and individualistic scientific investigation and development.

With sincere and high personal regards, we are,

Very truly yours,

A. M. LASSEK, Ph. D., M. D.,
Committee Chairman.
MARTIN D. YOUNG, Sc. D.
B. R. WHALEY.

UNION OF AMERICAN
BIOLOGICAL SOCIETIES,
New York, N. Y., May 13, 1946.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the Union of the American Biological Societies which comprises 38 national biological organizations with a total membership of over 25,000 individuals throughout the country, we are asking your support of the Senate bill 1850 creating a National Science Foundation.

The bill is nonpartisan. Its formulation has been through the active cooperation of numerous outstanding scientists and scientific groups in various parts of the country. Speaking more particularly for the biologists and biology teachers which include the botanical, zoological, physiological, biochemical, medical, and agronomical scientists, we all of us heartily endorse S. 1850.

We would greatly appreciate your assurance that all that is possible will be done to have the bill passed.

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT CHAMBERS,
President, 1946; Professor of Biology,
New York University.
JOHN S. KARLING,
Secretary, 1946; Professor of Botany,
Columbia University.

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF
THE YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN
ASSOCIATIONS OF THE UNITED
STATES OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., December 10, 1945.

Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KILGORE: The National Research Council of the Young Men's Christian Associations which was in session on November 30 and December 1, instructed me as its chairman, to express to you its hope that the social sciences would be included within the provisions that may be recommended by your committee for the establishment of a national research foundation—included both in relation to the training of research workers and to the promotion of research.

The Young Men's Christian Association and similar agencies devoted to improving the health, the vocational effectiveness, and the moral stamina of the people, together with their general competence as citizens of the Republic, depend largely upon the social sciences for the increase of their usefulness as organizations. These agencies, we believe, contribute largely to the national well-being, the security, and the defense of the Nation. Therefore, the increase of their effectiveness would seem to be a legitimate concern of the Government.

Moreover, the strength of the Nation seems to us to be dependent upon the wholesomeness of human relations among our own people and institutions quite as much as upon any other factors. These relationships are the subjects of scientific investigation beyond the fields of medical research or the natural sciences, as commonly classified. As increasing importance in the organization of the United Nations is being attributed to the Economic and Social Council, so it would seem to us that increasing emphasis in our own country should be placed upon the sciences that contribute directly to the social and economic welfare of our own people.

The Research Council of the Young Men's Christian Association, therefore, respectfully urges the inclusion of the social sciences within the scope of the National Research Foundation. This might be accomplished, it seems to us, either by setting up a section of the foundation to serve the social sciences, or by including the social sciences along with other sciences in such general fields of research as national security, health, and general welfare.

A similar letter is being sent to Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON.

Respectfully,

S. WIRT WILEY,
Chairman, Research Council.

PETITION CONCERNING NATIONAL SCIENCE LEGISLATION BY MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY OF THE COLLEGE OF LETTERS AND SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

We, the undersigned members of the Department of Geography of the University of California, Los Angeles, having reviewed the provisions and background of legislation now pending in Congress for the establishment of a National Science Foundation, respectfully petition the Senators and the Members of the House of Representatives to lend all possible aid toward enactment at the present session of Congress of the provisions embodied in S. 1850, and of suitable appropriations therefor.

1. Cogent reasons for the enactment of legislation providing liberal Federal support for research in the natural sciences have been well summarized in the report on science legislation from the Subcommittee on War Mobilization to the Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate, February 27, 1946. As professional students in fields especially concerned with the welfare of the individual and of society, we urge the importance of liberal support of scientific research on the grounds there stated.

2. With regard to the provisions of S. 1850 for support of research in the social sciences, we submit that more extensive and confident commitments might well be made. We view those provisions, however, as adequate to facilitate much-needed planning and important steps toward initiating a broadened program of research in areas of social science that urgently need Federal support to contribute to national prosperity and to good international relations. We therefore urge enactment of the provisions of S. 1850 with respect to social sciences without attempt at any modification which might jeopardize action during the present session of Congress.

In support of this position, we call attention to the statement regarding the importance of social science research submitted by the Social Science Research Council at the Senate hearings on science legislation, October 29, 1945, and to the statements on research in particular areas of social science submitted at those hearings by John M.

Gaus, Robert M. Yerkes, E. G. Nourse, William F. Ogburn, and John M. Cooper.

Social scientists and the results of their research, were of great aid in many branches of Government service during the war. General John Magruder, testifying at committee hearings on this legislation, said regarding social scientists: "Their role is vital, both in the strategy of war and in the strategy of peace, and the War Department takes the view that their encouragement is worthy of sponsorship." (Hearings, p. 899.)

The diversity of the service of social scientists and their dispersal among many agencies, however, militated against formulation during the war and in the early postwar months of a unified program for postwar research in the social sciences. Preoccupation of many social scientists with pressing postwar economic and social problems threatens further to delay the formulation of a needed broad program for research in the social sciences. Aid which enactment of the social science provisions of S. 1850 could give to such broad planning would be of the greatest value to the Nation.

3. In thus urging enactment of the provisions of S. 1850, including those appplying to social-science research, we do so in the opinion that Members of the Senate who have cooperated in developing proposals for science legislation to the stage represented by the bill, have considered and weighed numerous and sometimes conflicting views with such care and discrimination that efforts to improve further the legislative proposal before enactment are no longer warranted.

4. The undersigned members of the faculties of the indicated departments of social science of the University of California, Los Angeles, subscribe individually and personally to the foregoing statements.

CLIFFORD M. ZIERER.
RUTH E. BAUGH.
ROBERT M. GLENDINNING.
HENRY J. BRUMAN.
J. E. SPENCER.
R. REX BRITTINGHAM.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, in conclusion let me again urge the need for speedy action on this measure. Not only do we believe that speedy action on it is necessary, but we firmly believe that Federal support is necessary for the full development and application of the Nation's scientific resources. I do not believe that even the opponents of the bill will dispute that. As a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, I am naturally concerned over our measures for national defense. Today, our ability to defend our Nation depends on our progress in science and technology, not only in purely military fields but in all fields affected by modern total war.

As an American citizen and as a Member of the Senate, however, I am concerned about the scientific development of our Nation for the benefit of the people who live in it, because I consider that a national defense asset. Particularly we need a strong program for progress in the fundamental sciences which are basic to our industrial and technical development. We must assure opportunities for the education of our promising young scientists and we must assure that they will have the opportunity to turn their talents to useful work.

Mr. President, the National Science Foundation would naturally cover certain fields of applied science, but the principal thing in my opinion and the principal asset and resource which can be developed is the training of scientists and giving them an opportunity to engage in research.

One thing which would be done under this bill, and which has never been done before, is to make an attempt to explore certain unexplored territory, to analyze the explored territory, to map the explored territory, to decide what is unexplored territory, and to develop a centralized effort in respect to making researches in such unexplored territory.

For that reason I think all must admit that the bill is needed. I believe it is urgently needed, and I believe its speedy passage is essential to the safety of our Nation at the present time.

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

Mr. KILGORE. Gladly.

Mr. HART. I gathered from something the distinguished Senator said a little while ago, during the debate with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], that of the two divisions for scholarship and for fellowship, he believes that the one for fellowship is the more important. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. KILGORE. No. The Senator from New Jersey said he believed that provision for scholarships should be obliterated, and that provision should be made only for fellowships. I said that I felt that both were important. So I say it would be hard to determine which is the more important. There are many good scientific minds in this country among our youth that should have an opportunity to be developed. But the youngster who can get $5,000 or $6,000 to go ahead with a basic scientific education probably will not need a fellowship when his education is completed.

Mr. HART. I understood the Senator from West Virginia to say that this is not so much a matter of straight education in classrooms, and so forth, as it is a matter of actual participation in research, which, to me, from my experience in education—which was very brief—would indicate that the Senator was thinking of fellowships, rather than of scholarships.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator from Connecticut utterly misunderstood what I said. I said we cannot develop good scientists without research. We cannot teach science by textbooks alone, and research facilities are necessary in developing the undergraduate scientists. I further said that no man can teach scientists properly at a collegiate standard unless he is a good research man.

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

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. HART. No doubt the Senator from West Virginia is cognizant of the excellent address which was made last week by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] concerning consideration of Senate bill 1248, known as the Fulbright bill, more or less in conjunction with the bill now under discussion, Senate bill 1850. During that discussion it was stated that the two bills cover entirely different fields. The Senator from New York pointed out that Senate bill 1248 was very largely a matter of application.

If that be the case, will the Senator from West Virginia give his reasons for including the Division of Engineering and Technology as one of the eight divisions to be set up under Senate bill 1850.

Mr. KILGORE. I did not quite understand all the Senator said. I am sorry that I did not hear all of it.

Mr. HART. My question is this: Why does the Senator from West Virginia desire to set up a Division of Engineering and Technology, inasmuch as that field seems to be covered by the other bill which is on the Senate Calendar, Senate bill 1248?

Mr. KILGORE. Oh, no; it is not fully covered. We discussed that matter very fully. Although Senate bill 1248 goes into that subject, we have to have a Division of Engineering and Technology set up in connection with the pending bill, in order to keep the Foundation properly balanced. As I said before, the bill is an augmentation bill, and it establishes a revolving fund. If Senate bill 1248 would completely take care of our engineering needs, of course there would be no need for such a Division of Engineering and Technology as a part of the Foundation to be set up by the pending bill. But I assure the Senator from Connecticut, as he must realize, because he is an engineer, that the engineering, exploratory fields of science are almost limitless.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. As one of the sponsors of the bill, I am very much in sympathy with its objectives and its purposes, and I am supporting it fully. However, there is one question which occurs to me and if I understand one of the provisions correctly, I am not in full accord with it. I refer to a provision on page 3, with respect to the eight divisions which are to be set up, and among them I notice there is to be a Division of Social Sciences. What is the conception of the Senator from West Virginia of the work which will be done by a Division of Social Sciences, and why should such a science be brought into a program of the kind covered by this bill? Why is it necessary?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Colorado that I hope he will hold up his question until a little later in the debate, when I am informed the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] will be present. He is an eminent authority on the subject and his advice was given great importance by the committee. I believe he can more fully explain the matter.

But let me say to the Senator very frankly that, in my opinion, the social sciences involve many problems which have to be solved by the natural sciences, and in turn the natural sciences involve many developments of the social sciences. So it is important to get the two groups together under one umbrella, so to speak. In addition, as was well pointed out by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] in the committee, it is impossible to draw a

distinguishing line between the social sciences and the natural sciences. There are a few subjects included in the social sciences which are not included in the natural sciences. However, there are many subjects included in the natural sciences which are included also in the social sciences. It must be remembered that we incorporated a statement in the bill on that subject. We make provision for setting up a division which is directed to make a study and promulgate a program. The purpose is to ascertain how the program will fit into the general picture. But we felt it to be only fair to give those sciences which have such close relationships a broad consideration under the bill. For example, anthropology in a social science, but we must admit also that it is a natural science as well. Mathematics and various statistics must also be considered. Why not give the scientists an opportunity to bring all those matters in and have the questions relating to them fully answered?

Mr. President, with reference to that subject I should prefer to have the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] go more fully into it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I would be very glad to hear the arguments of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] on the need for a division of social sciences. But it does not occur to me that we should cover all the extraneous sciences outside of natural sciences. I am heartily in accord with a bill to establish a foundation for natural sciences. But when we get into political sciences, social sciences, religious sciences, and so forth, it does not seem to me that the umbrella, to which the Senator has referred, could be large enough to cover such matters.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator noticed, did he not, that we did not go into the question of religion or politics? In many ways social sciences are so indissolubly linked with the natural sciences, that we want them to come in under their own subhead in order to achieve results. We say to the social scientists, "You must first submit to a group of scientists a program showing good reason for obtaining money to further your progress." No one would suggest that we depart from a study of anthropology. No one would suggest that we depart from statistics. Yet they are both a part of social sciences. Sometimes we find even sanitary engineering a part of the social sciences. Those various fields become so indissolubly linked that it is hard to separate them.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, before I proceed to a discussion of the bill I wish to make a statement with reference to the question which the Senator from Colorado asked. It was a very pertinent question, and I think it should be fully considered.

In case the distinguished Senator from Utah does not return soon to the Chamber, I think the RECORD should show, in all fairness, that the division of social sciences was added to both bills subsequent to the time of the hearings. It was added for some of the reasons stated by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and for other reasons as well.

During the course of the testimony of many eminent witnesses, it was found that scientific problems overlapped on some occasions into the realm of social sciences. The social scientists themselves testified that they had no intention of embarking upon a vast program into the realm of social sciences, but they did feel that there would be many cases in which the Foundation would probably agree to go into a program which involved the natural and social sciences, even when they overlapped.

In order to safeguard the situation, we incorporated the following language:

> The functions of each division shall be prescribed by the Administrator after receiving the advice of the Board, except that until the Administrator and the Board have received general recommendations from the Division of Social Sciences regarding the support of research through that Division, support of social science research shall be limited to studies of the impact of scientific discovery on the general welfare and studies required in connection with other projects supported by the Foundation.

In other words, for the next few months, or possibly for the next few years, the Division of Social Sciences will merely be in position to submit certain studies to the Board. The Board may decide that there may be some necessity for research being conducted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator for the information.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, before leaving that point, I wish to say that there may be some misconception with regard to a study of social sciences being confused with what we commonly think of as politics, socialism, or some form of social philosophy. It certainly was not in the minds of the authors of the bill to promote any particular social philosophy of that kind. But a study of certain human relationships and certain scientific bases would have nothing to do with socialism, or any subjects of that kind. A subject such as psychological warfare, which was of extreme importance in connection with fighting the war, would be the type of scientific research which would be a part of national defense. It is a subject which could consistently be studied on a scientific basis, and would have nothing to do with communism, socialism, or any matter of that kind. I believe that fact should be kept in mind.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In preparing a bill for atomic energy control, for example, we encountered that very problem. We did not set up an organization to handle the Division of Social Sciences as applied to nuclear fission. We simply skipped it. We felt that the matter bordered on political and social questions of many kinds. We could see no value in delving into it at this time. It seems to me that unless a very pronounced limitation is placed upon the activities which might be pursued along this line, Congress might be building up something which will not be of advantage to the country, but, instead, of great disadvantage, and will bog down the foundation of natural sciences which we are trying to create through this bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator that many of us share his views. The atomic energy bill, of course, dealt with one specific subject, while this bill deals with the broad field of science. That particular field could include, for example, the subject of medicine and medical research. Dr. Bowman, as I recall, testified that it might be entirely possible that a university in some section of the country would wish to examine into the living conditions of the population and learn how they live, in order to gather information regarding particular diseases, such as tuberculosis or cancer. Therefore, we thought that by placing this limitation in the bill, the Board could well pass on those questions. We believed that the Board would be sensible about the matter and would not approve any activity in the social science field which was not strictly a part of natural science, or a part of some national problem involved in science itself.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that probably those who are somewhat doubtful about the pending bill are not essentially in opposition to it, but probably are more in need of information as to some of its provisions, possibly I shall be briefer in my statement on the bill than I would have been, in the hope that any Senator who is in doubt will ask questions, and in the hope that I may explain sections of the bill which are not quite clear to Senators. In any event Mr. President, in my opinion, Senate bill 1850 is substantially more in the public interest at the present time than any other measure pending in Congress.

Science has become a full partner with the military. It proved its worth in winning the war. Probably no more important function of our Government existed in the preparation for war and in the winning of the great war just concluded than the Office of Scientific Research and Development, headed by the very able and eminent Dr. Vannevar Bush. He, along with his fellow educators and scientists throughout the country, gathered together in a single body all the great scientific brains at our country's disposal, and developed so many things that to go into detail would take too long, but they range from the atomic bomb clear on down to the proximity fuse, sound devices, and literally hundreds of other devices which did not exist prior to the war, but which not only helped us win the war, but will be of great benefit to our people in peacetime.

In the last 2 or 3 weeks we have passed several bills which appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars for our Military Establishment, both the Army and the Navy, and it was proper and necessary to do that. But side by side with the upkeep of our great military strength, in order to help keep the peace in the world, comes science. In that field, in my opinion, we have been woefully neglectful. The draft in the early days of the war, and up to the end of the war, to some extent, continued to take basic scientific people. I stated on the

floor of the Senate a few days ago, when I offered an amendment to exempt those in scientific pursuits and those studying science from the draft in the future, that it could be conceivable that training 2 or 3 men in a laboratory might be worth 10,000 men marching up and down a parade field.

Of course, predictions sometimes go into the realm of the unknown, but surely there is not a man in this country or in this body who will not agree that science has now taken on such an important aspect that we cannot afford to neglect its development, both for military and peacetime uses.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There cannot be any doubt of that. It is not a matter of speculation that such things as the proximity fuse, for example, were worth many battalions of men. Was it not absolutely essential when it came to the invasion of Europe?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It was absolutely essential. Of course such things contributed in a great degree to the winning of the war

As the Senator from West Virginia has pointed out, the pending bill is the result of many months of hearings and of study. I have in my hand one volume, which contains the testimony of approximately 110 of the most eminent people in the United States, both in the scientific and lay fields. It contains the testimony of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Director of the Budget, the Secretary of Commerce, and many others who have been interested in this matter for some time.

Not only has the subject been gone into in the hearings proper, but my files, and I know the files of the Senator from Arkansas, the Senator from West Virginia, and other members of the committee, are filled with statements and correspondence, speeches and exchanges of views on this whole subject. Although in the beginning there were some mild differences of opinion as to the administrative set-up of the National Science Research Board, and although there were some differences of opinion regarding some sections of the bill because of the vast range of activity the bill covers and because of the complexities involved, that was only natural. Most of us have gotten together and have agreed that Senate bill 1850 is about as good a bill as can be written at this time on this very vital subject. I hope the Senate will act quickly on the measure. It is of vital importance, and every witness, including the eminent people about whom I have spoken, has urged expeditious passage of the bill.

The Office of Scientific Research and Development expired last night. Within their files they had, and still have, some continuing contracts, some of them of a highly secret nature, but all of them with great scientific institutions. This activity should not be allowed to expire and disappear, but should be taken over for the national welfare by some such foundation as would be set up under the bill.

Mr. President, I introduced an original bill for the National Science Foundation, but my original proposal, developed some year and a half ago, confined itself mostly to fellowships and scholarships. I followed that course because an appraisal of our scientific manpower reservoir was appalling at that time and somewhat disturbing, not only to me but to many of the witnesses, including the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War. We are short approximately 17,000 basic scientists in this country. Because of 5 years of war, we took away from many young people the possibility of getting education and training in basic science.

The strange thing brought out by the war, although we probably excelled the world in applied scientific development, was the fact that America lagged behind other countries in the training of basic scientists and in basic scientific principles.

I refer briefly to the committee report, in which it is pointed out:

> First is the fact that practically no basic scientific research was carried on during the war years; scientists were too busy developing practical applications of previously discovered scientific principles to continue their basic research. In the words of one of the witnesses appearing before your subcommittee:
>
> "For the most part, what happened during the war was not in any proper sense scientific work; it was the exploitation of skills, techniques, fundamental knowledge, all of which had been cultivated in the days of peace; an exploitation which has tended to impoverish our stocks rather than to increase them."
>
> Even more disturbing to your subcommittee was its finding that the basic scientific discoveries on which most of the wartime scientific developments were based were made not by American but by European scientists. Again to quote from a distinguished scientist:
>
> "It should be somewhat humiliating to us to realize that the revolutionary sulfa drugs had their beginning in German research laboratories; that atom splitting was discovered in Berlin; that the basic pioneer work that has led to radio and radar and the enormous American electronic industries was that of a German professor. Penicillin came from England, DDT from Germany and Switzerland."

By that the witness means, of course, the basic scientific principles which led to the development of these things. He proceeded in the testimony to give a list of many things we can initiate here, and the things we used for military purposes during the war. The report proceeds:

> Witness after witness emphasized the relative weakness of American science in fundamental studies, but perhaps none so effectively as one great chemist, a Nobel laureate:
>
> "This contrast between the relative strength of pure science and its industrial applications in Europe and the United States can be illustrated in other ways. We are strong on applications and weak in fundamental science.
>
> "The point I wish to make is illustrated by the statistics on the number of men who have received Nobel prizes in chemistry, physics, and medicine. These prizes are not the only measure of scientific excellence, as all scientists are aware, but they are a significant index, since they are awarded without regard to nationality."

Here, Mr. President, are the statistics showing the number of Nobel prize winners in the United States as compared to the prize winners in Europe. In chemistry the United States has 4 and Europe 37. In physics, the United States has 8 and Europe has 39. In medicine, the United States has 6; Europe has 37. The committee quotes the conclusion from the Bush report on this matter as follows:

> Our national preeminence in the fields of applied research should not blind us to the truth that with respect to pure research—the discovery of fundamental new knowledge and basic scientific principles—America has accepted a secondary place.

So therefore, Mr. President, a vital part of this bill is section 6, which sets up within the foundation the authority to grant scholarships and fellowships in order to determine and to make certain that our present standing shall not continue in the future to be as I just read from the report of the committee. Section 6, on page 13 of the bill reads:

> SEC. 6. The Administrator is authorized to award scholarships and fellowships to persons for scientific study or scientific work in any field of science, including but not limited to the mathematical, physical, biological, medical, and social sciences at nonprofit institutions of higher education, or other institutions, selected by the recipient of such aid, for such periods as the Administrator may determine, in the United States or in foreign countries. Persons shall be selected for such scholarships and fellowships solely on the basis of aptitude, within the limits of such quotas as may be established to insure an equitable selection of such persons from among the States, the District of Columbia, and the Territories.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. HART. My question refers to the sentence which the Senator has just read. Does that mean that the Administrator is expected to distribute the awards of scholarships and fellowships geographically, or is he expected to survey the United States and pick out the best material wherever it may be found?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will say to the Senator that it is not expected that the Administrator will survey the Nation geographically at all. What happens is that when a young man or a young woman is selected for a scholarship or a fellowship, he or she has the right to say, for instance, "I should like to go to MIT," or, "I should like to go to Georgia Tech," or, "I should like to go to California Tech," or, "I should like to go to the University of Connecticut." The Administrator and the Board would merely advise. Let us suppose a man wanted to study radar. I suppose MIT, which has done more work than any other school on radar research, might be the logical school. If he selected North Dakota Agricultural College, for example, they might say to him, "Well, we think perhaps you had better go to the school that specializes in this work." It is only permissive with the Board to make the suggestion. The language "such quotas as may be established to insure an equitable selection of such persons" does not relate to the school the individual goes

to. It relates to the selection of persons from various States, much as we select them for Annapolis or West Point.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HART. I do not gather from the language of the bill that anyone has anything to do with the selections except the Administrator himself. Is it intended that one man shall have the full power in this rather important function?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Administrator actually carries it out, but the matter of policy, in other words, how many shall be selected from the whole United States, would be a matter for the Board to determine. Then the Board would say to the Administrator, "We are now going to pick out 5,000 men and women for scholarships and fellowships in 1 year." They would say to the Administrator, "Distribute them geographically if possible." The selection of these men should be done geographically if possible. In other words, there may not be a scientific school in Kansas, but it might be said, "We want so many young men and women from Kansas." The Administrator merely carries out the policy which will be laid down by the Board; but, in order to have someone assigned to the actual selection, we say the Administrator shall do this.

Mr. HART. I hope that will be the case, I will say to the Senator, but I do not see in the bill——

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator will go back in the bill he will find that all through, in setting up the Board and the Administrator, it is provided that the Administrator shall always confer with the Board on the making of policies.

Mr. HART. Then the policy would simply be, and these are the words of the bill, "within the limits of such quotas as may be established." Would the Senator expect the Administrator to establish the quotas all over the country?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Board might say, "We have so much money to use this year. We are going to use a certain portion of it for scholarships and fellowships. That will give us so many openings for scholarships and fellowships." That number would be a round number. Then the Administrator would make the selection from within that number, geographically consistent with the States in the Union, and then he would actually give those selected their scholarships and fellowships. The Board would not select them from each State. The Board would have the broad powers of determining how many would be selected from the United States, and how much money would be spent during the year out of the appropriation for that purpose. That is my understanding of the language. That was our intention, anyway, I will say to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. HART. Will the Senator yield for another question on the same section, section 6?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. HART. It indicates that after the person to whom the award is to go is chosen, he himself has full latitude in selecting the institution at which he will receive this benefit.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, yes.

Mr. HART. The Senator mentioned West Point and Annapolis. Of course, there is no choice there. Those chosen go where they are appointed to go, and that is the end of it. Is it intended that the recipient should have full latitude to go where he pleases after he is chosen? If he has a desire to go to an institution to which, clearly, it would be a waste of money to send him, does he still have the right to go there?

Mr. MAGNUSON. He has the right to. I do not think the Board or the Administrator would have the right to tell him to what institution to go. It would be a matter of advice to the young men or the young women to whom they give the scholarships or the fellowships. I did not mean that the Senator should interpret my use of Annapolis and West Point as an answer to his question in this matter. What I meant was that it is hoped the selection of individuals will be somewhat equitably distributed all over the United States, similar to the way individuals are selected to go to the military schools.

Mr. HART. Of course, there is really no parallel, for one thing. The recipient of an appointment to the Naval Academy or the Military Academy obligates himself to a certain number of years of service after he receives his education. With respect to these scholarships and fellowships there is no similar obligation on the part of the recipient. Furthermore, it appears that the recipient has full choice of where he shall go during the time the Government spends money upon his education.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct. He has full choice. But in examining, let us say, John Doe, in California, who is a young man who wants to obtain one of these scholarships—in examining him and in determining his aptitude they would probably, through a series of questions in connection with the application, ask him what school he might prefer to go to, and give him an opportunity to make three selections. He might inadvertently select a school with respect to which the Board and the Administrator could easily say, "We think this fellowship would be a waste of money in that school." But there is no reason why the Board, if he insisted on it, could not say that he could go to any place he wanted to go. We have to provide some latitude in this respect. We have to have some faith in the Board, and believe that the Board would not let a man go to an agricultural school, let us say, to study electronics, or vice versa. I suppose that matter could easily be worked out. But if the young man were given the fellowship and insisted on going to an agricultural school to study electronics, there is no restriction placed upon him in that connection in the bill.

Mr. HART. It is the Administrator who determines, and not the Board; is it not?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; the Board would determine that, because the Board ultimately receives the fund. Of course the Administrator would have to work the matter out.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. I wonder if the Senator can reconcile the provision with respect to aptitude with that calling for the selection of individuals geographically. It is provided that individuals shall be chosen on the basis of aptitude, with due respect to all the States.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let us say that there were to be 5,000 scholarships and fellowships given during the year. It would be the duty of the Administrator, in my judgment, to distribute the scholarships and fellowships throughout the various States and Territories. Suppose the State of Washington were allotted 100 scholarships and 100 persons did not qualify. The Board would have latitude under the bill to distribute the remaining scholarships elsewhere. If only 88 qualified, it could distribute the other 12 somewhere else. We could not lay down a hard and fast rule; but we say in the bill that as a matter of policy these opportunities should be as equally distributed as possible.

Mr. WILLIS. The question that gives me concern is how the determination is to be made on the basis of the two factors, aptitude and geography. Suppose 5,000 were to be chosen, and a small State had only 25 who met the qualifications for aptitude. Would the other States be limited to the same ratio?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No.

Mr. WILLIS. That State, then, would not have its full quota.

Mr. MACNUSON. The Board must have some latitude. I suppose the Board would lay out a blueprint. Of course, aptitude has nothing to do with geography. Geography has to do with the opportunity to qualify. We wish to distribute the opportunity geographically as equitably as possible throughout the United States. I will say to the Senator from Indiana that if the Board wished to do so, it could say that all the students should come from the State of Rhode Island.

Mr. WILLIS. Without regard to the law?

Mr. MAGNUSON. We say in the bill that as a matter of policy the Board should follow a certain procedure. Whatever blueprint the Board may lay down is something for the Board and the Administrator to determine.

Mr. WILLIS. Is it the Senator's thought that if the factor of aptitude were not in the formula of the State, the State quota could be disregarded?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct; but every State should have an opportunity, in an equitable way, for its sons and daughters to take advantage of these scholarships.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. In the first place, this section provides that the Administrator and not the Board shall be authorized to award fellowships and scholarships

That is a fundamental difference between this bill and the substitute which I am offering. We believe that a board should do it. We do not believe that the Administrator should do it. No administrator can set up machinery to award 5,000 scholarships.

I should like to ask this question of the distinguished Senator: Would he be willing to change this section and limit it to graduate fellowships? The whole question so far as the age of students is concerned, is whether we are to pay, in undergraduate years, for thousands of youngsters who may not have scientific aptitude. I should like to see the channeling through our State institutions of those who have real scientific ability. Those are the ones whom we should subsidize for advanced work. We are trying to promote research in basic science, and I do not think we can do it by having a broad educational program, confusing aptitude with geography. What we are after is research in basic science. This is not an educational bill. This is a measure to promote research in basic science. There is another bill, Senate bill 181, which looks to the question of division of funds for educational purposes. This is not an educational bill. This bill is aimed at research in basic science.

My objection to the bill now before the Senate in its present form is that it spreads too far and confuses the subject. I hope that it can be simplified so as to eliminate many of its complications. I ask the Senator whether he would be willing to limit this section to graduate fellowships. That is what we wish to subsidize. We do not wish to subsidize every boy in the United States who thinks he would like to study science.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I would not be willing to do that, because my purpose in the bill is to subsidize education in basic science. Out of that reservoir, which is so sadly short in this country, surely we will lose some of them who will not go on. Some of them will not go further into basic research, and into fellowships. But the point made by all the witnesses was that we need a great pool of men who have studied basic science, so that we can draw upon them for research. The Board could well confine its program to the education of basic scientists, and spend all the money for fellowships. We make no provision as to the proportion to be spent for fellowships and scholarships. As the program progressed the Board would in all probability make available for fellowships a large percentage of the money, for the simple reason that once our universities get started again, and once overcrowding in the universities has been relieved, there will come from the universities a great many youngsters who have taken basic science. We must leave a certain degree of latitude with the Board. However, the present situation is that we are short approximately 17,000 basic scientists, men who have had college training in science. We need to fill up that reservoir. We do not need to spend money to get those basic scientists. We simply need to have a selection made by draft boards, now that the Selective Service Act has been amended. I am advised that the budding scientists are coming to the colleges all over the country. They cannot get in. There is no room for them. That is a totally different problem. That is the problem of the man in his undergraduate years. We do not need to offer inducements to boys to go into science. They want to go into it. I am not worried about that. But I am worried about screening the boys who go through undergraduate years and show aptitude for advanced work in science. We are looking for researchers. We are not trying to make a broad coverage of everyone who may think he likes science.

The Board will have to gage the situation from year to year. It can spend all the money for basic research and for fellowships. The Senator says that we can accomplish the desired result in part by not taking some of the young men in the draft. I attempted to provide for that the other day.

Mr. SMITH. I joined the Senator in that effort.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senate adopted an amendment. I do not know what help the Senate conferees gave me, but it was thrown out in conference, and now such boys are being drafted.

Mr. SMITH. I agree with the Senator that scientific men ought to be allowed to continue in scientific work. But I do not feel that it is proper under the terms of this bill to subsidize boys in their undergraduate years. We are spreading ourselves too far with this bill, and attempting to cover too many things. What we wish to do is to encourage research in basic science, by men who have shown an aptitude for it in their undergraduate years. If they are placed with more experienced men, we can get results. We cannot get results by scattering our fire.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then the Senator disagrees with all the witnesses who testified before the two committees. They agree that the Board should have the authority set forth in the bill. They also state that the time may come when the Board may not wish to spend a nickel of the money available to help a man in his undergraduate days. In any event, those who are to receive the benefits of the provisions of this bill will be those who show some aptitude and some promise in basic research.

Mr. SMITH. Then, to do justice to all the boys in our country—and there will be not merely a few thousand, but hundreds of thousands—we must give them all an opportunity, by some examination, to qualify for this free ride and education in science.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They should all have an opportunity.

Mr. SMITH. It is a strange policy to say that every boy in the United States who wishes to study science is to be subsidized by the Federal Government in his college course.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They will be screened. Only a certain number will be chosen. They will have the same opportunity to obtain scholarships and fellowships under this bill as they would have in obtaining scholarships or fellowships from any other institution engaged in research.

Mr. SMITH. Then the Senator is planning Nation-wide examinations to see who is entitled to scholarships.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know what the Board may do. It would not be necessary to have Nation-wide examinations.

Mr. SMITH. I have had some experience in this field.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Board may not wish to conduct Nation-wide examinations. As it is, we find that we are not getting a sufficient number of basic scientists. We must encourage the development of basic science in some way.

Mr. SMITH. I simply cannot agree with the Senator's conclusions.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it not true that a man who plans to be a lawyer is required to have at least 2 years' college work before undertaking the study of law? I think the premedical course is ordinarily 2 years. I have in mind—although it is not spelled out in this bill—that a student must demonstrate some ability and proficiency in his chosen field before he would even have an opportunity to be selected. On the other hand, it is not necessary that he receive a degree after a full 4-year course. I believe that ordinarily, under our present system, a student makes his decision as to what his profession is to be after 2 years in college. That is when he begins to specialize in whatever profession he expects to enter, unless he continues with a strictly liberal arts course.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Does the distinguished Senator and educator feel that we should start to subsidize boys in their undergraduate years?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe that after a boy has had 2 years of work he should be able to demonstrate whether or not he has any ability. I think it would be safe to grant a scholarship after 2 years of college work. Most law schools require such preparation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, law scholarships are on the same basis. I do not believe that the Foundation would go to the high schools to make selections. It might survey the universities, and decide to distribute scholarships among men who have spent 3 years in pre-scientific training in basic science. I do not disagree with the Senator. Our point is that we must do something now to fill up the depleted reservoir. In the future the Board should have latitude in determining how to select these men. I do not conceive that these scholarships will be for a 4-year college course. I think there will be some selection within the colleges, as the Senator from Arkansas suggests, among boys who have had 2 or 3 years of college work. Many colleges now have 5-year courses in science and medicine. The selection might be made just prior to graduation.

I believe that the Board should have considerable latitude. Surely the members of the Board will be men who are skilled not only in science, but in education. They will understand the problem. I feel sure that they will have a keen sense of responsibility about the money of which they have charge and about the scientific needs of the country. I believe that they will make every penny count, and that a man will have to show considerable aptitude in order to obtain one of these scholarships. It may be that as much as 70 percent of the money will be spent for fellowships. We could not lay down a blueprint.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I am sorry to disagree with distinguished Senators who have had experience in education; but my experience has been different from theirs so far as undergraduate study is concerned.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will say that I have had no experience as an educator. I was merely exposed to an education.

Mr. SMITH. In institutions with which I have been connected we have had much experience with scholarships. Today, most educational institutions provide scholarships for promising young men.

It seems to me that what we need is something to help graduate students who need to make progress in specialized lines of scientific research. That is what I think we need to do at this time.

I do not think the Senator need worry about getting the reservoir filled. I believe it will be filled without regard to whether a subsidy of the sort proposed is actually offered. I think many young men wish to enter this field. The reports which I am receiving indicate that the colleges have not been able to accept all those who now are applying. So I do not believe we need to offer any subsidies. Of course, I agree that we must fill the reservoir. I agree with the Senator on that point. That is why I think we should exempt scientific men from the draft.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The indication is that the reservoir of scientific men now is almost empty, and that some incentive is needed. Of course, the Board will be composed of scientists and educators who understand the situation. I have no doubt that the Board will be composed of eight or nine of the men who testified. They can vary the program. But it was felt that under present circumstances they should have authority to see what they could do with some portion of the funds so as to take care of the need for scholarships and fellowships.

