for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1742. A bill for the relief of Mary Lomas; with amendment (Rept. No. 307). 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. BEALL:

H. R. 3208. A bill to permit the use of appropriations of the National Capital Housing Authority for the maintenance and operation of buildings and grounds used for nurseries and nursery schools established by the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia within projects under the jurisdiction of such Authority; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 3209. A bill for the relief of persons or their legal heirs or administrators against whom suits have been brought or assessments made by the Price Administrator under the provisions of section 205 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, approved January 30, 1942 (56 Stat. 23), and who have paid the United States Government treble penalty as provided therein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 3210. A bill to reduce juvenile delinquency by providing for the care and prompt return home of run-away, transient, or vagrant children of juvenile age, going from one State to another without proper legal consent, through the use of funds appropriated under the provisions of the Social Security Act for aid to dependent children, under certain conditions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 3211. A bill to make unlawful certain acts in connection with picketing in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3212. A bill to amend section 3360 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 3213. A bill to authorize the promotion of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who were prisoners of war; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBSION:

H. R. 3214. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 3215. A bill to revise the Medical Department of the Army and the Medical Department of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3216. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the upper Susquehanna River watershed in New York and Pennsylvania for run-off and water-flow retardation, and soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 3217. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 3218. A bill to authorize an emergency fund for the Bureau of Reclamation to assure the continuous operation of its irrigation and power systems; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 3219. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator or officials of the Federal Works Agency duly authorized by him to appoint special policemen for duty upon Federal property under the jurisdiction of the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 3220. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States in more nearly equalizing educational opportunities among and within the States by establishing a national floor under current educational expenditures per pupil in average daily attendance at public elementary and secondary schools and by assistance to nonpublic tax-exempt schools of secondary grade or less for necessary transportation of pupils, school health examinations and related school health services, and purchase of nonreligious instructional supplies and equipment, including books; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 3221. A bill to declare Parsees as persons of white race; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 3222. A bill relating to actions brought on behalf of the United States to enforce civil liability, under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, on account of overcharges in the sale of commodities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. J. Res. 183. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. J. Res. 184. Joint resolution to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to ratify the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to approve the present granting of extensions of leases for a term to expire March 31, 1967, to the present lessees at the original rentals; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to establish a national cemetery at Birch Coulee Battlefield, in Renville County, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 3223. A bill for the relief of John Arethas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 3224. A bill to authorize the cancellation of deportation proceedings in the case of Frank Durante and wife, Maria Durante, and two children, namely, Paul Durante and Patsy Durante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH (by request):

H. R. 3225. A bill for the relief of Anna Pechnik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 3226. A bill for the relief of Thomas M. Bates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

378. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of New Jersey State Patrolmen's Benevolent Association, urging the enactment of S. 715, a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for investigatory personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation who have rendered at least 20 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

379. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of Bronx Zionist region, Zionist Organization of America, New York, N. Y., urging immediate large-scale Jewish immigration into Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 28, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

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

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We unite our hearts, O God, in this prayer that Thou wilt teach us how to trust in Thee as a Heavenly Father who loves us and who is concerned about what we do and what we are. Forgive us that there are times when we find it hard, when it ought to be so easy. It is not that we have no faith, but that we seem so reluctant to put our faith in Thee. Men have proved to be untrustworthy, yet we trust each other. Banks have failed, still we write our checks. Depressions have upset our economy, still we carry on business in faith. Blizzards have made the winter drear, yet with the coming of spring we plant our seeds. Hurricanes have screamed across the land, yet we build our windmills. Give to us the faith to put our trust in Thee who dost hold in the hollow of Thy hand all things living. May we learn, before we blunder, that Thou art willing to lead us, to show us what to do, and that it is possible for us to know Thy will and to be partners with Thee in doing what is right.

This we ask in the name of Christ, who never made a mistake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 25, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2849) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

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. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, Mr. STEFAN, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. KEEFE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. KERR, and Mr. MAHON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3123) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 547) to provide for annual and sick leave for rural letter carriers, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

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

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

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Daniel
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Overton
Brewster	Hoey	Pepper
Bricker	Holland	Reed
Bridges	Ives	Revercomb
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	Kem	Russell
Butler	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Byrd	Knowland	Smith
Cain	Langer	Sparkman
Capper	Lodge	Stewart
Chavez	Lucas	Taft
Connally	McCarran	Taylor
Cooper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McFarland	Thye
Donnell	McGrath	Tobey
Downey	McKellar	Tydings
Dworshak	McMahon	Umstead
Eastland	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ecton	Malone	Watkins
Ellender	Martin	Wherry
Ferguson	Maybank	White
Flanders	Millikin	Wiley
Fulbright	Moore	Williams
George	Morse	Wilson
Gurney	Murray	
Hatch	Myers	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

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

MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Appropriations Committee may meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

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

MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary may meet at 2 o'clock p. m. today in the District Committee room to vote on the nomination of Joe B. Dooley for United States judge for the northern district of Texas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR MINE SWEEPER TO PUGET SOUND NAVAL ACADEMY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Puget Sound Naval Academy, of Winslow, Wash., had requested the Navy Department to transfer a motor mine sweeper for use by that Academy in connection with the training of students; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF GOVERNOR OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Governor of the Virgin Islands for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Lands.

REPORT OF SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION AND OFFICE OF SMALL BUSINESS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the final report of the operations of the Smaller War Plants Corporation and the Office of Small Business, Department of Commerce (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

RATIFICATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TERM OF OFFICE OF PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a certified copy of a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the term of the office of the President, which was ordered to lie on the table.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, favoring the enactment of legislation to increase the amount of personal exemptions on Federal income taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. WILEY on April 25, 1947, p. 4014, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, favoring the enactment of legislation to amend the social-security law relative to persons in public institutions; to the Committee on Finance.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. WILEY on April 25, 1947, p. 4014, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Vermont; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Whereas the economic structure of this country is now faced with inflationary tendencies similar to those which, after every war, have caused a drastic economic dislocation and depression; and

"Whereas the memory of the last economic depression still burns in our minds, during which period men and women were thrown into bankruptcy, homes were lost, farms given up, and millions of persons jobless and disheartened; and

"Whereas the fixed costs of Federal, State, and local governments cannot be substantially reduced; and

"Whereas countless persons in varied occupations throughout the Nation are finding it more and more difficult to balance their income with the ever-rising cost of living; and

"Whereas a continuing level of prosperity is a necessity if free democratic government is to be maintained and we are to avoid our past eras of despair; and

"Whereas many agencies of government which are concerned directly or indirectly with the fiscal-monetary functions, which influence the general price level, often work at cross purposes; and

"Whereas no constructive plan has been adopted by the Federal Government whereby another depression may be averted and the relationship between production and the prices received by primary producers stabilized: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That it is the opinion of this legislature that there should be an immediate and thorough examination and study by the Congress of the United States, through a special stabilization committee, of the reasons for the grave disparities that now exist and have existed to an even greater extent in other critical eras of our country's history in our price structure and that such committee report their findings, together with their recommendations for preserving a reasonable price balance at an early date to the Congress of the United States for proper action; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be directed to send a certified copy of this resolution to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of Vermont's Senators and Representative in Congress; also to the Governors of New England, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and West Virginia.

"Approved April 24, 1947.

"ERNEST W. GIBSON,
"Governor."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 13

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, endorsing equal rights for women

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the house of representatives concurring therein):

"Whereas the women of America have shared equally with men in the hardships and sacrifices incident to the building of this Nation; and

"Whereas they have shared equally in the pain and distress which have been involved in the maintenance of the American Republic and the ideals of free government against the aggression of tyrants and have participated, and are today participating, in the battles precipitated by the enemies of freedom; and

"Whereas this Nation was 'conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal,' and such declaration has no actual or implied limitations on equality before the law by reason of sex, and,

"Whereas the rights of women before the law are much abridged in many States, and this legal discrimination on the basis of sex constitutes an intolerable burden upon thousands of women who are solely dependent upon their own efforts for their livel-

hood, and is a source of irritation to many thousands of others who recognize this discrimination a flat contradiction of the American principle of equality, wholly out of accord with the status of American women, which they have reached by their achievements in other fields of human endeavor, and,

"Whereas there are today 985,000 more women than men in this country and women have served this country in time of war as well as in peace, equally well with men in every field of work: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the senate and house of representatives pass the following resolution and the amendment as follows:

" 'EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

" 'Equality or 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 the power within the respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation. This amendment shall take effect 3 years after the date of ratification'; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress elected from the State of North Dakota."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Resolution 217

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to taxation and expenditures

"Whereas for many years the Federal Government has heavily taxed the people of Rhode Island and the other States and has used the money among other things to build up a huge Federal bureacracy and to make grants to the States for local purposes; and

"Whereas this practice is wasteful and expensive; and

"Whereas this seizure by the Federal Government of the wealth of the people has made it difficult for the States and municipalities to raise the revenue needed for their operations, a difficulty which will increase as time goes on; and

"Whereas the wealth that is taxed by the Federal Government is within the boundaries of the 48 States and could be taxed directly by them and the revenue spent by them, and large sums saved thereby; and

"Whereas a continuance of this practice will eventually destroy the American system of government by an excessive concentration of power in the Federal Government and by rendering the States completely subservient to it; and

"Whereas the Federal Government is but a government of delegated powers, delegated by the people of the States, and the powers not delegated are reserved to the people of the States, so that historically the States are the masters and the Federal Government the servant: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Rhode Island*, That the Congress of the United States of America be and it hereby is requested to limit the expenditures of the Federal Government to matters of purely national concern, and as a means to this end to appoint a commission to study the matter with a view to defining and restricting the activities of the Federal Government within such limits; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be, and he hereby is, directed to send duly certified copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Senate of the United States and to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Resolution protesting the closing of the Twin Cities' Arsenal at New Brighton, Minn.

"Whereas, it is proposed to close the Twin Cities' Arsenal at New Brighton, Minn.; and

"Whereas there are employed at the arsenal more than 500 persons, of which 20 percent are disabled war veterans; and

"Whereas, this arsenal is now engaged in reclaiming substantial quantities of small-arms ammunition per month, extracting metals that would have a substantial salable return; and

"Whereas it is possible for the arsenal to show a 50-percent profit on any ammunition sent in for reclamation from anywhere in the United States; and

"Whereas, the closing of this arsenal will throw a large number of persons, including disabled war veterans, out of employment, and will deprive the United States of a profit from the operation of it: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Minnesota State Legislature*, That we protest against the closing of the Twin Cities' Arsenal at New Brighton, Minn., and urgently request that it be permitted to continue to operate; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

"Adopted by the Senate, State of Minnesota, April 23, 1947."

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

"Assembly Joint Resolution 3

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to effect legislation which will permit the use of decommissioned hospital ships by State and city agencies

"Whereas there exists in the State of California, as well as in numerous other States throughout the Nation, an acute and critical deficiency of hospital facilities due to an ever-increasing influx of permanent residents from other areas, the return of thousands of veterans, and the necessary restrictions upon building and construction programs during the recent conflict; and

"Whereas the present need for adequate hospital facilities is urgent in many communities and the death toll among the aged, the sick, and the injured can only be alleviated by hospital building programs, which are hampered by and subject to a critical shortage of building materials; and

"Whereas several naval hospital ships are now being decommissioned and laid up as surplus and as inactive fleet units where they can serve no immediate useful purpose; and

"Whereas there is an immediate solution available for many coastal communities through the use of decommissioned naval hospital ships, whose facilities and equipment are far superior in every respect to many community hospitals: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the President and the Congress of the United States be memorialized to effect and enact legislation which will permit the temporary use of decommissioned naval hospital ships by local and State agencies during this critical period of deficiency in permanent hospital facilities, and until such time as permanent facilities can be constructed; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Navy, to the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of Califorina."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 18

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to enact legislation to authorize conversion of Federal savings and loan associations into State savings and loan or building and loan associations

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of California was requested in 1935 to enact legislation authorizing the conversion of California building and loan associations into Federal savings and loan associations and in connection with such request it was stated at that time by those representing the Federal Government that provision would be made for converrion of Federal savings and loan associations to State savings and loan and building and loan associations; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of California, pursuant to such request, enacted chapter 163 of the Statutes of 1935 of the State of California and thereby added a new section, No. 12.11, to the Building and Loan Association Act providing for the conversion of California building and loan associations into Federal savings and loan associations; and

"Whereas the Federal authorities have repealed the regulation which purported to provide for conversion of Federal associations to State associations, and no provision has been made in the Federal statutes for such conversion; and

"Whereas operation under Federal or State charter ought to be a matter of choice, to be exercised by the parties concerned: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby requested to enact legislation to authorize conversion of any Federal savings and loan association into a State savings and loan or building and loan association upon a majority vote of the members of such association, at a legal meeting of such members, and that provision be made for such converted association to continue as an insured institution under title IV of the National Housing Act, with the right to issue shares and certificates in the form approved by Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, for issuance by similar State associations; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Clerk of the Senate and to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to all Members of the Congress from the State of California."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Resolution 30

"Resolution memorializing the United States Senate to disapprove a convention between the United States of America and Canada relating to fisheries of the Great Lakes and their connecting waters, signed at Washington April 2, 1946

"Whereas a convention was negotiated and signed April 2, 1946, with the objective of providing for the development, protection, and conservation of the fisheries of the Great Lakes by joint action of governmental agencies of the United States and Canada; and

"Whereas as a means for achieving such objective the convention creates an international commission for the Great Lakes fisheries; and

"Whereas if such convention becomes effective, Ohio and other States of the Union having responsibility and valuable interests

in such fisheries will lose jurisdiction over the same; and

"Whereas the inclusion of the waters of Lake Erie in the proposed international treaty delegates forever the sovereign rights of the United States and of the State of Ohio to an international governmental agency; and

"Whereas the interests of the State of Ohio in these waters and fisheries will best be served if the convention is not ratified; and

"Whereas the citizens of Ohio are very much opposed to the convention establishing an international authority over such fisheries: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Ohio senate respectfully memorializes the Senate of the United States to disapprove ratification of the convention between the United States and Canada relating to fisheries of the Great Lakes and connecting waters signed at Washington, April 2, 1946; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That properly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Senate of the United States, to each Ohio Member of said Senate and to the Governors of the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, and Illinois; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the attorney general of Ohio be directed to inform appropriate Federal authorities of the desire of the State of Ohio to intervene before the appropriate senatorial committee in opposition to the treaty creating such international commission."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"House Joint Memorial 2

"*To the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, and the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition your Excellency and honorable bodies as follows:

"Whereas the predatory animals within the national parks in the State of Washington, a natural breeding ground for such animals, are going outside of national park boundaries in the State of Washington and are causing great damage to livestock of farmers adjacent to such national parks; and

"Whereas the predatory animals in the national parks in the State of Washington also kill off many large game animals as well as birds, such as blue grouse and native partridge; and

"Whereas the predatory animal population is increasing in national parks at a rapid pace; and

"Whereas hunting of any kind is prohibited in national parks in the State of Washington by Federal regulation; and

"Whereas the State of Washington has no jurisdiction of such areas and no control over the situation: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That, we, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington do hereby respectfully memorialize and petition the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to cause to be provided sufficient hunters to kill off and exterminate all predatory animals such as cougars, wild cats, wolves, and coyotes in the national parks within the State of Washington; or, set aside a small area within the national parks in the State of Washington as a complete game sanctuary and allow hunting in the remaining portions and provide adequate bounties to attract sufficient hunters to exterminate such predatory animals; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States and to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Washington."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"House Joint Memorial 9

"*To the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, and to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress Assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas Vancouver, Wash., is one of the oldest cities of the western part of the United States having been established by the Hudson's Bay Co. in the year 1825, with Fort Vancouver thereafter becoming the center of all business, government, agriculture, commerce, education, culture, and civilization on the Pacific slope of these United States; and

"Whereas Vancouver Barracks, presently a United States military reservation located in Vancouver, Wash., contains the site of this historic landmark; and

"Whereas the restoration of old Fort Vancouver is now mandatory in order to preserve for present and future generations this shrine of early American history, ranking equally in historical importance with those already perpetuated by the Nation on the Atlantic coast of the United States; and

"Whereas the preservation of this historic shrine transcends local interest and concern and is of historic value and essence to each and every citizen of the United States of America; and

"Whereas the probable cost of the restoration of this landmark is beyond the financial means of local, State, and regional government and rightfully should be borne by all of the citizens of this Nation, they being jointly inheritors of the history and civilization here begun; and

"Whereas failure to keep and preserve for all time this historical site would constitute incalculable loss to all citizens of this Republic; and

"Whereas Vancouver Barracks is now surplus to needs of the War Department and is to be disposed of as surplus property, thereby making immediate and effective action imperative: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, do hereby respectfully memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States, that the following tracts within the present boundaries of Vancouver Barracks be forever set aside as a national monument under direction of the National Park Service:

"(1) That area south of what is known as Officers' Row to East Fifth Street and from the present eastern boundary of Vancouver Barracks Military Reservation to McLoughlin Road; and

"(2) That area within 200 feet of what is known as the first apple tree now enclosed within a chain fence; and

"(3) The building known as General Grant's quarters; and

"(4) The military cemetery; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we do urge Congress to appropriate adequate funds for the immediate acquisition, research, and construction of buildings reproduced in detailed dimension and exactness to those previously constituting old Fort Vancouver; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be placed in the hands of the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, the Members of Congress, and in those of all persons, corporations, groups, or agencies interested in the preservation for posterity of this their rightful heritage."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"House Concurrent Resolution 42

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has heretofore executed certain general leases covering water-front lands on the islands of Hawaii, said leases being for terms of 21 years and providing for the erection of improvements by the lessees, which improvements are to revert to the Territory at the termination of said leases; and

"Whereas the improvements erected under many of said leases were severely damaged during the tidal wave of April 1946, and the lessees have spent substantial sums in repairing or replacing the damage to said improvements caused by said tidal wave: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-fourth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be requested to approve the present granting of extensions of said leases for a term to expire March 31, 1967, to the present lessees at the original rentals reserved in said leases and without compliance with the provisions of the statutes requiring the sale of such leases at public auction; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Joint Memorial 20

"*To the Congress of the United States: Hon. Julius A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior; the Alaska Fish and Wildlife Service; and Hon. E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress from Alaska:*

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully represents that:

"Whereas expansion of Alaska's fishery is vitally important to the development of the Territory, and the Second Division in particular has a rich resource of many kinds of fish in the waters of Bering Sea that are awaiting commercial utilization; and

"Whereas the Fish and Wildlife Service, upon request of the Alaska Development Board, recently instituted a preliminary investigation of the fishery possibilities of the Bering Sea in the Nome area, in connection with which A. W. Anderson, Chief, Division of Commercial Fisheries, and C. V. Carlson, fishery engineer, personally studied the situation and rendered a favorable report; and

"Whereas provisions of said report included a recommendation that a vessel be provided and equipped to carry out a complete survey of the premises and that the Delegate be asked to introduce a bill into Congress for the purpose of carrying out these recommendations.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in eighteenth regular session assembled, respectfully urges that Congress take appropriate action for the purpose of carrying out such survey, commencing during the summer of 1947.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"House Joint Memorial 22

"*To the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and Delegate from Alaska to Congress:*

"Whereas every encouragement should be given to prospective settlers and investors

to settle in and to develop the natural resources of Alaska; and

"Whereas every cloud on title to lands should be removed without delay; and

"Whereas the question of Indian or aboriginal title constitutes such a cloud on title to lands desired by homesteaders, trade, and manufacturers, to pulp and paper investments; and

"Whereas economic and industrial progress and development of Alaska as a whole, and of the coastal areas in particular, are being retarded and hampered by the uncertainties of the Indian or aboriginal title controversy:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to take prompt action to investigate and settle equitably to all parties in interest the question of Indian or aboriginal title to all lands in the Territory of Alaska.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 19

"To Harry S. Truman, President of the United States; to the President of the Senate; to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; and to the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in regular session assembled, respectfully represents that:

"Whereas the Seventy-ninth Congress approved a resolution introduced by Senator VANDENBERG, of the Senate Finance Committee, calling for the creation of an advisory committee to study the entire social-security program; and

"Whereas it would appear likely that the Eightieth Congress will consider the amendment of the present Social Security Act; and

"Whereas the Territorial and municipal employees of the Territory of Alaska do not now receive the benefits of the Social Security Act, nor do they have any system of retirement pay; and

"Whereas the benefit payments now provided for in the Social Security Act are low on a national basis and particularly low in the Territory of Alaska, where cost of living is high:

"Now, therefore, we, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in eighteenth regular session assembled, respectfully request that the present Social Security Act be amended to include the Territorial and municipal employees of the Territory of Alaska under the provisions of the act, and further respectfully request that the Congress of the United States consider favorably our recommendation that the present benefit payments be liberalized and increased, particularly in the Territory of Alaska.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

Two joint memorials of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Joint Memorial 19

"To the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, the Delegate from Alaska, the Delegate from Hawaii, and the Members of Congress from Delaware, Montana, Nevada, Vermont, and Wyoming:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in eighteenth regular session assembled, respectfully represents that:

"Whereas Public Law 725 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, commonly referred to as the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, is designed to encourage the States and Territories to match funds with the Federal Government for increasing hospital facilities within their respective bounds; but

"Whereas the allotment clause of said act, based on apportionment according to population and other factors, unduly limits the funds available for the more thinly populated States and Territories and the smaller States in consideration of their need and ability to match funds: Now, therefore,

"Your memorialist, the Alaska Legislature, in eighteenth regular session assembled, respectfully recommends that said act be amended by fixing a minimum of $250,000 for the States and Territories above mentioned with apportionment of the balance of the money according to the prescribed formula, as follows:

"'SEC. 624. Each State for which a State plan has been approved prior to or during the fiscal year shall be entitled, for such year, to an allotment of "$250,000, and the balance of such appropriation made to carry out the purposes of this act shall then be allotted to such States in a sum bearing the same ratio to the sums authorized to be appropriated pursuant to section 621 for such year as the product of (a) the population of such State and (b) the square of its allotment percentage (as defined in section 631 (a)) bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all of the States.'"

"The proposed amending language is shown in the lines above quoted.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

"House Joint Memorial 37

"To the President of the United States, the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress Assembled, and the Secretary of War:

"Whereas continued military activity and construction in the vicinity of several cities in Alaska have resulted in an influx of hundreds of workers with their families; and

"Whereas the resultant increase of population is largely transitory and has contributed little to the revenues of such municipalities or the Territorial treasury and existing school facilities cannot be expanded sufficiently or new schools be constructed without financial assistance to accommodate the increase in the number of school children entitled to enrollment in the schools: Now, therefore,

"Your memorialists pray that funds be appropriated by Congress of the United States from which grants may be made for the assistance of the Territorial school system or that the War Department be authorized to allot funds from its appropriations for this purpose.

"And your memorialists will ever pray."

A resolution adopted by the executive board of the Free Sons of Israel, New York, N. Y., favoring the enactment of House bill 2910, relating to the resettlement of displaced persons in Germany, Austria, and Italy, and so forth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by San Juan Bautista Council, No. 1543, Knights of Columbus, San Juan, P. R., requesting that any legislation approved against communism and communistic organizations, as well as any measures derived from the investigation being conducted by the administration, be extended to Puerto Rico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition of members of the Orlo Vista Townsend Club, No. 1, Orlo Vista, Fla., praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Concurrent resolution to memorialize Congress to provide losses under the Federal cooperative insurance plan

"Whereas the Department of Agriculture of the Federal Government inaugurated a program, so-called crop insurance, designed to indemnify cotton and other farmers against loss; and

"Whereas, by personal solicitation by employees of this Department and by an urgent and continued selling campaign by mail, farmers were induced by the Government to buy this indemnity; and

"Whereas, having trust in their Government, large numbers of farmers did buy this insurance, paying therefor cash premiums with all assurance that the plan was sound and that they would be paid in case of loss; and

"Whereas it now develops that the money available to pay losses has been exhausted, and a very great number of farmers cannot collect the losses due them, thus hampering their operations: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the General Assembly of South Carolina do memorialize the National Congress to appropriate sufficient funds to liquidate these honest obligations of a department of the Federal Government; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Members of Congress from South Carolina, and that they be requested to urge the necessary appropriations to pay this past-due indebtedness."

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 21

"Concurrent resolution respectfully urging Michigan Senators and Congressmen in Congress to exert all their efforts in attempting to stop or at least reduce the offering of Federal aid to the several States and Territories

"Whereas our sister State of Indiana has shown the courage to declare against the unsound financial practice of so-called Federal aid, and the general assembly of said State has passed a concurrent resolution calling upon its Senators and Congressmen 'to vote to fetch its county courthouses and city halls back from Pennsylvania Avenue'; and

"Whereas the said State of Indiana has called upon the legislatures of her sister States to join with her in appealing to Congress for a cessation of this unsound political fiscal extravagance; and

"Whereas when a State legislature is confronted with a Federal-aid law, the legislature must either comply or forfeit money which has been or will be taken from the citizens of the State in taxes, the effect being virtual compulsion; and

"Whereas it is obvious that unless Federal aid is discontinued to all States, it will not be refused by any State; and

"Whereas the members of the Senate and House of Rrepresentatives of the Michigan Legislature agree with Gov. Thomas Dewey, of New York, when he said that, 'It is a fundamental truth that when a unit of government spends money that has not been raised locally through taxes, the inevitable result is irresponsibility and waste and it is old-fashioned common sense that best government is that which is closest to the people and their pocketbooks'; and

"Whereas our Nation is financially embarrassed to the amount of one-quarter of a trillion dollars and should divert so-called Federal aid toward reducing its indebtedness; and

"Whereas Michigan and most other States are in sound financial condition, able to handle their own fiscal responsibilities: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Michigan Legislature joins forces with our neighboring State of Indiana in denouncing this practice of so-called matching dollars; and be it further

"Resolved, That we respectfully petition and urge Michigan Senators and Congressmen in Congress to exert all their efforts in attempting to stop or at least reduce the offering of Federal aid to the several States and Territories; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the legislatures or assemblies of the 48 States, and to the Michigan Senators and Congressmen in Congress.

"Adopted by the senate March 13, 1947.

"Adopted by the house of representatives April 9, 1947."

By Mr. THYE:

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the President of the United States and Congress to assume full financial responsibility for the maintenance of all indigent Indians, including those receiving social security assistance benefits, and who are members of and reside upon the Red Lake Indian Reservation of the State of Minnesota

"Whereas there has been steadily developing a serious problem with reference to public assistance to and for the benefit of the Indians on the closed reservation of the Red Lake tribe of Chippewa Indians of the State of Minnesota; and

"Whereas the Indian population is increasing at a relatively rapid rate, in that the population has more than doubled during the past 25 years on said reservation; and

"Whereas as citizens of the United States, the Indians are entitled to public assistance benefits on the same basis as all other citizens; and

"Whereas the Indians are not financially able to bear their fair share of cost of government; and

"Whereas neither the State nor the counties have taxable powers against personal property or real property on the Red Lake closed reservation, which reservation is located wholly within the boundaries of the State of Minnesota; and

"Whereas the State of Minnesota has for the past several years found it necessary to assume the greatest portion of the cost of maintaining indigent Indians on the Red Lake closed reservation; and

"Whereas the financial burden to the State of Minnesota and counties within which said reservation is located is becoming increasingly serious; and

"Whereas most Indians living on said closed reservation are not subject to the civil or criminal jurisdiction of the courts of the State of Minnesota; and

"Whereas for proper administration of the various public assistance programs it is essential that the persons receiving such public assistance be subject to the jurisdiction of such courts; and

"Whereas the financial responsibility toward said Indians, individually and collectively, is rightfully and justly a Federal problem: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Minnesota (the house of representatives concurring herein), That recognition be given this problem by the President and the Congress of the United States to the end that the United States Government assume full financial responsibility for the maintenance of all indigent Indians, including those receiving social security assistance benefits, who are members of and reside upon the Red Lake Indian Reservation in the State of Minnesota; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota."

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to establish a national cemetery at Birch Coulee Battlefield in Renville County, Minn.

"Whereas on September 2 and 3, 1862, there was fought at Birch Coulee in Renville County a battle with the Indians of great historic importance, at which soldiers and pioneer citizens, heroically fighting against overwhelming odds, laid down their lives; and

"Whereas said battlefield has been set apart and designated as a State park and cemetery of the State of Minnesota by Laws 1929, chapter 75; and

"Whereas said battlefield, by reason of its unsurpassed natural beauty and advantageous location is eminently suitable for a national cemetery for soldier and sailor dead, and there is urgent need for such cemetery in this section of the country: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Minnesota (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be and hereby are requested to establish a national cemetery upon said battlefield, and to provide for the acquisition by the United States of the necessary ground therefor, including the ground already set apart as a State park and cemetery, or so much thereof as may be required; be it further

"Resolved, That it is the sense of this legislature that in case the Congress shall establish a national cemetery upon said battlefield the State of Minnesota will cede to the United States that part of said battlefield which has already been set apart as a State park and cemetery and will consent to the acquisition by the United States of such further ground as may be desired for a national cemetery; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, properly attested, by the proper officers of both houses, be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, the Presiding Officers of the Senate and House of Representatives, and to each United States Senator and Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota."

The President pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition signed by 324 citizens of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MAINTENANCE OF 9-FOOT CHANNEL ON UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by board of directors of the Minneapolis (Minn.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring adequate funds for the maintenance and repair of the navigational structures and aids in the 9-foot channel on the upper Mississippi River.

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

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *April 23, 1947.*

Hon. EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THYE: I am pleased to advise you that the board of directors of the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce yesterday adopted the following resolution relative to maintenance appropriations for the 9-foot channel in the upper Mississippi River.

"Whereas the ever-increasing tremendous tonnage of bulk commodities, principally fuel, both solid and liquid, being carried on the Mississippi River north of St. Louis, proves the economic necessity of a continued properly maintained 9-foot channel; and

"Whereas industry is daily finding river transportation an economical means of securing raw materials and shipping finished products; and

"Whereas in the past 6 years hundreds of thousands of tons of coal, millions of gallons of petroleum products and tremendous tonnage of grain and other products have moved to and from the Twin Cities area on the canalized upper Mississippi River; and

"Whereas major maintenance work on the structures of the 9-foot channel has been deferred due to the prosecution of the war; and

"Whereas as a result of this deferred essential maintenance, a backlog of such work has been built up which will require a larger appropriation than that made prior to the war effort: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the board of directors of the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce urge the Congress of the United States to provide adequate funds as requested by the Corps of Engineers for the maintenance and repair of the navigational structures and aids in the 9-foot channel on the upper Mississippi; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Members of the Minnesota congressional delegation and to the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee."

Your assistance in accomplishing the objectives set forth in this resolution will be sincerely appreciated.

Yours very truly,

EMMETT SALISBURY,
President.

RESOLUTIONS OF FOREIGN MISSIONS CONFERENCE OF NORTH AMERICA

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, at its fifty-third annual meeting at Buck Hill Falls, Pa., on January 16, 1947.

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

FOREIGN MISSIONS CONFERENCE
OF NORTH AMERICA,
New York, N. Y.

The following action was taken by the Foreign Missions Conference of North America at its fifty-third annual meeting at Buck Hill Falls, Pa., on January 16, 1947:

"Recognizing the close bonds which have long existed between Korea and North America through the relations between Christians in these two countries: Be it

"Resolved—

"First, that the Foreign Missions Conference commend to its constituency an intelligent and active interest in the great cause of our Korean brethren who demand their long-promised liberty.

"Second, that we ask the Korea Committee to study and interpret to American Christians how best we can aid them in the quest for freedom while continuing its aid to Korean Christians struggling to rebuild their church that they may have a light to guide them in this quest.

"Third, that the Foreign Missions Conference go on record in support of Senate Resolution 152, introduced by Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, which provides for a temporary quota of 100 immigrants per year from Korea with the privilege of their becoming citizens of the United States.

"Fourth, that we wish to record our opposition to all proposals which would have the effect of making more permanent the present division of Korea, especially the current proposals to set up a separate and independent Southern Korea. We are convinced that this action would result in the setting up of a separate Northern Korea and add greatly to the existing difficulties in the establishing of an independent, united Korean Nation.

"Fifth, that recognizing the importance of United States policy in regard to the Korean situation and to rectify in part the mistakes our Nation has made in this regard since 1905, we call upon the constituted authorities of the United States Government to propose to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics the immediate, simultaneous evacuation by both American troops of southern Korea and by Russian troops of northern Korea, with the establishment simultaneously of a United Nations Plebiscite Commission which would proceed at the earliest possible date to hold an election to provide for free, democratic government. We urge this in the belief that only those men who are entrusted with their own political responsibility can develop the capacity to govern themselves."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. 408. A bill to repeal section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act, to amend section 13 of the said act, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 145).

By Mr. KNOWLAND, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 2700. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 146).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 28, 1947, he presented to the President of the United States, the enrolled bill (S. 547) to provide for annual and sick leave for rural letter carriers.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate, messages from the President of the United States, submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Joe B. Dooley, of Texas, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Texas, vice James C. Wilson, retired;

Drake Watson, of Missouri, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Missouri, vice Harry C. Blanton, term expired; and

Benjamin Scott Whaley, of South Carolina, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of South Carolina, vice Claud N. Sapp, deceased.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

(Mr. BALDWIN introduced Senate bill 1172, to make it a crime to receive money, compensation, consideration, or thing of value for advocating the overthrow of any government in the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. ELLENDER (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. MAYBANK) introduced Senate bill 1173, to prevent corrupt practices in connection with Federal elections, to prevent pernicious political activities, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 1174. A bill to provide for inactive duty training pay for the Organized Reserve Corps, to provide uniform standards for inactive duty training pay for all reserve components of the armed forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 1175. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

(Mr. BREWSTER introduced Senate Joint Resolution 107, limiting the application of provisions of Federal law to counsel employed under Senate Resolution 46, which was passed, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. EASTLAND) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 108, to prevent the dismantling of fertilizer plants in Germany, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

PUNISHMENT FOR SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit certain subversive activities; to amend certain provisions of law with respect to the admission and deportation of aliens," and so forth. The bill merely adds a fourth paragraph to the part of the act which deals with what constitutes unlawful activity against the United States. The bill simply adds the provision that it is unlawful for any person "to receive any money, pay, compensation, consideration, or thing of value for knowingly and willingly, advocating, abetting, advising, or teaching the duty, necessity, desirability, or propriety of overthrowing any government in the United States."

It seems to me to be an unusual thing that it has never been made a crime in the United States for individuals who believe in communism and want to impose it upon us, to preach communism for pay, and be in the pay of the Communist Party, so-called, the main purpose of which is to subvert the Government of the United States. The provision of the bill I have introduced makes that unlawful, and subjects to a penalty one who is guilty of accepting pay for spreading propaganda subversive to our institutions and to any government in the United States.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1172) to make it a crime to receive money, compensation, consideration, or thing of value for advocating the overthrow of any government in the United States, introduced by Mr. BALDWIN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PREVENTION OF DISMANTLING OF FERTILIZER PLANTS IN GERMANY

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill designed to prevent the destruction of any fertilizer plants in our zone of Germany. It is written along the same lines followed in the amendment proposed a few days ago by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], which was ruled out of order, and properly so, as being legislation on an appropriation bill. The Senator from Mississippi joins with me in the introduction of this measure today.

Mr. President, many of us from agricultural States have been struggling for months in an attempt to secure additional supplies of fertilizer for our farmers. Fertilizer is an absolute essential to the production of the maximum quantities of vital foods. We have suffered from a severe shortage of fertilizer this year, and many farmers have been unable to secure even half as much as they need. At the same time, tremendous quantities of nitrogen have been shipped abroad, and are being shipped abroad this year, not only to Germany, but to other countries of Europe and the world.

Now we are told by no less an authority than our former President, Herbert Hoover, that in Germany our occupation authorities are busy destroying the German fertilizer plants in that area. This policy has created a fertilizer shortage, not only in Germany, but in other countries of Europe which might have secured fertilizer from Germany, through operation of the plants that are being destroyed there.

Mr. President, that is the picture. We deliberately create a fertilizer shortage in Europe, then we deprive our own farmers of fertilizer in order to ship it to Europe to replace the product that should have come from plants we destroy. The American taxpayer pays for all this. Instead of letting the Germans produce and pay for their own fertilizer needs, we are furnishing fertilizer to them from our own meager supply.

Mr. President, I hope our Chief Executive and our occupation authorities will not wait for the enactment of this bill. They do not really need the authority contained in it, and they can reverse the present unwise policy immediately if they choose to do so. But in the meantime, Mr. President, I hope the committee will take prompt action and report the bill. Time is of the essence. If we delay too long with this legislation,

until after the German capacity is almost completely destroyed, we may have a fertilizer shortage which will last many years.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 108) to prevent the dismantling of fertilizer plants in Germany, introduced by Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. EASTLAND), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PURCHASES OF COTTON FOR EXPORT

Mr. MAYBANK (for himself, Mr. HOEY, and Mr. GEORGE) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 108), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Whereas the Commodity Credit Corporation has requested bids on the sale to it of cotton for export; and

Whereas the terms under which such cotton is to be sold to it are such as to exclude the submission of bids by cotton vendors in many of the principal cotton export ports of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other Government agency which purchases cotton for export should purchase such cotton under terms which will enable cotton vendors in any port where as many as 2,000 bales are available for sale to bid for the sale of such cotton to the Government at said port.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3123) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

FRONTIERS OF AVIATION LAW—ADDRESS BY SENATOR McCARRAN

[Mr. McCARRAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Frontiers of Aviation Law," delivered by him at a dinner honoring Carl Rix, president of the American Bar Association, at Milwaukee, Wis., on April 25, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LEGAL CHALLENGES OF THE ATOMIC AGE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Legal Challenges of the Atomic Age," delivered by him at the annual banquet of the Law School of the University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis., April 26, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROGRAM OF THE CONGRESS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BALDWIN

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the program of the Congress, delivered by Senator BALDWIN on April 25, 1947, before the Yale Engineering Association, at the Yale Club, New York City, which appears in the Appendix.]

"MAINE MOTHER OF 1947"

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement, several newspaper items and an editorial relating to the naming of Mrs. Alina Fisher Bridges, the mother of Senator BRIDGES, as "Maine Mother of 1947," which appear in the Appendix.]

FACTS ON AIR POWER—ADDRESS BY J. E. SCHAEFER

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Facts on Air Power," delivered by J. E. Schaefer, vice president, Boeing Airplane Co., to the Wichita, Kans., Rotary Club, April 7, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE INDIAN QUESTION—ARTICLE BY ANSEL E. TALBERT

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article discussing the Indian question written by Ansel E. Talbert and published in the New York Herald Tribune of March 2, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL DEFENSE—LETTER BY C. ANDRADE III

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an open letter proposing a Supreme United States Defense Council, addressed to the President by C. Andrade III, of Dallas, Tex., which appears in the Appendix.]

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY—EDITORIAL FROM THE ARKANSAS DEMOCRAT

[Mr. McCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senate Takes Momentous Step," discussing the proposed aid to Greece and Turkey, published in the Arkansas Democrat of April 24, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

WOOL DILEMMA—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Wool Dilemma," from the Washington Post of April 28, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR VANDENBERG

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, occasionally all of us have what seem to be good impulses. Not always, however, do we follow them, and they pass into the realm of things left undone. At least I have that characteristic, Mr. President, and I am sure I am not alone. Today I propose to follow one of these good impulses.

A certain newspaper columnist and radio commentator has on more than one occasion used the facility of his pen and the biting sarcasm of his voice to ridicule and condemn Members of this body and other officials of Government. In return he has been most bitterly excoriated here in the Senate and elsewhere. But it is not of that I would speak today.

Last night I listened to Mr. Drew Pearson's radio broadcast. I was deeply impressed by his comments concerning the President pro tempore of this body, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. I myself have wanted to pay some tribute to the Senator from Michigan for the magnificent work he has done in his strong support of his country and her foreign policy. Not alone in his support of our foreign policy has this contribution been invaluable, but in helping to shape and formulate a firm and just policy the Senator from Michigan has rendered a service to his country which cannot be minimized, and must be long remembered.

Mr. President, last evening, as I listened to the broadcast I have mentioned, there came what I call the good impulse to say these words. As a Senator, one of the opposite political party, but more as an American, I am glad to follow that impulse, and make this permanent record of an altogether inadequately expressed appreciation of one who I am convinced has risen above party politics, has waved aside personal ambition, and has unselfishly sought only his country's good and the peace and welfare of the world.

And now, Mr. President, I quote Mr. Pearson's tribute to the Senator in his broadcast last night:

Salute to a statesman: Tonight I want to welcome into the "Order of the Green Hat" a Senator who has done so much to make democracy live—a man who has been impartial in impatient times, who has shown integrity when some Senators showed insincerity, who has put the country's good before his own gain—ARTHUR VANDENBERG, of Michigan. So to Senator VANDENBERG, who wears no man's collar and hides behind no man's hood, goes a green hat to wear on his head. Congratulations, Senator VANDENBERG.

EDWARD H. CRUMP, OF MEMPHIS, TENN.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD an article on Mr. E. H. Crump, of Memphis, Tenn. The article, which is entitled "The Last of the Big-Time Bosses," was written by John Gunther, and the copy I am presenting is taken from page 69, and the following of the Reader's Digest for May 1947.

While this article does not give all the facts about Mr. Crump, it is so much better than the articles usually printed about him in magazines that I want to make a record of it. I do not know Mr. Gunther. The article shows that he saw Mr. Crump for a short time only. If he had seen him longer, it would have been a stronger and better article.

Mr. Crump and I have been friends for more than 50 years. If my recollection is correct, I went to Memphis shortly before he did. I went from Alabama; he, from Mississippi. He belongs to a splendid family. His mother, who lived at Holly Springs, Miss., a short distance from Memphis, was one of the loveliest elderly ladies I ever knew or saw; one of the brightest, most sprightly, keenest-minded of women. She lived to be 95 years old. I saw her not a long while before she died, and she was then just as bright and attractive as ever. Mr. Crump's devotion to her was boundless, as was her devotion to him.

Almost from the day he arrived in Memphis Mr. Crump became popular. He first engaged in the buggy business; afterward, in the insurance business; and he has been very successful both in business and in every other way. He has remained popular and successful to this day. He was well educated. He is a gentleman in every sense of the word, who has enjoyed the finest standing and held the finest of positions. As a young man he was in demand socially, and he still enjoys wide popularity.

Soon after coming to Memphis, Mr. Crump married one of the most beautiful and popular and attractive young ladies in Memphis. Her maiden name was Bessie McLean. She was the only child of Mr. and Mrs. Robert M. McLean. Mr. McLean was a member of William R. Moore & Co., one of the best known and wealthiest business firms in Memphis. I was at Miss McLean's coming-out

party, and it was certainly a great success. She was not only beautiful and popular, but she was also well educated and gently reared. She was one of the brightest and most attractive young ladies to be found in Memphis or elsewhere. She is still lovely and attractive.

Mr. and Mrs. Crump had three worthy sons. One of them, John, the youngest, was killed in an airplane accident before the last war. The other two are today leading businessmen of Memphis of the highest standing. No family stands any higher or better in Memphis or in any other city than does the Crump family.

Mr. Crump's word is as good as his bond. He has made a great success in business. He has a brilliant mind and possesses one of the finest personalities I know. I endorse each and every one of the good things said about him by this interesting writer. I do not know the writer, but he certainly learned a great deal about Mr. Crump in the short interview he describes. Had he known Mr. Crump as long and as well as I have he could indeed have said much more in his praise.

No more public spirited man than Mr. Crump ever lived, and the things he has done for Memphis, for Shelby County, and for Tennessee are invaluable and outstanding. He was mayor of Memphis for many years and also was a Member of the National House of Representatives for several terms. I have no doubt he could have been Governor or Senator at any time he might have wanted to be. His life has brought many blessings to Memphis, to Shelby County, and to the State of Tennessee. He is one of the hardest-working men I know, one of the most charitable men I know, and one of the most honest men I have ever known in my life.

To illustrate, I recall that while I was ill in Memphis last fall he took the lead as he had done several times before in raising a fund for the blind, and my recollection is that under his leadership more than $80,000 was contributed, and all donated to this worthy charity.

He gives boat rides for the crippled children; he puts on drives for the disabled servicemen, and is active in almost every kind of good work and is always successful.

Mr. President, wanting nothing from any man, I take pleasure in lifting my voice in honor of one of the great men of the State of Tennessee, and one of the great men of our country.

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

LAST OF THE BIG-TIME BOSSES

(By John Gunther)

The case of E. H. ("Ed") Crump, of Memphis, is something tart and special. He is a political boss in the grand manner—the last of the great city bosses to function unimpaired in the United States.

Actually, Crump runs not only Memphis but the State of Tennessee. He controls 100,000 votes, 60,000 of them concentrated in Shelby County, of which Memphis is the county seat. Time and time again opposition candidates are well ahead until the Shelby ballots are counted, then are drowned by the great Crump vote.

Crump is 72—a tall, lean man, and, under a streaming mop of pure-white, cotton-wool hair, his round, red cheeks stand out like apples, and so does the round, red chin. He is a vegetarian and doesn't swear, drink, or smoke. He is president of E. H. Crump & Co., investment bankers, one of the most prosperous firms of its kind in the South. There has never been a whisper that the Crump company gains financially from its president's political position. But it is only natural that individuals in Memphis with real estate to sell or insurance to buy should favor the Crump firm.

After working in his youth as a Mississippi farmhand, Edward Hall Crump moved to Memphis at 17. Soon he organized the E. H. Crump Buggy & Harness Co., and then branched out into real estate. He was about 26 when he first went into politics; he was red-headed in those days and gained the nickname "The Red Snapper." He was elected to several minor municipal posts, and in 1909 became mayor of Memphis. His hold on the city has never slackened. He has taken part in 85 elections without a single defeat; he himself has run for office 23 different times and won each time.

Crump is vindictive if anybody really gets under his skin; the legislature once wrote specific legislation solely to embarrass a Crump enemy. Yet the great majority of citizens feel no threat to their liberties, civil or otherwise; there is no atmosphere of tension or reprisal. One of Crump's most consistent critics has been Edward J. Meeman, editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar. Crump writes fantastically vituperative letters to him, signed with a giant floriferous scrawl, but Meeman has never been personally threatened or interfered with.

But for Silliman Evans, publisher of the Nashville Tennessean, who led a poll-tax fight against him, Mr. Crump reserves his really sulphurous thunder. Crump delivered one such letter to Evans in January 1945 by messenger, in order to avoid possible violation of the postal laws, after causing it to be read in the legislature as "privileged" matter. He called Evans a man "with a foul mind and a wicked heart." He called Jennings Perry, then associate editor of the Tennessean and one of the most sincere liberals in the South, "unworthy, despicable, a venal and licentious scribbler with the brains of a quagga," who writes unintelligently on any subject "just as one would expect of a wanderoo." Of a third Tennessean victim, the political columnist Joe Hatcher, Crump said simply that he had "a low, filthy, diseased mind" full of "ululation."

Silliman Evans is a doughty character with no mean sense of humor. He simply printed on his front page Crump's full and unexpurgated text, under pictures of Crump, a "wanderoo" (a purple-faced monkey), and a "quagga," which is a kind of African wild donkey.

No one should think from this that old Mr. Crump is crazy, or that he is some type of monster. Actually, he is a man of considerable erudition and, when he wants to turn it on, is a man of persuasive, fresh, and engaging charm. Yet I didn't particularly want to meet him. I told a newspaper interviewer I didn't care how Crump bossed Memphis since the pattern is the same in most cities, but that I would be interested in what forces, if any, bossed the boss. The phone rang soon afterward. "So you want to know who bosses me!" Mr. Crump said, and laughed, and asked me to come right over. I hesitated and he went on, "Really, I don't think you can write about Tennessee without seeing me." We had a fascinating session.

But I didn't get a direct answer to my question. Instead, Mr. Crump gossiped and reminisced. When I asked about his organization he said, "Oh, we have friends all over the State," and murmered that he merely liked to "assist things"; that his only real interest was in building a good community. He added that his position was totally unlike that of the usual boss; he has never made a nickel out of it, and he only gives the newspapers "the deuce" occasionally because they don't have "the real interest of the people at heart."

Tennessee is not a white primary State, and Memphis has the largest proportionate Negro population of any southern city—41 percent. The Negro vote is consequently of considerable value and Crump has controlled it for years, absolutely.

Mr. Crump doesn't, I heard it said, "go in for rough stuff except in a nice way," but a lot depends on your definition of the word "rough." Suppose, like Edward W. Carmack in 1946, you are running against a Crump candidate. You will find obstacles, to put it mildly. For one thing, Mr. Crump will buy advertisements in most of the State's newspapers at considerable cost, in which he will call you anything from "donkey" to "vulture." You will find, as Mr. Carmack did, that no arena or other site in downtown Memphis is available for speech making, and that no printer will dare to make your campaign posters.

Beyond this Mr. Crump has other powers. He controls Federal and State patronage. State employees are expected, during a campaign, to contribute to the organization; and insurance agents, road contractors, liquor dealers, automobile agents, and so on, if they do business with Memphis or the State, also contribute—or else.

In a personal way Mr. Crump does things with real style. He donates boat rides to cripples and shut-ins, organizes possum hunts for the faithful, and gives a prodigious annual picnic at the fair grounds. At such affairs he tosses firecrackers to the children, under pennants and banners streaming with the words "Thank you, Mr. Crump."

