PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 3982. A bill to provide for the readmission to citizenship of Hua-Chuen Mei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. R. 3983. A bill for the relief of Northwest Missouri Fair Association, of Bethany, Harrison County, Mo.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. R. 3984. A bill for the relief of George Hampton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 3985. A bill for the relief of James R. Frazer; 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:

678. By Mr. DONDERO: Petition of sundry citizens of Royal Oak, Mich., petitioning Congress to prevent the cutting down of the trees in the Olympic Forest by individuals or corporations for commercial uses and urging adverse action on Senate bill 711, House bills 2750 and 2751, and House Joint Resolution 84; to the Committee on Public Lands.

679. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution by Auxiliaries of the United Spanish War Veterans of Wisconsin, protesting entrance of 250,000 displaced persons into our country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

680. By the SPEAKER: Petition of 200 members of St. Lukes' Archconfraternity, Gary, Ind., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for investigation of conditions in Yugoslavia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

681. Also, petition of A. M. Corbett and sundry other citizens of West Palm Beach, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, House bill 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

682. Also, petition of T. S. Kinney and sundry other citizens of Orlando, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, House bill 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

683. Also, petition of Miss Anna L. Stark and sundry other citizens of Sarasota, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, House bill 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

684. Also, petition of members of Loyalty Council No. 55, a subordinate council, representatives of the Daughters of America, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition to House bills 35, 36, 37, 38, 464, 466, 1249, 1250, and 1251; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 26, 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:

Our Father, we are beginning to understand at last that the things that are wrong with our world are the sum total of all the things that are wrong with us as individuals. Thou hast made us after Thine image, and our hearts can find no rest until they rest in Thee.

We are too Christian really to enjoy sinning and too fond of sinning really to enjoy Christianity. Most of us know perfectly well what we ought to do; our trouble is that we do not want to do it. Thy help is our only hope. Make us want to do what is right, and give us the ability to do it.

In the name of Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Tuesday, June 24, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 25, 1947, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 317. An act for the relief of Robert B. Jones;

S. 361. An act for the relief of Alva R. Moore;

S. 425. An act for the relief of Col. Frank R. Loyd;

S. 470. An act for the relief of John H. Gradwell;

S. 514. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Sylvia De Cicco;

S. 561. An act for the relief of Robert C. Birkes;

S. 597. An act to provide for the protection of forests against destructive insects and diseases, and for other purposes; and

S. 614. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a permanent Census Office," approved March 6, 1902, as amended (the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3303) to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1358. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations outside the continental United States," approved June 28, 1944;

H. R. 1371. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to appoint, for supply duty only, officers of the line of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1375. An act to further amend section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to provide for the clothing allowance of enlisted men of the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve;

H. R. 2276. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to pay certain expenses incident to training, attendance, and participation of personnel of the Army of the United States in the seventh winter sports Olympic games and the fourteenth Olympic games and for future Olympic games; and

H. R. 3791. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

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

H. R. 3342. An act to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries, and by means of public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people, and its policies;

H. R. 3830. An act to provide for the promotion and elimination of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3911. An act to continue temporary authority of the Maritime Commission until March 1, 1948.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 381. An act for the relief of Allen T. Feamster, Jr.;

H. R. 407. An act for the relief of Claude R. Hall and Florence V. Hall;

H. R. 493. An act to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 ed.);

H. R. 577. An act to preserve historic graveyards in abandoned military posts;

H. R. 617. An act for the relief of James Harry Martin;

H. R. 1067. An act for the relief of S. C. Spradling and R. T. Morris;

H. R. 1144. An act for the relief of Samuel W. Davis, Jr.; Mrs. Samuel W. Davis, Jr.; and Betty Jane Davis;

H. R. 1318. An act for the relief of Mrs. Fuku Kurokawa Thurn;

H. R. 1358. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations outside the continental United States," approved June 28, 1944;

H. R. 1362. An act to permit certain naval personnel to count all active service rendered under temporary appointment as warrant or commissioned officers in the United States Navy and the United States Naval Reserve, or in the United States Marine Corps and the United States Marine Corps Reserve, for purposes of promotion to commissioned warrant officer in the United States Navy, or the United States Marine Corps, respectively;