Furthermore, what alarmed most of them was that the war taught us the need to keep America abreast or ahead of the rest of the world scientifically, as a matter of our own defense. One of the witnesses was fresh from Russia, and he said that an examination of what the Russians are doing in this respect shows that they not only take such young men when they are young, but they make special citizens out of them. I have a report here regarding Russia, and I should like to read it for the information of the Senate:

> Reports coming out of Russia indicate, for example, that they are, and have been throughout the war, making a special effort to develop scientific talent. With a strong emphasis on science and technology, over 600,000 persons are slated to graduate from institutions of higher learning between 1940 and 1950. And to further persuade Russians to become scientists, large salaries and many other special inducements are apparently being offered. On April 1, by special decree, the scientific profession in Russia became one of their highest salaried, and what with special rations and the provisions of comfortable living accommodations, scientists in Russia are probably better rewarded than anywhere else in the world. New housing is being earmarked for them, just as it is for generals and high party functionaries. A full professor who is head of a department now makes from 4,000 to 6,000 rubles per month. At the present official rate of exchange, that corresponds to $800 to $1,200 a month in terms of our own currency.

Mr. SMITH. That is very interesting.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is what alarms some of these men.

Mr. SMITH. It may alarm them, but I do not think we should try to copy that kind of approach, by which men are dragooned into that field. I wish to have us develop men who have ability, and then say to them, "You have proved your ability, and here is your scientific job." I think that is the way to proceed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agree with the Senator. I do not think we should copy their system. I merely point this out in order to show that if we are to keep abreast of the world in scientific matters, in our American way, our Government will have to give some inducements and will have to establish some such incentive as is proposed by this bill. Otherwise, we are likely to slip back and we are likely to come to a time when not enough of our young men will be interested in science, with the result that perhaps in time of emergency we might find ourselves without a sufficient number of basic scientists.

As is pointed out by other scientists, and as the records show, we have done much better in the field of applied science than we have in the field of pure science.

Mr. SMITH. I think the Senator from Washington and I are agreed as to the objective. I simply do not wish to spread the butter on the bread too thin.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. I was very much interested in the Senator's statement of what is proposed to be done in other countries. But, in the vernacular, I say, "so what?"

During the war Americans demonstrated what they could do. Our scientific development is in advance of that of any other country, so far as I know. Of course, we wish to keep abreast of the world in respect to the various developments.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not know that America led the world scientifically during the recent war. I do know that we made excellent progress in applied science. But I pointed out earlier in the debate that the basic principles which we used so effectively during the war were invented or discovered in Europe, and in the enemy countries. So I do not think we were way ahead.

Mr. WILLIS. I think the results speak for themselves.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does the Senator from Indiana think that if Germany had had the same industrial facilities we had, knowing what she did know about the atomic bomb, and if she had had the same amount of money and manpower that we had, she would not have developed it before we did?

Mr. WILLIS. But she did not have them.

Mr. MAGNUSON. She did not have them because God was kinder to us.

Mr. WILLIS. I think we shall keep ahead of them.

I was also very much impressed with what the Senator from New Jersey said. I think we should give the matter careful consideration. It seems to me that we cannot very well subsidize education at the lower levels. For instance, many young men wish to study medicine. But if we were to start to subsidize their education, we would find it simply impossible to make the proper selections.

The point I wish to make is that the scarcity of young scientists has not occurred because of lack of money or lack of will, but it has occurred because we have taken so many of the young men for service in the armed forces. We hope that never again will be necessary. It is not a question of giving a vast sum of money to a board which we shall have to trust, and then perhaps change the membership of the board from time to time.

Therefore, it seems to me that at least some standard of aptitude should be provided, such, for instance, as that a candidate for such aid should be a graduate of a recognized university, with a degree of bachelor of arts or a degree of bachelor of science, before he could be selected as one having some evidence of aptitude, and in whose education the country would invest a considerable sum of money. I should like to leave that suggestion for consideration.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, that would be done. The Board can prescribe that the men selected must have a degree. That would be a matter entirely up to the Board, which will be composed of scientists and educators.

I do not wish to burden the RECORD with quotations from those who have testified that they feel this is the most important provision of the bill, but Dr. Bush and Dr. Conant, of Harvard, have discussed this section.

Dr. James B. Conant, the president of Harvard University, testified that——

> Those sections which deal with scholarships and fellowships * * * are by far the most important parts of the bill * * * for there is no use considering ways and means of spending money on research unless first-rate men are available to do the work.

Bernard M. Baruch, in his testimony, said:

What should the Government aim for through a peacetime program such as this committee contemplates? I would list eight major goals. 1. Increase scientific brainpower. Greatly increase our scientific brainpower, using scholarships and other aids to develop new scientific talent in American youth.

Bruce K. Brown, vice president in charge of development, Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, said:

I am entirely convinced that unless we do something drastic and extraordinary to increase the training of technical men, increase the number of technical men we have in this country, we are going to be in a pretty sad state.

So says one of the Senator's constituents, and a very eminent man.

Many other outstanding men take the same position. They all insist that this part of the bill is one of the most important parts. Of course, we could lay down a blueprint administratively, but it would be most difficult to handle the matter in that way. I have every faith that the Board will award scholarships and fellowships, not only in a just way but in a way that will tend to utilize every dollar of the money to the best advantage, so as to increase our great scientific development and the number of young men who are using their talents in the scientific fields.

Of course, the Board could make a mistake in the case of one student here or there, but that would happen only rarely.

We must remember that only a small portion of the money to be appropriated will be used for this purpose, and we must also remember that the Board will be required to make a report every year to the Congress. The Board must go through the Appropriations Committee and be screened as to what they do; and as I said to the Senator from New Jersey, the Board will have some leeway as to the extent to which they wish to grant fellowships.

I do not think we shall thus be dipping into the field of American education in any way at all, unless the Board abuses the authority given to it. Frankly, it is most difficult to write legislation on the subject.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. I do not wish to have the distinguished Senator derive the impression that I am not in sympathy with the objectives of the bill, because I am very sincerely so.

But when it comes to allotting the people's money for this program and setting up the practical machinery which will have to be circumscribed, I think that is the responsibility of the representatives of the people in the Congress, both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. I think we must proceed very cautiously in order that we may not make a failure of the program, which is so important to the future welfare of our country.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the section limits the Board to the expenditure of the money for scholarships and fellowships for qualified persons. I do not think the Board is going to give the money to people who are not qualified. But there might be a time when the Board would find that a certain person who did not have a collegiate degree did show great aptitude for such work. These distinguished men, who can discern such aptitude much better than we can, may say, "Well, here is a worthy place to spend a little of this money, in order that we may ultimately have another great scientist in America."

Mr. President, there are other features of the bill, but I do not wish to cover all of them at this time.

I might say that the Senator from West Virginia read a joint statement from scientists and educators with regard to the need for a bill of this kind. He read the names of distinguished men, such as the president of Harvard and the president of the American Medical Association. It is well known how conservative is the American Medical Association with regard to all scientific matters. I wish to point out to the Senate that although the endorsements were of 10 men representing the great groups to which the Senator referred, they come as endorsements of men who are speaking for their respective groups.

As I have already said, I do not know of any person who is opposed to the bill. Some mild differences of opinion were expressed in the hearings before the committee with respect to the language of the bill, but those differences have been resolved. We have put a great deal of hard work on the bill. We do not interfere with Government research. We do not intend to interfere with the freedom of scientists. They may continue as they have in the past. We only try to do for America what the scientists have told us is necessary, not only for peacetime uses but for the defense of our country in warfare. The only strong objection came from Dr. Jewett. He is president of the National Academy. I can say only that his idea was disagreed with by every member of the Academy. We had before the committee approximately 15 witnesses who were members of the National Academy. We polled them, and I have figures which I shall later put into the RECORD. As I have said, Mr. President, there is no opposition to the basic need for legislation of the type embraced in this bill. There may be some question as to the proper approach to the matter. But we are entering not necessarily a new field. I myself was the author of a bill in 1937 in which provision was made for the establishment of a national cancer institute, with an appropriation of $1,000,000 a year for its use. A board pertaining to national aeronautics was also provided in another bill, with an appropriation to carry out its purposes.

Mr. President, I hope that we will not quibble about the sections of the bill. We must place faith in the Board, which will be composed of outstanding men of this country, both lay and scientific. Everyone who knows anything about the subject agrees that the bill should be passed by this Congress.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may propound a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HART. I wish to inquire about section 9, under the heading "International cooperation." Of course, the bill is for the establishment of a National Scientific Foundation to pertain to the fundamentals of basic research. Under section 9 (a) the head of any Government agency is authorized, with the approval of the President, to do certain things. The language then refers to concluding reciprocal agreements with foreign governments relating to the interchange of scientific and technological information, including models and samples for information purposes, and the use and availability of patents and patent rights owned or controlled by the respective governments. Of course, very few patents ever result from techonological research. Will the Senator explain the reason for that section?

Mr. MAGNUSON. There was a great deal of testimony presented to the committee with reference to the subject to which the Senator has referred. As I recall, the situation was explained in this way: There now exist many of what we call international societies. The members of those societies hold a scientific congress each year, and ideas are exchanged. One man may say, "I have been working all year on this." Another man may say, "I have been working all year on this." The scientists meet in congress, read and discuss the papers, and later those papers may be published. We have always been represented at those congresses, but in an unofficial way. The State Department has usually assigned some person to attend. We were told by representatives of the State Department that, in view of the fact we were seeking to establish a National Science Foundation, and although our representatives at the congress would be appointed through them, the State Department, nevertheless the Foundation itself should have some authority in choosing the men to represent this country. Therefore, we incorporated the language, "The head of any Government agency is hereby authorized, with the approval of the President, and through the Department of State," and so forth.

Mr. HART. I fully sympathize with the objective of this section, but it appears to me that the method suggested is a peculiar one. By law we permit any Government agency—of, course, with the approval of the President—to give away almost anything which the agency sees fit to give away.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not believe that any person attends the scientific meetings of the congress to which I have referred for the purpose of giving away anything. They may attend those meetings regardless. No one can prevent them. No one could prevent Dr. Bowman, Dr. Bush, or Dr. Oppenheimer

from leaving this country tomorrow and attending a congress of scientists if they wished to do so. We merely give them some degree of official authority in that connection.

Mr. HART. The Senator misunderstood me. The language of the section is, in part, "The head of any Government agency." Those words do not refer to any unofficial agencies.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The purpose of the language is to include the State Department, because they may wish to send some person who will officially represent them. I am frank to say to the Senator from Connecticut that I do not recall why the word "head" was made a part of the language. However, I see the Senator's point. I think that perhaps the section should be amended so as to apply to the foundation.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I submit a revision of my amendment in the nature of a substitute for the pending bill. The substitute is submitted on behalf of myself, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The revised amendment in the nature of a substitute will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Washington that what we have tried to do in the revised version of the amendment is to incorporate those points on which we disagree with the Senator's version, and bring the issue before the Senate, so that it may decide which form of language it wishes to adopt in establishing the foundation.

I wish to commend the Senator from Washington for the splendid work he has done. I am in favor of a bill covering this subject, but I believe that some of the provisions of the pending bill can be improved. As I said earlier in the day, I am opposed to the power proposed to be given to an administrator to be appointed by the President. I believe that the director of the foundation should be a man appointed by the scientific groups which have the responsibility of determining the policy to be pursued.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say to the Senator from New Jersey that my original bill contemplated the system used by universities, but it also contemplated establishing scholarships and fellowships. As the testimony was presented to the committee from time to time, we incorporated in the bill other features. The money which is to be spent will be the taxpayers' money, and I think the administrator should be given some responsibility, because he will be blamed for the mistakes which may be made, just as would the President of the United States have been blamed if some of the research which he authorized during the war had not resulted successfully. I have changed my views, and I may say that Dr. Bush, Dr. Bowman, and all the men who originally aided me, have also changed their views with regard to this matter. I believe that, with the compromise to which I have referred, the bill will serve an important purpose. The compromise was brought about mainly during the hearings, by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, who cannot be present during the consideration of the bill.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator is referring to the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. I talked to him with reference to this matter, and I believe that he feels the bill contains the necessary compromise. However, I think that the main difficulty of control would be solved if the bill did not attempt to cover so much ground. But, Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Washington for his vision, and for his original view that the matter should be controlled by a Board instead of by an Administrator appointed by the President.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, unless there are some further questions which Senators wish to propound with regard to the bill, I yield the floor. I am sure the Senator from New Jersey wishes to have time to speak on his substitute.

Mr. SMITH. I do desire time to speak on the substitute. I believe that the Senator from Connecticut also wishes to comment on the bill, and I am happy to allow him to speak first.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Connecticut will listen, before I take my seat I wish to offer a committee amendment on page 19, line 20, to strike out the words "The head of any Government agency" and insert "the National Research Foundation." I ask that that amendment be considered.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the 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; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HARE, Mr. TARVER, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, Mr. KEEFE, and Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

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. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to comment on two or three points which were raised in the course of the remarks of the Senator from Washington.

There was one point relative to the activities of the Russians, and I wanted to point out one or two sentences in the hearings, in the testimony of Dr. Langmuir, who is the head of the General Electric research laboratory. Dr. Langmuir had just returned from a conference of scientists in Russia the preceding July, that is, a year ago. He said, as appears on page 32 of the hearings:

> I think Russia at present is far below us in scientific invention. They are doing good work but not as good as is being done in American universities or American industries. They have, for the reasons I have given, I believe, a tendency to rise at a higher rate than we do—

That is a significant sentence.

> unless we do something very definite to prevent these tendencies to level off or even to hold down progress.

Then on the next page, page 33, he said, in answer to a question of the chairman:

> In fact, long before the war, I think Germany was going fast downhill in pure science. It was devoting all its time to military work and neglecting pure science, whereas in Russia I saw a remarkable amount of pure scientific work kept up, even during the war.

I could refer also to other points in the testimony. Particularly, I recall Dr. Oppenheimer's testimony to the effect our activities during the war were not in the field of pure scientific research at all. He said at one point, for instance, that the production of such things as the atomic bomb and the proximity fuze, and other improvements in aircraft, and so forth, were not the results of new scientific research, but were like shaking the tree and the ripe fruit falling in the form of these particular weapons, and that, as a matter of fact, we neglected pure scientific research during the war. As the Senator from Washington has pointed out, we did not even exempt from the draft our students of science in the universities, which has created a great vacuum in the supply of scientists for the future. I remember I made a speech in the Senate about the inducting of scientific students. I think that was a great mistake from the standpoint of the future of our national defense.

On the same page from which I read, Dr. Langmuir drew a distinction between the bill now pending and the ordinary applied science. He said:

> The aim of fundamental science is to acquire new basic knowledge. This is inherently unpredictable—discoveries cannot be planned or foreseen.

He proceeded on this basis to develop the idea which we are trying to accomplish in the bill.

Mr. President, I think we have been misled by the efficiency of our industrial

machine in applying scientific principles, into believing that we are the last word in all the phases of scientific research, and therefore we are not worrying much about it. The atomic bomb itself gave a good illustration of how much was contributed by others. I think all will recall, if they stop and think of it, that the basic scientific knowledge in that field was far from being strictly American. Not only Dr. Einstein, but Fermi from Italy, and Meitner from Germany, and Chadwick from England, and many others from countries in Europe, contributed the basic knowledge which made it possible for our industrial genius to develop the bomb.

Mr. President, those are merely a few points. One of the principal things I wanted to say a few words about was mentioned by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] when he was questioning the advisability of inserting a Division of Social Sciences in the bill. That provision was a source of considerable discussion. If I recall correctly, the objections to it were not because we do not need it, because it is not a good thing, because it is not advisable, but on practical grounds. There was fear that the Senate or the House might be afraid of some investigation or some research in that field, and therefore that it might prejudice the bill as a whole.

A moment ago the Senator from Colorado, if I recall his words, said something to the effect that this is something new in social science, that it might lead us off into new fields in which the Government has never before participated, and involve us in controversy. I am in agreement with his view that it is new. In fact, it is so new that we know practically nothing about the social sciences, and it is for that very reason I think it is high time we undertook some program which might teach us a little about the social sciences.

As I understand, a study of social sciences could lead us to an understanding of the principles of human relationships which might enable us to live together without fighting recurrent wars, to live together within this country, and also might promote an understanding among the peoples of the various nations which would enable them to live together in peace.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. I am quite perplexed about this phase of the bill. I wish the Senator first to give a definition of social science, tell us what it is.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know that I can give an all-inclusive definition. I think I can point out a few activities which are commonly considered social sciences. Economics is one of the principal ones. Psychology is another, and there are other things which are talked about under the general subject of sociology. I would say such studies as are concerned primarily with human relationships are studies in social science. Politics is a fundamental social science. I confess that the word "science" is not properly used in that field, in that it is not of the same nature as mathematics.

Mr. WILLIS. That is, we cannot develop practical formulas or concrete formulas for social relationships.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would not say we cannot develop them. I think progress in that field has been much slower than in the field of physical or natural science. In the field of government itself we have not made any appreciable, hardly any noticeable, progress or change in this country for 170 years. We are operating in the Senate under rules which were formulated largely well over 100 years ago. I do not mean to intimate that I am in favor of throwing them all out. I mean there has been very little change in the art of government, if I may call it that.

Mr. WILLIS. I think that is a better definition.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am only using terminology that is commonly employed. There is only a difference of degree, however, as between what we call science, and art. An art, after it has been sufficiently studied, gradually becomes a science. Not very long ago, the Senator will recall, medicine was full of superstitions.

Mr. WILLIS. The art of witchcraft.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The art of witchcraft. I asked an able scientist yesterday if he would define social science. I had been worrying about that. He said in his definition, "In the first place, I would not call it science. What is commonly called social science is one individual or a group of individuals telling another group how they should live."

Mr. WILLIS. I wonder if that is not a pretty good definition.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is that not just about what Government does? Government by a majority means that the majority tell the minority what to do.

Mr. WILLIS. What I wonder is whether we are going to derive any good by appropriating a considerable amount of money for such purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not prepared to guarantee any result. I think there is room for questioning any of these activities on that ground. It seems to me that social science is a recognized field of study now. It has been sadly neglected for the very reason that it does not yield immediate financial returns such as the invention, for example, of a better mouse trap or some other useful gadget. For that reason it needs governmental assistance a great deal more than mechanical engineering does, because the study of mechanical engineering brings its own rewards under our commercial system. I think social science has been sadly neglected. If one looks at the situation in the world today, or even at the situation in our Nation today, he will find that the difficulties lie not with respect to the production of tangible things, but with those human relations which enable us to get along together. I think the basic trouble arising out of OPA today goes to the lack of people knowing how to live together, more than it goes to the question of the technology of production. That is my judgment.

Mr. WILLIS. It is a question of keeping selfishness in restraint, that is all.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is one aspect of the matter, and it is an important aspect. How one treats it or how one deals with it as a government or as a society is an important aspect. At the request of the physical scientists, we incorporated a special provision in the bill in an effort to try to prevent the division of social sciences getting out of hand, so to speak. I have no fear of that, however. I only hope this provision will give some prestige to social science, that it will sort of recognize that field of study as a legitimate thing in our society, and I hope it will encourage some of our more intelligent young people to go into that field. I think it is sadly understaffed. I know there are many crackpots in that field, just as there were in the field of medicine in the days of witchcraft, but it is not something from which we should back away. We have to solve the social problems one way or the other. I cannot see any harm in admitting that they are legitimate problems and giving the Board authority to devote some of its resources to that study.

Mr. WILLIS. I wonder whether we should accept the argument that simply because no harm would be done we should implement this study?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I only make that argument in response to those who say that harm will come from it; that it is getting into a dangerous field. I do not agree with that argument at all.

Mr. WILLIS. I should like to leave this thought for the Senator to consider: I was thinking whether it would not be better for us to confine this program, which it is proposed to set up, to certain definite fields. We cannot reach out too far, because a part of the program might fail, and bring discredit on the whole program. Why can we not confine ourselves to the fields in which we know there is a practical and a crying need for development, and leave matters which are of doubtful value to be taken up after we have tested the plan on things of known value?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. One distinction between the pending bill and the one I introduced, S. 1248, is that this bill deals with the very essence of pure science in any field, and its purpose is to investigate what we do not know about. It goes into principles which we do not know about at all. After that point is reached the domain of applied science is entered. I will read again the last sentence that I read from Dr. Langmuir's statement:

> The aim of fundamental science is to acquire new basic knowledge. It is inherently unpredictable — discoveries cannot be planned or foreseen.

I cannot guarantee any discoveries or any results in this field. Likewise, if I understand the other provisions of the bill, they do not deal with things we already know and with respect to which we can calculate the results. We are in a

sense fishing around in the unknown, and that is what the bill is designed to accomplish.

Mr. WILLIS. Will not the Senator agree that for 5,000 years mankind has tried to control human emotions and prejudices and selfishness, and that it is not an unknown field?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. So far as I know there has been no concentrated effort in this country or anywhere else, to study, or, if the Senator will permit the use of the word, to make a scientific approach to these problems. We have always considered them somewhat taboo, just as not so long ago the subject of syphilis was taboo, and we would not do anything about syphilis because it ought not to be touched. It was one of those things that decent people did not discuss. There is a little of that attitude today toward social science. It is something that everyone is assumed to have been born with, and we do not want to study it.

Mr. WILLIS. I would not agree that the Senator's suggestion is a sound one or a happy one.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. One does not mention those words. One does not want to talk about the subject.

Mr. WILLIS. The Senator does not wish to say that all efforts that have been made through all the years have failed to develop better relations between men?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should say that what has happened in the last 25 years, including two world wars, would be pretty good evidence that mankind has not gone very far forward toward solving human relationships. The problem starts at home. The present situation respecting OPA is pretty good proof that we do not know a great deal about the subject of human relationships in the United States.

Mr. WILLIS. Does the Senator think that by spending a great deal of money the problem can thereby be solved?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The purpose of this measure is to try to find out whether there is anything in this field that might be of benefit to us. If one could foresee and plan the matter one would be working in what I call the field of applied science. I cannot guarantee that there will be any result from this study.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I am fully in accord with the idea that social science should have increased study and deserve fostering in every way that is reasonable. Certainly the right kind of research is needed. But I want to ask the Senator from Arkansas whether he does not think there is some danger that this program might become somewhat top-heavy if social sciences are included as a part of the program under this bill? Everyone knows that there is obvious necessity for many sound, carefully thought-out studies in matters of that kind. On the other hand, there is not anything that leads more readily to isms and to quackeries than so-called studies in social science unless there is eternal vigilance to prevent. If we could be assured that only a reasonable amount of the time and money and the activities under this bill would be devoted to social sciences I would feel very much relieved from the fear that research into the physical might be slighted under this program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT I can say to the Senator that, in spite of this provision, it would surprise me very much if the social sciences division got anything at all, because it is very evident that physical scientists will naturally dominate the Board, and the very fact that they outnumber others in every respect I think will be the controlling influence. I think it will be very difficult, as a practical matter, for the social scientists to get very big slices of pie, if that is what the Senator means.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. To a certain extent that is what I mean. I can realize that probably there would be a tendency toward such restraint on the part of the Board, if the Board were dominated by those who might be termed "applied scientists" rather than by social scientists.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In the very nature of things, if there are studies to be made of mathematics and biology and public health and so on, the subject of social science would be somewhat in a class by itself, and in the minority.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I know of nothing more difficult than to point out exactly what type of study should be made and what phase of such study should be included in social sciences. Social sciences cover or touch upon, I assume, almost everything one can think of in the way of human associations, conduct, and relationships. I can remember years ago when some sociologists used to insist that sociology included practically every form of human endeavor; that it was really the parent of economics and politics, and that even the natural sciences sprang from social science.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator will remember also when a rabbit's foot was thought to be a sure cure for certain diseases. Ideas with respect to the rabbit's foot have changed a great deal.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes; happily so. But I believe I would prefer to see social sciences covered in a separate bill, under certain special arrangements. I can readily understand, because I worked in some of them myself for a number of years, that the social sciences are matters which require close attention, close consideration, and that they should be fostered in every suitable way. But if, on the other hand, they are more or less jumbled up with the applied sciences, unless there is a pretty clear line of cleavage, and unless it is clearly understood that the purport of the bill and its operations are such as to be concerned with applied science, if that is the correct term for this objective, I am afraid that the purpose of the bill will be somewhat misunderstood and possibly misdirected.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is not supposed to be concerned with applied sciences; that is, in taking known things and making them useful. The purpose is to investigate pure science. In that field one does not even know what he is looking for.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I am always at a loss when I attempt to refer to science as pure or applied or physical. I have heard many definitions and many descriptions as to suitable terminology. I had reference more or less to the natural sciences, dealing with so-called material objects—sciences such as medicine, chemistry, biology, physics, and electricity. Those are the fields in which so much is needed today in the way of investigation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator feel that not much is needed in sociology, politics, and economics?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Of course, it is seriously needed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator feel we know all we need to know?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Not in any sense; but if we are to enter that field of research we ought to be sure that we safeguard our program very carefully. As I understand, 25 percent of the funds appropriated is to be apportioned among the States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. What is to be done with that money?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In a sense, the bill itself is an experiment. We are giving authority to the Board and to the Administrator. In view of our lack of experience in the field of Government participation in aid of education, I know of no other way then to make a start with the idea of arriving at the correct procedure through trial and error. There is no guide for judgment as to what this bill would do. It is a perfect example of our ignorance in the field of social sciences. No Member of the Senate has the vaguest idea of how the program will operate. It is a new experiment. I agree that there are all kinds of dangers. But how shall we ever reach the point of starting a program?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. If one contemplates making investigations in the field of chemistry, there are certain obvious recognized subjects for inquiry accepted I take it generally by experts. I believe that all scientists who know anything about chemistry or physics would be fairly well satisfied that there are certain special subjects which ought to be studied very carefully. There is a more or less definite course to be followed which is obvious. But when we say that we are going to attempt to investigate the science of government, and the general field of social relations, that is so exceedingly vague, and covers such an enormous field, that unless the work is very closely coordinated, and unless an effort is made to map out the courses very definitely, we are likely to run into difficulties, into confusion and cause the research to be much too thin. Let me give an illustration——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator believe that the Congress ought to map out that course in a bill? Even if we were to have a separate bill, does the

Senator feel that we should undertake to map out just what shall be investigated?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No; I would not say that; but if we are to cover social sciences, I should like to see the subject as to the scope of the program given additional and fresh study.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator feel that the Congress is capable of setting up a program of investigation?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Of course not.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. All we can do is to delegate the authority. I do not know how else to handle the problem.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Of course, the Congress cannot pick out specific points for research. In any event, I do not wish to see the Federal Government directing concretely inquiry and research.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In any field? Or does the Senator limit it to social sciences?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I prefer to see the main direction come from the scientists themselves. I would not like to see a situation arise in which the Federal Government would say, "We will look into this subject in chemistry, and that line of inquiry in physics." That is putting it very crudely, but that situation could very well arise in careless administration of such a Federal program. After the Government makes an appropriation for research, I think the helpful province of the Government comes pretty close to being at an end. For many years I was connected with one of the outstanding universities of the country specializing in work of research. I am quite confident that if the Federal Government had been shaping the course of research in any way, and had told that university what to investigate in the field of chemistry or medicine, the results would not have been nearly so satisfactory.

I realize that there are certain safeguards in the bill which will probably avoid putting a crimp in scientific research conducted in what might be termed the historic manner. However, I would like to see the bill go further in the way of protection than it goes. I am appalled at the idea of opening up the social sciences without any charting of what the investigators are to study or how they are to go about it. I presume that any State which received its share of the 25 percent allotment would say, "We want to use this fund for a certain purpose."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The program must be approved by the Administrator and the Board, acting together.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. If the Board's approval were sufficiently tight to afford adequate protection from misdirected or unwise inquiry that might be some safeguard.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That depends upon the intelligence of the members of the Board. We assume that we are to have a good Board and a good Administrator.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I am not raising any serious objection to the inclusion in this bill of the social sciences. There is nothing more important than that we should come to a better realization of what the social sciences really are, and the principles of human conduct underlying them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As I visualize the way the program will work, the University of Chicago, the University of Minnesota, or any other school will ask for funds to promote some program which the scientists in the particular schools have already undertaken. Usually the aid will be used for clerical assistance, and for the collection of statistics. Ordinarily the principal ingredient of research work in the social sciences is statistics relating to human behavior, and so forth. Such things as polls of public opinion are sometimes very much abused, and in many cases misleading; but they are part and parcel of what we call one field of research in social science. They relate to the large-scale problems of the democratic system. I do not think there is anything very dangerous in that field. I feel that the social sciences have been sadly neglected. They have not had any money, because they have nothing tangible to produce. They are unlike the science of chemistry, for example, which can produce nylon in a chemical laboratory.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Of course I do not see anything essentially dangerous in any real research into phases of the social sciences.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Unless the Government or some great philanthropist helps them along, they make no progress. I think the Senator will not deny that there has been very little progress in the field of human relations, and especially in the fields of government and economics, for a long time. The Senator was an eminent teacher of history. I should like to have him express himself as to the great progress we have made in getting along together as humans in this modern age. Does the Senator believe that there has been any substantial progress?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I appreciate the Senator's reference to my teaching. I did some teaching in history but most assuredly I was never in any sense whatever eminent.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has taught in one of the great universities.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. My teaching in history was rather short in time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. History is one of the leading social sciences.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The modern conception of history is widely different from history as it was understood by our grandfathers. That change has been exceedingly helpful in every sense. I repeat, I am not afraid that the program under this bill will be used to any considerable extent to foment various kinds of insidious doctrines.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is what many persons fear. They fear that their particular antipathy will be fomented.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. There is some possibility that if an allotment is made to a certain university, and the head of a particular department is a man addicted to certain isms, he might use the fund for that purpose. I suppose that is a danger the existence of which we must contemplate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The program must have the approval of the Board. If the Board does not approve it, the head of a department in a university has no inherent right to the fund. It would not be a violation of due process if he did not get it. This is all under the control of the Board.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Does the Senator feel that the control of the Board as to the type of research would be likely to be sufficient general protection to head off wild-eyed so-called research?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There are two protections. There is the Division of Social Sciences, which I assume will be composed of outstanding and recognized social scientists. They will set up the program and submit it to the Board for its approval. The division itself passes on it, and the Board passes on it. Then if a crackpot turns up somewhere, the Board can stop the program. It does not have to continue with it. The Board would have discretion in the administration of the program. I do not see much danger in it. I cannot prove the result, but I do not see much danger in the social sciences. I believe that they represent a field in which we ought to know something.

Before we leave the matter of history, for many years people have played with the idea of trying to have histories written in a more objective way. Senators are familiar with the manner in which histories have been written in the North and in the South relative to the Civil War, and the manner in which histories have been written in various other countries. I understand that Norway and Sweden have agreed to rewrite their histories and try to present them in an objective way. It is an objective problem in human relations. I think the Senator will agree that that type of project is not very revolutionary. I believe it is directly in line with what is proposed here.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Let me ask the Senator a question, and then I shall not trespass further on his time. Is the Senator satisfied that with the incorporation of this provision with regard to social sciences, the social sciences would not more or less dominate the scene to the slighting of other studies? I wish to emphasize again that I believe that the studies in the social sciences and helpful progress in that field are just as important as anything else we have before us today. I cannot overstress the gravity of the need and importance of such studies. The Senator cannot emphasize that point more than I do. It is most unfortunate that more progress has not been in constructive work in this. But the general purport of the bill is that it is aimed at investigations in what we may call the pure physical sciences.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am quite confident that the personnel of the board will be such, and the administrator will be such, that there will be sufficient protection. The administrator is very likely to be a leading physical scientist. During the hearings, so far as I know, only 1 day was devoted to hearing social scientists. The remainder of the time was

devoted to scientists in the field of physical science. The country acclaims the physical scientist because the physical sciences produce tangible results. I have no doubt that the social sciences will have a very difficult time, even though this provision is included in the bill.

The Senator suggests that the social sciences be dealt with in a separate bill. In the first place, no such bill has been introduced. In the second place, as a practical matter I think it would be very difficult to have such a bill enacted, for the reasons which the Senator has pointed out.

In the third place, I see no logical reasons why the social sciences should not be included in this bill. The dividing line between the social sciences and the other sciences is very vague and very difficult to draw. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] asked for a definition. It is very difficult clearly to define them and distinguish one from the other, because they all impinge on one another. Both the physical sciences and social sciences are important. They react and affect one another, so it is difficult to compartmentalize science in that way.

I think it is important to have social sciences covered in the program set up in the bill. If some Senators wish to throw it out and if they wish us to go on our merry way ignoring the significance of the social sciences, that is a matter which the Senate must determine. But I see no logical reason to fail to cover the social sciences in this connection.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I am not advocating that they be thrown out. I merely am making comments in regard to some reasons for not including provision for a Division of Social Sciences as a part of the program to be set up by this particular bill.

Let me say that I think it would be most unwise for the Federal Government to attempt either directly or indirectly to shape research. I know that in some branches of medicine progress has been made because of governmental research, and possibly in other respects governmental activity has been helpful. But it seems to me we open a dangerous field when we give the Federal Government the power to shape closely research. The best research which has been done, in this country at least, has been done by agencies which have not been controlled or regulated by the Government and which have not been instructed or shaped by the Government in regard to what they do. I think it is quite possible that the arrangements proposed by the bill would probably protect against what might be called governmental domination of any kind.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator's statement about the proper method. I am assuming, and I believe, that the protection afforded by the bill against governmental domination is sufficient. In that connection, the problem is similar to that which we had in connection with the so-called Federal aid to education bill, Senate bill 181. I do not think the field of research should be controlled by the Federal Government, but the experience we have had in connection with the land-grant colleges shows that Government aid is not detrimental to education or research. If the Federal Government falls into the hands of a dictator, then the whole situation will be bad, of course. But so long as we have a division of power such as now exists in the National Government, whereby no two parts of the Government seem to be able to agree, we are not likely to have domination of education or research by the Government.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Is not the argument of the Senator from Maryland based upon the idea that the research to be done under the program established by the bill will be the only research which will be done?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Not at all. I am not assuming that all the universities and great corporations of the United States will quit such research work merely because this program begins.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it the Senator's viewpoint, then, that the Government should not be permitted to help in certain phases of research which some governmental agencies have found require help?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No. I personally would have the Government appropriate the money and turn it over to research agencies which are clearly recognized, and without in any way being controlled or shaped or directed by the Federal Government except in very special cases. It may be that sufficient safeguards are placed in the bill in order to take care of that matter. I do not know. I have not been able to study the bill from that standpoint as carefully as I should like to do.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is what I think the bill means. At some place we should make provision for preventing any complete "crackpots" from receiving aid from the fund.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, let me point out to the Senator that all the research which now is being done privately in the United States will be continued. The program set up by this bill will not stop it.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Of course.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The bill will provide funds which are badly needed in a most important field. For instance, if the Army has a problem which is too big for its research laboratory to solve, it will go to the Foundation, and the Foundation will say, "Perhaps we can get the General Electric Research Laboratory and Johns Hopkins to help."

There will simply be some check, not to determine what research shall be conducted but to make sure that there shall not be abuses in connection with the expenditure of the funds.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the bill provides:

(c) The Board shall continuously survey the activities and management of the Foundation, and shall periodically evaluate the achievements of the Foundation in accomplishing the objectives of this act. Each divisional scientific committee shall survey continuously the scientific field which it encompasses, shall undertake to determine the specific scientific needs of such field, and shall evaluate proposed programs and projects.