Let no one doubt the efficacy of all this. In 1936 Gordon Browning, running for Governor with Crump's backing, won Shelby County by 60,000 votes. The two men fell out, and when Browning ran for reelection Crump opposed him. Browning lost the county by 60,000 votes.

Crump has given Memphis first-class government in some respects. The city has admirable public services cheap. There is no graft, no corruption; Crump has never taken a cent from the public treasury, nor will he permit anybody else to do so. Gambling is abolished and crime has been cut down; Memphis is one of the few big cities with no policy or numbers racket, and prostitutes have been driven out. What it amounts to is that Crump has "bribed" Memphis with good government at low cost.

It's the equivalent, more or less, of Mussolini's bribe in making the trains in Italy run on time. But at what cost to things much more important? Stanley Baldwin once wrote that dictatorship is like a giant beech tree—very fine to look at, but nothing grows underneath. Memphis has not really functioned as a democracy for more than a quarter of a century; a whole generation has grown up without fulfilling the simplest duty of citizenship, that of political choice.

EMPLOYMENT OF COUNSEL BY COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce, out of order, a joint resolution dealing with the Presidential veto which has aroused some comment, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 107) limiting the application of provisions of Federal law to counsel employed under Senate Resolution 46 was received, read the first

time by title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That nothing in section 109 or section 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 18, secs. 198 and 203), or in section 361, section 365, or section 366 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 306, 314, and 315), or in any other provision of Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States, shall apply with respect to counsel to the special committee of the Senate serving under the provisions of Senate Resolution 46, Eightieth Congress, first session, adopted January 22, 1947: *Provided, however*, That nothing contained herein shall be deemed to authorize such counsel to initiate, prosecute, maintain, defend, or otherwise dispose of any claim, action, proceeding or matter, civil or criminal, on behalf of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, does the Senator anticipate any debate on the joint resolution relating to the President's veto?

Mr. BREWSTER. This is a matter which has occurred within the committee. It was proposed by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], with an amendment by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], and was agreeable to me, so I anticipate making only a brief explanation of its contents.

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

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I merely rise to express the hope that objection will not be made to the joint resolution. The measure, as introduced by the Senator from Maine, corrects and remedies the technical objection which was raised in the President's veto. The amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] amply takes care of that situation. I am sure all the members of the committee are satisfied not only with the joint resolution but with the procedure which is proposed, and I trust no objection will be made to its passage.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. TAFT. Do I understand correctly, Mr. President, that the Senator now is proposing to permit the veto message to lie on the table, substitute the joint resolution for the original bill, and have the joint resolution passed. Is that the Senator's proposal?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is the procedure which is contemplated.

The joint resolution which was read is identical with the original, with the exception that the proviso at the end is added, that nothing contained in the joint resolution shall be construed to authorize what no one in the committee or the Senate thought would be authorized. Some anonymous adviser in the White House or in the Department of Justice intimated the possibility of such a construction, so it was entirely agreeable to all of us to say that nothing herein contained is supposed to authorize the committee or its counsel to take certain action.

I find this extremely interesting historical fact, of which the Senate should be apprised: Approximately 20 years ago a similar situation arose, when the Senate, under the leadership of the late Senator Reed, of Missouri, brought action in the name of the United States in a Pennsylvania election case. The Supreme Court of the United States decided that it was not within the power of the committee or of the Senate to take such action under the law, whereupon Senator Reed introduced a resolution, which was solemnly adopted, giving to any committee the authority and power to bring action in the name of the United States at any time it thought appropriate.

This proposal affects that resolution in no way. I call the attention of the Senate to it because that resolution, for whatever good it is, is still on the books. The joint resolution here proposed affects that situation in no way, as it is simply confined to a limitation of the effect of the joint resolution which is now proposed. But it is a very interesting historical fact.

I myself have some qualms as to whether I should wish committees of the Senate to bring proceedings indiscriminately in the name of the United States, so I am not enthusiastic about the proposal; but I think the Senate should have in mind the existence of the resolution to which I have adverted.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I shall not object to setting aside the unfinished business temporarily for this purpose. However, I shall certainly object to setting it aside for any purpose which will arouse considerable controversy.

At this time I wish to say that it is our hope that we may be able to finish the labor bill this week. If the procedure appears to be lagging—perhaps in any event—there will be a night session Wednesday evening. I hope very much that with the assistance of that session we may be able to complete the bill this week. However, it will not be possible to set it aside for any matters involving lengthy debate.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to speak briefly on this matter so as to include in the RECORD a summary of the statutes which are involved and the content of them, together with the resolution to which I have referred and a statement dealing with the history of this matter, in order that the entire subject may be perfectly clear.

The specific statutes, from the operation of which Senate Joint Resolution 97 sought to exempt counsel for the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program are as follows:

Section 109 of the Criminal Code—United States Code, 1940 edition, title 18, section 198—which reads as follows:

Whoever, being an officer of the United States, or a person holding any place of trust or profit, or discharging any official function under, or in connection with any executive department of the Government of the United States, or under the Senate or House of Representatives of the United States, shall act as an agent or attorney for prosecuting any claim against the United States, or in any manner, or by any means, otherwise than in discharge of his proper official duties, shall aid or assist in the prosecution or support of any such claim, or receive any gratuity, or any share of or interest in any claim from any claimant against the United States, with intent to aid or assist, or in consideration of having aided or assisted, in the prosecution of such claim, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

Section 113 of the Criminal Code—United States Code, 1940 edition, title 18, section 203—which reads as follows:

Whoever, being elected or appointed a Senator, Member of, or Delegate to Congress, or a Resident Commissioner, shall, after his election or appointment and either before or after he has qualified, and during his continuance in office, or being the head of a department, or other officer or clerk in the employ of the United States, shall, directly or indirectly, receive, or agree to receive, any compensation whatever for any services rendered or to be rendered to any person, either by himself or another, in relation to any proceeding, contract, claim, controversy, charge, accusation, arrest, or other matter or thing in which the United States is a party or directly or indirectly interested, before any department, court martial, bureau, officer, or any civil, military, or naval commission whatever, shall be fined not more than $10,000 and imprisoned not more than 2 years; and shall moreover thereafter be incapable of holding any office of honor, trust, or profit under the Government of the United States.

Retired officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, while not on active duty, shall not by reason of their status as such be subject to the provisions of this section: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to allow any retired officer to represent any person in the sale of anything to the Government through the department in whose service he holds a retired status.

Section 361 of the Revised Statutes—United States Code, 1940 edition, title 5, section 306—which reads as follows:

The officers of the Department of Justice, under the direction of the Attorney General, shall give all opinions and render all services requiring the skill of persons learned in the law necessary to enable the President and heads of departments, and the heads of bureaus and other officers in the departments, to discharge their respective duties; and shall, on behalf of the United States, procure the proper evidence for, and conduct, prosecute, or defend all suits and proceedings in the Supreme Court and in the Court of Claims, in which the United States, or any officer thereof, as such officer, is a party or may be interested; and no fees shall be allowed or paid to any other attorney or counselor at law for any service herein required of the officers of the Department of Justice, except in the cases provided by section 312 of this title.

Section 365 of the Revised Statutes—United States Code, 1940 edition, title 5, section 314—which reads as follows:

No compensation shall be allowed to any person, besides the respective district attorneys and assistant district attorneys, for services as an attorney or counselor to the United States, or to any branch or department of the Government thereof, except in cases specially authorized by law, and then only on the certificate of the Attorney General that such services were actually rendered, and that the same could not be performed by the Attorney General, or Solicitor

General, or the officers of the Department of Justice, or by the district attorneys.

And section 366 of the Revised Statutes—United States Code, 1940 edition, title 5, section 315—which reads as follows:

Every attorney or counselor who is specially retained, under the authority of the Department of Justice, to assist in the trial of any case in which the Government is interested, shall receive a commission from the head of such department, as a special assistant to the Attorney General, or to some one of the district attorneys, or as a special attorney, as the nature of the appointment may require; and shall take the oath required by law to be taken by the district attorneys, and shall be subject to all the liabilities imposed upon them by law. Foreign counsel employed by the Attorney General in special cases shall not be required to take the oath required by this section.

No question is raised in the veto message with reference to the first two sections of the statutes quoted above, namely, section 109 and section 113 of the Criminal Code. Accordingly there is no occasion for a discussion of them at this time.

With respect to the three last above-quoted sections, namely, section 361, section 365, and section 366 of the Revised Statutes, the veto message of the President objects to their inclusion in Senate Joint Resolution 97 on the following grounds:

The exemptions with respect to sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes do not appear to be necessary in order to carry out the intent of the Congress. Of more importance, however, is the fact that the inclusion of these sections in the resolution might be interpreted as granting authority to the committee counsel to initiate civil or criminal proceedings on behalf of the United States.

I am confident that this was not the intention of the Congress and it is for this reason that I am withholding my approval of the legislation.

The legal effect ascribed in the veto message to the inclusion of sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes as laws from which counsel for the Senate committee are to be exempted by Senate Joint Resolution 97 is not, in my judgment, tenable as a matter of legal interpretation.

I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Wednesday, April 23, 1947, on page 3830, a memorandum on this subject prepared, at my request, by the legislative counsel of the Senate, the last paragraph of which memorandum, dealing with the above-mentioned sections, reads as follows:

With respect to the suggestion in the veto message that inclusion of these sections in the resolution might be interpreted as granting authority to the committee counsel to initiate civil or criminal proceedings on behalf of the United States, such a construction would, to say the least, be a very strained construction and it is our opinion that no court would accept this novel theory of creating a new Department of Justice through a provision in a resolution applicable only to Senate committee counsel in which it is sought to exempt such counsel from the provisions which at least for their principal purpose apply to the executive departments only. We are confident that the dire consequences feared in the veto message are without foundation, particularly in view of the fact that it is apparent from the legislative record that this resolution was passed solely for the protection of counsel to the committee.

Section 361, which I read in full above, specifies the duties of officers of the Department of Justice in rendering legal services to the President, heads of departments, heads of bureaus, and other officers in the departments, and provides that no fees shall be allowed or paid to any other attorney or counselor at law for any service herein required of the officers of the Department of Justice, except in the cases provided by section 363 of the Revised Statutes, authorizing the Attorney General to employ special attorneys to assist district attorneys whenever, in his opinion, the public interest requires it.

The apparent reason for including exemption from section 361 in Public Law 298 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to counsel for the Special Petroleum Committee of the Senate, and in Public Law 257 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, relating to counsel for the Joint Pearl Harbor Committee, as well as Senate Joint Resolution 97 of the Eightieth Congress, seems to be that certain broad language is contained in section 361, which the sponsors of these resolutions thought might be applicable to a Senate committee. The broad phrase in question, in which such a Senate committee or the members thereof might be included is as follows: "proceedings in which the United States, or any officer thereof, as such officer, is a party or may be interested."

The theory, on which is based the exemption of Senate committee counsel from the provisions of section 361, seems to be that it was feared that Section 361 might mean that the Department of Justice and its officers were required to represent all agencies of the United States Government, including the Congress, and, therefore, unless counsel appointed by a Senate committee were exempted from the provisions of this section, if he accepted an appointment by a Senate committee without becoming an officer of the Department of Justice, he would be subject to the prohibition that no fees should be paid to him for rendering services which section 361, under such an interpretation, required the officers of the Department of Justice to perform.

In my own judgment, it would be a strained interpretation of the law for a court to construe section 361 as including congressional committees within the phrase I have quoted above and could, therefore, be served only by officers of the Department of Justice. I think it is clear that the philosophy of our government of separated powers contemplates that the Congress should have the right to appoint its own agents and not be required to accept legal services from a coordinate branch of the Government—namely, the Department of Justice of the executive branch of the Government. The entire act of June 22, 1870, of which the three sections here under discussion are a part, relates to the Department of Justice, and I do not think it was in the minds of the Congress that it should be required to rely upon officers of the Department of Justice for legal services in connection with the discharge of the investigative and other legislative functions of the Congress. The relationship of attorney and client is peculiarly one of high trust and confidence, and there is no doubt in my mind that the Congress, fully aware of its independent responsibility to the people, never intended to divest itself of the power to appoint its own agents, and, particularly, its own attorneys and counselors.

Notwithstanding, my interpretation of section 361, I cannot say, categorically, that it is unreasonable for an attorney to interpret that section otherwise, and to fear that the above-quoted section 361 might be so interpreted as to prevent the payment of fees by a Senate committee to an attorney who had rendered services on its behalf, if section 361 should be raised in some proceeding as a bar to such payment.

In my judgment, the fear that this untoward result would occur was not well founded, but I am unwilling to say that its inclusion as an exempted provision of the statutes was improper in the interest of anticipating and protecting against all adverse results by one who contemplated becoming counsel to a Senate committee.

Apparently, my interpretation was also the view of the author of the paragraphs I have quoted from the President's veto message, since it is there said that exemptions from the three sections mentioned "do not appear to be necessary in order to carry out the intent of the Congress."

Section 365 prohibits compensation to any person other than district attorneys for legal services "to the United States or any branch or department of the Government thereof" with certain exceptions.

This broad language would seem to justify an opinion that the Senate of the United States or one of its committees might be included as a branch of the Government of the United States, and is much clearer than the language referred to in the discussion of section 361 above. I am unwilling to say that an attorney who feared, because of the broad language above quoted, that he might be prevented from obtaining compensation for services rendered to a Senate committee was acting unreasonably or that the inclusion of exemption from this section was unnecessary.

Section 366 requiries a specially retained attorney to be commissioned by the Attorney General as a special assistant, to take the oath required of District attorneys and be subject to liabilities imposed by law upon District attorneys. Again I say, while it is clear in my mind that this section is designed to apply only to attorneys employed by the Department of Justice, I am unwilling to characterize as unreasonable a legal interpretation holding that this section might be applicable to Senate committee counsel.

In support of the view that the inclusion of section 361, 365, and 366 is proper,

I quote a paragraph from the report of the House Committee on the Judiciary, dated April 25, 1944, with respect to Senate Joint Resolution 122 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, exempting counsel for the Senate Petroleum Committee from the operation of the same laws referred to in Senate Joint Resolution 97 of the Eightieth Congress. This paragraph reads as follows:

Sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes provide that no fee shall be allowed or paid to any attorney or counselor for any service which is required to be rendered of officers of the Department of Justice, and also provides in effect that the Department of Justice shall have control over the naming of Government counsel. It is probably doubtful that these latter sections of the Revised Statutes would be applicable in this matter. However, following the precedents established in other cases, it is advisable to have the exemption proposed in the joint resolution apply to these sections also.

If the three above-mentioned sections—361, 365, and 366—do not apply to Senate committee counsel, their inclusion as exemptions in Senate Joint Resolution 97 and its similar preceding statutes could be nothing more than surplusage. Mentioning these sections specifically in Senate Joint Resolution 97 and preceding similar statutes merely confirms and makes clear what already was the law. If these sections should be construed to apply to Senate committee counsel then their inclusion as exemptions were necessary and proper to maintain the independence of the Senate by avoiding a situation where Senate committee counsel would be responsible to and subject to the control of the Attorney General rather than the Senate.

I am wholly unable to follow the reasoning in the President's veto message contained in the following sentence: "Of more importance, however, is the fact that the inclusion of these sections in the resolution might be interpreted as granting authority to the committee counsel to initiate civil or criminal proceedings on behalf of the United States."

That the sole purpose of the legislation is to exempt committee counsel from certain provisions of law is apparent on the face of Senate Joint Resolution 97 and its predecessors. I have sought to discover what reasoning known to the science of jurisprudence could have led the author of the above-quoted phrase to conclude that the Congress was divesting the Department of Justice of authority to initiate civil or criminal proceedings on behalf of the United States, and vesting that authority in counsel for a Senate committee. Nowhere in Senate Joint Resolution 97 is any authority conferred upon committee counsel. It is merely provided that certain restrictions, thought to apply to committee counsel, shall not be operative with respect to such counsel in carrying out duties conferred by reason of wholly different powers of the Congress. I cannot do otherwise than conclude that the legal reasoning expressed in the above-quoted passage of the veto message is tortured and unsound, and I doubt that any such theory would be accepted by any court.

I say, as the sponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 97, that there was no intention in my mind to accomplish any such result as the above-quoted passages from the veto message suggest, and I am confident that no other Member of the Congress, either with respect to Senate Joint Resolution 97 or with respect to its predecessors in the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses, had any such thought in mind.

The Attorney General has admitted that the veto message was clearly erroneous in stating that the inclusion of sections 361, 365, and 366 was novel after it appeared that the President, himself, had signed a joint resolution in December 1945 calling for exemption of counsel for the Pearl Harbor Committee in identical phraseology with that contained in Senate Joint Resolution 97. We have been informed that Mr. Clark Clifford, legal adviser to the President, disclaimed all responsibility for the legal reasoning contained in the veto message. In fact, we have not yet been told what official or employee in the executive department is responsible for this unusual legal opinion. Many able constitutional lawyers, including some distinguished Members of this body from the other side of the aisle, have disclaimed any association with this legal reasoning. We have been told from sources usually considered authoritative at the White House that the veto message was a mistake; that frequently these procedural matters were handled by subordinates; and that the individual who handled this matter ought to be sent back to law school.

Mr. President, I have full appreciation of the numerous and important duties resting upon the President of the United States and am fully aware that no human being could personally give close attention to all of them and while things are and must be done in the name of the President, it is perfectly obvious that he must rely upon subordinates for a great deal of the detail for actions taken in his name. Yet, Mr. President, the exercise of the veto power with respect to measures solemnly adopted by the representatives of the people should be exercised with extreme care and caution. Particularly is this care important when the Chief Executive is a member of one political party and the Congress is controlled by a majority of members of the opposite party.

We have heard expressions indicating a desire on the part of both the Congress and the Executive to work in harmony in solving the many important problems facing the country during the session of the Eightieth Congress. I am especially impressed with the necessity for such harmonious action. The veto of Senate Joint Resolution 97 is the first veto exercised by the President with respect to the Eightieth Congress. Under these circumstances, it appears to me that, important as it is in all cases that the veto power be exercised only after careful scrutiny and consideration of the facts and the law, it was of far greater importance under the special circumstances surrounding this particular joint resolution.

Therefore, surprising as it was that the President should veto this measure in the first place, it was even more surprising, in the light of the statements emanating from the White House and from Democratic Party leaders in the Senate, that the President should have reaffirmed his intention to veto the measure and thus endorse anew a legal theory which had been rejected by competent lawyers, including members of his own party.

Mr. President, I have reviewed these matters so that they may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD relating to the action which we may take with respect to the adoption of a resolution achieving the objectives sought to be accomplished in Senate Joint Resolution 97. On principle, I would be inclined to say that there is no occasion for the Congress to admit that it has erred in adopting Senate Joint Resolution 97. I do not think the Congress should be called upon to confess a mistake simply to avoid possible embarrassment to the Executive. Nevertheless, we are told that if the Congress should seek to call up Senate Joint Resolution 97 from the table to pass it over the President's veto, the members of the opposition party would treat such a proposal as a party issue and muster sufficient support of the position taken by the President to defeat any effort to override the veto. Although not agreeing with the propriety of this decision on the part of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I can understand it. I realize that it confronts the Senate with a practical problem and a choice between an extended controversy over this particular issue on the one hand and the desirability of organizing the Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program so that it may proceed with the investigation of a very important subject as promptly as possible.

It seems to me clear that the Members of the Congress, including members of both parties, were not in error in enacting this legislation with those two precedents in mind. On the other hand, I do not consider this issue, which is of a procedural nature, of as great importance as expediting the committee's investigation of the procurement of petroleum products by the Navy Department from certain American oil companies operating in and near Saudi Arabia.

I, therefore, shall offer a substitute resolution which has been considered by the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, of which I am chairman, which would make clear that the Congress did not intend in Senate Joint Resolution 97 to accomplish the unfortunate result suggested in the President's veto message. The substitute resolution was drafted by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Rhode Island, [Mr. MCGRATH] and is the same as the language in Senate Joint Resolution 97, except that there has been added at the end of the language contained in Senate Joint Resolution 97 a proviso which reads as follows:

Provided, however, That nothing contained herein shall be deemed to authorize such counsel to initiate, prosecute, maintain, defend, or otherwise dispose of any claim,

action, proceeding or matter, civil or criminal, on behalf of the United States.

The purpose of this proviso is to make clear that the Congress does not intend the possibility mentioned in the President's veto message—namely, that counsel for the Senate committee might, by reason of the inclusion of exemptions from sections 361, 365, and 366 be said to have become vested with authority to initiate civil or criminal proceedings on behalf of the United States. This language does not in any way limit counsel for the Senate committee from performing their full duties as counsel and attorneys for the Senate committee in accordance with the laws and the practices of the past, but does make it clear that the Congress does not intend to vest in such counsel the authority heretofore conferred on the Department of Justice and its officers.

The entire resolution which I now offer reads as follows:

Joint resolution limiting the application of provisions of Federal law to counsel employed under Senate Resolution 46

Resolved, etc., That nothing in section 109 or section 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 18, secs. 198 and 203), or in section 361, section 365, or section 366 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 306, 314, and 315), or in any other provision of Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceedings, or matter involving the United States, shall apply with respect to counsel to the special committee of the Senate serving under the provisions of Senate Resolution 46, Eightieth Congress, first session, adopted January 22, 1947: *Provided, however*, That nothing contained herein shall be deemed to authorize such counsel to initiate, prosecute, maintain, defend, or otherwise dispose of any claim, action, proceeding, or matter, civil or criminal, on behalf of the United States.

To complete this discussion I must call attention to Senate Resolution 262 of the Seventieth Congress, first session, agreed to May 29, 1928, which reads as follows:

Resolved, That hereafter any committee of the Senate is hereby authorized to bring suit on behalf of and in the name of the United States in any court of competent jurisdiction if the committee is of the opinion that the suit is necessary to the adequate performance of the powers vested in it or the duties imposed upon it by the Constitution, resolution of the Senate, or other law. Such suit may be brought and prosecuted to final determination irrespective of whether or not the Senate is in session at the time the suit is brought or thereafter. The committee may be represented in the suit either by such attorneys as it may designate or by such officers of the Department of Justice as the Attorney General may designate upon the request of the committee. No expenditures shall be made in connection with any such suit in excess of the amount of funds available to the said committee. As used in this resolution, the term committee means any standing or special committee of the Senate, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, or the Senate members of any joint committee.

The background of that resolution is this. In 1926, the Senate passed a resolution creating a special committee to make investigation of means used to influence the nomination of candidates for the Senate. The resolution contained the usual language giving powers to Senate investigating committees. Representatives of the committee had demanded ballot boxes used in connection with the election in Delaware County, Pa. Upon refusal of county authorities to give up the ballot boxes, the committee filed suit in Federal court to obtain possession of them. The case was carried to the Supreme Court of the United States—*Reed* v. *County Commissioners*, 277 United States Reports 376—where it was held that the plaintiffs were not authorized by law to sue within the meaning of section 24 of the Judicial Code defining jurisdiction of the district court. The Court said that even if it be assumed that the Senate alone may give that authority, the committee had not been so authorized by its basic resolutions. Thereupon Senator James A. Reed, of Missouri, the chairman of the special committee, introduced Senate Resolution 262, Seventieth Congress, quoted above, expressing it as his opinion that it would meet the requirements of the decision of the Supreme Court. The Senate passed the resolution with no extended debate. So far as I am advised, the resolution has not been repealed, amended, modified, cited, or resorted to.

Naturally in the light of action by the Senate to give all its committees authority to go to the courts if that be necessary to the adequate performance of the powers vested in it or the duties imposed upon it by the Constitution, resolution of the Senate, or other law, it should be pointed out that the resolution that has been proposed here today would have no effect upon Senate Resolution 262 of the Seventieth Congress. The Senate was careful to declare in that resolution that its committees might be represented by such attorneys as they may designate or by officers of the Department of Justice designated by the Attorney General. But the Senate was obviously clear in its view that its committees were not dependent upon the Department of Justice for counsel even to initiate litigation, in matters within the jurisdiction of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 107), limiting the application of provisions of Federal law to counsel employed under Senate Resolution 46, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. FERGUSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate Joint Resolution 107 was passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion will be entered.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Is the motion subject to immediate consideration?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is merely entered for future consideration. That is the Chair's understanding of the purpose of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct; namely, to have the motion taken up at a later date.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, let me inquire when the motion is to be considered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the joint resolution was passed earlier today. It relates to the employment of counsel for the War Investigating Committee.

Mr. McGRATH. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Michigan is giving notice of a motion to have the Senate reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct; I have entered a motion to reconsider. The motion will be taken up later.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Do I correctly understand that the motion now goes on the calendar?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is equivalent to going on the calendar. It goes on the calendar under the heading "Motions to Reconsider."

Mr. LUCAS. May the motion be taken up at any time?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It may be taken up as the result of the adoption of a motion to have the Senate take it up; and such a motion may be made whenever any Senator wishes to make it.

Mr. LUCAS. How long a time must elapse?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Such a motion can be made at any time, up until the end of the Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. For instance, could such a motion be made 30 minutes from now?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; it is entirely in the hands of a majority of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Would the matter be entirely in the hands of a majority of the Senate, or would not the unfinished business first have to be set aside, by action of the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair's statement of the parliamentary situation was based on the theory that a majority of the Senate could vote to set aside the unfinished business.

Mr. TAFT. But a majority of the Senate would first have to set aside the unfinished business; is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

AMENDMENT OF ACTS RELATING TO CORRUPT PRACTICES AND POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, before proceeding with the discussion of the pending measure, I should like to take a few minutes to present a statement pertaining to a bill which I ask unanimous consent to introduce.

The bill which I am introducing today, on behalf of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator

from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and myself, dealing with corrupt practices in elections and political activities is designed to replace the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 and the Hatch Act. It repeals those acts and embodies the subject matter, with substantial revisions, in one piece of legislation. The bill is for the most part based upon the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Senatorial Campaign Expenditures, 1946, filed January 31, 1947—Senate Report No. 1, part 2.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. There is one point which I should like to have the Senator make clear, because there has been a great deal of discussion to the effect that the various acts to which he has referred ought to be repealed entirely.

I am somewhat familiar with the proposal which the Senator submits. I should like to know whether his bill is destructive of those acts, or whether it is a constructive measure designed to plug some of the loopholes and make our present election laws stronger.

Mr. ELLENDER. The purpose of the bill is to plug many loopholes and make our election laws stronger. It does not seek to repeal the Hatch Act or the act passed in 1925, but to make them stronger and more rugged.

It came to my attention as chairman of that committee—and this feeling is shared by committee members joining me in sponsoring this bill—that the present statutes dealing with elections, campaign expenditures and contributions, and limitations thereon, are utterly inadequate and unrealistic and as now in force do not begin to accomplish the purposes for which they were enacted. It was for this reason that the committee, in the report referred to, recommended that new and comprehensive legislation covering the subject matter included in the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 and the Hatch Act be introduced in the Eightieth Congress. This bill is the response to that recommendation.

I want to summarize the principal features of the bill and in addition ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks there be printed in the RECORD a memorandum which I have had prepared giving a detailed explanation of the bill and a brief discussion of legal questions involved.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the memorandum will be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Now for a brief statement of the more important changes made by the proposed bill:

First. The bill redefines the term "election" now contained in the Corrupt Practices Act to include a primary election or a convention of a political party as well as the general election. The present exemption of primary elections and party conventions from the Corrupt Practices Act grew out of the doubt created by the *Newberry case* (256 U. S. 232) on the power of Congress to extend the Federal Corrupt Practices Act to primaries and conventions. The Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 299)—which, by the way, originated in my State—has now clearly upheld such congressional power, and unless the law is so extended the purpose of Congress to deal with campaign contributions and expenditures cannot be effectuated, because in many States where one political party dominates, the real contest is the contest for the party nomination.

Second. The present definition of "political committee" contained in the Corrupt Practices Act is inadequate. To begin with, the definition, which purports to exempt unaffiliated committees which do not operate in two or more States, was largely based on the theory that Federal power to deal with this subject must be based on the commerce clause. This is erroneous. The legal jurisdiction to regulate attaches whenever a political committee seeks to influence election of Federal officials whether in one State only or in two or more States. It is the office concerning which the election is influenced which gives the power, not the character of the political committee's operations. Accordingly, the definition has been changed to eliminate the restriction to interstate operations and in addition is broadened by making it apply where contributions are accepted or expenditures made for the purpose of influencing directly or indirectly the election of candidates.

Third. Perhaps the most criticized feature of existing law is the provision in the Hatch Act which limits contributions to and expenditures by national political committees to an aggregate of not more than $3,000,000 in any calendar year. This provision has utterly failed in its purpose. It does not limit over-all expenditures because the responsibility for raising and expending funds has been decentralized into innumerable State and local committees to the entire confusion of the public and the defeat of publicity features of the law. This situation is a racketeer's paradise. Equally ineffective is the provision in the Hatch Act which makes it unlawful for individuals to contribute more than $5,000 during any calendar year or in connection with any campaign for nomination or election, in the case of Federal offices. The Senatorial Campaign Committee felt that it was in the interest of effective regulation to encourage official national party committees to reassume principal responsibility in campaign financing. The first step is to abolish the $3,000,000 limitation on committees and the $5,000 limitation on individual contributions. The second is to require publication of national committee contributions and expenditures in two or more leading newspapers in each State and make it the duty of the congressional committees to publish the name and address of, and amount contributed by, every contributor of $5,000 or more, in lieu of the unrealistic ceiling limitations in existing law.

Fourth. Closely paralleling the matter to which reference has just been made are the provisions of the bill revising upward ceiling limitations heretofore placed upon candidates for Senator and the House of Representatives.

Section 309 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 provides in part that "unless the laws of his State prescribe a less amount as a maximum limit of campaign expenditures," a candidate may expend in the alternative, first, up to $10,000 if a candidate for Senator, or up to $2,500 if a candidate for the House of Representatives; or second, an amount equal to the amount obtained by multiplying 3 cents by the total number of votes cast at the last general election for all candidates for the office which the candidate seeks, but in no event exceeding $25,000 if a candidate for Senator or $5,000 if a candidate for Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner.

As stated in the committee report referred to above:

> This formula in the 1925 act dates from an even earlier period. In view of an extensive rise in the national price level and consequent decline in dollar value, and in view of total population growth, coupled with major population shifts, the legitimate costs of campaigning in many districts have obviously increased. Ceiling limitations governing contributions to and expenditures by candidates should be raised to correspond to the existing higher price level.

Accordingly, the bill proposes the following ceiling limitation for candidates:

> The revised ceilings are (1) $25,000 if a candidate for Senator or $6,500 if a candidate for Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner or (2) an amount obtained by multiplying 5 cents by the total number of votes cast either at the last general election or the last primary election, for the office which the candidate seeks or the total number of votes cast within the State or district for all candidates for any office at the last general election or at the last primary election where candidates for governor were being voted for (whichever of the foregoing is the highest), but in no event exceeding $50,000 if a candidate for Senator or $12,000 if a candidate for Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner. The revised draft retains the further limitation in existing law that a candidate shall not make expenditures in excess of the amount which he may lawfully make under the laws of the State in which he is a candidate. Attention is called to the fact that the revised formula based on the number of votes cast recognizes the situation in many States where the number of votes cast in the primary or even in a gubernatorial election greatly exceed those cast in the general election.

Fifth. Another substantial change made by the bill is the extension of the prohibition upon contributions to include a prohibition upon expenditures by a corporation, national bank, or labor organization in connection with any Federal election.

I may state, Mr. President, that our committee last year found that many corporations and some labor organizations had spent thousands of dollars in Federal elections, but we could not force them to report for the reason that the money expended was not considered as contributions. So this bill requires any money spent to be reported by whoever makes the expenditure.

Experience has shown that some corporations and labor unions have spent money directly on behalf of a party or candidate and thus evaded the applica-

tion of the prohibition upon contributions. Extension of the prohibition to include a prohibition upon expenditures will plug that loophole. It will be noted that the extension of section 313 of the Corrupt Practices Act to include contributions by labor organizations was brought about by the War Labor Disputes Act. This extension will expire June 30, 1947, under the terms of that act, and the effect of including it in this bill will be to make that provision permanent.

I believe that about summarizes the principal features of the bill introduced by me, and, together with the memorandum containing the detailed explanation to which I referred should enable Senators to reach a clear understanding of the bill. It is my hope and belief that Congress will take prompt action on this needed revision of this all-important Federal legislation.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1173) to prevent corrupt practices in connection with Federal elections, to prevent pernicious political activities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ELLENDER (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. MAYBANK), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EXHIBIT A

MEMORANDUM ON PROPOSED BILL TO REPLACE THE CORRUPT PRACTICES ACT AND THE HATCH ACT

This bill would repeal the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 and the Hatch Act, as well as the so-called Powers Act relative to publishing or distributing political statements, and would replace them with one act embodying the subject matter of these acts with certain revisions.

The new act would be known as the Federal Corrupt Practices and Pernicious Political Activities Act of 1947.

The draft is based in the main upon the report of the Special Committee to Investigate Senatorial Campaign Expenditures, 1946, filed January 31, 1947, Senate Report No. 1, part 2.

A detailed explanation of the bill follows:

TITLE I. CORRUPT PRACTICES

Section 101 is identical with present section 303 of the Corrupt Practices Act relating to the duties of the chairman and treasurer of a political committee.

Section 102 is identical with present section 304 of the Corrupt Practices Act requiring accounts of contributions received.

Section 103 is in substance the matter now contained in section 305 of the Corrupt Practices Act.

Subsection (a) of section 305 requires the filing of certain information on a certain number of days preceding the date on which "a general election is to be held at which candidates are to be elected in two or more States." This provision is changed by deleting the word "general," and also by changing "in two or more States" to "in any State in which such committee accepted a contribution or made an expenditure during the calendar year." These changes are made necessary by the broadening of the term "election" (post) to cover primaries.

The Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives is made the depository instead of the Clerk of the House as in existing law.

One of the filing dates, January 1, is changed to January 7.

A new subsection is added requiring in Presidential years, publication by national committees of contributions and expenditures in two newspapers of general circulation in each State in which contributions were received or expenditures made.

Section 104: This section corresponds to section 306 of the Corrupt Practices Act. The latter section now requires the filing of certain information by persons (other than committees) who make expenditures (other than contributions to political committees) of more than $50 for the purpose of influencing in two or more States the election of candidates for election to the Senate or House.

In the bill the $50 figure is increased to $100, and the "two or more States" requirement is eliminated. The provision is also broadened to cover nomination and election of Presidential and Vice Presidential electors.

Section 105 is substantially the same as section 307 of the Corrupt Practices Act, which requires the filing of statements by candidates for Senator or Representative, Delegate or Resident Commissioner. The depository for the Senate is made the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration instead of the Secretary of the Senate as in existing law. Certain clerical changes are made because of the application of the bill to primaries.

Section 106 is in substance the same as section 308 of the Corrupt Practices Act which outlines the formalities in connection with filing of reports. Under the present law the statements are "open to public inspection."

The bill provides that they shall be open to public inspection under regulations prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate or the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

Section 107 provides that the House Committee on House Administration and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration shall perform the functions now performed by the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate, respectively, as heretofore noted, and shall act jointly in providing for publicity and uniform methods and forms for the making of reports. There is a specific requirement that there be published the name and address of, and the amount contributed by, every contributor shown to have contributed the sum of $5,000 or more.

Section 108 is a revision of present section 309 of the Corrupt Practices Act, which fixes limitations on the amount of expenditures by candidates. The existing ceilings on amounts which may be expended by candidates are (1) $10,000 in the case of a candidate for Senator or $2,500 in the case of a candidate for Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, or (2) an amount equal to the amount obtained by multiplying 3 cents by the total number of votes cast at the last general election for all candidates for the office which the candidate seeks, with a limitation of $25,000 upon a candidate for Senator and $5,000 upon a candidate for Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner. The revised ceilings are (1) $25,000 if a candidate for Senator or $6,500 if a candidate for Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, or (2) an amount obtained by multiplying 5 cents by the total number of votes cast either at the last general election or the last primary election for the office which the candidate seeks or the total number of votes cast within the State or district for all candidates for any office at the last general election or at the last primary election where candidates for governor were being voted for (whichever of the foregoing is the highest), but in no event exceeding $50,000 if a candidate for Senator or $12,000 if a candidate for Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner. The revised draft contains the further limitation in existing law that a candidate shall not make expenditures in excess of the amount which he may lawfully make under the laws of the State in which he is a candidate.

Section 109 is section 310 of the Corrupt Practices Act prohibiting promises or pledges by candidates with respect to political appointments.

Section 110 is the present section 311 of the Corrupt Practices Act prohibiting payments to influence voting.

Section 111 reenacts the amendment to section 118 of the Penal Code embodied in section 312 of the Corrupt Practices Act prohibiting solicitation or receipt of political contributions by Senators or Congressmen and other public officers.

Section 112 in effect amends section 313 of the Corrupt Practices Act relating to contributions by national banks, corporations, and labor organizations so as to apply as well to expenditures by these banks, corporations, and organizations. It is noted that the extension of section 313 to include "contributions" by labor organizations was brought about by the War Labor Disputes Act (section 9 of Public Law 89, Seventy-eighth Congress). This extension will expire June 30, 1947, under the terms of the War Labor Disputes Act, and the effect of including it in this Act will be to make that provision permanent.

Section 113 is new. It penalizes collecting money for campaign purposes and then pocketing it, and makes the failure to file required reports prima facie evidence of violation of this section.

Section 114 is section 314 of the Corrupt Practices Act prescribing general penalties for violations.

Section 115 is section 315 of the Corrupt Practices Act, which provides that the act shall not affect the right to make expenditures for proper legal expenses in contesting the results of an election.

Section 116 is section 316 of the Corrupt Practices Act, which provides that State laws are not to be affected unless directly inconsistent with the provisions of the act.

Provisions covering definitions, separability, and repeals, now contained in the Corrupt Practices Act, are transposed to title III, miscellaneous.

TITLE II. PERNICIOUS POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

Section 201 is section 1 of the Hatch Act, prohibiting intimidation and coercion of voters, changed to conform to extension of the application of the law to primaries.

Section 202 is identical with section 2 of the Hatch Act, which makes it unlawful for administrative employees of the United States or any State (in connection with activities financed by the United States) to use their official authority to influence elections.

Section 203 is identical with section 3 of the Hatch Act, which prohibits promises of Federal employment, compensation, or other benefit as a reward for political activity.

Section 204 is section 4 of the Hatch Act, prohibiting deprivation of employment, compensation, or other benefit on account of race, creed, color, or political activity.

Section 205 is section 5 of the Hatch Act, which makes it unlawful to solicit or receive assessments or contributions from persons receiving compensation, employment, or other benefits under acts of Congress appropriating funds for relief.

Section 206 is section 6 of the Hatch Act, which prohibits the furnishing of lists of benefit recipients to persons engaged in political activities.

Section 207 is section 7 of the Hatch Act, which prohibits the use of appropriations for the purpose of coercing voters.

Section 208 is section 8 of the Hatch Act, which prescribes penalties for violation of the foregoing provisions of the title.

Section 209 is section 9 of the Hatch Act, which prohibits the use of official authority by executive employees for political purposes; but there is omitted a temporary provision excepting employees on part time serving in connection with the existing war effort.

Section 210 is section 9A of the Hatch Act, making it unlawful for Federal employees to have membership in any political party or organization which advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government.

Section 211 is section 12 of the Hatch Act, prohibiting employees of State or local agencies financed by loans or grants from the United States from using official authority to influence elections and providing for investigations by the Civil Service Commission, for removal of employees in violation, and for withholding grants from States.

Section 212 is derived from section 13 of the Hatch Act but omits subsections (a), (b), and (e) of that section which made it unlawful for individuals to contribute more than $5,000 during any calendar year or in connection with any campaign for nomination or election, to or on behalf of any candidate for an elective Federal office, or to or on behalf of any committee. The matter retained prohibits the purchase of goods or commodities where the proceeds directly or indirectly benefit a candidate for an elective Federal office or a political organization.

Section 213 is section 14 of the Hatch Act, providing that District of Columbia employees shall be deemed to be employees of the United States for the purpose of this title, but excepting the Commissioners and the Recorder of Deeds from prohibitions against taking part in political campaigns.

Section 214 is section 15 of the Hatch Act, which provides that activities prohibited on the part of civil-service employees are prohibited on the part of other Government and State employees covered by this title.

Section 215 is section 16 of the Hatch Act, authorizing the Civil Service Commission to issue regulations permitting persons in localities where the majority of voters are Government employees and voters in the immediate vicinity of the National Capital in Maryland and Virginia to take part in political campaigns.

Section 216 is section 18 of the Hatch Act, which excepts elections not specifically identified with national or State issues or political parties.

Section 217 is section 21 of the Hatch Act, which excepts activities of employees of State educational and research institutions, or any recognized religious, philanthropic, or cultural organization.

Section 218 is section 5 of Public Law 753, Seventy-sixth Congress, which amended the Hatch Act in many respects but did not embody section 5 in the Hatch Act itself. The section prohibits persons or firms negotiating for or performing Government contracts from making political contributions.

Section 219 is in substance the matter contained in the Powers Act which requires political publicity material to contain the name of the person responsible for publication and distribution. Section 3 of the Powers Act is deleted inasmuch as similar definitions of "elections" and "candidate" appear in Title III, Miscellaneous. (Public Law 544, 78th Cong., 58 Stat. 914.)

The following sections of the Hatch Act have been omitted:

Section 10, providing that that act shall be in addition to and not in substitution for any other provision of law. It would not seem to be appropriate here.

Section 11, separability clause, now found in Title III, Miscellaneous.

Subsections (a), (b), and (e) of section 13, being the $5,000 ceiling provision on contributions referred to above under section 212.

Section 17, which was a transition provision, referring to State candidates who were running at the time certain provisions were enacted.

Section 19, defining "State," which is now covered in Title III, Miscellaneous.

Section 20, which made it unlawful for political committee to receive contributions or make expenditures aggregating more than $3,000,000 during any calendar year.

Sections 22 to 25, inclusive, which are the prohibitions against the furnishing of political propaganda to members of the armed forces, added to the Hatch Act by the Soldiers' Voting Act of April 1, 1944, and which in any event will expire June 30, 1947.

TITLE III. MISCELLANEOUS

Section 301 (a) would broaden the definition of "election" now contained in section 302 (a) of the Corrupt Practices Act so as to cover primaries and nominating conventions. It will be noted that this broadening of the definition will likewise extend the application of certain provisions of the Hatch Act (title II of this bill) which use the term "election."

Section 301 (b) would broaden the definition of "candidate" now contained in section 302 (b) of the Corrupt Practices Act so as to include candidates for nomination.

Section 301 (c), now contained in section 302 (c) of the Corrupt Practices Act, redefines political committee so as to include those which accept contributions or make expenditures for the purpose of influencing directly or indirectly the election of candidates, whether or not such committee operates in more than 1 State, and so as to include State and local committees of political parties.

Section 301 (d), (e), and (f) are identical with section 302 (d), (e), and (f) of the Corrupt Practices Act.

Section 301 (g) is the definition of State which is the same in substance in both the Corrupt Practices Act and the Hatch Act.

Section 302 is the separability clause now contained in both the Corrupt Practices Act and the Hatch Act.

Section 303 repeals the Corrupt Practices Act, the Hatch Act, and the other acts affected.

Section 304 provides that the act shall take effect 30 days after the date of its enactment.

Legal questions

The constitutionality in general of the Corrupt Practices Act was upheld in the case of *Burroughs* v. *U. S.* ((1934) 290 U. S. 534), where the Court declared that requiring public statement of amounts received and expended by a voluntary political committee to influence election of Presidential and Vice Presidential electors in two or more States was within the power of Congress, and not an unconstitutional interference with the power of a State to appoint electors or the manner of their appointment.

The Hatch Act, which prohibits Federal employees and certain State employees whose work is in connection with an activity financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government from engaging in certain political activities, has likewise been upheld in two recent cases. *United Public Workers of America (CIO) et al.* v. *Mitchell* and *State of Oklahoma* v. *United States Civil Service Commission*, both decided February 10, 1947.

However, the proposed draft raises some legal questions that are not present in the existing Corrupt Practices and Hatch Acts.

The Corrupt Practices Act specifically exempts primary elections and party conventions from its provisions. Sections 1, 3, 4, and other sections of the Hatch Act are also apparently thus limited in their application. Of course, it is common knowledge that in many States where one political party dominates, the real contest is the contest for the party nomination, and the candidate who wins the nomination is for all practical purposes already sure of election. Even though such a candidate may have an opponent of another party in the final general election, the latter election merely rubber stamps the primary nomination. The Newberry Case (256 U. S. 232), although it did not satisfactorily answer the question, threw doubt on the power of Congress to extend the Federal Corrupt Practices Act to primaries. The question has been definitely set at rest, it is believed, by *United States* v. *Classic* ((1941) 313 U. S. 299), which upheld the power of Congress to legislate to prevent interference with primary elections for nomination of candidates for Congress where the primary is an integral part of the elective process. The Court said (p. 319): "Unless the constitutional protection of the integrity of 'elections' extends to primary elections, Congress is left powerless to effect the constitutional purpose, and the popular choice of representatives is stripped of its constitutional protection save only as Congress, by taking over the control of State elections, may exclude from them the influence of the State primaries." The Classic case was discussed at length and cited with approval in *Smith* v. *Allwright* ((1944) 321 U. S. 649), holding that the right of a citizen of the United States to vote for the nomination of candidates for the United States Senate and House of Representatives in a primary which is an integral part of the elective process is a right secured by the Federal Constitution. The extension of the law to party primaries and nominating conventions is therefore on solid constitutional grounds.

Attention has been called to the omission of the provisions which relate the activities of political committees to two or more States. Examination of congressional debates reveals that the present provisions were largely based on the erroneous theory that Federal power to regulate corrupt practices in elections stemmed from the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution. As indicated in the report of the special committee to investigate senatorial campaign expenditures, referred to at the beginning of this memorandum—

"In fact, legal jurisdiction to regulate attaches whenever a political committee seeks to influence the election of Federal officials, whether or not it seeks to influence in one State only or in two or more States. The test of Federal power is the office concerning which the election is influenced, not the intrastate or interstate character of the political committee's operations."

The definition of "political committee" has been changed accordingly, and it is believed that the modification should encounter no constitutional objection.

It may be suggested that a further legal question is raised by the new section 113 of the bill which makes it unlawful for anyone to utilize moneys collected as campaign contributions for any other purpose, and provides that failure to make reports required by the act shall be prima facie evidence of a violation of this section by the person so failing to report. Without discussing the matter at any length, it is believed that this statutory presumption can be sustained, despite the scrutiny that all such provisions are given by the courts, because there is a rational connection between the fact proved and the ultimate fact presumed, which is the test laid down by the Supreme Court for such cases. Cases on this subject are reviewed in *Tot* v. *United States* ((1943) 319 U. S. 463).

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEM in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] on

behalf of himself and certain other Senators.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I now desire to discuss the pending labor bill. At the outset I wish to say that the bill has been exceptionally well and painstakingly considered by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I do not know of any bill in recent times which has received more careful consideration than has the pending bill. I do not know of any bill handled by any committee of the Senate as to which there was more of a give-and-take attitude than was evidenced when this bill was being written by the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Although the hearings lasted only 4½ weeks, I may say that every member of the committee, with the exception of two, namely the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], was a member of the old committee which handled all labor legislation. The old committee heard many witnesses who appeared before the new committee and it really amounted to a rehash of testimony heretofore presented. I recall that it was one of my first chores, when I came to the Senate during the Seventy-fifth Congress, to hear testimony on proposed amendment of the Wagner Act. Strange to say those amendments were suggested by the American Federation of Labor, that took the position at the time that the NLRB was partial to the CIO and the proposed amendments were to correct that situation.

It is my hope, Mr. President, that the Senate will vote for the bill as it has come out of the committee without amendment. The amendments which have been proposed by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and other Senators, were considered by the committee, and, after long discussion, rejected. I was agreeably elated over the attitude of many members of the committee in being willing to go as far as they did in voting for the various provisions of the bill which is now before the Senate.

I may be wrong, Mr. President, but I believe that some of the Members of Congress, both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, would willingly assist in enacting a bill which would restrict labor unions to a greater extent than the pending bill. Some of them, I would judge, take that position in the hope that no legislation at all on the subject will become law; and others take that position in the hope that such a bill, if vetoed by the President, might be used for political purposes during the next Presidential campaign. In other words, make a political football out of the labor issue. I say that with the knowledge that President Truman saw fit during the Seventy-ninth Congress to veto a bill which was not as broad and which did not so extensively deal with labor problems as the bill we are now considering. But, so far as I am concerned, I am interested in having the Congress enact legislation which will deal with some of the most obnoxious evils in labor relations which have come into being in the last decade.

Mr. President, prior to 1932, the history of labor legislation was very dark from the standpoint of labor. When the Clayton Act was passed, giving labor the right to unionize, did management respond? No, Mr. President. Instead management instigated and helped the organization of so-called company unions. Management began to indulge in the practice of writing so-called yellow-dog contracts, which in effect provided that an employee could not get a job unless he agreed not to join a union.

Furthermore, as we know, the injunctive process was resorted to by employers in thwarting strikes and in denying the right of labor to organize. During that period, because of the opposition of management, the American Federation of Labor dwindled in membership from a total of 4,000,000 to 2,000,000. Most of us are familiar with the famous Parker decision, in the Red Jacket case, which recognized the yellow-dog contracts.