H. R. 1371. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to appoint, for supply duty only, officers of the line of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1375. An act to further amend section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to provide for the clothing allowance of enlisted men of the Army, Marine Corps, and Marine Corps Reserve;

H. R. 1376. An act to amend the acts of October 14, 1942 (56 Stat. 786), as amended, and November 28, 1943 (57 Stat. 593), as

amended, so as to authorize transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to oversea bases;

H. R. 1514. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1628. An act relinquishing to the State of Illinois certain right, title, or interest of the United States of America, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1807. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the county of Pittsburg, Okla., a perpetual easement for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a public highway over a portion of the United States naval ammunition depot, McAlester, Okla.;

H. R. 1845. An act to amend existing laws relating to military leave of certain employees of the United States or of the District of Columbia so as to equalize rights to leave of absence and reemployment for such employees who are members of the Enlisted or Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard, or the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1997. An act to provide seniority benefits for certain officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for promotion by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States;

H. R. 2248. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant an easement and to convey to the Louisiana Power & Light Co. a tract of land comprising a portion of Camp Livingston in the State of Louisiana;

H. R. 2276. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to pay certain expenses incident to training, attendance, and participation of personnel of the Army of the United States and of the naval service, respectively, in the Seventh Winter Sports Olympic Games and the Fourteenth Olympic Games and for future Olympic games;

H. R. 2339. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the designation of Army mail clerks and assistant Army mail clerks," approved August 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 656), and for other purposes;

H. R. 2411. An act to authorize patenting of certain lands to Public Hospital District No. 2, Clallam County, Wash., for hospital purposes;

H. R. 2545. An act to provide funds for cooperation with the school board of the Moclips-Aloha district for the construction and equipment of a new school building in the town of Moclips, Grays Harbor County, Wash., to be available to both Indian and non-Indian children;

H. R. 2654. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to grant to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, State of Maryland, a permanent easement for the purpose of installing, maintaining, and servicing a subterranean water main in, on, and across the land of the United States Coast Guard station called Lazaretto depot, Baltimore, Md.;

H. R. 2655. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, State of Maryland, a permanent easement for the purpose of installing, maintaining, and servicing two subterranean water mains in, on, and across the land of Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Shrine, Md.;

H. R. 2915. An act for the relief of Mrs. Frederick Faber Wesche (formerly Ann Maureen Bell);

H. R. 3124. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the Eighty-first National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, August 10 to 14, 1947;

H. R. 3372. An act authorizing certain agreements with respect to rights in helium-bearing gas lands in the Navajo Indian Reservation, N. Mex., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3629. An act to authorize the transfer to the Panama Canal of property which is surplus to the needs of the War Department or Navy Department;

H. R. 3769. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to qualifications of part-time referees in bankruptcy;

H. R. 3791. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution authorizing the presentation of the Distinguished Flying Cross to Rear Adm. Charles E. Rosendahl, United States Navy;

H. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Roy Stanley Geiger, lieutenant general, United States Marine Corps, a commission as general, United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to recognize uncompensated services rendered the Nation under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate tomorrow and Monday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request is granted.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I am doing now what I have failed to do thus far, and I believe one of the subcommittees of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is still standing in suspense because I have forgotten to do this.

The Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which is now in the process of holding a hearing on Senate bill 545, asks the consent of the Senate to continue the hearing during the rest of today, or so much thereof as may be necessary for that purpose.

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

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REVISED ESTIMATE OF APROPRIATION FOR VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION (S. Doc. No. 66)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 involving an increase of $2,088,000 for the Veterans' Administration in the form of an amendment to his submission of May 15, 1947, to the House of Representatives contained in House Document 252 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

GENERAL PROVISIONS OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS AND CREDIT AGENCIES (S. Doc. No. 67)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the language of the "General provisions" of the Government corporations and credit agencies budget for the fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

DONATIONS BY NAVY DEPARTMENT TO NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, a list of institutions and organizations, all nonprofit and eligible, which have requested donations from the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXPENDITURES FROM APPROPRIATION OF ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

A letter from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, recommending an amendment to draft of a bill to authorize certain expenditures from the appropriation of St. Elizabeths Hospital, and for other purposes, submitted to the Senate on April 22, 1947 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore and referred as indicated:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Resolution 21

"Whereas the present system of financing the cost of administration of State unemployment-compensation and employment-service operations by grants from the Federal Government under the provisions of the Social Security Act, the Wagner-Peyser Act, and the Unemployment Tax Act is defective in the following respects:

"1. Congress and the responsible Federal agencies have failed to make available to the State of Illinois and the other States sufficient funds to permit proper administration, adequate planning and staffing, and the rendering of the services to the employers and workers of the respective States to which they are entitled by reason of the provisions of their unemployment-compensation laws;

"2. It has permitted the Federal Government to collect from the employers of this State Federal unemployment taxes at the rate of three-tenths of 1 percent of their pay rolls, amounting to approximately $98,000,000, to be used for administration of this State's Unemployment Compensation Act, while granting for such purposes only the sum of approximately $28,000,000, thus diverting for other purposes the sum of $70,000,000;

"3. It permits the determination of the amount necessary for efficient operation of State unemployment-compensation laws and the granting of funds for that purpose by a Federal agency which has no obligation or responsibility for the administration of such State laws;

"4. By permitting a Federal agency to grant or withhold funds, such agency is enabled to interfere in matters of administration which should be the sole province of the State.

"5. It burdens the employers of this State and other States with the obligation of duplicate reporting to the State and Federal Government, and in some cases with double taxation; and

"Whereas the State of Illinois is fully capable and desirous of administering its employment security program without aid or interference by the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fifth General Assembly of the* State of Illinois (*the senate concurring herein*), That the Congress of the United States be respectfully requested to enact legislation to exempt employers from the payment of the Federal three-tenths-of-1-per-

cent unemployment tax and to permit each State to collect such tax, in addition to contributions now collected by it, and to use such sums to finance its employment security program without Federal restriction; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate of the United States, and each Member of the Congress elected from the State of Illinois.

"Adopted by the house, June 11, 1947.

"Concurred in by the senate, June 18, 1947."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"House Resolution 45

"Resolution commending the United States Forest Service for the manner in which it has activated and maintained the Apalachicola National Forest in Liberty County, Fla.

"Whereas the United States Forest Service in 1933 activated the Apalachicola National Forest in Liberty County, Fla., and since said date has enlarged and maintained said forest and it is now one of the largest and outstanding national forests in the United States of America; and

"Whereas the soil contained within Apalachicola National Forest is especially suited to the production and growth of long-leaf yellow pine trees; and

"Whereas the timber resources of the United States are becoming extinct except within the national forest, and it is of paramount interest and concern to the people of the United States that the production and growth of timber should be carried on; and

"Whereas it is the sense of the House of Representatives of the State of Florida that the continued growth and production of long-leaf yellow-pine timber should not be interfered with but should be encouraged in every way possible: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Florida:

"SECTION 1. That the House of Representatives of the State of Florida commends the United States Forest Service for the manner in which it has activated and maintained the Apalachicola National Forest in Liberty County, Fla., and for its splendid record in the conduct of said forest and in the production of timber and the distribution of the proceeds of the sale of said timber to Liberty County, Fla.

"SEC. 2. That it is the desire of this House of Representatives that no action of any kind be taken by the United States Forest Service or any branch of the United States Government that would tend to reduce the size of said forest, the production of timber therein, or the distribution of the proceeds received from the sale of said timber to Liberty County, Fla., and that said forest be maintained at its present size.

"SEC. 3. That a certified copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Honorable CLAUDE PEPPER and the Honorable SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, United States Senators from Florida; to the Honorable BOB SIKES, Member of the House of Representatives of the United States from the Third Congressional District of Florida; and to the Clerk of the Senate of the United States; and to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States; and to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America."

A petition signed by sundry citizens of the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

PROTEST AGAINST LIQUOR ADVERTISING

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, over the past weeks I have received in my office 600 petitions in favor of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes.

These petitions contain over 16,000 signatures. I should like to have a list of the communities, cities, and villages represented in the petitions incorporated in the RECORD with my remarks.