It seems to me that that provision is included only in order to make sure that those who receive the aid are not completely "nuts." Of course, some people who are entirely crazy will apply for the aid, no doubt; such persons almost always do apply in connection with such projects, so the bill simply provides for a check.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I suppose it would also be an advantage in preventing some obvious duplication.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of course it will. Such duplication is often found.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Let me give an illustration which I recall very well. A friend of mine was working at Johns Hopkins University in astronomy, and he spent several years in making a special study in that field. As his particular line of inquiry was about completed and he was about to present it for his doctorate of philosophy, he learned that someone else thousands of miles away had done similar research work, and, as a matter of fact, has gotten publicity ahead of him by only a few days. So not only did my friend lose that opportunity for his degree and 3 years of work but he also found he had wasted his time because someone else was doing the same research job.

I can understand the importance of coordinating the work so as to promote a free interchange of ideas and of knowledge of the work which is being done, and of course that will also tend to prevent duplication. I think that might be a distinct advantage from the operations of this bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to bring my remarks to a conclusion, but first I desire to read a short paragraph from a statement by Dr. Wesley Mitchell, who is one of the leading social scientists of the country and, incidentally, is an economist. I should like to read a portion of his statement at this point:

The present inadequacy of knowledge of human relations is a source of danger which can be greatly reduced by more adequate applications of scientific techniques in the study of human problems. Social-science personnel, research procedures and facilities are underdeveloped in terms of the tasks which must be undertaken. It has been demonstrated, however, that the earnest and objective investigation of problems of human relations can produce results of inestimable practical value when properly trained research workers imbued with scientific detachment and integrity are given opportunity to apply themselves with adequate resources. The fact that it cannot be claimed that the social sciences have reached a stage comparable to that of some of the other scientific disciplines is considered the strongest possible reason for advancing their development by every effective means. The problems with which they deal are urgent. The advances in research planning, techniques, and organization which have been achieved during the war and the immediate prewar years offer

promise of a period of unusually fruitful progress if adequate support is made available.

Mr. President, I close by saying that I think it is well worth our while, and it may very well be most valuable to us in the future, to leave in the bill provision for the Division of Social Sciences.

As for the bill as a whole, it goes without saying that I am strongly in favor of it, and I hope the Senate will pass it.

EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution for the extension of rent control, and I request that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RADCLIFFE in the chair). Without objection, the joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. What measure was just introduced for appropriate reference?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The caption of the joint resolution is "A joint resolution extending the rent control provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, until June 30, 1947."

Mr. WHERRY. Is unanimous consent required for the introduction of the joint resolution at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is, at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. Was unanimous consent requested?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I requested unanimous consent. The joint resolution is introduced at this time merely in order to have it referred to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair heard no objection.

Mr. WHERRY. Unanimous consent was granted on the basis of the reference of the joint resolution to the appropriate committee; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 171) extending the rent control provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, until June 30, 1947, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to take only a minute to address the Senate at this time.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to ask the Senator from Washington, as one of the Senators in charge of the bill, if he will refer to page 13 of the bill, subsection (e) of section 5, and later I shall ask him to refer to subsection (f) of section 8, on page 19.

My good friend the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], who is a member of the Atomic Energy Committee, particularly directed my attention to these two subsections. Of course, the Senator is aware of the fact that some three weeks or more ago the Senate unanimously passed the Atomic Energy Act, Senate bill 1717. That bill contains very carefully worked out provisions for the treatment of basic and applied research in the field of nuclear physics. I should like to ask the Senator if there is any intention on the part of the sponsors of the bill or anything in the language of the bill as he reads it which gives to this Foundation any right to engage in research in the field of nuclear physics.

I may say to the Senator that I am afraid that we might run into some conflict. We have carved out the field of nuclear physics and have put it under the control of the Atomic Energy Commission. Because of the nature of the beast, as it were, we have had to devise special treatment for security reasons. Allow me to invite attention to the fact that, under section 5 (e) of the bill, if nuclear physics was conceived to be within the operating functions of the Commission, the following language on page 13, in line 8, would apply:

> Any person engaged in such research and development activities shall not be precluded from independently discussing, writing, or publishing his own views and conclusions relating to such research and development.

In the atomic-energy bill we went to great pains to keep research free, but at the same time we imposed criminal penalties for the publication or disclosure of restricted data. The term "restricted data" was defined in the bill. On page 19 of the pending bill, in section 8 (f), there is a saving provision permitting the President to withhold from publication or dissemination certain material if it involves national security. However, I question the Senator's belief that we should permit the National Science Foundation to engage in the field of nuclear physics.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say to the Senator that the foundation will, of course, be given broad authority. I suspect that if the Army or the Navy asked the foundation to go into the field of nuclear physics, it would go. However, once it got into such field it would be in a special sphere, subject to the provisions of the bill which was sponsored by the Senator. His bill deals specifically with that subject.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator from Connecticut must realize that the pending bill was agreed upon long prior to the introduction of his bill. His bill made provision for taking care of the entire situation on the basis of secrecy and national protection. I believe there will be no conflict between the Senator's bill and the pending one. However, I am sure, as one of the sponsors of the pending bill, that we would be willing to go along in taking care of the situation to which the Senator refers.

Mr. McMAHON. Does not the Senator believe that it would be advisable to provide in this bill that the Atomic Energy Commission will be expected to do the basic and applied research in the field of nuclear physics? I should think that it would be well to do that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Who knows where that would lead us to? We might prohibit the Foundation from using nuclear physics, for example, in research in connection with the treatment of cancer. The language on page 13, section 5 (e) of the bill is only to restrict the Board, Administrator, or anyone else from saying to a student, for example, "You must direct your research along this or that line."

Mr. McMAHON. I am in favor of that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The bill also contains a saving clause under which the President may say, with respect to any problem, "This is a secret problem." That would include nuclear physics and other matters.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes. If we start to make particular exceptions, in bills introduced in the future, different matters may be brought into the picture than those pertaining to nuclear physics. They will also have to be taken care of. If the Senator has an amendment to suggest I personally, as one of the sponsors of the bill, would be delighted to consider it. But if we start particularizing about nuclear physics, and then continue with some other kind of physics, or some other kind of mathematics which may arise in scientific fields, we may get into many difficulties. We cannot foresee 12 months from now everything which may be associated with the subject of nuclear physics.

Mr. McMAHON. I see the point which the Senator has in mind. I should like to have an opportunity to think the matter over and discuss it with the sponsors of the bill. What I believe at the moment is this: If the proposed Foundation intends to spend any of its funds for research and development in the field of nuclear physics, it should be done only after consultation with the Atomic Energy Commission, which, under section 3 of the atomic energy bill, is specifically authorized and directed to do its own research in this field. I am trying to avoid duplication and conflict of jurisdiction.

Mr. KILGORE. I should like to explain the jurisdictional theory. In other words, if work is to be done in nuclear physics, it must be done under the division covering nuclear physics and must originate in the nature of a request from someone. The Foundation would only furnish some funds to the agency working in that particular field, and those funds would have to be allocated as designated by that agency under the terms and conditions set forth.

In other words, this is not a research organization. It is merely a fund-allocating organization in aid of scientific

research to augment—shall we say—other appropriations, other funds, and other steps taken by private or public organizations. When they find themselves with a problem which they cannot solve, or when they do not have the necessary funds to carry on their work, they come to the Foundation, ask for money, go through the necessary process up to the Director. If the proposal is worth while, they may receive an allocation of funds.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In other words, the Atomic Energy Commission should come to the Foundation and say, "We need more money."

Mr. McMAHON. Then, if I understand correctly the Senator from Washington and the Senator from West Virginia, the only basis on which the Foundation should inject itself into the field of nuclear physics, either basic or applied research, would be the request of the Atomic Energy Commission. Am I correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. Or upon the request of the Army, the Navy, or some agency of that nature.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They could have a fellowship man somewhere dealing with nuclear physics.

Mr. McMAHON. Do not the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Washington believe that it would be sensible to have all applications for funds for conducting research in nuclear physics, presented first to the Atomic Energy Commission and then to the Foundation for approval?

Mr. KILGORE. It would be better to have a general clause in the bill stating that with reference to any specific scientific subjects which are now or may hereafter be considered, with exclusive rights to deal in certain phases, all requests shall be cleared through the body governing that particular group. That would take care of any situation which might arise later.

Mr. McMAHON. I do not know. I believe that I would rather take care, particularly, of the present situation, and then let any new science, or art, or whatever it may be, take care of itself through a later amendment to the act. Because this is an immediate situation, it might be well if we were to put in a clearance provision that all applications for research grants-in-aid must go to the Atomic Energy Commission with reference to the particular field involved.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They should be cleared.

Mr. McMAHON. They should be cleared.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Because there may be a desire to establish nuclear physics reseach in, for example, the field of cancer, in which the sponsors of the Senator's bill are not interested.

Mr. McMAHON. Oh, yes; we are interested in such matters.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The sponsors of the Senator's bill are interested, of course, from a humane standpoint.

Mr. McMAHON. Yes. But I believe it is particularly important at this time to have, as near as we can, a centralized place for the study of nuclear physics. I believe that would be highly desirable, in the public interest and in national security. So I shall attempt to draft such an amendment and submit it to the Senator from Washington and to the Senator from West Virginia, and see if we cannot arrive at an agreement.

I note that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is here on my right. He brought the matter originally to my attention, and I should like to ask him if the proposal meets with his views of the situation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; it meets with my views. What I fear is that there will be a conflict. The Senate has only recently passed a bill which we all know provides for the control of atomic energy. We should be very careful that we do not have a conflict between this bill and the other bill. There is no need for having a conflict, and if we spell it out, as the Senator from Connecticut has indicated he would like to have done, there can be no basis for conflict; provision will be made for full cooperation, and there will be no bickerings and no misunderstandings and no loopholes through which atomic controls might escape.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think a satisfactory amendment can be prepared. I understand the Senator's idea. It is that if someone should come to the Foundation with a research problem which involved nuclear physics, surely the commission set up by the other bill should have the right to say "You go ahead with it" or "Do not go ahead with it," or whether it is a good idea or a bad idea. Something can be worked out along that line.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hope it will not deal in questions of scholarships or fellowships, because that is merely a matter of training. The Senator is speaking of specific research problems.

Mr. McMAHON. I shall endeavor to work it out.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator, with the understanding that I may have the floor tomorrow for a few moments, if that is agreeable to the majority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is all right with me, when the consideration of the pending bill shall be resumed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I mean when the consideration of the bill is resumed.

Mr. WHERRY. The pending bill is the special order of business, is it not?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; it is the special order.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RADCLIFFE in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the appropriate committee.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Capt. Erl C. B. Gould, United States Naval Reserve, to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service, while serving with the Foreign Liquidation Commission, State Department, and to continue during any assignment commensurate with the rank of commodore or until release from active duty.

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

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Sundry candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service.

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURE—PROTOCOL TERMINATING ROME CONVENTION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive H, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, a protocol dated at Rome March 30, 1946, terminating the Rome convention of June 7, 1905, and transferring the functions and assets of the International Institute of Agriculture to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the protocol and it will be published in the RECORD.

The protocol, with accompanying papers, is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified photostatic copy of a protocol dated at Rome, March 30, 1946, terminating the Rome convention of June 7, 1905, and transferring the functions and assets of the International Institute of Agriculture to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

The protocol has been signed, "Subject to ratification," by the American chargé d'affaires ad interim at Rome for the Government of the United States of America (including Hawaii, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands).

I also transmit herewith, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Acting Secretary of State with respect to the protocol.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 1, 1946.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Acting Secretary of State; 2. Protocol dated at Rome, March 30, 1946, terminating Rome convention of June 7, 1905, and transferring functions and assets of International Institute of Agriculture to Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.)

JUNE 27, 1946.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House:

The undersigned, the Acting Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, a certified photostatic copy of a protocol dated at Rome, March 30, 1946,

terminating the Rome convention of June 7, 1905, and transferring the functions and assets of the International Institute of Agriculture to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

The protocol has been signed by the American Chargé d'Affaires ad interim at Rome for the Government of the United States of America (including Hawaii, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands), subject to ratification. The protocol has been signed also by the plenipotentiaries of a number of other countries, and it is anticipated that additional signatures will be affixed by August 1, 1946.

The convention for the creation of an International Institute of Agriculture was signed at Rome, June 7, 1905, by the plenipotentiaries of the United States of America and a number of other countries. The United States of America became a party to that convention by the deposit of its instrument of ratification with the Italian Government on August 13, 1906. The official citation of the convention is Thirty-fifth Statutes, part 2, 1918.

In 1924, at the request of the Government of the United States of America, and in conformity with the last paragraph of article 10 of the convention of 1905, Hawaii, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands were admitted to participation in the International Institute of Agriculture.

On April 21, 1926, there was signed at Rome on behalf of a number of countries, not including the United States of America, a protocol amending the convention of 1905. The United States of America became a party to that protocol on August 25, 1934, by adherence. In depositing the instrument of adherence, the American Ambassador at Rome informed the Italian Foreign Office that the adherence of the United States of America to the protocol extends to and embraces Hawaii, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. The official citation of that protocol is Forty-ninth Statutes, part 2, 3350.

By joint resolution of the Congress of the United States of America, approved July 31, 1945 (Public Law 174, 79th Cong.), the President was authorized to accept membership for the United States of America in the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Section 3 of that joint resolution refers to the contemplated dissolution of the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome and the merger of its functions and assets with those of the Food and Agriculture Organization. Section 3 reads as follows:

"In adopting this joint resolution, it is the sense of the Congress that the Government of the United States should use its best efforts to bring about, as soon as practicable, the integration of the functions and resources of the International Institute of Agriculture with those of the organization, in a legal and orderly manner, to effect one united institution in such form as to provide an adequate research, informational, and statistical service for the industry of agriculture."

At the first meeting of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, at Quebec, October 16 to November 1, 1945, the conference (the governing body of the Organization) adopted unanimously a resolution requesting that those governments which are members of both the Food and Agriculture Organization and the International Institute of Agriculture take action for the purpose of bringing to an end the affairs of the Institute and of transferring the library, archives, and other property of the Institute to the Organization.

The director-general of the Food and Agriculture Organization, by a letter dated November 10, 1945, requested that the Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain, and Northern Ireland, Canada, France, the Netherlands, and Belgium work together to give effect to the Quebec resolution relating to the dissolution of the International Institute of Agriculture.

During January and February 1946 the Government of the United States of America, after prior consultation with the British Government, communicated with the other governments members of both the Organization and the Institute, urging the cooperation of those governments in the adoption of procedure for the dissolution of the Institute and the merger of its functions and assets with those of the Organization.

On March 30, 1946, the permanent committee of the International Institute of Agriculture, meeting in Rome, adopted without dissenting vote a resolution prepared by the United States Government and presented to the committee by the American and British representatives on the committee. This resolution urged that each of the governments concerned authorize the signing on its behalf of a protocol for the purpose of dissolving the Institute, terminating the convention which created it, and transferring its functions and assets to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. The resolution also urged that the General Assembly of the Institute take action to authorize the permanent committee to take the necessary steps for this purpose.

The protocol, as recommended by the permanent committee of the institute, was opened for signature on March 30, 1946, and bears that date. It is this protocol of which a certified photostatic copy is enclosed herewith.

Article I of the protocol provides that from a date which is to be announced by the permanent committee of the institute, in accordance with article III, the convention of 1905 shall be no longer effective as between the parties to the protocol, and the institute (including the international forestry center) thereupon shall be brought to an end.

Article III provides for the giving of a notification by the permanent committee to the members of the institute when the duties assigned by article II of the protocol have been completed. It is provided further that the date of notification shall be deemed to be the date of termination of the convention of 1905 and also the date of the dissolution of the institute (including the center).

Article IV provides for the transfer to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the powers, rights, or duties attributed to the institute (including the center) by the provisions of certain international conventions, as listed in an annex to the protocol.

Article V sets forth the procedure by which a member of the institute which is not a signatory to the protocol may accede to the protocol.

Article VI contains provisions relating to the coming into force of the protocol. Pursuant to this article, the protocol shall come into force when it has been accepted by at least 35 governments members of the institute. Such acceptance may be effected by any one of three methods, namely, by signature alone when such signature is without a reservation in regard to ratification, by the deposit of an instrument of ratification in the case of signature with a reservation in regard to ratification, or by notice of accession in accordance with article V. The coming into force of the protocol for other governments, after the protocol has come into force as provided in the second paragraph of article VI, is governed by the third paragraph.

In the opinion of the Department of State, this protocol, together with the action to be taken by the General Assembly and the permanent committee of the institute, would accomplish the object mentioned in section 3 of the joint resolution of July 31, 1945, namely, the integration of the functions and resources of the institute with those of the Organization, in a legal and orderly manner, effecting "one united institution in such form as to provide an adequate research, informational, and statistical service for the industry of agriculture.

It is believed that, in order to be fully effective, the action of the United States of America with respect to this protocol should be completed as soon as practicable.

Respectfully submitted.

DEAN ACHESON,
Acting Secretary of State.

The Governments signatories to this Protocol,

Being parties to the Convention signed at Rome on June 7, 1905, creating the International Institute of Agriculture (hereinafter called the Institute),

Considering it desirable that the Institute (including the International Forestry Center, hereinafter called the Center) be dissolved and that the functions and assets thereof be transferred to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (hereinafter called the Organization), and

Being cognizant of the resolution of the Permanent Committee of the Institute, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

From the date to be announced by the Permanent Committee of the Institute in accordance with Article III of this Protocol, the Convention signed at Rome on June 7, 1905, by which the Institute was created, shall be no longer of any effect as between the parties to this Protocol, and the Institute (including the Center) thereupon shall be brought to an end.

ARTICLE II

The Permanent Committee of the Institute shall, in accordance with the directions of the General Assembly of the Institute, bring the affairs of the Institute (including the Center) to an end and for this purpose shall

(a) collect and bring together all assets of the Institute (including the Center) and take possession of the libraries, archives, records, and movable property thereof;

(b) pay and satisfy all outstanding debts and claims for which the Institute is liable;

(c) discharge the employees of the Institute and transfer all personnel files and records to the Organization;

(d) transfer to the Organization possession of and full title to the property in the libraries, archives, records, and all residual assets of the Institute (including the Center).

ARTICLE III

When the duties assigned to it by Article II of this Protocol have been completed, the Permanent Committee of the Institute shall forthwith, by circular letter, notify the Members of the Institute of the dissolution of the Institute (including the Center) and of the transfer of the functions and assets thereof to the Organization. The date of such notification shall be deemed to be the date of the termination of the Convention of June 7, 1905, and also the date of the dissolution of the Institute (including the Center).

ARTICLE IV

Upon bringing to an end the affairs of the Institute (including the Center) the powers, rights, or duties attributed to it by the provisions of the International Conventions listed in the Annex on this protocol, shall devolve upon the Organization; and the parties to this Protocol which are parties to the said conventions shall execute such provisions, insofar as they remain in force, in

all respects as though they refer to the Organization in place of the Institute.

ARTICLE V

Any Member of the Institute which is not a signatory to this Protocol may at any time accede to this Protocol by sending a written notice of accession to the Director General of the Organization, who shall inform all signatory and acceding Governments of such accession.

ARTICLE VI

1. This Protocol shall not be subject to ratification in respect to any government unless a specific reservation to that effect is made at the time of signature.

2. This Protocol shall come into force upon its acceptance in respect to at least thirty-five Governments Members of the Institute. Such acceptance shall be effected by:

(a) signature without reservation in regard to ratification, or

(b) deposit of an instrument of ratification in the archives of the Organizaiton by Governments on behalf of which this Protocol is signed with a reservation in regard to ratification, or

(c) notice of accession in accordance with Article V.

3. After coming into force in accordance with paragraph 2 of this Article, this Protocol shall come into force for any other Government a Member of the Institute.

(a) on the date of signature on its behalf, unless such signature is made with a reservation in regard to ratification, in which event it shall come into force for such Government on the date of deposit of its instrument of ratification, or

(b) on the date of the receipt of the notice of accession, in the case of any non-signatory Government which accedes in accordance with Article V.

In witness whereof the duly authorized representatives of their respective Governments have met this day and have signed the present protocol, which is drawn up in the French and English languages, both texts being equally authentic, in a single original which shall be deposited in the archives of the Organization. Authenticated copies shall be furnished by the Organization to each of the signatory and acceding Governments and to any other Governments which, at the time this Protocol is signed, is a Member of the Institute.

Done at Rome this 30th day of March 1946.

For the Government of Argentina:
CARLOS BREBBIA.

For the Government of Australia:
G. S. BRIDGLAND.

For the Government of Belgium (including the Belgian Congo):
G. DASPREMONT LYNDEN.

For the Government of Brazil:
J. LATOUR.

Sous reserve de ratification.

For the Government of Canada:
ALFRED RIVE.

For the Government of Cuba:
MIGUEL A. ESPINOSA.

For the Government of Denmark:
T. BULL.

For the Government of Egypt:
MAHMOUD MOHARRAN HAMMAD.

For the Government of Ireland:
MICHAEL MACWHITE.

For the Government of the United States of America (including Hawaii, the Philippines, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands):
DAVID MCK. KEY.

Subject to ratification.

For the Government of France (including Algeria, Franch West Africa, French Morocco, Indo-China, Madagascar and Tunis):
AUGÉ-LARIBÉ.

For the Government of Greece:
G. A. EXINTARIS.

For the Government of India:
JOHN O. MAY.

For the Government of Luxembourg:
G. N'ASPREMONT L.

For the Government of Norway:
SIGURD BENTZON.

For the Government of the Netherlands (including the Netherlands Indies):
H. VAN HAASTERT.

For the Government of Poland:
W. WYSZYNSKI.

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
JOHN O. MAY.

For the Government of Czechoslovakia:
Dr. JAN PAULINY TOTH.

For the Government of Turkey:
FURUZAN SELCUK.

Sous réserve de ratification.

ANNEX

LIST OF CONVENTIONS TO WHICH ARTICLE IV OF THE PROTOCOL RELATES

International Convention for Locust Control, dated at Rome, October 31, 1920.

International Convention for Plant Protection, dated at Rome, April 16, 1929.

International Convention concerning the Markings of Eggs in International Trade, dated at Brussels, December 11, 1931.

International Convention for the Standardization of the Methods of Cheese Analysis, dated at Rome, April 26, 1934.

International Convention for the Standardization of Methods of Analyzing Wines, dated at Rome, June 5, 1935.

International Convention for the Standardization of the Methods of Keeping and Utilizing Herd-Books, dated at Rome, October 14, 1936.

AMERICAN EMBASSY, ROME, ITALY.

I certify that this is a true copy of the original.

[SEAL] DAVID MCK. KEY,
Chargé d'Affaires ad interim.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I inquire of the Chair whether there are any nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that there is nothing on the calendar except treaties.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 2, 1946, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JULY 1, 1946

The House met at 11:30 o'clock a. m.

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

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever.

Amen.

By unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, June 29, was considered as read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6477. An act 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.

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

S. 2280. An act 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;

S. 2307. An act to provide that every Saturday shall be a holiday for banks and building and loan associations in the District of Columbia; and

H. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution to extend the succession, leading powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

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. 6739. An act 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 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. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MEAD, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. WHITE, Mr. BALL, and Mr. BRIDGES to be the 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. 6777. An act making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies 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. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. GURNEY 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. 6496) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the

House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 12, 19, and 62 to the foregoing bill.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had on June 29, 1946, examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title:

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 therof and supplementary thereto.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Saturday, June 29, 1946, he did, on Sunday, June 30, 1946, sign the following enrolled bill of the House:

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.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the House will stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 33 minutes a. m.) the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 11 o'clock and 42 minutes a. m.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE (HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF H. CON. RES. 152)

MEMORIAL SERVICES IN HONOR OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT, 1882–1945

PROGRAM

The Joint Committee on Arrangements

For the Senate: RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia; SCOTT W. LUCAS, of Illinois; WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California.

For the House: ALFRED L. BULWINKLE, of North Carolina; FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania; EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS, of Illinois; EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts; JAY LEFEVRE, of New York.

The joint session of the Congress

Music---------- United States Marine Band Orchestra (11–11:30, 11:45–12)

Capt. William F. Santelmann, leader

Prelude—Guilmant.
Calm as the Night—Bohm.
Melody of Peace—Martin.
Andante Cantabile—Tchaikowsky.
Adagio Élégiaque—Wieniawski.
Largo—Handel.

Presiding officer-------- The Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives

Invocation-------- Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., Chaplain of the House of Representatives

Vocal solo: Eternal Father, Strong to Save---- Mr. Robert Merrill, Metropolitan Opera Co.

(Miss Lila Edwards at the piano)

Address-------- The Honorable John Gilbert Winant, United States representative on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations

Vocal solo: The Lord's Prayer---------- Mr. Robert Merrill

Taps---------- Mr. Edward L. Masters Principal musician, USMC

Prayer and benediction------ Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., Chaplain of the United States Senate

The SPEAKER of the House of Representatives presided.

The Doorkeeper announced the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Members of the United States Senate.

The Senate, preceded by its President pro tempore, its Secretary, and Sergeant at Arms, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore of the Senate took the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the following guests, who were escorted to the seats assigned to them:

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affairs of foreign governments.

The governors of States and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Commanding General of the Army Ground Forces, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the Commandant of the Coast Guard.

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The members of the Cabinet of the late President Roosevelt.

The Honorable John G. Winant.

Mrs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt and members of the late President's family were escorted to the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, accompanied by a committee of escort of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall and took the seat reserved for him in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The SPEAKER. The Senate and House of Representatives, in joint session, with their invited guests, are assembled to pay tribute to the memory of one of the great Presidents of our Republic—a man beloved by millions, not only in his country, but in every nation of the world. In these simple services we wish to keep in remembrance something of the life, character, and public services of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

INVOCATION

Rev. JAMES SHERA MONTGOMERY, D. D., the Chaplain of the House of Representatives. Let us bow our heads in a moment of devotional silence.

(There followed a moment of devotional silence.)

Almighty God, unto whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid, cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of Thy holy spirit, that we may perfectly love Thee, and worthily magnify Thy holy name, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

O Thou who art the Father of us all, in whose sight a thousand years are but as yesterday, we ponder the strange tidings of destiny, in which are mingled joy and sorrow. We pray fervently that Thy spirit may possess our souls so that no selfish passion may hinder us from knowing Thy will and no weakness from doing it.

Today we are assembled to give tribute and honor to him who strove to create a new era of brotherhood for our country and the races of earth. His was the sympathetic heart and open mind for those who are scourged by the ills of misfortune and affliction. For him the winds did not speak more swiftly to the giant oak than to the humblest human flower by the wayside. As we contemplate the humane purpose in the life of Thy servant, grant that we, renewed and cheered, may turn to our particular tasks and ever stand for the maintenance of spiritual integrity of our land; and walking with Thee, may find the ways of peace and concord. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

VOCAL SOLO

Mr. Robert Merrill sang Eternal Father, Strong to Save, a favorite hymn of the late President Roosevelt.

INTRODUCTION OF MR. WINANT

The SPEAKER. The joint committee of the Congress has invited the Honorable John Gilbert Winant, a close friend of the late President, our former Ambassador to Great Britain, and now the United States representative on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, to deliver the address on this occasion. It is my privilege to present Mr. Winant.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JOHN GILBERT WINANT

Mr. WINANT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, and distinguished guests, it has been the custom of the Congress to set aside a day for appropriate exercises in commemoration of the life, character, and public services of Presidents of the United States who have died. This day has, therefore, been set aside in memory of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, thirty-first President, who took office at the gravest moment of an economic crisis which threatened the security of the Republic, who twice preserved his country, was three times reelected to its Presidency, and died in office in his country's greatest war, having lived to see the victory assured but not to share it.

The final estimate of Franklin Roosevelt's achievement will not be made by us or in this room. It will be made elsewhere, and later, and by men who will judge all of us, not him alone. What Lincoln's message of December '62 said of his listeners in this same House is true of us:

> We cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation.

But though we cannot pay the final tribute which time reserves to others, we can do what later generations may not

do. We can speak of Franklin Roosevelt as a living man. All of us in this room, or almost all, are men and women who knew him—men, for the most part, who served with him in government in this country's greatest war. Some of us loved him well. Some of us opposed him earnestly. Many in this room bore responsibility at his request; sat in council with him. There is not one of us here who did not watch him near or at a distance, privately or publicly, in the great trial which was his life.

Greatness in a man, as in a mountain, requires distance to be seen. The things a man has lived by take their place beside his actions in the true perspective of time, and the inner pattern of his life becomes apparent. In the long range, it is the things by which we live that are important, although the timing and circumstance play their part. This was true in the life of Franklin Roosevelt. He might have been speaking of himself, as well as of the country, when he said:

> To some generations much is given; of some generations much is expected. This generation has a rendezvous with destiny.

He played a great part in great events. He was his country's President and undisputed leader at a great and decisive moment in its history. Under his Presidency, the Republic reached the position of principal importance and power among the nations of the earth which it now holds. It may be, indeed, though God forbid, that the power to which the Republic then reached was the high power of its destiny: only we, the living, can determine whether that be so.

These are the facts of history which no man disputes. But greatness does not lie in the association—even the dominating association—with great events. Events have an impersonal inertia of their own and a nation is something other than the purpose of its officers of state. Greatness lies in the man and not the times; the times reflect it only. Greatness lies in the proportion.

In Franklin Roosevelt the qualities we knew were these—we who worked with him and watched him. He loved mankind. There was no one in public life in our time who had the confidence of a greater part of the people of the earth than Franklin Roosevelt. He had their confidence not only because he believed in them as men and women, but because he expected much of them as men and women. The world to him was not composed of nations only, nor the nations of classes. He did not believe in abstractions. He believed in individual human beings. The compact, as Walt Whitman put it, was always with individuals. The decisions, whether in war or in peace, were decisions which affected the lives of individuals. The friendships, the dissensions, the agreements were individual friendships, individual dissensions, individual agreements. He loved men, but he loved them to be free, to be themselves.

He was brave. There is no man in this room—not those who saw him in the weakest moments of a frightful illness—not those who saw him in the most terrible moments of the war—there is not one of us who can say that he saw Franklin Roosevelt afraid.

He was steadfast. Once the decision had been made, he stood to it. Strong-willed and stubborn of purpose, he chose the men and framed the plans to bring to bear upon his country's enemies the full and overwhelming power of its strength, turning the first and terrible defeats to victories unprecedented in the history of war. Those who know of their own knowledge what risks he had to take, what burden of responsibility he had to bear, know how to estimate his steadfastness.

He saw the facts and faced them. Even in the brief perspective of a year we have learned how well he saw the facts of danger to his country. At a time when few men other than he, whether in positions of responsibility or not, understood the meaning of the history of our time, he understood it. We know now from the mouths and records of our enemies how well he understood. At a time when it was intellectually unpopular and politically dangerous to face the facts, he faced them. Neither the initial indifference of many among our people upon whose understanding he must have counted, nor a campaign of personal vilification in certain sections of our press, rarely equaled in any country, deterred him. He carried the distasteful burden of an unpopular awakening and brought the people, not of his own country only, but of the democratic world, to see their danger while yet there was time—how little time—to save themselves and save the world they lived in.

He dared to act. It is not always that those who have the courage to see have the courage to act on what they see. Franklin Roosevelt acted. In two great crises, one within, the other without, his acts changed history. That the confidence of the American people in themselves and in their Nation was restored and strengthened by the vigor and decisiveness of his action of 1933, all of us here know, for many have shared in that action and remember well. That Britain was saved to fight the war through by the courage and decisiveness of his action of 1940 we know also. None of us who knew of that decision and its consequences can forget it now that the war is won.

He believed. There was no American of his time who believed more deeply in America than he, and no believer in democracy who had a firmer faith in man. Freedom to him was not a word but a reality; not a sentiment to which men might aspire, but a reality they might possess. The reaffirmations of the rights of man to which he committed his administration and his country in the domestic and the foreign crises of his years as President were reaffirmations not of word but fact. They stand with the great charters of mankind.

And finally, and most important of all perhaps for us who have outlived him, he dared to hope. There was never a time in the dark years of the depression, of the black years of the war, when he lost hope. And as the end of the war drew near, and the end of his life with it, his hope grew greater, grew beyond the war, beyond the victory to peace. He dared to hope for peace, to believe in peace, and to act for peace. Young in heart himself, he always thought of his country as young also, as the New World, as the builder of new worlds of peace. Believer in man, and believer therefore in men, he thought of this Republic of ours as part of that greater republic of mankind on which alone a true peace can be rested. He never thought the labor would be easy. He never questioned—he least of all men—that differences and difficulties would arise. But neither did he cease to hope. Nor would he now.

These then were his qualities as President and foremost citizen of the United States. Brave, steadfast, one who dared to see the facts, to face them, and to act; one who believed, who hoped. Whatever verdict history writes down; this much we know who knew him—that he was a man. God give us heart and will to take this Nation as he left it—not only powerful, not only rich but young and hopeful and confident and believing and strong—God give us heart and will to take this Nation forward as he meant to take it to a new, more daring future, a new world of peace.

VOCAL SOLO

Mr. Robert Merrill sang The Lord's Prayer.

TAPS

Taps was sounded by Mr. Edward L. Master, principal musician, United States Marine Corps.

PRAYER AND BENEDICTION

The Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., Chaplain of the United States Senate, offered the following prayer and benediction:

God of the living and of the living dead, in a realm where beyond these voices and party cries there is peace and a pure plane of appraisal where the motives and deeds of men are weighed in juster scales than ours, and where the souls of the righteous are in Thy hands and belong to the undivided nation forever:

We thank Thee for the life of this servant of Thine and of humanity who led the Republic in the days of its most crucial test and that for the world's fairest hopes he was a word made flesh in a torn and tormented generation. We give Thee thanks that while others slept Thou didst give him to see clearly that the vital issue was a slave world or a free world, and that Thou didst anoint him to make our America the arsenal of democracy's weapons for imperiled freedom everywhere.

Now that that foul tyranny is in dust and ashes we come to acknowledge in this Chamber, where with failing physical strength and faltering voice he gave a last account of his stewardship, that among the shining memories of the Nation he served will abide always the heritage of his personal courage, his utter faith in democracy, and his passion to uplift the underprivileged and the exploited everywhere.

We think tenderly today of his heroic triumph over bodily affliction and disability, a precious gift he has bequeathed to all who with maimed bodies have returned from the carnage to face the test he surmounted in the art of living. This memorial hour we would listen to his parting words, his marching orders, as Commander in Chief, as, being dead, he yet speaketh:

"Let us move forward with a strong and active faith, remembering that the only limit to our realization of tomorrow is our doubts of today."

We are grateful that in Thy providence before he ceased at once to live and to work he knew that triumph was perching on Allied banners, and that every white cross on far-stretching God's acres under alien skies was a belfry for the chimes of victory.

And now, under the spell of his example, with the elixir of his winged words still ours, we pray that when for us all the voices that praise or blame grow faint and drift away, Thou wilt give us to know that Thy everlasting arms are still there beneath us. At the last, when the fever of life here is over, bring us all to the homeland of Thy eternal love: In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect in every good work to do His will, working in you that which is well pleasing in His sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom be glory forever and ever. Amen.

JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The joint session of the two Houses is now dissolved.

The President and his Cabinet, Mr. Winant, the members of the late President Roosevelt's Cabinet, the Diplomatic Corps, Mrs. Roosevelt and members of the late President Roosevelt's family, the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, the governors of States and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the commanding general of the Army Ground Forces, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, the Commandant of the Coast Guard, the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Members of the Senate retired.

Thereupon, at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m., the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the House will stand in recess until 2 p. m. today.