It was during those trying times that labor asked help from Congress. Congress finally responded, when in 1932 the Norris-LaGuardia Act became law. That act prevented the promiscuous granting of injunctions by the courts for concerted activity by workers. It virtually limited injunctive relief to cases of fraud and violence. Under that act no injunction could be granted to stop jurisdictional strikes, secondary boycotts, or to protect interference with contracts of employment. The Norris-LaGuardia Act, moreover, prevented an ex parte proceeding by an employer for the granting of an injunction against a union upon a mere affidavit, without producing facts to sustain it. The same act made the "yellow-dog contract" unenforceable.

However, the Norris-LaGuardia Act did not go far enough, for the unions were still hamstrung; workers were prevented from obtaining protection or security by way of unionizing for even though union activity was not enjoinable, employees who joined unions still ran the risk of losing their jobs. Labor kept on fighting for its very existence and in 1935, the Congress again responded and enacted the Wagner Act, which has often been referred to as labor's magna carta. Under that act, employees were protected in their jobs if they wished to join unions. Company-dominated unions were prohibited. Collective bargaining was made compulsory, if a union had a majority of the employees in a certain plant. It created a board to remedy unfair labor practices by employers. It established machinery providing for a secret ballot for employees to select bargaining representatives. In fact, it gave affirmative encouragement to the organization and expansion of the unions.

Mr. President, it is my conviction that if the employers of this Nation had come to Congress at that time and had assisted in the drafting of the so-called Wagner Act, that act would not have been as one-sided as it is. However, management, in the form of employer associations, took a negative attitude on the subject. Industry said to labor in effect, "We will defeat you here in Congress; but if you happen to get Congress to pass such a law, we will defeat you in the courts." That was the attitude of management. Why? Because at that time management was in the saddle, so to speak. Industrialists were still confident with the pendulum still swinging in their direction.

Mr. President, I make that point simply to stress the fact, that we have a parallel today with the short-sighted attitude of industry on that occasion. We should observe by way of contrast, that today organized labor is in the saddle, so to speak, and labor has assumed a negative attitude. Union after union in effect has said, "We do not need any more legislation. We are satisfied with what is now on the statute books. If the Congress should pass the law that it is proposing to pass, we will fight it in every court of the land." Such a statement was also recently made by Mr. Padway, the general counsel of the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I am not at all disturbed by that threat; but I do plead with my colleagues in the Congress to pass a law which, as I have indicated, will have the effect of curbing and curing many of the most serious evils which have become apparent in recent years. I propose to say a few words in the course of my remarks in respect to these various evils, and then try to demonstrate to the Senate how the pending bill seeks to deal with and cure them.

Mr. President, it will be recalled that soon after the Wagner Act went into effect there was a terrible scramble, as it were, between the CIO on the one side and the American Federation of Labor on the other in regard to the administration of the act. The AFL took the position that the National Labor Relations Board created by the act was biased and prejudiced, and that it was intent on destroying the American Federation of Labor. They further contended that the staff of the Board leaned backward to assist the CIO instead of giving a square deal to the AFL.

It will be remembered by most Senators who were here in 1938 that the American Federation of Labor led a fight in an attempt to amend the Wagner Act, so as to afford to that organization greater security in the administration of the act. In 1940 a bill backed by the AFL passed the House but was not acted upon in the Senate. While the Board in the last few years has rectified many of its decisions, the difficulty which existed in the past between these two dominant branches of the labor movement still persists.

Mr. President, now for a few moments I desire to discuss some of the abuses which labor unions can indulge in with impunity under existing law. Among the most aggravated of those practices are secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes. It is true that such practices are not new, but it seems that under the Norris-LaGuardia and Wagner Acts these abuses grew steadily.

A secondary boycott, as all of us know, is a concerted attempt on the part of a strong union to compel employers to deal with them, even though the employees of that employer desire to be represented by other unions, or not to be represented at all.

Some of the most glaring examples of the secondary boycott occurred in Ohio, the State of the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill [Mr. TAFT]. They affected the neon sign business. Some manufacturers were compelled, under the Wagner Act, to contract with the CIO as the bargaining agent. When neon signs manufactured for distribution all over the United States were shipped to such States as Illinois, Indiana, and Michigan, the AFL unions in those States which had contracts for installing the neon signs, because the neon signs bore the label of the CIO, said, "We will not put them up." Of course, trouble followed, and losses ensued to the manufacturer. Yet management was, in a measure, compelled to take the steps it did, as it was helpless to do otherwise, as I have just indicated.

Another example is the New York Electrical Workers Union, the IBEW. That union has become so powerful that it has organized not only those who make the electrical equipment but those who receive it from the factory and install it. As a matter of fact, no employer who manufactures electrical equipment outside of New York has a ghost of a show of having his equipment placed in the large buildings in New York City. When such equipment is sent to New York City, the IBEW local refuses to install it unless it is permitted to tear all the equipment apart and assemble it again. Of course, one can readily understand that such procedure is unconscionable and that it results in high costs to those engaged in the erection of office buildings, homes, and stores; in fact, all sorts of buildings requiring electrical equipment.

As another glaring example, I cite the California cannery case of 1946. Sixty canneries in California banded together. They had AFL contracts with both the teamsters and the cannery workers. The CIO threatened to organize the canneries. It petitioned the Board for an election. While the election was pending, AFL teamsters demanded a closed shop as the price of transporting produce from farm to cannery. This was done while the Board had before it the petition by the CIO. The canneries became desperate. Vegetable and fruit was lying in the fields, a good deal of the crop going to waste; fruit growers' losses were heavy. In order to curtail losses, the canneries were forced to enter into a contract with the AFL. Such abuses must be ended, and I shall in a moment endeavor to show how, under the pending bill, that will be accomplished.

Other recent glaring examples of the secondary boycott are the ones involving longshoremen on the coast of Oregon, Washington, and California. In those instances CIO workers refused to unload lumber carried in ships manned by AFL seamen. Practices of that sort have caused a great many people to become sour against organized labor. I do not blame them for it.

An equally grave abuse is the jurisdictional strike, which is the refusal by one union to continue at work, unless certain operations which the employer thinks lie within the terms of a contract with another union are given to the first union. Many examples of the jurisdictional strike could be given, particularly in the building trades. Under the new methods, more steel is used than heretofore in the building of homes and offices, and disputes often arise between unions as to the division of the work. In cases of that kind both owner and contractor are helpless.

There is in Hollywood a 2-year-old strike between stage hands and designers, the question involving a determination of what properties are to be handled by the respective unions. Studio owners are helpless. They must stand by and permit the strike to continue. As I shall show in a few moments, the pending bill would attempt to remedy that situation.

In the brewery industry, there still persists the fight between teamsters and brewery workers, a case familiar to all of us. It involves the question of who shall load the beer, and who shall haul it away. The struggle is of many years' standing. There have been many strikes and delays. The brewery owners are helpless. It has been claimed by the brewery workers that the AFL was partial to the teamsters. They have, I understand, during the last year completely withdrawn from the AFL and are no longer affiliated with it. They withdrew because they felt the AFL, had it acted effectively, could have prevented the jurisdictional strikes. Under this bill, as I shall further demonstrate in a moment, I believe such situations will be remedied.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me that, in the case of economic action in jurisdictional disputes, in the absence of any proven collusion on the part of the employer with one union, the economic and property rights of innocent third parties are greatly damaged by such disputes?

Mr. ELLENDER. There can be no question about that.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me also, that the time has come when the public interest has a right to demand, in the absence of collusion on the part of the employer, that labor desist from economic action in jurisdictional disputes? And does the Senator further agree with me that the Government should provide a fair procedure that will result in a settlement of the jurisdictional dispute?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am certain that this condition is what prompted the distinguished Senator from Oregon and others on the committee to devote much time to the provisions of the pending bill in an effort to remedy that situation.

Mr. MORSE. If I may ask another question or two, does the Senator agree with me that if there be an acceptance of the major premise that a procedure must be devised through which decisions can be rendered in jurisdictional disputes, our area of choice lies for the most part in choosing between a procedure which would throw the issue into our common law courts, and a procedure which would throw the issue into the field of administrative law?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will say to the Senator that I did not intend to go into detail about that matter at present. As the Senator knows, I presented a proposal to correct the existing evil, and, after long discussion as to how best to handle the subject I followed the views of the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from New York respecting the method of dealing with the situation, which is through the Board, instead of by direct action on the part of the employer.

Mr. MORSE. Throughout our hearings and in executive sessions the Senator from Louisiana and I many times found ourselves in disagreement respecting the merits of various proposals. I want to commend the Senator from Louisiana for the very fair and helpful attitude he took throughout our meetings, because he too recognized, as the rest of us tried at all times to recognize, that we were dealing with a problem which calls for conscionable compromises; a problem which places upon us the responsibility of establishing in the Eightieth Congress a procedure which will work, which will be fair and reasonable, and duly moderate; a procedure with which labor can live in the sense that it can retain its rights; but at the same time a procedure that will protect the public from the type of labor abuse the Senator from Louisiana is presently pointing out to the Senate.

Mr. President, I hope the discussion of the pending labor legislation will not be a brief discussion. I think we have reached the point where the floor of the Senate of the United States for some days to come must be used as a great educational forum to educate the American people into an understanding of the practical administrative problems which confront us in the field of labor legislation. Hence I, for one, am not going to favor at all any quick votes on any of the questions involved in the pending bill, because I do not know of a better service we can render the American people than to have a full, prolonged, and detailed discussion of the whole problem of labor relations.

So I close this portion of my comments with the question: Does the Senator agree with me that we must make clear to the Senate that the choice which must be made is whether we are going to try to do this by way of an administrative law approach, or by way of a so-called court approach?

Mr. ELLENDER. That seems to present the whole issue, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I wanted to point that out.

Mr. ELLENDER. After hearing the subject discussed pro and con in committee, I felt that the former was the reasonable approach. It seems possible to handle all unfair practices charged against management in that manner. I am of the personal opinion that in the bill we have provided a rather quick and decisive remedy in dealing with this situation. I fear that if we permit employers to resort to court procedure on their own we may again drift into the type of abuses which brought about the passage of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. It is my belief that through suggestions made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon the committee adopted a procedure under which preference is given to cases such as those we are considering, and which goes so far that a regional attorney who makes an investigation and comes to the conclusion that a jurisdictional strike is in the offing, or that a secondary boycott is in the making, can, on his own motion, go to court and obtain relief for the employer.

Mr. MORSE. In other words, the Senator from Louisiana thinks we have a proposal which really has teeth in it?

Mr. ELLENDER. I absolutely know it has teeth in it. The only argument I heard against the provision which is contained in the pending bill was that the other proposal would provide a quicker process; that under it an employer could go into court today and obtain an injunction tomorrow and stop the threatened action. As I understand, the bill contains a prohibition against such action as a jurisdictional strike or a secondary boycott. It authorizes a temporary injunction, followed by a Board cease-and-desist order against those who participate in such action. That, to my way of thinking, will act as a deterrent. Today there is in the law nothing at all to cope with such a situation.

Mr. MORSE. Certainly that is true; and with this particular procedure provided for it is not proper to label the bill a "milk and water bill" or, as one editorial has called it, a cream-puff bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; it is neither. I do not know whether the Senator was present a short while ago when I stated that I never dreamed that the committee as a whole would submit as strong a bill as it did report. As a matter of fact, I was greatly surprised to note the attitude of the distinguished Senator from Oregon and the distinguished Senator from New York and other Senators—but particularly the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from New York. Both Senators assisted greatly in imparting to the Senate committee the vast knowledge which both had obtained in labor-relations work. The distinguished Senator from Oregon had been a member of the War Labor Board, and the Senator from New York, I believe, fathered and piloted through the New York Legislature some administrative law versions which I understand are operating well. What I am anxious for, and what I am sure every other Senator should be anxious for, is legislation with teeth in it which will cure the most obnoxious evils which have existed in the labor movement during the past 10 or 12 years.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Louisiana has been kind to me both in the time he has allowed me and in the comments he has made. I want to trespass only for one more question. Does the Senator agree with me that it would be quite fair and reasonable to ask those who want a more drastic bill than the one we have proposed, to take the bill we have proposed back to their respective States and present it to the business and industrial interests of their States, and put this simple question to them: "Gentlemen, if this bill were placed on the statute books do you think it would be very helpful and constructive in equalizing the Wagner Act?"

Does the Senator think that would be a fair question to put to them?

Mr. ELLENDER. Absolutely; and I know what the answer would be.

Mr. MORSE. I think I do also. I think the answer would be "Pass the bill if you can."

Mr. ELLENDER. Undoubtedly.

As I indicated in my opening remarks, my fear—and I think it is a justifiable fear—is that if we should go too far we may end with no legislation at all. I do not want that to happen. I have been a member of the committee dealing with labor matters for more than 10 years, and that committee has worked industriously and assiduously in an effort to draft and have passed reasonable labor laws. I have spent, I suppose, as much time as any other member of that Senate committee in an effort to secure the passage of a measure in the nature of the Case bill, in the hope that it would cure many of the evils of which complaint is now made. But this bill goes much further than the Case bill in many respects. It seeks to deal realistically with many of the labor-management problems which are now facing the country. I am satisfied that if a bill of this nature were passed it would have the immediate effect of placing labor and management more nearly in balance. I hesitate to say what I would do if the Senate were to pass a bill as stringent and as far reaching as the House bill. My present inclination would be to vote against it. We have before the Senate today a good workable bill with teeth in it, something that has not been presented to the Senate for some time in such an extensive way. I for one am pleading with the chairman of our committee, as well as with every other member of the committee who is now trying further to amend the bill, to forget about such amendments. They were considerd for 5 weeks before the committee.

Let us be fair with each other. Legislation comes about through compromise, give and take. As I said, when I started with the work of the committee 5 weeks ago I did not expect such unanimity of approval on most of the issues involved as came about during the consideration of the bill by the committee.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BALL. The Senator has referred to some of the pending amendments, most of which, I think he will agree, were in a committee print on which we worked, and were stricken out in the committee by a vote of 7 to 6.

He has also stated—and I think quite correctly—that the legislative process is a process of compromise. I think he would also agree that the conditions created by industry-wide bargaining and industry-wide shut-downs, and the concentration of bargaining power in international unions, which are pretty far removed from the individual who works, constitute one of the most serious problems in this field considered by the committee. Unfortunately the print we are now working on does absolutely nothing about that particular problem. One of the amendments we are seeking to insert in the bill is a very mild provision that bargaining power shall rest in the local union, close to the employees actually concerned, and that no international union shall have power to dictate the terms on which any particular local shall settle a dispute with a particular employer.

I do not think that is punitive or drastic, or going too far. It is a very mild attempt to meet what is clearly and admittedly one of the major problems in this field, as to which the committee print does absolutely nothing.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, we discussed that problem at length in committee. It has been only in recent years that that situation has come to the fore, as the Senator well knows. The amendment is directed partially to the activities of Mr. Lewis during the coal strike.

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

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

I point out to the Senator that I do not know of any occasion on which Mr. Lewis used the Wagner Act to have his union as a whole, or members of it, bargain collectively. I believe that if we take the bill as a whole, many of the evils which have existed in the past through industry-wide bargaining will fade away. We are seeking to give greater responsibility to independent unions. I believe that industry-wide bargaining has come to the front because of the fact that the entire labor movement was dominated by two large unions which went into the field and organized entire industries. Attempts were made by independent unions to obtain collective-bargaining contracts, but because of stale charges made against them of company domination which took place 9 or 10 years before, they were disestablished by the Board.

We have now added a provision in the bill which will give to independent unions more power to obtain status as bargaining agents with various employers. I think we have, to a certain extent, removed some of the abuses which have come about from industry-wide bargaining. On the other hand, we seek to write into the law a clause which would force unions to bargain collectively. I think that would have some good effect, and that in a measure it would dissipate much of the industry-wide bargaining evil to which the Senator now refers.

Quite a few other provisions have been placed in the bill which in my judgment

will tend to minimize the evils which have grown up in the past few years because of industry-wide bargaining.

I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. I think the Senator is mistaken in saying that this amendment is directed primarily at the United Mine Workers and John L. Lewis because of the situation in the coal industry. I do not believe that the Wagner Act would affect him very much. His organization is too tightly organized. Only an emergency provision for an injunction, with the 60-day period of mediation, will affect him. We had specific testimony concerning locals in the case of the United Auto Workers and the steel workers. The National Labor Relations Board—I believe in violation of the intent of Congress—had certified as bargaining agent not the local union which actually won the election, and which actually represented the men directly, but the international union. So the international union had the power, and the local could not sign a contract unless the international said it could.

As the Senator knows, we had a great deal of testimony to the effect that both among the steel and auto workers local unions wanted to settle with their employers. Perhaps there was a slightly different wage system from that laid down by the international. The international union said to the local, "You cannot settle on anything but these terms," and many unions went through 2 or 3 months of strikes for that reason.

Does not the Senator believe that the situation can be corrected without injuring any legitimate activity or power of labor unions?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will say to the Senator that we have gone far toward correcting it and forcing both sides to bargain collectively. In other words, if a local union today should refuse to bargain collectively with its employer it would be guilty of an unfair labor practice. Previously unions were at the mercy of the nationals and internationals, as it were, and there was no remedy to correct the situation. What we have provided in this bill will not do away with the evil totally, but it will ameliorate many conditions which have existed in the past few years in respect to industry-wide bargaining.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BALL. The obligation of a union to bargain collectively will not mean a thing where the international union is the certified bargaining agent. That is the situation which we are trying to correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the Senator's opinion, but I entertain a contrary view. I believe that if the obligation to bargain collectively by management and labor had been placed in the law from its inception, we might not have drifted into the situation into which we now find ourselves. As I said a moment ago, I believe that what has given rise to the industry-wide bargaining contracts is the power which was wielded by one big union to the exclusion of all independent unions. All that the affiliated unions had to do was to say to the Board: "Just a minute. This union has been and therefore still is a company-dominated union. It is not an independent union." If affiliated unions could prove that the now independent union was charged of being company dominated 4 or 5 or 6 years ago, that union was disestablished and was prohibited forever from bargaining again with its former employer. In other words an independent union could never wash itself of sin if it was once company dominated. The Senator knows that to be so.

I believe that by giving to independent unions more leeway in permitting them to organize throughout the country it will in a large degree encroach upon the rights and prerogatives of the larger affiliated organizations which have been able to "go to town," as it were.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield once more, I agree that the provision in the bill which requires the Board to treat independent unions and affiliated unions alike is a correction in Board policy which is long overdue, but I do not think it goes to the heart of this problem.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does not the Senator believe it will assist?

Mr. BALL. No; I do not think it will, because the fabrication industry and a great many other industries not even remotely connected with the steel industry are organized now, and not the local union is the bargaining agent, but the NLRB has certified an international union as the bargaining agent. The local union has nothing to say about the contract. The international has all the power under the law; and the bill as it stands does not correct the situation which we mean to correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree with the Senator that it does not deal with it specifically, as he has indicated, but many of the proposals, by way of amendments to the Wagner Act, which have been made by the committee will have a tendency to give less power to the large international organizations.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, granting that what the Senator from Minnesota says is true—and I do not think anyone will dispute the fact which has been cited by the Senator from Minnesota, that it is one of the aggravating conditions existing in the whole field, and is one of the complicated problems which must be solved; I think anyone who is at all fair must recognize that fact. I want to ask the Senator from Louisiana this question: Does he not think that the remedy which is proposed by the amendment which has been placed before the Senate and which the Senate is at this time considering would open the whole matter up to complications far more serious and to difficulties far greater than any of those from which it is hoped we would escape?

Mr. ELLENDER. There can be no question about that. It was only after an extended discussion that I felt that I should like to go along. I want to say to my colleagues of the Senate that I voted on several occasions with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and my reason for taking the position which I am now assuming is that I want legislation. We have worked since January on this bill, and I repeat that I firmly believe that our committee has done a good job; but what we ought to do is to pass the bill and cure the most conspicuous evils about which the Senator has been complaining during the Seventy-ninth Congress; and I join in the complaint.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BALL. As the Senator has stated, when this particular provision, amendment B, was in committee, the Senator from Louisiana supported it on its merits, did he not?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. BALL. And, as he will recall, it was stricken out of the bill by a 7 to 6 vote?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. BALL. One more question. Does not the Senator believe that on a major issue, such as this, one of the most important, I think, in the whole bill, the Senate is entitled to pass on the merits of a provision which lost out in committee by so close a vote?

Mr. ELLENDER. It maybe that the Senate ought to pass upon it on its merits, but I contend that by the addition of such an amendment to the pending bill it may nullify all the work which has been done up to date.

I have been engaged in legislative work for almost 22 years. Not long after I started working in the Louisiana Legislature and after I came here I realized that all legislation is derived from compromises. The man who goes to Congress or to a State legislature and thinks that he will obtain everything he wants without giving anything in return is just a hopeless optimist. We must give and take. We have many problems confronting us which must and can be solved. The abuses to which I have referred and others to which I shall refer in the course of my remarks can be solved, if only we do not attempt to extend ourselves too far at one time. I want legislation in order to abolish existing evils. Let us have it now. Let us not permit present conditions to continue for two more years and further widen the breach which has existed in the past between labor and management. I am confident that if we load this bill down with controversial amendments we will accomplish nothing.

Let me say that I am glad to be interrupted, and I shall answer or try to answer any questions which may be propounded. I know that all Senators realize that this is a very technical bill. It may be that I shall not be able to answer all questions, but I shall endeavor to do so; and if I fail, I shall call on some of my distinguished colleagues who assisted in writing the bill.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for one further comment,

let me say I have differed with him rather severely; but I want to say to my colleagues that there was no member of the committee who was more constant and faithful in his attendance during six long weeks of hearings and at every committee session at which we worked on the bill than was the Senator from Louisiana. I think he has devoted at least as many hours to the bill as has any other member of the committee, and I certainly respect his judgment and his viewpoint on this issue and all of the issues involved in this proposed legislation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am deeply grateful to the Senator for that kind remark.

Mr. President, before I was interrupted I was discussing the abuses which grew up in the past 10 years. A moment ago I dealt with jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts. Now I wish to say a few words in respect to the abuses which occurred because of compulsory union membership. I am now referring to the subject matter of an amendment which the committee has proposed to the Wagner Act. I did not believe that amendment would receive the support which it got in the committee. I refer to the amendment providing for the abolition of the closed shop. It outlaws the closed shop altogether. Several of the witnesses who appeared before the committee gave a number of examples of the abuses which were engaged in by unions who had a closed shop. One of the cases was that of Cecil B. DeMille, who, as we know, is a producer of motion pictures on the west coast. He is also a radio headliner. Mr. DeMille was forced to join a union in order to be able to appear on the radio. Soon after he joined the union he was asked to make a contribution to a cause in which he did not believe.

He refused to make such a contribution. Then what happened? The union kicked him out; it said, "We do not want you as a member any more." Up to this moment, Mr. President, Mr. DeMille has not been able to make any further broadcasts on the radio, simply because he violated the rules of the union to which he belonged. Now here was a man called upon to put up a contribution to fight a cause in which he did not believe and because he refused to pay the assessment made on him he was kicked around and is now unable to pursue his work. Such a situation is intolerable and must be corrected. The pending measure, as I will show later corrects such an evil.

Let us consider the McGrath case, in which a union member was called into court to testify in regard to a fight which occurred between a union member and a foreman. Because Mr. McGrath went to court, in response to a court summons, and testified to the truth, he was kicked out of the union, which meant the loss of his job.

Consider the Edmonson case. When Mr. Edmonson said he would be a candidate against John L. Lewis for the presidency of the United Mine Workers organization, and when he made an attempt to run against John L. Lewis, he was kicked out of the union and was forbidden to have any employment in any coal mine in which the UMW had a contract.

Mr. President, we wish to stop all such foolishness; and the bill now before the Senate would do just that. A great many of the Nation-wide strikes in recent years arose out of the refusal on the part of local unions to bargain collectively. As Senators know, the Wagner Act makes it imperative that employers bargain collectively with a union or other organization of employees, when that union or organization is certified by the board as representing a majority of the employees in the plant affected. However, the employees are not compelled to bargain collectively. In some cases, some of them frustrate the duty to bargain collectively, by delivering an ultimatum on a "take it or leave it" basis.

Many such cases were presented to the committee during the hearings. I am sure that Senators remember the steel strike which occurred in 1946, when Mr. Murray gave notice that he would demand that every steel company grant his union a 30- and 40-cent increase. Mr. Murray succeeded in getting the United States Steel Co. and the Bethlehem Steel Co. to sign a contract; but after he got those two large concerns to sign a contract, he said, "We are not going to go back to work now until we get all of the companies to sign a contract." How did they bargain, Mr. President? They simply said, in effect, "Here is a contract. We want so much pay an hour. We want you to do this, that, and the other. Sign here on the dotted line." No effort was made to bargain with the smaller companies. Why? Because there was nothing in the act to force those unions to bargain collectively. They could almost get by with murder.

But under the pending measure not only must employers bargain collectively, but employees must bargain collectively, as well. If either of them fails to do so, they are guilty of engaging in unfair practices, if the bill becomes the law.

Senators remember the attitude of Lewis when he went to the coal-mine operators with a contract which he did not show them. They tried to see it, to find out what it was all about; but he would not let anyone know what he desired, but simply took the position of, "No contract, no work." Later on, he made a proposal on a basis of "Take it or leave it." Of course, that could not be regarded as realistic collective bargaining.

The same situation existed with respect to General Motors, when the president of the union dealing with it, Mr. Reuther, presented to General Motors the proposition, "We want a 30-cent increase in wages, and we will not take 'No' for an answer, unless you open your books and show us that you cannot pay it." That attitude was assumed throughout the collective-bargaining period.

I say to my colleagues that such action is not collective bargaining. In order to remedy this situation, the pending bill provides that both parties must bargain in good faith. The bill contains a definition of collective bargaining. Under the bill, it means meeting at regular intervals and seeking in good faith to negotiate an agreement.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I wish to ask the Senator whether he recalls what Mr. Reuther said, after the controversy was over, about his demand to inspect the books. Does the Senator recall what Mr. Reuther said at that time? My memory does not serve me very well on that point.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. He admitted 2 or 3 months later that the demand to see the books was a mere stunt to inflame public opinion against the company. "To get the company over the barrel" was the way Mr. Reuther expressed it. However, I recall that Mr. Reuther contended for a 30-cent per hour increase and took the position that he would not take any increase if it meant a rise in the prices of automobiles. Such a contention was advanced before our committee during the last Congress when he was seeking a 30-cent increase and insisted in some measure that would force General Motors to open its books. I may further state——

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

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

Mr. WILEY. I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for his very lucid presentation of the facts. I am sorry I was not present when he began his argument.

In the labor-management controversy, which, as the Senator has said, has been going on for some 10 years, it always appeared to me that the party with the primary interest was always neglected, that is, the public. It seemed to me that the recent strikes in the steel industry, in the coal industry, and other Nation-wide industries, as well as the threatened strike on the railroads, have brought prominently to the attention of the American people and of the legislative branch of the Government the fact that there is a primary interest on the part of the public.

I am not one of those who have been fortunate enough to have studied the bill. I am not a member of the committee, nor have I had the time to look into the bill carefully. I hope that before any votes on the subject are taken I shall be able to find opportunity to look into its provisions. I rise to compliment the distinguished Senator because he is courageously bringing to the fore the facts which point up the public interest.

He has just now called to our attention the fact that one great labor leader said that there could be an increase of 30 cents an hour in the wages of workers producing automobiles, and that he would not expect an increase in the price. We know what has happened to the price of automobiles. We have seen the prices of automobiles and other articles skyrocket, and there has been much blame attached to people who, in my opinion, are innocent in the matter.

I remember reading in the newspapers a few days ago a comment from the President, which was like the comment he made after he went into office the first time, that it was possible to raise the wages of labor and decrease the cost of the products they manufacture. To me, from an economic standpoint, that was a very unsound statement. It has thrown confusion into the ranks of our people, just as did the previous statement in relation to the automobile situation, that wages could be increased and the prices of automobiles stabilized. I must say that when that statement went out it was accepted as a verity by countless numbers of people. When I said previously that such a statement was unsound, unhealthy, and one which would only cause trouble, I received letters from people who said, "Well, you must have a lot of General Motors stock." I never owned a share of General Motors stock in my life.

I rise now only because I feel that the more the facts can be brought into the open, the more will the smoke screen be cleared away, and the more will we be able to get onto a realistic basis in the solution of the problem which is what we all want.

One further comment. Much propaganda is being sent out again against the Members of this distinguished body. Senators are pictured as either prolabor or procapital. The result is that letters we are receiving indicate clearly that the people are again being led astray, little realizing that there are at present 95 Members of this body who have taken an oath. It is true these 95 men have different backgrounds—economic, political, religious, educational, and social, and, what is more, geographic. They represent different constituencies. But by and large, they have only one motive, and that is do that which will serve the public interest, and promote the general welfare.

I thank the Senator for giving me an opportunity to make these few remarks. I interrupted him at this time only because I have to attend a committee meeting at 2 o'clock.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was glad to yield to the Senator. Let me remind him that some of us called the attention of Mr. Reuther to the fact that should wages be increased, irrespective of what the profits were in the last 2 years, it would be necessary to increase the prices of the commodities manufactured by General Motors. I wish to say further that the prediction which was made by those of us who took that position came from the fact that the percentagewise increase in the cost of the commodities was almost equal to the percentage of increase in wages. That was because the productivity per man had fallen from 20 to 23 percent, and the wage scale had been increased about 37 percent above the prewar scale. I may be in error about the percentage increase in wages, but as I recall it was such a figure as I indicated. I took the position that with a decrease in productivity and a rise in wages, it was impossible for a manufacturer to sell his product at the prewar price; which was the contention, in effect, of Mr. Reuther. When he presented his figures to show that General Motors could have paid the 30-cent increase in wages without increasing the prices of cars, what facts did he advance in support of his contention? He showed the profits made on war contracts, rather than the condition that prevailed before 1941, when this country was about to enter the war.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I am sure the Senator will not overlook a matter which occurred last week, an account of which I read in the newspapers yesterday or the day before, that the General Electric had granted a slight increase in wages, and Mr. Wilson, of that company, announced that it would be necessary to increase the cost of their products 7½ percent, as I recall.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. Unless a concern can be mechanized so as to increase the productivity of the workers, whenever wages are increased the cost of the commodity must be increased. Otherwise, it is not possible to increase productivity by raising wages. Thus every increase in wages merely adds to the cost of the commodity sold. That goes without saying.

It is true that before the war it was possible in some industries for an employer to increase wages and lower prices. That was because productivity had so increased per man that the cost was lessened considerably. Consequently a little of the added profits could be placed in the wage earner's envelope and the consumer could be given a little cheaper price. But it was only because productivity kept pace with the wage structure and in a measure surpassed it.

Mr. President, another evil that has grown up in recent years has been that of giving legal protection to the organization of supervisory employees. When the Wagner Act was placed on the statute books, supervisory employees were not considered to be employees as such. They were thought to represent management. Because of that, for 7 or 8 years, no effort was made by unions to obtain supervisory employees as members. The early decisions by the Board had been against unionization. Subsequently, the attitude of the Board changed. Soon afterward, when the question was submitted to the new Board, the former holding was reversed.

As I recall, it was only recently that the Supreme Court, in the Packard case, noted that the Board made no distinction in the classification of employees, as defined by the Wagner Act. The Court went so far as to say that even the vice presidents working for a large corporation were admitted to membership in a union, under the Board's interpretation of the act, they could compel their employer to recognize them. It said, further, that the Court was powerless to act, and that it was a matter to be decided by Congress.

In reporting the pending bill the committee stated in effect that supervisory employees were not to be considered as employees having bargaining rights under the Wagner Act.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator will recall and I think it should be in the RECORD, that the definition of a supervisory employee was considerably changed in committee. As originally written into the bill, it included night watchmen, time-study men, all guards, and many other types of workmen, who very clearly were not supervisors.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. The committee then more closely defined the word "supervisor," to include supervisors in fact, rather than all the other groups of employees whom some employers would like to have had included in the list of supervisory employees, so that such employees would not be able to join the union and gain the benefits of the Labor Relations Act.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say to the distinguished Senator that, as I recall, the committee by its definition excluded guards from the original definition of supervisory personnel.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Our amended definition also excludes the straw boss. What the committee did was to limit supervisory employees, by definition, to those having power to hire and fire for the benefit of the employer, and those who are permitted the exercise of independent judgment. That, in essence, is the definition of a supervisory employee. As I shall demonstrate in a moment, such men are not prohibited from joining a union, but they are not permitted to force a collective bargaining agreement under the Wagner Act.

Mr. AIKEN. This was another case——

Mr. ELLENDER. It was a case of compromise.

Mr. AIKEN. In dozens of cases labor wanted nothing whatever to be done, while industry wanted to include in the definition of "supervisor" any number of occupational employees who had no business whatever being included in the definition of "supervisor." The committee simply had to work out for itself what it thought was a proper definition of a supervisor.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Whether or not supervisors should be permitted to come under the protection of the Labor Relations Act, I want to say that I think the definition of "supervisor," as worked out by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, is the best definition which has been made to date.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me state to the distinguished Senator that the definition adopted by our committee is the one that has been put into practice for several years last past by the NLRB.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. The committee said they should be supervisors, in fact.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. One large concern, Jones & Laughlin, in connection with coal mines owned by them had a number of supervisory employees. They were organized by the United Mine Workers. The supervisors included not only those who represented directly the employers, and who had power to hire and fire and do many other things but all the night bosses, all the assistant foremen, whether they had a right to discharge or employ or not. The result was that the number of disciplinary cases fell off 66 percent under these unionized supervisors. But the accident rate doubled. It was said that the foremen became subservient to the union, which was composed of the very men the foremen were to hire and supervise.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. On the other hand, going on the other side of the fence to an extreme, the Senator will recall that the original bill included in its category of supervisors those who guarded the health of the employees, and that a difference of opinion arose among lawyers who were in the committee room at the time, as to whether this included the washroom attendants or not, some saying yes, others saying no.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. In any case, they were not foremen.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; certainly not.

One large company which permitted supervisors to join a union was the Ford Co. Three years ago it signed a contract with the foremen's association in good faith. The Ford Co. was willing to try it, because the foremen's association stated that it would make the supervisors feel that they were recognized as a part of management. In order to show how groundless the fears of employers were, a witness for the foremen's union told our committee this contract was a fine example of industrial relations and had worked well at Ford's. But since our hearings adjourned, the company has canceled this arrangement. In terminating the contract with that union, the Ford management said that it had been disappointed. Although the foremen's association had claimed that having such a contract would cause the foremen to feel themselves a part of management, the activities of the union had been such as to compel the foremen to be dominated in a manner adverse to the company. From the record it appears that in other Detroit plants no action was taken by the foremen's association with respect to a strike, without first consulting leaders of the union supervised by them. In other words, the foremen's association is subservient to and collaborates with rank-and-file unions.

Another abuse is the strike in violation of contract. That has caused a good deal of trouble to management. In numerous cases, companies agree in return for a no-strike clause to enter into contracts providing for arbitration. Yet, frequently, the unions bypass a solemn provision providing for arbitration of grievances, and call strikes to force management to capitulate. The bill would stop actions of that kind by giving to management the right to sue, and by making breaches of contract unfair labor practices.

In the campaign for higher wages last year employees of Western Union agreed to arbitrate. Arbitrators were appointed under an agreement—signed, sealed, and delivered. Because the arbitrators did not award to the CIO union an increase in wages sufficient to give them what they thought they should have, a strike was called, in violation not only of their written agreement but of the contract to arbitrate. In the pending bill such a proceeding would be outlawed. As a result of that strike by the Western Union employees, New York was without telegraphic communication with many States for a period of more than 2 weeks.

Other examples can be given. For instance, oil companies all over the United States entered into a solemn agreement with the union respecting certain wages which were to be paid their employees. As I remember, soon after the contract was entered into controls were removed. Because controls were removed, the employees struck for higher wages, despite the fact that several contracts had yet several months to run.

Other abuses exist, such as strikes over questions relating to invasion of management prerogatives. It often happens that management is forced to replace a foreman because the union does not like him—because he is too strict. Cases of that nature are very numerous. It is not my purpose to go into any more detail with respect to them. The bill outlaws such conduct.

In addition to abuses on the part of unions, many abuses arose from Board procedure and practice during the early period of administration of the Wagner Act. Under the rulings of the Board, employers were forbidden to express any kind of opinion on labor matters. Even recently the Board has held that if an employer made a speech during working hours, although the employer did not use any coercive language, yet the fact that he spoke to the employees while they were at work constituted coercion, and, therefore, the Board declared such activity to be an unfair labor practice.

I shall refer to another case sometime earlier. The manager of one concern complained that he had positive evidence that several Communists were members of the union, and he thought they should be ousted from the union. It turned out that his assertions were true, yet because he made them his statement was deemed an unfair labor practice. His company was cited by the Board because he made a true statement respecting some of his employees.

The point is that if ever an employer had engaged in an unfair labor practice, no matter how remote or how separable, the Board has held that a casual speech coercive in theory was a part of the pattern of unfair labor practices. In other words, the mere fact that he had previously engaged in any such practices placed a stigma upon him, and thereafter anything he said, whether it was coercive or otherwise, was declared to be an unfair labor practice. In other words he could not be washed clean once he had sinned.

There has also been partisanship on the part of the Board in connection with election proceedings. As Senators know, the only employees who are allowed to call for an election are those who are members of a union which has declared that it has a sufficient number, or sufficient percentage of the total number of employees, to justify action by the Board. The employer is now powerless to call for an election unless two unions or more are contending over which shall represent the employees. Nonunion members are now prohibited from calling for an election. Even though a union demands recognition and threatens to strike, the employer is not allowed to petition for an election. Moreover, employees who wish to be rid of a union which has communistic or racketeering leadership are not permitted to petition for a new election unless they can find some other union willing to represent them.

Another instance of maladministration by the Board is unfairness to independent unions. I have discussed that proposition to some extent previously today with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL]. Under the bill as it is now written, if it becomes law, the Board will be empowered to recognize, indeed will be obliged to recognize, independent unions. If today an independent union has attached to it the stigma of ever having been a management-dominated union, or if 2 years back or 10 years back it received any money by way of help from management, because of that stigma the Board will in all cases disestablish it. Such an independent union has absolutely no standing before the Board. The pending bill prevents the Board from treating independent unions more severly than affiliated unions which has been dominated or subsidized by an employer.

As I pointed out in the early part of my remarks, the Board has been charged with unfairness with respect to craft unions. As I observed a while ago, the American Federation of Labor contains any number of craft unions. Soon after the Wagner Act went into effect the CIO began to obtain contracts on a plant-wide basis. In many cases craft unions were denied the right of representation as craft unions, but were thrown together with other factory employees, no matter whether they were craft-union members or not. Thus they were forced to accept contracts on a plant-wide basis rather than on a craft basis.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. What the Senator has been pointing out is that no law passed by Congress is any better than the manner in which it is applied, and the manner in which it is applied drifts with the tide of public opinion. Therefore, no matter how good the law the Congress may enact, if it is not backed up by the force of public opinion and efficient application, it is not much better than no law whatsoever.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

In that connection, as I stated to the Senate a while ago, I am very sorry that the leadership of our large unions did not attempt to assist us in writing the bill. I do not know of a single leader of any of the large unions who offered any help in drafting the bill, by making proposals to correct by law evils whose existence they themselves admitted. We put the question to Philip Murray, as the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] will recall, in respect to jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts. He admitted that those evils existed and that something should be done about them. When asked what his remedy was, he said, "Send for Bill Green, and let us come before you and we will settle that matter to your satisfaction." I understand that they have tried, off and on, for many years to settle such questions, but they have never succeeded, and never will succeed. The only way is to do what we have done in the bill. I am satisfied that if the leadership of organized labor had come before us and said, "Gentlemen, we admit that this is wrong, and that is wrong, and we think this ought to be done or that ought to be done," they could have rendered a great deal of assistance in the light of their experience. But instead of cooperating with us they took the same attitude that management took when the Wagner Act was placed upon the statute books. As I pointed out a while ago, management made every effort to defeat the passage of that bill saying, "If we fail to defeat it in the Halls of Congress, we are going to see that the Supreme Court nullifies it."

The same attitude is now being taken by labor leaders. They say, "Let us alone. The Wagner Act should not be amended. If you do amend it, we are going to fight it through every court in the land."

Mr. President, I accept their challenge. I say to them that this bill ought to pass. It is a mild bill compared to what might have been expected in view of this defiant attitude.

I am very hopeful that the Congress will pass this bill as written, and let us give it a trial, because I am confident that if it is administered as we intend, it will place management and labor more nearly in balance and will lead to a peaceful solution of their difficulties.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wonder if the Senator would not correct his statement that it is a mild bill, and say that it is a just bill. A just bill would be mild in comparison to the punishment which might be meted out to labor unions if certain extremists in the field of industry could write the bill to suit themselves. I like the term "just bill" rather than "mild bill." The Senator will recall—and anyone who reads the reports on our desks will learn—that four members of the committee claim that the bill is not tough enough; three members claim it is too tough; whereas six members seem to think it is a just bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator and I agree that the bill is just and equitable to all concerned.

Mr. President, I shall hurriedly go through the various sections of the bill which attempt to correct the evils which I have been discussing during the past hour or so.

Take the case of secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes. We treat them similarly. The bill declares that secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes are unfair labor practices, and that those who engage in them shall be subject to the processes of the Labor Relations Board under the terms of the bill.

As I pointed out a while ago, secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes are treated as unfair labor practices. Should a complaint be made by an employer, all he would have to do, in effect, would be to let it be known, and the the local attorney in the regional office would have the power to make a quick investigation. If he should find that there was a jurisdictional strike in progress or in the offing, he could investigate. If in his judgment it would cause irreparable injury to the employer, he would have the right to go into court and obtain an injunction. He could obtain a cease-and-desist order. If perchance the union should continue its illegal conduct it could be punished. Its officers could be cited for contempt of court.

In respect to jurisdictional strikes we have provided for the appointment of an arbitrator, to have almost the same powers as the Board itself in investigating complaints. He would have the power to stop jurisdictional strikes.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Not only would he have almost the same power but his decision would be the decision of the Board, subject to court enforcement, as a Board decision is subject to a court enforcement.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I intended to say, and I appreciate the interruption of the Senator.

The third abuse which I discussed a while ago is compulsory union membership. As I have stated, the closed shop is banned under the terms of the bill. An employer would have the right to select employees of his own choosing. Should a majority of the employees in an establishment desire a union shop they could have it. If a majority should say that it desired a union shop that matter could be made the subject of collective bargaining.

But even an affirmative vote by a majority of the members of a union does not compel an employer to accept a union shop unless he desires to do so. It simply gives the union the right to bargain collectively for it. Should the union be in a position to persuade the employer to agree to a union shop one can be had.

In order to protect the employees a union cannot cause the discharge of any of its members simply because it wants to blackball them such as in the De Mille case or in the McGrath case. The union may still expel a man but so far as the employer is concerned he does not have to fire that man so long as that employee pays his dues to the union. I think this provision is bound to prevent such abuses as I discussed a while ago.

I also mentioned the fact that under this bill unions will be placed on the same basis as management with respect to collective bargaining. Today the act provides that management must bargain collectively. The bill provides that unions also must bargain collectively. We have defined what that term means and have said that unless both management and union bargain collectively on a realistic basis, the party at fault can be held for an unfair labor practice.

I discussed a moment ago another part of the bill which provides for the organizing of supervisory personnel. The description of a supervisor as written in the bill is practically the same used by the NLRB for the past 5 or 6 years. The definition given in this bill is not nearly as broad as the one which was included in the Case bill of last year, since timekeepers and other employees having to do with the fixing of wage rates were treated as supervisors in that bill. We have also made it an unfair labor practice for strikes to occur in violation of a union contract.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. In one moment. We have provided two methods of meeting that situation: One by direct action in the courts and the other by making it an unfair labor practice. I am satisfied that with such an inhibition in the law it will correct many of the evils which have grown up in the past because of the violation of contracts solemnly entered into between labor and management.

I now yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I take it the Senator is now discussing the bill which has been reported favorably by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand, that bill was reported by a vote of 7 to 6?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; by a vote of 11 to 2, except that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who voted to report the bill, later filed minority views.

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to receive that information, because I was misinformed through newspaper reference to the committee's work or through a conversation which I had with a Senator. I am glad to be corrected upon that score.

The Senator from Louisiana mentioned in his discussion the Case bill. Can the Senator tell me, briefly, in what respect this bill, which was reported favorably by the committee, differs from the Case bill? Or will that take some time?

Mr. ELLENDER. It will take some time; but the principal distinguishing features are these: The Case bill did not propose any revision of the Wagner Act except in one respect. It also contained provisions, not found in the committee bill, extending the antitrust laws to secondary boycotts and jurisdictional

strikes, and regulated union-welfare funds.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is speaking of the welfare fund?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. It also provided for a mediation board of five. That, in a nutshell, describes the Case bill. This bill covers, in a somewhat different way, the abuses at which the Case bill was aimed, with the exception of the union-controlled fund. It goes further than the Case bill in many important respects.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The reason I am interrogating the able Senator upon this matter is primarily because the President of the United States last year vetoed the Case bill and set forth his reasons for his veto, but stated definitely in the veto message that he would sign a labor bill, pointing out certain things which he thought should be taken care of through legislative action. I am wondering whether the committee has taken that into consideration in its deliberations upon this measure.

Mr. ELLENDER. We have not considered the President's viewpoint as to his veto of the Case bill, but I will say to the Senator that one of the reasons which the President gave for vetoing the Case bill last year was that he felt that the line was not properly drawn with respect to supervisory employees. In this bill we have a definition of supervisory employees which is not as broad as the one contained in the Case bill last year. The Case bill would have excluded weighmasters, bookkeepers, and anyone who had to do with figuring out the rates of pay of an employee. In the pending bill we have so narrowed the definition of supervisory employees as to include only personnel who actually represent management. I may further state——

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator will further yield for one observation which I desire to make, it seems that there are some who in reality desire the kind of a labor measure passed by the Congress that the President is sure to veto. I do not know what the President will do regarding labor legislation; I have no way of knowing. But, as I view the situation throughout the country, it strikes me as one United States Senator that the Congress ought to pass labor legislation which the President of the United States will sign. The sooner the Congress and the Executive agree upon some type of labor legislation, it seems to me the sooner will we in America move to a more stable economy and a more favorable position from the standpoint of our people as a whole. Therefore the Congress should pass labor legislation which the President will not veto rather than to encourage a veto message on a "tough" labor bill, and then have to indulge in further long arguments and debate on the question of sustaining or overriding such a veto message. I am afraid that if the Congress embarks upon the latter course, before we get through, if we are not careful, we shall find ourselves at the close of the present session of Congress without having passed any labor legislation at all.

Mr. President, we should be able to give and take in connection with labor legislation. That is what I should like to do. That is why I propounded the inquiry about a comparison between the measure now before the Senate and the measure which I know the President vetoed last year.

I, for one, think that some labor legislation is necessary; but I certainly am not going to support a punitive bill which definitely discriminates against the laboring men, and finally will result in an impasse in the Congress, with the result that no labor legislation at all will be enacted.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am in thorough agreement with some of the views expressed by the Senator from Illinois. As I stated at the beginning of my remarks, my desire is to have the Congress pass a reasonable bill. I would not expect labor to like it, but I should like to have Congress pass a bill which is not punitive in character, a bill which I hope the President will sign.

I say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that if the Congress passes a bill of the character of the one which is now before it, I hope the President will approve it. But if he does not, I shall vote to override his veto, because I feel that the bill is "must" legislation. Legislation of this character is necessary at this time; and I know it will do much good in bringing labor and management more into balance, and really will result in better relations in the future.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to let me ask one other question. Do I correctly understand that all 13 of the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which reported this bill favorably, are supporting the final enactment of this bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know as to that. But judging from the views expressed by three Senators in a minority report which was filed by them, I do not believe they will vote for the bill as presented.

I believe that the 10 remaining members of the committee will vote for the bill as now reported. The only unfortunate thing is, as I have said earlier in my remarks, that some of the members of the committee, including the distinguished chairman, are desirous of amending the bill so as to make it much tougher. I fear that if a course of that kind is pursued, the President may veto the bill. I do not know whether he will or not; but if he does veto it, then it may be rather difficult to get the Congress to override his veto.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Illinois has asked the reasons for the President's veto of the Case bill, and whether those reasons have been met in the bill now before the Senate. I think it is fair to say that none of the reasons for which the President vetoed the Case bill have been met in this bill. Last year, the President objected to every provision of the Case bill. He objected to the provision for the establishment of the Mediation Service outside the Department of Labor; he said that was contrary to his policy.

He objected to the provision which would permit unions to be sued. Such a provision is carried in the bill now before the Senate in almost exactly the same form.

The President objected to the fact-finding provision relating to public utilities, and the provision for injunction and for vote. That provision is similar to the emergency provision contained in the bill now before the Senate.

The President also objected to the removal of foremen from the operation of the act.

So, Mr. President, if Senators are trying to have the Senate pass a bill which will be consistent with the President's veto message of last year, let me say I am afraid that will be impossible. Unless the President has changed his views, I do not see how in any way they have been met in the bill which is now before the Senate.