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

PETITIONS RE CAPPER BILL (S. 265), WITH 16,346 SIGNATURES AFFIXED, RECEIVED FROM NEW YORK STATE CITIES AND VILLAGES

Adams, Akron, Alabama, Albany, Albertson, Albion, Alden, Alexander, Alfred, Allegany, Alplaus, Altamont, Alton, Ames, Amityville, Amsterdam, Andover, Anglica, Apalachin, Arcade, Argyle, Armonk, Ashville, Atlanta, Attica, Auburn, Aurora, Averill Park, Avoca, Avon, Babylon, Baldwin, Baldwinsville, Ballston Spa, Barnerville, Barneveld, Barton, Bason, Batavia, Bath, Bayport, Beaver Dams, Belfast, Bellerose, Belmont, Bergen, Berkshire, Barne, Bethel, Binghamton, Black River, Bloomingburg, Bloomingdale, Blossvale, Bombay, Boonville, Boston, Breesport, Brewerton, Brightwaters, Broadalbin, Brockport, Bronxville, Brookfield, Brooklyn, Brushton, Buffalo, Burdett, Caledonia, Cambridge, Camden, Canajoharie, Canastota, Candor, Caneadea, Canisteo, Carthage, Cassadaga, Castle Creek, Catskill, Cazenovia, Central Bridge, Ceres, Champlain, Chapin, Chautauqua, Chenango Forks, Cherry Creek, Cherry Valley, Chili, Chittenango, Churchville, Cicero, Clarence, Clarendon, Clarksville, Clay, Clayville, Cleverdale, Clyde, Clymer, Cobleskill, Coeymans, Cohocton, Cohoes, Collins, Collins Center, Commack, Comstock, Conewango Valley, Cooksburg, Cooperstown, Copenhagen, Corfu, Corinth, Corning, Cornwall, Cortland, Coxsackie, Crown Point, Crown Point Center, Cuba, Dale, Dalton, Dansville, Dayton, Delanson, Delhi, Delmar, Depauville, De Peyster, Deposit, De Ruyter, De Witt, Dewittville, Dickinson Center, Dresden, Dryden, Dundee, Eagle Bridge, Earlville, East Amherst, East Aurora, East Bloomfield, East Moriches, East Northport, Eastport, East Rockaway, East Syracuse, East Williston, Eaton, Edwards, Elma, Elmira, Elnora, Endicott, Endwell, Erieville, Erin Esperance, Etna, Fairport, Falconer, Farmingdale, Fayetteville, Ferndale, Fernwood, Fillmore, Fishers, Flushing, Fonda, Forestville, Fort Edward, Fort Hunter, Fort Plain, Frankfort, Franklin, Franklin Depot, Franklin Square, Franklinville, Fredonia, Freedom, Freeport, Freeville, Frewsburg, Friendship, Fulton, Fultonville, Gainesville, Galway, Gasport, Geneseo, Georgetown, Germantown, Gerry, Glen Aubrey, Glenfield, Glens Falls, Gloversville, Gouverneur, Gowanda, Grahamsville, Granville, Great Neck, Greene, Greenlawn, Greenport, Greenville, Greenwich, Guilderland Center, Hagaman, Hamburg, Hamilton, Hamlin, Hannacroix, Hannibal, Harrisville, Hartwick, Hauppauge, Hemlock, Hempstead, Herkimer, Hermon, Heuvelton, Higgins Bay, Highland, Hilton, Himrod, Hoffmans, Hollis, Holcomb, Holland, Holley, Holmes, Homer, Honeoye Falls, Hoosick Falls, Hornell, Horseheads, Houghton, Howes Cave, Hudson, Hudson Falls, Hume, Hurley, Hurleyville, Hyde Park, Ilion, Interlaken, Ionia, Ira, Ithaca, Jamaica, Jamesport, Jamestown, Jay, Jeffersonville, Johnsburg, Johnsonburg, Johnson City, Johnstown, Jordan, Kauneonga Lake, Keeseville, Kendall, Kenmore, Keuka Park, Kingston, Kirkville, Knapp Creek, Lacona, La Fargeville.