There was no objection.

Accordingly, at 12 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m., the House stood in recess until 2 p. m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock p. m.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS AND INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1947

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 6777, an act making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is the chairman of the committee going to bring this back in disagreement on some of these appropriations for power projects and the construction of a fertilizer plant? They were never considered by this body.

Mr. WHITTEN. We are going into conference and I would hate to say in advance what the conferees will agree on. Of course, I cannot tell the gentleman at this time what action may be taken by the committee of conference or what kind of a report we may bring in. I am merely asking for the appointment of conferees.

Mr. RICH. You have there the construction of a Government fertilizer plant in Alabama. Is that going to be retained in the conference report?

Mr. WHITTEN. All I can say to the gentleman is that the conferees will confer on the matter and we will have to wait until action is taken on it.

Mr. RICH. Unless you bring that back in disagreement so the House will vote on it, I am going to object.

Mr. WHITTEN. I cannot speak for the conferees. All I can do is to request the appointment of conferees so that we can go into conference with the Senate.

Mr. RICH. Unless you will agree to use your influence to bring that back in the House, then I object.

Mr. WHITTEN. Does the gentleman mean to say that he would bind the conferees in advance of their meeting?

Mr. RICH. I am opposed to the Government setting up a fertilizer plant or any other kind of plant. I am not going to permit it to go through by unanimous consent at this time. I am against the Government going into business in competition with private enterprise. That is communism.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman will withhold his objection, I would like to make a further statement.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania withhold his objection?

Mr. RICH. I withhold the objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am not making a request to approve the report. This is for the appointment of conferees for the very purpose that the gentleman has in mind, and that is to consider the amendments which the Senate put in the bill. It does not have to do with approving the conference report at all.

Mr. RICH. Will you bring it back in disagreement?

Mr. WHITTEN. I cannot promise the gentleman what action the committee will take. I can speak only for myself. We will go into the matter.

Mr. RICH. Poll your committee and find out.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am sorry but the gentleman can pursue whatever course seems advisable to him, but I cannot poll the committee in advance.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1947

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 6739, an act 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, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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. HARE, TARVER, ROONEY, NEELY, ENGEL of Michigan, KEEFE, and H. CARL ANDERSEN.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Houston Chronicle of June 28.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include a statement in one extension.

Mr. WILSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three separate instances and to include editorials.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a short newspaper article, and in the other two brief letters.

Mr. CLASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include facts found by a department of the State of Massachusetts and also tables included in their report.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and in one to include a newspaper article.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Lorain Journal.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a resolution adopted by the Municipal Finance Officers Association, and in the other to include an article which appeared in the Meath Chronicle.

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a letter, and in the other a set of resolutions.

Mr. ROGERS of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech given by Kent Hurley, graduate of East Roger High school, entitled "Our Challenge in This Atomic Age."

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and include a letter from the Letter Box of the Detroit News.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short letter from the president of the Farm Bureau.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL ACT, 1942

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 689 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

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.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is 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. 192]

Adams	Granger	Patterson
Anderson, Calif.	Grant, Ala.	Peterson, Ga.
Andresen, August H.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Ploeser
Andrews, N. Y.	Hall, Leonard W.	Powell
Barden	Harness, Ind.	Rankin
Bates, Mass.	Harris	Reece, Tenn.
Bell	Hoffman, Mich.	Robinson, Utah
Bonner	Hoffman, Pa.	Rodgers, Pa.
Boren	Holifield	Roe, N. Y.
Boykin	Horan	Rooney
Bradley, Mich.	Izac	Sheridan
Bradley, Pa.	Jackson	Sikes
Brumbaugh	Jennings	Slaughter
Camp	Johnson, Okla.	Stewart
Clippinger	Kefauver	Stigler
Cochran	Kilburn	Tarver
Coffee	LeCompte	Thomas, N. J.
Corbett	Ludlow	Tolan
Cox	McGehee	Torrens
Crawford	McKenzie	Vinson
Curley	Mahon	Vursell
Daughton, Va.	Mankin	Wadsworth
Drewry	Mansfield, Mont.	Welch
Eberharter	Mansfield, Tex.	West
Engel, Mich.	Miller, Calif.	White
Gardner	Norrell	Wickersham
Gibson	Norton	Winstead
Gifford	Pace	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gillespie	Patrick	Wood
Gossett		Worley

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 345 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENDING EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes. I shall later on yield the usual 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order House Joint Resolution 371. It provides for 1 hour of general debate, after which the resolution will be read for amendment. Points of order against the resolution have been waived.

ACTION UNUSUAL

Some Members may ask whether the action of the Rules Committee was unusual. I will say without waiting for the query, yes, it is, but we have precedents for the action that has been taken by the Rules Committee. You will recall that a rule was given to the Case bill, though it had not yet been introduced and had no number, while the bill made in order by this rule, House Joint Resolution 371, was already formally before the House.

The Committee on Banking and Currency was precluded under the rules from calling a meeting to consider the joint resolution that was introduced by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE]. Realizing the importance and the seriousness of conditions that existed throughout our country, I called a meeting of the Rules Committee, and I am pleased to say that I am thankful to the majority members of the committee that they agreed to report this rule making the joint resolution in order. They, too, realized that it is of the greatest importance that action be taken without delay.

THIS BILL OF VAST IMPORTANCE

As I stated, it was my intention to call up the resolution Saturday afternoon, but before we had an opportunity to act we were informed that the Senate had adjourned. Consequently there was no benefit to be derived in urging the House to act Saturday.

I consider that this joint resolution before us is of such vast importance to the American people that I expect all fair-minded Members, whether on this side of the aisle or on the other side, who have the interest of the American people at heart, and the interest of the consumers at heart, will vote for the rule and will vote for the joint resolution, without trying to delay action unnecessarily.

NEWS SHOWS PRICES SKYROCKET

Mr. Speaker, the facts stated in the President's message are so clear and so convincing that I feel all of us, without regard to party affiliation, must realize the need for immediate action to save the country from plunging into a ruinous inflation.

If there are any remaining doubts as to the need for continuation of price control, surely a perusal of the day's news will convince the most skeptical. The majority of American businessmen are anxious to save the Nation from a boom that can end only in their own economic injury, but there are always some who, with a reckless disregard for their own and their country's welfare, will "get while the getting's good."

BEEF AT $1.75—NYLONS, $1.95

I have just been handed a brief summary of news from the news tickers. Let me mention a few of the items:

New York: Hindquarters of beef selling at 60 cents a pound wholesale, including waste, forces retail price up to $1.75 a pound.

Rhode Island: Nylons up from $1.35 to $1.95.

Chicago: Livestock up $1 to $5 per hundredweight.

New York: Cotton up $4 a bale.

New Orleans: Cotton up $5 a bale.

Chicago: Corn up 41 cents, selling at $1.85.

Boston: Room rentals up $5 to $10 weekly; residence rentals up, for instance, from $36 monthly to $45 monthly.

Memphis: Rents up 100 percent.

Philadelphia: Rents up. Example—from $90 to $150 a month, effective immediately, despite legal provision of 30-day notice.

St. Louis: Rents up 15 to 30 percent.

Chicago: Some rents more than doubled.

Miami: In one apartment hotel rent increased from $55 monthly to $160 monthly; maid and linen service eliminated.

Laguna Beach, Calif.: Resort rentals changed from $35 monthly to $10 a day.

BUTTER SELLING AT 99 CENTS

Here in the District of Columbia frying and roasting chickens are up 14 cents a pound. Oranges have jumped 50 cents a case. Fresh fruits and vegetables are selling to the highest bidders, with all price tags removed. Butter is selling at 99 cents in some stores in Washington and at $1.10 in Maryland. The price of scallops and crab meat advanced 35 percent. Tires went up from $16.25 to $21.75.

These, as I have explained, are merely news stories hot off the ticker, and you will read more details in today's and tomorrow morning's papers. I am told that some restaurants have increased prices 50 percent.

SUCH ADVANCES UNFAIR

I think it is unfair and un-American on the part of the irresponsible dealers responsible for these breath-taking advances to take advantage of the emergency; and I appeal to the decent dealers, if they have their own interest and the interest of the country at heart, to desist, and to comply with the appeals of the President of the United States and their own business and trade leaders.

Surely they should realize that if a wild inflation comes with its aftermath of depression and panic it is the small businessman who will suffer most and the small manufacturer who will be wiped out.

SMALL COMPETITORS CAN BE WIPED OUT

It is not unreasonable to suspect that the enmity of the National Association of Manufacturers for price control is based in part on the belief of the huge manufacturing interests that they can eliminate competition, and their virtual monopoly can be made absolute.

Certainly it will inure to the benefit of all business and all manufacturers if they will hold prices in check and not permit themselves to be swayed by greed to increase profits unfairly and without justification.

WARNING TO CONGRESS

At the same time these newspaper stories are a grave warning to us here in Congress to act promptly and fairly in protection of the people. Perhaps some of those who voted to sustain the President's veto did so under the misleading pressures of the National Association of Manufacturers and similar organizations and the powerful propaganda lobbies they have maintained to fight price controls. Surely they can see now that the anti-OPA lobbies have viciously misrepresented the facts.

As I stated here Saturday, this should not be a fight between Republicans and Democrats; it is a struggle between the desire of the people to make a living, and the desire of selfish interests to make a killing.

SHORTAGES ARTIFICIAL

I am not opposed to people making a fair return on their investments, Mr. Speaker. I believe in free enterprise; I myself have been in business. But free enterprise cannot be free if it uses its freedom to unjustifiably gouge the American people, as obviously some people in business are doing right now in this critical situation; and if that kind of freedom of enterprise is long indulged in it will lose its freedom entirely in the ultimate crash between the just anger of the people and being gobbled up by powerful trusts and monopolies who can ride out the crash.

We know that in all too many instances there has been no real shortages of goods where shortages were supposed to exist. The goods are being withheld from the market by greedy speculators and hoarders. If the food, the fabrics, and scores and scores of other high-demand articles had been put onto the market as they were produced there would have been few real shortages.

BUYERS CAN STRIKE ALSO

The American people can play that game too.

If the speculators think they can make a killing in the next few days, they are mistaken, because I know the consumers of the country will resent it, and they too can strike and can withhold their buying until these greedy men come to their senses.

I presume that my Republican friends who have been disarmed by the President's honest, straightforward, and positive presentation of evidence and facts will revert to name calling, and will charge that the Washington bureaucrats want OPA to be a continuing and permanent agency. Such insinuations and other unjustified charges are deplorable; they are unfair and anything but statesmanlike.

OPA DOES NOT DESTROY FREE ENTERPRISE

They will shout that free enterprise is being destroyed. I ask them: Have we free enterprise today when a few large groups can dominate the basic prices of everything we consume, and can withhold their products from market while their warehouses are bulging with unsold merchandise, in order to create artificial shortages and gouge the American public with falsely inflated prices? They willfully close their eyes and refuse to see that we are on the brink of economic crisis and chaos. Their shortsighted policies cannot aid them in gaining political advantage in the next political campaign; on the other hand, the just anger of the American people may well consign them to political oblivion for years to come.

I hold in my hand over 350 telegrams, and I have received thousands of letters and petitions to extend OPA in the face of continuously rising prices; how will millions of people with small incomes exist if the cost of living is constantly increased and their incomes are held constant?

IN ROOSEVELT'S MEMORY, EXTEND OPA

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me remind my colleagues of the prayers we offered this morning in memory of the greatest and most humanitarian of all our Presidents, who gave his life for the common people, and to express the hope that in his memory and in his example fair and honest consideration will be given to the legislation before us by all Members, even by the bitterest opponents of OPA. I know that if he were with us today he would strongly urge us to act favorably, and to extend price control, not permanently, but for at least 1 year. That this will be done I am sure, after you have seen what avaricious landlords, manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers have done in less than a day without price control.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order consideration of House Joint Resolution 371, extending the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended. All points of order against said resolution are waived. General debate shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue for not more than one hour, to be divided and controlled equally by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, after which it shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

I am opposed to this resolution because, like everyone here, I am convinced that unless Congress completely "bends its knees" in subjugation to the bureaucrats administering OPA, that we unfortunately cannot have any price-control legislation. After listening to the veto message of the President, after listening to his radio message to the American people, probably written by the OPA bureaucrats, it should be obvious to all of us that there can be no compromise, no mutual understanding. It should be apparent that there is only one way to settle this controversy to satisfy the President and that is for the legislative branch of our Government to completely capitulate and surrender to the executive branch. After 14 years of association with you, I feel certain that this you will not do. By so doing we would be weaklings. We would not be entitled to the respect of those who send us here. We would be surrendering a principle that undoubtedly would return to haunt us. Nothing would be more detrimental to our system of Government than to have the Congress of the United States meekly accept the dictates of another branch. By so doing we would be nullifying the protection of one-third of our branches.

On the floor of this House our beloved Speaker stated when this legislation was before us—I quote—"that in his opinion Congress would not pass a continuing resolution." I agreed with that statemen. I am of the opinion now, that even should we pass this resolution, the price-control legislation cannot be enacted because the great majority of the people of this country want less controls and the membership of this body knows it. With this in mind, I ask you how can legislation be enacted. Is it not useless for us to spend our time attempting to do something that we know to be impossible. Yes, we can pass this resolution extending the act for 20 days during which time the Banking and Currency Committee can endeavor to present us with another bill, a bill which I predict after consideration by this body will have less controls, and will consequently be vetoed by the President. We know the feelings of the other body and we can imagine the importance

of days of debate over on the other side of this Capital.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask you this. How can this Congress be honest with itself, how can we be consistent, if after months of profound study and consideration, we now about face and pass hurried legislation within the next few days with no additional evidence available, but with exactly opposite meanings and purposes? It should be obvious to all of us that the executive branch wants what it wants, nothing we will pass will receive approval except a measure free from our judgment; nothing but a measure as dictated by the bureaucratic administrators of the OPA. I am not willing to throw aside the judgment of this body to appease these bureaucrats. I am unwilling to accept the arbitrary position of the bureaucrats that either Congress is unfit and incompetent or dishonest.

Mr. Speaker, we must never forget that Mr. Truman has ignored the advice and council of his leaders on Capital Hill. I feel that he must know that you presented him for his signature the best compromise possible. Why should he subject you to humiliation?

Now this administration is attempting to scare Congress by a flood of telegrams. I refer to the many communications we have all received the past 48 hours. In answer to these last minute messages I would refer you to the many letters you have received from thousands of your people who have been penalized by the many unfair practices of those charged with the administration of OPA. In this grave hour we must not forget them.

Neither must we forget the months of hard work of the members of our Banking and Currency Committee. Weeks after weeks they heard conscientious and patriotic Americans from all walks of life. Who were these people? Small businessmen, manufacturers, consumers, spokesmen for agriculture, stockraisers, lumbermen, laborers, administrators for OPA. The measure Congress passed was passed after considered judgment. One that passed the acid test of careful and patriotic thought. Now do we wish to send them back to bring forth a measure for which they could have no respect? That is all that is acceptable to the administration bureaucrats.

Although, I believe that we should not take off basic price controls which would permit speculation; that we should not take off rent controls I voted against the vetoed bill because while the President thought it too moderate, I thought it too severe. I was of the opinion that it left too many unwarranted powers, too many control decisions to those administering the act. Therefore, last Saturday, along with many others I found myself in an ususual position. I sustained the veto of the President because it was too drastic—while he vetoed it because it was not drastic enough. I repeat, I was not alone in this predicament. I merely mention it now in attempting to illustrate the futility of our labors. A compromise is impossible.

Mr. Speaker, I trust this resolution will be voted down. Only by casting aside our considered judgment after extensive hearings and by shirking our responsibilities can legislation demanded by the President be enacted. For one I am not willing to do this.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Is it not a fact that OPA legislation died at midnight last night?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is true.

Mr. RICH. Then could something that is dead be continued? Would it not require entirely new legislation to revive it?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Well, that has me also confused. I repeat, it is merely shadow-boxing if we force a committee to go back, then come in here and lose all its respect and the respect of the Congress if they make an about-face and bring in new legislation which they will be compelled to do if they desire Presidential approval.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would like to ask the gentleman, why is this resolution worded as it is, extending the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, rather than the enactment and continuance of those acts?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I cannot answer the gentleman because the Banking and Currency Committee never met. The chairman of that committee came up and asked on his own motion for a rule. I do not believe they even took the trouble of going before the Banking and Currency Committee to ask the desire of the other Members.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Along the same line as the question raised by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, this resolution simply amends certain clauses of two laws which are now dead. Should we not, first, reenact the entire law, then amend certain parts of that law?

Mr. GRAHAM. We are dealing with two acts, not one.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I reiterate, I cannot understand why we should force the Committee on Banking and Currency to go back and attempt to bring in legislation when, according to the President's veto message and his message over the radio, there can be no compromise. We know full well that the people of the United States want less control and the bureaucratic administrators of the OPA want more control. Are we not shadow boxing here by taking the time of the Congress to even discuss this proposition?

Mr. GEELAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GEELAN. The gentleman is not making a correct statement. The gentleman states the committee will be doing an about-face on this measure. The committee did not bring the bill in as it was passed by the House; therefore the committee could very well stand on the bill that it reported.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I may say to the gentleman that in the event the committee comes in with another bill there will be less control than in the bill vetoed by the President and the President will more hastily veto the next bill that is presented.

Mr. GEELAN. What the President is asking for is to allow the people of the United States to tell the Congress of the United States how they feel about this, and they should be given that opportunity.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for the past 48 hours there has been a flood of telegrams coming to us. May I also ask you to just read the mail you have received over the past 3 or 4 years. Read again the letters that you have received from your small business people, from the consumers, from the farmers, from the small manufacturers, and that will give you every reason to vote against the pending resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I know that all of us feel badly because the President of the United States did not follow the advice of the leadership of this House and Senate. I know that those gentlemen fought gamely. Again, perhaps, we shall see the spectacle over in the United States Senate where they will be days and days not settling anything, because we know that there cannot be any compromise on the OPA, that it is a dead issue. The only compromise is to pass a bill giving to the President of the United States and these bureaucrats everything they desire. This, in my opinion, the Congress will not do.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Why join the panic? Why not give the American producer a chance for freedom? This morning I had a telephone call from the Middle West and I was informed that just as the grain was beginning to move to the legitimate dealers so the people could have food, instead of going to bootleg distillers and other bootleggers, over the radio came the false announcement that Congress had passed a continuing resolution by unanimous consent immediately after 12 o'clock.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I say that every one knows that this is shadow boxing. There can be no compromise.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Michener.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I want to impress upon you the fact that at midnight on yesterday, by direction of the President of the United States and a minority of those Members of the House voting to support his veto, OPA ceased to exist.

There is no Office of Price Administration at this hour. Confusion and uncertainty reign supreme in the land. The President, in his veto message and in his radio speech to the country, predicted such dire results from the death of OPA that there is reason for prudent

people to be alarmed. Reconversion has already been so delayed by strikes, misunderstandings, and the resulting lack of production, that a further period of uncertainty will surely make the picture worse. Yes, OPA is dead, but the President has indicated that he has a solution which he will ask the Congress to enact forthwith.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no stability warranting greater production, reasonable prices, and jobs for all during this hiatus. This controversy must be settled and settled as soon as possible.

We are confronted with a condition and not with a theory. For more than 5 months, the Congress has struggled valiantly with the OPA problem. We must not forget that there are three distinct lines of thought in the country. One group believes that our country has outlived the free enterprise system. They would have economic planning, implemented by bureaucratic control and regulation, from here on out. Another group would have none of price or rent control. They would wipe it out lock, stock, and barrel. Then there is another group in between, composed largely of those who are opposed to price control as a permanent part of the American system of government, and who believe that this war agency should be eliminated just as soon as the economy of the country will permit. They realize that when the Government entered upon the venture of supervising production, fixing prices, and regulating when our people can sow, when they can reap, when and where they can buy and sell, it got a bear by the tail, and it is an angry bear. Today he is going around in circles chasing his tail, and we must be mighty careful how we let loose; if we are not, certain groups of our people are going to get severely bitten. Those who have fixed incomes, as well as those who will not, or cannot strike to enforce their demands, must not be forgotten.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. All we are hoping is that the tail will not pull out.

Mr. MICHENER. I hope not, for if it does these groups will either get a hard fall, or a painful bite.

Mr. Speaker, while we have no OPA at this hour because of the Presidential edict, certainly the blame cannot attach to the Congress. True, the bill sent to the White House was a compromise. None of the three groups which I have mentioned had their way in writing it. As so forcibly stated to the House by our distinguished Speaker, it was the best compromise possible.

OPA was of value during the war. However, its administration has always been faulty. The Administrator has been arbitrary, unyielding, impractical, and domineering.

Chester Bowles, the Administrator, is an advertising man. His experience in the past has been that of a propagandist. He lacks practical business judgment and know-how to accomplish in the production field. In short, regardless of his intentions, he has been a failure as head of OPA. Certainly there are men of experience in the country who would do a better job. That is all water gone over the dam, however. Because of the attitude of Mr. Bowles, apparently supported by the President, all price control has been eliminated. Possibly we are attempting a futile thing. However, the President is pleading for just 20 days to work out a solution and bring before the Congress a new proposal that he says will be effective in the price-control and production field. If the future is to be judged by the past 5 months, the passage of this resolution will be but an idle gesture. Nevertheless, he may submit some simplified plan and name a new, practical administrator. There has been much over the radio and in the press within the last few days suggesting that Mr. William Jeffers, former rubber administrator, was being considered to take over OPA.

Somebody has responsibility for either proper administration of sensible price control or its abolition in a way that will not bring so much distress to our people. The Congress recognized this responsibility and sent to the President the best compromise possible. The President threw this handiwork out the window and pleads for but 20 days' additional time. Under present circumstances, this is the President's baby. In the meantime, he has told industry, labor, the farmers, little business, and big business to keep things in status quo for a few days until the Congress has time to consider his new plan. During that period we will have a sample of what is going to happen if price control is abruptly removed with nothing but moral suasion as an incentive.

For my part, I do not believe that the Congress should assume the responsibility which the President has assumed. Fifteen or twenty days is not a long time, it will pass very rapidly, and, unless the President has something up his sleeve that he has not yet shown to the Congress or to the country, there is little possibility of OPA's revival beyond the 20 days. This whole OPA matter is a hot potato and I do not propose to let the President hand it back to the Congress just for the sake of getting rid of it. As a practical matter, that is what his veto message amounted to. Be it remembered that this spiral of increased costs had its inception in the President's order requiring increases in wages and, thereby, in cost of production.

Evidently the President has been the recipient of a mess of bad advice. By his act destroying every vestige of OPA he has not only killed price control, he has taken rent control along with it. If rent control is desirable, and the President objected to other features of the bill, the rational course would have been to sign the bill, save what was good in it, and submit proposed changes. He pursued the other course. Indeed, his course is most unusual and lacks every element of cooperation between the Executive and the elected Representatives of the people. Who is Chester Bowles that he, an appointed bureaucrat, should tell the Congress that it must accept his dictation or there will be no OPA?

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON. Does the gentleman from Michigan feel that 20 days will give the President time to clear any price-control bill that this Congress would pass with Sidney Hillman and his "Red" outfit?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, possibly other members of the Rules Committee will discuss in some detail those from whom the President receives his advice, those with whom he clears. I have very definite views concerning some of these advisers, politicians, and self-seekers. However, that is beside the question here, and I do not want to inject anything political in these remarks. This should not be a political issue.

In conclusion, I want to reiterate that OPA should be done away with the very minute that this can be accomplished with safety to our country and without great suffering to our people. Prices have materially increased under OPA; they will continue to increase in some cases, with or without OPA. As production is stepped up, supply will come into balance with demand; and when that happens, there will be no more necessity for OPA.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I cannot feel that it is exactly fair for it to be said that the existing situation is the fault of the President. I think the record shows that the President of the United States months ago called to the attention of the Congress the desirability and necessity of doing something about the OPA. Congress did not do anything about it until just a few days ago.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I ask the gentleman why Congress did not act? Whose fault was it, probably, that Congress did not act?

Mr. CLARK. Probably a little on each side of the aisle.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Who has charge of the legislative program?

Mr. CLARK. I think the gentleman knows the Democrats do and probably will continue to do so for some time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The rest of this year.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I am very glad to have you assume responsibility.

Mr. CLARK. To be perfectly candid and frank about the matter, I was only making the point that I do not think Congress skirts are entirely clear in this matter. We have got into an unfortunate situation, but to the average American citizen it will not be reasonable or

sensible that the Chief Executive and the Congress cannot get together and do something sensible and effective to prevent what is in my judgment the greatest economic crisis that has ever existed in the United States. If we do not do so, and the dire results that are entirely possible by reason of that neglect carry this Nation into economic chaos, we should not be unmindful of the fact that the whole world may be affected. Let us not forget that we are really the last sound, stable, and solvent Nation in the world today.

I think we ought to take this 20 days. The existing situation is as much or more our fault than it is that of the Chief Executive. We should not quibble about that. Let us vote this 20 days' extension and see if we cannot within that time do something that will meet the necessities of a grave situation.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the matter of the time just referred to by the gentleman from North Carolina, I think it might be well to call attention to the fact that the price-control extension was passed in the House of Representatives the 18th of April last, which was quite some time ago.

The President's veto of the OPA bill will make good news in Moscow, but his action shows a reckless disregard for the welfare of our country and of the views of the Congress, which represents our people, and his own party leaders in the Congress. Although he has insisted that the whims and the policies of the bureaucrats must be continued without correction, Mr. Truman's veto message expresses approval of many of the provisions of the bill which Congress sent him. The inconsistency in his attempted justification of his position causes him no apparent embarrassment.

The truth is the President is the misguided follower of the most violent partisans of the New Deal. They told him to abolish the War Labor Board last year and he did so. They told him the country faced deflation and they were wrong. They told him the Government should seize the steel industry and the coal mines and write labor contracts. He followed their lead. They told him labor should get wage increases and the employers should have no compensating price increases. They told him that producers could be made to produce at a loss—and shortages followed and production was paralyzed.

They told him the Government's erroneous fiscal policies must be pursued without correction, and no steps have been taken to correct the basic difficulties confronting us. The value of the dollar continued to decline.

Meanwhile these factors were mounting, and were forcing black markets and rising prices. OPA itself granted 824 industry-wide price increases since VE-day, and thousands of individual price adjustments which increased the cost of living.

Finally Congress acted and sent the President the Case bill, by an overwhelming vote. The New Deal politicians told him to veto it and he did so. Congress sent him the Hobbs bill and he says he has submitted it to the departments, which means the New Deal bureaucrats, for their advice. Congress sends him an OPA bill designed to deal realistically with the demands of a situation which the bureaucrats created. Once again they tell the President to override Congress, and the President responds accordingly. These things do not merely reflect incompetence and bungling. They are purposeful, willful acts designed to produce the very plight in which the country finds itself. They are part of a policy looking to demands for a nationalization of business and for a socialist economy. These New Dealers give impetus to their program through thousands of Government propagandists. They aim to destroy the Congress and to substitute bureaucracy and a Washington dominated and controlled economy.

The crisis confronting the country has been deliberately created. It is politically inspired to the end that government shall direct the American economy and control the American people. And the President has been victimized by the planners and the plotters who bring this about.

Congress is entitled to the support of the American people. This is their Congress—fighting for the people, for the American system, against the bureaucrats. The issue was inevitably bound to come to a head. The "Macedonian cry" we now hear is from the President—for the bureaucrats and the New Deal.

However, we have an immediate problem, the handling of which has tended further to division among the American people. It has been precipitated by the New Deal and left wing bureaucrats who have manned our agencies and our bureaus and who are the advisers to the President. How it happened, important though it be, must be set aside for further discussion under other circumstances. I feel that the important thing now for me as a legislator, is to recognize the practicalities and to do what I can for the immediate and best interests of the country under the conditions prevailing.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the resolution which we have before us provides for the extension of OPA until July 20, a period of 20 days, during which time it is hoped that the objections of the President to the extension bill passed by the Congress can be ironed out in a satisfactory manner. I very much hope that they can. I do not know whether the predictions of uncontrolled inflation will come to pass if OPA is not extended. No one else knows. But I am very much afraid that we would experience a period of inflationary prices in cost-of-living items that would be disastrous to the great masses of people who work on fixed salaries, wages, and fixed incomes. We must not take that chance. The differences between the Congress and the President must be composed in the interest of the welfare of the Nation. The greatest good for the greatest number demands retention of adequate but sensible price control.

Personally, I believe it desirable to continue price control for a period of 12 months, and I so voted when the bill was up in he House. I do not believe that any essential cost-of-living items should be arbitrarily lifted from price control, and so voted when the bill was before the House.

It has been said on high authority in both the Senate and the House, that if the President vetoed the bill passed by the Congress, there would be an end to price control, as the Congress would not yield on any of the questions in disagreement between the legislative and executive branches. The subject is too vital to the Nation to accept this defeatist attitude. We are confronted with a condition of the utmost gravity. Regardless of who is right, or who is wrong in the controversy, it is imperative that we rise above the personal animosities that have been engendered in this controversy, and do something that will control the prices of essential cost-of-living commodities until the natural law of supply and demand can again function.

I, therefore, strongly favor the resolution to extend the present act, pending further legislation. However, I do not believe that a 20-day extension will be effective. It has taken us nearly 6 months to get through the bill which was vetoed. Some months ago, I expressed on the floor of the House the hope that Congress would act promptly on this vital subject and not wait until the last minute and leave the Nation in the present uncertainty in which we find ourselves.

I do not believe, in the first place, that Congress can act calmly and adequately within the brief period of 20 days proposed in this resolution. In the second place, in all fairness to the administrators of the OPA, whatever changes are made in the law should be made far enough in advance of the effective date so that the OPA can have the opportunity to study them and be prepared to put them into effect when the law goes into operation. To pass an amended act and require the OPA to formulate its regulations and put them into effect overnight, or within a few days, places upon that agency an impossible task that would be unfair both to the agency and to the public, and would add to the confusion already existing.

I, therefore, suggest that the resolution be amended to extend the present law for a period of 60 days, instead of 20 days.

We can all sympathize with the impatience of the American people to be rid of the rigid, and often foolish and unfair, regulations, and the petty persecutions that some officials of the OPA have visited upon innocent people. But this question now before us is whether it is better to put up with the present annoyances, inconveniences and often injustices, or do away entirely with price control and take the chance of uncontrolled

inflation with all of its attendant evils and sufferings.

I am not willing to take that chance and I say so with full knowledge and after extended investigation of the many just complaints that have been lodged against the administration of the OPA.

The Special Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies, of which I am chairman, held weeks of hearings on complaints of arbitrary and unlawful activities on the part of the OPA. We made several reports to the Congress, critical of the agency's arbitrary and capricious abuses of its authority. We thought and still think that it is highly desirable that these abuses be corrected, and corrected promptly. We have not hesitated to say so, either in our reports or in our conferences with Mr. Chester Bowles and his advisers. And yet, when it comes to the question of abolishing price control, or putting up with the inadequacies and injustices of its present administration, I unhesitatingly advise that we adopt an extension resolution for a period of 60 days, instead of 20 days, and settle down earnestly and calmly to a fair solution of the differences between the Congress and the President.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks that this resolution is sufficient, in view of the fact that the OPA expired last night at midnight.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. I do not think anybody is going to try to violate this resolution if the Congress passes it and the President signs it. I think that is a question that is not practical.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman feel that it is good legislative practice to try to amend a law which has expired?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. As a matter of fact, the last paragraph in this resolution undertakes to revive the law. Whether it can do so constitutionally or not I do not answer; but I say that for all practical purposes it will revive the law.

Mr. COOLEY. Why would it not be well to amend the resolution so as to reenact the law if that is what you desire to do?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I feel very deeply about inflation. I said the other day and I say now that we passed a workable bill. I do not believe that we are going to be able to get any more rigid control bill than the one we passed. I am afraid the other body will insist on removing controls from all foods. The Members of this House do not realize how hard we did work to persuade the conferees of the Senate to leave controls on food. The conferees of the House were finally successful in persuading the conferees of the Senate to let controls stay on food, and I think they ought to be on food, clothing, and rents for a while longer.

I do not believe we are going to get a better bill.

I am satisfied that the bill that we passed would have worked.

I believe the President has made a mistake in vetoing the bill the conferees and the leaders of the House and Senate asked him to O. K., but if he thinks he can get a more rigid bill or if he thinks he can get any bill at all let us give him the time stipulated in this resolution, because I feel deeply we must have control on scarce commodities during this emergency. If we cannot get any more satisfactory bill for the present than we have passed, I believe if we repass the same bill the President, upon mature consideration, will sign it.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, when this rule came before the Rules Committee, and before it was brought to a vote, we discussed it rather thoroughly, and then when it was finally brought to a vote after the Senate had adjourned, I voted against it for several reasons. First of all, I questioned then, and I question now, whether the Congress, by House Joint Resolution 371, can legally and constitutionally extend a law that has already died, that has already expired, and that no longer exists; and I think the courts will have something to say about that.

Second, I examined, and questioned very carefully and fully, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, when he appeared before the Rules Committee last Saturday and asked for this rule. I asked him whether or not in his opinion the House could in the short space of 20 days prepare and enact price-control legislation that would be satisfactory to the Congress and to the President, when we have failed to do so after 4½ months of hard work and full consideration. The gentleman's answer was that he did not know. He said very frankly and very honestly that he could give the committee no assurances that any legislation could be presented which would be enacted by the Congress or approved by the President. And then, finally, I had this in mind: There is a fundamental issue involved, a fundamental difference of opinion, between the Chief Executive on the one hand and the Congress on the other. The Chief Executive has seen fit to veto the price-control legislation Congress has sent him, despite the sincere counsel and advice of the legislative leaders of his own party in the Congress that the measure was the best that could possibly be expected from the National Legislature, and should be signed by him. By his action the President, and he alone, killed price control, killed OPA, and killed rent control.

This difference exists between the executive and the legislative branch. We do not believe here that there should be a continuation of these permanent controls, of all these broad powers, but that there should be changes and amendments in the law; while the President has followed the advice of Chester Bowles, the bureaucrats and the left-wingers, and he takes the position that there should be no change, or practically no change, and that the powers, the broad and great authorities, that he has exercised, either directly or through his bureaucratic agencies, should be continued, perhaps indefinitely, because he asks that they be continued until June 30 next year without any real break in subsidy payments.

That is the fundamental difference and that is the fundamental issue before us. So I suggested, and I did so, not facetiously at all, but in all seriousness, to the Democratic leadership present before the Rules Committee that the one honest, fair thing to do to settle this issue was to bring in an extendure resolution, not for 20 days, because we know nothing is going to be done in the 20 days. In fact, we are back, right now, where we were when we came in the first of last February, and at the end of 20 days we will be back again where we came in today, in exactly the same position we are now. So I suggested that the administration and the leadership, which has the voting power in, and control of, the committees having jurisdiction of this measure, bring in a simple resolution extending price control "as is" for 6 months, or until December 31, 1946, and give the Congress and the people the opportunity to pass upon the clear-cut issue whether they want to continue OPA as it is, or want something else.