We must assume, therefore, that the President has changed his views. However, whether the bill now before the Senate would meet his views is a matter of pure conjecture, so far as I know.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana will further yield, let me ask him a further question. Assuming that what the Senator from Ohio has said is true, the amendments which are to be offered by the chairman of the committee, the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as I understand, will not moderate the bill in any way, but will really make it——

Mr. ELLENDER. They will make it tougher, as I indicated a few minutes ago.

Mr. LUCAS. They will make the situation a little more difficult, from the standpoint of trying to get along with labor. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct; there can be no question about it.

Mr. LUCAS. If those amendments are adopted, the bill probably will be more detrimental from the viewpoint of labor than the Case bill would have been, will it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. There can be no question about that. In my opinion, if those amendments are adopted and if the Senate passes the bill as thus amended, and should the President veto it, I am almost confident that the Congress will not override the President's veto. In that case, we would be without any labor legislation of the type that is needed.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to say that I know of no method of determining that the President will veto a bill because it contains a particular provision, or that he will not veto a bill because it does not contain a particular provision. It seems to me we must pass on each provision on its merits. If the Senate thinks that a provision is fair and just, and that it corrects an injustice, it seems to me the Senate should vote for it, and should assume that the President will reach the

same conclusion, because his attitude has been very much that of the Members of the Senate.

So it seems to me that to follow any other course would simply be to indulge in wild guessing. There are some 20 different provisions of importance in the bill now before the Senate. I do not know how we can determine in advance whether provisions No. 1, No. 2, or No. 3, will be unsatisfctory to the President or will be satisfactory to him, or whether he will veto a bill which contains two unsatisfactory provisions, or whether he will veto a bill which contains 18 unsatisfactory provisions, or what his attitude finally will be. At the moment, I cannot conceive under what conditions the President might veto or might not veto such a bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator well knows that if we should pass a bill with the same force and effect as the House bill, we might lose the support of many Senators who are willing to go along with the Senate bill as it is now written. Should we make the bill as reported a little tougher than a majority of the committee contemplated, a majority of the Senate may pass the bill, but when it comes back from the White House with a veto message, my fear is that there will not be enough votes to override the veto.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I only wish to point out that if the Senate adopts a particular amendment because Senators believe it is a fair amendment and represents a fair method of dealing with a particular situation, we have no right to assume that the President is going to veto the bill because of that particular amendment.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. It may be that in my absence from the floor this matter has already been brought up, but if I may address myself, with the Senator's permission, to the Senator from Ohio, was it not argued in committee that it would be better to divide the bill into four parts? Was not that argued by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] who is now on the floor, and was it not urged, as one of the arguments, that there would be a better chance of getting remedial legislation on this subject and that it would be a more logical approach, if we presented the President a bill dividing the subject up into its natural segments? And did not the Senator from Ohio oppose that procedure, and was he correctly quoted in the press as having stated to a Republican caucus that the desire was to give the President one single bill so that he would have one bill on his lap to deal with?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the question was argued in the committee as to whether there should be one bill or many bills. Primarily, I argued in favor of having one bill, because the subject being considered is one subject, and there is no way to separate it. One title deals with the question of mediation, and what mediation is for. It is to help collective bargaining. Another section deals with the Wagner Labor Relations Act, which deals with collective bargaining.

During the course of the consideration of the bill, we moved sections from one title to another because it was felt better, from a psychological standpoint, to put the provisions in as amendments of the Wagner Act instead of having them stand by themselves.

There was the question of the creation of a joint committee, and the question of a Nation-wide strike and the method of enjoining it, which follows right after the mediation procedure. The subject is one subject. I do not see how we can separate it. Certainly I would not be in favor of passing one section dealing with mediation which would not accomplish any reforms, and leaving all corrections of injustices in the section dealing with amendments to the Wagner Act.

Frankly, I do not know what the President's attitude might be, but the subject is one subject, it is handled on the floor of the Senate far more easily as a single subject and it seems to me it was entirely proper that there should be one bill.

Some argued the other way. Their argument was to this effect: "Let us separate it so that the President may select that which he likes and that which he does not like, and have the power to choose what kind of a result he wants to obtain." On the same theory, we should have separated the bill into 20 bills, because there are 20 different subjects dealt with in the bill, so far as minor sections are concerned. The natural thing to do, the thing already done by the House of Representatives, was to agree on one bill. Furthermore, so far as I remember, the argument in the caucus, which, it seems to me, is not material in this debate, was that the House has passed one bill, and that if we pass three bills we must consider what will happen. We would substitute one for the House bill, and the House would say, "Well, we will not touch your other two bills. We sent you a whole bill, and we are entitled to have you consider that whole bill." So that, from a practical standpoint, it seems to be impossible to handle the matter in three bills, hoping we would ever get any concurrence from the House in that kind of proposition.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana will yield further, the fact is that if the Senate were to pass four bills and send them to the White House there would be a far greater probability of getting some kind of labor legislation, as a practical matter, than if the Senate followed the procedure advocated, and finally obtained, under the advocacy of the Senator from Ohio and the House. In other words, if the Senator from New York had prevailed, we would be passing on four bills which were logically provided by a man who has had more experience in the labor field, in fact, than any of us on the Committee on Labor, or on this floor. Yet that division of the subject into four bills, which offered some assurance of there being some legislation on the subject, was defeated in the committee, and the President will be presented with one bill.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I wish to make my position clear, because I am afraid it has been a little misconstrued.

My idea in desiring that the bill be presented in the form of four different bills instead of one was not at all in any way to give the President of the United States an opportunity to pick here and there. It was because I felt that was the proper way to consider the proposed legislation.

As we progressed with the amendments to the bill in the committee, I think the members noted that what we were trying to do was to put the different parts of the bill where they belonged. Amendments to the Labor Relations Act were put in the Labor Relations Act part. Amendments dealing with mediation and the processes of mediation, and, finally, the emergency section, were put in the appropriate place. The part that related to the taking of cases involving a violation of contracts before Federal courts was in a separate title of the bill. The part, finally, establishing a joint congressional committee, was put in a separate title of the bill. Those are all different phases of the question. I will not argue for one moment that the parts are not related; of course they are related, but they are distinctly different in their various aspects, and in the way in which they approach the question under consideration.

As I saw the situation at the time—and I still think I was right; I have not changed my opinion on this aspect—the bill should have been broken up into four bills: First, that part dealing with the Wagner Labor Relations Act, and the consideration of the changes proposed; then mediation, and all that pertains to mediation. I am sure the Senator from Ohio does not mean to say that that did not amount to much, because in my judgment the mediation process provided for in the proposed legislation is one of the most important phases of the whole bill. If we can get mediation working as it is contemplated in the bill, we will have gone a long way toward eliminating industrial strife in America. So it goes with the other provisions of the bill.

Never for one moment did I assume the position I took because I was trying to get the President to go along with one part and not with another. In my judgment, as the bill is now written the President should go along with all of it—and this is where I may differ with some of my good friends on the Senate floor—whether as a whole or whether it is separated. But from the standpoint of consideration on the Senate floor, at least, it should be separated.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I rise for the purpose of keeping the RECORD straight. Of the 13 members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, nine indicated the belief that the bill should be divided into three or four different bills. After the Senator from Ohio appealed to the Republican conference to support the principle of

one bill, and received the endorsement of the conference, then three members of the committee stated that if the majority party of Congress believed that action on a single bill was the proper procedure, they would not oppose the desires of the majority party. That left the committee seven to six in favor of a single bill, although nine of the 13 members had expressed themselves at one time or another as favoring the introduction of four bills, to the end that at least some legislation could be assured of passage.

Mr. MORSE and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield first to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask the Senator's indulgence and the Senate's consent to make a very brief comment on this matter of procedure, because it has been raised here in the debate, and I think it is important that the respective positions of those of us who have taken very definite stands on the issue be made clear in the RECORD at this point. Therefore, unless there are objections, Mr. President, I want to take 2 or 3 minutes to set forth my view, as have the Senator from Ohio, the Senator from Vermont, and the Senator from New York.

I have not changed my position at all that that procedure will prove to be fundamental in determining whether satisfactory labor legislation is passed by the Eightieth Congress. I hope time may prove me to be wrong, but certainly I think that as of this hour there is strong indication that the procedure we are following will in all probability result in no legislation at all. Hence I took the position very early in the debate—and I may remind the Senate that the debate on this bill has in reality been proceeding for many weeks—I took the position on March 10 of this year, in a rather long speech on the floor, that it was a great mistake to pass an omnibus bill, because, although there are interrelations, nevertheless the topics are also separable. I am in complete agreement with the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], that we should have agreed procedurally weeks ago upon separate bills.

I think it is perfectly clear that if we had limited one bill to amendments to the Wagner Act, we could in all probability have passed such a bill. I cannot imagine any sound basis for a veto of such a bill, and, if it had been vetoed, I believe there would have been the votes to override the veto.

I think of all the labor reforms which are needed, legislatively speaking, the paramount one, the most important one, is a bill that seeks fairly and reasonably to equalize the Wagner Act, and bring about such reforms as are set forth in title I of the pending bill. I submit to the Senate that if we could have passed title I of the bill and the other titles had ultimately failed, we still would have made a great and constructive contribution to sound labor legislation in the Eightieth Congress.

Likewise, I agree with the Senator from New York that we should have proceeded then with title II in a separate bill, and passed it. Again, I think legislation dealing with mediation, conciliation, arbitration, and national emergencies would have had to be signed by the President because of the inherent fairness of title II; and thus as to title III and title IV.

My fear—and I think it is a reasonable fear—is that we are going to end up with an omnibus bill, with certain amendments adopted on the floor of the Senate to the bill voted out by committee, which will make it impossible, in all probability, for some of us who voted to report the bill from the committee to vote for the bill going into or coming out of conference. With the Hartley bill containing the drastic provisions embodied in it—and I shall not discuss that bill now, but I shall do so, at length, in the days to come—the bill which would emerge from the conference committee would be so unreasonable in its terms, since it would represent, I think, some compromise between what comes out of the Senate and what is in the Hartley bill—that the votes will not be here, and I certainly hope they will not be here, to override a Presidential veto on that type of legislation, because I think it will be more causative than preventive of labor disputes.

So I think, Mr. President, we are dealing here with a very important point of procedure. I want to keep the record straight, as well as I can. I know when I am engaged in a losing battle—and I know that on this point the battle has been lost—but the RECORD must make perfectly clear the responsibility for the loss of the battle. I think some Senators are saying that because the House has passed an omnibus bill, we therefore are faced with a so-called practical situation that makes it impossible for us to pass certain bills separately.

I do not agree with that point of view at all. I think if we, in the Senate, believe that on the merits we ought to have separate bills, then we ought to make our record on separate bills, send them to conference, and do our best there to work out with the House separate bills. If we are beaten, then we are beaten. But I do not feel, Mr. President, that we have made the fight that we ought to have made for separate bills. I think the people of the country are entitled, as I have said in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare as well as here, and at a meeting of representatives of my party in conference, to have fair, sensible, and constructive labor legislation come out of this Congress. I do not think we have any right, because of procedural tactics or strategy, for whatever purposes they may be used, to follow a course of action here which runs the serious risk and danger of our having no legislation on the subject of labor relations.

Therefore, Mr. President, in order to get the record straight so far as my position is concerned, and with the indulgence of the Senator from Louisiana—if I am denied the privilege, I shall do it at a later time—I simply want to offer now certain amendments to this bill. I want to state briefly what they are.

The first amendment seeks to strike out, from line 7, page 40 of this bill, all of the bill down to and including line 2 on page 58. This would leave in the bills titles I and V only.

Then, I want to offer an amendment in form of title II of the bill and an amendment in form of title III of the bill and an amendment in form of title IV of the bill, which will at least place before the Senate four pending individual bills which constitute only the separate titles of the pending bill.

I do it, on the basis of a form of parliamentary procedure, which I understand is proper, namely, by this motion:

I move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with instructions to report the same back to the Senate on or before Friday, May 2, 1947, with separate bills for titles II, III, and IV.

I offer my amendments, Mr. President.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I want to make one statement to show that the pending bill relates to one question. The abnormal thing would be to separate it. First, we have title I, which entirely rewrites the Wagner Act. Of course, the primary purpose of that act is to assure collective-bargaining agreements between employer and employee.

In title II we change the mediation procedure. I did not say it was not important, but we do have a mediation setup today, which the President, in vetoing the Case bill last year, indicated he thought was satisfactory. Title II is not so important as the amendments to the Wagner Act. But what is the purpose of mediation? The purpose of mediation is to bring about collective-bargaining agreements between employer and employees. That is its only purpose. The bill then provides for emergencies, covering cases where such agreements cannot be brought about. It provides for an injunction in those cases, to hold the matter up for 60 days while the Mediation Service may bring about a collective-bargaining agreement between employer and employees.

The whole purpose of all four titles of the bill is to bring about such an agreement that, at the end of the national emergency, if no agreement is ratified, a vote shall be held, so that the workers may have opportunity to decide whether they want to enter into a collective-bargaining agreement.

What is the purpose of title III? The purpose of title III is to give the employer and the employee the right to go to the Federal courts to bring a suit to enforce the terms of a collective-bargaining agreement—exactly the same subject matter which is contained in titles I and II. It is impossible to separate them. The committee had difficulty even in separating matters as between titles, and moved some matters back and forth from one title to another.

Finally, we have title IV, which proposes to set up a joint committee to study the problem. That subject might be contained in a separate bill, but there seems to be no reason why it cannot be

added to the other provisions of the measure, since it is intended to set up the joint committee to study titles I, II, and III, and then determine whether there should be further legislation. So the measure, in fact, deals with one subject.

So far as the suggestion made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon is concerned—that if we pass separately title I, the amendments to the Wagner Act, which he regards as most important, it would be less likely to be vetoed—I can assure Senators that the opposite is the fact. It seems to me that all the important changes—the things at least that aroused most opposition from the labor unions—fall in that title. I would be more fearful that the President would veto title I, embracing the amendments to the Wagner Act, and approve the other titles than I would that the reverse would occur. But I can see no reason, in order that the President may have the right to select, why we should separate one subject into four different measures—all dealing with exactly the same question.

Certainly, Mr. President, I think from the point of view of procedure it is far easier for the chairman of the committee—I think perhaps that was as much my motive as anything else—to handle one bill on the floor—to have the whole labor subject debated at once—than to have four measures come up, one after the other, and in each case have fundamentally the same questions discussed again with reference to each measure.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me that on every ground this bill should be one bill; I trust it will remain one bill, and I think if we ever want to reach an agreement with the House it has to be one bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will ask the Senator from Louisiana to suspend for a moment until the parliamentary situation created by the proposal made by the Senator from Oregon is cleared up. For the information of the Chair, will the Senator repeat the motion he made?

Mr. MORSE. I made the motion that the bill, the basis of the amendments I offered, be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with instructions to report the same back to the Senate on or before May 2, 1947, with titles II, III, and IV eliminated, and with separate bills for those three titles.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator ask that the pending bill be recommitted to the committee with his amendments?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's motion is in order, and is in order for a vote.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. The motion is debatable, is it not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; the motion is debatable.

Mr. TAFT. And the Senator from Louisiana has the floor. Is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I desire to say that when I began my remarks at 12 o'clock—and it is now about 3:30, almost 3½ hours since I started—I did not expect to take up so much time of the Senate. I do not mind being asked questions, and I shall make every attempt to answer them, but I request my colleagues not to make extended speeches on my time.

In respect to the proposal which was debated a moment ago, I wish to say that I was one of the four Senators who thought the bill should be considered as a whole, and if any effort is made to separate the bill into four parts I shall vote against such a proposal. I share the view of the distinguished Senator from Ohio that the bill should be considered as a whole.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a short observation, and I trust the Senator from Illinois will make it short, because I have not had any lunch today; in fact, I had breakfast at 7 o'clock; have had nothing to eat since, and am becoming somewhat weary and tired and a little hungry.

Mr. LUCAS. It seems to me, Mr. President, that the longer the Senator from Louisiana continues the better he speaks. Lack of food and drink does not seem to make much difference to him.

Mr. President, I confess I am somewhat confused after hearing the last statement made by the Senator from Louisiana that he is associated with the Senator from Ohio in respect to this proposal, and dissociated with the Senator from New York and the Senator from Oregon on another proposal; and both proposals are, of course, very vital.

A few moments ago the Senator from Ohio was speculating and conjecturing respecting what the President of the United States might do. I undertake to say that the question I asked with respect to the Case bill was perfectly proper, and had a very sound premise from the standpoint of using any kind of a yardstick, even in speculating on what the President of the United States might do. I think it is perfectly proper to speculate about securing any kind of legislation on labor matters. I am not one of those who want to have enacted all the labor legislation which has been or may be proposed. There are numerous labor proposals, and it seems to me we are plunging headlong and attempting to write an over-all bill on the subject of labor relations which goes too far in the wrong direction. In other words, what we should do is to approach the labor problem in a reasonable, logical, and moderate fashion, and not in an illogical manner, and not in such a way as will, as the Senator from Oregon suggested, result in no labor legislation whatsoever.

To illustrate my point more forcefully, from the experience I have had in my own State of Illinois with jurisdictional strikes, I would rather have enacted legislation outlawing jurisdictional strikes and nothing else than to have no labor legislation at all. I would rather take a little at this session of Congress and see what happens, note how the law or laws work, and ascertain how labor and management and the public react. Then as we move into the future and understand, through experience, what is happening, we will be in a much better position to write further legislation, if it is needed, next year in the next session of Congress. I believe that to be better procedure than to plunge headlong and try to do everything at this time. That is exactly what some want to do. Some want to write the toughest possible bill so that the President of the United States will be forced to veto it. That is the truth of the matters. Others, who are truly interested in labor-management conditions, who are interested in the public welfare, in sound economy from the standpoint of fair public relations between management and labor, want to see written the kind of a bill which both management and labor can ultimately accept without any violent reaction from either one, so that the country as a whole can say, "At least we have a start here on labor legislation which we think is worth while, and we can give it a trial during the coming year until the next Congress convenes."

I am satisfied that the American people would rather have some kind of legislation than no kind of legislation at all. If we are not careful, I fear that as the result of what was done in the House by the passage of the Hartley bill and of what some Senators want to do on the floor of the Senate, we will wind up with no labor legislation at all. That may be good politics from the standpoint of some, but it is not good politics from the standpoint of sound American economy and from the standpoint of the safety and security of the people of this Nation, in view of what we know as to labor-management conditions.

Mr. ELLENDER. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that title I deals with amendments to the National Labor Relations Act. That, of course, is the most important title in the bill. I believe that most of the opposition from labor stems from the amendments to the National Labor Relations Act which are included in title I.

Title II deals with the creation of an emergency mediation service, which I do not believe is very objectionable to labor. It may be objectionable to some, but it is not so bad.

Title III deals with suability of both union to attempt to coerce an employer

Title IV deals with the creation of a commission to make a joint study of the problems confronting labor, not only in the light of the pending bill if enacted, but to consider some of the subjects discussed by the committee and not incorporated in the bill. This title also deals with the welfare fund.

I believe that all those titles are somewhat related to each other. That was my reason for voting to report an omnibus bill rather than four separate and distinct bills.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a very brief comment?

Mr. ELLENDER. I hope the Senator will make it brief, because I should like to complete my remarks. I understand that several other Senators are very anxious to speak this afternoon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator has been very gracious and kind to me.

I should like to make a brief comment in reply to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. It seems to me that after the Senator from Ohio finishes his argument on this point, the fact still remains that we could separate the bill into its separate titles, enact any one or all of them, and they could be carried out irrespective of the other titles. In other words, this is a separable bill. The Senator from Ohio is quite correct in saying that it deals with the whole subject of collective bargaining; but it can be broken up into four separate parts.

The second point I wish to make is that while it is true we may run into the danger of a veto if we add drastic amendments to any of these titles, particularly title I, which deals with amendments to the Wagner Act, my feeling is that we can get some of them through without drastic amendments; and if title I is fairly enacted, I think we have enough votes in the Senate to override a veto.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Chair make it plain that the pending question is now on the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to recommit the bill with instructions.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to say to my colleagues that I shall cheerfully yield for any questions, but I do not propose to permit any Senator to make a speech, no matter how brief, in my time.

Before I was interrupted I was attempting to show how the proposed legislation dealt with many of the obnoxious evils which I discussed in the early part of my speech. I showed how the bill dealt with secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes, also with compulsory union membership, refusal of unions to bargain, and the question of supervisory personnel. I also dealt at length with the remedy for strikes in violation of a contract. I shall now deal briefly with strikes invading the prerogatives of management.

The bill prevents a union from dictating to an employer on the question of bargaining with union representatives through an employer association. The bill, in subsection 8 (b) (1) on page 14, makes it an unfair labor practice for a union to attempt to coerce an employer either in the selection of his bargaining representative or in the selection of a personnel director or foreman, or other supervisory official. Senators who heard me discuss the issue early in the afternoon will recall that quite a few unions forced employers to change foremen. They have been taking it upon themselves to say that management should not appoint any representative who is too strict with the membership of the union. This amendment seeks to prescribe a remedy in order to prevent such interferences.

I have also discussed the question of how the Board acted in respect to certain unions as against others. It was entirely unfair. In order to meet the situation, the right of employers to express their opinions in labor disputes is made coextensive with the rights which labor unions enjoy. The bill would permit an employer to speak his mind, provided he refrained from any threat or coercion, or any indication of bribery. Section 8 (c), on page 16, line 20, is the amendment which seeks to correct that evil.

As to election procedures, which I discussed at length this afternoon, the bill makes all parties, the employer, any union, or any individual employee, whether he belongs to a union or not, whose status may be affected by a representation case, equal in the eyes of the law. Subsection 9 (c), on page 19, gives employers and individual employees the same right of petition which unions have heretofore enjoyed.

Moreover, under subsection 9 (c) (3), on page 21, the Board is directed to do away with any disparity of treatment in run-off cases by placing the two highest choices on the ballot, irrespective of whether one of those choices is prounion or antiunion. Both craftsmen and professional employees are protected by these amendments from having their wishes submerged by being thrown into a large unit of production and maintenance employees.

The bill, in subsection 9 (b), page 19, gives craftsmen and professional employees the right to vote in separate units. If they wish to be represented by the organization which represents the plant unit, however, these amendments still permit them that choice.

Mr. President, I have discussed at length this afternoon independent unions and how, in my opinion, many of them were badly treated by the Board. I referred to several occasions in which independent unions had made every attempt to be named the bargaining agents for groups of men, but because 7 or 8 years ago these independent unions suffered the stigma of employer favor they were disestablished and denied the right ever to represent any group of employees.

We have cured that evil by giving an independent union the same right as an affiliated union, under the procedures of the Labor Board with both protection and the right of being placed on the ballot.

The discussion which I have been carrying on for the past 3 hours and 40 minutes has dealt with the most obnoxious evils which have marred relations between labor and management in the past 10 years. I have attempted to point out to the Senate how the pending measure deals with all of those evils. I am most anxious that the Senate enact the bill as it has been reported from the committee. I repeat that my fear is, that if we should tighten up on this bill, as it were, if we should pass a bill as restrictive with regard to unions as the Hartley bill, we may end with no legislation at all. I should not like the 90 days' work which I have put forth on this bill to end with no legislation at all. I again plead with the distinguished chairman of the committee to forego the amendments that have been submitted by others and which have been heretofore considered by the Senate Labor and Public Welware Committee. We discussed the bill at length in the committee. We debated in executive session every issue which is now being presented to the Senate. After discussion the majority of the committee voted out those proposals. Before the bill was presented to the Senate I made the statement in committee, and I repeat it now, that my purpose has been to stand by the bill as it is written. Consequently, I shall vote against any amendments which were rejected by a majority of my colleagues on the committee even though I may have favored them at the time. I am very hopeful that if this Congress shall pass a bill in line with the Senate version the President will sign it. If the President should make the mistake of vetoing a bill substantially the same as the one which we are now discussing, I have little or no fear but that the Congress will quickly override his veto and thereby make it possible for us to place on the statute books legislation which will cure the most serious problems which have developed in the last 10 years in the industrial-relations field and leave other problems to the recess committee, created by the bill, for investigation. I should like to see this bill as it is written tried out in practice. In the meantime we can have a committee of the Senate and House proceed to make a further investigation of the problems touched upon in the amendments which will be proposed by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and others.

Mr. President, there are many additional provisions of the pending measure which I have not discussed this afternoon. The bill also provides for enlarging the Board from three to seven members. I am sure that phase of the bill will be discussed fully by some of my colleagues. I thought that I would leave something for them to say. I did not wish to cover the whole subject matter. I did not wish my colleagues to think, however, that I had overlooked the other provisions.

The review division of the bill is abolished in the hope that we can insure judicial consideration by the Board members of the various matters which come before it.

We enlarge the Board and permit the Board members to select attorneys of their own choosing so that each Board member will be in a better position to determine the issue himself rather than to rely upon one set of attorneys. Usually the Board members will get the same opinion from the review section, whereas if we should permit each Board member to have an attorney of his own and permit that attorney to review various cases, we are more likely to get a fair decision than otherwise.

Mr. President, as I intimated a moment ago, there are five titles in this bill. My discussion has been primarily with respect to title I which deals with amendments to the so-called Wagner Act. Title II, which I am sure will be discussed at length by some of my colleagues deals with the creation of a mediation service and for injunctive relief in national emergencies. I shall be glad to discuss that title at a future time, should any of my colleagues overlook doing so.

The suability provision is very simple, in that it gives to both management and labor the right to sue for breach of a

contract solemnly entered into. That is provided for in title III.

Title IV deals with the creation of a joint committee composed of seven members from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate and seven members from the Committee on Education and Labor of the House. This joint committee can, I am sure, be of inestimable service to the Senate in making a further study, in the field, if necessary, of many of the problems which have faced labor and management for the past 10 or 12 years; and I am very hopeful that the bill will be enacted and that the joint committee will be selected as soon as the bill becomes law, so that they may undertake their task.

Mr. President, I have nothing further to say at this time; but I repeat that I am hopeful that the Senate will turn down all the amendments which now are before it. I include the amendments dealing with the subject matter that has been passed upon by the committee. I am certain that if the Congress passes the Senate bill, as it has been presented by the committee, that bill will become law and will solve many of the difficulties which have been the cause of so much trouble between labor and management.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as bearing on the pending bill I should like to submit a matter for insertion in the RECORD at this point. Today I have received from the attorney general of Nebraska, Mr. Walter R. Johnson, a letter with an attached resolution. The letter reads in part as follows:

On the 14th and 15th of this month a conference was held at Omaha, Nebr., to discuss the legal issues involved in suits that have been instituted, attacking the validity of statutes and constitutional amendments of the States which regulate or prohibit the closed shop.

There were 15 States, namely, Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, represented by their attorneys general or assistants at the meeting.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter and resolution printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. The resolution was adopted by representatives of the States mentioned in the letter, as I have read it. The resolution is self-explanatory.

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

STATE OF NEBRASKA,
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Lincoln, April 24, 1947.

The Honorable KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR KEN: On the 14th and 15th of this month a conference was held at Omaha, Nebr., to discuss the legal issues involved in suits that have been instituted, attacking the validity of statutes and constitutional amendmens of the States which regulate or prohibit the closed shop.

There were 15 States, namely, Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin, represented by their attorneys general or assistants at the meeting.

A resolution was unanimously adopted requesting that Congress specify in the enactment of pending labor legislation that regulation of the right to work is properly a matter for State control under the police powers reserved to the States. A copy of the resolution is herewith enclosed.

I note from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the House amended its bill, H. R. 3020, by adding section 13, which is a very desirable provision insofar as the States are concerned that have adopted legislation or constitutional amendments with reference to the right to work.

I am writing Senator TAFT, chairman of the Labor Committee of the Senate, concerning this matter, but if you would speak to him, it would, no doubt, more forcibly bring it to his attention.

I hope you will check into this phase of the pending labor legislation.

With kind personal regards and with best wishes, I remain,

Sincerely yours,
WALTER R. JOHNSON,
Attorney General.

"Whereas a considerable number of States have by legislative enactment or constitutional amendment taken action designed to protect the right of the citizen to work free from any requirement of membership or nonmembership in a labor union; and

"Whereas it is considered that such action is a valid exercise of the police power reserved to the several States and the people thereof; and

"Whereas, it is desirable that there be no doubt as to the power of the several States to protect the right of its citizens to work: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the attorneys general and their representatives present in this meeting do respectfully request the Congress of the United States to specify in the enactment of pending labor legislation that regulation of the right-to-work is properly a matter for State control under the police powers reserved to the States; be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Chairman of this meeting is hereby authorized to appoint a committee of such size as he deems appropriate, and of which he shall serve as Chairman, with full power to act in the premises."

On motion of Attorney General Abram P. Staples, of Virginia, and seconded by Attorney General Roy H. Beeler, of Tennessee, the foregoing resolution was unanimously adopted.

The committee named: Attorney General Walter R. Johnson, of Nebraska, chairman; Attorney General Abram P. Staples, of Virginia; Attorney General J. Tom Watson, of Florida; Attorney General Roy H. Beeler, of Tennessee; Attorney General John L. Sullivan, of Arizona.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 736) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District of Columbia during 1947, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 9) to print for the use of the Committee on Finance additional copies of Senate Report No. 610, Seventy-sixth Congress, entitled "Survey of Experience in Profit Sharing and Possibilities of Incentive Taxation."

DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 736) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District of Columbia during 1947, which was, on page 1, line 7, after "District", to insert "and those in neighboring counties who may be affected."

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion submitted by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to recommit the bill, with instructions.

Mr. HOLLAND. I 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'Conor
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Daniel
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Overton
Brewster	Hoey	Pepper
Bricker	Holland	Reed
Bridges	Ives	Revercomb
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	Kem	Russell
Butler	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Byrd	Knowland	Smith
Cain	Langer	Sparkman
Capper	Lodge	Stewart
Chavez	Lucas	Taft
Connally	McCarran	Taylor
Cooper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McFarland	Thye
Donnell	McGrath	Tobey
Downey	McKellar	Tydings
Dworshak	McMahon	Umstead
Eastland	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ecton	Malone	Watkins
Ellender	Martin	Wherry
Ferguson	Maybank	White
Flanders	Millikin	Wiley
Fulbright	Moore	Williams
George	Morse	Wilson
Gurney	Murray	
Hatch	Myers	

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

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to recommit the bill with instructions.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I commend the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to recommit the pending bill to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with instructions that the bill be divided into several parts. That is the position which was taken in the committee by the able Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and I doubt that any Senator on this floor will claim the knowledge and experience on the subject of labor-management relations which has been had by the two Senators who have committed themselves to the point of view indicated in the motion, namely, that instead of having one bill on this subject, there should be four bills into which the subject should be divided.

I am sure the Senate has been impressed by what was earlier said upon this floor by the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], that, in the committee of 13 Senators, 9 expressed the view that there should not be presented to the President one bill upon this complicated subject, but four bills, that that was not only the logical way to approach the subject, but, as I said, was the sentiment of 9 of the 13 Members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. President, it is known that the committee consists of eight Republicans and five Democrats. That means that not only the five Democrats, but that four Republicans, as well, expressed themselves in the committee as believing that four bills would be a better approach to this subject, a better way of securing some legislation on the subject, than one bill.

The able Senator from Vermont has pointed out also that it was only after the chairman of the committee, the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], referred the matter to the Republican caucus, that enough committee members belonging to the Republican Party, out of deference to the vote of that party in caucus, changed their votes in the committee to report to the Senate one bill instead of four bills on this subject.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think the statement of the Senator from Florida requires a word or two from me at this point. When the question had been referred to the Republican conference, the situation then became immediately different from what it was before the question was referred. I was the member of the committee who made the original suggestion that the bill be divided into parts. I made the suggestion sincerely. I made it because any big, complex bill, dealing with questions as we are dealing with them here, brings about misunderstanding, and I felt that if we could have one bill relating to amendments to the National Labor Relations Act, another bill relating to mediation, and another dealing with the subject in general terms, we would know exactly what we were talking about; would not become confused, and the people would not be confused. That was the suggestion made. The chairman said, "Well, let us proceed with the omnibus bill, and then settle that question later." But, Mr. President, after a party conference has been held and sides have been taken on a party question, and it therefore becomes a party question, it seemed to me that it would be wrong to come out against the theory of the party, because then we would spend our time discussing a parliamentary question on the floor of the Senate, instead of discussing labor legislation. I want the people of our country and I want Senators to know that we are dealing with labor legislation, and that practically every provision in this bill will change the theory of labor-industry relations as that theory has evolved in the last 10 or 15 years, and I hope and trust that we can debate this question on the basis of industry-labor relations and not find ourselves in a situation where we will vote because of some parliamentary arrangement. I think the people should be told exactly what the Congress is doing in regard to labor. I say that for the benefit of industry; I say that for the benefit of labor; and I say that for the benefit of the Congress itself. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, it was suggested in committee, and I think I am accurate in the categories that I enumerate, that the subject should be broken logically into four categories or into four titles; one bill, amending the Wagner Act; another bill, providing for some improvement in the Mediation and Conciliation Service; a third bill, authorizing suits against and by labor unions in the courts; and a fourth bill, providing for a joint commission to make a thorough study of the whole subject of labor-management relations.

The able Senator from New York, who comes with wide experience in this field—and, may I add, who brings to this subject a nonpartisan point of view—was the one who insisted that that was the logical and practical approach to this problem which should be made by the Congress.

It was obvious, Mr. President, that from a political point of view, from a point of view of affording the better basis for an agreement between the Executive and the Congress, it was also the desirable approach to the subject.

As the able Senator from Utah has just said, this legislation will change almost totally the concept of labor-management relations, and the concept of Government-labor relations, which this Nation has written into law and observed for over a decade. Legislation so complex as that, having such far reach and import as that legislation, obviously Mr. President, affords a wide basis for disagreement between the Executive and the Congress.

While the able Senator from New York disclaims, and I am sure he did not have in mind, any political purpose of any character in making his proposal, undoubtedly it would be far more probable that the Executive and the Congress could get together upon some kind of legislation if it were presented to the Executive by the Congress in the form of four bills, rather than being presented to the Senate in the form of a single comprehensive bill, with respect to which it is unlikely that there can be total agreement between the Executive and the Congress.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just one question?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. It apparently is the sense of the House of Representatives that this entire subject-matter should be included in one bill, and it is apparently the sense of the Senate, up until now, that it ought to be included in one bill. Under those circumstances and in the light of what the Senator has just said, is it not highly possible that under the partnership the President announced shortly after the election, he would be willing to receive the bill in that form and work with it on that basis?

Mr. PEPPER. I have no right to speak for the President or to prognosticate what his opinion will be. The able Senator went a little bit afield, however, in saying that so far it has been the opinion of the Senate. It actually became the opinion of the Republican conference that there should be one bill; contrary to the expressed sentiment in the committee of nine members, including four Republican members, that it would be better to divide this subject logically into four separate bills.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Can the Senator advise us what arguments were made that prevailed upon our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to adopt that policy?

Mr. PEPPER. I can only, as the dearly beloved Will Rogers used to say, tell what I read in the papers; but it appeared in the papers that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—and I mentioned the matter here while the Senator was on the floor this afternoon, or I should not mention it now—that he stated in the Republican conference he thought there should be laid on the President's doorstep a single bill, and that the President should have to veto it in toto or accept it in toto. There was a suggestion that political considerations and values had entered into the decision on the subject. Now, whether that was true or not, I cannot say.

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

Mr. PEPPER. Just a moment, please. At least, it was stated that it was the affirmative view of the chairman of the committee that the President should have the whole subject dumped on his doorstep in one package, and have to reject or accept it all in toto.

Mr. McMAHON and Mr. SMITH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield, first, to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Frankly, I have not seen it in the papers. Could the Senator spell out for us what the political reasoning was, so that the people of the United States might know? What kind of political scheme is on foot?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am not attributing to anybody political motives or a political scheme. But Senators recognize that——

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

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will let me finish this sentence, I shall be glad to yield. We all know as a practical matter that there is a large difference of opinion in this whole field. We all know that, if this complicated subject is put into one bill and thrust upon the President, it is a very difficult task for him to bring himself into an assured accord with the Congress upon such momentous legislation, touching so many different subjects, all contained in

one bill. There is a greater likelihood of disagreement if so many subjects are enumerated in one bill, than if the subjects are divided up into four bills, wherein there would be a greater probability of accord between the Executive and the Congress upon one or more of those four bills.

Also, we might as well take cognizance of the fact that, if the President should veto the legislation, there will be many people who will make political charges that he is not in favor of any legislation, with a view to prejudicing the view of that segment of the country's opinion which feels that there should be some legislation. So, it is undoubtedly the kind of thing that is calculated to be the subject of political appeal, if not the basis of political capital. I think it is also less likely to create any legislation, than would be the policy suggested by the Senator from New York, approved by the Senator from Oregon, and contemplated by his motion to recommit, and which was the expressed committee sentiment of 9 members out of a committee of 13, before the chairman of the committee saw fit to refer the matter to the Republican conference. I now yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator. I think possibly I can clarify some of the points that he has raised. I was one of those, as the Senator, I think, knows, who favored a two- or three-bill approach. Personally, I felt that was the right way to deal with this matter, and I so expressed myself in our group. We do not have caucuses in our party; we discuss these various problems without committing anybody on the results.

The chairman of the committee said that he could report two or three bills, or that he could report one bill. Nothing was said about the position into which it would put the President, or anybody else. Politics was not discussed. The question was merely one of the easy way to handle it. We were aware of the fact that the House was going to pass one bill. Should we pass one bill, have a conference with the House, and adjust the differences between the House and Senate versions, or should we pass three or four bills, and cause possibly endless confusion? I thought, as my good friend the Senator from Oregon stated, we could have done that. It is a matter of reasonable judgment as to which is the most expeditious way to proceed, and it seemed to be the judgment of most of my colleagues that the one-bill approach was the best approach. I said it was contrary to my judgment, but that being the judgment of my colleagues I would vote for one bill, which I did. I am going to oppose the motion made today by the Senator from Oregon because, although originally I was in favor of his position I think that now is not the time to bring it up. So I am going to oppose his motion to recommit the bill. In committee we decided that matter. We decided on the one-bill approach. I am supporting the chairman of the committee in that matter.

Mr. President, I wish to take issue with the implication that there was any politics in our approach to the matter. There is no politics connected with it. So far as politics is concerned, there is just as much danger one way or the other. It would be very foolish to send to the President a bill which he would veto. I wish to make it perfectly clear that what we want to do is to decide upon a procedure which will enable a bill to be passed through both Houses of Congress in the most expeditious manner and go to the President. Then, when the time comes, if it does come, we can consider the question of a veto.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I know we all like to have the advice of the Senator from New Jersey to the effect that political considerations are never discussed in a Republican conference.

Mr. SMITH. I interrupt the Senator to say I did not say that. I said that on this particular occasion we did not place the matter on any political basis. It was placed on the basis of the best and the easiest way for the chairman of our committee to present this matter on the floor of the Senate—whether in the form of three or four bills or one single bill.

If it is desired to have any fun out of this subject by bringing in the question of politics, I am very happy to suggest that once in a while from some of the Members of the Senate on the other side of the aisle we are given a few political suggestions, and I might suggest that on this occasion the Senator from Florida is trying to put politics in where there is no politics.

Mr. PEPPER. I will say that it would be most natural for the Senator from Florida to suggest that there is politics in this matter.

Mr. SMITH. I can understand how easy it is for the Senator from Florida to see an Ethiopian in the wood pile, and all that sort of thing, so I am not at all surprised at what he has stated in this case.

Mr. PEPPER. I will say, Mr. President, that it is easy to see the Ethiopian in the wood pile, especially when he sits up on top of it.

Mr. SMITH. I am delighted to have this little exchange of fun. I always enjoy a discussion with the Senator from Florida because of his good nature and his humor; and his witty sallies are impressive to me, and, I am sure, to the occupants of the galleries.

Mr. PEPPER. The presence of the Senator from New Jersey always affords pleasure to me when I am speaking. It is a great satisfaction to be able to serve in the Senate with a gentleman so able and gracious as the junior Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator from Florida.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Many months ago I became concerned about the possibility of the election of a Republican Congress. That was not simply because I belonged to the opposite party; it was because some study of the history of the country had convinced me beyond any shadow of a doubt that whenever we had a Congress of one political complexion and an executive of another, the country suffered regardless of whether the President was Republican or Democratic. I predicted that if such a situation arose there could easily exist in the Eightieth Congress a stalemate between the Executive and the Congress which would result to the damage of the country. Anticipating the very situation which has arisen here today and the discussion which has taken place, on the 23d of this month I placed in the RECORD an article written by Mr. Roscoe Drummond, of the Christian Science Monitor, and if the Senator will yield further, I will quote just a little from that article as to what one nonpolitical observer thinks about this identical situation; and he pays his respects, I must say, to both our parties, the Republicans and the Democrats. He said:

> Events are pointing to a deadlock between Congress and the President over labor legislation.
>
> There still is an opportunity to avert this deadlock, but so far neither side is showing any disposition to take advantage of that opportunity.

Then I skip quite a bit and read further:

> A new labor law is needed. There is no doubt about that. The President wants one kind of labor law; Congress wants a different kind. Because the Presidency and the Congress are in divided hands, it is imperative that a real effort be made by Mr. Truman and the Republican leaders to work out the widest possible area of agreement between them.
>
> Thus far, there is every evidence that 1948 campaign politics is playing a dangerous part in the strategy of both sides.
>
> Here's the way some of the Republican politicians figure it: Pass an omnibus labor bill; make it as stringent as possible. Put everything into it, including what the President would welcome and what he is most likely to veto. Some would welcome a veto, and since there probably are not enough votes in the Senate to override the veto, let Mr. Truman take the blame for no legislation and keep the issue hot for 1948.

Now I must also give the other side. Mr. Drummond continues:

> And some of the Democratic politicians see it this way: The Democratic Party needs labor support. It may not be able to win with labor backing next year, but it certainly can't win without it. Therefore, Mr. Truman will be serving his political interests by having no consultation with the Republican leaders on labor legislation. Do nothing to discourage the most extreme bill and then veto it and stand as labor's champion.
>
> This just isn't good enough. The Republican leaders can ignore the President by deliberately throwing everything into the labor bill but the kitchen sink. Such an attitude risks any labor bill.
>
> The President can ignore the Republican Congress by not calling its leaders into consultation before it's too late. By holding back his own views, he will be deliberately courting a labor bill of a kind he can veto—and the Nation will be the loser.
>
> A dangerous legislative stalemate can be averted if Mr. Truman and the Republican leaders are prepared to adjourn 1948 politics until 1948.

I want to add, Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, that I am in thorough accord with what Mr. Drummond has so effectively written.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator.

Mr. President, I, of course, do not know what the President might do with respect

to this legislation, if it is passed. But it was stated in the minority report by three of the Democratic members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the senior Senator from Florida:

President Truman and the people are aware that our present problem is one of swollen prices and high profits. One marvels at the audacity of those who, drawing to themselves an ever-increasing share of the Nation's wealth, successful with the help of congressional allies in liquidating many of the popular protections against extortion, now call for another "Battle of the Bulge" against workers' last and best protection—their trade-unions. In the name of "fairness" many of them would give more to those who have and less to those who have not; in the name of "equality" they would increase maldistribution of wealth; masquerading as protesters against monopoly they would weaken the remaining barrier to concentration of industrial power. Enough of their position is included in this bill to make it but one further example of a determination to resurrect those mistakes of 1920–29 which led inevitably to the horrors of 1929–33.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I want to add another brief comment to the discussion which has already taken place with regard to the omnibus versus the separate bill approach. I think it is very difficult for any of us to say to what extent, if any, anyone has been influenced in his vote in committee on this matter because of political strategy. Certainly my good friend the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is one whom I know, because of my close friendship with him, does not move on the level of political strategy. I think the Senator from Florida is quite right when he points out that the Senator from New Jersey takes a fine nonpartisan approach to these matters. I think it is perfectly obvious, however, that at the particular Republican conference meeting to which he refers there was a considerable amount of discussion as to the political effects of an omnibus bill; especially was there discussion with regard to a veto possibility if we passed such a bill. We discussed the chances we might have to override a veto, and what the consequences would be if we did or did not.

However, I think that is quite beside the point. I think the job ahead of us in the Senate is to pass fair and reasonable labor legislation. My heart is so set on the four main titles of the bill before us that I think it is of the utmost importance that we get all of them, or each one of them, or as many of them as we can, passed. I think any one standing alone would be a great contribution to industrial stabilization. That is why I have been so insistent on at least trying to approach the question from a separate bill standpoint. That is why I have made my motion. I am interested in trying to get the Senate, if it will, to follow the separate bill approach. If my motion is adopted, the effect will be that all four bills will be pending before the Senate at one and the same time, but we shall vote on them separately. We shall be discussing them interchangeably. But we shall have the opportunity, it seems to me, of getting through some legislation which the President may not veto. I would vote to override his veto on any one of these titles. However, I think we can almost take judicial notice of the fact that some of the titles will be amended in a way which, in all probability, will bring forth a veto. If that happens, I think there is great danger that we shall have no legislation at all as the result of all of our work, and I think that would be playing politics with the people's interests, so far as labor legislation is concerned. I do not want to be a party to that type of strategy.

I have only one further suggestion, and then I shall substitute certain language for the motion which I have already made. I recognize the shortcomings of the suggestion I am about to make. Nevertheless I wish to point out that we are dealing with a subject matter in which, after all, mediation ought to be the predominant characteristic of our negotiations. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] has pointed out very clearly the political situation in which we find ourselves. We are in a situation in which the Executive is under one party and the Congress under another. I do not think we would violate any prerogatives of the Senate or of the Executive if as reasonable men we should advise and consult with the President. We are not enemies. We are all trying to do the best job for the American people in accordance with our sights and our consciences. So is the President. He is a fair-minded man devoted to the public interest just as we think we are. I hope we can at least meet the definition of fair-minded and reasonable men. I think the time has come when our leaders, in a bipartisan committee, ought to sit down with the President and say, "Mr. President, you have been in the Senate. You see the parliamentary situation which confronts us. We want to advise and consult with you as to how we can work out an arrangement which will result in the most constructive labor legislation that can be both passed and signed."

I may be quite mistaken, but it strikes me that in a situation such as the one in which we find ourselves that is the way public servants in both branches of Congress ought to act. I sincerely hope that the leaders in both parties in the Senate will follow some such course of action, because I believe that Harry Truman will advise with us in such a spirit as I have suggested.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question, which he can answer as a result of his wide knowledge of the subject and his experience in these questions. Would the Senator say that the pending bill, taken as a whole, is more severe or less severe against labor than the Case bill, which the President vetoed during the last session?

Mr. MORSE. I think it is less severe against labor.

Mr. President, when I made my motion earlier this afternoon I really was in the midst of a discussion with my good friend the Parliamentarian as to the proper procedure for me to follow in trying to secure a vote on separate titles of this bill. The issue was raised on the floor before I had time to resort to the Senate rule book. I am very much surprised that I made a motion that was within the rules prior to the conclusion of my consultation with the Parliamentarian. I think the Chair gave me the benefit of the doubt in his ruling by amending my motion as being in conformity with the spirit and intent of the rule on recommital.

In order to make the motion perfectly clear, I ask to have the following substituted for the language previously used:

I move that the pending bill, Senate bill 1126, be recommitted to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with instructions to report the same back to the Senate on or before May 2, 1947, with the following recommendations:

(a) Strike out all after line 6, on page 40, down to and including line 2 on page 58, being titles II, III, and IV; and

(b) Report titles II, III, and IV as separate bills.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion will be entered in the form just read. That is the form which the Chair assumed the Senator was undertaking to propose when the Chair originally entertained the motion.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am not sure that I made myself clear to the Senator from Oregon. It is my observation—and I think it is the consensus—that this bill, with the injunction which is allowed, and many other aspects of it, is more severe than the Case bill, which was before the Congress at the last session. Possibly the Senator from Oregon had in mind the total legislation before that session, including the possibility of drafting labor, which, of course, is not in this legislation.

A little while ago I quoted the following language from the minority views:

President Truman and the people are aware that our present problem is one of swollen prices and high profits. One marvels at the audacity of those who, drawing to themselves an ever-increasing share of the Nation's wealth, successful with the help of congressional allies in liquidating many of the popular protections against extortion, now call for another "Battle of the Bulge" against workers' last and best protection—their trade-unions. In the name of fairness many of them would give more to those who have and less to those who have not; in the name of equality they would increase maldistribution of wealth, masquerading as protesters against monopoly; they would weaken the remaining barrier to concentration of industrial power. Enough of their position is included in this bill to make it but one further example of a determination to resurrect those mistakes of 1920–29 which led inevitably to the horrors of 1929–33.

I am not basing my conclusion only upon what we said there. Governor Stassen, of Minnesota, expressed substantially the same fear before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, namely, that, if this Congress passes legislation which is so restrictive of the power of labor unions, which so impairs the power of collective bargaining, that the wages of workers in this country are cut so that their share of the national

income is reduced in relation to other income groups, the blow will fall not only upon labor, but upon the whole economy. Therefore, in protesting against this legislation, I believe I do so not only at the instance of labor, and for its protection, but also for the protection of the strength and virility of the whole national economy.

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

Mr. PEPPER. Let me complete this thought.