Mr. Speaker, this is a Democratic administration. The President of the United States is the head of the Democratic Party. He has seen fit to deliver a political veto, and a political message to the people of the United States in his recent address. This Congress, the House and the Senate, is controlled by heavy Democratic majorities. We have able Democratic leadership in this and the other body, and I am sure that regardless of what any of us on the Republican side, on the minority side, of this House, or the other body, might think about this legislation, the Democratic leadership and majority in the Congress of the United States can enact any kind of legislation they want. It is a strong leadership. They are able, they have the capacity to lead. So, let the Democratic leadership demonstrate its capacity and assume that responsibility.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Let the great majority here measure up to its responsibility, let them assume the leadership in this great hour of crisis, and enact the kind of legislation it wants regardless of what anyone else may think about it. Then the country can decide next November, on the first Tuesday after the first Monday, whether it has been right or wrong. That is the chal-

lenge. It is their responsibility. Let them live up to that responsibility.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman support an amendment to extend it say to January 20, 1947? That will be 3 weeks after the new Congress reassembles.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No; I would not. But that does not make any real difference. You have the votes on your side of the aisle. You have the responsibility. You have a majority of 50 or more in the House, and 18 or 20 in the Senate. Why do you not use those majorities, if you can control and order your own party and if you have the leadership that you should have, for you are next to the ranking member of your commmittee, and enact the kind of legislation you want? That is your right, your duty and your responsibility.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, it is all too plain that our American economy is once more rushing toward the brink of disaster. Already the danger signals so well remembered from the debacle of 1929 are unfurled.

If any added proof is needed of this warning let me read into the RECORD excerpts from an Associated Press dispatch of Saturday last on the situation on the New York Stock Exchange.

The following table shows some industrial issues which have capped their 1929 highs—adjusted where stock splits have occurred:

	High, 1929	High, 1946
Celanese Corp	57⅞	83½
Chrysler	135	141
Douglas Aircraft	45½	108⅞
Loew's, Inc	28⅛	41
May Department Stores	54¼	70
Phillips Petroleum	47	73¼
Sears, Roebuck	45¼	49⅝
Swift & Co	34¾	41⅛
U. S. Gypsum	91⅝	132
U. S. Rubber	65	80
Wilson & Co	13½	19⅞

In late June the Associated Press average of 20 industrial stocks stood at about 105, or only 29 percent below the 1929 record of 146.9. At the 1946 high it was 25 percent under 1929.

The current level of the market as indicated by the Associated Press averages is corroborated by other well-known price gages.

Barron's index, based on the market value of all shares listed in the New York Stock Exchange, was 23 percent below the 1929 peak on May 31, last date for which the index was computed. The industrial component was only 14 percent under 1929.

Standard & Poor's weekly index of 354 industrials was 19.8 percent below 1929 on June 12 this year.

Stock market analysts have put two labels on the 1946 market: First, it is an inflation market; second, it is one of the thinnest markets on record.

The logical sequence to uncontrolled prices, Mr. Speaker is a runaway market in which millions of Americans will again lose billions of their wartime savings.

The Congress cannot ignore this situation. We must set up at once a sensible procedure to check this inflationary hurricane. To do this effectively, the Congress must have some definite commitment from our manufacturers, processors and from labor groups that the "line" once set by legislation will be strictly adhered to. Any other course is fraught with grave danger to our future economy.

As a friend of 20,000,000 union workingmen, I urge the House to vote approval on the pending rule.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] are very clever, and as we follow them through the sum and substance of them would be that a minority party in our constitutional set-up has no responsibility; that under our set-up the minority party is an opposition party like it is in any other parliamentary government. Under our form of government, the minority party has its responsibilities, the responsibility of constructively criticizing, the responsibility of constructively proposing, and the responsibility of supporting good legislation. My good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] thoroughly realizes that, but in his genial and able and subtle remarks he seeks to throw this responsibility only on the majority party, in this case the Democratic Party, a theory that has no place under our two-party system.

The debate has been very fine, and I am not going to enter into the realm of politics, except the brief observation I just made, which is not of a partisan nature. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] very ably presented the situation from the minority angle. Other Members from the majority side have spoken.

We are faced with a condition and not a theory. I am not going to blame Congress or blame anyone else for the present situation. Months ago I saw the probability of it, and I sent a memorandum around urging early action in committee. Now, as practical men, we realize that when a minority of any committee wants to delay, that it is pretty difficult for the majority and the chairman of a committee to prevent delay. You cannot accuse Members, whether they are of the minority party or of the majority party, of filibustering in the committee when they want to have any number of witnesses appear before them. Those who have been here for years are too well acquainted, from a practical angle, with the operation of committees to know that you cannot arbitrarily cut short hearings when a minority, whether political, or a combination of Republican and Democratic Members constituting a minority, want to have hearings held. In any event, hearings went on, and on, and on, in this branch and in the other branch, and the bill was presented to the President Saturday, June 29, with the law expiring on Sunday, June 30, at midnight.

The President of the United States immediately sent back his veto.

There has been some misunderstanding, as far as I am concerned, about the leaders' talk. I frankly told the President that I thought it was a very poor bill that we had presented to him. If I may use the phrase I did use, privately speaking, and which I know will not be misunderstood in this Chamber, I said the bill was "rotten." I urged the President to sign the bill if he felt he had the ability to control prices, but if he did not think that under that bill he would have the ability to control prices in the national interest of the people and the country, then I did not expect him to sign the bill. He had his constitutional duty to perform. We did ours by sending the bill to him. I do not think it is fair to criticize any person for exercising his judgment and his conscience. One can disagree, I agree with that, but to impugn the motives of any man I do not think is fair.

In any event, we are faced with a condition, and I urge the passage of this resolution today. All we can do is do the best we can. Speaking as the majority leader of this House, I serve notice on the country that whether Members vote for the resolution or not, we are doing the best we can as quickly as we can.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCOWEN].

LIBERTY OR THE OPA—WHICH?

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Speaker, at 12 o'clock midnight last night the Liberty Bell rang again and "proclaimed liberty throughout the land unto the inhabitants thereof" in strict harmony with the inscription made on it long before the American Revolution. Liberty throughout the land, by the death of the OPA, and freedom were restored to Americans to make men who were free before World War II, free again. The question now is, Will this Congress preserve this newly restored liberty by not reenacting the price-control law? The statutory death of the price-control law ended bureaucratic terrorism and despotic control over the lives of Americans in many fields of business. It should not be renewed at this time. A price-control law that has caused a black market of so great an extent as now exists, that has created a scarcity by having ceiling prices below the cost of production, and that has humiliated honest Americans by persecution in the name of prosecution, much like the star-chamber methods of old, should remain dead.

Some would renew the Price Control Act for fear of inflation, if it did not exist. This fear, in my opinion, is not well founded. Much inflation existed under price control. There will be some increase in prices when controls are removed whether it be now, 6 months from now, 1 year from now, or at any other time. But when those controls are removed production will be free to increase

and will increase rapidly. The law of supply and demand will reduce prices to some degree of normality and people will be able to get the things they need. Production will prevent inflation to a large degree.

A greater issue is involved in price control than the mere question of dollars and cents. It is the question as to whether we shall have regimentation in general by the Federal Government or whether free enterprise shall exist, and, as a consequence, whether freemen shall remain free. Those who fought and won the American Revolution risked the loss of all their earthly possessions, as well as their lives, for freedom, that freedom which has been handed down to us. Is it not up to us to preserve that freedom by ending a planned economy now? One of the big steps in that direction is to let the dead OPA remain dead.

Let us show the world that the Government of the Republic of the United States is the servant of the people, and not its master. Let us show the world that Americans in time of peace can run their own affairs honestly, intelligently, and right, and that democracy lives in the United States, by not reenacting a price-control law now.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the pending legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, all sensible people want to do all things that are necessary to prevent inflation. I think we can all agree on that. As to how to obtain this objective which we all agree can be obtained there is considerable division. While I voted to override the President's veto, believing as I did the price-control bill as passed was the best bill we would be able to obtain, I am perfectly willing to make a further effort, and therefore shall vote for the resolution under consideration. If this further effort proves successful we will all become the beneficiaries of the effort; if, on the other hand, it proves unsuccessful we will be in no worse fix than we are today. We, therefore, have everything to gain and nothing to lose by supporting the resolution.

I hope it will be the pleasure of the House to adopt the resolution.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the following:

I would like to vote for rent control effective until we are able to build more houses, and the law of supply and demand will take care of the situation. I do not want to see people evicted from their houses and on the streets, but OPA should have given some relief to those landlords who lost money under OPA regulations when their expenses of operation increased greatly.

I am now and always have been against subsidies. With people making high wages, we can keep our Treasury from going on the rocks by stopping those subsidy payments which never should have been made. That system was started in Germany, and see what happened there. We do not want it to happen here.

The law of supply and demand is our best and most efficient price regulator under the private enterprise system. It will protect the farmer, the merchant, the manufacturer, and the worker. It made America great. I am against this bureaucratic government. It is foreign to our Constitution, and to our Government, previous to the New Deal. I never supported it in the past, and I am too much of an American to vote for it now. By the methods of inefficiency employed, price control as administered by the OPA has done more to make merchandise scarce than any other agency of government. Many of the regulations have been most ridiculous, no business in them. The OPA has hindered production, thus increasing the black market and causing higher prices, and creating scarcities. OPA creates more black markets than prohibition ever did, and we have seen illegal selling of all kinds of produce at ever higher prices. Scarcity is more and more apparent in many commodities.

If we do not give everything away to foreign countries, our supply will catch up with demand in a few months. The majority of our people are honest businessmen, and I do not look for the honest manufacturers, merchants, and farmers to gouge the workers and attempt any excessive profiteering. I believe in our people, and want to see them given a chance. I am against bureaucratic government and regimentation. I believe in our Constitution, and have always supported it and will continue to do so. Working under that Constitution has made America a great Nation. It is high time to stop tearing it down.

The OPA died last night at 12 o'clock.

This resolution is not constitutional to reenact OPA. You should pass a new law if you want to revive the OPA. When a thing is dead, it is dead—you cannot put life in it. Let us do things constitutionally; you all took an oath to do so.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, in the last month, President Truman has demonstrated on two different occasions his capacity as a great leader in this afterwar economic emergency. His first demonstration of fearless leadership was the vetoing of the Case bill, disregarding the great pressure brought upon him by antilabor forces throughout the country. His veto of this measure was upheld by the narrow margin of five votes. It is my firm belief that had President Truman not presented his temporary emergency legislation to the joint session of Congress on the previous Saturday, the Case bill would be on our statute books today. His leadership on that occasion averted the further rise of industrial unrest and confusion and today we can see economic peace on the horizon.

His second demonstration of great leadership was when he vetoed the impotent and emasculated OPA legislation last Saturday. By that veto he served notice on the special privileged pressure groups of this country that they cannot amass postwar profits at the expense of the American consumers. His veto of a weak and impractical price-control bill assured the millions of Americans that they had a champion in the White House who will fight to preserve their savings, defense bonds, wages, insurance policies, homes, and their future security.

Every Member of Congress who has the interest of the consuming public at heart should vote for this continuing resolution—House Joint Resolution 371—which will make the present law effective until July 20, 1946. Within the next 20 days I hope Congress and the Senate will join on the passage of a rigid and stable price-control law which will carry through this emergency and save us from a paralyzing inflation and industrial turmoil.

RENTS SHOULD BE CONTROLLED

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this resolution asking for the continuance of the OPA for 30 days should be defeated. I spent the week end in one of the country's greatest industrial centers. I spoke with many people and overheard a great many conversations. I found that there is a genuine fear existing in the public mind because of the President's veto action.

I learned, however, that the fear centers around rents. I have always felt, and still do feel, that rent control should be retained, but in all cases the administration should be in the hands of local authorities. I read an Associated Press report on Sunday which said that in most of the States the Governors have the authority to set up rent control. The report stated further that the Governor of Pennsylvania has this authority. I have since been informed that he has asked the Attorney General for an opinion on this matter.

This gives me reason to believe that should necessity arise our Governor will take appropriate action. My reasons for wanting this control in the hands of local authorities is because I believe that they will adjust the glaring inequalities that have been tolerated under the OPA administration.

So far as other controls are concerned, I learned that people want food and are not so much concerned about the price. I heard many people express the belief that while prices will undoubtedly rise, the prices will still be lower than present black-market prices. About 1 week ago I saw practically a new sedan stop in front of a grocery store here in the capital. The driver got out, opened the trunk of the car, pulled out a quarter of beef, and carried it into the store. His trunk was packed solid with meat. It was about 8 in the evening. Legitimate slaughterers or dealers do not handle meat this way. No doubt, this turned out to be expensive eating for those who had the price.

The trainmaster in the railroad yards at Pittsburgh, who has handled all the livestock coming from the West for nearly 25 years, informed me that during the last 6 months more livestock passed through the Pittsburgh yards, where they are unloaded, fed and watered, than have at any other period during his time.

Shipments are at their peak at this moment. Very recently three men came into the yards as he was making up trains and inquired about three carloads of cattle they had in transit. He pointed out their cars and they requested him to put them in a train that had just been made up. He informed them that they were too late, the train would leave shortly, and that he would put their cattle in the next train, which would leave in a few hours. When they became insistent and declared they must have their cattle in New York at the earliest possible movement, they offered him $100 per car to get them in the first train. The cattle did not get away until the trainmaster included the cars in the next train 6 hours later.

Now, talking about black market, here is a case where these fellows purchased cattle at ceiling or above, came to Pittsburgh from New York to expedite their shipping, then slaughtered the cattle somewhere in black-market fashion, losing all the offal, hides, and so forth. This made expensive beef for somebody, and no doubt a lot of money for the black-market racketeers. Could this beef have gone into an open competitive market no doubt it would have reached the public at a much lower cost than it did otherwise, and the byproducts, so much needed, would have been utilized.

Hon. C. GROSS:

OPA will die Sunday at midnight. Please ask Congress not to write another OPA bill. I want clothes for my body, household goods for my home, and food for my children. I trust the merchant will not raise his price more than to cover the OPA profit loss. I am willing for the merchant to have it.

A HOUSEWIFE.

To Congress:

Hon. C. GROSS: OPA is dead. Please do not write another bill. We will soon have the scarce articles we are longing for: Meat, butter, pepper, sugar, bread, flour, and so forth.

HOUSEWIFE (10 of a family).

JUNE 29, 1946.

Hon. C. GROSS:

OPA goes out Sunday night, and I am very glad. Now I can shortly get the scarce articles I have needed so badly. Butter will be back, and then I will not have to chew dry bread. I feel very poor in a land which at one time knew no scarcity.

A DEMOCRATIC VOTER.

JUNE 29, 1946.

Hon. C. GROSS:

OPA expires Sunday night and I feel sure we will now get prosperity. Burn OPA bill. We will get all the scarce goods caused by the OPA. It should have been kicked out last year. Why is it Truman does not declare the war over? Politics, I suppose. He is holding all the war emergency agencies, causing higher national debt.

A MOTHER OF FIVE CHILDREN.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: OPA is dead. Please bury it deep before it smells.

A DEMOCRATIC VOTER.

Hon. C. GROSS,
Washington, D. C.:

Now OPA is dead, please bury it deep in the ash pile.

AN OLD-LINE REPUBLICAN VOTER.

YORK, PA., *June 30, 1946.*

Representative CHESTER GROSS,
Washington, D. C.:

We applaud the return to the law of supply and demand for merchandise pricing, and suggest a 15 percent approved increase on rents.

Mr. and Mrs. A. E. CROCKETT, Jr.

BELAIR, MD., *July 1, 1946.*

Hon. CHESTER H. GROSS:

Your support of President's veto is commendable if followed by active effort to reinstate price control over rents and scarce commodities. As a life-long Republican, I urge support of extension act, but this action is probably too sensible to be expected.

C. CLARK GAILEY.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, many of the speakers from the Republican side of the House in this debate on the extension of OPA have been laboring over the fact that the Speaker called on the House to vote for the passage of the conference report. They try to maintain that we who voted with the Speaker will be inconsistent unless we now vote against extending price control. Let me point out that had we not voted on the conference report there would have been no dramatic veto message. Had the House voted the conference report down it would have meant an undramatic end of OPA and the real issues involved would have not been brought sharply to the attention of the people. Had it not been brought to the attention of the people we would not have this opportunity today to vote for this resolution to extend OPA. A lot of crying has come also from the Republican side of the House because of the gap between the expiration of OPA and this extension resolution. Let me also point out that had the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] not objected to the immediate consideration of the extension resolution on last Saturday that the resolution may have been passed before the expiration of the old law.

We should not quibble longer about bygones. Let us consider the problems facing us today and pass this resolution to extend OPA.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the conference report when it was before this House last week. I voted to sustain the President's veto of the bill. I voted not to sustain the reasoning of his veto message, but to sustain the effect of the veto, namely, to put an end to the unreasonable, unrealistic control that has been forced upon the American people by the administrators of OPA.

Fundamentally I believe in a reasonable control during this transition from producing for the devil of war to producing for the American people. But I have been in this Congress for 1½ years, not long as compared with most of the Members, but long enough to have seen the operations of OPA and come to the definite conclusion that we cannot expect a reasonable, realistic administration of any act which we might pass. There is ample evidence of this fact in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where daily Members of Congress have called attention to the unreasonableness of OPA in solving our problem of production. Anyone who has had any relation with OPA—and we all have had many—knows that their attitude has always been one of adamant arrogance. They have hindered rather than aided production. They are all so wound up in their own rules, regulations, and orders that our entire production facilities have been stymied.

The arrogant frame of mind of the OPA has been demonstrated during the time Congress was considering the extension of control. Chester Bowles and other spokesmen for OPA have consistently taken the position that the law had to be extended as is—without crossing a "t" or dotting an "i"—the way they wanted it. That was their attitude last week end. That is their attitude today. If we are looking for a place to put the blame for killing price control, let us put it where it belongs, on Chester Bowles.

Mr. Speaker, the phase of the discussion that troubles me most is the underlying lack of confidence in the American people and the American system of free enterprise which is evidenced by the scare artists and calamity Chesters who picture absolute chaos in this country if we do not keep control over the people and business. Our people are pictured as being so greedy that some superman in Washington must hold a club over them. That our people are so ignorant that they will buy anything offered to them and at any price. As for me I have greater confidence in the intelligence and honor of the American people. I have confidence in that system which has made us great—the free-enterprise system. At least give it a fair chance.

The adoption of this resolution can only add more confusion and more uncertainty to our already overstrained economic system.

The solution to our problem is full production. The adoption of this resolution will only delay production further.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, when we had the OPA bill before us in the House, I made my position clear. I have been against any sudden or abrupt termination of OPA. And as I stated during the time of our consideration of the measure, I felt that despite its deficiencies, and the sum total of the harm it has worked, I believe that to terminate its life without providing something better in its place, would bring up even greater disorders, injustices, and harmful consequences.

Those disorders are now upon us. Chaos may well be around the corner. Only reason, self-restraint on the part of the whole country can save us. But these disorders will not come by action of the Congress, but by the action, practically unbelievably, of the President of the United States.

Today, by his direct action, rent control is terminated; there is no ceiling on any item of food; there is no legal restraint on any item going into the cost of living; there is no restriction of any kind. The lid is off. And the President took it off.

The President's veto of the price control extension bill was a reckless gamble. Mr. Truman took the position that he

was willing to wreck all price control if he did not get the kind of control he wanted. He gambled to get his "all or nothing bill" and he lost.

It would have been real statesmanlike action on the part of the President had he signed the measure presented to him and then made his arguments to the Congress and the people for the corrective amendments he felt were imperatively necessary. In that way he could have built a basis for improvement of the bill, afforded a ground for compromise.

But like certain labor leaders he gave way to reckless action first and having done that he wants to build anew when he really has not got a base on which to work. We are now in the position of having to start from scratch, and in the meantime the people of the country lack the protection of any price control policy at all. That is an impossible situation and therefore I will certainly support action to continue the old law on a temporary basis.

What a comparison between President Truman and the far-sighted, sound planning of Governor Dewey. One minute after midnight of June 30, Governor Dewey put into operation the State law that he had readied and that was waiting on the shelves in order to take care of any untoward development affecting Federal control of rents. Possibly Governor Dewey had a prophetic feeling. But he was right, in any event. He was not willing to rely on what this administration might or might not do to protect the public interest incident to rent controls. Naturally I am proud of New York State's position and that we have a governor who knows not only when to move but who has planned the right move; and who is not put in the ludicrous and sorry position of an executive who guesses wrong, acts wrong, and who seemingly can do little but to recommend, and regret and get nowhere.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the veto by President Truman of the latest version of the so-called price control law has once more put before the country the question of what to do about price control and prevention of inflation.

The bill passed by the House for the extension of the price-control law was, on paper at least, an improvement over the old one. The same may be said for the bill as it passed the Senate. In my judgment, the bill finally agreed upon was not as good as either.

Congress is now being asked to pass temporary legislation keeping the old law in effect for a short period while we determine what should be done next. While the extension will probably be granted, nevertheless, I wonder what good will be accomplished by it. Is it not another postponement of the great decision which sooner or later must be made?

A strong majority of Congress and of the country want a return to competitive private enterprise at the earliest possible date. There is some difference of opinion among this group as to when the return should be attempted. Congress has been trying to chart a course which would provide for a gradual return. It has sought to set up machinery for decontrol when the supply of a particular product approximated the demand. The OPA on the other hand has abundantly demonstrated that it will maintain controls as long as it can. After months of honest effort, all attempt to reconcile these widely divergent views have failed. It is difficult to see how any different result would be reached in the next few weeks.

After all, what is the real difficulty? Is it not in the maladministration of the law by the OPA? The Washington cell of the gigantic machine has been manned by people who have done no more than render lip service to the free enterprise system. Whenever a decision had to be made between capitalism and socialism, its decision was usually on the side of the latter. For example, amendments have been made by both the House and Senate to require ceiling prices to reflect costs plus a reasonable profit. It was always my view that the original law contemplated that very thing. The Congress has consistently sought to outlaw profiteering; the OPA has done its best to eliminate profits.

The OPA, through its spokesmen, has proclaimed its willingness to abandon controls when the supply was abundant. But their conduct has been to the contrary. The real difficulty with meat has not been in the short supply. There are more cattle than ever. Packing plants are adequate and now that the war is over, there should be no shortage of labor. The trouble lies in the black market which the OPA does not seem able to stamp out. Consequently, legitimate packers are idle and there is a scarcity of meat at regular dealers. The largest producer of oatmeal in the country was closed a short time ago. Creameries are greatly handicapped by OPA regulations and many of them are not operating. Farmers are uncertain what to do.

There may be a difference of opinion as to what to do next but there is general agreement that the present attempts at price control have been futile.

As the real trouble lies in the administration of the law, why not apply the only remedy that will be effective. The OPA has grown to be a gigantic octopus, strangling the life out of the country. If the law is allowed to expire, that does not mean that Congress is powerless to take whatever steps are necessary to protect the national economy. It has been suggested, for example, that control of rents is still needed. If that be true, why not pass a simple law covering rents and provide that its enforcement be put in the hands of local people. I am satisfied the people would cooperate and that better results would be secured in this manner than through some large bureau in Washington trying by multitudinous regulations to regulate details in the far reaches of a great country.

Eventually we must return to the American system of competition and free enterprise. How much longer can we postpone that return without creating a situation which will make the return impossible? Private enterprise and free government are dying all over the world. Has not the time come for this great country to reaffirm its confidence in the type of government which has made us the greatest Nation on earth.

The people say we are taking a great chance if we do not continue OPA as our guardian. That may be true. But are we not taking a greater risk in allowing an ever growing bureaucracy and expanding government controls to sap our independence, our vitality, and our courage?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who believes in price control. The particular thing which I think we should retain is rent control. The area from which I come is so short of houses that without rent control prices might soar to unprecedented elevations. We are in a curious situation at this moment. The Congress passed a Price Control Act after very prolonged hearings before the committees of both Houses. When the bill was before the House, numerous amendments were submitted. I voted against all of the amendments but two of them. The bill which we passed was changed by the Senate. The conference committee finally agreed upon a bill and the matter was submitted to us for our ratification. I voted for the conference report. The Speaker expressed my viewpoint in much better language than I could myself. Therefore, I am taking the liberty of quoting his statement at the time we were considering the conference report which contained a bill which the conferees had agreed upon. Here are his words:

> 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. If this House will not vote up this conference report, it certainly will not vote for a continuing resolution and continue the law as it now stands. Even though the House were to pass a continuing resolution, the leaders of the Senate are doubtful if it has a chance on earth to pass there. So if we want to control any kind of food prices and if we want to control rents and not have people turned out into the streets—as they will be turned out—the only alternative is to vote up this conference report. The responsibility is here. I will not, as far as I am concerned, by my vote here this afternoon shoulder the responsibility of killing all price control.

We all know that the President vetoed the bill. That is his constitutional privilege but I for one was willing to take the bill that was agreed upon rather than gamble on having no price control.

There are other items in which we should retain price control, such as food, clothing, appliances, and so forth. Decontrol should be gradual rather than abrupt and the bill which was vetoed did provide such decontrol.

However, not being able to get the kind of a bill I wanted I was willing to accept the best kind of bill that Congress would adopt. It is significant that in voting upon the conference report 265 Members voted for it, including many

strong advocates of price control and including the chairman of the committee which wrote the House bill, the ranking Republican Member and the ranking Democratic Member, the majority leader of the House, and the minority leader.

When the President presented his veto we were confronted with this situation: The law would expire the following day which was a Sunday. The problem was, Shall I vote to sustain the veto and thereby take a chance of completely giving up price control or shall I vote to override the veto and accept the bill which all of the leaders in both Houses of Congress said was the best bill that could be gotten out of this Congress? I chose to take this bill and I voted to override the veto. However, not enough Members voted to override the veto and therefore although only a minority of the Members of the House voted to sustain the veto the law was killed.

We are now confronted with the problem of revising the law which was killed by a minority number of the House Members plus the President's veto.

While I intend to vote for the resolution granting 20 days in which the former price control bill shall remain in effect I have little hope of getting any more in the way of price control than there was in the bill that the President vetoed and which was adopted by the overwhelming vote of the House. To me it is very unfortunate that the President disregarded the advice of the leaders of his party in both Houses of the Congress, of the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate. Uncertainty has been cast into the situation. No one knows what is going to happen and all production will be on an uncertain and in some cases on a chaotic basis until a new law is passed or rejected. The result may be that we will have no price control at all although I am predicting that we will perhaps obtain about the same type of bill which we have approved prior to the President's veto.

Unfortunately the public has been inflamed unnecessarily by a very partisan discussion as to the effects of the bill upon which the Congress finally agreed. There are many able and disinterested people who believe that this bill would be workable and in any event it would be far better than no bill at all. Some of the weird administrative monstrosities which the OPA put into effect is what created the violent opposition to the OPA. The unfortunate thing is that because of this the American public may reap the whirlwind of the administrative ineptness of the OPA. I am hoping that we can get a workable bill with perhaps a little more control than the former bill contained but at the present time this looks extremely doubtful.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that I ask for time to speak on a resolution from the Rules Committee making in order the immediate consideration of a measure in the House. During the 10 years that I have been a Member I do not believe I have asked for this opportunity 10 times. I do not believe I have asked the privilege on an average once a session. The time is naturally limited on the rule and usually I prefer to speak on the measure itself in general debate or on amendments. However, this time is an exception, because it is urgent and because I am for the measure without amendment as this resolution makes it in order.

This legislation is of transcendent importance. Our country is in an appalling economic crisis. Very much depends upon our decision. I am ascribing sincere motives in many of the moves I have seen in connection with this, both friendly and unfriendly to OPA, and, while I may be naive, there seem to be as many close questions on which my colleagues differ, perhaps as many controversial but valid contentions, as there are fallacious arguments. Of this one thing I am sure, that the vast majority of American citizens want, demand, and must have continuation of price controls on the necessities of life until such a time as supply and demand are about equally balanced. If the Government fails to furnish those controls, the Government has fallen down in its duty. I have by every act and vote of mine, directly or indirectly connected with OPA, endeavored to support the Government in the fulfillment of this solemn duty to all American citizens.

We have heard a lot of sophistry today and last Saturday and for many previous weeks, in regard to who is to blame for the present predicament and what ought to be the proper course of action and what is the real significance of this or that vote on the various proposals touching OPA. When I hear lawyers on opposite sides of a controversial question, and often members of opposite political parties, using arguments that sound so persuasive, and yet I know are as full of holes as a colander, I think of that lawyer of whom Abraham Lincoln spoke who could by a clever arrangement of words prove that a horse chestnut is a chestnut horse.

As I have listened through hours of this discussion I have felt within my own heart almost convicted by their arguments of inconsistency. Some arguments are so powerful they make black look white. I know solemnly that I wanted to preserve and continue as long as necessary an effective and sound OPA, but some of the sophisticated political reasoning, which have been expressed today have almost convicted me of having killed cock robin.

Yes, I voted on April 18 for the OPA extension bill when it was up for final passage originally in the House. Does that mean that I went off the deep end in my enthusiastic support of it? It certainly does not—not of that measure. My "yes" that day on April 18 was a very feeble "yes" to a measure that had been emasculated the day before by many crippling amendments. The RECORD will show that on every roll-call vote taken in the House on April 17 I voted "no" because I felt that these amendments were dangerous amendments. I voted "yes" on final roll call only that we might have a bill on which the other body, in our two-Chamber National Legislature, could work in order to keep price control beyond June 30.

When the conference report came back to the House on June 25, I was little better satisfied with it than I was with the House version on April 18, but not being an expert in such intricate business problems I felt that although business undoubtedly had the advantage in its general nature and provisions, this bill was better than nothing and therefore I voted for it on agreeing to the conference report. However, when a ringing veto came from the President on June 29, and my eyes were open to things that I had not seen before, I voted to sustain the President's veto. He said it was an impossible proposal. I agree with the President that if we are going to have wild, runaway inflation, and that such is inevitable, we had better have it without a law than to have it encouraged—yes, guaranteed—by a law which I by my vote helped to pass. Yes; the President did ask for it, asked several times, but he asked for bread and we gave him a stone.

What then is our present problem? Clearly it is our duty to extend the present OPA law as is for a short period and meanwhile attempt to write a law which will contain only the necessary controls, and also provide for decontrols where such controls are no longer needed. I agree with my colleague who said we had spent more than 20 weeks writing a measure according to the pleasure of business and looking after business interests and profits, therefore the Congress of the United States might very properly give at least 20 days to safeguarding the interests of the American people. I shall vote for the proposal to extend OPA for 20 days and hope that decontrol provisions may be written into law to ease the transition from wartime economy to peacetime economy in a safe and sane way. Let us remember that we are dealing with the very lives of our people, as we legislate on this vital matter, dealing with lives just as surely as we did during and just preceding the war. It is a solemn thing to deal with human lives.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the rule under consideration makes in order for the consideration by the House, House Joint Resolution 371. Without legislation the OPA terminated on June 30, 1946. Bills were introduced in the House and Senate to modify the OPA and to extend its life. These bills were referred to the Committees on Banking and Currency of the House and Senate. Both committees gave everyone an opportunity to testify for and against the bills and to make recommendations and suggestions. Each committee, after these extensive hearings and many executive sessions of the committees, reported their respective bills to the House amending and modifying the OPA Act.

The House, after long debate and consideration, passed a bill by an overwhelming majority and the Senate did likewise, and as there were some differences in the two bills, they were referred to a conference committee made up of Republicans and Democrats from the Banking and Currency Committees of the House and Senate. After 2 weeks of consideration, this able conference committee agreed on a compromise bill and

made a favorable report to their respective Houses. The House and Senate adopted the conference report by an overwhelming majority and then it went to the President and was vetoed by the President. We received his veto in the House last Saturday, June 29. While a substantial majority of the Members of the House voted to override the veto, they lacked 34 votes of having a two-thirds majority. Nothing could be done to restore OPA, which expired on Sunday night, June 30. The veto of the President killed the bill.

Speaker RAYBURN, Democratic Majority Leader MCCORMACK, and Mr. SPENCE, author of the OPA bill, urged the House to accept the compromise bill and stated that unless the compromise bill was accepted there would be no legislation on OPA at this session of Congress. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], the ranking Republican on the Banking and Currency Committee and one of the conferees, and other Democrats and Republicans, made the same statements, and we are advised that Senator BARKLEY and other administration Democrats and leading Republicans urged the Senate to accept the compromise bill, and the House and Senate did accept the compromise bill by an overwhelming majority. These Democratic leaders of the House and Senate and strong friends of the President called on him and urged him to sign the bill, but no doubt to their surprise, as well as to the surprise of the Members of the House and Senate and the country, he, at the request of Bowles and some other New Dealers outside of the Congress, vetoed the bill. It came to the House on Saturday, June 29. It takes a two-thirds majority to override the veto of the President. Through the strong pressure of the administration, less than a two-thirds majority voted to override his veto, although a substantial majority did vote to do so. Therefore, the veto of the President killed the OPA legislation. Very few persons expected him to turn down four and a half months of earnest work of Congress on this important subject and turn down the recommendations and advice of his congressional leaders in the House and Senate.

Of ours, Mr. Bowles and his OPA'ers and some other left-wingers are very happy. Now the President and his New Deal friends are very unhappy. They are busy putting out propaganda trying to blame this situation on a few Republicans. They are busy again trying to deceive the American people. The President and Chester Bowles must carry the full responsibility of killing OPA. You may ask why they wanted to kill that OPA bill. That bill was the only thing that could have extended the OPA. There were several reasons. The bill took from the OPA the control over food prices and placed this authority in the hands of Mr. Anderson, the Secretary of Agriculture, who has had actual experience in cattle raising and stock raising and other agricultural activities. He also served for many years on the Committee on Agriculture of the House and was a member of that committee at the time he was appointed Secretary of Agriculture. The OPA'ers certainly did not want that done.

The OPA has had turned over to it billions of dollars in the way of subsidies. The bill provided for the elimination of some subsidies now and the gradual elimination of others so that all subsidies would have ceased by December 31, 1946. The OPA'ers wanted to play with these billions of dollars of subsidies and to fool the American people. These billions were used to help pay the grocery bills and store accounts of the rich as well as the poor widow. Of course, we had to borrow the money and thereby increase the national debt. This was clearly unjustified. When the American people had more money to expend than they had ever had, why should the Government borrow the money, increase the national debt and taxes, to pay the grocery bills and store accounts of the rich people of this Nation and then Bowles and his crowd took credit for reducing the prices on commodities and consumer goods? Mr. Wallace and some other New Dealers had told the people of the Nation that wages could be increased from 30 to 50 percent without increasing the price to the producers. Of course this was ridiculous, but they tried to force the producers to absorb these enormous increases of wages and costlier materials in production with the net result that hundreds of thousands of small businesses were put out of business and thousands of others were forced into the black markets to save their businesses, and this all meant a slowing down of production.

Every one who knows anything about the subject knows very well that scarcity of consumer goods forces prices up, creates black markets, destroys the equitable distribution of available consumer goods and increases the threat of inflation and the real answer to the control of prices is plenty—an abundance of consumer goods to meet the great demands of the people. We cannot have abundance without full production. We cannot have full production unless the producers, processors, and distributors of consumer goods are given a price that will cover the cost and a reasonable profit. Mr. Truman and his New Dealers entertained the unsound economic policy that you could have full production, processing, and distribution without a fair and just price that would take care of the cost as well as a reasonable profit. Mr. Bowles and Mr. Wallace have many admirers urging that the OPA continue as is and without any profit motive and without the producers being assured of even the cost of production. This might work in totalitarian countries for whom we are now stripping our country to provide food and clothing but it will not work in free America. Each one of us should be willing to pay such price for our products and goods as will enable the producers, processors, and distributors with proper management to pay the cost of production, good wages, and a fair profit.

The bill that the President vetoed also contained a provision for the final ending of the OPA. That, of course, was one of the bitterest pills for Mr. Bowles and his wrecking crew. As we have stated, the bill had many other splendid features. There was almost unanimous agreement that there should be reasonable rent control until the housing shortage could be relieved. Mr. Truman, by his veto, killed rent control.

THE FOUR IMPORTANT OBJECTIVES

We have now had OPA for more than 4 years. The Congress in establishing the OPA contemplated four important objectives: First, to stabilize prices; second, to provide for an equitable distribution of available supplies; third, to prevent black markets; and, fourth, to lessen the danger of inflation. Ninety-nine percent of the American people must know by this time that not one of these objectives was achieved, although the OPA was given the power and billions of dollars to accomplish these purposes. No one has ever possessed greater power than the OPA and they even exceeded those powers by their Executive orders, rules, regulations, and interpretations. It was strictly a war emergency measure and was never intended for peacetime.

The administration has had the Congress to appropriate four and one-half billion dollars—$4,500,000,000—for subsidies alone. The OPA has had hundreds of millions of dollars for propaganda and to administer the OPA Act. They have had a veritable army of Federal officeholders.

FAILURE, FAMINE, CHAOS, AND DISCORD

After having exercised all of these extraordinary powers, spent billions of dollars, and harassed the American people for the last 4 years, what do we find? Failure, famine, discord, and chaos. The lives and health of tens of thousands of the American people have been and still are threatened because of the lack of nourishing food. Livestock and poultry have starved to death. Hundreds of thousands of business concerns have been bankrupted and destroyed. Working people have been forced to quit their employment because of lack of food. The wives, mothers, and daughters of this country were willing to stand in line for hours to get a piece of meat, a quarter of a pound of butter, a little sugar, and a few vegetables to feed and nourish their families. They thought and we believed that when the war ended in Europe 15 months ago and especially when it ended in Japan nearly a year ago, that they would be relieved of this burden and that we would have more food; but as the weeks and months have come and gone, we find less and less food, prices have soared all the way from 25 to 200 percent on many necessities. More than 75 percent of the transactions in consumer goods and especially food, lumber, and clothing, are handled in the black markets or in some elements of the black markets, either in actual overcharges, shortage of weights, lack of quantity, or lack of quality.

The black market is one of the greatest curses that has ever come to a great people. Through the mismanagement, tyranny, oppression, favoritism, and corruption of the OPA, millions of honest Americans have been forced to re-

sort to practices that are entirely foreign to our great people. The people of my district and others have appealed to me to aid them to secure food and feed and to have allocated to the grain-processing mills corn, wheat, oats, and barley, but we have been told recently that there is no corn or wheat available. This administration caused the black marketeers to leap with joy when our Government became the greatest black marketeer of all in the Nation. A ceiling price was placed on corn, wheat, and other grains. The owners of these grains could not sell them to the mills for more than the OPA price and the mills could not pay more than the OPA price, but the Government came along and told the owners of wheat and corn: "If you will sell your corn and wheat to the Government and make it available for this country to ship to foreign countries and give it away, the Government will pay you 30 cents a bushel above the OPA price." What is the result? We had hundreds of millions of bushels of corn and wheat made available for shipment to foreign countries, but over 90 percent of the wheat and corn mills of Kentucky and the Nation were closed down and the American people find themselves faced with famine.

The Government itself, as we all know, broke the OPA line in prices as well as in wages and cost of materials. We must get back to honest business, free competitive enterprise, constitutional government, and the real American way of life. We must get away from regimentation, from tyranny, oppression, favoritism, and corruption in government.

THERE MUST BE A CHANGE

Mr. Bowles and the President want the Congress to continue OPA as is, with one of the blackest records of any governmental agency in the history of this Nation. There must be a change. These conditions cannot go on. It will turn this great, free country into a totalitarian government. The liberties of the American people will be wiped out. The Congress, by an overwhelming majority, attempted, after months and months of careful study—in fact, after observing the OPA and its doings for more than 4 years—to make such changes as would correct these conditions, restore honest, private enterprise, eliminate the black markets, and lessen the threat of inflation. There will be temporary rises in prices. In fact, the OPA planned to increase prices. The new prices were already set up. Some increases were absolutely necessary. The Government, out of the tax-and-bond money of the people, had been paying from 4 to 9 cents a pound in subsidies on grocery bills and store accounts of the people. The subsidies will be cut out.

The increase for the railroad workers and the increase in prices for steel and other materials made it necessary to increase transportation rates and this was applied to the consumers of coal. The cost of bituminous coal production was increased on an average to about 50 cents to 60 cents a ton and anthracite coal more than 90 cents a ton. All these things helped to increase the cost of production and, therefore, there had to be some substantial increases under the OPA, but let us not forget whatever bad conditions we have had, up to this time, have been under OPA and if the resolution is adopted by the House and Senate that is now before us, extending the OPA until July 20, then whatever conditions are prevailing up to July 20 in the way of prices, black markets, lack of consumer goods, and threat of inflation, must be justly laid at the door of the OPA.

I voted for the amended OPA bill. I voted to pass the bill over the President's veto, and if the President had signed the bill or if two-thirds of the Congress had voted to override his veto, we would not have the disturbed conditions in the country today. Of course, the President and the OPA'ers have become alarmed and they now insist that we extend the OPA for 20 days to see if some bill cannot be worked out to save the situation.

An overwhelming majority of the House, including myself, will likely vote to give 20 days' time to see if some legislation cannot be worked out that will be fair and just to the American people as well as to the producers, processors and distributors of this country. The President's leaders in the House and Senate have expressed the opinion that they did not believe a better bill could be passed than the one the President had vetoed. I certainly will not vote for an OPA bill without modifications that will prevent conditions that have been prevailing under Chester Bowles and other OPA officials. I do not propose for the people of my district to continue to suffer from the maladministration and oppression of this group of bureaucrats here in Washington. If the President would name an honest and able administrator who believes in the American way it would help.

The Democrats have a majority on each and every committee of the House and Senate. They have a substantial majority in the House and Senate. If Mr. Truman would quit listening to the PAC and other radicals and left-wingers and give more consideration to his own leaders in the House and Senate, a bill could be worked out that would provide for the gradual closing out of the OPA, with full protection to the American people and unless such a bill is passed, I certainly reserve the right to oppose it by my voice and vote.

In extending this resolution, it is the purpose of the overwhelming majority of the House to take away from Mr. Truman any excuse to cooperate with the House and Senate in bringing about a solution that can be approved by the representatives of the people in the House and Senate and that will be fair to the American people generally as well as to the producers, processors, and distributors of products, goods, and supplies. If the President and his party want to pass some bill, they have the votes to do so. The President and his party killed OPA and it is now up to them, with their majority and control in the House and Senate, to back such a bill as can be approved by the Congress and that will be just and fair to the American people.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest as my distinguished, able, and good friend from Massachusetts, the majority leader, again rose to great heights. I think we should clarify the situation here today as to who is responsible for the situation that exists. Therefore I shall read the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the Speaker of the House, delivered here several days ago. He said:

> 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. If this House will not vote up this conference report, it certainly will not vote for a continuing resolution and continue the law as it now stands. Even though the House were to pass a continuing resolution, the leader 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 and if we want to control rents and not have people turned out into the streets—as they will be turned out—the only alternative is to vote up this conference report. The responsibility is here. I will not, as far as I am concerned, by my vote here this afternoon shoulder the responsibility of killing all price control.

So we followed the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Texas, who in a very sincere, honest, clear, and aggressive manner presented the whole situation to us, and we acted on his recommendations, it was vetoed by the President and now it is again brought back to the House for reconsideration and vigorous appeals are made to continue it, after 435 duly elected Members of the House of Representatives and 96 duly elected Members of the Senate have taken action expressing the will of the American people, which is now to be denied by the veto. We are asked again to renew it. The time has come when the responsibility should be placed where it rightfully belongs.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS].

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, my time is short but there has been one point raised here this morning which is extremely important and which was referred to several times, particularly by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] with reference to the statement that section 4 of House Joint Resolution 371 extended this act or revives it. I do not see how anybody can come to that conclusion from a reading of the resolution. The resolution attempts to amend two sections and then provides in section 4 that the provisions of the joint resolution, that is, the amendments, shall be retroactive as of yesterday. I submit to you that you cannot amend an act which has gone out of existence no matter how much you provide there for its retroactivity. You may revive it. You may revive it with amendments, but you cannot, it seems to me, amend an act which has gone out of existence. It seems to me legally impossible to amend an act which has gone out of force by its own provisions and then attempt to make your amendment retroactive. In

my opinion, if you consider this resolution and vote it up and then consider House Joint Resolution 371 and vote for that, you will be doing a nugatory thing, and in the meantime there will be more uncertainty as to whether we have price control or not. In my personal opinion, the thing that the people of the United States need most, whether they have price control or not, is certainty. They want to know where they are going.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, week before last I visited the great State of Wisconsin. I was privileged to speak before a splendid group of Wisconsin sportsmen. I did not speak altogether about conservation. I spent a good deal of time talking about the principles of government in which I believe and what I thought would be good for the country. After the meeting was over one of the members of the audience came up and whispered to me, "I am a Democrat." I assumed that the rest of them were Republicans. They knew I was a Democrat. But in all my life I have never received a more cordial and enthusiastic reception than I got there that night in Wisconsin. It forced home to me this vital and fundamental fact, that there is a bond of fellowship between those who entertain certain fundamental beliefs and who are willing to put the welfare of their Nation first, above group interest. I come to you today not as a Democrat but as one who, like you, loves his country, who is patriotic, and who wants to see the progress of America sustained and does not want to see an uncontrolled price boom followed by a depression which we would not be able to survive with a public debt of $265,000,000,000. That would mean economic chaos which would not only destroy our country economically but might ultimately imperil our cherished traditions and institutions. We met this morning to hold memorial exercises not to honor a Democrat but to honor the memory of a President of the United States.

In opening those ceremonies our Chaplain prayed, "O Lord, purify the thoughts in our hearts with the inspiration of Thy Holy Spirit." I tell you the root of our trouble today is selfishness. It did not start with World War II, but it started with World War I. A group of war millionaires was made and a group of industrialists profited from the tragedy of war. They proceeded to take off the restraints after the war was over and cut down taxes, which were needed to control inflation and pay the public debt, until their program ultimately collapsed with the stock-market crash of October 29, 1929, and we were plunged into a depression. Before that the farmer, workingman, and the white-collar man had suffered, and in the depression we all suffered. Those who William Allen White said believed that God presided over a 6-percent heaven and all was well with the world realized that they, too, lost in the depression that they had helped to bring upon us. The progressive principles of Woodrow Wilson were repudiated in 1920 for the reactionaryism and isolationism of Warren G. Harding. The patriotic unselfishness which had characterized our prosecution of World War I turned into a program of gross materialism. In his last message to the American people, delivered in August 1923, Woodrow Wilson warned us of the consequences of such a program. After discussing the causes of the revolution in Russia he predicted a world revolution if the people here and abroad continued to ignore the just aspirations of the masses and continued to make the selfish acquisition of material things their chief aim in life. He concluded that appeal by saying:

> The sum of the whole matter is this: If our civilization is to survive materially, it must be redeemed spiritually. It can be saved only by becoming imbued with the spirit of Christ and made free and happy by the practices that spring from that spirit. Only thus can discontent be driven out and the shadows lifted from the road ahead.

Never in my life have I known more discontent or the road ahead obscured by darker clouds. And the root of our trouble is selfishness. We are called upon today to act on a resolution to temporarily continue the present OPA law, with the hope and the belief that we can work out a better one. In approaching that problem we would do well to recall the prayer offered by our chaplain this morning and to realize that we are not voting for or against a Democratic President or a Democratic administration. We are voting to promote the welfare of a country which we all love and to protect institutions which we all cherish. There is not a Member of this House who desires to see rent control immediately ended. There is not a Representative of an agricultural district who believes that our farmers can successfully compete with organized industry in a mad scramble for upping prices. There is not a Representative of an industrial area who does not view with alarm the prospect of uncontrolled food prices. There is not a member of this House who does not know that in any given line of endeavor those who produce are fewer than those who consume, and that no program is a just and fair program which ignores the rights of the consumer. Yet all of us are besieged by pressure groups, most of which are seeking a selfish advantage.

When we entered the war and had under consideration a price control bill, labor strenuously objected to any effort on the part of the Congress to control wages. It finally worked out an agreement with the President which was known as the Little Steel Formula. In working out that formula, labor leaders selected the period of the highest hourly wage rates in the history of the country and refused to permit consideration of the take-home pay resulting from overtime. Future advances were to have been limited to 15 percent, but this year that formula was broken in the negotiation of new contracts calling for an increase of 18½ cents per hour. Those wage increases have resulted in increased cost of production, which must inevitably result in price increases else one of two things, and maybe both, will happen. Production will be stifled, or goods will reach the consuming public by way of the black market at prices above legal ceilings. When we undertook to frame a new wage law industry insisted on selecting the most advantageous period it had had in a period of 5 years in determining what was a fair profit, to which was to be added all subsequent increases in the cost of production. It is now quite impossible for the Congress to write a price control bill which will prevent further price increases. But Congress can and should write a new price control bill which will prevent inordinate increases and unjustified increases and which will assure the consumer a reasonable supply of scarce articles through legitimate channels of distribution while lifting price control from other items as the supply catches up with the demand.

And while we are working on a bill of that character, the Congress should continue the present act. We may not know the type of new bill upon which a majority of us can agree, but we all very definitely know what is going to happen in the absence of no price control whatever. There is in the Congress enougn ability and enough patriotic regard for the general welfare to write a new bill if we be determined that our actions shall not be controled by selfishness.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time, 4 minutes, to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, section 4 of this bill reenacts the law as of June 30, 1946. I believe that is just as satisfactory and just as legal and constitutional as if you reenacted the text of the entire law.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, a member of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House.

Mr. WALTER. I would like to call to the attention of the gentleman that this procedure is not without precedent. It was done when the dollar was devalued.

Mr. PATMAN. The Devaluation Act.

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. So it is not new. In addition, if it needed amending, the other body would have that privilege.

PRESIDENT NOT TO BE BLAMED

I do not see how anyone can vote against this resolution who believes in price or rent control. It is only asking for an extension of 20 days, in the hope that a satisfactory bill can be agreed upon during that time. I know that efforts have been made to blame the President of the United States, but I do not believe the President should be blamed, when the President in January sent a special request to Members of Congress to give speedy action to the OPA law, not to wait until almost the deadline; twice in May he asked the Congress to hurry and pass a satisfactory OPA law; and in the early part of June he renewed the

request. Now, what held up this bill? In our Committee on Banking and Currency there were three or four Members who were opposed to OPA. I venture to say, and it cannot be successfully contradicted, they took up two-thirds of the time before that committee asking questions of Chester Bowles, Paul Porter, and other important witnesses.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not yield to the lady. I do not have the time.

Then, when the bill went to the other body, in that committee a few who opposed any kind of controls took up the time to delay and delay. The bill was delayed and delayed until it got to the President's desk one day before the day it would have expired by law.

Now, who is responsible for this? The Congress is responsible. Let us not add to that blame which we should assume by refusing a 20-day extension of a bill that was presented to the President so unworkable and so impossible to administer. The Taft amendment could not be enforced. It was absolutely impossible of enforcement or administration. People who have been on the committee, as I have, and listened to this testimony for 3 months at a time—we had Leon Henderson on the witness stand under cross-examination for three long months—know that the Taft amendment was unworkable. We have spent months on this subject, over a period of several years, and I know that the Taft amendment that was in the other bill could not be enforced. Are we now going to blame the President for vetoing an unenforceable law?

I ask that this resolution be passed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 371, extending the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 371, extending the Emergency Price Control Act and the Stabilization Act, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I do not delude myself by thinking that I can persuade the Members to vote in any way other than the way they have already made up their minds to vote.

Mr. Chairman, we are at the threshold of something that may mean much to the weal or the woe of the American people. Nobody that I know of denies that there is still the economic pressures making for inflation as great as those that existed during the war. I am no prophet, I do not know what the result will be if we take all the lids off at this time; but I feel a great catastrophe would come on the American people.

I hear a great deal of talk about propaganda. Do not think it is propaganda that brings about this condition. There is a psychological condition sweeping over America. You talk to the common man and woman on the street and they have fear in their hearts because they know that if we make a mistake the savings of their lifetime and the purchasing power of the money they earn may be largely dissipated. I do not want to take the responsibility.

It is said that if we agree with the President we retreat. We do not retreat. I do not retreat. The Committee on Banking and Currency reported a bill to the House that I am confident the President would have signed. But it was scuttled on the floor of the House and it was scuttled on the floor of the Senate. The pressure groups had their amendments adopted, and those were the amendments the President objected to. I voted against all of them because I could see that the catastrophe might result that has resulted, and there was no other thing to do but to go along as best I could.

We had to present some bill. I was hopeful that the bill would be workable. When we went into conference the area of difference was not great. Both bills were bad, but we had to accept the best bill we could get out of the material we had. The President said it would not work. He said he could not make it effectively operate. I was hopeful that he could. I wanted to avoid what has happened, but if he cannot make it work he was most courageous and honest in the stand he took.

We have come back here and asked for 20 days. I have been asked if I can assure you that we will have a bill in 20 days. I cannot. I cannot assure you of anything. But certainly it is not an unreasonable request to ask the Congress to give us 20 days in which to attempt to work out a solution of this problem. I am confident you will do that.

Politics has been brought into this matter. I tried to be fair in the committee. I tried to give everybody a chance to be heard who wanted to be heard. The critics of the bill and those who were opposed to most features of the bill took up four-fifths of the time interrogating witnesses. Then we are charged with delay because the bill was not brought in here in ample time. If we had not done that we would have been charged with unfairness. I believe if you do give us 20 more days, we may work out something that will meet with the approval of the President. I am certainly hopeful of that or I would not be urging that we be given the 20 days unless I thought we could accomplish that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in light of the great emergency that presents itself at this time, it certainly should be the policy of the Congress to give this committee time to do something that will conform to the wishes of the President, something that he thinks can be effectively used in carrying out the purposes for which the price control law was enacted.

We will continue price control, we will continue rent control, we will continue the Stabilization Act for those 20 days. Price control and rent control are so inseparably connected in one picture that it is impossible to consider one without the other. We must give complete relief to the American people or we can give them no relief at all.

I hope you will set aside political considerations, though we have heard political speeches here. This transcends political questions and political interests, and besides, nobody is going to make any political capital by destroying price control at this time.

I desire to make the explanation of House Joint Resolution 371 section by section.

Sections 1 and 2 of the extension resolution merely change the expiration date of the Emergency Price Control Act and the Stabilization Act of July 20, 1946.

Section 3 gives the authorization for the continued payment of subsidies during the short period of extension provided for by sections 1 and 2. Just extending the act would make effective the last paragraph of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act which prohibits the payment of subsidies by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or the Commodity Credit Corporation unless funds have been specifically appropriated. Since subsidies relating to price control are paid for out of revolving funds, this clause would not permit the payment of subsidies during the extension period. Therefore, section 3 specifically authorizes the payment of subsidies during the extension period on just the same basis that subsidies were being paid on June 29, 1946. No new subsidies would be undertaken in this period.

Section 4 covers the problems arising from the fact that there will be a gap between the original termination date of the act and the enactment of the extending resolution. If the resolution did not specify an effective date, the enactment of the resolution would reenact the Emergency Price Control Act and the Stabilization Act as of the date of enactment of the resolution. It would then probably be necessary to reissue all regulations and orders fixing prices and rents, and other problems would arise because of the interruption to the effectiveness of price and rent controls. By specifying that the effective date of the resolution should be June 30, 1946, the Congress would make it clear that there was no interruption to the continuity of

the acts and regulations and orders issued under them. But if the law were made retroactive with respect to violations of regulations or orders after June 30, 1946, it would conflict with the constitutional prohibition against ex post facto laws. Therefore section 4 specifically provides that the resolution shall not operate retroactively with respect to offenses committed after June 30, 1946, and that no actions may be brought with respect to such violations. The result is that the continuity of the laws will be preserved so far as it can be done constitutionally.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there has been presented to us a very unfortunate situation. One, I might say, that is no little embarrassing to all of us who were sincerely and conscientiously in favor of the continuance of price control but in such a manner that we would get maximum production. I am afraid that the action taken by the President has destroyed all control which we ever have had over the objectives of the House in controlling prices, and at the same time getting adequate, sufficient production, to prevent inflation.

The theory of the bill was that when the President broke the wage price line, that effective price control no longer existed, and that the only thing which would save this country from inflation was production, production, and more production. Notwithstanding any action which this Congress takes or might have taken, notwithstanding any action which the President took in respect to the bill which was sent to him, prices are going up within the next few days, and I know that if they follow their usual bent many of the people who have been denouncing the action taken by the House are going to blame the Congress for the increase in these prices. But the OPA was about to announce an increase in the price of many commodities to absorb increases in production costs; they were about to announce increases in the prices of many commodities, because today is the effective date of the increase in transportation costs on many commodities. Of course, the President, having vetoed the bill which provided for the payment of subsidies, he has wiped out all possibility of subsidies being used to adjust our economy in such manner that it will not feel the impact of suddenly taking these subsidies off.

Under those conditions, of course, prices are bound to go up slightly, anyway, within the next few days, and would have gone up regardless of what action the President took and regardless of what action we had taken.

I am not going to vote for this resolution. I do not see how I can consistently vote for this resolution after I have told this House that after the House and the Senate and the conferees on the disagreeing amendments have striven for months to harmonize all the differences in this bill, after the statement was made that that was the very best bill which could possibly be enacted, that statement being made by the leaders on both sides, a statement which I honestly and conscientiously believe. Because I believed it I advised you at that time that the President might be justified in the public mind in vetoing a bill with specific decontrols in it, but would not be justified in vetoing a bill without specific decontrols, and I told you, as did the leadership on both sides—and I was merely reflecting their attitude when I told you this—that if you voted to eliminate these specific decontrols it would put you in a position where you could safely and justifiably refuse to vote for a continuing resolution, and that if in the face of that condition, where we had gone just as far as we humanly could go to make the bill satisfactory to the President before it was enacted, he vetoed the bill, then he must take the consequences.

I cannot consistently vote for the continuation of this bill because of that, but I might say that if it is in the wisdom of this Congress that we continue these price controls for 20 days or 15 days or any other length of time, then of course we will go to work on it. The Committee on Banking and Currency will probably report out again the same kind of a bill it reported out in the first place, which was not and would not be responsive to the will of this House. The Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate will likewise report out a bill, undoubtedly, which would not be reflective of the attitude of the Members of the other body. So there we are on the wheel again, we can keep going 'round and 'round and 'round. But in the meantime, because of the President's attitude, those of us who wanted to control prices and those who thought that that was the way to do it, those of us who were conscientious in the belief that price control should be continued in such a manner that full production could be obtained, have lost all control over the situation now. We have no control over that.

I would not get up before this House and seek to contend successfully against the attitude which was existent here for specific decontrols, and I would not think that under the circumstances I could say to the Senate conferees, "You shall eliminate these specific decontrols or otherwise the President might veto the bill," because he has already done it. So we have lost control over it. The Senate will write specific decontrols in the bill. The Senate will not pass this continuing resolution. What you are going to get back in consequence of passing this continuing resolution is perhaps just the same thing you sent to the President, and probably from his standpoint very much worse.

In the meantime, we have to do something with respect to the control of rents. Immediately after the consideration of this resolution I am going to ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a joint resolution which has for its purpose the reenacting and continuing of the effective control and stabilization of rents for housing accommodations. The resolution provides that any and all of the provisions of the Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, in respect to rents are reenacted and continued for a period of 1 year. We can eliminate from these disputes with respect to prices generally this question of rents. We gave the country the assurance that rent control would be continued. I do not think there are very many people in the House or in the Senate who successfully contend that we do not have to control rents during this period of housing scarcity. It would be catastrophic if we did not continue rent control. So in order that there might be good faith and in order that we may do what we wanted to do and what we understood we were doing, I have offered this resolution so that the question of rent control can be completely divorced from this controversy as to whether this temporary resolution shall be adopted or whether some bill may be agreed upon at some later date. I hope no one will object to the present consideration of the resolution when it is offered by me. I hope it will pass, and in that way we will guarantee to the people that rent control will not be affected by any action which we may take or neglect to take within the next year.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Of course, the bill which passed both the House and Senate and which was sent to the President and then vetoed by him expressly took care of the matter of rent control, did it not?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman is absolutely correct, and in vetoing the bill the President, of course, at the same time allowed rent control to lapse on June 30.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Will the gentleman explain the situation that may exist in the interim between now and the time that the bill is enacted? Goods are being billed now at prices on which there is no control. Will the reenactment of the bill affect such cases? Is it retroactive? Is there a free market now?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think the resolution should reenact the provisions of the Price Control Act. I think that is what they intend to do by the last paragraph It presents a very interesting academic legal question, but probably one which will not affect price control or any action which we may eventually take.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOM].

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, I am greatly surprised to see that there is so much divergence of opinion about the passage of this resolution. The newspapers carried a very vigorous and forthright statement by the chairman of the Republican National Committee, the gentleman from Tennessee, Hon. CARROLL REECE, calling upon the Congress to reenact price control for scarce articles as well as rent controls. It seems to me that that statement ought to have brought a substantial unanimity in the House to the effect that some kind of price control is necessary. However, members of his own party do not seem to respond to his call. I am sure that

he has expressed the feeling of the country.

The whole country is looking to the House of Representatives for action today. We have never had a similar economic condition in which there was so much uncertainty. No man can make a contract. No man can foresee what he can do in the future so far as business is concerned. Landlords and tenants are without knowledge as to what they are going to do in the future. Contracts are expiring. If you think the Congress is going to escape the burden of responsibility, I fear you will find yourselves greatly in error because the people know that the President is calling upon us to help solve this problem and it would be futile and unwise in my opinion not to respond favorably to that call.

We must remember that when we sent this legislation to the President almost on the last day before the expiration of price control, we put him in a position of great embarrassment. That was practically a club to force him to sign what we had enacted. He has a right to use his discretion. If we had given him sufficient time he could have exercised his veto and this Congress could have proceeded, before the expiration of the old Price Control Act, to remedy any defects and to improve the measure to the best of our ability. For these reasons I think the Congress has the burden of acting, and if we do not do so we will produce a stalemate in business that will affect all lines and will be dangerous to the future prosperity of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOM] has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER].

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, most people would think this too serious for political leaders to try to make such efforts toward lining up people by accusing them of playing politics if they do not vote for this, and try to make them act too tweedle dumbly.

Reference has been made to the hearings. There is an attempt to make it seem that there was some kind of a filibuster on the part of the minority. Therefore, I think you should know when your people ask you that in our committee the Democratic chairman the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], decides who shall be the witnesses for the administration and who shall be the witnesses for the minority, and he sets the time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Not at the moment. You can take your own time.

And he decides how long the minority witnesses shall testify. When I sat in the committee I have tried and tried to get a chance to ask a question and in order to do so, when the opposition witnesses are testifying, I had to interfere with their testimony and cut it short, and, therefore, mostly I do not even attend the committee.

In the OPA hearings we have had witnesses from every industry in the United States, I think, bar none, telling you that they cannot produce under OPA and the confiscatory OPA ceilings. The thing is too vast and complicated for such men—such little men as are these men in OPA to try to operate. Those insiders in OPA, as you know, are rather lawless men. You remember the Bankhead-Brown amendment. They have violated it repeatedly. Regardless of what law you pass, they are going to do business as usual. I think they were extremely disappointed, in reality, when you failed to pass that pale pink compromise law which would not have bothered them in the least, because when you failed to pass it over the President's veto you prevented their having a chance to blame on Congress the failures, the repeated failures, and the increasing failures which are inevitable because the OPA is one big racket from start to finish, even rent control. Rent control is only a method of keeping down rents even below costs, and making things so disagreeable that people have to sell their buildings for a song to some political racketeer, and preventing building, and in the end forcing Congress to pass the Communist Party program of housing, slum-clearance housing, costing billions of dollars every year, for which the big political racketeers who are the mainspring behind this OPA, and do not forget it, are going to get their usual hoggish share of the proceeds. The reason why high Government officials are floundering around like fish in a net, in a communistic net which they have built around themselves, is because they see by the Government statistics—and I do not mean the deceptive scrambled statistics they have fed the public—that right now their planned economy house of cards is tumbling right around their heads, and Government officials and Communists alike are going to fall with it—and you will fall, too, if you go along with them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] is a very fair chairman. There has never been a time when he did not treat each and every member of the Banking and Currency Committee and every Member of this House fairly. There has never been a time when he caused a member to stop interrogating a witness. That is evidenced by the printed hearings. From them you will find that the gentlewoman from Illinois and one or two other members of the minority took days, and days, and days, bringing back very important witnesses to the stand to interrogate them. The chairman of the committee was so fair and considerate that he invariably asked all witnesses to testify before our committee that the members of the minority wanted to testify. He never refused to do that.

The gentlewoman from Illinois insists on calling this bill a communistic bill. She has, as a matter of fact, branded every bill that comes from our committee and on the floor of this House that she opposes as a communistic bill. She said that OPA was communistic, that Bretton Woods was communistic, that the British loan was communistic, that the veterans' emergency housing bill was a communistic bill. So in calling these bills communistic I believe she is entirely wrong, just as wrong as she is when she says that our chairman has not treated her fairly. Our chairman has not only treated her fairly but he has treated every other member of that committee fairly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I assure you I did not know the gentleman from Texas was going to deliver a eulogy on me when I yielded to him.

I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of approving the resolution that is before the Committee at this time. I have been down home in recent days, I have talked with the people there. I have seen the messages that have been coming in. I believe I know what they are thinking. I have talked with veterans who are in school under the GI bill of rights and who are being paid $65 a month if single, and $90 if married. I have talked with their wives and I know something of the fear that confronts them today because of the effective emasculation of price control.

There is great concern throughout the country, and rightly so, because it is felt that if price control is discontinued or if we do not have some effective form of price control that same type of ruinous inflation that we experienced following the last World War is going to hit us again; and I believe there is no question about it. There is no way of avoiding inflation unless we continue price control. Perhaps a great deal of the confusion comes about, and probably some of the opposition to continuing price control, through reference to the agency, the OPA, itself. I do not uphold OPA for all the things it has done. I think it has done some foolish things. It has been quite unwise in many of its administrative orders. But I do thoroughly believe that we must have some form of effective price control if we are to stay out of that inflationary spiral that will ruin the small business people of this country, the farmers, wage earners, white-collar workers, the little people generally throughout these United States. I know that fear is gripping the people of this country today as they see price control going out.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Does the gentleman believe that the price control bill that passed the House and Senate and that was finally agreed upon by the conferees would have been at all helpful in controlling prices?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not know that I am competent to say. I had very much hoped from the statement made by the

chairman of the committee when he presented the conference report here that it would be a workable bill that we could live with. I may say I do feel that the bill which the House passed originally was practically a farce so far as price control is concerned. I voted against every single amendment offered to that bill, not because I felt there was no merit in any of them. I think several of the amendments had some merit in them. I felt very definitely, however, that the sum total effect of all the amendments was to destroy price control completely. Therefore I can say to the gentleman I feel that the bill which we sent to the Senate was totally ineffective as a price-control measure.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. The President, having been advised by the leadership of both the House and Senate, that if the bill reported by the conference did not become law there would be no price control, in view of that, and his having vetoed that bill, if we were to pass this resolution and send him a bill he could approve, the credit would mainly go to him. However, suppose we get no price control at all, because the President has vetoed the bill that the leadership of both the House and Senate advised him to sign, and we get nothing at all, where would the responsibility rest for getting nothing?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, I am not concerned with where the credit goes. I am concerned with having an effective price control to prevent ruinous inflation in this country and I do not care who gets the credit.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. It is not a question of credit. It is a question of responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL].

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, the situation already existing today, with no price-control legislation at all on the statute books, convinces me more strongly than ever that the proper course last Saturday was to override the President's veto and to have enacted the law as contained in the conference report.

I have spoken with a number of my friends who are members of the Judiciary Committee, and, in addition to the economic confusion pervading the country, apparently there are a great number of legal problems which have arisen and which will arise, even some legal problems connected with the resolution itself and the proper form which it should take.

I think the President made a grave error in confronting the country with this situation. Many of the consequences cannot be repaired even if this resolution is adopted quickly. That, after all, is water over the dam. Our problem today is to try to work out of the confusion created as quickly as possible and to the best interests of the country.

Personally, I feel strongly that we should vote for the continuing resolution. As a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, assuming the joint resolution is adopted, I intend to do my best to see that some workable compromise is brought in by that committee. I realize that we will have to find something that will be acceptable both to the President of the United States and to the Congress; consequently, some of us are going to have to yield our views on certain points, even as many of us did in respect to the conference report when we voted for it. There were many provisions in that report with which I disagree—some against which I voted.

I do not feel quite as pessimistic about the ability of the committee to do that as our chairman indicated he did in his opening statement. The trouble with the country today is that there has been too much rigidity of attitude, too much desire to secure one's own ends and one's own views to the exclusion of thousands of other people—too little give and take during this tough adjustment period. If we could only follow the Golden Rule just a little more closely—all of us. Personally, I am ready to yield considerably on my views with the desire and ambition to get something that will work and which will prevent any uncontrolled rise in prices. That is the essence of the problem. If we do not do that, we will have failed at this time. We will have permitted a minority to control, to the detriment of the great majority.

I believe that it can be done, and I shall do my best to have it done. The President's message, in the first part, was polititcal in its implications; it was a political speech; but when you get to the end of it where the President states what he will accept, he admits in principle the policy of decontrol which was incorporated in the bill which he vetoed. He accepts in broad principle the Taft amendment, which he so bitterly criticized by saying:

> 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.

I voted against the cost plus amendment in the House, but I cannot agree with the President's view that it will be as bad in its effect as he believes it would be. In my opinion it goes too far and would be damaging. It should have been put in in changed form, but it certainly would not have produced the results he claims it would. He also indicates that he is prepared to see subsidies eliminated and scaled down during the first half of 1947. If the President and the OPA had offered this much 3 or 4 months before the bill was reported by our committee, I believe many of the sweeping and bad amendments adopted on the floor could have been defeated.

So, in general, in the President's veto message, he indicates his willingness to accept a good part of the House bill. I intend to vote for this continuing resolution and do my best to bring in a workable bill that will provide effective price control. Then if the President should decide to veto that one, I will vote for another continuing resolution and go through the process all over again.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, as perhaps most of you know, I have consistently opposed OPA legislation. I think I was one of very few that voted against it at the time it was enacted. I thought then that it was not compatible with our form of government. I thought it was undemocratic, unconstitutional, and unworkable. I still hold to those views.

But notwithstanding the views that I have entertained heretofore in regard to the basic law, somewhat consistent with my own policy for voting for liberal rules which permit the consideration and adequate debate of legislation, I have concluded to vote for this resolution, believing that it is the only reasonable thing to do in view of the fact that the President has requested it. After all, he is the Chief Executive and charged with the responsibility of effectively enforcing the laws enacted by the Congress.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. It is the only possibility for any price control, then, is it not?

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is exactly right. While I doubt very much if the committee will bring in any legislation which will meet with my approval, I am willing to subordinate my views on this particular question and at least give them an opportunity to work upon the problem, because I realize that it is of great importance to the people of this country.

I do not agree that this resolution is legal, or that the effect of it will be to legally revive or reenact a law. The speech of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] a minute ago indicated that perhaps the resolution is not open for amendment, but it seems to me that it should be amended so as to reenact the law which expired last night at midnight. We certainly cannot revive or reenact it by merely amending it.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT].

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to offer my testimony on the statement made here a little earlier that the gentlewoman from Illinois spent days and days questioning witnesses. I have been a member of the Banking Committee now for 2 years, and I have never seen anything like that happen.