I mean to say that in my opinion this drastic antilabor legislation strikes not only at the rights of labor, not only at the wage scale of the workers of America, not only at the living conditions of the people who are the workers of America, not only at the purchasing power of our workers, but strikes a major blow, as did the same policy in the early 1920's, at the whole prosperity of the American economy. It strikes at the employer as well as the employee. It strikes at the farmer as well as the worker. It strikes at every aspect of the American economy. A similar policy followed by the Government after World War I accomplished the same purpose, as Governor Stassen stated.

I now yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I appreciate the oratory of the able Senator from Florida, but I cannot find anything in the bill which justifies his conclusions. There is nothing in the bill that would cut the wages of wage earners. There is nothing in the bill which would do any of the dire things to which the Senator refers.

Mr. PEPPER. There is nothing in the bill except a series of provisions the net effect of which would be practically to destroy the power of collective bargaining now maintained by the labor unions. I believe it is the judgment of moderate men in the labor movement, with many of whom I have talked, men whose names are associated with reasonableness, fairness, and moderation in the conduct of union affairs, that the effect of the bill—especially as I dare say it will be when it is augmented by amendments such as that now pending and others like them to be proposed—will be to hamstring the labor unions so that they cannot effectively preserve the principle of collective bargaining for the workers. When we break the power of a labor union to protect workers in collective bargaining, it means inevitably that the employer will beat down the wages of the workers.

That means that their purchasing power will be diminished, that the whole economy will suffer because they cannot buy the products of our factories, the produce of our farms, and the services which are made available by the people of this country. I wish it very clearly understood that neither the President nor the minority of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was opposing national labor legislation. In our report we emphasized what the President recommended to the Congress. Senators will recall that when the President's message was delivered to a joint session of the Congress, the opinion throughout the country was that it was a reasonable, fair, well-balanced executive proposal. He said, in effect:

> There are two things we must do. One, we must enact certain labor legislation. Two, we must enact certain legislation to protect the small businessman from monopolies which are getting into their hands the economic power of this country.

Almost universally the press in this country approved the reasonableness, the impartiality, and the fairness of the approach which the President made to the subject.

We stated in our report:

> The President outlined certain immediate steps to be taken: (a) Legislation to prevent jurisdictional strikes intended to compel employers to bargain with a minority union instead of the majority union in their plants; (b) legislation to provide for peaceful and binding determinations of jurisdictional disputes over which union is entitled to perform a particular work task; (c) legislation to prohibit secondary boycotts when used to further jurisdictional disputes or to compel employers to violate the National Labor Relations Act; and (d) legislation to provide for final and binding arbitration of disputes concerning the interpretation of the terms of collective-bargaining agreements.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I think that for the benefit of the RECORD it might be well, since the Senator from Florida has reported what the President recommended, for us to catalog, in a way which will make it possible, I think, for any person to answer the question which has been asked as to whether the bill which has been reported is stronger or weaker than the Case bill which the President vetoed.

In addition to the President's recommendations we have the question of industry-wide bargaining to consider. The Senate bill is milder and, therefore, better than the House bill in that regard. Industry-wide bargaining is still permitted, but it is restricted. The closed shop is prohibited. Union-shop contracts are limited. Injunctions to delay big strikes are authorized. That is an invitation to the whole injunctive process which brought forth the Norris-LaGuardia Act to try to cure the evils. The President says nothing about the conciliation service. A wholly new agency is created. The National Labor Relations Board is enlarged under the House bill, and a new board is provided for. Jurisdictional strikes are made unfair labor practices. Secondary boycotts, in accordance with the President's recommendations, are made unfair labor practices. The check-off of union dues is permitted under the Senate bill. Damage suits against unions are authorized. Unfair practices of unions are regulated. Union financial reports are required. Nothing is said in the Senate bill with reference to Communists, but in the House bill, which will have to be considered in conference, there is an entirely new idea, namely, that Communists in union offices are barred.

Mr. President, when it is realized how all-inclusive and how far-reaching is this legislation—we have reached out into many new fields—I think the point being made by the Senator from Florida is an extremely important point.

Mr. PEPPER. Did the Senator include in the catalog which he gave the provisions in the bill denying supervisory employees the right to organize themselves into collective-bargaining units which they enjoy under the present law and which is not included in the President's recommendations?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; I did not mention that, Mr. President, because, as the bill was reported, the supervisory provision is entirely satisfactory and is in agreement with the view of a majority of the committee. It is not the original idea, which would have made it impossible for supervisors in any industry to have become affiliated with unions.

Mr. PEPPER. But it is a subject in addition to those mentioned by the President in his message.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Am I to imply that because of the list or catalog of comparisons between the Case bill and the bill now before the Senate, read by the Senator from Utah, the Senator from Florida reaches the conclusion that the present bill is more drastic than the Case bill?

Mr. PEPPER. That is my opinion, after including all aspects of it.

Mr. MORSE. I would simply suggest to the Senator from Florida that wherein we differ is on this very vital point. I think that many of the things sought to be regulated in the Case bill, involving union abuses, should be regulated; but the real test as to whether we are violating union rights and legitimate labor rights, it seems to me, is the procedure by which we seek to regulate them. It seems to me that the procedure which we have in the bill now pending before the Senate is so fair and reasonable that the legitimate rights of labor are protected, and the abuse of them is checked, whereas, under the Case bill, if the Senator will reread it, he will see that the procedure developed in it would put all these problems before the common law courts of the United States, where they would be settled by the judges in America. Then there would be reestablished all the abuses which arose, I think, prior to the Norris-LaGuardia Act, by means of the injunctive processes. But we do not have the evils of government by injunction under the procedure provided in the present bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Let me ask the Senator from Oregon a further question. Suppose the amendment now proposed and the three other amendments evidently contemplated by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] were to be added to the Senate bill. What would be the opinion of the Senator from Oregon as to such a bill in such form, as compared with the Case bill which the President vetoed last year?

Mr. MORSE. My reply to the Senator is that he is asking me to pass a valued judgment that basically entails subjec-

tive values. He is asking me to make a choice between the qualities of two bills and is asking me to judge them on the basis of a subjective test as to which bill I think is most drastic. I have judged too many horses at horse shows to run into the error in answering the Senator's question of trying to justify a subjective value judgment. It is always difficult to explain why you put a blue ribbon on one horse and send another one to the gate. Hence, I prefer to answer the Senator's question this way:

I am satisfied that if the pending Senate bill is amended by adding to it the four amendments which are being proposed by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] we then truly will have a horse of a different color in the form of legislation which I shall have to vote against; and in the form of legislation that if vetoed I would vote to sustain the veto.

Last year I voted against the Case bill and I would vote against it again because I think it was too drastic and I think the procedure it proposed for carrying out its objectives would have caused great labor trouble in this country. If the bill now pending before the Senate is amended by adding to it the four pending amendments or similar amendments which, in my opinion, are equally undesirable, I shall have no hesitancy in saying that it is too drastic and not workable.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

I was giving what the President had recommended in order to show that the President was not taking the position that there should be no legislation; and neither was the minority of the committee taking that position. On the contrary, as shown beginning on page 40 of the report signed by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the senior Senator from Florida, we were prepared to go even beyond what the President had recommended. I read from page 40:

We agree, with the qualifications noted, that there should be machinery for procuring adherence to contracts as attempted by sections 8 (a) (6) and 8 (b) (5). We agree that it should be made an unfair labor practice for a union to interfere with an employer in the designation of his representatives, as provided by section 8 (b) (1).

We agree with our colleagues that "jurisdictional strikes" or "boycotts" should be limited. We believe, however, that as the President recommended, these terms should be carefully and narrowly defined. This has not been done in the majority bill. We approve of the provisions of the bill which treat them as unfair labor practices, subject to cease-and-desist order of the National Labor Relations Board, but we cannot agree with the mandatory preliminary injunction proceeding against such activities which this bill provides. We agree with the excellent protection of the right of free speech accorded by section 8 (c), and, except for the qualifications that we have noted with respect to the cooling-off provisions, with the definition of collective bargaining contained in section 8 (d).

The majority of the committee has spelled out desirable grievance procedures in section 9 (a). We concur with the grant of the right of employers' petition in section 9 (c) (1) (B), and with the revised run-off procedure under section 9 (c) (3).

We think the clarification of relations between the Federal and State boards contemplated under section 10 (a) a wise solution to a complex problem.

We are convinced that the National Labor Relations Board should have a limited access to the courts for temporary injunctions of the kind contemplated under section 10 (j), (k), and (l) but feel this should be limited to cases involving strikes against Board certifications. We commend the majority for establishing by statute the national labor-management panel provided under section 205 (a). We have not discussed these wholesome provisions at greater length since we assume they will be dealt with in the majority report.

So, Mr. President, I wish to make it clear that neither was the President taking the position that there were not things which should be the subject of legislation, nor was the minority of the committee taking such a position. But we feel that this bill, as proposed—and all the more so if to it is added the amendment now pending, as offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], or the other amendments which they propose to add—will have the effect of so strangling the privilege of collective bargaining for the American working people that it will condemn the American economy to another depression, just as a similar policy did after World War I.

Mr. President, I have before me a letter which I should like to submit for the RECORD. It bears numerous appended signatures. The letter comes from Amherst, Mass., and it is signed by Colston E. Warne, as secretary for the signers. I wish to read several paragraphs of the letter:

We, the undersigned, regret the decision you and your colleagues on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare have made to proceed at once to hearings on specific proposals for labor legislation. We had hoped that instead you would support the recommendation made by President Truman that a joint commission be established to make a thorough investigation of the underlying causes of labor-management disputes before the passage of any long-range legislation which might fundamentally alter the structure of labor-management relations in this country.

* * * * *

We strongly oppose any legislation which attempts to wipe out the gains made in the last decade granting the workers a somewhat more equal bargaining position with industry, and which proposes now to place workers economically at the mercy of their employers. We hope that your committee will realize that only a forward-looking approach to the problems of labor-management relations can lead to any real solution and prevent reprisals against workers which will endanger all democratic rights.

Mr. President, to that letter are appended the signatures of 150 outstanding men and women in various colleges and universities of the United States. They have given, in that manner, the views which I have just indicated by the passage I have read. I send the letter, together with the signatures, to the desk and ask that it be incorporated at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'CONOR in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it was not accidentally that the President incorporated in his message the recommendation that we deal with monopoly in America at the present time. In every statement of the subject it is affirmed that today monopoly is at an all-time peak in the American economy, and that today prices and profits are higher than they have ever been before. Not only that, but in the year 1946, in the fourth quarter, 625 companies earned $950,000,000, or about twice their earning rate during the war years. These figures come from the latest Federal Reserve bulletin. We find that the total corporate profits in 1946 were $12,000,000,000 as compared with $9,000,000,000 in the war years.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand an advertisement by the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. It is a full-page advertisement, and it was published in the Washington Post of April 27, 1947. The advertisement gives to the public some information regarding the affairs of that company. I read the following from it:

Net earnings accruing to the interest of Jersey shareholders represent a return of 11.12 percent on average net worth, or 10.80 percent on total income of the company and its affiliates. Such consolidated earnings for 1946 came to $6.50 per share of outstanding stock, a total of $177,610,000. Net income for the parent company was $3.83 per share, a total of $104,770,000. Dividends of $3 per share were paid by the company during 1946.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand an editorial published in the Dallas Craftsman, the issue of February 21, 1947. It is published in Dallas, Tex. I refer to the editorial because it is a fairly good summary of the profit situation. From it I read the following:

EVERYBODY BUT WORKERS DID BETTER LAST YEAR; MAGAZINES REVEAL HOW BUSINESS PROFITS ZOOMED

New evidence that almost every element in the Nation's economy did better in 1946 than in 1945—except the Nation's workers—was carried this week in two leading magazines, Time and Newsweek.

Neither magazine is friendly to labor, but, as a matter of news, the editors couldn't ignore the plain fact that, while profits set all-time records, labor's share of the national income declined.

A particularly significant summary was published in Newsweek, based upon official Government figures. It showed that aggregate wages and salaries paid to workers slumped from $114,500,000,000 in 1945 to $109,000,000,000 in 1946.

On the other hand, corporation profits, Newsweek pointed out, shot up 25 percent—from $9,000,000,000 in 1945 to $12,000,000,000 in 1946, the highest in history.

Also, over-all profits of individual business owners rose from $13,100,000,000 to $15,000,000,000, and of farm owners from $12,500,000,000 to $15,000,000,000. On top of that, interest and rent payments during the year took a sizable rise—from $11,800,000,000 to $13,000,000,000.

No wonder that Newsweek headed its account, "Profits—A Year of Feast."

Time devoted most of its roundup to corporation profits and it confirmed what Labor—

Referring to the publication Labor—reported last week—namely, that strikes in 1946 failed to make a dent in the fabulous earnings of industry. Labor's story then was based on an article carried in still another magazine, Business Week.

Substantiating that report, Time declared "United States industry found that, despite strikes, shortages, and controls in 1946, actual profits lived up to the great expectations."

Among examples, Time cited the fact that the steel industry "turned in some boxcar profit figures." Net earnings of the United States Steel Corp. jumped 50 percent, Time said, adding that "strikes hurt Big Steel less than expected."

The oil industry "had its best year in over a decade," with profits 25 percent larger than 1945, and with 1947 earnings, according to Time, slated to be "another 15 percent better."

Consumer industries—those making food and household products—likewise prospered. "In the last quarter many cashed in heavily on OPA's death," the magazine explained frankly.

"Typical was Procter & Gamble," the article pointed out. "For the 6 months ending December 31 it netted $16,300,341, versus $9,-456,033 for the same period of 1945, and P. & G. also laid aside $14,500,000 to take care of any inventory loss if prices dropped."

Even the "troubled railroads, overwhelmed by rising costs and falling traffic, did not do as badly as they had dourly predicted," the magazine added. It cited the fact that most of the roads reporting "were in the black."

The Association of American Railroads followed up with later data which showed that the final profits of class I carriers—"after interest, rentals, and taxes"—reached $287,-000,000. That was a substantial drop from the $447,384,678 netted in 1945, but still far from "red ink."

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield right there for a brief statement, which I know he would like to have in the RECORD?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. Does the Senator realize that the Pennsylvania Railroad, in making its annual report, which I put into the RECORD, showed they were in the red for the first time in 100 years? So certainly all the railroads did not profit commensurately with what the Senator is saying. I just wanted to bring out that fact.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator. The figures I am reading are over-all figures.

Mr. HAWKES. I understand that.

Mr. PEPPER. The statement continues:

And in 1947, as a result of higher freight rates granted by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the railroads are expected to do much better.

Meanwhile, individual corporation reports, coming through from day to day, underline the fact that 1946 was a bonanza year. Among outstanding ones of the week were: American Woolen Co., with profits of $20,-098,176, as against $8,301,140 in the previous year; United States Rubber Co., with $23,-207,941, almost double the 1945 figure of $13,-024,778, and National Steel Corp., with $20,-461,551, compared with $11,117,764 in 1945.

It is perfectly apparent, therefore, Mr. President, that there is already a decline, and I shall be able later to substantiate that statement further, in the working people's share of the national income, even under the labor legislation presently on the statute books. It is my belief, and it is the opinion of many men wiser than I, that, if we adopt legislation of the drastic character of the proposal before us, it will so impair the collective-bargaining power of the workers that there will be an acceleration in the decline of workers' wages, which will impair not only the living standards of the American workingman and his family but the whole economy of the American people, who enjoy the highest prosperity they have had in all our history.

Mr. President, I doubt if I shall conclude shortly, and if the Senator from Maine would like to have the Senate recess until tomorrow, and will permit me to resume when we reconvene, I should be pleased.

Mr. WHITE. Is the Senator about to conclude?

Mr. PEPPER. I cannot give the Senator that much encouragement.

EXHIBIT A

AMHERST, MASS., *March 1, 1947.*

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PEPPER: We, the undersigned, regret the decision you and your colleagues on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare have made to proceed at once to hearings on specific proposals for labor legislation. We had hoped that, instead, you would support the recommendation made by President Truman that a joint commission be established to make a thorough investigation of the underlying causes of labor-management disputes before the passage of any long-range legislation which might fundamentally alter the structure of labor-management relations in this country.

We write you as a group of economists, political scientists, and other educators, who have taken a keen interest in the problem of labor-management relations. We are convinced that no adequate solution to the problems of industrial unrest, which has disturbed the Nation's economic life since the end of the war, will be forthcoming except as the result of a careful, patient investigation of the present structure of collective bargaining, the problems on which it is most difficult to reach agreement in negotiations, and the present operation of the Wagner Act.

We are glad that your committee has announced a comprehensive and lengthy schedule of hearings. We do not believe, however, that committee hearings, valuable as they are as a forum for the expression of public opinion, can produce the objective record of factual material which is needed at the present time. Your committee hearings, as scheduled, must necessarily take place against a background of pending wage negotiations between several major industries and the unions representing their workers, and cannot help reflecting the pressures arising from this situation. Furthermore, the testimony heard will be directed at the bills under consideration by your committee and many of them seem to us to be punitive legislation designed to destroy many successful collective-bargaining practices and to jeopardize the rights of workers rather than to find solutions to existing problems.

We strongly oppose any legislation which attempts to wipe out the gains made in the last decade granting the workers a somewhat more equal bargaining position with industry, and which propose now to place workers economically at the mercy of their employers. We hope that your committee will realize that only a forward-looking approach to the problems of labor-management relations can lead to any real solution and prevent reprisals against workers which will endanger all democratic rights.

Sincerely,

COLSTON E. WARNE,
Secretary for the Signers.

FEBRUARY 28, 1947.

LIST OF SIGNERS

John H. Angell, Eureka College, Eureka, Ill.; Kurt Anderson, 5926 Kensington Road, Detroit, Mich.; George B. L. Arner, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.; Roscoe Lewis Ashley, Pasadena Junior College, Pasadena, Calif.; Elizabeth F. Baker, Barnard College, New York, N. Y.; Thomas S. Barclay, Stanford University, Calif.; D. M. Beights, Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla.; A. D. Beittle, president, Talladega College, Talladega, Ala.; Ray Billington, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.; Arthur E. Bestor, Jr., Stanford University, Calif.; Boit L. Brannen, Rollins College, Winter Park, Fa.; Walter N. Breckinridge, Colby College, Waterville, Maine; George W. Briggs, Drew University, Madison, N. J.; Leland L. Briggs, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.; Samuel H. Brockunier, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.; Emily Brown, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; Esther Lucile Brown, Russell Sage Foundation, 130 East Twenty-second Street, New York, N. Y.; Frank J. Bruno, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.; E. Douglass Burdick, 440 Hare Laboratory, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.; Nathaniel Cantor, University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N. Y.; Valdemar Carlson, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio; Harry J. Carman, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Murray Carroll, Bates College, Lewiston, Maine; J. C. Chalmon, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.; Vell B. Chamberlin, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Ill.; Edwin L. Clarke, Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla.; Charles Cogen, Bronx High School of Science, New York, N. Y.

George S. Counts, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Grace L. Coyle, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio; Ryland W. Crary, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Earl C. Crockett, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.; Hartley W. Cross, Connecticut College, New London, Conn.; Merle Curti, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.; Clyde E. Dankert, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.; Harold W. Davey, Institute of Economic Affairs, New York University, New York, N. Y.; Paul E. Davies, McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.; W. M. DePoister, chairman, Department of Sociology, Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa.; Marjorie Dilley, Connecticut College, New London, Conn.; Conley H. Dillon, Marshall College, Huntington, W. Va.; Hedley S. Dimock, George Williams College, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. James L. Duffy, S. J., Holy Cross College, Worcester, Mass.; Foster Rhea Dulles, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio; Fred Eastman, Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.; Dr. Lucile Eaves, Simmons College, Boston, Mass.; Thomas D. Eliot, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.; Mabel A. Elliott, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.; Horace B. English, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio; Harold N. Faulkner, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.; Harry M. Fife, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.; R. D. Fleming, New York State Education Department, Albany, N. Y.; Caroll W. Ford, Babson Institute, Babson Park, Mass.; W. E. Fort, Jr., Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla.; Royal W. France, Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla.; Bertrand Fox, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.; Morris Friedberg (formerly at Simmons College, Boston, Mass.).

Philip L. Gamble, Massachusetts State College, Amherst, Mass.; C. G. Gaum, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.; S. Colum Gilfillan, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.; Mary Barnett Gilson, Webber College, Babson Park, Fla.; C. R. Glaves, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Ill.; Josephine Gleason, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; Everett W. Goodhue, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.; Willystine Goodsell, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Leland J. Gordon, Denison University, Granville, Ohio; Eleanor

H. Grady, dean of faculty, Hunter College, New York, N. Y.; William D. Gray, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.; G. C. Groat, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.; George C. Grosscup, Jr., University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.; Harold W. Guest, Baker University, Baldwin, Kans.; Charles B. Hagan, 316 Lincoln Hall, Urbana, Ill. (University of Illinois); Bernard F. Haley, Stanford University, California; Calvin S. Hall, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio; Alice Hamilton, M. D., Hadlyme, Conn.; George H. Hand, Fairmont State College, Fairmont, W. Va.; John E. Harding, Texas Tech, Lubbock, Tex.; Robert J. Harris, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, La.; Marion Hathway, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.; M. Gordon Hayes, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio; George Hedley, Mills College, Oakland, Calif.; John Hope II, Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn.; William S. Hopkins, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.; Everette N. Hong, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.; John Ise, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.

Leland H. Jenks, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.; Henry P. Jordan, Washington Square College, New York University, New York, N. Y.; Albert S. Keister, Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, Greensboro, N. C.; Noble H. Kelley, University of Louisville, Louisville, Ky.; Vera Reynolds Kilduff, New York State Department of Commerce, Albany, N. Y.; C. Wendell King, Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla.; Philip Klein, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Laurence S. Knappen, 2611 South Lynn Street, Arlington, Va. (formerly at Rutgers); Bruno Lasker, 64 Shelly Avenue, Yonkers, N. Y.; Arnold J. Lien, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.; Bert James Loewenberg, Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville, N. Y.; Philip Lohman, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.; H. L. Lurie, Council of Jewish Federations, 165 West Forty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y.; Gault W. Lynn, research economist, 935 Lee Drive, Menlo Park, Calif.; H. F. MacNair, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.; Flora L. Magoun, Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla.; Mabel Magee, Wells College, Aurora, N. Y.; Norman R. F. Maier, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.; Charles F. Marsh, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va.; James M. Matthews, Babson Institute, Babson Park, Mass.; Elwyn A. Mauck, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.; William D. Max, S. J. Tilden High School, Brooklyn, N. Y.; W. A. McConagha, Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis.; Douglas McGregor, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.; M. K. McKay, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.; E. B. McNatt, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.; Caroline G. Mercer, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; William Milcher, Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla.

Glenn W. Miller, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio; F. L. Mizl, Texas Institute of Technology, Lubbock, Tex.; J. D. Morgan, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.; Gardner Murphy, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y.; Evan B. Murray, Utah State Agricultural College, Logan, Utah; Otto Nathan, New York University, New York, N. Y.; Edward G. Nelson, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.; M. F. Nimkoff, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa.; Ruby Turner Norris, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; Audrey L. Packham, Rollins College, Winter Park., Fla.; Julian Park, University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N. Y.; Rev. Wilfrid Parsons, S. J., Catholic University, Washington, D. C.; James E. Pate, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va.; R. D. Patton, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio; Paul S. Pierce, 320 Knowles, Winter Park, Fla.; Frank C. Pierson, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.; J. S. Prentice, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.; C. Herman Pritchett, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.; Robert W. Rafuse, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.; H. H. Remmers, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.; Bernard Riesse, Hunter College, New York, N. Y.; Robert Rockafellow, Rhode Island State College, Kingston, R. I.; Eliot H. Rodnick, Clark University, Worcester, Mass.; William S. Schlauch, New York University, New York, N. Y.; Melvin J. Segal, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich.; Fred A. Shannon, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.; J. Whitney Shea, Houghton College, Houghton, N. Y.; John H. Sheehan, University of Notre Dame, South Bend, Ind.

Henry Wood Shelton, box 48, La Jolla, Calif.; Carl D. Smith, Wayne University, Detroit, Mich.; Harry W. Smith, Lewiston, Maine; Rhea Marsh Smith, Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla.; T. R. Solomon, Prairie View University, Hempstead, Tex.; Alice W. Spieseke, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Albion G. Taylor, William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va.; W. Bayard Taylor, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.; Ralph B. Tower, University of West Virginia, Morgantown, W. Va.; Royal S. Van de Woestyne, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.; Jacob Van der Tree, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa; T. W. Van Metre, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Eric A. Walker, Penn State College, State College, Pa.; Goodwin Watson, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Howard White, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio; Thomas F. Wieson, Texas Institute of Technology, Lubbock, Tex.; William J. Wilkinson, Colby College, Waterville, Maine; Walter F. Willcox, 3 South Avenue, Ithaca, N. Y.; Theresa Wolfson, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Florence M. Woodard, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.; Helen R. Wright, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.; Dallas M. Young, Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa.

Colston E. Warne, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass. (secretary for the group).

FREE COMMUNICATION PRIVILEGES TO PARTICIPANTS IN WORLD TELECOMMUNICATIONS CONFERENCES

Mr. WHITE. In the circumstances, Mr. President, before I make a motion to recess, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 102, Calendar No. 140.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 102) to permit United States common communications carriers to accord free communication privileges to official participants in the world telecommunications conferences to be held in the United States in 1947.

Mr. WHITE. Just a brief word of explanation. There are to be held in the United States this summer three international communications conferences, which will, in the aggregate, be of tremendous importance not only to the United States, but to the communication facilities of the United States. The first one will open May 15, the second will open July 1, or thereabouts, and the final one on August 1, or thereabouts.

It has long been the custom at these international conferences that there should be furnished free communication facilities for all those who are technically participants in the conferences. Senate Joint Resolution 102 does not require but would permit the communications companies, in accordance with precedent, to furnish the participants in the conferences free communication facilities. It will cost the United States nothing. It will be a great convenience to all the visiting delegates, and others who may come here from all over the world to attend the conferences. I very much hope the Senate will feel like passing the joint resolution at this time.

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

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That nothing in the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, or in any other provision of law shall be construed to prohibit United States communication common carriers from rendering free communication services to official participants in the world telecommunications conferences to be held in the United States in 1947, subject to such rules and regulations as the Federal Communications Commission may prescribe.

RECESS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if there is nothing further at this time, I move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask that when the Senate reconvenes tomorrow I may have the floor to resume my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida? The Chair hears none.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 29, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 28 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 4 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Richard D. Gatewood, of New York.
Douglas Jenkins, Jr., of South Carolina.
John D. Jernegan, of California.

J. Jefferson Jones 3d, of Tennessee, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen, United States Naval Reserve, to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 6th day of June 1947:

Robert A. Aiken	William E. Boisvert, Jr.
Julian L. Alexander, Jr.	Myron E. Bond
James B. Allen	Lee H. Boyd
Ray M. Allman	Carl J. Bradley
Mickelangelo Altieri	Charles C. Brisco, Jr.
Arthur H. Anderson	Elmer C. Broadwell
Frank A. Anderson	John R. Brown
Kenneth L. Baker	Kenmore McM. Brown
William E. Bardelmeier	Orval W. Buell
	Sidney M. Burnett
Frederick J. Bear, Jr.	Ossian R. Butterfield
Francis J. Beitzer	William A. Buttlar
Roy M. Bell	Robert D. Buzzard
Charles H. Black	Harold P. Cahill, Jr.
William Blanchard, Jr.	Donald D. Campbell

Robert V. Canosa, Jr.
Earle W. Carder, Jr.
Herbert W. Carr
Robert V. Cauchon
Joseph R. Childers
Frederic J. Clawson
Robert J. Cleary
Robert W. Cohan
Thomas A. Connor
Frederick D. Cook
Wayne H. Crawford, Jr.
Harold W. Crozier
John D. Cumalat
John E. Cummings
William E. Cunningham
William S. Currie
Richard J. Dermody
Richard A. Derus
Eugene A. Dieckert, Jr.
Joseph E. Dierkes
Donald L. Dondero
Robert M. Ducey
Harry B. Ellis
James E. Empting
David L. English
William Evans
James V. Farley, Jr.
Doc G. Faulkner, Jr.
Robert Fedor
John J. Fickers
Albert O. Floyd
Archie E. Floyd
Isaac N. Franklin, Jr.
John McA. Frye
Peter Galimitakis
Joseph J. Garside
Gene F. Gauthier
Michael Gaydos, Jr.
George W. Gibson
Robert F. Graves
William D. Greene
Galen M. Hallett, Jr.
Charles R. Hannun
Andrew U. Hassman, Jr.
Millard F. Havener
Kenneth G. Haynes
Richard W. Haupt
Robert L. Heinz
Richard M. Hennigan
William McG. Hepburn, Jr.
Harold M. Hewell
Alvin S. Hibbs
Robert K. Hoffman
Carl L. Hokenson, Jr.
Philip C. Holland
Wallace J. L. Houde
Lewis McN. Hough
Richard H. Howe
George E. Hubbell
Ira J. Hudson 3d
Bruce M. Jacobs
William E. James
Robert W. Johnson
William N. Johnson
Charles W. Jones
Robert A. Keagy
James D. Kearny
Edward T. Keating
Owen K. King
Joseph M. Kitchen
John L. Kline, Jr.
Robert H. Koehler
Robert P. Kolar
Lee F. Kyle
Eugene Lange
Charles S. Leach
Morris Levin
Linus R. Litsey
James F. Logan, Jr.
Thomas Longo
Lawrence R. Lowe
Donald H. Lucas, Jr.
Robert T. Maconie
Patrick J. Madden
Don McC. Martin
Andrew J. Mashaw
Joseph C. McCalley
Raymond K. McDannold
William L. McGonagle
Robert M. McLaughlin
Grover C. Miller
Raymond T. Miller, Jr.
William J. Miller
Donald F. Milligan
Samuel R. Miserendino
Jack L. Morrow
Robert C. Newcomb
George E. Nuber, Jr.
Eugene W. Ostlund
Arthur M. Pastel
Dale S. Perry
Richard Porter
Paul R. Powell
William C. Powell, Jr.
William L. Prange
John F. Pritchard
Robert W. Proctor
Henry P. Quick
Robert L. Quimby
Robert B. Rausch
Davis W. Reed
William E. Reed
Donald H. Reese
Isaac P. Rehkopf
Benjamin T. Richards
Donald W. Richardson
Joseph M. Rideout 3d
David A. Robinson
William B. Robinson
Robert E. Rodes, Jr.
Estel E. Rouch
Clifford LeR. Sayre, Jr.
Walter T. Schultheis
Robert L. Scott
Harold Scudder
Aldo Serafini
Lester L. Shade
Frank G. Simala
Richard S. Slawson
Earl A. Sonnier
Monroe B. Sorge
George A. Souris
Charles J. Stanback
Jason K. Stewart
Joseph V. Sweeney
James Thomson
Paul E. Trejo
Edward "X" Tuttle
John Van Tol
Adelberta M. Von Almen, Jr.
James W. Wallace
Thomas C. Walsh
Harold E. Weber
David J. Werner
Cleo Weschke
John M. Westbrook
Donald J. Weinstraut
Thomas R. Wilkinson
Roy E. Williams
Laurence W. Wilson
Robert D. Wilson
Gordon L. Wineman
Richard G. Wisham
Richard A. Yale
McCaslin Yates
George T. Youngren

The following-named midshipmen, United States Naval Reserve, to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, from the 6th day of June 1947:

William E. Ainslie
Michael Bat
James M. Baumgardner
Carl I. Bergkvist
Robert M. Bonk
Duane D. Borgert
William H. Brownell
Wright A. Burnham
Ralph A. Buswell
Ervin H. Cooper
Howard R. Cottrell
Paul R. Ebling
Richard B. Euchenhofer
Malcolm E. Graham
Normal A. Henry
James D. Hereford, Jr.
Leif A. Houkom
Raymond E. Jeffery
Carroll R. Keyser
"J" Scott Kirkwood
John W. Kline
Francis A. Kocourek
Donald H. Lake
John R. Logan
Donald E. Mackin
Donald S. Macoy
Joseph L. Mahoney, Jr.
William F. Mangan
Noel D. Martin
Alfred S. Maurstad
Harold A. McCauley
Thomas T. McGinnis
David E. Moline
Robert F. Morison
Maurice A. Notch
Thomas O. Nutt, Jr.
Joseph F. Ouellette
Paul J. Pflueger
Charles R. Pitchford
Raymond Ramer
Robert L. Reed
Keith L. Robinett
Edward A. Short
John T. Snyder
Samuel S. Stephens
Jackson R. Strange
Lawrence E. Sutherland, Jr.
Edward J. Tuite
William S. Waldron
Carleton R. Williams

The following-named midshipmen, United States Naval Reserve, to be assistant civil engineers in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, from the 6th day of June 1947:

Joseph W. Neudecker, Jr.
Henry F. Peger
Maurice A. Person
Donald R. Williams
James L. Yates

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 28, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Jehovah God, we would heed Thy holy word and in all our ways acknowledge Thee, and Thou wilt direct our paths. We thank Thee that the ways of wisdom are ways of pleasantness and all her paths are peace. O may our souls burst in gratitude and praise before the purpose and the abundance of our God. Take our powers unemployed, our ideals unfulfilled, and our possibilities unachieved and use them for the promotion of Thy kingdom; so shall we find favor in the sight of God and man. Every noble task completed enlarges the soul of the doer and increases the blessings of peace and contentment for our country. As selected servants and leaders of the people, may we carry their needs in our hearts and be very, very sure that we live to serve them. We pray in the name of Him who carried our needs to the cross. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 25, 1947, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of State.
4. Department of the Treasury.
5. Federal Works Agency.
6. National Archives.
7. Railroad Retirement Board.
8. United States District Court (eastern district of North Carolina).

PROCUREMENT OF BUILDINGS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 196 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations with respect to procurement and buildings authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $40,000, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee and signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATION OF PUBLICITY AND PROPAGANDA IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 197 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations with respect to publicity and propaganda in the Government departments and agencies authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $26,000, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee and signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATION AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 118

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 198 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expense of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 118 of the Eightieth Congress incurred by the subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and provided for by House Resolution 135 of the Eightieth Congress, shall be effective from February 13, 1947.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SURVEY OF PROFIT SHARING AND POSSIBILITIES OF INCENTIVE TAXATION

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 9 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 2,000 additional copies of Senate Report 610, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, being the report entitled "Survey of Experience in Profit Sharing and Possibilities of Incentive Taxation," which was printed as a report from a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Finance, acting pursuant to Senate Resolution 215, Seventy-fifth Congress, agreed to May 18, 1938. Such additional copies shall be for the use of the Senate Committee on Finance.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LODGE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ROHRBOUGH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Hon. Walter S. Hallanan, chairman of the National Petroleum Commission.

GREEK-TURKISH LOAN

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, some of the criticisms which have been made by those who oppose the proposed legislation authorizing aid to Greece and Turkey have centered around the Greek elections. It has been stated by certain individuals that there have been no registrations for elections in Greece since 1932 and that no one not registered had been permitted to vote in the plebiscite held for the purpose of restoring the monarchy.

In order to ascertain the facts in this connection, I communicated with the Under Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, regarding the registrations in Greece.

I suppose that it is quite normal that people who are not registered should not be able to vote. This is the case in our own country.

I am putting this letter in the RECORD because I think it important that as much information as possible should be made available to the Congress before they are called upon to vote on this portentous issue. The letter follows:

The statements reported by Mr. Hubert E. Page in the letter which you transmitted to me on April 4, 1947, regarding registration in Greece are not in accordance with the facts.

In preparation for the elections in Greece which were held on March 31, 1946, the period from July 1945 to February 10, 1946, was set aside for registration of voters. Greek citizens were given another opportunity to register from June 3, 1946 to July 12, 1946, in preparation for the plebiscite held on September 1. Special provision was made for refugees from western Thrace and Macedonia who could not meet the residence qualification. According to the law of April 30, 1946, all electoral lists which had merely been revised and not newly compiled for the elections in March 1946 were required to be compiled anew for the plebiscite. At the request of the Greek Government, an Allied mission observed this undertaking, watching the operation of the registration machinery and analyzing the lists on the completion of the revision and recompilation. The mission expressed itself satisfied that the revision and recompilation of the electoral lists attained a degree of fairness and accuracy which justified their use in seeking the opinion of the Greek people in matters of national import.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ROBERTSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by Governor Carlson of Kansas at a recent meeting of the Republican National Committee in Kansas City.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, recently I received permission to include a statement adopted by the forty-fourth annual meeting of the delegates of the American Automobile Association at San Francisco. I am advised by the Public Printer that it exceeds the limit set by the Joint Committee on Printing, that it will take about three and one-half pages of the RECORD and cost approximately $248. Notwithstanding the excess I ask unanimous consent that it may be extended in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the excess, without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein articles from newspapers concerning the new Surgeon General of the Army.

AMUSEMENT TAX ON SCHOOL BENEFITS

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a letter from Mrs. Eunice Hauk, president of the Band Benefit Club of Cassville, Wis., stating that at the request of the local Band Benefit Club she was writing to me to protest the Federal amusement tax as applied to proceeds from school activities. She states:

It would seem to us that this tax is actually levied against public education, since all proceeds from school performances are spent for educational purposes.

This is a subject that has been on my mind a long time, Mr. Speaker. If the Lions Club, for instance, wants to put on a benefit to do something to aid the blind, if the Kiwanis Club wants to do something to aid underprivileged children, if the Rotary Club wants to put on a drive to aid in suppressing subversive activities, or if any fraternal organization wants to do something for patriotic purposes, or sponsor a benefit for world peace, or a home for the aged, or other worthy cause, or if the band mothers or the parent-teacher associations or the 4-H Clubs want to do something for their boys and girls, they have to pay an amusement tax on any admission fee or charge for this benefit. I am therefore referring this matter to the Ways and Means Committee to do something about it, because such organizations should not have to pay a tax in these cases.

THE LATE MRS. EVALYN WALSH McLEAN

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include therein certain editorials and newspaper comment about Mrs. Evalyn Walsh McLean.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there passed away, and the world lost, a very great lady, a very great American, Mrs. Evalyn Walsh McLean. She died at Friendship, a house well named, because those of us who knew her and loved her realized that there could not be a greater friend, a greater philanthropist, one who was more kind.

I wish to speak especially, though, of her friendship, her help to the disabled veterans. She fought to secure for them better houses, better living conditions, better medical services. She herself paid for many things for the disabled veterans. She did what she could to restore sight to the blind; she tried to get the best surgeons, the best drugs, and the best prosthetic appliances for them. No request from a veteran went unheeded. She made her home their home, and I know they mourn her as I do.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PRICE TRENDS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, press and radio report a trend toward lower prices, following the forthright statement by the President April 21.

I hope this represents a real willingness all along the line to be satisfied with reasonable prices, margins, and profits.

I hope it represents a turning away, even at this late date, from the reckless inflationary course which has already dangerously decreased the purchasing power of wage and salary earners and fixed-income people, including disabled veterans and those taking GI training.

If it does, we will have stopped at the edge of the abyss, at the edge of a deflationary collapse. Such a collapse, even if only a recession, might have caused unemployment to increase to four, five, or six million before the end of 1947, according to some economists.

Mr. President, it is with satisfaction and pride that I point out that this whole Nation-wide concern about high prices, about the high cost of living, was given sharp focus by the remarks of the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS], made on the floor of this House on March 13. I remember how she brought into the Chamber a housewife's market basket of common food items needed by every family and showed, item by item, how prices had increased since the end of effective price control June 30, last.

The gentlewoman from California, and the housewives of the Nation—if I may be pardoned for pointing—deserve recognition and credit for the part they have played by word and by cautious buying in checking run-away inflation before it is too late. They have helped to bring to their senses those who, for short-run profits, were pursuing a course that would have taken the American people over the same old tragic road of boom and bust. I think my colleague from California is entitled to a vote of thanks from the House and the American people for the timely and dramatic warning she gave to all of us.

And, may I add, the merchants of Newburyport, Mass., are to be commended for showing the same daring imagination in trade that their predecessors displayed when they built, equipped, and sent the clipper ships to the China seas and spread our commerce over the seven seas.

Truly, Mr. Speaker, the resources of democracy to save itself and its people are not exhausted. In the emergency, we find ways to save ourselves from drifting over the falls to final disaster. So it must always be.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. BUCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the New York Sun.

Mr. McDOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement from a special committee in his congressional district on appreciation for the program for restoration of our soil which has lifted our farm population from the depths of bankruptcy to a higher level of prosperity and has given assurance of a secure and sound agriculture for future generations, also to include "History of AAA" and "Why the AAA."

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a letter he received from the Polish-American Congress and in the other to include an article.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by Magistrate Maurice Simmons, past national commander, United Spanish War Veterans at Ulysses S. Grant birthday anniversary services, Grant's Tomb, New York City, on April 27, 1947.

Mr. COURTNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain resolutions adopted by an American Legion post in his district.

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Washington Post of this morning.

Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a broadcast by George E. Reedy.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter which I received from the Acting Secretary of State, Dean Acheson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. OWENS]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Washington Sunday Star.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD concerning a bill he is introducing today.

WAR DEPARTMENT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, we should always give credit where credit is due. Apparently the War Department is one department of the executive branch of the Government which is making a sincere attempt to cooperate with the Congress in an effort to reduce the number and expense of highly paid civilian personnel. I was gratified to read in the morning paper that the Under Secretary of War has directed the various bureau chiefs to recommend the elimination or demotion of at least 50 percent of the middle and top grade civilians. The bureau chiefs came back with their recommendations affecting only 20 percent in these grades. The Under Secretary, however, stood his ground and insisted that his original directive be carried out.

The number of military personnel is drastically reduced and reductions in grade are made right and left following the termination of active hostilities. There is no reason why the same should not apply to those acting in a civilian capacity.

This same article, however, written by a spokesman for the civil-service employees, charges the War Department with "trickery" in an attempt to make the demotions stick. He goes on to explain that new "job descriptions" are going to justify lower grades although many of the employees will do the same work as they are now doing.

Any of us who have had any intimate experience with Government departments know that this same device, which was never characterized as "trickery" when it worked the other way, was used to up-grade these employees and that it was done with the wholehearted approval and cooperation of the civil-service people. If you wanted to get a civilian promoted it was not possible to do so by simply showing that he or she was doing outstandingly good work, as is the case in ordinary civilian pursuits, but it was necessary to prepare a new "job description" which was done time and time again.

The promoted individual would do exactly the same work today as yesterday but under a different job description, which was the stock method of bringing about a promotion.

It does not lie in the mouth of those who enjoyed the benefits of this system now to complain when it works the other way. "What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander."

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRK-

SEN] chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AUTHORIZING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 736) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia during 1947; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 40 minutes, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 736, with Mr. CANFIELD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, so there will be no misunderstanding, I am not sponsoring the adoption of Senate bill 736. So that you may know—and I am sure all of you are up to date on it—I wish to call your attention to the fact that we considered the substance of this bit of legislation on February 24, 1947, when the original bill introduced by the chairman of the House District Committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], for the granting of daylight-saving time for the District of Columbia, was before the House. As all of you will recall, that bill was defeated by a roll-call vote of 210 to 124. During the period of that debate the situation was pretty well discussed, except that we now come back with a bill wherein the power is given to the District Commissioners to decide whether or not we should have daylight-saving time here.

Mr. Chairman, some 3 years ago I asked the minority leader, now the Speaker, to be placed upon the Committee on the District of Columbia because I felt rather sympathetic to some of the problems the District had. However, may I say that, as a Member of Congress, I live here and I am subjected to the conditions that are written in by the Congress. The conditions under which all of us live are as much applicable to me as to anybody else.

May I say at the outset that, regardless of how much criticism I may take, I just do not like the daylight-saving bill. I am against it, I have been against it, and I shall continue to be against the thrusting of daylight-saving time on the people of the District of Columbia, whether it be by direct action of the Congress or rather by the subtle attempts which are being made today to authorize the District Commissioners to give daylight-saving time to us if they decide in their wisdom to do so. I called your attention before to the fact that all of us are living here by reason of the fact that we are Members of Congress. We live here under the conditions existing, whatever they may be. I think the Members of Congress—certainly the Members of the House—have been very considerate of the District of Columbia and its problems. I happen to be one of those who, in the fight last year for the hospital situation, with the able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], prevailed upon the House to go along upon the hospital program and upon many other bills of benefit to the District.

Mr. Chairman, the subject of daylight-saving time has been before the Congress on other occasions. In January 1942, at the request of the President, we passed a daylight-saving bill under the theory and guise that it would permit a saving of electricity and would be in the national interest in carrying on the war. There has never been a single other bill during my years of service in this House that has aroused as much criticism and concern as that bill. As early as 1943 repealer legislation was introduced. I happened to dig up my old daylight-saving file Saturday when I was thinking about this matter, and I find that in the Seventy-ninth Congress, in September of 1945, we repealed that legislation—the first wartime legislation that was repealed. How many different Members of Congress had introduced bills or resolutions or amendments for that purpose? Some 55 in that session.

In the report upon the repeal of that legislation, and I am speaking now of House Report No. 945 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, you will find that there were 16 Members of Congress who introduced concurrent resolutions directly requesting repeal of that legislation, that there were 14 bills which sought to repeal it, and one joint resolution. The other bills, the difference between the 31 and 55, were bills amending that act. So I think the subject of daylight saving time has been pretty much discussed nationally during its trial run of some 3½ years, and it certainly created more unhappiness than any other single piece of wartime legislation that was passed.

Now let me call your attention to another thing. We had no hearings upon this legislation, and I believe there was none in the Senate. Some references have been made to the report of this or that organization that is for it or against it. I do not know how many people were asked to vote upon that or whether it was the usual club meeting, and three or four of the boys said, "Well, I see daylight saving is up, I believe it would help me play golf, so let us write up and tell the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that our group is for daylight saving time."

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. REES. I was called by telephone by one of the employees in one of the Government agencies a few days ago. This person said, "I was asked to vote as to whether I was in favor of daylight-saving time." She said, "Well, I voted 'no'." Then, she said, "They came back in a few days and rechecked to see if I had changed my mind." Her reason for calling me was to say, "We hope they get this thing out of the way. They are using up a lot of time somewhere in one of these Government agencies figuring out whether or not these people are in favor of it or against it." She said she thought the House had decided this thing several days ago.

Mr. O'HARA. I think that is true. May I point out in the matter of recreation that the Government employees under the 40-hour week have Saturdays off which is more than most of us have off. In the summertime the stores are closed on some days in the middle of the week so that the employees have their recreation and can get out in the sunshine and some of the people who are particularly interested in promoting this are in a position to take off whatever time they want.

Mr. REES. They certainly are.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I ask the gentleman if by contrast this is not true—that the men who produce the food consumed in the District of Columbia and who are not consulted concerning this legislation and never can be consulted, do not get any time off?

Mr. O'HARA. That situation just makes more apparent the confusion that exists on this matter. The last time this matter was up for consideration it was argued that they were going to adopt daylight-saving time in Maryland, I believe. Actually, the localities around Washington have not adopted daylight-saving time, and neither has the surrounding territory in Virginia. I want to point out to you that this will add further to the confusion of your folks back home who will not be aware that there will be another hour's difference in time if we have daylight saving here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I believe the bill calls for hearings by the Commissioners to hear the people of the District as to whether they want daylight-saving time or not. I am sure the gentleman believes in majority rule and if a majority of the citizens of the District do not want daylight-saving time, of course, it would not be granted.

Mr. O'HARA. The answer to that is that you have a few people who come up and say, "Well, we want daylight-saving time." You have a great number of people who say, "Hooey with daylight-saving time. I am not going to bother myself about voting on it." So, we get a small expression of opinion.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is it not possible to have a vote in the District and if the majority decide that they want daylight-saving time, then I presume the gentleman would be in favor

of it since it would be what the majority want.

Mr. O'HARA. I am going to exercise my vote right here.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. REES. What about the railroads and airlines? Are they going to change their time schedule?

Mr. O'HARA. No.

Mr. REES. Then people would have to observe the two different times.

Mr. O'HARA. They are not going to change their time. This is an example of the confusion that exists. The radio people are behind this effort to bring daylight-saving time to the District of Columbia. Because in the city of New York, where most of the programs originate, they want to change the time they think the rest of the country ought to bow down and say, "If you gentlemen on the radio want daylight-saving time, the whole country should have daylight-saving time." I do not agree to that.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill we have under consideration today has been more or less of a thorn in the flesh of the members of the District Committee during the past 2 years. As one member I know we want to get this bill out of the way. We want to find out whether a majority of the Members want daylight saving or want to keep the time as it is.

The bill under consideration today simply gives the Commissioners of the District of Columbia authority to grant daylight-saving time if a majority of the people in Washington want daylight-saving time. I am not saying whether I want daylight-saving time or not, but if the people of Washington want it I, personally, have no objection to their having it, even though it will affect Members of Congress. I think the Members of the House have been exceptionally fair to the District of Columbia. I know we have done a great deal more for the people of Washington than we have done for the people of South Carolina, which State I have the honor to represent. I think if the people of Washington really wanted daylight-saving time, they should have contacted the Members of Congress who are supposed to take care of legislation for the District of Columbia. I have had three letters relative to daylight saving: one against it and two for it. I do not see very much enthusiasm either way. According to the newspapers, it seems people are contacting the newspapers and asking them to sponsor this legislation. I am of the opinion the only thing for us to do is to take this matter up and dispose of it today once and for all.

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman, and I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this legislation. I do not know of anything that created quite so much confusion as daylight-saving time during the war. I believe more people in the United States were made happy over the repeal of the daylight-saving-time legislation than anything that has happened for a long time.