Secondly, I do not particularly want to enter into the controversy about "who killed Cock Robin." But I do believe we are entitled to a little more information on that subject. The President says that on September 6, 1945, he urged the Congress to pass an extension law promptly.

May I ask the chairman of my committee if the President at or about that time asked him to have hearings on this law?

Mr. SPENCE. I have no recollection of getting any communication from the President. Since the President said he asked for it, I assume he did ask, but I have no recollection of it. I know this, that most of the people who are now complaining about not being treated

fairly are the people who took up most of the time in the hearings.

Mr. BUFFETT. May I ask the gentleman this: If the President had sent a message directly to him, he certainly would not have turned the President down, would he?

Mr. SPENCE. I think it is very obvious I am not trying to turn him down now. I think the gentleman understands that.

Mr. BUFFETT. Yes; I do. I think the Congress and the country should understand that if the President had actually tried to secure hearings last September as his veto message indicated, he would have had those hearings promptly. I made such a request on the 26th of September. We started hearings late in February.

We are never going to get anywhere on the increase of inflation and prices as long as we keep working at cross-purposes. We have had one crisis after another here this spring, crises that are made to order for the advancement of communism not only here but all over the world. We are called on today to pass an extension of the OPA Act for 20 days because of the danger of much higher prices, but at the other end of this week we will be called upon to create $3,750,000,000 of pure inflation in the form of a loan to Great Britain.

Is it not about time to stop fooling the people of this Nation? If this administration continues its reckless loaning policy, price control becomes an instrument for the destruction of the Nation. Why not face the music now and save us from the fate of Germany and others who have been wrecked by price control.

It is time for a showdown—for the people to learn that all the price-control laws in the world cannot keep prices down as long as the Government keeps diluting and debauching our currency.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOPPLEMANN].

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, most Members of this House have been bombarded today with telegrams from constituents, running 35 and 40 to 1, demanding the continuation of price control, not the meaningless price control which would profit the inflationists and economically massacre the people, but price control with authority to lead us in an orderly fashion through the transition period from war to peace.

The facts are clear and decisive. The door to inflation has been opened wide. The situation would have been the same had the meaningless measure passed last week been upheld. The veto was the only step the President, fully cognizant of his responsibility to the country, could have taken to throw the issue squarely at the people and let them take up the cudgels for their own protection.

Every Member of this House is now fully aware of the danger facing the country.

The people are demanding that we face the facts and act upon them. It is our clear responsibility and business to reject the exploiters and vote for this resolution.

This resolution, moreover, gives the opponents of price control, who now are confronted by the Frankenstein they created, to extricate themselves from the mess into which they plunged themselves by their own short-sightedness. There is little comfort in "I told you so" for those of us who stood firm against every effort to scuttle these inflationary controls.

The country imperatively requires now a unanimity of support for this resolution and a sober approach to the magnitude of the problems as we resume work on a measure which will be an effective answer to the inflationary menace.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, the time has come to quit making reckless, incorrect statements. It has been said that every Member has been flooded with telegrams because the President asked the public to send telegrams to their Members. I received just one telegram, and I shall read it:

Representative WILLIAM LEMKE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Condemn veto by President Truman. Do not favor revising old OPA set-up. Rather let OPA die a natural death.

S. B. BAGNE.

It is the only telegram I have received.

Now, let us get together and reason and find out what is wrong with the OPA.

In the first place, it is an un-American institution. It is an illegitimate child. It was born of foreign parentage. It was imported from Russia and Great Britain. Canada, New Zealand, and Australia refused to adopt this Russian-British half-breed.

The ways of the OPA are foreign to the things that made America great. Regimentation and dictatorship, in themselves are un-American. Its performance has been even worse than its foreign birth. Few people realize to what extent it interfered with and prevented full production. It has been the bottleneck of production. It is largely responsible for the empty shelves. It has not kept the cost of living down but has increased it.

The OPA has been guilty of extortion. It has illegally extracted money from hundreds and thousands of innocent people. Recently merchants and implement dealers complained that the OPA was collecting twenty-five and fifty dollars not because of any overcharge, but because they claimed there was something wrong with the sales tag. These merchants and dealers were accused of violating some OPA regulation. They were threatened with prosecution, triple damages, and imprisonment.

When I mentioned this to a merchant recently, he smiled and said, "Well, I just paid $175. I knew it was extortion, but they threatened to drag me into court. You may blame us for submitting to such extortion and corruption, but Congress is responsible for permitting such an un-American institution to be at large. This because, as businessmen, we cannot afford to be brought into court even on false charges."

Mr. Bowles claims that the OPA kept the cost of living down. The truth is the cost of living is about one and a half times as high as it was during the comparable months after World War I. Nearly everything that you eat, drink, or wear, except sugar, is higher than it was after World War I. In addition, there were no empty shelves after World War I. There was no OPA to interfere with production. You could buy what you wanted and the prices were lower than now.

I repeat, the OPA has created a scarcity of commodities by interfering with production. The longer we keep it the greater will be the scarcity—the higher the prices. We should not expect that anyone can or will produce or manufacture articles below the cost of production. No honest person except the lounge lizard expects the farmer, the manufacturer, or the merchant to produce, manufacture, or serve him below cost of production or operation.

Mr .SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, on Saturday I voted to override the President's veto. I did so because I was deeply concerned about the situation in which I was afraid the country would find itself with a sudden complete cessation of all controls. By the same process of reasoning it seems to me it would be an utterly irresponsible action not to pass the pending resolution. I think the pending resolution is our very minimum duty to the Nation. Obviously, what the country needs is a transitional control of essential prices and rents until such time as production has caught up with demand. The law should provide for an orderly decontrol process, but for firm, effective control where needed. That is what we should have given the Nation in the first place. The only thing we can do in that direction today is to pass the pending resolution. I am confident it will pass. I hope it will pass without amendment.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. KUNKEL. The same reasons for supporting a vote to override the veto also will support a vote for this resolution?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I agree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we can go back into one of the books of our childhood to find a verse which aptly describes the condition confronting us as a result of President Truman's veto of the OPA Extension Act. As I recall, it went like this:

Humpty Dumpty (OPA) sat on a wall,
Humpty Dumpty (OPA) had a big fall,
All the king's horses and all the king's men
Could not put Humpty Dumpty (OPA) together again.

I am afraid that is exactly where the country finds itself today. I voted to

override the President's veto on Saturday because I was convinced that exactly this would happen. I think it was one of the most reckless and dangerous acts ever engaged in by a high executive of this country when President Truman, by Presidential veto, threw OPA into the ash can and bet the entire future stability of this dangerous transition period from wartime to peacetime on the flip of a coin, hoping that some particular philosophy of OPA which he favored might eventuate.

I shall vote today for the 20-day continuing resolution because I have always felt that there was a job for OPA to do in this country to help control prices so long as the supply fails to equal the demand. I think we require an OPA which not only seeks to control prices to curtail inflation but which also controls prices to stimulate production. We have not had that under Chester Bowles. His administration of OPA has fumbled badly the first of these objectives and it has failed even more dismally on the second.

Instead, we have had a poisonous potpourri of inept people and inane policies which were bringing us rapidly to disaster. It was in an effort to correct this bureaucratic bungling that Congress wrote the corrective amendments in the bill the President voted. I think if the President wants to have a speedy OPA bill passed by this Congress he can get it quickly by appointing William Jeffers as OPA Director. If he does not like Bill Jeffers, he can appoint Jesse Jones, of Houston, Tex. Jones is a good administrator, and the Congress and the people have confidence in his ability. I think he is the kind of man to do a job with OPA. If Mr. Truman does not like either of them he can appoint Edward R. Stettinius who did an efficient job with lend-lease but who has since been kicked around from pillar to post and from post to pitfall until finally he had to resign to save his self-respect. If we can get a good Administrator for OPA who believes in stimulating production rather than playing politics with OPA, I am convinced the President can readily secure from the Congress the kind of legislation which will enable OPA to attain its two-fold objectives.

Neither Jeffers, Jones, nor Stettinius would endeavor to create a climate of fear and of favoritism designed to make OPA a permanent Government agency. Each of them has business experience enough and confidence enough in our American way of life to realize the wisdom of establishing OPA policies which would as rapidly as possible stimulate production so that it would equal demand and in that way eliminate all reason—except the political one—for continuing OPA beyond that point.

Mr. Chairman, when I addressed this body last Saturday, speaking in support of the resolution to override the President's veto, I pointed out that failure to override the veto might well mean the demise of OPA. I called attention to the rules of procedure obtaining in the other body at the other end of the Capitol. I predicted that filibustering tactics and dilatory techniques in that body might well consume so much time that the price structures and rental controls of OPA could fall apart before a continuing resolution would be passed. The President is a former member of that other body. He knows better than I the realistic situation prevailing at that end of the Capitol. To me, this makes all the more amazing and alarming the fact that the President listened to the ambitious advisers in his New Deal coterie to the point that he vetoed the price control extension act against the considered counsel of Speaker RAYBURN, Majority Leader MCCORMACK, and Senate Leader BARKLEY and thus severed all the life lines which Congress had constructed to hold the line against runaway prices. As the lord high executioner of OPA, President Truman must stand the consequences of what develops.

Particularly in the field of rentals does it seem to me that the President has chosen to make a reckless gamble with the public interest—especially insofar as the veterans are concerned who so badly need housing facilities at a price they can afford to pay. I hope that some form of new rental control can be established without delay, regardless of what the fates have in store for this continuing resolution and for OPA in general.

In conclusion, let me urge my Republican colleagues to join me today in voting for this 20-day continuation of OPA to permit the President to have the time he has requested to work out adjustments between the OPA Act he vetoed and one which he may be willing to support. I hope that even many of you who voted in the negative on Tuesday and Saturday and who may feel that the time has come to end OPA entirely will vote in the affirmative today. If we do nothing more in 20 days than to work out an effective rent-control bill this continuation resolution will be worth while. It is to be hoped that more will be done and that the announcement of the appointment of an able, experienced, business-minded OPA Administrator will be made so that Congress can more confidently vote on new OPA legislation. Such legislation should include a workable formula for decontrolling prices when controls are no longer necessary and it might well include provisions so that wages, along with other costs, should be included in the establishment of OPA ceilings and prices. It should also include provisions for the orderly transition from price controls back to a control-free economy so that the shock of too great and too sudden a change can be cushioned for the protection of the general public.

Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this continuing resolution, and I urge others to join me in its support. However, I do not have too great a confidence that our work today will save the situation, even though we pass this resolution overwhelmingly. The Senate is likely to act with great deliberation on this matter and it may not act at all. Every day that passes will make more difficult the reenactment of price controls and the reestablishment of essential ceilings on rentals and other necessities of life. However, that is a situation created in the White House for which the House cannot assume responsibility. Let us by our vote today at least demonstrate that once again the great House of Representatives has risen to its responsibilities by meeting a critical situation with prompt action designed to make the best of a bad situation which it did not create but which perhaps it can at least help to cure.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I think I would not have asked for this time if I had not done so before the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] had made their speeches.

I think it is a rather small thing for us to debate and cavil about the question of who is responsible now for the position we find ourselves in. Some may want to lay the responsibility at the door of the President. Somebody else may want to say that the committees were not fast enough in their operations to get the bill before the Congress soon enough. Some may be so particular and meticulous in their way that they would try to say whether it was the Republicans or the Democrats who were responsible for the fact that the bill did not go to the President sooner. That seems to me rather childish in consideration of the position which we find ourselves in today. The fact of the business is I am convinced that when one comes through the door of this Chamber one ought to forget politics in a very large measure and remember that one is the Representative in the Congress of the United States and he has self-responsibility of all the people to the extent of his ability.

So it comes to the question: What are we going to do in the position we find ourselves in? Are we going to say we will not do anything because somebody else did not do something? We cannot afford that as Members of the House of Representatives. The country is involved, the welfare of the people is highly important, and above everything else and every other consideration—and I am glad to see Members on both sides of the aisle take that position—I stand with the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from North Dakota. I, too, voted to override the President's veto because I think now I was too fearful that a resolution would not be adopted.

I think we have come to a realization of the fact that we now personally owe a responsibility to the people of the United States, and it does not make any difference who is blamable for anything like a delay that may have occurred. I do not think we will require so much time to bring back a bill. I do not know whether it will be entirely satisfactory to everybody, but all the hearings have been had, many of the witnesses examined, the record is there, and we can move pretty quickly.

I hope the resolution will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, there is no use taking up a lot of time with a political post mortem on: Who killed Cock Robin? I think a dozen amendments in the House killed OPA and inflation control, and I think a dozen amendments in the Senate killed it. I think the President merely pronounced a dead bill officially dead when he sent his veto up here.

Today we are not faced with the question, Who killed OPA? We are faced with a decision on: Where do we go from here?

We are faced with whether we will give this country temporary interim continuation of inflation control for a mere matter of 20 days while the House tries to work out, with the Senate, a better bill than the crippled and mutilated one we sent down.

A vote against this temporary resolution today means that you are voting against production, because no processor and no producer in his right mind is going to engage in all-out production in the present uncertainty as the House and the Senate try to agree on a bill within the next 20 or 30 days. Without a temporary continuing resolution, production will be uncertain.

No one engaged in the production of most of the shortage items today—meat, butter, bread, dairy products—no dairyman, no meat processor, no manufacturer can proceed with any degree of assurance because he does not know whether he will get the subsidy provided in this temporary resolution or not.

Therefore we are apt to see a complete shut-down by almost all of the dairymen, all of the meat processors, who want to continue existing ceilings because they cannot afford to kill and manufacture and process these goods if they are not certain whether they can get the subsidy or not. Surely, if we do not have this temporary continuing resolution they cannot depend upon them.

Then what happens? It takes quite a time before these goods are processed from the raw materials and reach the dealers' counters. All of that inventory that will be built up by retailers in this interim may be at an uncontrolled price. Then these inventories will have to drop down 10, 20, or 30 percent after price control goes back on, should Congress finally agree on a bill for the next year. So business will find itself confused and confounded in an effort to try and operate in this interim unless we pass this simple 20-day continuance. We must let the people of America know where they stand.

Another thing I would like to point out is the suggestion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] that we pass only a rent control without other price controls and have that effective for a year.

In the interest of justice and equity do we dare make a guinea pig out of the landlords of the country? I am no lawyer, but may I ask, can the Congress pass a law so there will be no ceilings on anything except rents? Could we control the prices of buckwheat cakes, baby buggies, eggs, or butter selectively?

I do not think we can. I do know a little about law, and on the temple of justice across the plaza it is stated: "Equal justice under the law." I do not believe this Congress can penalize one single group of people and that group alone and make the law stick on rents, even as badly as we all need rent control.

Rent control goes with the rest of the inflation-control program, the program to stabilize the cost of living clear across the board.

We want to do the best possible job we can. I do not think the House, I do not think the Congress, I do not think the courts will recognize that an act simply stabilizing the cost of rents, penalizing one small segment of America only, and letting other costs go through the roof, is legal.

You know what will happen if we tried a law like that. You would have to raise the rent next month 15 percent, the following month 30 percent and the following month 45 percent if you try to do equity to the people who own property. For as the spiral of inflation goes on up, as the cost of their improvements, and so forth, including the maintenance of their property, spirals upward, more and more adjustments would have to be made.

I do not think this Congress wants to single out one group only for control.

Several things have been said about this satisfactory bill that the House sent down to the President. I would like to remind the gentlemen on the Republican side of the aisle that the two senior Senators in the conference refused to sign this so-called satisfactory bill, Senator TAFT and Senator MILLIKIN, and one of the senior Members of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], refused to sign the bill.

It seems to me, that this satisfactory bill was neither satisfactory to those who wanted less price control nor to those of us who wanted a bill which we felt was strong enough to prevent inflation. If it was not satisfactory to either side, it could not have been a very effective bill.

This Nation wants effective, not phony, price control until production makes further controls by law unnecessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

All time has expired. The Clerk will read the joint resolution for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement made by the gentleman from Oklahoma, something should be said in respect to what attitude the gentlemen he mentioned took. Of three conferees who did not sign the conference report, two of them did not sign it because we eliminated specific decontrols in the bill. Surely the gentleman from Oklahoma is not in favor of that himself. When he states that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] refused to sign the conference report he should have checked his facts on that a little bit because, at the time the conference report was signed about midnight, Mr. CRAWFORD was on his way to the Philippines and was not available to sign the bill. He had not left any instructions what to do, so none of us assumed to have his proxy in that respect.

The reason why the two gentlemen whom he mentioned in the other body did not sign the report was because it did not contain provisions which we had eliminated from it and because specific decontrols had been eliminated it was unsatisfactory to them, not because of the manner in which the conference report came back.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I want to thank the gentleman for the correction regarding the gentleman from Michigan, Representative CRAWFORD. I was not aware of those facts.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Well, the gentleman apparently has not got his facts straight in reference to the other gentleman either.

Mr. MONRONEY. The very fact that the two Senators refused to sign the report——

Mr. WOLCOTT. They refused to sign it because there were not specific decontrols in it; because they were dissatisfied on account of this bill not going far enough.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes, and a lot of us were dissatisfied because it went too far.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Then it was your responsibility to get something that was better.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, of course, it is interesting to hear my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] lay the whole of the OPA troubles onto the Republicans. It is my understanding that the Democrats had a majority in the Congress and also a majority on the Banking Committees in both the House and Senate. It looks like they ought to have been able to bring back a bill that was not such a monstrosity. According to the President, the bill which his party gave to him was impossible. The gentleman from Oklahoma, I assume, signed the conference report.

Mr. MONRONEY. I was not on the conference.

Mr. RIZLEY. Anyhow, you voted for the conference report when it was before the House, the bill which the President says is bad and which he vetoed, and I cannot quite understand now, why you should attempt to lay the whole blame to the three Republican Members of the committees. You had your own Democratic colleagues write the conference report. So you now charge three Republican members on a committee of

14 for this terrible, terrible thing that happened.

Let us analyze what my friend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] said. The substance of what he said was the same thing that this OPA crowd has been contending for all along, that you cannot decontrol one thing without decontrolling everything. Regardless of supply and demand you must control all or nothing. That was the substance of his argument. Again says my colleague, "We must not let this die because," he said "these cattle producers are not going to keep on producing because there will not be any more subsidies." The cattle producers, bless your heart, have been trying to get rid of this thing for months, they never wanted subsidies. What they want is a fair price and a market place and not subsidies, and I doubt that meat will go up as much as is now paid in subsidies, plus the black market prices, and we will be able to get meat in a legitimate market.

He mentioned rents. I think the most sensible thing that has been offered here today is the resolution by the gentleman from Michigan. Let us analyze it a little. Rent is in a different category than any of these other things. If you take these controls off, we do not know how fast many products which the consumer buys will come back into production. We are hopeful and believe much more quickly than most people contemplate. We do know, however, that you cannot build houses in a few weeks or in a few months, because we do not have the materials. So I think the sane solution of this thing would be to continue this control bill as to rents and let us try without other controls for a while and see whether or not all of this calamity happens that they talk about.

Here is the situation. For weeks and weeks and months two committees of this House worked on a price control bill. They brought in, according to the distinguished Speaker of the House and according to the Majority Leader in the Senate there, what they said was the best bill that it was possible to get. Now we are voting on a resolution here continuing it for 2 weeks. Let me remind you what was said not only by the members of the committee, but the Democratic leaders of the Senate and the House as well. They said, "We must get this conference report approved or we will not get anything." Now you want to go back for 2 weeks in the face of all that and keep this chaotic condition. People do not know where they are. We are asked to get this control bill out today, that is true, but what they are asking us to do is to send it back for 2 weeks and try to enact something that everybody says cannot be enacted. The President said that he would not just take any bill, unless it is substantially the law as it now exists. He will again veto it. Does anybody here think that the House or the Senate, either one, is going to give us the kind of a bill that the President and the CIO-PAC apparently want? Of course, they are not.

We had better pass this resolution offered by the gentleman from Michigan continuing control on rents and then hope the respective States will take care of their own rent situations. I think everyone in this country is patriotic. If the people who produce and if the manufacturers and the retailers and the wholesalers are going to put up prices sky high, this Congress can come back and write a real control bill and put wages in with it. That is one of the troubles we have had. We have not had a control bill. When the Little Steel formula went down the river the President of the United States, I will say to the gentleman from Oklahoma, was one of the first men that not only bulged the line, but he broke the line when he made the deal with the labor leaders. You cannot have price control unless some limit is placed on wages. The gentleman from Oklahoma as well as myself back in 1943, when the Gore amendment came up, voted for a control bill straight across the board, and the President of the United States then through his majority said "No," and the Congress put controls on everything but left wages alone, and wages have gone on up ever since. They are reflected in everything that is produced or manufactured, they enter into the price of everything the consumer buys, and you cannot have price control without controlling everything that enters into the price.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 1, lines 5 and 8, after the word "July", strike out the figure "20" and insert the figure "10."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order, simply to direct the attention of the Chair to it, that section 2 has not been read; therefore it is not in order to offer an amendment to it at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is correct. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment to include only the first section.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 1, line 5, after the word "July", strike out the figure "20" and insert the figure "10."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, we have "thrashed a lot of old straw" today. It is amazing what difficulties can arise from a veto. I am reminded now of when Winston Churchill graced the rostrum here and held up his fingers to indicate the V for victory, but I think in the lexicon of Mr. Truman "V" is now for veto; but it offers no comfort because we have a difficulty to contend with.

I fancy the most important and most impressive thing the President of the United States said in the veto message was that part in which he said, "Production slow-downs will develop due to price uncertainties." Why let it continue for 20 days? Why let uncertainty with its clammy hand reach into every enterprise, large and small, in the United States of America?

I had a call from Chicago a moment ago. I understand that live cattle on the Chicago market this morning jumped from 18 to 25 cents. "Shall we buy or shall we not buy? Shall we buy suits or shall we not buy suits?" Whether it is large business or small business, that uncertainty begins to upset the whole free enterprise structure of the country. Why let it continue? Why let the agony be prolonged for a period of 20 days? Is not 10 days enough?

You know very well what is going to happen. It is always rather perilous to be prophetic, but as I see it this is what is going to happen. This resolution probably will be adopted by this House this afternoon. It will go to another body. It will be referred to the appropriate committee, on Banking and Currency. It is entirely new matter. Let me say to you that another body does not easily and idly come by that characterization of the world's greatest deliberative body. They are going to deliberate because this is new matter. I have been over checking a little this afternoon to see what the possibilities are. It may run on for 2 or 3 weeks or for 4 weeks, and so the agony is prolonged, and where is the whole free enterprise structure of the country, not knowing which way to turn?

Is the difficulty so insoluble? I fancy from what I heard in the veto message and in the President's speech on Saturday night that the principal bone of contention is that amendment that accepts the base period of 1941 for cost purposes and then adds the accruing costs. Would it be so difficult for the conferees or, for that matter, for all the members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency and the members of the same committee of another body to sit down in sweet fellowship for just about 2 hours and determine what they are going to do? They require no 20 days to do it. They require, as a matter of fact, not 10 days to do it. It can be done within a space of a few hours if it is a question of whether they are going to agree or disagree. They can make up their minds within a period of a single day. But if this runs on until July 20 there will be confusion worse confounded in every corner of the country—so why not shorten the time? If I had my way, and if July 4 was not an official holiday, I would have made it the 4th day of July and then we would know whether there would be an observance of a second Declaration of Independence. But I am willing to err on the charitable side and make it 10 days. That will serve as a pressure upon those in another body who will then have the responsibility of disposing of this resolution. But to let it run on for 20 days is going to bring confusion to every line of enterprise in every section of the country and there will be indescribable bewilderment. I sincerely hope we do not do that. I think in that one respect the President was right. There will be confusion out of that kind of uncertainty. So I recommend to

you that we shorten the time by making the date July 10 and thus resolve this issue at the earliest possible date for the benefit of the country.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, certainly the gentleman from Illinois realizes the purpose for which we ask a 20-day extension. He says he is very generous in offering an amendment to make it 10 days. But we know how slow the processes of legislation are. We have heard the Chairman criticized today because he did not accede to the wishes of the Committee. If he had acceded, we would have been holding these hearings until the first of next year. Certainly the Congress is not going to cavil about 10 days which would utterly destroy the purpose of the resolution and which would make it impossible to act. I think if we are given 20 days we may have an opportunity to come to some conclusion, but certainly we can not do it in 10 days.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. It seems to me the gentleman from Illinois contradicts himself and is talking beside the point. The issue before us is to continue the OPA for 20 days as it was.

Mr. SPENCE. That is the purpose. The purpose is to give the Committee time to consider and try to come to some conclusion which will satisfy the President and those who have to administer the law.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman will recall when he appeared before the Committee on Rules there had been suggestions in the Congress and in the debate here about 15 days and 2 weeks. I suggested in the Committee on Rules what I thought would be desirable, that is, to limit the time to 2 weeks. I have sent to the Clerk's desk an amendment making such provision. Am I correct in understanding that the Chairman of the Committee would not be averse to a 2-week limitation rather than 20 days?

Mr. SPENCE. No, it seems that some of my colleagues have become very miserly with time just recently. It seems to me 2 weeks would not give us the same opportunity as 20 days. I do not think 20 days is an unreasonable request. If you followed the advice of the argument of the gentleman from Illinois, you ought to give us only 1 day.

Mr. HALLECK. I am certainly not urging anything that is out of reason. The fact of the business is that during the time this resolution is in effect this condition of uncertainty will continue throughout the country. The gentleman's committee held long hearings and gave careful consideration to this whole matter. My view is that the best interests of the country could be served by settling it as expeditiously as possible. It occurs to me that 2 weeks would be ample time for the Committee and the Congress to give it consideration.

Mr. SPENCE. May I answer the gentleman by saying there is no limitation on the time within which we could settle. If we are given 20 days to settle it and if we can settle the matter earlier than that, it would be within our province to do so.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. The type of debate that is going on now is the reason why you need all the time you can get. This is the very type that has caused delay. The conference brought the bill in at the last hour, at twilight, and now we are aroused because the President exercised his prerogative and vetoed it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact that in this resolution it provides for July 20?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. That does not mean we will have 20 days in which to get together on a bill, because what time the other body takes to consider this comes out of that time between now and July 20. So we certainly need enough time.

Mr. SPENCE. It is certainly not an unreasonable time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman. I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. SHORT. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia has the floor and has offered an amendment. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia to the amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Strike out "July 10, 1946" and insert "September 1, 1946."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the respite offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is so brief and so inadequate as in my judgment to be totally futile. As indicated by the chairman of the committee a moment ago, we all know the legislative processes. This measure must pass the House. It then must be passed by the other body, where it will probably be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. We know just as well as that we are here that most of the time for this extension is going to be consumed in legislative processes. Now, this is a serious situation. Let us do something or let us make up our minds we are not going to do anything, and let the country know it. To merely give this respite of 10 days, proposed by the gentleman from Illinois which is going to be consumed in debate in the legislative processes, we had better not do anything. I have suggested a period of 60 days. That is September 1. I think that should give adequate time for sober consideration of the grave differences that exist between the legislative and executive agencies. Let us get this matter straight, once and for all, and let us have time within which to do it.

There is another thing which is equally if not more important. When you enact new legislation, as you are planning to do, and send it down to the White House and get it signed and enacted into law, the OPA has to change all of its regulations to meet the changed conditions. Do you think it is fair to OPA or to the business world or to the purchasers of commodities that we should pass a law one day and expect the OPA and the country to recognize it and put it into effect the next day? Now, stop and think about that for a minute, whether you are for this or against it. That is not the fair way to do it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I decline to yield.

When we do pass this legislation, if we do, we ought to pass it in ample time so that the OPA will know where they stand before the law becomes effective, so that the public will know where they stand. Then, we can get an orderly process. Let us have ample time to get this straightened out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to correct a statement made by the gentleman from Virginia. The gentleman's statement was to the effect the OPA was required to change rules on June 30 under which they must operate on July 1.

If the gentleman had studied the bill which was vetoed by the President, he would have found that it contained a provision giving OPA a reasonable period of time in which to make adjustments in their regulations, bringing them into compliance with the new law. As a matter of fact we specifically said in the law that the old regulations and price formulas would be continued for 30 days. We gave the OPA 30 days in which to make such adjustments as they saw fit in order to bring the new standards and adjustments into keeping with the new type of bill.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Since the question of extension of time has come up for consideration in the last few minutes, I should like to ask the gentleman from Michigan whether the 7th day of November next would not be a proper date for it to terminate?

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MATHEWS. Is it not possible that at the end of this 20 days they might come back and ask for another 20 days or even more?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; and if we continue this to August 31 or September 1 we merely continue the uncertainty that much longer rather than only for 20 days.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. The committee took 4½ months to collect the evidence on which the bill we presented to the President was based. What new evidence could possibly be submitted to the Congress or has been?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No new evidence has been submitted and I might state there is no new evidence or argument which has been presented in the last week which has not been presented throughout the months of hearings before the Committees on Banking and Currency of both Houses.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The President vetoed this bill because he found it defective, and all the safeguards the gentleman was talking about were nullified by the veto. This means they have got to start over again. We cannot hark back to any provisions carried in the vetoed bill.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. At the time the President submitted his veto message he asked for 20 days' time in which a study could be made and a new bill passed. I am willing to vote for the 20 days; I shall vote for the 20 days, and shall vote against any proposal for a greater number of days at the present time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman wants to know what new evidence there is. If the gentleman who propounded the query and others will read today's papers they will see what outrageous increases in price have already taken place today. That in itself is sufficient evidence to stir us to action in the interest of the consumer and in the interest of the American people.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think it may be said, and I have told those who sought specific decontrols, especially on meat, that if it so happened that meat was specifically decontrolled and the price went up unusually high the American people would rise in their righteous wrath and be back here insisting that these controls be put back, and that if that happened they would be put back with a vengeance, and they would not come off in a matter of weeks or months and perhaps not in a matter of years. I think all industry will be hurt if they allow prices to go to unwarranted heights, for the American Congress is going to reflect the attitude of the righteously indignant people under those circumstances and put these controls back on. We are not of course going to know in 24 hours what is going to be the answer, and apparently the other body is going to take a little time to see what is going to happen before they take any action at all. What happens to prices within the next week probably will determine what kind of price control we have.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, are only members of the Banking and Currency Committee to be given an opportunity to speak on this resolution even under the 5-minute rule?

Mr. SPENCE. I renew the unanimous consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHORT) there were—ayes 131, noes 107.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BROWN of Georgia and Mr. SHORT.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 142, noes 119.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHORT moves to strike out all after the enacting clause.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that is not a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion is not in proper form.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 83, noes 166.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BALDWIN of New York: On page 1, line 5, after the word "substituting" strike out "July 20, 1946," and insert in lieu thereof "January 20, 1947."

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that if we are going to be honest with ourselves and the American public in this crisis—and it is a crisis—everyone here has said so—that confronts the country, the only honest thing we can do is continue price control throughout the summer into the next session of Congress. It seems to me that those of us here have got to cut bait or fish, and that applies to each side of the aisle as well as the executive department. I do not conceive of this as a Republican problem or a Democratic problem. It is an American problem. I can tell those of you who have said here that the telegrams on price control come from hysterical people and from rabble rousers that those in my community, 90 percent at least of whom are in favor of price control, are not rabble rousers and are not hysterical. They are frightened people when they see the way prices go up when this price control is suddenly lifted. All we ask is that this should be continued until production and demand reach a point of reasonable balance in the economy of the Nation. Certainly we ought to permit the American people to speak on this question at the polls at the election and let the next Congress decide. Under my amendment they would have the same amount of time to decide whether this is to be continued or not as they would have under this resolution. Mr. Chairman, there is a second amendment to the next section which obviously provides the same date because the date has to be changed in the other section to correspond and when that amendment comes up I do not intend to continue the discussion by seeking recognition. It seems to me that the arguments pro and con on this whole business have been threshed out on the floor of the House for weeks and weeks. We do not need further debate. I submit this amendment in good faith and I point out to you that the Senate in 6 days, 6 months, or 6 years probably will not change the thing but at least this gives the same opportunity to these as a continuing resolution. I earnestly hope you will support the amendment.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I am sorry, sir, that while I was busily engaged in counting the teller vote, I did not have time to write out the preferential motion in proper form.

It is a bit strange that standing here on my feet for the past 20 minutes I would be denied an opportunity to be heard. Not that I count my voice so convincing but at least those of us who oppose this iniquitous resolution should have their day in court. I want only to be fair, but will not have a repugnant measure crammed down my throat without protest. Some may surrender but I have never, nor will I ever, cowardly capitulate.

Mr. Chairman, heaven knows we have enough confusion now in this country. If this resolution is passed in the form now presented, I fear chaos will really reign.

It is now more than a year since the unconditional surrender of Germany. It will soon be a year since the total capitulation of Japan. We have had 4 years of war and 1 year of peace. When those two wars ended we had the biggest pent-up demand for civilian goods in all our history. This was caused by the sacrifices and self-denials made by our people and the accumulated shortages during 4 years of war. We also had, on VJ-day, not only the best domestic market and the biggest demand for goods but also the American

people, because of extraordinarily high wartime wages, and accumulated savings, had the greatest purchasing power in our history.

By all rules of the game we should have entered immediately, or very shortly after final victory, upon an era of unprecedented production and unparalleled prosperity, because both the demand and the purchasing power for goods were present.

It must also be remembered that many of our wartime plants and industries began their reconversion programs long before the collapse of Japan.

The natural, normal, and expected prosperity, however, did not follow and today, after a year of peace, our country is bogged down in its reconversion program. Selfishness, greed, and strife are to be seen on every hand. An epidemic of strikes has brought about commercial and industrial paralysis.

Our people are still being regimented by New Deal politicians in Washington who want to maintain indefinitely wartime controls. They are more interested in retaining their autocratic power than they are in setting the people free.

The infinite red tape and voluminous, intricate, and contradictory rules and regulations by an overgrown, arrogant, and arbitrary bureaucracy have stifled initiative and enterprise, cut down effort and production, and retarded reconversion and recovery. Today in this land of plenty we are faced with scarcity. One cannot buy butter. It is hard to get meat. The shelves of our dry-goods stores, hardware stores, and lumber yards are empty. We still have raw materials and the tools and skilled labor to produce goods, but both OPA and CPA, by their artificial controls, have reduced output. By increasing wages and costs and by freezing price ceilings, more than a million small businesses have been liquidated in the past 2 or 3 years.

The other side of the picture is just as bad. In 1940 we had $6,500,000,000 in circulation—money not in banks. Today we have twenty-six and one-half billions in circulation, or more than four times as much as at the outbreak of the war.

But what will your dollar buy?

Men and nations are not made rich by printing money. We have plenty of money but no goods. In fact, money is about the cheapest thing we have, but unfortunately men can neither eat nor wear it.

Our greatest need today is to stop printing money and begin producing goods, because money without goods will drive us to a ruinous inflation.

By creating scarcity and running our printing presses, the prices of all commodities are increased and black markets everywhere flourish. The Government loses revenue on bootleg transactions and our people pay exorbitant prices for inferior goods. Americans are tired of dealing under the counter. Let us be frank, forthright, and honest.

Competition in an open and free market will automatically bring about fair prices. Congress cannot repeal the natural economic law of supply and demand. There will be temporary fluctuations but under our free system, prices will naturally and normally adjust themselves. We will have an ample supply at a reasonable cost. Goods will bring no more and no less than they are actually worth.

Not only increased production is a cure of inflation but the American people should exercise common sense and self-restraint for just a few weeks. If we refused to buy things we did not really need or want, prices on every commodity would quickly be reduced and we would get back to where honest and decent people really live. I am not advocating a consumers' strike but I do wish to point out we should not be foolish and frantic—in spite of the OPA's psychology of fear—to purchase anything which we really do not need.