It is said that the people of Washington should regulate their own affairs. I agree with that, provided that when they regulate their own affairs they do not regulate the affairs of others. Many of the farmers adjacent to this territory have to get up now at 4 or half past 4 o'clock in the morning. This means you will get them out of bed between 3 and half past 3 in order to bring the milk and other farm products in to market. What right do the people of the District have to regulate the farmers adjacent to the District, and regulate them in such a way as to impose an undue hardship upon them? Who is behind this legislation, anyway? Is it the Government workers? The Government workers today get out around 4:30. You propose to let them out, under this legislation, at 3:30. In addition to that, the Government workers get a holiday every Saturday and some 45 days in sick and vacation leave. The farmers do not get a holiday on Saturday. They do not get off in the afternoon at 4:30. Now you are trying to make them get up at 3:30 and 4 o'clock in the morning and go to bed before dark if they are to get the proper amount of sleep. You are not treating the farmers who supply the food to the people of this District in the right way, in order to accommodate those who need no further accommodation, in my opinion.

This Government certainly has been generous in dealing with the Government workers. How much more time for recreation, play, and pleasure do they want?

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman agree with me that it will take 1 hour of good sleeping time away from the average person who lives in this hot climate in the summertime?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is what you are doing.

Mr. O'HARA. Does the gentleman know of any southern city, unless we classify Baltimore as southern, that has daylight-saving time?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I do not.

Then, another thing: Our transportation system is being run on standard time. This legislation is going to bring about confusion. You would go to work on daylight-saving time, but if you wanted to catch a train, an airplane, or bus, you would switch over to standard time. Is it right, in order to accommodate a few people here in Washington, to disregard the rights of the people who are supplying the citizens of this city with food, and at the same time bring about the confusion that will naturally follow the passage of this bill? These people are entitled to some consideration, and I do not believe the people of Washington, if they really understood the hardships this legislation would impose upon the rural population, would be in favor of it.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. This is going to make, perhaps, a 3 hours' difference in the transaction of business for Members of Congress from farm districts and farmers among their constituency, is it not?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. It certainly is.

Mr. STEFAN. You cannot regulate the time when you slop the hogs or milk the cows, can you?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. No; you cannot do that.

Mr. STEFAN. I agree with the gentleman. The best news our people received on the farm after the war was the repeal of daylight-saving time.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The gentleman is correct; and when the issue was before Congress it was repealed by practically unanimous vote.

We have been getting along on standard time for many many years, ever since this Government was formed. We made the change during the war. I did not think much of the change then. I thing it did more harm than good during the war period.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, we believe in self-government and self-determination for the Philippines, for the Germans, for the Japanese, and for most of the other peoples of the world. I believe charity begins at home and that it would not be out of order to allow some self-government and some self-determination for the voteless, unrepresented people of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNGBLOOD].

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, tells me that several polls have been taken on this subject amongst the people of the District of Columbia and that they run as high as 75 percent in favor of daylight-saving time.

Personally, it does not make any difference to me whether they use daylight time or standard time. Who are we to oppose the mandate of any people at any time in the United States of America? I believe that as Members of Congress we must and should recognize the wishes and concur in the mandate of the people we govern, that we should not oppose daylight-saving time if they so desire.

If the District of Columbia had self-government we would be under daylight-saving time at the present time, because that is what the people desire. Unfortunately, they cannot have it because Congress will not yield it to them.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. How many people were interviewed in those polls? Not more than six or eight thousand out of 900,000 residents.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. I know only what the chairman of the committee told me and I am certain he would not misrepresent the situation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDOWELL.]

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, a great many people seem to be under the misapprehension that this daylight-saving time is hooked up with and originated in New York or some other part of the country. Daylight-saving time originated in my district. A very distinguished Republican official, the Honorable Robert Garland, gave this great gift to America. We have used it for some 20 years over in Pittsburgh and I may say to the gentleman from Virginia that I have not heard of any farmers of western Pennsylvania being very seriously "discombooberated" by daylight-saving time.

I think it is time to do something for the people of Washington.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I believe in the right of people to petition; I believe in the right of people to have the type of laws which they want and I have this thought so far as the District of Columbia is concerned. In the course of the last few weeks since this controversy has arisen, I have gone out of my usual way to find out from the people of the District what they want and up until 11 o'clock last night I had not found a single person from the District of Columbia who by word of mouth, by letter, or by telegram asked me to vote for this bill. Everyone I spoke to said he was against it.

Mr. Chairman, the Government departments are closed all day Saturday; and moving up the time an hour here in the Capital of the Nation will make governmental business more difficult—in the West where there is a difference of 1, 2, or 3 hours against Washington time. In these far western areas the situation will be made much more inconvenient. For instance, a telegram sent from my district in Louisiana at 3 o'clock on Friday would arrive here at about 5 o'clock, closing time, and too late for anything to be done until the following Monday. This means, in effect, that the people in the far West where time will differ by as many as 4 hours will have to get their requests by telegram started to Washington as early as Friday morning in order to have any hope of getting action before the following Monday.

Mr. Chairman, for the reasons stated I am going to vote against this bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes on this side.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, did I understand that the gentleman from South Carolina yielded all of his time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. There are 5 minutes still remaining on the minority side.

Mr. HARRIS. Does the gentleman from South Carolina still have 5 minutes left after the gentleman from Illinois has finished?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, year after year for 15 years I have seen Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle come down into this well and belabor the District of Columbia and the portion it took of our legislative time for District affairs. Year after year for 15 years I have heard Member after Member in the well of the House assail the fact that Congress was serving as city council for the Nation's Capital. I took some stock of that argument. I felt there was some validity in the fact that in proportion as this takes time it does divest time from legislative duties on a national scale. In due course this argument developed to the point where finally the House and Senate set up a Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress, and I was one of the Members who served on that committee for 18 months. When we finally completed our labors we reported on the 4th day of March 1946, and then there followed a bill which was subsequently passed and signed by the President on the 2d day of August 1946. It was a rather broad-gaged bill. We increased our salaries in that bill. We increased our expense allowances in that bill. We passed a legislative lobby title. We included a bridge bill. We included a Federal tort claims act. What we were trying to do was to save time and economize on the time and the demands that were made upon the talents and the energies of Members of Congress.

As that bill was first reported, it contained a title to provide a measure of home rule for the District of Columbia. There is presently in the Senate a subcommittee of the Senate District Commitee on Home Rule. There is in this House, in the Committee on the District of Columbia, a Subcommittee on Home Rule under the very able leadership of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS], who has been devoting a great deal of time to that subject.

Now, we come here not with a daylight saving bill but with a bill that is predicated upon a principle of home rule. You do not say in this bill that there shall be daylight time for the District of Columbia. This bill confers authority upon the administrative heads of the District of Columbia, the Commissioners, who are appointed by the President, to hold a hearing. If they should decide after hearings that there should be daylight-saving time in the National Capital, then they will take the necessary steps in order to provide that change of time. There has been so much misapprehension about the pending bill. When you vote for this bill—and I hope it will go through by a resounding majority—you do not say that there shall be daylight-saving time in Washington, D. C. You simply confer power upon the appointive executive heads of the District of Columbia, after suitable hearing, whether or not in their wisdom and in all good conscience the time should be changed. I, for one, approve of it. They have daylight-saving time in Chicago. They voted by four to one in St. Louis last week for daylight saving. They have daylight saving in 10 different States of the Union. It started at midnight on Saturday night. They have daylight-saving time in New York City. They have daylight-saving time in Annapolis, Md., the next largest metropolitan center north of here. They have daylight-savings time in Baltimore, Md. The Governor of Maryland signed a bill recently whereby the three adjoining counties, in which so many of the District personnel live, can impose daylight saving as soon as it is done in the National Capital, if that is the decision of the District Commissioners. The Governor of Virginia, Governor Tuck, has informally notified the Boards of Trade of Arlington, Alexandria, and other cities, that if they want to set their clocks ahead, they may do so, but no State action was taken. But the point is that those people are allowed to fall in line.

We hear the argument about what distress will be imposed upon the farmers in the area. One of the largest milk distributors in the National Capital told me recently, and asked that I do not use his name, that milk is received at all hours of the day, and then it is homogenized and it is pasteurized and bottled and delivered the following day, and it offers no inconvenience so far as the farmer is concerned. If that argument is followed, then the arguments in the whole milkshed of northern Illinois, southern Wisconsin, and western Indiana, and a portion of Iowa would be equally valid, because Chicago is the largest metropolitan consumer area for that milkshed. If that argument is valid, it would be valid for the largest city in the gentleman's own State, New York City.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Did this informant state when that milk which arrived here all during the day, left the farm?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not that I remember.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is the important thing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. He said, "We receive milk all hours of the day and we are bottling all the time, and milk is delivered the following day as late as 11 and 12 o'clock in the day."

Then in addition thereto, why I presume—and I cannot say that this is absolutely correct—but you know out of your own experience, if you have a family here, that most of the milk is marketed through the grocery stores in the District of Columbia. But here is a

voiceless, here is a voteless community of some 800,000 which has to come as a suppliant on its knees and say, "Please, Congress, most of us are for daylight savings; won't you kindly forget provincial thinking for a while and give us daylight saving?"

The Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, and other veterans' organizations are for it. The board of trade and the junior chamber of commerce have done a monumental amount of work in behalf of daylight saving. The newspapers, including the Washington Post and the Washington Times-Herald, have held polls here and by overwhelming majorities the people have expressed themselves for daylight saving.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. How many people voted on those polls?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand that in one of those polls formally and informally they finally got up to nearly 66,000 people, and the polls represented different areas and different sources.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman means 6,600.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There was one poll of 6,600, but there was an informal poll that represented the thinking, I believe, of 66,000. Every group, every industrial group, every business group that I can find out about in this man's town has been for daylight saving.

Now, what an astonishing thing. The Senate, mind you, the Senate of the United States, approved this same bill by a vote of 57 to 16, which is more than 3½ to 1. They were having some regard for the desires of the people here.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say to the gentleman that, as the record will disclose, I voted for the daylight saving bill for the District when it was here before. However, as I understand the present bill, it simply seeks to invest in the Commissioners of the District the option and authority to put daylight saving time into effect after a hearing and after fair determination is made.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Precisely so.

Mr. HALLECK. In other words, that will bring about a situation approximating the condition that prevails in other cities and towns across the country where determination is made by local authority as to what they want to do in respect to daylight saving.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly so.

Mr. HALLECK. I propose to vote for this bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am grateful to the majority leader.

Let me leave you with this one question, before the time runs out. If we do not propose to support a bill to confer upon the District Commissioners the authority to hold hearings and determine this sort of a proposition, why should the District Committee come in here and endeavor to secure any kind of home-rule proposition in the interest of conserving time? Why should the District Committee submit to the Congress any proposal that is based upon this broad fundamental of home rule, because you would evidence that no matter what we do still you would not be in favor of conferring upon the duly appointed executive heads of the Nation's Capital the authority to deal with a proposition of this kind.

I earnestly suggest that we give these people an opportunity to represent their views before their own District Commissioners in the District Building and let the determination be made there whether or not there shall be daylight saving time for the District of Columbia. I would expect that much for my own folks back home if their interests were involved and I believe they would want me to do as much for the voteless residents of the Nation's Capital.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. NORTON. As a former chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I am heartily in favor of this bill. Some such bill has been in the House on many occasions before and in different Congresses. I think the people in the District should be allowed to decide whether or not they want daylight-saving time. The debate here today seems to me a very strong argument for home rule for the District of Columbia.

Mr. HARRIS. I am glad to have the statement from the gentlewoman from New Jersey, who served so long as chairman of this great committee, though I am not in accord with her viewpoint and with her position.

I have the highest esteem and admiration for our present chairman, the genial and able gentleman from the great State of Illinois, who has done such a magnificent job to try to bring this matter to a head in order to give the Congress an opportunity to decide it.

First, I want to talk to you about something that I believe means more than just the question of whether you personally want daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia or personally do not want it.

I had not intended to enter into this debate. I have heard all of the arguments and discussions about why we should have daylight-saving time and why we should not have it, and how it would put us to some personal inconvenience.

Mr. Chairman, we are deciding something here today that goes much further than the mere matter of how it affects us personally. The gentleman from Illinois has just brought it to your attention and I believe it well deserves your consideration. This House has expressed itself fully on this matter in recent weeks. Now, it is presented to you in a little different form. What are we asked to do here? We are asked to evade an issue that we passed on in order that we may let someone else have the jurisdiction to determine the very thing that we voted against. If that is not passing the buck by the Congress, I would like to know what would be a good example of passing the buck.

And, next, I want to talk to you about the question of home rule. I am not saying that the District of Columbia should or should not have home rule, but I say to you, my colleagues, if the District of Columbia is to have home rule, why do we not approach it in a manner so as to give the District home rule and let them vote for their representatives. Are we going to do it piecemeal?

The gentleman says, "They have daylight-saving time in Chicago and New York and St. Louis." The fact is that they do not have daylight-saving time in the Seventh District of Arkansas, but that has nothing to do with my position in this matter at all. Just because we may have it or may not have it somewhere else in the country—is that to say that we are to evade our responsibility here on the floor of the House? Is this going to be the first step in the process of saying to the District of Columbia, "You can have your own government," notwithstanding the record that Congress has made over the past century and a half? There is the issue that confronts you in this House today, and I think you are going to have to decide it.

This question of putting babies to sleep an hour earlier and trying to get them up an hour earlier is a problem for the individual mother in the household. When you consider issues like this on a broad fundamental basis it amounts to a policy of government. The real question at issue here is whether this is still the Capital of the United States which belongs to all of the people of the United States instead of just to those who are privileged to be here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of determining whether or not daylight saving time should be established in the District of Columbia during the year 1947, the Commissioners of the District shall conduct open hearings at which the residents of the District may express their views on the establishment of such time.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WADSWORTH: On page 1, line 7, after the word "District", insert "and those in neighboring counties who may be affected."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer this, it may be said, as a perfecting amendment. It does not indicate that I am in agreement with the provisions of this bill. However, I offer it to bring to your attention a situation which is extremely unjust. We talk about home rule for the people of the District of Columbia. I think none of us would have any objection to the exercise of home rule in the District if, in the exercise of that power or privilege, they did not injure

other people. But when it is found—and it cannot be denied—that the exercise of home rule in the District with respect to daylight saving, injures a very large number of people who have no voice in the matter whatsoever, I think we should pause. I am certain that I am stating the facts.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] said that in conversation with an unnamed milk dealer——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes, I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly, the gentleman from Illinois is anxious to get a complete expression on this matter and does not believe it ought to be ex parte. I have no objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York even though people in the outlying zones who are not responsible would come in in a permissive fashion.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am glad of that, but I am going to develop this subject.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] stated in his address that an unnamed milk distributor or processor here in Washington told him that the milk came in during a period covering several hours during the morning, some of it as late as 11 or 12 o'clock. I asked him if that same informant had told him when the milk had to leave the farm at which it was produced, and there was no answer.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The answer was that he did not know.

Mr. WADSWORTH. He did not know. Well, that is an important thing. It is perfectly true that milk coming into a great city arrives at varying times in the morning, but the time of its arrival depends entirely upon the distance over which it has been transported. The greater the distance the earlier the milk has to be put in the can and loaded on the truck. I have seen this thing work for years and it works a wretched hardship on the men who produce food. It compels them, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] said, to get up an hour earlier, in the dark, with no time off on Saturday. Nothing like the 8-hour day or the 40-hour week, perhaps working half a day on Sundays. They have no choice in the matter. They are helpless. The sun is their master. The Nation is divided geographically into time zones, if I may use that expression—eastern time, central time, mountain time, and Pacific time, across the continent to the Pacific Ocean. After years and years of experience those time zones have been laid out in order that those who earn their living, including those who produce the food in the several sections of the country, may have the greatest advantage of the shining of the sun. The time zones have been so erected as to conform as nearly as possible with sunrise, which commences in the east and travels through the morning westward, clear across the continent. Now, you cannot do away with the power of the sun in agriculture. It cannot be done. The sun is the master of the man who produces food. He has to get up with the sun and do his best all through the sunny day and stay at work until the sun sets; otherwise he loses out. The changing of clocks, the changing of laws, does not prevent the sun being the master of the producer of food. When you force, through the vote of people in the city, most of whom do not have the slightest conception of where their food is produced, how it is produced, or by whom—when you force man out on the land, who is the slave of the sun, to get up an hour earlier in the dark the year around, you are inflicting a hardship upon him which is difficult to exaggerate. That is why I have for years been opposed to this whole illusion—this whole illusion—known as daylight saving.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, we have as guests in Washington today sixty bright and shining students and their directors and chaperones representing Northland College of Ashland, Wis. They compose a choir of some 60 voices that is completing a tour of eastern United States. They have appeared in the States of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New York. Yesterday afternoon they gave a very impressive concert at the Foundry Methodist Church in this city. I had the honor and privilege of hearing them, and I wish each and every Member of this Congress had had the same honor and privilege.

Northland College is a small college, with an enrollment not exceeding 350 students, of which 75 percent have to work their own way. Yet they have organized a choir of 60 voices of such quality and training that they have been invited to broadcast over the Mutual Broadcasting Co. and over the National Broadcasting Co., both Nation-wide chains.

This choir has brought great honor and tribute not only to their college but to the State of Wisconsin and, indeed, to the United States of America.

On behalf of the Members of Congress I welcome this group to Washington. They are going to make a survey and study over here of how Congress is operating. I hope they will go back with pleasant words, words to the effect that the Members of this body and the Members of the other body are trying their very desperate best to solve the Nation's ills and the world's ills.

Mr. Chairman, Northland College deserves the gratitude of every American. Twenty of the group in this choir are veterans of the last war. A poor but thriving and growing institution this choir is a living memorial of what can be done when the will to do is there. Welcome to Washington Northland College. You came here and left a deep impression on the hearts of many of our Nation's leaders. We are truly proud of you. You are an inspiration to all of us. Come again.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that a short history of this college, this choir, together with a list of names of this group, their director, and chaperones, be spread upon the pages of the RECORD at this point.

HISTORICAL SKETCH OF NORTHLAND COLLEGE CHOIR

The Northland College Choir came into being in 1931 under Prof. Sigvart J. Steen. Although Northland's music department has been a feature of the college since its founding, the a cappella choir, singing only sacred music, was a departure from the program usually followed. In the early days of the academy and college there were separate organizations of glee clubs for the men and women, as well as concert orchestras, and the smaller voice and instrumental ensembles.

The choir took its first tour in 1934, traveling into southwest Wisconsin and eastern Minnesota. The first Atlantic coast or New England tour was undertaken in 1935. Since that time, tours to the East have been interspersed with tours into Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

The choir won national recognition singing in Constitution Hall as part of the program of the National Congress of the DAR. It has also appeared before the National Federation of Music Clubs, and its radio concerts have included broadcasts from Radio City in New York City.

The last tour by the mixed choir was made in 1942, that fateful year when our minds were temporarily diverted from the amenities and joys of life. The rumblings of war, reverberating into college ranks, soon changed our mixed choir into a small girls' chorus. Prof. Sigvart Steen and his successor, Prof. Harold Brown, both resigned as director and took their places in the armed services.

Northland soon came to resemble a women's seminary more than a coeducational college, and Mrs. Kathryn Ragsdale Church was called to direct the remnants of the choir. Mrs. Church doubled the size of the girls' chorus the first year and continued to increase the membership until 1945 when there were 44 girls singing in the chorus. During the first 2 years Mrs. Church trained the chorus, and short trips were taken in the surrounding territory. Since bus companies were not accepting charters, the transportation problem was solved by the use of cars which were supplied through the generosity of trustees and faculty members.

Impressed with the excellent musicianship and attributes of quality displayed by the chorus, two Northland trustees, Mr. George I. Haight and Mr. Howard I. Potter, both of Chicago arranged to bring the chorus to Chicago where they sang in Kimball Hall. On that same trip they sang in the Public Service Auditorium in Milwaukee through the courtesy of former Governor Julius P. Heil, who is also a Northland trustee.

Last spring a tour was scheduled through Central Wisconsin and Northern Michigan, and included besides evening concerts a number of high school appearances.

When college opened last September, many veterans thronged the campus and among them were former Northlanders who returned to take up their studies where they left off 3 or 4 years years before. With this influx of students tryouts were held and approximately 60 voices were selected to be trained for a mixed choir. That this is a carefully chosen group and an expertly trained one was manifested in the outstanding concert presented during the past Christmas season.

It was acclaimed by critics to be the finest program ever to be presented in the city of Ashland.

It is with confidence and real pride that the Northland College Choir is presented to you this evening.

KATHRYN RAGSDALE CHURCH, DIRECTOR, NORTHLAND COLLEGE CHOIR

Kathryn Ragsdale Church has a rich background of specialized training and experience which makes her a most capable choral director and teacher of voice. Part of her experience includes 8 years of acting as a judge at the State music festivals held in Iowa.

She is a graduate of Christian College and has attended Iowa State Teachers College and the Conservatory of Music at the University of Iowa. She has studied voice with Afra Kirsch of Chicago and has also had private voice coaching under Mrs. Elizabeth Birney Schmidt and Mr. Thomas Muir, both of New York City, and Mr. Luther Richman, who is now president of the Music Educators National Conference.

BRIEF HISTORY OF NORTHLAND COLLEGE

Northland College, located at Ashland, Wis., was founded in October 1892 as North Wisconsin Academy. The leader of the movement to found an academy at this pioneer outpost was the Reverend Edwin P. Wheeler, son of one of the early missionaries on Madeline Island, the largest of the Apostle Islands group in Lake Superior.

As Mr. Wheeler's dreams took shape others caught his enthusiasm. Working closely with Mr. Wheeler were the Reverend George Nelson, the general missionary of the Congregational Churches of Wisconsin, and Dr. Edwin Ellis, Ashland's first doctor, who came in 1855 when about a dozen cabins straggling along the shore of the bay comprised the entire community.

Northland, born in the colorful days of the lumbering industry, was still found standing after the echoes of the lumberman's ax had died away and the hordes had stripped the lands of their virgin timber wealth. It was indeed a desolate setting for such a cherished dream, but the founders of the school surmounted obstacles that would have broken most men. They refused to accept defeat but rather, were fired with new enthusiasm to nurture and strengthen the one thing which was needed the most—a school to train the young men and women of North Wisconsin who would be faced with the problems arising from the inevitable economic readjustment. Their labors have borne fruit and today Northland College is still rendering a service unsurpassed in any other part of the State.

In 1907 articles of incorporation were drawn up for a college department, and in June 1912 the first class of college students was graudated. One of the first graudates now heads the science department. Academy and college work were carried on simultaneously until 1932 when it was felt that the academy was no longer needed. The advent of the State-graded schools in the rural communities answered the need in secondary education and after a service of 40 years the academy was discontinued. Northland College continued to grow and widen its field of service and is still the only liberal arts college within a radius of 200 miles.

Though Northland's physical plant is utilized to capacity and there is need for more buildings, the work continues under the direction of an able administration and loyal faculty. The excellent record of alumni accomplishment is monumental evidence of sound basic training received at Northland College. Four college presidents are listed among Northland's alumni. Many leading research scientists, ministers, journalists, librarians, educators, doctors, and industrial leaders began their work at Northland.

Like all colleges, Northland laid her sacrifice on the altar of the war gods, writing the names of 19 young men among the stars. Over 400 Northlanders answered the call to service. The war years were troublesome for the college but the unselfish devotion of the faculty and students together with the loyalty of understanding friends helped to keep the college running so that the doors were open when the young men and women returned searching for a way back to peaceful living.

Sacrifice and privation form a large part of Northland's cornerstone. Love, faith, devotion, Christian ideals, and a fighting spirit were stirred into the mortar. The early days were filled with trials and burdens which were shared by friends who appreciated Northland's great task and wanted to have a part in it. A deep-rooted faith has been justified and Northland College stands high in the ranks of Wisconsin colleges. The rich heritage of faith and tenacity left by her founders is Northland's greatest spiritual strength and power. Such memories as are written in her history will serve to burnish the ideals by which Northland lives and grows.

ITINERARY

Tuesday, April 8, Akron, Ohio: First Congregational Church.

Wednesday, April 9, Elmira, N. Y.: Park Congregational Church.

Thursday, April 10, New York City: Rotary luncheon at Commodore Hotel.

Friday, April 11, Queens Village, N. Y.: Hollis Avenue Congregational Church.

Sunday, April 13, Westfield, Mass.: First Congregational Church.

Monday, April 14, Greenfield, Mass.: Second Congregational Church.

Tuesday, April 15, Lynn, Mass.: Boston Street Methodist Church.

Wednesday, April 16, New Bedford, Mass.: The United Church.

Thursday, April 17, Haverhill, Mass.: First Congregational Church.

Sunday, April 20, Melrose, Mass.: First Congregational Church.

Monday, April 21, Wakefield, Mass.: First Congregational Church.

Tuesday, April 22, Norwood, Mass.: First Congregational Church.

Wednesday, April 23, Bristol, Conn.: First Congregational Church.

Friday, April 25, Bethel, Conn.: Bethel High School.

Saturday, April 26, Philadelphia, Pa.: James Evans Memorial Presbyterian Church.

Sunday, April 27, Washington, D. C.: Foundry Methodist Church.

Monday, April 28, Washington, D. C.: Luncheon, Capitol Dining Room.

Tuesday, April 29, Johnstown, Pa.: Central High School.

Thursday, May 1, Green Bay, Wis.: Union Congregational Church.

Friday, May 2, Rhinelander, Wis.: First Congregational Church.

Saturday, May 3, Park Falls, Wis: City Hall.

In addition to the above concerts, several radio broadcasts and special convocations are included in the schedule of appearances. Individual soloists have participated as guest soloists in Sunday church services.

PERSONNEL OF THE CHOIR

Soprano: Betty Greech, freshman, Owen, Wis.; Julie Johnson, special, Hollywood, Calif; Mary Lou Ferkovich, sophomore, Mellen, Wis.; Mary Dexter, freshman, Bayfield, Wis.; Patricia Biglow, junior, Ashland, Wis.; June Emerson, senior, Ashland, Wis.; Cleone Fecteau, junior, Ashland, Wis.; Madeline Lindquist, junior, Chicago, Ill.; Betty Jane Larson, freshman, Ironwood, Mich.; Rita Reed, freshman, Ashland, Wis.; Betty Johnson, senior, Ashland, Wis.; Patricia Berg, junior, Ashland, Wis.; Mary Jeanne Welker, sophomore, Ashland, Wis.; Sally Murray, sophomore, Ashland, Wis.; Mary Lynn Elsner, sophomore, Trout Creek, Mich.; Joyce Synnott, freshman, Rib Lake, Wis.

Alto: Kathryn Wilson, junior, High Bridge, Wis.; Jeane Anne Johnson, freshman, Monroe, Wis.; Rose Mary McDonnell, freshman, Ashland, Wis.; Audrey Reistad, freshman, Rib Lake, Wis.; Jacqueline Klatt, sophomore, Ashland, Wis.; Ruth Spoolman, senior, Ashland, Wis. Rose Marie Hindes, senior, Ashland, Wis.; Emmy Lou Forster, freshman, Ashland, Wis.; Eleanor Perrin, sophomore, Mason, Wis.; Virginia Darling, freshman, Chicago, Ill.; Connie Moller, freshman, Weyerhauser, Wis.; Eileen Carroll, freshman, Ashland, Wis.; Elaine Anich, sophomore, Ashland, Wis.; Marguerite Johnson, sophomore, Ironwood, Mich.; Elaine Schroeder, freshman, De Pere, Wis.; Avonel Anderson, senior, Rice Lake, Wis.

Tenor: Gilbert Vickers, junior, Springfield, Mass.; Gene Carlson, freshman, Ashland, Wis., William MAuliffe, freshman, Ashland, Wis.; Lowell McMullen, sophomore, Ashland, Wis.; Edward Bardill, sophomore, Spooner, Wis.; Richard Stroshane, senior, Ashland, Wis.; Kenneth Daniels, freshman, Ladysmith, Wis.; Guillermo de la Riestra, sophomore, Havana, Cuba; Henry McKenzie, freshman, Chicago, Ill.; Bruce Johnson, freshman, Hancock, Mich.; James Zar, freshman, Ashland, Wis.; Jack Boucher, sophomore, Ashland, Wis.

Bass: Lyman Thompson, freshman, Antigo, Wis.; John Dosedel, freshman, Ladysmith, Wis.; John Ferris, senior, Hancock, Wis.; Howard Johnson, sophomore, Ashland, Wis.; Lyle LaPoint, freshman, Chicago, Ill.; James Burlager, freshman, Washburn, Wis.; Marvin Sykes, freshman, Ashland, Wis.; Dale Borowick, sophomore, Ashland, Wis.; Howard Konkol, freshman, Ashland, Wis.; Kenneth Martinson, sophomore, Ashland, Wis.; Milton Carlson, sophomore, Mason, Wis.; Lawrence Clark, freshman, Wauwatosa, Wis.; Sam Wheeler, junior, Ashland, Wis.

APPRECIATION

To those churches, alumni, and friends who helped to make this tour possible, we wish to express a word of appreciation. We sincerely hope that the concert which you hear will be worthy of the interest you have manifested by your presence, and merit your support.

It was with the financial help of New Englanders that our first building, Wheeler Hall, was made possible. A few years later a family in Massachusetts gave us the funds to erect Woods Hall. It was Congregational women who gave us our ladies' dormitory, Memorial Hall. Our library was built largely through the efforts of the Daughters of the American Revolution. Others have kept the doors of Northland open by their regular contributions to the current operating budget. To you may we say that this choir is a product of Northland College—your school.

GLADYS W. ULINE,
Secretary to the President,
Manager 1947 Choir Tour.

DEDICATION

The concerts of this 1947 choir tour are humbly dedicated to the memory of the 19 Northlanders who gave their lives in battle during the world conflict, and to the 400 other Northlanders who struggled with them in order to again raise their voice in a song of freedom.

Raymond Adelman, class 1920; Fred Anderson, class 1940; Donald Benson, class 1943; John Cate, class 1939; William Fuller, class 1944; Everett Gillam, class 1940; Edmund

Jeffers, class 1940; Robert Lynch, class 1940; Wallace Ringham, class 1943; Morris Ristvedt, class, 1939; Edward Rogers, class 1942; John Schoonover, academician 1921; William Sherry, academician 1943; William Steinmetz, academician 1946; Franklin Tomenendale, academician 1942; Wesley Warvi, academician 1932; Charles Watson, academician 1937; Gerald Weiss, academician 1946; Danforth Welty, academician 1941.

MUSIC FACULTY

Perry Howard Yaw, Jr., bachelor of science, Mansfield State Teachers College, master of arts, University of Michigan, director of music department, assistant professor of music theory and instrumental music, director of orchestra and string ensemble.

Kathryn Ragsdale Church, teacher diploma in voice and piano, Christian College, Iowa State Teachers College, Iowa State University Conservatory of Music, studied voice with Afra Kirsch, of Chicago, Ill., and has had voice coaching under Mrs. Elizabeth Birney Schmidt and Thomas Muir, of New York City, as well as Luther Richman, president of Music Educators National Conference, instructor of music theory and voice, director of Northland College choir.

Marcia-Mary Ball, bachelor of music, American Conservatory of Music, master of music, American Conservatory of Music, assistant professor of music theory, piano, and organ.

Ingyr Marie Lien, teacher diploma in violin, Oberlin Conservatory of Music, bachelor of music, Philadelphia Musical Academy, master of music, Philadelphia Musical Academy, University of Michigan, assistant professor of music theory, violin, and piano.

Manley E. MacDonald, president, 1945, bachelor of arts, Greenville College, master of arts, University of Michigan, doctor of philosophy, University of Michigan.

Lewis H. Brumbaugh, dean, 1945, bachelor of arts, Mount Morris College, master of arts, University of Chicago, bachelor of divinity, Yale University, doctor of philosophy, University of Pittsburgh.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

One of the basic purposes of this bill is to provide that the District Commissioners shall hold a hearing to secure an expression of views from the citizens of the District of Columbia. Certainly there can be no objection to an expression of views by people who live in the adjoining counties of Virginia and Maryland, and I, for one, do not object. I believe I bespeak the sentiment of the membership of the committee when I say they would have no objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York; certainly I do not.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Does the gentleman feel that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia could have any authority over the surrounding territory of Virginia and Maryland?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The question of authority is not involved here. The language of the bill is that the Commissioners shall hold a hearing at which the people may express their views. That makes it entirely permissive. So I see nothing wrong with permitting people who live outside and beyond the District line from expressing their views also, because it is on an informal basis.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it contended by the gentleman from Illinois that this bill does not give the Commissioners authority to determine whether or not there shall be daylight-saving time in the District?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very definitely it does give them the authority after they have had a hearing and made a determination that there should be daylight-saving time.

Mr. HARRIS. Then, does the gentleman contend that the authority given to the Commissioners of the District can extend to Maryland and Virginia?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It gives no such authority. The bill merely provides that the Commissioners shall hold a hearing at which the people may make an expression of their views for the benefit of the executive heads of the Nation's Capital.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the statement by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] about the farmer being the slave of the sun.

Back in the old days they used to tell the story of a Negro whose employer gave him an old watch with a long brass chain. He put it on and went to town. Another Negro hailed him and said: "Hey, Bill, what time is it?"

He looked at his watch and said: "Hit's 15 minutes after half past of a quarter before 11 o'clock. Hereafter when you wants to know what time it is, you look at de sun what's made for po' folks and don't be pestering gentlemen on de streets."

The sun is what our time is regulated by. I have never seen any advantage come from daylight saving. I went through it in the First World War and I saw it imposed during the last war. I have always thought we would have been better off if we had just gone ahead with the regular standard time, governed, as the gentleman from New York said, by the sun which the farmers go by.

Again, you are moving up the time at which the employees of the Federal Government will leave their work in the afternoon. Already every department is closed on Saturday. Now, under this bill, they will close Friday afternoon at the very time that a Member of Congress has the most time to contact the departments about matters affecting his district. You will find the departments closed and the employees gone home.

I do not agree with the gentleman from New York that you can impose this time on the people of Virginia and Maryland. You may make it apply to Government employees, but if you do you will have to make it apply to Government employees elsewhere, in other States. I cannot see how you are going to make this apply to the surrounding territory of Maryland, Virginia, and Delaware.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi that it should not be made to apply elsewhere, but automatically it applies. If the public markets of Washington open an hour earlier in the morning it means that the farmer has to start an hour earlier in the morning to get there.

Mr. RANKIN. If the bill in its present form passes it would not apply to the people who work in the Pentagon Building, which is over in Virginia; is that correct?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I suspect the gentleman is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, the majority of the people on the pay roll of the War Department would not be affected.

Mr. Chairman, I am just like the Negro; let us look at the sun which was made for "po' folks" and be governed accordingly and stay by standard time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this involves the question whether you want the folks in the District of Columbia to have the right to make some decision as to whether they are going to have daylight-saving time. You know, the Congress takes up a lot of time with District of Columbia affairs. I happen to be chairman of a Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare of the District. Do you know some of the bills we have had to consider from the District? Oh, we have had a bill to regulate the hours of barbers in the District. We have had one for the undertakers. We have a bill to get rid of the starlings in Washington. I can tell you how to get rid of the English sparrows, but not over this microphone. Yes, we have a bill to require sanitary straws in the District.

Now, it is ridiculous that all of those little matters—I call them chicken-feed bills—should come before the Congress for decision. It takes time of the committee and it takes the time of this Congress. But the Commissioners must bring all these little problems to the Congress. Whether it is starlings, barbers, undertakers, or sanitary straws, those matters must come to the Congress. Last week we had a bill that would permit the Commissioners to tear down some road signs by the White House. They cannot even change the name of a street in Washington without coming to Congress. If you believe in the right of home rule and that the Commissioners should handle the affairs of the District, and if you believe that they ought to have the right to hold hearings on whether or not the District should have daylight-saving time, then you should have no objection to this bill. Personally, I would be opposed to a bill of this sort in the western part of my State because my people do not want it, but if they did, I would support it. The Commissioners must hold hearings—the people decide—that is the democratic way of doing things.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I would like to ask the gentleman if the Congress and the District Committee of the House, or a subcommittee thereof, is not in effect the council for the District of Columbia?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; I think that is true, and the District Committee voted for this bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Those matters that the gentleman has just mentioned are matters, of course, that are usually considered by the councils of the various municipalities of the Nation, are they not?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is true. I have been one of those Members of Congress that felt like the people of the District of Columbia ought to have a little self-rule of their own.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman brings up the question of the Committee on the District of Columbia, of which I have been a member for 10 years, being the city council for the District of Columbia. In the city councils of other cities, whatever they do, subject to the approval of the mayor, becomes law. If the Congress will follow the advice and recommendations of the city council of the District of Columbia this bill will become law.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is right, if they will follow those recommendations.

I think as far as home rule for the District is concerned they ought to have the right to elect their Commissioners. I believe personally in the city-manager form of government where they have some business logic in the government. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS] and his committee are now studying the problem of home rule. If you do not believe the city ought to have home rule, you ought to vote against the bill. This bill does not state that there is going to be daylight-saving time; it gives the Commissioners the right to hold a hearing of interested citizens and make a decision. I think that is democratic; I think that is the proper way to proceed. I feel the House ought to give that right to the Commissioners and to the folks living in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, Billy Sunday once said, speaking of prohibition and the effort to regulate the saloon, that you might as well attempt to regulate "a powder mill in hell" as to regulate a saloon. I think as far as this Congress or anyone else attempting to regulate the sun is concerned, we would have about as much chance as Billy Sunday said we would have in regulating the saloon.

The first speech I ever attempted to make on the floor of this Congress was against daylight-saving time, because the people of Ohio did not want it. It was a definite hardship upon those people. I also helped to vote the repeal of daylight-saving time. I also voted against this bill 2 weeks ago today. However, it was a different proposition we voted on then than that which is before us today. Today we are simply saying that the people of the District shall have a right to determine the matter for themselves, and who am I or who is any Member of this Congress to say they shall not have that right? Therefore, I now reverse my position. I am still opposed to daylight saving in my district and State, but I would not deny anyone the right to decide on it himself. Therefore I shall vote for the bill.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Ohio who just spoke will not leave the room, because I want him to know that the utter sophistry of this bill is simply this: On February 24 we voted down the daylight-saving proposition. This bill would be subject to a point of order for that reason if it were not for the fact that the Senate saw fit to pass this sophistry which states that the District of Columbia Commissioners may take a poll. It does not say the people shall vote, it does not say they shall be required to vote; it merely means that we are not giving the people of the District of Columbia the right to vote, for it means that under some sort of an informal proposition maybe the Commissioners will hold a meeting. They will advertise it or give notice in the paper and then down here in one of the committee rooms they will have a hearing at which maybe 200 or 300 or 400 people will express themselves. Does not that show the utter sophistry of this situation? The people do not vote.

You are being asked to say that you do not have enough brains to pass on this matter, that you should leave it up to two men. That is the actual situation we are in in this case. The most ridiculous argument is that it gives the people of the District of Columbia the right to express themselves. That is perfectly ridiculous.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The fact of the matter is that the people express themselves through the medium of citizens associations, of which there are nearly 70. It is fair to assume that the heads of those associations, who are gathered into a common council known as the Federation of Citizens Associations, will express themselves, and they have expressed themselves in an overwhelming majority in favor of daylight saving. They are for the present bill.

Mr. O'HARA. If the gentleman places it on that basis, I may say that on some other matters of which I know concerning which the citizens associations have expressed themselves the Commissioners have paid not too close attention.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. The gentleman is a very practical politician.

Mr. O'HARA. No; do not say that.

Mr. BREHM. When a majority of a group express themselves, I imagine the gentleman gives heed to them. Even though the citizens of the District do not vote for the Commissioners, does not the gentleman feel that the Commissioners are practical politicians enough to listen to the majority, and that they will not deliberately force this upon the people unless the majority of the people desire it?

Mr. O'HARA. I will not argue with the gentleman on that proposition, but, of course, we find ourselves often in the same position. Sometimes we do not agree with the majority of the people in our districts if we think that the rules of logic compel us to come to an opposite conclusion.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. I know that the gentleman is a distinguished lawyer in his State so I take the liberty of asking him this question. Do you think this Congress that is vested with the power and authority to determine these questions with reference to the District of Columbia has any power to delegate that authority to two or three men to make a decision for the people of the District of Columbia?

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman is a very fine lawyer and has raised a question which did occur to me but which I did not want to raise. But I will say, this is an attempt to unlawfully delegate authority to two Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

I now yield to my young friend, the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Chairman, will my able and distinguished friend from Minnesota tell me just what adverse effect the passage of this bill would have on our farmers in Minnesota?

Mr. O'HARA. Of course, I am not voting on this proposition on that basis at all. I am voting on it because, as I said before—the gentleman would have heard me if he had been here, which he was not—I do not like the daylight-saving time. If this bill passes, if the gentleman has to get up an hour earlier on one of these hot steaming Washington mornings, which he has not yet experienced, although he may be for this bill now he certainly will say that he made a mistake.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I started from my home city of Binghamton in New York State yesterday to return to Washington. As soon as I hit the Pennsylvania border I had to inquire what time of day it was. A few hours later I hit the Maryland line and there again I was in a quandary because, unlike Pennsylvania and New York, Maryland is on the old time. Imagine my consternation when I again crossed over into the District and found

that the same time existed here as in Maryland. In other words, there were four great sections or divisions of government that I passed through yesterday on my trip and I found there was a great difference practically every place I visited.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It should be said that the cities of Annapolis and Baltimore are on daylight-saving time by authority of an ordinance enacted by the people there and the counties adjoining the District line have authority under a bill which was recently passed by the Maryland Legislature and which has been signed by the Governor to follow the lead of the District of Columbia in the matter of daylight-saving time if the District adopts daylight-saving time.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I will say to the distinguished gentleman that I am not addressing my remarks at the present time to the issue of daylight-saving time. The issue, as some gentlemen have said, goes much further into the scheme of things of our representative form of government. As one who has always been violently partisan as far as the championing of the rights of men and women all over the country to enjoy their privilege of participating in a representative form of government, I feel that the time has come for us to consider representative government in the District of Columbia, which I believe is the only place in the entire country that does not enjoy such a constitutional privilege. I want to go on record here today as being in favor of the nearly 1,000,000 inhabitants of the District of Columbia who are good patriotic Americans and who are able to decide for themselves the vital issues they are concerned with. I think the Congress is making history by taking this position. It is evidencing its interest in the same kind of government which we have back in our home districts in every township, county, and subdivision of government, in the various States, and, finally, in the Federal Government itself. It is a challenge—and I believe this question presents the very beginning of that challenge—that 800,000 inhabitants of the District of Columbia, now voteless, now without any expression of opinion in government, now without any opportunity to rule themselves—this question goes to the heart of this issue, and gives them the first step they have ever had in the matter of home rule. Home rule and representative government go hand in hand. Home rule is the issue which already the people of the United States have decided upon and which they feel ought to be given to themselves. Finally, when residents of the District of Columbia obtain that blessed privilege of representing themselves, I believe that the problem of constitutional government in the United States will be solved. For that reason, I am voting for this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] has expired.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this resolution reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia.

As the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] has well stated, the Committee on the District of Columbia is really, in fact, the city council of the District of Columbia. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], chairman of the committee, and I have served on this committee for a period of over 10 years. We have had to consider all matters of legislation affecting the welfare of this community. This year is no different from any other. From the middle of January, as chairman of the Committee on the Fiscal Relations of the District of Columbia, I have been sitting constantly in respect to the consideration of the over-all tax problem of the District of Columbia, and also the question of the teachers' salary increase which we had here last week. This committee is busy from one end of the legislative year to the other. It is an additional load that we gladly assume, because it is the responsibility of the Congress of the United States to consider all matters pertaining to the welfare of this community, just so long as we deny the right to the people of the District of Columbia to settle those questions themselves. This is a question that I believe ought to be determined by local option, insofar as we are permitting it to be determined that way, by permitting the administrators of the District of Columbia, the three District Commissioners, to hold hearings and from those hearings determine what is the viewpoint of the people of the District of Columbia.

Here we find a poll taken by one of the local newspapers, that the sentiment is in favor of daylight saving in the District of Columbia 8 to 1, yet the membership of this House, practically every one of us who will leave the District of Columbia, and go home into our own districts during the month of July or August or whenever we will adjourn, are denying the right to the people of the District of Columbia to have what they consider they are entitled to, daylight saving in the District of Columbia.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, we are wasting a lot of time on matters that personally are of but very little interest to us. Of course, we are interested in what goes on back in our own States, but every State north of us along the coast, whether it be New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, or Rhode Island, has daylight saving. To be sure, it was quite confusing when we picked up the paper yesterday to find out what the radio schedule was. We found when we turned the dial that the program we were interested in was on an hour ago.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we ought to follow the recommendations of this committee which has given so freely of its time in the determination of the problems of the District of Columbia. I hope that this bill as amended by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] will be approved this afternoon.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the argument of the gentleman from New York, the very distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL], and the argument of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] that this was a question of home rule misstates the real issue.

Then, too, I am surprised that the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] should want to put through a bill which will require Federal employees to get up and go to work an hour earlier each workday. I cannot understand the gentleman with the large family that he has, always in favor, as he has been in favor, of those who must work, now supporting a bill which will require them to get to work an hour earlier in the morning, so the golf player can get out an hour earlier in the afternoon.

These two gentlemen have mistaken the issue. It is not one of home rule.

This measure directly affects us and our constituents. By moving the clock ahead, every Member of Congress has to get over to his office an hour earlier. What for? To satisfy the people in the District.

Well, back in my country, the tail does not wag the dog all the time, not all of the time; the dog has something to say about it once in a while. And yet we will have to go to work an hour earlier, and, as one Member said—I think it was the gentleman from Mississippi—you who want to work Saturdays and your people want you to work and you are working in your office Saturday, when you call up a department and ask for information and the answer is "Nobody home," they have closed the office. Under this bill they will close an hour earlier. They now have a number of holidays each year, and I think in addition they have 15 days' sick leave and 30 days' annual leave. That is 45 days they now have, and every Saturday off.

Now, once in a while somewhere, sometime, somebody has got to work. The folks in my district call up my office in the afternoon and want to know something—want action. I must learn from a department down here, not on Saturdays, but on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays, Thursdays, and Fridays. My home folks call me. I have to tell them I cannot get an answer because the Federal employees have gone home. "What time do you quit down there?" "Well, they have gone home." It is 4:30, and we are on Washington time.

Now, these people do not have to work for the Government, but if they do ask for and accept a job, then they, as well as Members of Congress, should render service when the people want it.

When they tell us that it is a question of home rule, they are in error. It is a

question of whether your people in your district and my people in my district are going to get service out of Washington after 4 o'clock in the afternoon, or whether when the clock strikes 4 on 5 days a week there is no service in Washington because somebody here wants to quit to go fishing, to play golf, to play tennis, or do something else, and as a result we cannot get service, nor can they through us get service.

I say it is about time that the Congress began to legislate and continue to legislate on matters that we were sent here to legislate on, and not just make it easy for people who come to Washington to work a part of the time for a wage that is higher than our folks back home get.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the Wadsworth amendment. The committee has no objection to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARRIS) there were—ayes 116, noes 12.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. If, as a result of the hearings held pursuant to the first section of this act, the Commissioners should decide that daylight-saving time should be established in the District during the year 1947, the Commissioners are authorized to advance the standard time for the District 1 hour for any period of the year 1947 not earlier than the last Sunday of April of such year and not later than the last Sunday of September of such year. Any such time established by the Commissioners pursuant to this act shall, during the period for which it is applicable, be considered the standard time for the District of Columbia.

The Commissioners shall forthwith proceed in the exercise of the authority herein contained and shall, as soon as practicable, publish their findings and orders thereunder.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Page 2, line 10, strike out the period and insert the following: "*Provided, however,* That the establishment of such time for the District of Columbia shall not be construed to require any change in time for services in interstate commerce, nor shall any action by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or the governing body of any municipality be construed to require a change in time for any service which originates beyond a State line or is the subject of a contract in interstate commerce."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground it is not germane and covers interstate commerce as distinguished from local jurisdiction.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold his point of order?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I will withhold the point of order.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I shall not contend, of course, that the amendment is germane under the rules of the House, but it is pertinent and I suggest that it accomplishes the purpose that the gentleman ought to want to accomplish and in line with the argument advanced there should not be any objection to it. It will improve the bill considerably and also improve its chances of passage.

The amendment says:

Provided, however, That the establishment of such time for the District of Columbia shall not be construed to require any change in time for services in interstate commerce, nor shall any action by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or the governing body of any municipality be construed to require a change in time for any service which originates beyond a State line or is the subject of a contract in interstate commerce.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Obviously the Commissioners of the District of Columbia have no authority whatsoever over interstate commerce. The phraseology here might raise some very delicate questions of interpretation and definitely mutilate the purposes of the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The intent of the amendment is to enact the purposes of the bill proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] which would relieve radio stations, for example, in outlying States from having to change their schedules because the time is changed in some city where a program might originate. It would also relieve the railroads of the responsibility of changing their time to conform to a change in time in some city where a train starts. You might turn on your radio, if this amendment were adopted, and count on getting a program at the time it used to originate according to the zone you might be in.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The administrative difficulty of the amendment would heighten confusion and it might take months to resolve that confusion.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the gentleman insists on his point of order, of course I am not responsible for that, but it is a problem that the Congress should address itself to. We have an opportunity here to correct it but probably will not be able to do so if the gentleman interposes his point of order.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. It illustrates what we do in this bill in affecting the people who come in here from all over the country also.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct. I regret that the gentleman from Illinois in this particular matter seems not to be able to let his usual generous nature dictate consideration of the amendment.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Would not the adoption of this amendment create more confusion?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No. The purpose is to make it decidedly more acceptable to the people of the country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota goes beyond the jurisdiction of the District of Columbia, and is not germane. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, although a member of the District Committee, it is very seldom that I make a statement on the floor of this House with reference to District legislation. But I have a feeling in my heart about this matter and I cannot pass the opportunity to make a short statement.