Future historians will call this the age of chiselization, and for very good and indisputable reasons. The OPA has made chiselers, cheats, cowards, and crooks out of good, loyal, law-abiding, honest American citizens.

The OPA is the same old political siren as the NRA. She now wears gingham instead of calico. Her aims, purposes, and methods are very much the same. She wants to get the halter around the necks of both business and workers and force them into a strait-jacket of regimentation.

Do we still want to maintain our American system of individual initiative and private enterprise, or adopt the foreign ideologies of mass regimentation and nationalization of the Nation's business?

After furnishing not only the 12,000,000 men and women in our own armed forces, but also those of our allies with the sinews of war—munitions, food, and clothing—it is now a bit strange that we should be asked or compelled to forsake the American system and adopt a plan of some foreign country that proved insufficient for the day.

This resolution as framed is innocuous, and no more than shadow boxing. It is false and deceptive. It tries to resurrect a skeleton. Though the corpse has been dead only since last midnight and its body is still warm, it yet stinks. Dead or alive—it is rotten. Like a mackerel in the moonlight, it shines and stinks, stinks and shines.

Mr. Chairman, a thing that is basically wrong and fundamentally unsound, contrary to our whole philosophy of government, cannot be made right.

This measure needs not amendment, but extinction; not a physician, but an undertaker.

Let us bury it deep to remove the foul stench from all decent breathing Americans.

For many months our House Committee on Banking and Currency held long hearings, and finally made its report. The same committee in the other body did likewise. We passed a bill, sent it to the White House where it was vetoed over the protest of the leaders of the majority party in both Houses.

Never have I questioned the motives of any man, nor shall I do it now, but I do say that the administration that is now in power with a majority in both Houses for the past 14 years will have its own way. If there be failure, whom can anyone blame except the party that is in power, that has the majority in both Houses, and on every committee?

Mr. Chairman, this is not a political issue, but is an American question and we all should face it squarely. Frankly, I do not like some of the political sparring and parliamentary maneuvering that has been going on on each side this aisle. I believe that an overwhelming majority on both sides knows that it is bad legislation and that the OPA should end.

However, some men want to carry water on both shoulders until after the election. They blow hot and cold in the same breath and are unwilling to fish or cut bait. Better should they stand up and be counted and stop their pussyfooting. The American people will not forever be deceived.

When are we going to end this intolerable situation? Shall we postpone it indefinitely? There are some who would rather maintain wartime controls than to surrender their extraordinary powers voted under the cry of emergency. They are more interested in retaining their autocratic powers than in setting the people free.

For myself, sir, I hope and pray as I have often said, that we shall forever keep America a land where every man can walk the earth his own king, the equal lord of every other man, to go his own way, work out his own will, weave into the warp and woof of magic days the dreams that haunt, the duties that inspire and urge him on.

Though I may be helpless I still want to live my own life and do not wish to become a ward of the Government. I would rather live in freedom and fail than to be bossed by a tyrant and succeed—according to the tyrant's standard.

Benjamin Franklin, one of our wisest philosphers, greatest statesmen, and unexcelled patriots, once said:

> He who surrenders a little liberty for temporary security deserves neither and will soon lose both.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

I will not take the 5 minutes, but I want to say the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], speaks of prosperity. What about the man on a fixed salary? What about the people on retirement pay? Let us do a little thinking here. Let us vote for a continuation of this resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BALDWIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BALDWIN of New York) there were—ayes 84, noes 159.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. BROWN of Georgia,

and Mr. BALDWIN of New York to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 82; noes 168.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

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."

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know if this is a Macedonian cry or not, but I do know that it is an appeal to the Congress of the United States, and to the House of Representatives for courage and for leadership. I know of no time in my brief experience here when we have so badly needed those characteristics as we need them now.

We have had presented to us a request for an extension of the present OPA. I was by accident in a newsreel theater on Saturday evening when the President spoke. It seemed to me to be the speech of a somewhat frightened man who was concerned over a condition he himself had brought about. The incident which impressed me, and which I have not heard anybody else mention, is that when he called upon the OPA employees to stand at their "battle stations" there was audible laughter in the audience.

I believe the people of the United States, as evidenced by their attitude and the telegrams that have come to me, and the telegrams that have come to many other Representatives, are looking to the Congress of the United States to bring order out of this confusion.

Repeatedly this afternoon reference has been made to these telegrams and letters. One Member spoke of a flood of telegrams. Well, let us see: I have received 26 telegrams, including 1 radiogram from Tokyo. I will take for granted that the sender of the radiogram is from my district, when he is home. Two others were from the secretary of the California CIO Council, in San Francisco—one as the secretary, the other as an individual. A fourth was from Los Angeles and I will print it here.

Destroy OPA. Wage earning families, two veterans, can't get butter, meat, bread, suits, underwear, linens, refrigerators, lumber, automobiles, because of OPA. Please restore freedom. No British loans.

I congratulate the three signers of this telegram, Albert L. Hess, C. L. Reigelman, and Margaret Wheeler Hess, on their understanding of the present situation in the United States. They put the blame exactly where it belongs.

That leaves 24 telegrams from my district; not exactly a flood, in my opinion. Of the 24, 13 of the telegrams, signed by 31 people, want the immediate end of the OPA; they do not want any pulmotor used on the body sent to Congress by the President last Saturday. Three more telegrams, signed by three people, want rent controls only, and two other wires, signed by five people, want controls kept on both rents and food. Only five wires, signed by six people, want the OPA continued, and then I have one wire from the acting chairman of a local chapter of the American Veterans Committee also asking for the reenactment of the OPA controls.

This makes 13 wires against OPA; 5 for partial controls, and 6 for OPA; and it makes 31 individuals against OPA, 8 for partial controls, and 7 for OPA. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, this is not a flood of telegrams overwhelming the Congress with demands that OPA be saved.

More people in the United States still have confidence in the Congress than the majority party seems to realize, and particularly the majority members of the Banking and Currency Committee.

There is not a Member of this House who does not know that whether OPA controls are removed today, 10 days from now, 20 days from now, or 6 months from now there will follow a short period of confusion. We would do better to have the operation now and start the economic body of the Nation toward recovery. It has been said that steers are selling on the Chicago and Omaha markets for $25 instead of the OPA "loss ceiling" of $18. If so, I am surprised it is not more. That would do little more than take up the historically deceptive subsidies the OPA has been trying to fool us with. These would be only the first cattle offered after the death of price controls. More cattle will head immediately for the markets. It means the prices will come down. We have more cattle in the United States, almost, than we have ever had. I have said repeatedly that the end of controls will mean more meat, and cheaper meat, allowing for subsidies, on most of the common cuts.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Because cattle are up on the Chicago and Omaha markets does not mean that the price of meat will be going up in the retail markets all over the country, because that is merely the black market price some people are already paying for their meat.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I just learned that cattle were selling in Omaha today for $22.50, and I understand that the top price in Chicago was about the same. The gentleman well knows that the cattle had to go up about 3 or 4 cents to compensate for the loss of the subsidies.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I know very well also that they are going into the regular markets and will therefore go into the regular distribution channels and not into the black market.

We have large crops of deciduous fruits, yet OPA decontrolled some of them, and left pears, with the second largest crop in the history of that commodity, with a ceiling under which the producer will take a loss if he ships. Potatoes are not being harvested in some areas. We have a great wheat crop. Fluid milk is at top production.

It was said here today that one market, I think in Chicago, was selling butter at 99 cents. Think a minute before getting excited. The OPA ceiling on wholesale butter was about 56 cents and the cream it took to make a pound of butter cost about 70 cents. Would you make butter? With the ceiling off and subsidies out of the way, butter will be about 75 cents, perhaps more, but probably not 99 cents. This 99-cent butter is the black market butter going back on the regular shelves at that price instead of the black market price of $1.25, which black-market buyers in Chicago and New York and Los Angeles have been paying for it. If the customer has been going without butter for months and months, let her go without 99-cent butter for a few weeks more and the price will adjust itself, but Mr. Speaker, there will be butter.

There will be meat, through regular channels, not through unsanitary and wasteful black markets. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] told several days ago how pancreatic products were in short supply because black-market operators do not make these products from slaughtered steers. There will be suits and underwear and refrigerators and lumber and the other things the veterans want, referring again to the telegram I quoted.

I see no advantage in a temporary renewal. We can just as well work on a regular bill. A temporary renewal will add to the present confusion. Supplies will not come to the markets, if there is still danger of losing on every shipment. Farmers and manufacturers and consumers will not know if OPA is alive or dead. Let us have courage to vote against the short extension; then vote for the Wolcott amendment to renew rent control, until this can be worked out, and then refuse all other controls which were killed Saturday by the President.

If the vetoed bill had continued the arbitrary powers of Mr. Bowles, I doubt if it would have been vetoed. It gave supervision of foods to the Secretary of Agriculture, and it set up an independent decontrol board for other commodities. It was vetoed, and it is a curious thing that the veto message had no suggestion of the style of the President, but had a remarkable similarity in style to the recent radio speeches of Chester Bowles.

This is a time for courage and for leadership in the House of Representatives.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK].

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I was rather surprised and, I might say, actually shocked by the statement made on the floor of this House that there were more cattle on the hoof, more meat in the lockers, and the crops were abundant with food more plentiful than ever, and still we have scarcities in the retail stores today. The housewives are crying for bread, butter, meat, and clothing. If

that is true, and I have no doubt but that it is true, then who is responsible for the black market? It is the big packers who are trying to browbeat the people into submission. It is the manufacturers who have deliberately withheld those things from the market in order to break down controls in this Nation. This is what I call a real strike. A strike to wring your last dollar or war bond from you.

Might I ask you now, you who have opposed labor, you who have criticized the strikes, who is on strike against the American people, in view of the statements that were made on the floor of this House? You know it is the packers and manufacturers of this Nation and those who would destroy price controls. Yes, might I say, and I say this honestly, that a big majority of the Republican Party with the exception of a very few like, for instance, my good friends, HOMER RAMEY, JOE BALDWIN, DICK WELCH, CHARLEY LA-FOLLETTE, and a few others are on strike against the people today. You people were responsible for the loading down of the OPA with crippling amendments. Let us call a spade a spade. It is an actual fact, and you know it. You will get regular order next November, and the regular order will be an exodus of the people going down to the polls to show those who opposed OPA that the will of the people will rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, there is another responsibility for the inflation which today hangs over this country. That responsibility lies with the Members of the Congress who voted before the war and who have voted since the war to spend Federal money in excess of receipts, and lo, those in the Congress who have been the greatest spenders are the ones who, too late, now recognize the sickness they have created and cry out loudest for the opiate known as OPA. It is too late for opiates.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I voted this afternoon for the amendment for a 60-day extension of OPA and for a 6-month extension, because I feel very profoundly that whatever Congress does should be a real extension; both of these amendments were defeated, and we are now back to where we started from this afternoon. I want to say that this 20-day proposition is a 100-percent phony. In the first place, we all know that the Senate is not going to pass this 20-day proposition. In the second place, we also know that if a 20-day bill were passed by both bodies today, it would calm nobody, comfort nobody, and reassure nobody, because we would still have complete uncertainty as to what the policy would be 20 days from now. We simply cannot get away from the fact that until the Congress determines upon a long-time policy and until the President approves that policy, or until the Congress enacts that policy over his veto, there is going to be confusion, turbulence, and uncertainty.

There is only one kind of new evidence that we can secure now while we are deliberating on what our price control policy should be, and that is how the United States acts with controls off, what element of self-control there is left in the American people, how prices function when there is no OPA. We will get that evidence and that evidence will be valuable in our consideration. But if we pass here a 20-day phony, letting anybody think that there is going to be real price control for the next 20 days, I think we are cowards.

If we had voted first to extend OPA for a substantial period, for 60 days or 6 months, then this House would have considered carefully what kind of extension we wanted and amendments would have been adopted to show the kind of extension we favored. Now it looks as if the House is going to pass this 20-day phony, without amendments, without even bothering about the fact that we are merely amending a dead law, and have put in no words that would revive it.

I have felt sure and feel sure of one thing, that unless and until we act on a long-time policy we are fooling ourselves and fooling the people.

The President asked for a workable OPA law. People are wiring me to vote for a workable law. I think the law we sent to the President was workable. In any case, a 20-day extension of a law that even the President says needs at least five changes, is a completely unworkable proposition. Mark my words, a 20-day extension just will not work.

But some of my colleagues are saying, this is an emergency; the President demands it. Well, I remember Saturday, May 25, when the President demanded an emergency law to stop a railroad strike against the Government. I voted for the bill he handed us, although I had no time to study it. I found out later that the emergency was a phony; that he knew when he started to talk to us that afternoon that there was no railroad strike. From now on I am remembering that Truman-announced emergencies may be merely an excuse for him and his crowd to ask for more power.

This present proposition, of a 20-day amendment of a dead law, will help no one, not even President Truman, and in the end will fool no one except those who vote for it thinking they are helping someone, or fooling someone.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments to offer to this resolution, but due to the limitations of time and the closing of debate I have not had an opportunity to offer either one of them. I do not suppose it would be possible for me to make any contribution to this argument that will have any effect whatsoever. However, I do not want the record to be barren and to show that someone at the time when amendments could be offered has not at least attempted to offer an amendment that would in effect commit this Congress to an effective price-control program for whatever period the extension is to be.

I do not care what the legislative council says with respect to this legislation, I know that this resolution was drawn with the idea that it would be passed last Saturday before the expiration of the present law. I say as a matter of common sense and the legalistic application of legal principles to this resolution that you are not going to accomplish the purpose that you intended. So I had at the Clerk's desk two amendments, one to the first section and one to the second section, which would reenact the provisions of the Stabilization Act and reenact the price-control law, and thus not have any question raised as to whether or not we are engaging in a mere futility by the adoption of this resolution. I submitted the amendments to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and he was inclined to agree that the amendments should be offered. Then, after consultation with someone whom he identified as the legislative counsel for the committee, he came to the conclusion that the amendments would be superfluous. All I have to say to my colleagues is that sometime if this ultimately passes and you are attempting to protect prices and rents under the Stabilization and Price Control Acts, somebody will raise the question in the court as to whether or not you have in fact extended either act for the 20-day period. Then perhaps you will think that perhaps somebody should have raised this question here on the floor. It is too late now to do anything about it due to the steamroller tactics.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

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.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: On page 2, in line 16, at the end of the bill, add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 5. That whenever any State or subdivision thereof, which shall have established provisions for the control and regulation of the rent of housing accommodations within its boundaries, notifies the United States Administrator or official controlling and regulating housing accommodations rents that it is prepared to assume such regulation and control, no provision relating to rent of

housing accommodations of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, shall be applicable within such State or subdivision thereof."

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have offered indicates the direction in which we may move to decentralize Federal control and add to governmental efficiency. In a sentence it proposes that when a State or subdivision of a State shall assume responsibility with regard to rent and shall notify the proper officials of the Federal Government that it is prepared to assume that responsibility, then the activities of the Federal organization in that community shall cease.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. How will this affect the veterans' emergency housing program which contemplates that the Expediter will permit people to build homes for veterans at a certain price if they do not rent the dwellings that are built over a certain amount? In other words, we would not want the States to go in there and interrupt the veterans' emergency housing program.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes. I assure my colleague that I have checked in on that and I find that the Expediter will not operate under the powers to be effected by the proposed amendment. The Expediter does not have to do directly with rent control. I understand that before he will agree that building material be used, there must be an agreement as to rent to be charged. He does not otherwise have to do with rents.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Many States have a provision in their constitution, including I think the gentleman's State constitution, prohibiting impairment of a contract.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes. I have your point.

Mr. GORE. I wondered how effective that could be.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The Federal Constitution provides that a State may not enact legislation impairing the obligation of contracts. It is held by the Supreme Court of the United States that notwithstanding that provision the States may control rents in congested areas. The State of New York, following World War I, enacted exactly that sort of legislation. It was challenged on the ground that it was in violation of the Federal Constitution. The case went to the Supreme Court, and in a most specific and clear sort of determination, the Supreme Court held that that legislation on the part of the State did not violate such a provision of the Constitution or that to which the gentleman refers. It is held that such legislation falls within the broad police power of the State, and is not affected by the prohibition that States may not enact laws impairing the obligation of contracts.

In the case of *Levy Leasing Co.* v. *Siegel* (258 U. S., p. 242) appealed from a decision of the Supreme Court of the State of New York to the Supreme Court of the United States, the constitutionality of the emergency housing law of the State of New York was sustained. Mr. Justice Clark of the Supreme Court delivering the opinion for the Court, the Court held:

> The warrant for this legislative resort to the police power was the conviction on the part of the State legislators that there existed in the larger cities of the State a social emergency, caused by an insufficient supply of dwelling houses and apartments, so grave that it constituted a serious menace to the health, morality, comfort, and even to the peace of a large part of the people of the State. That such an emergency, if it really existed, would sustain a resort, otherwise valid, to the police power for the purpose of dealing with it cannot be doubted, for, unless relieved, the public welfare would suffer in respects which constitute the primary and undisputed, as well as the most usual, basis and justification for exercise of that power (police power).
>
> If this Court were disposed, as it is not, to ignore the notorious fact that a grave social problem has arisen from the insufficient supply of dwellings in all large cities of this and other countries, resulting from the cessation of building activities incident to the war, nevertheless, these reports and the very great respect which courts must give to the legislative declaration that an emergency existed would be amply sufficient to sustain an appropriate resort to the police power for the purpose of dealing with it in the public interest.

The Court concluded with this language:

> Given a constitutional substantive statute, enacted to give effect to a constitutional purpose, the States have wide discretion as to the remedies which may be deemed necessary to achieve such a result and it is very clear that that discretion has not been exceeded in this instance by the State of New York.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. SPENCE. If the State and the Federal Government both exercise the power, they have concurrent jurisdiction with reference to this?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. This amendment provides that if the State will exercise its power and assume the responsibility, the Federal Government moves out of the picture.

Mr. SPENCE. But now, both exercise the same functions?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes; they may. This amendment would remove all possibility of conflict.

Mr. SPENCE. Would you not have fragmentary and uncoordinated control if you gave it to the States, without any overseeing provision by the Federal Government?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Not at all. The city of Flint, Mich., has always exercised this power, and I am assured they are doing a good job up there.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. I just wanted to add that New York has a law establishing a moratorium on the foreclosure of mortgages, and that law has been sustained.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes. I do not understand why people who believe in the philosophy of government that we profess to believe in, are not willing to have their State undertake to discharge this responsibility in their community, at least if they are willing to do so.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes, I yield to my colleague.

Mr. COMBS. Is it not a fact that the Constitution of the State of Texas, in the article dealing with the bill of rights of such State, forbids impairment of contracts?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. COMBS. And under that very provision our Supreme Court held unconstitutional the moratorium law in Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I am not advised. It might be so. I know that the Supreme Court of the State of New York held that a law of that State regulating rents was a constitutional exercise of its broad police power and the Supreme Court of the United States with the question squarely before it held that such regulation and control did not violate the Federal constitutional provision prohibiting a State from enacting legislation impairing the obligation of contract; that such legislation was within the States' police powers which were not interfered with by this constitutional provision.

Mr. Chairman, this is the proposed amendment:

> That whenever any State or subdivision thereof, which shall have established provisions for the control and regulation of the rent of housing accommodations within its boundaries, notifies the United States Administrator or official controlling and regulating housing accommodations rents that it is prepared to assume such regulation and control, no provision relating to rent of housing accommodations of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, or of any other act shall be applicable within such State or subdivision thereof.

Mr. Chairman, the various communities of the States can do this job better than the agents of a great organization centering in Washington. But that is not the most important reason for the adoption. The thing which makes this proposed amendment of very great importance now is that it is a definite movement against the present trend toward the decentralization of governmental power; a definite movement toward putting back in the States governmental powers within their governmental capacity. It is a movement toward reestablishing the governmental sovereignty of the States and toward having the people again look to their States as the responsible sovereign agency of general government, local domestic government. It is a movement toward what we profess to believe in.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. At the time I offered my amendment to section 1, I stated that I had an amendment which I wanted considered at the same time with reference to section 2. In order to get the record straight I would like unanimous consent to have had that considered at the same time. It simply changes the dates in the two paragraphs.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am wondering just what shape this proposition would leave the State of New York in. We have a rent-control law; we have a commissioner in charge of the operation. The whole thing is functioning, regulations have been promulgated, and it is in effect. If this rent-control amendment were adopted, I am wondering how it would operate. I am wondering what would happen, whether or not the State of New York would have to make a certificate to the Federal Government. I am rather inclined to believe that the amendment would tend to result in considerable confusion, and I am inclined to believe, also, that it would be a little difficult to handle with the picture that the gentleman from Texas presented to us when he was on the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] made practically the point I wish to make. We have a rent-control law in the State of New York and it went vigorously into effect yesterday. The State rent law operates under the sovereign power of the State of New York. For the life of me I cannot see just where this amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas would either benefit or injure us. I think it would lead to some confusion.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I suggest to the gentleman that this would not at all disturb the State of New York if it assumed responsibility for rent control; it could not.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Representatives from New York appeared at the hearing and wanted a State amendment, perhaps not precisely like that offered by the gentleman from Texas, but they wanted that in principle.

Mr. HANCOCK. If the gentleman will yield, it simply means that where a State has taken over rents the Government will stay out. How can there be any objection to that from the standpoint of New York?

Mr. REED of New York. I have no objection if the State of New York still retains its sovereign rights.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. If the gentleman will yield, would not the amendment produce conflict between State law and Federal law?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes; I think it would.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, let us live by the rules of the game. It was announced here on the floor by the chairman of my committee just before we voted on the President's veto that a resolution would be offered at the suggestion of the President, asking for 20 days to consider another bill. It was contemplated that nothing would be in the resolution beyond the 20 days' extension so that the Banking and Currency Committee of the House could go carefully into all phases of another bill. I think, since the President's veto was sustained, we certainly ought to carry out his wishes.

I believe this amendment ought to be considered by the Banking and Currency Committee. It was the purpose of the rule when granted that matters dealing with OPA would be sent to the Banking and Currency Committee and there we could take up every phase of OPA. To come in here with one amendment to change rents, means opening the resolution to many amendments.

Let us carry out the wishes of the President as they were stated by the chairman of my committee when the President's veto was sustained. If you are going to deal with rent in the resolution, it would be germane to introduce many amendments, including the bill that the President vetoed.

Now let us be fair to all parties concerned and take back to the Banking and Currency Committee all phases of the OPA for consideration and carry out the wishes of the President, or make the resolution open to all amendments, including the bill he vetoed. If the Banking and Currency Committee is going to consider another bill, it should not be hampered by this resolution.

Therefore, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be voted down and that the original intention of this resolution will be carried out.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, this is similar to an amendment I offered when we had the price-control bill under consideration.

The State of New York is the only State in the Union that has a rent-control act of its own. Last night, as my colleagues have said, this was invoked by Governor Dewey. He has appointed a rent director. He issued his executive order last night and froze rents at the same ceilings that are now in effect under the OPA law. We are ready to operate. The rest of you are in trouble and we would like to keep going under our own law, and I hope this is enacted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] is recognized.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I feel the same way that my colleague from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] does, that we should not load down this simple resolution to give us 20 days to consider these matters with amendments.

The distinguished gentleman from Texas has said this regulation on rents might be under the police powers of the States. I can see how that might be done under slum clearance and by other agencies, but the Constitution of the United States says, that no State shall make laws impairing the obligation of contracts and that applies to every State in the Union. I do not see how the States can impair the obligations that exist now under contracts between landlord and tenant.

As I stated, I feel like the gentleman from Georgia does. I feel the States ought to exercise their function and I feel this agency should be temporary, but I am afraid if we take this step we will get into a chaotic condition and we do not know what the result will be; therefore I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement of the chairman of the committee, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 371, pursuant to House Resolution 689, he reported the resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

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

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOLCOTT moves to recommit House Joint Resolution 371 to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 283, nays 61, answered "present" 1, not voting 87, as follows:

[Roll No. 193]

YEAS—283

Abernethy
Allen, La.
Almond
Andersen, H. Carl
Andrews, Ala.
Angell
Auchincloss
Bailey
Baldwin, Md.
Baldwin, N.Y.
Barrett, Pa.
Barrett, Wyo.
Barry
Bates, Ky.
Beall
Beckworth
Bender
Bennet, N. Y.
Bennett, Mo.
Biemiller
Blackney
Bland
Bloom
Bolton
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Bryson
Buchanan
Buck
Buckley
Bunker
Butler
Byrne, N. Y.
Canfield
Cannon, Fla.
Cannon, Mo.
Carlson
Carnahan
Case, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.
Celler
Chapman
Chelf
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clark
Clason
Clements
Cole, Mo.
Cole, N. Y.
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Courtney
Cravens
Crosser
Cunningham
D'Alesandro
Davis
Dawson
De Lacy
Delaney, John J.
D'Ewart
Dingell
Dirksen
Domengeaux
Dondero
Doughton, N. C.
Douglas, Calif.
Douglas, Ill.
Doyle
Durham
Earthman
Elliott
Ellis
Elsaesser
Elston
Engle, Calif.
Ervin
Fallon
Feighan
Fenton
Fernandez
Fisher
Flannagan
Flood
Fogarty
Folger
Forand
Fuller
Fulton
Gallagher
Gamble
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Gearhart
Geelan
Gerlach
Gillie
Gordon
Gore
Gorski
Graham
Granahan
Grant, Ind.
Green
Gregory
Griffiths
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Hancock
Hand
Hare
Harless, Ariz.
Hart
Hartley
Havenner
Hays
Healy
Hébert
Hedrick
Heffernan
Hendricks
Henry
Herter
Heselton
Hess
Hill
Hinshaw
Hobbs
Hoch
Hoeven
Holmes, Mass.
Holmes, Wash.
Hook
Hope
Howell
Huber
Hull
Jackson
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Ind.
Johnson, Luther A.
Johnson, Lyndon B.
Judd
Kean
Kearney
Kee
Keefe
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, Ill.
Keogh
Kerr
Kilday
King
Kirwan
Klein
Kopplemann
Kunkel
LaFollette
Landis
Lane
Lanham
Latham
Lea
LeFevre
Lesinski
Lewis
Link
Luce
Lyle
Lynch
McConnell
McCormack
McDonough
McGlinchey
McMillan, S. C.
McMillen, Ill.
Madden
Maloney
Manasco
Marcantonio
Martin, Mass.
Mathews
May
Michener
Mills
Monroney
Morgan
Morrison
Mundt
Murdock
Murphy
Murray, Tenn.
Murray, Wis.
Neely
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Neal
O'Toole
Outland
Patman
Peterson, Fla.
Pfeifer
Philbin
Pickett
Plumley
Poage
Pratt
Price, Fla.
Price, Ill.
Priest
Quinn, N. Y.
Rabaut
Rabin
Rains
Ramey
Randolph
Rayfiel
Reed, Ill.
Rees, Kans.
Resa
Richards
Riley
Rivers
Robertson, Va.
Robsion, Ky.
Rockwell
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, N. Y.
Rowan
Ryter
Sabath
Sadowski
Sasscer
Savage
Scrivner
Sharp
Sheppard
Sheridan
Smith, Maine
Smith, Va.
Somers, N. Y.
Sparkman
Spence
Springer
Starkey
Stefan
Stevenson
Sullivan
Sumners, Tex.
Sundstrom
Talbot
Talle
Taylor
Thom
Thomas, Tex.
Thomason
Tibbott
Towe
Traynor
Trimble
Voorhis, Calif.
Walter
Wasielewski
Weaver
White
Whitten
Whittington
Wigglesworth
Wilson
Wolverton, N. J.
Woodhouse
Woodruff
Zimmerman

NAYS—61

Allen, Ill.
Arends
Arnold
Bishop
Brehm
Brown, Ohio
Brumbaugh
Buffett
Byrnes, Wis.
Campbell
Clevenger
Curtis
Dolliver
Dworshak
Ellsworth
Fellows
Gillette
Goodwin
Gross
Gwinn, N. Y.
Gwynne, Iowa
Hagen
Jenkins
Jensen
Johnson, Ill.
Jones
Jonkman
Kinzer
Knutson
Lemke
McCowen
McGregor
Martin, Iowa
Mason
Merrow
Miller, Nebr.
O'Hara
Phillips
Pittenger
Reed, N. Y.
Rich
Rizley
Robertson, N. Dak.
Roe, Md.
Schwabe, Mo.
Schwabe, Okla.
Shafer
Short
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Ohio
Smith, Wis.
Stockman
Sumner, Ill.
Taber
Vorys, Ohio
Vursell
Wadsworth
Weichel
Winter
Wolcott

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Larcade

NOT VOTING—87

Adams
Anderson, Calif.
Andresen, August H.
Andrews, N. Y.
Barden
Bates, Mass.
Bell
Bonner
Boren
Boykin
Bradley, Mich.
Bradley, Pa.
Bulwinkle
Camp
Clippinger
Cochran
Coffee
Cole, Kans.
Colmer
Corbett
Cox
Crawford
Curley
Daughton, Va.
Delaney, James J.
Drewry
Eaton
Eberharter
Engel, Mich.
Gardner
Gibson
Gifford
Gillespie
Gossett
Granger
Grant, Ala.
Harness, Ind.
Harris
Hoffman, Mich.
Hoffman, Pa.
Holifield
Horan
Izac
Jennings
Johnson, Okla.
Kefauver
Kilburn
LeCompte
Ludlow
McGehee
McKenzie
Mahon
Mankin
Mansfield, Mont.
Mansfield, Tex.
Miller, Calif.
Norrell
Norton
Pace
Patrick
Patterson
Peterson, Ga.
Ploeser
Powell
Rankin
Reece, Tenn.
Robinson, Utah
Rodgers, Pa.
Roe, N. Y.
Rooney
Russell
Sikes
Slaughter
Stewart
Stigler
Tarver
Thomas, N. J.
Tolan
Torrens
Vinson
Welch
West
Wickersham
Winstead
Wolfenden, Pa.
Wood
Worley

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan against.

Mr. Pace for, with Mr. Wood against.

Mrs. Mankin for, with Mr. Clippinger against.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Bradley of Michigan against.

Mr. Slaughter for, with Mr. Larcade against.

Mr. Gillespie for, with Mr. Adams against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Horan.

Mr. Drewry with Mr. Jennings.

Mr. Izac with Mr. Harness of Indiana.

Mr. Camp with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. Rooney with Mr. Engel of Michigan.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Corbett.

Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. McKenzie with Mr. Cole of Kansas.

Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Daughton of Virginia with Mr. Crawford.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Welch.

Mr. James J. Delaney with Mr. Rodgers of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Rankin with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.

Mr. Coffee with Mr. August H. Andresen.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Hoffman of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Andrews of New York.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. SLAUGHTER. Had he been present he would have voted "aye." I therefore withdraw my vote of "no," and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RENT CONTROL

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 372, reenacting and continuing the effective period of certain provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, in respect to the stabilization of rents for housing accommodations, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I cannot conceive how rents could be controlled without the control of other matters over which OPA exercises its powers. Certainly it would be unfair to attempt to control rents unless we attempted to control those things incident to rents and upon which rents are based.

There is a provision with respect to rents in the resolution we have just adopted and when the Committee on Banking and Currency takes up the consideration of OPA we expect to consider the control of rents. I certainly would not be in favor of any bill that did not control rents, because I think it is essential to the welfare of the American people; but I do object to the immediate consideration of this resolution at this time. I hope the matter will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KERR filed a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6837) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GARY submitted a conference report and statement on 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.

AMENDING EMERGENCY FARM MORTGAGE ACT

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6477) to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended, and section 3 of the Federal Farm Mort-

gage Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 19, after "Federal" insert "Farm."

Page 3, line 1, strike out "Agriculture and Forestry" and insert "Banking and Currency."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the gentleman conferred with the minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I did.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not see him here and no one has said anything about it.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The only change is that we require the Farm Credit Administration——

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I know nothing about it and I would prefer to know something.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I thought he had spoken to the minority leader.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. No; he has not.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I may say to the minority leader that the distinguished chairman and two other members of the committee were the only ones who were in favor of continuing this legislation and I am sure that by the agreement made the other day to continue it for 1 year more will take care of the Senate amendments.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. It is only a technical matter.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his request.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution No. 371, just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I received unanimous consent some time ago to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by William S. Bennet. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $160, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a speech entitled "Top Public Relations Man of 1945." I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $240, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made earlier in the day and include certain telegrams and postcards.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ALMOND, from July 2 to August 2, on account of official business.

To Mr. DAUGHTON of Virginia (at the request of Mr. BLAND), for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. GRANT OF ALABAMA, for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. HORAN (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), from July 1 to July 11, on account of official business.

SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and under the rule referred as follows:

S. 2280. An act 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; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on June 30, 1946, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

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.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 2, 1946, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee on Tuesday, July 2, 1946, at 10 a. m., at which time hearings will be continued on H. R. 5993, a bill to provide for the extension of the air mail postal service, and for other purposes. Consideration will also be given to H. R. 2000, the star-route bill, and House Joint Resolution 356, having to do with giving to the veterans' hospitals undeliverable magazines and other periodicals held by the postal service.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will hold a meeting on the audit of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Document No. 674, on Tuesday, July 2, at 10 a. m., in room 304, House Office Building.

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will hold hearings on S. 1636 and H. R. 6680, both relating to surplus property on Wednesday morning, July 3, at 10 a. m., in room 304, House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1430. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of May 4, 1898 (30 Stat. 369), as amended, to authorize the President to appoint 250 acting assistant surgeons for temporary service, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

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. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Public Lands. S. 1236. An act to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended, in order to promote the development of oil and gas on the public domain, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2446). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 6911. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2447). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2093. A bill for the relief of J. P. Kerr and Robert P. Kerr; with amendments (Rept. No. 2445). 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. LANHAM:

H. R. 6938. A bill to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 6939. A bill restricting importations of mink skins and fox skins, except red-fox skins; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 6940. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct aviation facilities at the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BUNKER:

H. R. 6941. A bill to amend Public Law No. 2, Seventy-second Congress, as amended, and for the purpose of transferring to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the administration of the premium-price plan for copper, lead, and zinc; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 6942. A bill to amend Public Law No. 2, Seventy-second Congress, as amended, and for the purpose of transferring to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the administration of the premium-price plan for copper, lead, and zinc; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 6943. A bill to amend Public Law No. 2, Seventy-second Congress, as amended, and for the purpose of transferring to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the administration of the premium-price plan for copper, lead, and zinc; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. J. Res. 372. Joint resolution reenacting and continuing the effective period of certain provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, in respect to the stabilization of rents for housing accommodations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. J. Res. 373. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, of a permanent memorial to the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York:

H. Res. 690. A resolution requesting the executive department to take no action which in any way recognizes the Trans-Jordan area of Palestine as a separate or independent state; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 6944. A bill for the relief of Ira D. Doyal and Clyde Doyal; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 6945. A bill for the relief of Frank A. Ledgett; 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:

2049. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Dr. Paul Newton Poling, minister, the First Presbyterian Church, El Paso, Tex., favoring Senate bill 191; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2050. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Texas Newspaper Publishers Association petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for extension of OPA; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2051. Also, petition of the Bergen County Detachment, Marine Corps League, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for increase of all benefits to all members of the armed forces who have been disabled in the performance of their duties; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

2052. Also, petition of the Bergen County Detachment, Marine Corps League, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for legislation protecting the jobs of veterans; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2053. Also, petition of the Seventh Day Christian Conference petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to extension of OPA; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2054. Also, petition of Texas Junior Chamber of Commerce petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to amendment of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.