I have served on the Committee on the District of Columbia for about 4 years. I have enjoyed that service. For that service the members of the District Committee, except from the District citizens themselves, receive no praise. I have thought several times of resigning from the committee, but it is a job that somebody in this Congress has to do, and there are not many of you that want to do it. If you had been sent to this Congress to represent the people of the District of Columbia, by the votes of the people of the District of Columbia, we would not have spent 3 minutes on this little bill today; not 3 minutes. I just want you to quietly ask yourselves, not your neighbors, but just ask yourselves this question: If I had been sent to this Congress by the votes of the people of the District of Columbia, what would I do with this bill?

Now, there have been some here today who have intimated that passage of the bill would be equivalent to passing the buck. Well, if that be true then we have passed the buck many, many times to the Commissioners of the District, and you should not be embarrassed in doing so again. But I do not believe passage of this bill could be so construed. I see no harm and no wrong in the Commissioners of the District, after calling in the residents of the District, determining themselves whether or not they should have daylight-saving time. What is wrong with it?

There are many of you here today—you will not publicly so say—who are opposed to the District of Columbia having the right of ballot. Well, I will say publicly I am opposed to it. But let me say to you now unless you give to the people of the District of Columbia a few of the things that they want in which there could possibly be no harm or no wrong, then the demand is going to be so strong upon this Congress in years to come that you are going to have to give them the ballot. Now, the question is just this: Do you want to give to the people of the District one of the minor, little, ordinary things that they are asking—that is this: Daylight saving? You know down deep in your hearts that nearly all of the citizens of this District want it. What would you do if you had been sent to Congress by their votes?

I live in a rural district. There are 153,000 farmers and farm people residing in my district. They are a wonderful people. I do not think they give one tinker's hoot whether or not the District has daylight saving, midnight saving, or whether District residents work at night and sleep all day, or vice versa. I believe that your people are no different from mine. They will respect you more for casting your vote in keeping with the desires of the District residents.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman think his constituents will be pleased when they learn that these two Commissioners have said to all these Federal employees here that they do not need to give service to the Congressmen or the people of the District after half-past 3 in the afternoon every day?

Mr. ABERNETHY. The legislation contemplates no such. If it did, I would be against it. I think the gentleman is using a vague and misleading illustration of what the legislation contemplates. There are Representatives here from California. The sun does not go down out there for 4 or 5 hours until after it does here. I have not heard the California Representatives complain because the Government offices are not open until 8 or 9 o'clock p. m. eastern time, which is about closing time—5 o'clock—on the west coast.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The departments and the Congress will all be on the same time. From the standpoint of putting in a given number of hours a day, there will be precisely no difference whatsoever.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman has stated it correctly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Are you going to have the District tell us what time we shall get up and what time we are going to go to work? That is going a little bit far.

Mr. ABERNETHY. All I ask you to do is vote as your conscience dictates; and when you do, I have no fear but that this measure will have your approval.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HENDRICKS: On page 1, line 9, strike out all of section 2 and insert the following:

"The Commissioners of the District shall report their findings to the District Committees of the House and Senate with their recommendations."

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, it seems that the whole purpose of this bill is to permit the people of the District to express themselves, but we then go a little further and give to the Commissioners the right to determine what shall be done. I do not think there is anything democratic about that, particularly. There is democracy in permitting the people of the District to express themselves, and certainly the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York was all right, but the Commissioners were not elected by the people and the people have no right to say what is going to be done.

I do not know whether the House held any hearings on this or not, but I do know that the House voted down daylight-saving time not very long ago. This is simply a method of circumventing what we have already done and giving three Commissioners the right to determine whether we were right or wrong.

Remember we had daylight-saving time during the war, but we had it all over the entire Nation, and that did not complicate problems so very much. Many disadvantages of daylight-saving time have been pointed out here today. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] pointed out the fact that people would be getting up earlier. The gentleman from New York pointed out the fact that the farmer would have to get up earlier to get his produce into the market. The gentleman from Mississippi has said it does not make any difference to the farmer what time the people get up here in Washington or what time they have, but it does make a difference throughout the Nation.

As the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has told you many times, you get calls and you want information from the departments. You find now that it takes all you can do to attend your committee hearings and get back to the office and make your calls in time to find somebody down there to do it. Now, when we go into daylight-saving time, they are going to get off earlier and you will not be able to finish that work in the afternoon. You will not find anyone in the departments, and you cannot find them in Saturday.

I remember daylight-saving time—we had it during the war in the winter. Do not forget the winter months are important too. In the winter we did not have daylight according to clocks until after 8 o'clock. Now you are going to have that situation again, just as some of the Members have pointed out here today. These people who have to get up and report to work by 7:30 or 8 in the morning are going to be handicapped because they are going to have to get up before daylight to do it.

I will tell you what this is exactly, and if you want to find out you can investigate. I do not object to people playing golf; in fact, I like to play a little golf once in a while. I would rather do a little fishing on the banks of the Potomac late in the afternoon, but we do not usually get to do that. The main reason for this daylight-saving time is the man who works in an office and can report at 9, 10, or 11, if he pleases. Then he wants the afternoon to end early so he can get out and play some golf. Go to the working people that have to get up early, to people who have children that they have to send to school. They are going to have to get the children up earlier in the morning.

I think the proper thing to do is let the people come in and be heard, and let the Commissioners take the testimony and then come to the Senate and House District Committees and report and make their recommendations. Then let this House decide on daylight-saving time.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Does not this bill expire on September 20? September 20 is not wintertime.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Even if it expires on September 20, it is still running into the winter. You know that daylight comes later in those months. But whatever time it may come, you are putting a burden upon the people who have to send their children to school and upon the workingman who has to get up early in the morning, and on the farmer who has to get his produce to the market when the market opens. He would have to get up before daylight to do that. Do not tell me that it does not affect the entire Nation, because it does.

Mr. BREHM. The workingmen with whom I have talked are in favor of it because it gives them more time to spend in their gardens and to do work around their homes after their regular day's work is finished. Since it ends on September 20, it would not interfere with children going to school in the dark.

Mr. HENDRICKS. If you would speak to a few of them, they might say they are in favor of it, but if you put daylight-saving time into effect and then ask them how they like it, they would tell you that they do not like it at all.

Mr. BREHM. Does not the gentleman believe in giving the people of the District of Columbia the right to make their own decisions on this question?

Mr. HENDRICKS. They are not making their own decision.

Mr. BREHM. Yes; they are.

Mr. HENDRICKS. If the people would make their own decision, that would be different. All you are doing is to tell the Commissioners to do what they want, and do not tell me that the Commissioners will not do what they please, as they have in the past. Just as has been pointed out by some of the other speakers here, the people have expressed themselves to the Commissioners in the past, and the Commissioners still do exactly as they please.

Mr. BREHM. I have more confidence in the Commissioners than that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, here you have a very interesting amendment. We have been trying for quite some time to dispose of this issue of daylight-saving time and to do it on the basis of home rule by conferring upon the Commissioners the power to hold a hearing and then make a determination. Now, the Committee of the Whole House has adopted the Wadsworth amendment which permits those who live in adjoining areas to come in and be heard so that it would not be an ex parte proceeding. Now comes the gentleman from Florida who says in his amendment that after the hearing and after the Commissioners

make a finding they should report their finding to the District Committees of the House and Senate. So, the Commissioners—he mentions two when, as a matter of fact, there are three—will report to the House District Committee and to the Senate District Committee. Then, the committees will have to convene and dispose of the findings one way or another and work out some kind of procedure that is not yet apparent to me and bring the matter back here to go through the same identical proceedings that we have before us this afternoon.

Now, that is a beautiful piece of circumlocution and if you want to eviscerate a bill, that would be a fine way of doing it. I suggest that we vote down the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CANFIELD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 736) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia during 1947, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'HARA) there were—ayes 121, noes 82.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and forty-one Members are present; a quorum.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 218, nays 145, not voting 68, as follows:

[Roll No. 42]

YEAS—218

Abernethy	Andrews, N. Y.	Bakewell
Albert	Angell	Banta
Allen, Calif.	Arends	Bates, Mass.
Allen, Ill.	Auchincloss	Battle
Beall	Gwinn, N. Y.	Mills
Bennett, Mich.	Hagen	Monroney
Blackney	Hale	Morgan
Blatnik	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Morrison
Bloom	Hall, Leonard W.	Muhlenberg
Boggs, Del.	Halleck	Murdock
Boggs, La.	Harless, Ariz.	Nixon
Boykin	Harness, Ind.	Norton
Bradley, Mich.	Hays	O'Brien
Bramblett	Hébert	O'Konski
Brehm	Hedrick	O'Toole
Brown, Ga.	Herter	Owens
Bryson	Heselton	Pace
Buck	Hess	Patterson
Buffett	Hinshaw	Peden
Burleson	Holmes	Peterson
Busbey	Hope	Plumley
Butler	Horan	Poage
Byrne, N. Y.	Howell	Potts
Canfield	Huber	Poulson
Carroll	Jarman	Price, Fla.
Case, S. Dak.	Javits	Price, Ill.
Chadwick	Jenison	Priest
Chelf	Jenkins, Pa.	Rabin
Chiperfield	Johnson, Calif.	Ramey
Clason	Jonkman	Rayfiel
Coffin	Judd	Reed, Ill.
Cole, Kans.	Karsten, Mo.	Reeves
Cole, Mo.	Kean	Rich
Cole, N. Y.	Kearney	Riehlman
Combs	Keating	Rivers
Corbett	Kee	Robertson
Cotton	Keefe	Rogers, Fla.
Coudert	Kelley	Rogers, Mass.
Courtney	Kennedy	Rooney
Cravens	Kilburn	Ross
Crosser	Kilday	Russell
Crow	Klein	Sadlak
Dague	Kunkel	Sadowski
Davis, Tenn.	Lea	St. George
Dawson, Utah	LeFevre	Sarbacher
Deane	Lodge	Sasscer
Delaney	Love	Seely-Brown
Devitt	Lucas	Sikes
Dingell	Lyle	Simpson, Pa.
Dirksen	McConnell	Smathers
Dondero	McCormack	Smith, Maine
Durham	McDonough	Snyder
Eberharter	McDowell	Stigler
Ellsworth	McGarvey	Stockman
Elston	McGregor	Stratton
Engel, Mich.	McMahon	Sundstrom
Evins	McMillen, Ill.	Teague
Fallon	MacKinnon	Thomas, N. J.
Feighan	Macy	Tibbott
Fenton	Madden	Towe
Fernandez	Mahon	Trimble
Fogarty	Maloney	Twyman
Foote	Manasco	Van Zandt
Forand	Mansfield, Mont.	Vorys
Fulton	Marcantonio	Walter
Gamble	Mathews	Whitten
Gearhart	Meade, Md.	Whittington
Goff	Merrow	Wigglesworth
Goodwin	Meyer	Wilson, Tex.
Gordon	Michener	Winstead
Gore	Miller, Nebr.	Wolverton
Gorski		Worley
Gossett		Youngblood
Grant, Ind.		

NAYS—145

Allen, La.	Cooper	Hull
Almond	Cox	Jackson, Wash.
Andersen, H. Carl	Crawford	Jenkins, Ohio
Anderson, Calif.	Cunningham	Jennings
Andresen, August H.	Davis, Ga.	Jensen
Andrews, Ala.	D'Ewart	Johnson, Ill.
Arnold	Dolliver	Johnson, Okla.
Barden	Dorn	Johnson, Tex.
Barrett	Doughton	Jones, Ala.
Bates, Ky.	Eaton	Jones, N. C.
Beckworth	Elliott	Jones, Ohio
Bell	Engle, Calif.	Kerr
Bennett, Mo.	Fellows	Knutson
Bishop	Flannagan	Lanham
Bonner	Gary	Larcade
Bradley, Calif.	Gillette	LeCompte
Brooks	Gillie	Lemke
Brophy	Graham	Lesinski
Brown, Ohio	Grant, Ala.	Lewis
Burke	Gregory	Lusk
Byrnes, Wis.	Griffiths	McCowen
Camp	Gross	McMillan, S. C.
Cannon	Gwynne, Iowa	Martin, Iowa
Chapman	Hardy	Mason
Chenoweth	Harris	Miller, Calif.
Church	Harrison	Miller, Conn.
Clark	Havenner	Miller, Md.
Clevenger	Hendricks	Morris
Clippinger	Hill	Mundt
Colmer	Hobbs	Murray, Tenn.
Cooley	Hoeven	Murray, Wis.
	Hoffman	Norblad
	Holifield	Norrell
O'Hara	Rohrbough	Taber
Passman	Sabath	Talle
Phillips, Calif.	Schwabe, Okla.	Thomas, Tex.
Phillips, Tenn.	Scrivner	Thomason
Pickett	Shafer	Vursell
Rains	Sheppard	Wadsworth
Rankin	Short	Weichel
Rayburn	Simpson, Ill.	Welch
Redden	Smith, Kans.	West
Reed, N. Y.	Smith, Ohio	Wheeler
Rees	Smith, Va.	Williams
Richards	Smith, Wis.	Wilson, Ind.
Riley	Spence	Wolcott
Rizley	Springer	Wood
Robsion	Stefan	Woodruff
Rockwell	Stevenson	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—68

Bender	Gallagher	Mansfield, Tex.
Bland	Gathings	Meade, Ky.
Bolton	Gavin	Mitchell
Buchanan	Gerlach	Morton
Buckley	Gifford	Nodar
Bulwinkle	Granger	Patman
Carson	Hand	Pfeifer
Case, N. J.	Hart	Philbin
Celler	Hartley	Ploeser
Clements	Heffernan	Powell
Curtis	Jackson, Calif.	Preston
D'Alesandro	Johnson, Ind.	Sanborn
Dawson, Ill.	Jones, Wash.	Schwabe, Mo.
Domengeaux	Kearns	Scoblick
Donohue	Kefauver	Scott, Hardie
Douglas	Keogh	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Drewry	Kersten, Wis.	Somers
Ellis	King	Stanley
Elsaesser	Kirwan	Taylor
Fisher	Landis	Tollefson
Fletcher	Lane	Vail
Folger	Latham	Vinson
Fuller	Lynch	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. D'Alesandro for, with Mr. Domengeaux against.

Mr. Folger for, with Mr. Gathings against.

Mr. Vail for, with Mr. Schwabe of Missouri against.

Mr. Nodar for, with Mr. Jackson of California against.

Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Gavin against.

Mr. Hardie Scott for, with Mr. Landis against.

Mr. Kefauver for, with Mr. Carson against.

Mr. Lane for, with Mr. Jones of Washington against.

Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Curtis against.

Mr. Stanley for, with Mr. Mansfield of Texas against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Johnson of Indiana with Mr. Drewry.
Mr. Hand with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. Case of New Jersey with Mr. Preston.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Donohue.
Mr. Latham with Mr. Clements.
Mr. Gifford with Mr. Riley.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Granger.
Mr. Fuller with Mr. King.
Mrs. Bolton with Mr. Bulwinkle.
Mr. Bender with Mr. Philbin.
Mr. Kearns with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Kirwan.

Mr. ENGLE of California changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

PAYMENT OF ALLOWANCES TO THREE INSPECTORS OF METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE FOR USE OF PRIVATELY OWNED MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 1624) to authorize payment of allowances to three inspectors of the Metropolitan Police force for the use

of their privately owned motor vehicles, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to allow not more than three inspectors of the Metropolitan Police force an allowance for privately owned automobiles used by the inspectors in the performance of official duties at not to exceed $480 per annum for each automobile used during the fiscal years 1945 and 1946 and thereafter to pay to not more than three inspectors of the Metropolitan Police force who may be called upon to use privately owned automobiles in the performance of official duties for each automobile an allowance not to exceed $480 per annum.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a quotation from a newspaper article.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include editorials.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. BRADLEY of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution of the City Council of Baltimore in support of an adequate merchant marine.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and in each to include an editorial or an article.

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution by the Certified Public Accountants of Minnesota.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an act concerning displaced persons.

Mr. FULTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Pittsburgh Press.

PERMISSION TO FILE MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tomorrow night to file minority views on the bill H. R. 3203.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I had a special order for today. I ask unanimous consent that it may be transferred to Monday, May 5, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] may address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow after the disposition of the legislative business for the day and special orders heretofore entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

RELIEF ASSISTANCE TO PEOPLE OF COUNTRIES DEVASTATED BY WAR

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 153, providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war.

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 further consideration of House Joint Resolution 153, with Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that when the Committee last had this joint resolution under consideration the first section of the resolution had been read.

The first section of the joint resolution is now open to amendment.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONKMAN: On page 1, line 4, after the words "not to exceed" strike out "$350,000,000" and insert "$200,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes to strike out the authorization of $350,000,000 and insert in place of it $200,000,000. It is complementary to another amendment which I expect to offer to section 2 reducing the term from June 30, 1948, to December 31, 1947.

Mr. Chairman, I supported the two authorizations for UNRRA in the sum of $1,350,000,000 each. I did that with some misgivings, but especially on the second authorization. At that time I offered an amendment that we give notice to the United Nations that at the end of this term the United States would withdraw from UNRRA. That was done because I felt that at some time this should become residual relief instead of what it promises to be—permanent relief year after year. I am concerned that that is what this bill contemplates at the present time; that is, that we are going permanently into the relief business, the only difference being that the United States is singly and alone taking over the burdens of UNRRA. I think I can point to the evidence which sustains that conclusion, and I want to examine with you the record and show that there will be no need for relief after 1947.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Does this amendment eliminate those countries that are Communist-controlled?

Mr. JONKMAN. No; it does not.

I do not see how any Member can consistently vote for relief through or in 1948 when all the evidence, the only thing that we have to guide us, shows that there will be no need for relief after 1947. We all know that the inspiration for this bill came from the General Assembly of the United Nations where continuation of UNRRA was considered and their recommendation at that time was 6 months of residual relief after the expiration of UNRRA on March 31, 1947, which would bring it up to October or until the next crop year.

Mr. Hoover recommends on page 55 of the hearings:

These estimates, except for Austria, in my view should first include the period from the end of UNRRA until the 1947 harvest.

President Truman in his message recommending this legislation said:

The authorization recommended is designed for the urgent relief needs for the balance of the year.

That is on page 2 of the report.

Under Secretary of State Clayton said on page 13 of the hearings:

Question by Mr. JONKMAN. Is it your belief from present indications that they will have less acute need for 1948 than they will in 1947?

Answer by Mr. CLAYTON. Yes. They have made such progress in the last 2 years, considering the conditions under which they have had to live and work, remarkable progress in many of these countries, that if the progress should continue at the same rate at which it has gone in the last 2 years we believe, as I stated here, that the need for relief by the United States Government will have been met and passed by the end of this year. I refer to free relief, of course.

Mr. Acheson, Under Secretary of State, in a letter written and produced at the debate in the House of last week, April 23,

and, therefore, the last word on this subject, wrote:

Question. Is it intended that the amounts authorized in the bill will be adequate to take care of the relief need of the countries assisted to the end of the crop year 1948?

Answer. The amount requested is to assist in meeting the estimated relief needs for the calendar year 1947.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Was there any evidence submitted before the gentleman's committee indicating that the problems of Europe today are more politcal than they are economic?

Mr. JONKMAN. Well, there is that indication. I repeat:

The amount requested is to assist in meeting the estimated relief needs for the calendar year 1947. In the actual operation of the program, some shipments may slip over into the first few months of 1948. With the possible exception of Austria—

Now, mind you, with the possible exception of Austria; not probable exception—

we do not anticipate that further relief will be necessary unless disastrous crop failures or other unforeseen events occur.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is no other guide for us, there is no other evidence for us than that relief will not be needed in 1948.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. They have had ample opportunity to make two crops since the war closed. The war did not tear up their fields; it tore up the factories and the towns. With the exception of Germany, you might say, there has not been a gun fired across the soil of any country for 2 years, and there is no reason on earth why they should not have made crops, except that they have been harassed by a Communist regime or encouraged to beg help from us.

Mr. JONKMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. But I want to emphasize what I was just saying. There is nothing else to guide you. The evidence positively shows that no relief will be needed after the end of 1947, and even the statement "with the possible exception of Austria" makes it stronger. They say they may need some limited relief; in other words, the other countries absolutely will not need it.

Now then, why do they ask for $350,000,000 to run through 1948? There was $100,000,000 in the budget to take care of 1947. I want you to look at the record and see what those who prepared this legislation had in mind.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman think we ought to make a difference between the Governments of Europe which are dominated by communism and those which are not dominated by communism?

Mr. JONKMAN. Well, it is most difficult to say that we are not going to go into those countries dominated by communism, if we can control this relief so that it goes to needy people without regard to creed, color, or race.

I ask you then, why do they ask for $350,000,000 to run into 1948? What is the analysis of it? I will give it to you again from the record, from the evidence, from the only thing that we have to guide us in this matter. This is from the hearings:

Mr. VORYS. Then in addition to the $500,000,000 of UNRRA products yet undelivered by UNRRA, I understand that $100,000,000 of this $350,000,000 to be authorized by this legislation would be the amount distributed up to June. Is that correct?

Mr. CLAYTON That depends on how soon this $350,000,000 would be available to us if at all, by Congress, and how quickly we could enter the procurement. The critical time, as I have said in my previous statement, is in the spring and summer before the harvest comes in.

That is the spring and summer that we are now in.

Therefore we would like to get the money as quickly as we can and start shipping wheat and other supplies as quickly as possible.

Mr. VORYS. I noted in the budget that $100,000,000 of that was put in for fiscal year 1947.

Mr. CLAYTON. That is just an estimate, sir. We would like to spend more than that if we could in the fiscal year 1947.

Mr. VORYS. According to the budget, you would contemplate that $250,000,000 would be distributed through 1948?

Mr. CLAYTON. That is the estimate we made; yes, sir.

In other words, they are going to spend $250,000,000 in 1948 where there is no need of relief in 1948 according to all the testimony available.

Let us fortfy that just a little further. Mr. Tyler Wood, Deputy to Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, said:

Mr. JARMAN. You spoke of the $100,000,000 last November, and the acting chairman spoke of $200,000,000. Are those figures in the budget?

I think that should be $250,000.

Mr. WOOD. Yes, they are in the budget. They are on the expenditure budget, which is the $37,500,000,000 that everybody is talking about, and the estimate is that of the $350,000,000 that is in the budget, $100,000,000 would actually be spent in the fiscal year 1947 and $250,000,000 in the fiscal year 1948.

In other words, we have the same thing there. They are contemplating expenditures into 1948 to the amount of $250,000,000. I submit, however, why should they propose this when no relief is needed in 1948.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment does not hold them to the $100,000,000 that was contemplated for 1947, that would carry them through the spring and early summer of 1947. I think, Mr. Chairman, that we could with consistency cut this authorization down to $100,000,000, and that would meet the needs of 1947. That is what the evidence shows. But I am not asking for that. We propose to give them under this amendment $200,000,000. That is up to the end of the year. On January 3, 1948, Congress will be in session. We have not yet seen, Mr. Chairman, how this replacement for UNRRA is going to work. We know that UNRRA worked very, very poorly. I dare say from what I have seen that if 10 to 20 percent of the $2,750,000,000 that we put in there actually went to the needy people for food, medicine, seeds, and so forth, it is a high percentage. What assurance have we that this is going to be handled any better?

I hope my amendment will be adopted. It provides ample funds for the balance of the year 1947, and at the end of that time Congress will be in session if further help is needed.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we are all well aware of the fact that this House is so large that it is utterly imposible for it to function as a strictly deliberative body. We fully realize the impossibility of 435 Members sitting in this Chamber and discussing an item of legislation. Why, we would never get through. It would even take us more time than is required in another place I know of to pass legislation. Therefore that realization requires us to rely very heavily on the committees of the House. One specializes in foreign affairs, one on the armed forces, and one on appropriations. We naturally and properly look to the Appropriations Committee on matters germane to it. We look to the Committee on Armed Forces on matters of defense. It is equally natural for us to look to the Committee on Foreign Affairs on matters of foreign relations. But regardless of which committee it be, the only way the committee can bring the results of its work to the House is in a report. These circumstances place a heavy responsibility on the committees to make sure that the reports speak the truth, of course, the same responsibility rests on the shoulders of those who submit minority reports.

We have in this case a very strong majority report and a strong minority report. The minority report is signed by three able members of that committee, three very fine gentlemen of whom I am personally quite fond. I want to read the two concluding paragraphs of that minority report:

We propose to offer amendments which will reduce the authorization of this bill to $200,000,000 and provide that no transfers of supplies or establishments of credits may be made thereunder after December 31, 1947.

This will more nearly meet all the considerations which a judicious approach would recommend and which is adequate to accomplish the desired result if distribution is made with reasonable diligence.

That is what the minority report says, my friends, from which this amendment results with which the majority of the committee, and I mean the majority of both Republicans and Democrats, are in complete disagreement.

I quote again from that same minority report, on page 9:

Finally, the State Department has not made any on-the-spot check of the needs in

these countries. It does not know whether there is scarcity—

Remember these words—

whether there is scarcity in Warsaw or Athens; and if so, which of the two has the greatest scarcity.

Now, I read from page 86 of the hearings. Bear in mind that word "Warsaw."

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] was asking a question of the representative of the State Department, Mr. Wood, and he said:

Mr. Hoover made a great deal of the importance of having on-the-spot investigations and studies by qualified experts in the field of relief. As I understand your answer to Mr. JARMAN's question, those on-the-spot investigations have not yet taken place in any of these countries.

Mr. WOOD. No; I did not mean to give that impression. They have been continuous.

Mr. MUNDT. No special missions have been sent over to make a specific study leading up to this?

Mr. WOOD. There have been continuous investigations by the people in the embassies in these countries, in addition to which there was this investigation, on which we had really expert people, made by the Devastated Areas Subcommittee of the Economic and Social Council.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. Of course I will have to yield to the gentleman—I am talking about him. But if he would let me proceed I might compliment him even more highly.

Mr. JONKMAN. Does the gentleman mean by that last statement the Social and Economic Council of the United Nations made on-the-spot investigations?

Mr. JARMAN. I am reading from the hearings. I believe I reached the point where I said investigation was made by the Devastated Areas Subcommittee of the Economic and Social Council.

Mr. JONKMAN. That is the United Nations organization.

Mr. JARMAN. Oh, yes; "on which we had really expert people." If the gentleman will permit me to proceed—my time is very limited.

There has not been in these countries a formal investigating committee from the outside, but let me assure you that, for example, we went into Poland this summer and Ambassador Lane and his whole staff were spending a great deal of time, not only in Warsaw, but all over the country, looking at the condition of the crops and interviewing people in various places.

Now, my friends, I submit to you the considered opinion—and I may be wrong, but if I am, I am subject to being challenged—that I do not believe that evidence is controverted anywhere in the hearings. Therefore, I do not believe there appears to be anything in the hearing to substantiate the positive statement of the minority report that no on-the-spot investigations occurred. On the other hand, it is directly contradicted by the testimony. If that be true, who is the House of Representatives to follow—the three gentlemen who signed this minority report or the Democrats and Republicans who agree to the majority report? The former express the opinion in the same report in which they say no on-the-spot investigation occurred, that $200,000,000 will prove adequate; whereas the latter will, I am sure, reiterate the position they took when voting this amendment down in committee.

In conclusion, may I repeat that I have only the highest regard for those three gentlemen. I do not believe they would deliberately attempt to mislead this House. On the other hand, as I said last week, we are all so thoroughly occupied that frequently we do not have time to go into these matters, to study them from all angles as I know these three gentlemen would have done had time been available to them. In that event they never would have placed that statement in the report.

In view of that statement, how can we have too much confidence in their recommendation that $200,000,000 would be adequate?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute offered by Mr. VORYS:

Mr. VORYS moves to amend House Joint Resolution 153 as follows:

Strike out the Jonkman amendment and at the end of section 1 add the following: "there is hereby established a joint committee on International Relief consisting of five Members of the Senate appointed by the President pro tempore, and five Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker.

"It shall be the duty of the joint committee to study relief needs in foreign countries and the ability of the United States to furnish relief; the President shall keep the joint committee advised of foreign relief needs and the measures he is taking to relieve such needs and all expenditures in excess of $200,000,000 from the appropriations herein authorized shall have the approval of the joint committee. Such approval may be given in detail or in gross amounts as the joint committee shall deem advisable."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer this substitute as another way of solving the problem presented by my esteemed colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN]. I offered the amendment to cut the amount of the authorization to $200,000,000 in committee. In the meantime, time has been going by. I have seen how kleidoscopic and unpredictable the changes in Europe and in our relations with Europe make the future. I therefore propose the suggestion which carries out the suggestion made by Mr. Hoover before our committee.

If you will look at the hearings on page 57, you will find Mr. Hoover said:

There is no mortal man who can determine what the requirements of those various nations are going to be after the next harvest and determine the requirement of each nation after harvest, at the present time.

Therefore, he suggested that a small committee of Congress be set up to review the needs after the next harvest. Remember, this is only an authorization bill. The Committee on Appropriations will have to do the appropriating. But only God knows what the needs are going to be in those countries next fall after their harvests are in, and what our ability will be to fulfill those needs after our harvests are in. Therefore, this amendment would provide for a review by an appropriate joint congressional committee on relief. All expenditures over $200,000,000 would have to be approved by this committee.

Now, let us face the practical facts. We are hopeful that the Congress will be in recess this fall. Therefore, the Congress will not be here to review the authorization. If we have a program that runs up to December 31, it is not contemplated that the Congress will be in session in December. This authorization continues through fiscal year 1948, but the proposal has been made that it may be spent in 1947. Only God knows the needs. We know something about the needs, on the Foreign Affairs Committee, but, as I explained the other day, due to the way this was presented to us, only 6 of the 12 days of hearings are before you. The secret documents which gave the needs and the proposed distribution are not before us and, therefore, we cannot intelligently discuss this. But it seems to me that, patterning this after a similar joint committee that has been in effect for some years, we can do a good job. The Foreign Service Building Committee is made up of Members of Congress from the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. This is provided in the Foreign Service Buildings Commission law, title 22, section 293, United States Code. That joint committee must approve, even though appropriations are made, before an embassy can be put up on foreign soil.

Under the proposed substitute I offer, a joint committee which would obviously be made up of a majority of the party in power in Congress would have to approve all expenditures after the first $200,000,000. If we adopted this we would have bipartisan power and responsibility in carrying out this policy in that we would have the Executive proposing the expenditures and the committee, a majority of which would be Republicans, approving these expenditures. I am sure the committee would approve them if the funds were necessary. In the event the expenditure were not necessary I am sure that such a committee would prevent needless expenditure.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. EATON. Do we understand from the gentleman's amendment that this proposed committee is to be appointed from the membership of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and

the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House?

Mr. VORYS. The amendment merely provides that the Speaker shall appoint five members and the President of the Senate shall appoint five. Where they are to come from is left to the wisdom of these Presiding Officers. I imagine that the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House would be represented heavily. There might be members from the Appropriations Committees.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. HERTER. Is it not true that in advocating the type of check the gentleman has in mind in offering this amendment, Mr. Hoover likewise recommended that the sum of $350,000,000 be left intact?

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Hoover suggested that this sort of control would leave the authorization intact subject to appropriation, but would permit a congressional string to it in case the money were not needed, and would also give congressional power and responsibility to make this relief truly a bipartisan proceeding.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Was this amendment proposed in the Committee on Foreign Affairs?

Mr. VORYS. Yes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. What was the result?

Mr. VORYS. It lost.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. By how many votes?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman's amendment provide for an administrator?

Mr. VORYS. That will be proposed in an amendment to be offered later.

Mr. HERTER. The purpose of the gentleman's amendment is to make it clear that the United States is preparing to contribute up to $350,000,000 if it is needed; but there is not any sense in actually spending it unless it is spent after investigation and that investigation proves that it is actually needed.

Mr. VORYS. That is right.

This is only an authorization bill, but this will help the Appropriations Committee, which would not be permitted to put any such legislative restriction in an appropriation bill in connection with any appropriation made beyond $200,000,000; but if the Appropriations Committee is so disposed it would be subject to the control of this congressional relief committee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. What assurance have we that any other nation in the world other than this Nation will make any contribution to this money that we are proposing to spend?

Mr. VORYS. We have no assurance at all.

Mr. JENNINGS. I am talking about the percentage. What I want to know is if we have any assurance that any other nation on earth will make any contribution.

Mr. VORYS. We know that the British are going to lend $40,000,000 in Austria, but due to the fact that no treaty has been had in the case of Austria it is doubtful in my mind whether Austria will come into this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support House Joint Resolution 153, and I think it should be passed without amendment. I shall endeavor to develop my reasons for this statement.

Whereas I agree with my distinguished colleague from Ohio in that we should have a committee to study the way in which this money is to be spent, I believe that is part of a larger problem. For a long time I have been asking that there be a select committee of 23 Members appointed to make a full study of foreign policy, both economic and political, in every country and with full power to investigate the Department of State and the Foreign Service. So far as the committee suggested by my distinguished colleague is concerned, I believe it would be a subject for legislation other than House Joint Resolution 153.

Mr. Chairman, nobody has been any more outspoken against communism than I. I would vigorously oppose the spending of American money if in any way it could be used to advance communism and to assist Moscow-controlled governments. If this resolution were to continue UNRRA, I would strenuously oppose the measure. In the summer of 1945 I witnessed the UNRRA operations in western Europe and the Balkans. While in this area and particularly in Belgrade, the capital of the Moscow-Tito-dominated Yugoslavia, I learned that UNRRA was being used to advance the fortunes of the Communist Party. In an effort to focus attention on the misuse of UNRRA funds I introduced on October 10, 1945, House Resolution 369 to set up a committee to make an investigation of UNRRA.

UNDER SECRETARY CLAYTON'S ASSURANCES

The joint resolution under discussion provides for unilateral relief action by the United States to prevent starvation. It is "based on the principle that relief of this kind is for people in need, and that these unfortunate people cannot be allowed to suffer from hunger because of the nature of their governments."

On February 25, 1947, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, Mr. Clayton, appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee at the opening of the hearing on this measure. Fearing that the proposed relief might be used by Russian-controlled governments to advance communism, I said to Mr. Clayton:

I just do not see how we are going to send relief, for instance, to Hungary, and particularly Poland, where there is Soviet-dominated government and let that government distribute the relief, without advancing the Communist Party in those countries. That is what happened under UNRRA, as near as I can find out, and that is what worries me about this situation. I think if Russia is going to dominate those countries she had better help feed them.

To this Mr. Clayton replied in the following manner:

Mr. MERROW, may I say just a few words on that: Of course Hungary is hungry, and starving people are starving people wherever you might find them, under what conditions of government or otherwise. However, I think, under the conditions which we will name in these agreements, you may be sure that the people getting this relief will know where it comes from and who is supplying it, that it will be distributed without discrimination, and that the purpose we have in mind will be accomplished to prevent starvation in these countries.

PROPOSED AGREEMENTS

In the appendix of the hearings, page 125, there is a statement by Mr. C. Tyler Wood, Deputy to the Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, concerning the agreements referred to by Mr. Clayton to be made between the United States and relief-recipient countries. Under 13 headings Mr. Wood has outlined the agreements referred to by the Under Secretary. I quote only part of his statement:

The agreements will provide for reports covering (a) prompt notice of arrival of United States supplies, (b) the allocation of those supplies to commercial and other channels and the quantity of supplies used for free distribution, (c) current inventories of all supplies available for relief, and (d) forecasts of local supplies which will become available; the agreements will provide that the United States representatives will be completely free to observe, inspect, and travel at any and all times as they consider necessary, and the full cooperation of the Government in providing them with information, statistics, and reports; the agreements will provide that representatives of the United States press and radio will be given complete freedom to observe and report on the relief distribution; the agreements will provide that the recipient governments will arrange for publicity regarding the arrival of United States supplies, the channels of distribution, any unusual features of the distribution of supplies, and the utilization of funds accruing from sales of supplies for the benefit of the people; the agreements on this subject will give the United States control of the program at all times and provide a powerful means of enforcing compliance with United States wishes concerning the distribution; since conditions vary from country to country, it is possible that other provisions will be necessary to insure proper conduct and effectiveness of distribution in some particular country.

REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION 3

In section 3 of the resolution it is expressly stated:

No relief assistance shall be provided under the authority of this joint resolution to the people of any country unless the government of such country has given assurance satisfactory to the President that (a) the supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution, as well as similar supplies produced locally or imported from outside sources, will be distributed among the people of such country without discrimination as to race, creed, or political belief; (b) representatives of the Gov-

ernment of the United States and of the press and radio of the United States will be permitted to observe freely and to report fully regarding the distribution and utilization of such supplies; (c) full and continuous publicity will be given within such country as to the purpose, source, character, scope, amounts and progress of the United States relief program carried on therein pursuant to this joint resolution; (d) if food, medical supplies, fertilizer, or seed is transferred or otherwise made available to such country pursuant to this joint resolution, no articles of the same character will be exported or removed from such country while need therefor for relief purposes continues; (e) such country has taken or is taking, insofar as possible, the economic measures necessary to reduce its relief needs and to provide for its own future reconstruction; (f) upon request of the President, it will furnish promptly information concerning the production, use, distribution, importation, and exportation of any supplies which affect the relief needs of the people of such country; and (g) representatives of the Government of the United States will be permitted to supervise the distribution among the people of such country of the supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution.

CONFIDENCE IN STATE DEPARTMENT TO ADMINISTER THIS RELIEF

The conditions set forth in section 3 of this measure in addition to the assurances of the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs and the proposed agreements as outlined by Mr. Wood satisfy me that this money will be spent to prevent starvation and that in no way will it be used to further the interests of the Communist Party. For a long time I have been asking for a select committee to study foreign policy and to study the Department of State and the Foreign Service. I have been requesting such a study not in an attempt to hunt witches but to improve the State Department. I have confidence in Mr. Clayton and his associates and I believe that they will conscientiously carry out the provisions of the resolution and will fulfill the pledges they have made in reference to the agreements they propose to make with relief recipient countries.

TERMINATION

Furthermore House Resolution 153 provides that the President shall terminate relief assistance whenever by reason of changed conditions the provision of relief assistance provided by this joint resolution is no longer necessary, whenever the assurances of section 3 are not being carried out and whenever any supplies made available under this resolution or similar supplies produced locally or imported from the outside is being used for the maintenance of the armed forces in such country and whenever similar supplies produced locally or imported from the outside are being removed from such countries. Furthermore, the joint resolution can be terminated by a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress.

SAFEGUARDS ADEQUATE

I believe the safeguards in this bill are adequate to insure the proper use of the funds provided. The measure has been carefully prepared and does not need to be amended. I believe that this aid is necessary to complement the aid we are going to give to Greece and Turkey. We are determined to prevent the spread of communism and one of the most effective ways to do this is to aid starving people in devastated countries. The rigid requirements which must be met before relief can be furnished to these countries will guarantee that the American taxpayers' money will not be used to bolster Moscow-controlled governments in nations such as Poland and Hungary. I hope this measure passes by a substantial majority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. Inasmuch as the gentleman stated that he does not want any amendment, and I have an amendment at the desk, I would like to ask the gentleman if he can state what the constitutional authority for this $350,000,000 gift is?

Mr. MERROW. We have a constitutional right to appropriate any money that we desire for relief to any country.

Mr. OWENS. There is nothing in the Constitution on it. That is why I have the amendment. We cannot depend on it.

Mr. MERROW. We have done it before.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the constitutionality is found in the power of the Congress to appropriate money for the general welfare.

Mr. OWENS. That is the amendment I have at the desk, but I do not believe it is sufficient without the specific amendment in the bill.

Mr. MERROW. There has been no provision like this before.

Mr. JAVITS. There is no question of constitutional authority.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Does not the gentleman think we ought to put this matter over until tomorrow, until after we hear General Marshall?

Mr. MERROW. I would have no objection to that.

Mr. RANKIN. I think the measure ought to go over at least until we hear General Marshall tonight.

Mr. MERROW. I have no objection but I hope the measure passes.

YOU CANNOT TRUST A COMMUNIST

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as I announced the other day, I will not vote for a single dime to go to any country that is Communist-dominated, for a gang of commissars to steal, misuse, and starve the helpless women and children in those countries.

I live in a country that once lost a war. I think I can refer back to that tragic era without in any way offending the sensibilities of anyone. There never lived greater soldiers in time of war, or greater citizens in time of peace than those brave men who wore the gray in that unfortunate conflict known as the Civil War, or the War Between the States.

When that war closed those men came home and tied their empty sleeves to the plow lines and began making their own way. I know because I saw it 25 years after the war closed. I have seen a one-legged ex-Confederate soldier leaning on his hoe for a crutch and cultivating his field, hoeing cotton, or cutting sugarcane.

One of the leading businessmen of the country in which I live told me that he plowed the milk cow the first year after the war closed.

Their horses were gone, and in many cases their outhouses, and even their homes, had been burned. There was hardly a home but had lost a son, and a large percentage of the ones who survived had been severely wounded.

They got no assistance from anyone, they were unable to do so; yet they struggled on, developed the strongest stamina ever known, and taught it to their children. It has been the savior of the Southern States for the last 80 years.

They were men, take them for all in all. We shall not look upon their likes again.

This war has been over 2 years, and the peoples of Europe have had ample time to make two full crops.

In the fall of 1945 the greatest soldier developed in this war, Gen. George S. Patton, came here to see me. He came by to thank me for defending him on this floor, as he expressed it, "When I was on the battlefront and could not defend myself."

He said, "Why are you people getting ready to feed Germany?" He said, "I have been all over Germany, and they have the finest crops I ever saw." That was in the fall of 1945. He said, "We didn't shoot up the fields, we shot up the towns and the factories and the cities."

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. May I say as one who traveled over Germany in the summer of 1945 that I can confirm exactly what General Patton said.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Last year I told another general, who was with General Patton, what General Patton had said, and asked him why the people were asking for help. He said, "The trouble is, the Communists went in there and drove off their livestock, and took their farm machinery," just as they will take this money if we pour it into those countries that the Communists dominate.

I am certainly going to vote for the amendment to be offered by my colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] to deny this money to any country that is Communist-dominated.

Communism is not a form of government; it is a criminal conspiracy to overthrow every government in the world, including the United States. I read that to you from their own lips on this floor a few days ago. But, if you continue to go down into the pockets of the American people and pour money into those countries, I am not sure they will ever make a crop. They tell us that we have absolutely killed, in large measure, the desire of a great many people of Europe to become self-sustaining with the money we have already poured into those countries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. The United States of America won this war, Mr. Chairman. We won it with our men, our money, and our material. We are today staggering under a burden of debt the like of which no other nation on earth ever saw or could survive. If you were to reduce price levels to what they were 15 years ago, the entire wealth of this Nation would not be sufficient to pay the public debt. It is about time that we take those things into consideration, and not be continuously pouring money by the hundreds of millions of dollars into areas where it promotes indolence and encourages people to hold out their hands and beg for the American taxpayers' money.

I read portions of General Morgan's report. UNRRA was a farce. The money provided was used to finance a lot of "joyriders" of a minority group, while they let many of the Christian women and children starve to death.

Now, you come along and ask for this $350,000,000. Next week you are going to ask for $400,000,000 to try to stop communism in Greece and Turkey. As I said before, if we are going to fight communism, let us begin on Capitol Hill. Let us begin in the House Office Building. Let us begin in the Senate Office Building and in the Library of Congress. Let us go down through the War Department, the State Department, and the Treasury Department, and every other department of this Government, and drive these Reds out of our Government. Then let us drive them from our educational institutions where they are poisoning the minds of the youth of America, and drive them from the radio where they are insidiously pumping poisonous propaganda into the ears of the unsuspecting men, women, and children of America. Let us clean them out of our picture shows where they are spreading before the youth of the land the insidious Communist lines that are undermining the moral fabric of America and destroying those things for which our forefathers fought, and for which our young men were told they were fighting in this war.

If we are going to fight communism, no man on earth will go farther than I will. But we cannot afford to fight it at one place and feed it at another. Therefore, I think we should carry this bill over at least until we hear General Marshall tonight, and we should probably postpone it indefinitely. Certainly, we should adopt the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] to provide that not a dollar of this money, not a dime of it, shall go to a Communist-dominated country.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I wonder if the gentleman saw in this morning's Times-Herald the statement by John O'Donnell where he points out in a quotation from a letter, that he received from some veteran down in Newport News, the names of the Russian ships that are there now loading the so-called UNRRA materials and heavy machinery and trucks and things of that kind.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not surprised.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Do you not think this is a little inconsistent for us to be considering a measure like this until that sort of thing is stopped?

Mr. RANKIN. Why, certainly. Some of those countries to which UNRRA assistance was furnished, Yugoslavia, for instance, took it to build up their armed forces and then with the very guns that we furnished them shot down, murdered our aviators in cold blood and buried them without notifying the American authorities.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman for a question as the gentleman yielded to me.

Mr. MERROW. I compliment the gentleman on the splendid fight that he has always made against communism. I want to say frankly that I would oppose a measure which would send materials to Communist-dominated countries if it did not contain certain restrictions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Subsection (c) of section 2 on page 4 of the bill says:

> Full and continuous publicity will be given within such country as to the purpose, source, character, scope, amounts, and progress of the United States relief program carried on therein pursuant to this joint resolution.

I doubt if the Soviet-dominated governments of Hungary and Poland would agree to that.

Section 5 of the bill states that—

> The President shall promptly terminate the provision of relief assistance to the people of any country whenever he determines * * * that supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution, or similar supplies produced locally or imported from outside sources, are being exported or removed from such country.

If the people of the countries in question know that the relief comes from the United States will it not help us fight communism?

Mr. RANKIN. I doubt it. In the first place, I would not believe a word a Communist would say. He does not believe in God. He is an atheist, and no obligation would bind him. Anything a Communist would sign would not be worth the paper it is written on. I do not care what they tell you about getting this money under their control, or this food and material. They will do just as they please with it and then lie to us about it.

Get the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, turn to page A1895 of the Appendix, and read the report on the Soviet spy ring and their traitorous operations in this country, in Canada, and in Great Britain, in flagrant violation of every obligation they have signed and every promise they have made.

Former Ambassador to Russia Hon. William C. Bullitt told the Committee on Un-American Activities that in his deliberate opinion if the Russians had the atomic bomb and we did not have it they would have dropped it on us long ago.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION. Anyway, it would be distributed through this Government, would it not?

Mr. RANKIN. Why, of course. If we are going to feed the hungry people of Europe, we should do it through the International Red Cross.

The American Treasury is not inexhaustible. The American taxpayers are not inexhaustible, although they have gone a long way further than any other country that ever existed in answering the appeals of people of other lands. In my opinion, we have gone further than we were justified in going in many instances.

I am not in favor of taking any chances on sending money into Communist countries or sending food into Communist countries, to be taken over and used by those Communist regimes that would use it to overthrow every other government in the world, including our own, undermine and destroy our way of life, and wreck our entire Christian civilization.

I think it is dangerous, and I am opposed to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Jonkman amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, let me say first of all, I congratulate this body on the close attention it is paying to the discussion dealing with the problems presented in this bill. I think it has seldom been true that a bill has come before you which required more careful attention, because, if for no other reason, the march of events and time since the date this was reported from the com-

mittee has changed some of the fundamental considerations.

On the face of these hearings you will notice they were held February 25, 26, 27, 28, March 3, 4, 5, and 6. The history of the world has changed since March 12, because that was the day that President Truman came before us and delivered his message concerning the Greek-Turkish situation. So much of the testimony which took place in support of this bill is obsolete today, due to the fact that the march of events has come along and changed it and made it antique and archaic.

I think this bill should be amended. I think it should be amended by the Members of this body this afternoon and tomorrow. I think we can tighten it up. I think we can improve it. Certainly, in view of what has transpired since March 12, I think we can save the $150,000,000 which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] proposes to save in his amendment, where it would reduce the over-all figure from $350,000,000 to $200,000,000.

May I point out especially to my Republican brethren who have had considerable to say about economy at this session, President Truman appealed to this Congress to appropriate $100,000,000 for the fiscal year 1947 for the purposes provided in this bill. We now propose to double President Truman's recommendation, making it $200,000,000 for the calendar year 1947, under the Jonkman proposal. If you go along with the bill as originally presented, or if you go along with the bill as it will remain if the Vorys amendment is adopted, or if it goes through without any amendment, you are voting to appropriate three and one-half times as much as President Truman recommended in his annual budget message. I think we should consider this bill in view of what has happened in the world since the request was originally made. I would have favored the $350,000,000 total had it not been that on March 12 the President proposed this new $400,000,000 program, a program which I expect to support, a program which I think is now essential to peace and security, but a program which in large part overlaps, duplicates, and underscores the same program for which we are now voting $350,000,000 unless you accept the Jonkman amendment.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Does not the gentleman think this House is entitled to know what the policy of the Government is in connection with the supplying of Russia with UNRRA supplies in the nature of trucks and heavy machinery, and also lend-lease material that could be used against us at a time when we are trying to stop communism by helping Greece and Turkey?

Mr. MUNDT. I certainly do.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. What I wish to know is why we should not be told whether they are going to stop the shipment of lend-lease materials and UNRRA materials in the nature of heavy equipment, machinery that could be used for the very purpose of doing the thing they ask us to do, stop Communism over in Greece and Turkey.

Mr. MUNDT. If the gentleman will support the Jonkman amendment he will at least make sure that the remaining $150,000,000 which will become available in the calendar year 1948 will not be made available unless and until they stop that. The decision is in the gentleman's hands and in the hands of his colleagues this afternoon.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I am going to support the amendment, but I want to know whether when we get the $400,000,000 bill for which they asked a rule today we are going to continue as we did before the war started, shipping hundreds of millions of dollars of scrap to Japan. The gentleman from South Dakota and I both fought the idea, but our views did not prevail. Are we going to do the same identical foolish thing and continue to ship all this material to Russia at a time when they ask us to put $400,000,000 over in Turkey and Greece to stop Russia?

Mr. MUNDT. I think the gentleman understands, of course, that the time to make that fight will be in connection with the $400,000,000 bill for Greece and Turkey. I shall do all I can to see that we do not follow policies which are opposed to each other, one of which would undo the other.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I make this reservation to propound this inquiry of the Chair: Is there any way we can find out now whether or not this debate is going to be very limited and after a few moments a motion be made that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto be concluded? Because there are a lot of us who want to speak on this proposal. I want to speak on it myself.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman that as far as I am concerned this debate ought to be unlimited. Every Member of the House ought to have an opportunity to express himself.

I hope every Member will get the May issue of the Reader's Digest and read about the Russian spy ring in this country as reported on page 127 of the May issue. If he does, then tomorrow he will feel just as I do.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, for the purpose of making an inquiry, whether the Chair is about to state that as far as the Chair is concerned time for debate, like relief, will be unlimited?

The CHAIRMAN. As far as the Chair is concerned, it is, of course, unlimited; but such remarks should be addressed to the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill.

The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Then I shall be happy to yield. I believe the gentleman who first addressed me was the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. I am sure the gentleman did not intend to confuse the Congress in regard to President Truman's position in this matter. It is a fact that the President has asked the Congress for a $350,000,000 authorization, is it not?

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is correct, $100,000,000 for 1947, and $250,000,000 for the remainder of the program.

Mr. RICHARDS. No. I wish to ask the gentleman this: Is not the President's recommendation that this Congress provide $350,000,000 for relief this year, but he does not specify that any part of it is to be provided for 1947 and the other part for 1948?

Mr. MUNDT. The budget message which spells out exactly what he has in mind this year provides $100,000,000 for 1947 and $250,000,000 for the remainder of the program.

During the hearings, as the gentleman knows, there was some confusion on the part of the State Department as to how much they would be able to spend during the remainder of this calendar year, some even believing we could not spend $150,000,000 during the remainder of this year. Under the Jonkman amendment, however, we can spend $200,000,000 during the calendar year 1947, which is more than the most optimistic witness before the Committee believed they could spend in so short a time.

Mr. RICHARDS. Is not the gentleman confusing this request for relief and the budget estimate for relief in the occupied countries of Europe?

Mr. MUNDT. I do not think so, because, as the gentleman knows, the estimate for the occupied countries goes to the Appropriations Committee and not to our committee, because it is handled by the Army.

Mr. RICHARDS. I would like to clear up what the gentleman means about this $100,000,000 proposed by the President. The President has asked this Congress through the present authorization to provide $350,000,000 for relief in six particular countries. None of these countries is occupied territory.

Mr. MUNDT. That is right, except for Austria.

Mr. RICHARDS. If the gentleman will refer to the Budget he will see most of the relief mentioned there refers to funds needed for relief in countries occupied by our own forces, such as Japan, Korea, and Germany.

Mr. MUNDT. That is a tremendously greater figure than the $350,000,000. That runs close to a billion dollars and will be administered by the Army. I do not want to yield to the gentleman further. He may get his own time to discuss that.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. In view of the fact the bill is drawn in such language as to make certain that the Communists shall get the lion's share of the fund, does the gentleman not find it inconsistent with this later suggestion of extending aid to Greece and Turkey?

Mr. MUNDT. No. I do not think you can say that this bill is drawn so that the lion's share will go to the Communists. If the gentleman will support, as I feel confident he will, amendments which are to be offered by members of our committee, we are going to tighten this bill up so none of it will go to the Communists.

Mr. COX. I hope the gentleman and his colleagues will make certain to write into the bill all of the recommendations made by ex-President Hoover.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. We propose to bring them up one by one so none of this relief can go to help communism. If we fail to do that, and if under maladministrative practices the aid should go to fatten the Communists, we will of course be in a strange position of incongruity after passing the Greek-Turk bill.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I have a high regard for the gentleman's study and judgment on this problem. Why does not the Vorys amendment, in the gentleman's opinion, give every protection which the Jonkman amendment gives and still take care of the possibility of meeting the larger demands?

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad the gentleman asked that question because I want to discuss it. In the first place I am one Member of Congress who is opposed to having the lower House of Congress delegate its authority and responsibility anywhere. I have opposed it as we have been repeatedly asked to delegate it to the White House. I have opposed it when we have been repeatedly asked to delegate it to the State Department. I am opposing it when we are now asked to delegate it to a small committee to be set up, as the Vorys amendment would propose, and delegating the responsibility of the Members of Congress to a committee which acts without authority, because we would then have authorized the full $350,000,000. Only the Jonkman amendment cuts it down specifically to $250,000,000. If we authorize the entire $350,000,000 that becomes a Congressional directive to the Appropriations Committee to make the full amount available. On the other hand the Jonkman amendment reduces that directive to a $200,000,000 expenditure. Congress will be in session again next year. If it should develop the other $150,000,000 is needed next year we could then authorize and appropriate it. According to former President Hoover, however, no more than $200,000,000 and perhaps less can be spent effectively and helpfully during the remainder of 1947. It thus seems wise to limit this bill as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] proposes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I want to ask our distinguished colleague from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] this question: As I understand the momentary situation, the gentleman from Michigan has an amendment at the desk cutting the $350,000,000 to $200,000,000?

Mr. JONKMAN. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has an amendment before us calling for the appointment of a commission to consist of five men.

Mr. JONKMAN. Not as an amendment. As a substitute.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As a substitute. That is what I want to clear up. In other words, the Vorys amendment would leave the $350,000,000 in the bill, is that correct?

Mr. JONKMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, first, I wish to say that I am wholeheartedly in favor of what I understand will be the Colmer amendment. That is to put provisions in the bill that will prohibit the so-called communistic countries from receiving any of this money. I do not propose to cast my vote in favor of any such contribution. To do so would be an insult to my own intelligence and an insult to the good people of my district who pay taxes and buy bonds with which to furnish the Treasury the dollars with which to make these extensions of credit, or grants, or gifts, or whatever you want to call them. We are either fighting communism or we are supporting it. As I understand the proposal which will come before us in a few days to give aid to Greece and Turkey, relief to Greece and finances to equip Turkey with a great, strong, modernized, fully-equipped army to fight Russia, if necessary, I see no sense in giving the so-called communistic countries relief money at the same time.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. About 4 hours ago I had lunch with one of the most prominent newsmen of this city who just returned from Europe after having been there 4 months. His conclusion is that it would be ridiculous on the part of the United States to furnish relief or money to countries dominated by the Communists.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And I think "ridiculous" is too mild a word for it. I would like to say exactly what I think, but it would not be permissible to print it in the RECORD.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Three or four days ago I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report that is in the May Reader's Digest of the Communist spy ring, the Soviet spy ring in this country. If any of you think you can deal with a Communist country, get the Reader's Digest, or turn to the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and read that report, and you will see that you might as well attempt to tame a rattlesnake or pet a hyena.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to emphatically go on record in favor of the Jonkman amendment to reduce this $350,000,000 to $200,000,000. I regret that the Vorys amendment is not in such shape that I can vote for it, but if it is to serve as a substitute, leaving the $350,000,000 in the bill, then I cannot support the Vorys amendment. If the Vorys amendment is offered independent of the Jonkman amendment I shall certainly support an amendment providing for a commission consisting of 10 men, 5 from this body and 5 from the other body to be created to supervise the expenditures of these funds. I do not propose to vote for any bill of this nature unless there is language put in the bill which gives the people of this country some supervision over the distribution of these funds. I prefer to go back home to my district this summer and next summer and stand there and tell my good people that at least I tried to protect their funds by keeping these grants and gifts under the supervision of the people of the United States instead of giving blank checks to all of the other people of the earth.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I was just thinking, in view of the past history, it might be well to allocate a certain amount of these funds to the Turks to be used only for cutting the throats of the Armenians, which they have done through the ages.

Mr. CRAWFORD. They might do something of that kind.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. I think the gentleman is a little bit confused with reference to the administration of funds in this bill. All of this money will be spent, and the regulations will be written by our own Government. This is entirely different from the funds administered by UNRRA. UNRRA was under an international organization.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I understand that very well, and I do not think the language in this bill goes far enough, and I shall support such amendments as may be offered in that general direction.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, if I pretend to be anything at all in this life, it is to be a realist. I like to view problems realistically, and in order to do that I like to know the facts, and one of the troubles that I have found as a Member of this House in dealing with matters emanating from the distinguished Committee on Foreign Affairs has always been a deep-seated conviction that the House, as a House of Representatives, has never had all of the facts. And I

know of no bill that has ever come before this House where that fact is so apparent as the bill now under consideration, because it has been conceded by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], who brought here the secret files of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, giving the record before that committee held in executive sessions. So the members of the committee like the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] can stand up here and tell the Members, "Now, you other Members of Congress aren't supposed to know all the facts about this thing. You rely upon your committee."

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. He did not say it in that language, but he gave in substance that type of advice here just a little while ago. I say to the gentleman it is pretty fair advice, but what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. As part of this debate, I want to say to the gentleman that I would like to see him conform to that advice in other days. It notice that he did not support the committee the other day when the vote on the Interior Department appropriation bill was before the House. He went off onto a tangent by himself. But when State Department matters are here or Foreign Affairs matters are here, the ordinary Member of Congress is supposed to sit by meekly and humbly and just adopt wisdom from the people of the Foreign Affairs Committee who have been privileged in their secret sessions to hear all the stuff that is given to them spoon-fed by the people from the State Department.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has referred to me. Will he yield now?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman spoke with great irony of the secret sessions of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the executive sessions. May I ask the gentleman whether or not his Appropriations Committee has executive sessions, and whether even Members of Congress may appear.

Mr. KEEFE. Let me tell the gentleman, every Member of Congress can read every word that transpires in a meeting of the Appropriations Committee. They are all printed, and you have seen them here 6 or 8 inches deep. Every word is taken down, and they are brought here so that every Member of Congress can read those hearings.

What have you got here on this important bill? You have got just these little, few pages, and it is admitted that most of the important evidence that you received does not appear. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] brought them in the other day.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not yield further. I have answered the gentleman's question. I have a few other things I should like to call to your attention about this bill.

Turn to the first page of the hearings and read the testimony of Will Clayton. What does he say? I quote him:

The UNRRA pipe lines will soon run dry.

The UNRRA pipe lines will soon run dry. I happen to have had the privilege, may I say to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama——

Mr. JARMAN. Do not address me if you will not yield to me.

Mr. KEEFE. I have already yielded to the gentleman.

Mr. JARMAN. Yes; but the gentleman declines to further yield when I asked him a question.

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman again.

Mr. JARMAN. I do not think it is fair for a gentleman to address another gentleman in this House and then decline to yield to him.

Mr. KEEFE. I have yielded to the gentleman. Does the gentleman want to say something more?

Mr. JARMAN. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. All right; I yield to the gentleman. Does he want to ask a question?

Mr. JARMAN. I repeat that a while ago the gentleman spoke with great irony of executive sessions. When I asked him whether the Appropriations Committee, his committee, has executive sessions, and whether it permits even Members of Congress not on the subcommittee concerned to attend, he switched off onto secret documents.

Mr. KEEFE. No; I did not switch off at all. I told the gentleman the facts, and he was so excited he did not pay any attention to them. He did not hear them.

The point I want to make is just this: Here is just a little bit of the record of what transpired. Does the gentleman concede that this is not the whole record of the evidence before his committee?

Mr. JARMAN. If the gentleman will yield, I certainly do.

Mr. KEEFE. All right; that is all I wanted to say. Then, of course, you have some information that the rest of us do not have. But I am basing my opinion, may I say to the Members, on what is here, and this is enough.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. Not right at this moment.

The UNRRA pipe lines will soon run dry.

I want to say to the gentleman that in another committee of this House I have heard the testimony with reference to the general relief proposals for money to take care of relief in occupied areas. I have heard a good deal about those pipe lines, and, being a realist, I want to talk about those pipe lines for just a moment.

You know, you cannot take $350,000,000 or $200,000,000 and go out and spend it overnight and start the pipe line running, and then take a spigot and turn it off.

Did it ever occur to you that it takes weeks to get this program under way and that it takes weeks to go into our markets and purchase the wheat and other supplies that you are going to ship over there and that it takes weeks to get the food on the ships and get the ships chartered and routed to those countries to which they are going? And, then, when the goods get over there, what happens to it? What happens to this food after it gets there? Oh, you say, We are going to throw hedges around it. But when you take this food off the ships and you unload it, as you must, you say you are going to relieve Poland. Where does this food go? They have warehouses there. It goes into the warehouse. Then, after you get it there Joe Stalin says, Well, we are sorry, boys. We have the food over here but we cannot do it just that way. Supposing they do do things as your contract provides. Who gets the food? Who gets the wheat? Did anybody ask a question about that? You load a boat with wheat which has to be ground into flour. Who grinds it and who pays for the grinding? After it is ground into flour and is sacked, how does the wheat get to all these poor starving people that we hear about? How does it get into the bakeshops to be baked? Has anybody told you about that? You can read the record of these hearings. They are barren of a single word on that subject. It would be interesting to know that, would it not? If these people are so poor and emaciated and are suffering so from malnutrition and they cannot work and do anything, how are they able to buy this food? Is it given to them? Is it distributed as relief? How does it get to these poor people?

I will tell you how it gets to them from the evidence that came before my committee. They buy it and they buy it with the currency of the country that they live in. They pay for it in Polish currency or Austrian currency or Greek currency or whatever other country it might happen to be. And if a fellow does not have that currency, God help him. Then, who gets that currency? To whom does it go and what becomes of it? Has anybody told you about that? Well, it goes into our hands, but then what do we do with it? Does it have any value? In relation to the dollar, it does not have much value, but it is the medium of exchange of that country. Then, what do we do with it? We use it to buy more produce that is produced locally in those countries. Some time the thing is going to end. What becomes of the money that they collect? Is there a word in here about it? Not a word.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. SADOWSKI. The gentleman mentioned relief in Poland and the distribution of relief. Did the gentleman hear General Drury when he gave his report on UNRRA relief and distribution in Poland? The report was made here in the Speaker's dining room and all of us were invited to hear it.

Mr. KEEFE. I did not happen to be invited, or at least I do not recall it.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. SADOWSKI. General Drury told the group of Congressmen who were there to hear him, and there must have been at least 60 or 70 of us who heard the report, that he was very well pleased with the system of distribution. He told us that it was distributed on this basis. He said you did not give them a basket of relief supplies as you did here in the

United States under the WPA program. He said they had to work in order to get this food. Everyone who worked received food. You were able to buy it, but you got UNRRA relief supplies only if you worked. The only other class of people who received UNRRA relief supplies were the orphaned children, and the disabled and hospitalized, and sick people. No drones received any relief supplies. Those who did not work did not get any relief.

Mr. KEEFE. I cannot yield further to the gentleman.

Let me call your attention to this language in the testimony of Mr. Clayton.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. In describing what the agreements are between this country and the countries receiving our help, he says this:

> Our agreements will be very comprehensive and will include methods, principles, and policies for the distribution of all supplies. The agreement would cover the question of ration systems that should be in effect in the country, and price controls. It would provide that there should be no discriminations, no export or diversion—

And so on and so forth. Now, UNRRA tried to get free access for radio and press into those countries that are dominated by communism. We tried to write such a provision in that bill the last time it was on the floor, providing there would be no distribution of UNRRA supplies in those countries that did not open up and let us see what took place. Do you think for a minute, speaking of the poor people of Poland, Yugoslavia, and those nations under the heel of communistic control—do you think that Mr. Stalin is going to open up those nations now and take down that iron curtain? If he does not, under the provisions of this bill, how are those poor people going to get any relief from these funds? Will you tell me that?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The American supplies went into Russia, into the hands of Communist Russia and were distributed, and the people were told that they were coming from Russia. No credit at all was given the United States.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say in closing, if you go through this and analyze it step by step as to just what happened, yes, you can listen to some of these broad reports, but you get right down to it and you see how futile all these things are that we try to put around and hedge and protect this money. The safest thing to do is to see to it that we do not appropriate one dollar to be spent in those countries that are dominated by communistic countries or organizations. Then we are safe, and we do not need worry about it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is the gentleman in favor of the Jonkman amendment?

Mr. KEEFE. I am heartily in favor of it. May I say I thoroughly agree with what the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] said. I was in hopes that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] could be so drawn that we could adopt the Jonkman amendment limiting the sum to $2,000,000 and then set up a committee to see what the situation will be after this next crop year has come about.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman not agree that if the statement made on the floor a short while ago with respect to supplies being sent to Russia under lend-lease is true, then a colossal fraud is being perpetrated upon the people of the country.

Mr. KEEFE. I think that is a fair statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I rise especially at this time to try, if I can, to defend the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I think it is very unfortunate that any statement should be made on the floor of this House criticizing the committee for doing something that will permit them to legislate properly and to receive information by which no one will be embarrassed. Your chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], has done wonderful work in the time he has been there. It would be impossible to allow the testimony of witnesses called in executive session to go out. It just could not be done. But all of the testimony was taken by the official reporter, and any Member, I believe, has the right to go up there and read the testimony given at that time.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I would prefer to make this statement if you will permit me. When you call an ambassador from a country to testify before the committee and that ambassador is going to return to his post in a few days, it would be very embarrassing if the testimony given by the ambassador were to be broadcast in such a way that he could not return to his post. You are withholding such testimony to protect yourself. If you want to get the real information, if you want to get the inside information, if you want to get everything he knows, if he is willing to give it to you, you cannot hold open sessions on an occasion of that kind; it is impossible to do it. But you have your 14 Republican members and you have your Democratic members and they get the evidence and the testimony that is necessary in order to legislate properly. I think every Member of the House, Mr. Chairman, ought to feel satisfied that the chairman and the members of the committee are doing the best they can under the circumstances.

It is not all foreign affairs, because you must remember that foreign affairs is 50 percent domestic affairs as well. It is very unfortunate to give out the impression that your committee is functioning in secret and nobody is supposed to know anything about this. It is not so.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other thing I wish to say. We are asking here for an authorization of $350,000,000. This is predicated upon what the other members of the United Nations are going to give. The total amount is $610,000,000. If we cut the authorization, and it is only an authorization, the members of the Appropriations Committee do not have to appropriate the full amount if they do not want to; they hold their hearings, they get whatever testimony they want to—if we cut the $350,000,000 nearly 50 percent we are automatically going to cut the balance of the $610,000,000 that we are looking for.

This is entirely different. I think those gentlemen who are bringing UNRRA into this legislative picture, Mr. Chairman, are not doing justice to the legislation we have before us. UNRRA was an entirely different thing. That was an international organization governed and controlled internationally, but this one is not. We said right in the beginning to the United Nations that we wanted to do this on our own, that we wanted to regulate everything.

The gentleman has asked how we are going to distribute the food. We will regulate every contract and every agreement entered into between these different countries; and it is not only for Europe, they have said nothing about China and I think China is going to take a great part of this. We do not know at this time really what is going to happen over there. They said, "Wait until we hear General Marshall's speech." General Marshall's speech tonight will not give you any information on which you can govern yourself in your vote on this legislative authorization in the House.

They say we must stop communism from spreading. We have to destroy communism in other parts of the world and we also have to destroy it in this country.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Are you not going to create a worse condition by encouraging communism?

Mr. BLOOM. I will answer that; I am just as good a Christian as the gentleman is. I am not that kind of Christian. If I find a man starving in any part of the world I am not going to ask him what his religion is or what kind of politics he believes in. I will feed the starving and give them a helping hand wherever they are. You cannot fight communism with empty stomachs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may proceed for 3 additional minutes, I want to ask him a question.

Mr. BLOOM. Two will be sufficient.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. If we go into these different countries—and I find there is nothing new about it, I have studied this thing for a long time, long before this war, and long after the first war. I have been through 3 wars; I know what we are going through; but I will say this, that we have to do this job here today and we have to feed these people at all costs, and it is not going to cost us more than this $350,000,000. If we can give to the organization $350,000,000 and let the other countries throughout the world know we are going to do this and go along with them and want them to go along with us, then we will have them with us. If I know someone is starving any place and if I can get food to them, if I can give them a helping hand, I do not care whether it is in New York, Washington, or where it is, I am going to try to do that.

Mr. RANKIN. The trouble is when you send this food into these Communist-dominated countries, the Communists take it and use it to suit themselves and let the Christian women and children starve to death.

Mr. BLOOM. It is up to us to make the rules and regulations so severe and make them so binding that the food will get to the starving people who need it. That is what ought to be done. We have everything to say in the matter. We hold the whip hand from beginning to end.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Is the gentleman sure he was accurate in the statement he made that this is conditioned upon participation by any other government?

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no; I did not say that. If I said that, I was in error.

Mr. COX. The gentleman used the word "dependent." That is not correct then?

Mr. BLOOM. It is dependent in this way, if you use the word "dependent." I will admit that I did say that. There is a certain percentage of the different countries that will give a certain amount of money. The total sum is $610,000,000 of which our share it is stated we are going to give is $350,000,000.

Mr. COX. It is proposed that we donate $350,000,000 whether any other country gives a dime or not?

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, yes; that is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended one additional minute because I want to ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. I have great confidence in the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I want to see the people of Poland and these other nations helped, but I am very doubtful about one question that concerns an amendment I have at the desk. Does the gentleman from New York feel this gift of $350,000,000 is necessary for our common defense and general welfare?

Mr. BLOOM. For both and be sure that I said "for both." There is nothing stronger than the truth and that is the truth, sir.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs I wonder if my friend can give the House any definite information concerning the statement made a moment ago to the effect that we are now shpping heavy equipment to Russia under UNRRA?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, answering the gentleman's question, of course that is aside from the bill we have under consideration, but let me say that Russia owes us under lend-lease about ten or eleven billion dollars. We have been trying to get some kind of answer from them, but they have not answered until just the other day. UNRRA has a contract with Russia. There are a few businessmen in this House and they will see the situation we are in. We have a contract. We have agreed to give, sell, or allow Russia to buy a certain amount of goods. This is a contract. Now, the United States does not fulfill her part of the contract. Let me tell you, Mr. RANKIN, about this. Listen, because this is good for you.

Mr. RANKIN. I will hear you.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman cannot feel any worse toward those people over there than I do, but they are a shrewd people. If we default on our contract, well, Mr. Soviet Russia will sit back and say, "When you fulfill your part of the contract we will talk to you."

Unfortunately we are in the position that if we do, well, we are dashed, and if we do not, we are dashed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire how many Members desire to speak further on this amendment, so that we can get some idea as to when we can conclude.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Which amendment does the gentleman refer to? There are two amendments pending.

Mr. EATON. This amendment and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. There are 12 Members in addition to the chairman.

Mr. RANKIN. You cannot possibly finish this bill tonight. Why not carry it over until tomorrow? As I said, we want to hear General Marshall tonight, and I want every Member to read the story in the Reader's Digest before he votes tomorrow on this proposition.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the Committee rise at 5 o'clock because of other committee engagements that we have, so that a half hour from now we will rise. I do not see how we can vote on this bill tonight intelligently.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. What is the parliamentary situation at the moment?

The CHAIRMAN. There is pending an amendment and a substitute therefor offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. A further parliamentary inquiry. That does not preclude other amendments to this section?

The CHAIRMAN. It does not.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. EATON) there were—ayes 73, noes 56.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to clear up any possible misunderstanding that may have arisen from the remarks of the gentleman from South Dakota in regard to the President's request for relief funds this year. Bear in mind that the $100,000,000 referred to by the gentleman from South Dakota was a $100,000,000 estimate by President Truman to carry on relief expenditures for the balance of the fiscal year 1947. The $350,000,000 provided for here is estimated to be used up by the end of the calendar year 1947, that is, to January 1948. It is entirely possible that there will be some slip-over for the delivery of some of these supplies into January and February 1948. I just wanted to make this absolutely clear.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me, inasmuch as he has been referring to my remarks?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I refer the gentleman and my colleagues to the testimony at

the top of page 84, where Mr. Wood, who spoke for the State Department all through these hearings, said specifically that in this amount of $350,000,000, $100,000,000 would be spent in the fiscal year of 1947 and $250,000,000 in the fiscal year 1948; so there should not be any argument about that. It is printed in the hearings at the top of page 84.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman's quotations are correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

Gentlemen, I speak not for the committee which needs no defense in view of the distinguished character and great reputation for public service of the chairman and many of the members who are far senior to me, including the ranking minority member, but because I think no word has been spoken here this afternoon about the people who are waiting for this relief. We are talking about $350,000,000 which sounds like a great deal of money. But let us realize that in Greece alone there are 7,000,000 people. I was in Greece. I personally saw the situation there. Just as these distinguished gentlemen tell you that they personally saw the situation in Germany, to which we are contributing no money in this bill—let us get that perfectly clear—I want to tell you what I saw in Greece. The roads are torn up and the railroads are torn up. There is no rolling stock on the railroads. The farms are denuded of the equipment with which to cultivate crops. The situation generally is a shambles. If the Greek people did not have this relief from us to look forward to, it has been said and said truly that their despair would drive them into the arms of communism, not tomorrow, but today.

We must send them this help so that these people can fight against communism. Remember that communism is an idea—a conviction. It is not anything that you can exercise with bayonets. It is only the faith of these people that the democracies have a heart and that the democracies will come to the aid of those countries that are starving and that the democracies will not let them starve, that keeps these people from turning to communism. The Communists tell them that we will let them starve and that we are so selfish, so money-mad, so generally egotistical and set on maintaining our own standard of living, which incidentally is two or three times theirs, that we will let them starve. The greatest thing in the world for communism is this debate taking place on the floor of the House today.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

Mr. CARROLL. I have read the committee's report very very carefully. I heartily endorse the position taken by a majority of the members on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, both Democratic and Republican. It is unfortunate that the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] who preceded me had so little time to speak against the amendment. Therefore, I should like to interrogate the gentleman from New York if he will submit himself to questioning.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall be very glad to.

Mr. CARROLL. Is it not true that $50,000,000 of this sum will go to Greece for food and medicine?

Mr. JAVITS. $50,000,000 or $60,000,000. If I may have a little more of your time, I am so grateful to you for giving me a little more time, I had started to say that we were fact-finders. The facts are in the RECORD regardless of what has been said here to the contrary. I most respectfully ask the Members to turn to pages 107 and 108 of the record in which we have the testimony of a man by the name of FitzGerald. Mr. FitzGerald is a technician and adviser to former President Hoover in all of these things. He is the Secretary-General of the International Emergency Food Council on leave from the United States Department of Agriculture. FitzGerald said it would cost $296,000,000 to acquire the elementary food and not anything else just this year. That is $296,000,000. Those are the facts and negates completely this argument about the $200,000,000 which with all due deference is made not by the friends of this bill but by those who feel that while they cannot defeat it at least they will cut it down so that it means nothing.

Mr. CARROLL. Exactly. And is it not true that this fifty or sixty million dollars for food and medicine lays the foundation for the bill which is to come before us relating to Greece and Turkey?

Mr. JAVITS. Without that we might just as well forget about the bill. We can not save dead men from communism.

Mr. CARROLL. Is it not true that in Italy alone between $100,000,000 and $150,000,000 is to be spent from this relief fund?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. So the relief money necessary for Italy and Greece as contemplated under this bill exceeds the amount of $200,000,000?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. If this present amendment is adopted, it is crystal clear to me that it may deprive the United States and other countries functioning through the United Nations from giving adequate relief to the starving millions of men, women, and children in China, Poland, Hungary, and Austria. The hope of the people of these nations must be sustained by our unselfish action during the remainder of this year and through 1948. It is hoped by that time that they will have sufficient economic strength to stand on their own feet. At this time they are prostrate, flat on their backs, and we must do everything possible to help them regain their balance. If we do not do so, starvation, disease, and terrorism will take over. I shall vote against the present amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Jonkman amendment.

The record before us is absolutely void of any showing that even $200,000,000 will be spent between now and harvest time of 1947.

As I said the other day, this is another blank-check proposition. We are asked to go along. If I am any judge of the sentiment that is exhibited in this House this afternoon, it is because our people are concerned about it. Our people are for no more blank checks. How did this figure of $350,000,000 come to be born? On page 81 of the hearings the State Department said:

> This figure of $350,000,000 was in some respects a figure based on judgment, and, in part, picked out of the air.

Picked out of the air by the State Department, based upon a survey that had been made by an agency of the United Nations Organization. In addition to the statement I have made—that they cannot spend $200,000,000 for the rest of the year—secondly, there has been no assurance that this relief is going to get down to the grass roots. How is it going to be done? Just as my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] said, it is going to get down to the grass roots by selling it to those people through the ordinary method of sales—through retail stores. I cannot conceive of a lot of those poor people who need this relief getting it at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has said it all in a few words. You cannot save dead men from communism.

I am opposed to the present amendment. I am particularly opposed to the Colmer amendments that will be offered later. The Colmer amendments would deny bread, aid, and assistance to the Polish people. I want to repeat, we have had so many congressional committees go to Europe and see conditions in Europe, but how many of you have been in Poland? How many Members of the House have seen Poland? I doubt whether three of you have seen conditions in Poland, yet here is a country that was most devastated; whose people have suffered most; where the Nazis and the Russians both did their damnedest. The Colmer amendments would deny to those people aid and assistance. Then, surely Hitler was right. Hitler would have won this war. We cannot—we must not—listen to that sort of reasoning or logic. Remember this: Germany on three or four different occasions has tried to swallow Poland, and did swallow it. Remember that Russia on three or four occasions in history has swallowed Poland and the Polish people. Remember that each time they had to vomit that country up again. They never could digest Poland or the Polish people. They are a Christian people, a liberty-loving people. They are not Communists. Everyone who has been in Poland will tell you there are less Communists in Poland than there are in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma, 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 153, had come to no resolution thereon.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 736. An act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia during 1947.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution of the Lithuanian Society of Luzerne County.

Mr. CHADWICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks with reference to one of the bills discussed today.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Evening Bulletin of today's date entitled "No Somersault."

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

WAR DEPARTMENT PROGRAM RELATING TO IDENTIFICATION OF UNKNOWN DEAD

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the press of postwar problems with which we must deal each day tends to obscure the actual price of victory paid for by our armed forces in the field with human lives.

But while we go on in our efforts to shape the sort of world for which more than 300,000 Americans gave their lives, it is heartening to note that we have not forgotten our honored dead and the next of kin who gave their sons into the service when our country was attacked.

Today the Office of the Quartermaster General is actively engaged in determining where the next of kin of all identified American World War II dead who now rest in cemeteries overseas want their loved ones to be finally buried.

The War Department is pledged to carry out all feasible wishes of the next of kin. In order to carry out this pledge, personnel of the American Graves Registration Service, of which the Quartermaster General of the Army, T. B. Larkin, is chief, have been at work throughout the world, wherever our troops fought and died. To them has fallen the solemn duty of recovering remains, making positive identification, and reverently interring the remains in temporary United States military cemeteries until such time as the next of kin make decision as to final burial.

Last year I introduced a bill which became a law and which provides for the return to the United States of an unknown American member of the Armed Forces who will be buried in the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., near or beside the remains of the Unknown Soldier of World War I. But the American Graves Registration Service is performing a noble and necessary work in taking every possible step to identify as many Americans who lost their lives overseas as is humanly possible.

The next of kin and relatives of our World War II dead should find some measure of comfort and solace in knowledge of the great care with which the remains of these honored dead are being treated, the pledge of the War Department to carry out all feasible wishes of the next of kin, and the promise that no remains will be identified unless that identity is established beyond the shadow of any possible doubt.

In the wake of war in the Pacific, personnel of the American Graves Registration Service disinterred the remains of some 1,600 Americans who had been buried in the prisoner of war cemetery at Camp O'Donnell on Luzon, P. I. These remains were reburied in a temporary United States military cemetery at Manila.

But of these 1,600 remains, approximately 800 were in an unidentified status.

Today it is gratifying to me to report that the Memorial Division of the Office of the Quartermaster General, where the Government's program relating to our military dead is being capably and ably directed by Brig. Gen. George A. Horkan, has identified 642 of these unknown Americans after approximately 9 months of careful, painstaking work. Letters have gone out to next of kin of these identified informing them that positive identification has been made and that soon they will be able to make the decision as to where final burial of their loved one shall be made.

This is typical, Mr. President, of the efficient work being done by the Quartermaster Corps today in carrying out one of the most solemn postwar tasks ever assigned to the War Department—the return and final burial of our World War II dead.

Identification work is one of the most important and vital aspects of this return and final burial program, for the War Department has given its pledge that no next of kin will receive the remains other than those to which he is entitled, and all identification will be positive beyond any question whatsoever.

In the case of these deceased prisoners of the Japanese who were buried at Camp O'Donnell, identification was based upon a number of facts. Reports of death and reports of interments were compared. An officer's diary and casualty reports were carefully studied. Finally, dental charts were compared and authenticated by an expert in toothchart identification.

All of this information was then studied by an identification board of Army officers, and certification as to identification was not made until all were satisfied that the case histories left no doubt as to the separate identities of the individuals involved.

Present plans call for the disinterment and reprocessing of all remains from the Camp O'Donnell cemetery that are still in an unidentified status in an attempt to obtain new dental charts, if possible, and additional identifying media. This is in keeping with the policy of the American Graves Registration Service regarding unknowns. That is, no case of an unknown will ever be considered closed. A constant effort will go on, through the years, to locate evidence and information which will eventually result in sufficient accumulation of evidence to warrant identification.

I have gone into detail about the unknowns from the Camp O'Donnell prisoner-of-war cemetery because the work done by the American Graves Registration people and the personnel working in the Memorial Division of the Office of the Quartermaster General here in Washington was so extensive. But every individual case of an unknown is given just as much attention and study as was given this large number of unknowns.

As our troops fought from one area to another throughout the world during World War II, Graves Registration units went about the sorrowful task of interring our dead in the temporary United States military cemeteries which were established.

In most cases identity of the dead was positively established through the identification tags which each man wore, through personal papers found on the remains, or through laundry marks which were on the clothing of the deceased.

Where remains could not be identified personnel experts in identification processes have been working for the American Graves Registration Commands in an effort to establish identity. Every useful devise known to modern science and every skill needed in detection work has been made available so that the number of unknowns will be reduced to an absolute minimum. Every bit of evidence connected with any unknown remains is scrutinized carefully and subjected to searching analysis. Use of the fluoroscope has been particularly successful in discovering metallic objects within the remains which might lead to positive identification. Anthropological methods have been employed. In using this science, actual bone measurements are made. From these, with the help of scientific tables, it is possible to determine race, sex, and age. In this way leads are obtained which help toward the eventual establishment of an individual's identity.

Some of the stories of identification work being done today by American Graves Registration Service personnel in the field and by personnel in the Office of the Quartermaster General here in Washington rival the most unusual tales set down by writers of fiction. In several cases Quartermaster Corps identification personnel have spent several months

tracing down ownership of rings or bracelets found on unidentified remains. Working with only this type of clue to start with, they have carried on the task of identifying an individual, step by step, until the entire case has been completed and presented overwhelming evidence that the remains could be positively identified as those of a particular soldier, sailor, marine, or coast guardsman.

This is no impersonal, cut and dried type of assignment which the Office of the Quartermaster General and the American Graves Registration Service are carrying on. It must be conducted always with the thought in mind that somewhere the next of kin and relatives of men who gave their lives on the field of battle are hoping that the remains will be found and properly identified.

You are all familiar with the name of Capt. Colin P. Kelly, Jr., Air Corps, who died December 10, 1941, in the Philippine Islands following a bombing operation which won for him posthumous award of the Distinguished Service Cross. Captain Kelly was buried for more than four and a half years as an unknown until American Graves Registration Service personnel, after careful study of a great deal of accumulated evidence, was able to make positive identification.

Captain Kelly, you may recall, was one of an eight-man crew in a B-17 aircraft which went out on a mission of bombing Japanese naval units. The aircraft crashed about 5 miles east of Clark Field on Luzon, P. I, while returning from the mission.

Now, six men of this eight-man crew bailed out. The remains which eventually were identified as those of Captain Kelly were found near the body of a Brooklyn, N. Y., sergeant. The sergeant was identified through identification tags found on his body. But there were no identification tags on Captain Kelly's remains. And Graves Registration officers would not make identification on flimsy evidence.

So Captain Kelly's remains were buried first on Luzon and subsequently were reburied, as unknown, in the United States Military Cemetery, Manila No. 2, at Manila, P. I. Accelerated progress of the war made it impossible to conduct a complete investigation at the time.

With the coming of peace in the Pacific, identification data supplied by American Graves Registration Command personnel in the Philippine Islands was compared with records made during Captain Kelly's service in this country after he had been graduated from the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y. It was on the basis of positive evidence only that identification of this hero was ultimately made.

As of February 28, 1947, the Memorial Division of the Office of the Quartermaster General estimated that there were a total of 294,690 remains in all overseas theaters. Of this number, a total of 251,186 had been identified and 43,504 were unidentified. Of 294,690 estimated remains of World War II dead buried overseas, a total of 269,044 were in United States military, Allied or civilian cemeteries, or isolated locations. And of this number, 251,186 had been identified as of that date. The War Department is confident that many more identifications will be made in the months which are ahead.

All next of kin of identified personnel have already received a letter from General Larkin setting forth the cemetery and the plot, row, and grave number within that cemetery overseas where their loved one is interred. And work has already been started on sending to each next of kin of an identified member of the armed forces who died overseas and who is now buried in one of our temporary United States military cemeteries a photographic reproduction of that cemetery.

There has been some talk in the press recently to the effect that these honored dead should remain in the lands where they fought and died and are now buried, and that they should not be brought back to the United States.

But I feel that the War Department is carrying out this program for return and final burial in a most democratic manner, in the fairest possible way. It is leaving this decision entirely up to each individual next of kin.

The Office of the Quartermaster General has started to send to each next of kin a letter containing complete information about this return and final burial program. That letter contains a form on which next of kin will designate where they wish final burial of a loved one to be made. That form, in turn, is sent back to the Office of the Quartermaster General, where steps will be taken to carry out all feasible wishes of the next of kin.

Next of kin may decide to have the remains returned to the United States for burial in a private cemetery; returned to the United States for burial in a national cemetery; buried in a permanent American military cemetery overseas or buried in a private cemetery in a foreign country which is the homeland of the deceased or the next of kin.

If next of kin ask that remains be returned to the United States for burial in a private cemetery, the remains will be sent to the point designated, all expenses paid, with a military escort.

It is fitting and proper, Mr. Speaker, that we go to these lengths with our honored dead of World War II. By carrying out the wishes of the next of kin we are, in some respects, paying back to these good people throughout the land a debt incurred when we asked them to give us their sons for military duty.

No matter what decision next of kin may make, they may be assured that if the Office of the Quartermaster General has written to them concerning the remains of a loved one, that the remains are those to which they are entitled. There can be no question whatsoever as to the identification which has been made.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin, for April 28, 29, and 30, on account of official business.

To Mrs. NORTON, for April 29 and 30 and May 1, on account of official business.

To Mr. PRESTON, for April 28, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 29, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

605. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, so as to authorize naval retiring boards to consider the cases of certain officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

606. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft o a proposed bill to provide additional inducements to physicians and surgeons to make a career of the United States naval service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

607. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the allowance of leave credit to officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and the Reserve components thereof, who were denied such credit as the result of certain changes in their status between September 8, 1939, and August 9, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

608. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a final report of the operations of the Smaller War Plants Corporation and the Office of Small Business, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

609. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a printed copy of the Annual Report of the Governor of the Virgin Islands for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Public Lands.

610. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Long Beach, Calif., for street purposes an easement in certain lands within the Navy housing project at Long Beach, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 3203. A bill relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 383, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 317). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JUDD: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 1179. A bill to aid in defraying the expenses of the Seventeenth Triennial Convention of the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union to be held in this country in June 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 318). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 196. Resolution providing the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee

on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; without amendment (Rept. No. 319). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 197. Resolution providing the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; without amendment (Rept. No. 320). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 198. Resolution providing that the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 118 and House Resolution 135 of the Eightieth Congress shall be effective from February 13, 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 321). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 9. Concurrent resolution to print for the use of the Committee on Finance additional copies of Senate Report No. 610, Seventy-sixth Congress, entitled "Survey of Experience in Profit Sharing and Possibilities of Incentive Taxation"; without amendment (Rept. No. 322). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 3227. A bill to provide for inactive duty training pay for the Organized Reserve Corps, to provide uniform standards for inactive duty training pay for all Reserve components of the armed forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 3228. A bill granting the same income tax treatment to married persons living in non-community-property States as is now allowed to married persons living in community-property States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 3229. A bill to repeal the act of April 29, 1902, relating to the procurement of statistics of trade between the United States and its noncontiguous territory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 3230. A bill to provide a method of paying referees in those bankruptcy courts where the existing funds are insufficient to pay sums due such referees for services rendered and expenses incurred; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 3231. A bill to provide for old-age assistance payments to the States with respect to needy individuals who are voluntary inmates of public institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEVENSON:

H. R. 3232. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 3233. A bill to amend the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 3234. A bill relating to the acquisition of civil-service status by certain war-service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA (by request):

H. R. 3235. A bill to amend the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia with respect to abandonment of condemnation proceedings; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 3236. A bill to provide for the preparation and distribution of booklets of information relating to Members of, and Delegates to, and the Resident Commissioner in, the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 3237. A bill to enable debtor railroad corporations expeditiously to effectuate reorganizations of their financial structures without any or further proceedings under the Bankruptcy Act, as amended; to alter or modify their financial obligations; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 3238. A bill to secure prompt payment and adjustment of just claims for loss of or damage to property received by laundries and dry-cleaning and dyeing establishments in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 3239. A bill to amend section 4 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, approved September 7, 1916; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 3240. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to promote on the retired list officers who were decorated and recommended for promotion for distinguished service during the World War and who have not attained the rank to which recommended," so as to extend the same provisions of said act to officers of World War II, and to add the Legion of Merit and Silver Star to those decorations cited in the act of June 13, 1940; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WORLEY:

H. J. Res. 185. Joint resolution to provide emergency relief for victims of the extraordinary disaster at Higgins and Glazier, Tex.; Woodward, Okla.; and surrounding areas; and for the restoration and reconstruction of the devastated areas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the Baruch plan for the international control of atomic energy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to ratify and confirm Act 10 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1947, amending chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945, relating to revenue bonds; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to taxation and expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to migratory game birds; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to effect legislation which will permit the use of decommissioned hospital ships by State and city agencies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend Public Law 725, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States urging investigation and settlement of the question of Indian or aboriginal title to all lands in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to survey of the fishery possibilities of the Bering Sea in the Nome area; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to protest the closing of the Twin Cities Arsenal at New Brighton, Minn.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Vermont, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide for an examination and study to preserve a reasonable price balance; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide sufficient hunters to kill and exterminate all predatory animals such as cougars, wildcats, wolves, and coyotes in the national parks in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide funds from which grants may be made for the assistance of the school systems; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to raise the amount of personal exemptions on Federal taxation of incomes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 3241. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mrs. Margaret Pickett Yellowtail; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 3242. A bill for the relief of Dora M. Barton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH (by request):

H. R. 3243. A bill for the relief of Roman Toporow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWE:

H. R. 3244. A bill for the relief of Nellie M. Clark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

380. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 33 residents of Lawrence County, Pa., urging liberalized benefits for veterans under the GI bill of rights; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

381. By Mr. HALE: Petition of the State of Maine, that Congress request the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service to review the present methods employed in determining conditions under which soft-shell-clam-producing areas are closed to the taking of all shellfish that go into interstate commerce, and that the study be made with the least possible delay in order to relieve the serious consequences now resulting from restrictions currently in force that hinder the complete utilization of the shellfish resources of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

382. By Mr. HOLMES: Petition of Washington State Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors with attached resolutions of Washington Wool Growers' Association and National Wool Growers' Association, commending Soil Conservation Service and its accomplishments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

383. Also, petition of the State of Washington, to set aside the area of old Fort Vancouver as a national monument; to the Committee on Public Lands.

384. Also, memorial of the State of Washington, to provide hunters for extermination of predatory animals in national parks; to the Committee on Public Lands.

385. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of Mrs. Jesse Tanner and 28 other residents of St. John, Kans., urging the enactment of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

386. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine, respectfully presenting and petitioning that Congress request the Surgeon General review present methods employed in determining conditions under which soft-shell-clam-producing areas are closed to the taking of all shellfish that go into interstate commerce; that the review be made with the least possible delay to relieve the serious consequences; that the review complete whether or not the methods of determining the sanitation of soft-shell clams and the areas involved should not be different from those used in the examination of oysters and oyster beds; and that the test shall be made by testing the clam and not by testing the water; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

387. By the SPEAKER: Petition of San Juan Bautista Council, No. 1543, Knights of Columbus, San Juan, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for extension to Puerto Rico of all legislation that may be approved against communism; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

388. Also, petition of the Free Sons of Israel, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to support of H. R. 2910 and promotion of its enactment into law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

389. Also, petition of American Association of Social Workers, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to passage of legislation to permit admission of displaced persons into the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

390. Also, petition of the Atlantic City Board of Trade, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the bills S. 866 and H. R. 2523; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

391. Also, petition of the delegates from the Townsend clubs of the Second Congressional District of the State of Florida, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

392. Also, petition of membership of the Orlo Vista Townsend Club, No. 1, of Florida, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for enactment of a uniform national insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

393. Also, petition of the New Port Richey Townsend Club, No. 1, of Florida, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 29, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

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

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Give us open eyes, our Father, to see the beauty all around us and to see in it Thy handiwork. Let all lovely things fill us with gladness and let them lift up our hearts in true worship.

Give us this day, O God, a strong and vivid sense that Thou art by our side. By Thy grace, let us go nowhere this day where Thou canst not come nor court any companionship that would rob us of Thine. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 28, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 28, 1947, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1009) to extend the time within which the municipality of Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Fla., may consummate the purchase of the Coast Guard site (commonly known as the Base Six property) which is located at Fort Lauderdale.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1624) to authorize payment of allowances to three inspectors of the Metropolitan Police force for the use of their privately owned motor vehicles, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 736) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia during 1947, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands.

"House Concurrent Resolution 33

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the twenty-fourth session of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, requested to amend section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act to provide that whenever 25 or more persons holding an honorable discharge from service, during the present war, in the armed forces of the United States or from service, during the present war, in the merchant marine who were residents of Hawaii for a continuous period of not less than 5 years immediately prior to entry into such service, who have not theretofore made application under such organic act, shall make written application to the commissioner of public lands for the opening of agricultural lands for settlement in any locality or district, it shall be the duty of said commissioner to proceed expeditiously to survey and open for entry agricultural lands, whether unoccupied or under lease with the right of withdrawal, sufficient in area to provide lands for use and occupancy upon 99-year lease, by such persons, together with all persons of like qualification who shall have filed with such commissioner prior to the survey of such lands, written applications for lands for occupancy in the district designated in said applications, of 4 acres each. The land to be so opened by said commissioner shall be either the specific tract or tracts applied for or other suitable and available agricultural lands in the same geographical district, and, as far as possible, in the immediate locality of and as nearly equal to that applied for as may be available: *Provided, however,* That no leased land under cultivation shall be taken for homesteading until any crops growing thereon shall have been harvested: *And provided further,* That each lease made under such enactment shall be deemed subject to the following conditions, whether or not stipulated in the lease:

"(1) The lessee shall pay a rental of $1 a year for the land and the lease shall be for a term of 99 years.

"(2) The lessee shall occupy and commence to use or cultivate the land as his home or farm within 1 year after the lease is made, and shall continuously so use and cultivate said land during the entire term of the lease.

"(3) The lessee shall not in any manner transfer to nor mortgage, pledge, or otherwise hold for the benefit of any other person, or agree so to transfer, mortgage, pledge, or otherwise hold, his interest in the land. Such interest shall not be subject to attachment, levy, or sale upon court process. Upon the death of the lessee his interest in the land and improvements thereon shall vest as follows:

"(a) In his widow, if he leave a widow;

"(b) If he leave no widow, in such child or children of his as he may designate by will, or upon failure of such designation, in his children in joint tenancy;

"(c) In the event that he leave no widow or children, the right to the use and occupancy of said land shall thereupon revest in the Territory.

"(4) The lessee shall pay all taxes assessed upon the land and improvements thereon