Lake Luzerne, Lakemont, Lakewood, Lancaster, Lebanon, Leon, Leonardsville, Le Roy, Liberty, Lima, Limestone, Lisbon, Lisle, Little Falls, Little Valley, Liverpool, Livingston, Livingston Manor, Livonia, Lockport, Long Eddy, Long Island City, Loon Lake, Lowman, Lowville, Ludlowville, Lynbrook, Lyons, Machias, Madrid, Maine, Malone, Manchester, Mannsville, Manorville, Marilla, Marlboro, Martinsburg, Martville, Massena, Mayfield, Mayville, Medusa, Merrickville, Mexico, Middlefield, Middle Grove, Middleport, Middletown, Milton, Mineola, Minetto, Minoa, Mohawk, Moira, Montgomery, Monticello, Mooers, Moravia, Moriah, Morristown, Mount Morris, Mount Vernon, Myers, Nanticoke, Nanuet, Naples, Nedrow, Newark Valley, New Berlin, Newburgh, Newfane, New Hartford, New Hyde Park, Newport, New Suffolk, New York, Niagara Falls, Nile, North Bangor, North Chili, North Cohocton, North Granville, North Pitcher, Northport, North Rose, North Tonawanda, Norton Hill, Norwich, Nunda, Nyack, Oakfield, Ogdensburg, Olean, Oneida, Oneonta, Oramel, Orient, Oriskany Falls, Orweli, Ossining, Oswego, Otego, Otto, Owego, Painted Post, Palatine Bridge, Panama, Patchogue, Pavilion, Pearl River, Peekskill, Penfield, Penn Yan, Perry, Perrysburg, Peru, Philmont, Phoenix, Plattekill, Port Byron, Porterville, Port Henry, Port Jervis, Portville, Potsdam, Poughkeepsie, Prattsville, Preston Hollow, Pulaski, Pultneyville, Randolph, Ransomville, Ravena, Red Creek, Rensselaer, Rexford, Rhinebeck, Richburg, Richford, Richland, Richmondville, Ripley, Riverhead, Rochester, Rockland, Rockville Centre, Rose, Rosendale, Round Lake, Rouses Point, Rush, Rushford, Russell, St. Johnsville, Salamanca, Salt Point, Sandusky, Saranac Lake, Saratoga Springs, Savannah, Sayville, Schenectady, Schenevus, Schuylerville, Scio, Scottsville, Selkirk, Sharon Springs, Sherburne, Sherman, Shortesville, Silver Creek, Silver Springs, Sinclairville, Skaneateles, Sloansville, Smiths Basin, Smithtown, Smyrna, Snyder, Sodus, Sodus Point, Southampton, South Dayton, South Lansing, South Otselic, South Westerlo, Sparrow Bush, Speculator, Spencerport, Speonk, Spragueville, Sprakers, Springfield Center, Spring Valley, Springwater, Stafford, Stanfordville, Stanley, Staten Island, Stillwater, Stockton, Straits Corners, Sundown, Swain, Swan Lake, Syracuse, Tarrytown, Ticonderoga, Tioga Center, Tomkins Cove, Tompkins Corners, Tonawanda, Troy, Trumansburg, Truthville, Unadilla, Union Grove, Union Springs, Utica, Vails Gate, Valley Stream, Varysburg, Vermontville, Vernon Center, Vestal, Victor, Voorheesville, Walden, Wallace, Wallkill, Walton, Wantagh, Warnerville, Warsaw, Warwick, Washingtonville, Waterford, Water Mill, Waterport, Watervliet, Watkins Glen, Waverly, Wayland, Wayne, Webster, Weedsport, Wells Bridge, Wellsburg, Wellsville, Westdale, West Falls, Westfield, Westhampton, Weston Mills, Westport, West Winfield, Whitehall, White Lake, White Plains, Whitney Point, Williamson, Wilmington, Wilson, Windsor, Wolcott, Woodhull, Woodmere, Woodville, Worcester, Wyoming, Yorkshire, Youngstown.

College Point, Middle Village, Solvay, Fairview, Richmond Hill, Woodhaven, Port Dickinson, Pine Bluff, Laramie, Bosler, Cheyenne, Eggertsville, Williamsville, New Hackensack, Port Richmond, Scotia, Menands, East Bethany, Ellenville, Queens Village, Synden, St. Albans, West Granville, Maspeth, Tottenville, Frankport, Astoria, Bayside, Woodside, Forest Hills, Jackson Heights, Sprokers, Elmhurst, Rutherford, Southampton, Sterling, West Barre, Langnoit, Oceanside, Gilbertsville, South New Berlin, Mount Upton, Centerport, Nichols, Troupsburg, Circleville, Fair Oaks, Palmyra, Marion, East Palmyra, Upper Nyack, South Nyack.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 3251. A 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; without amendment (Rept. No. 356).

By Mr. BALDWIN, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 364. A bill to expedite the disposition of Government surplus airports, airport facilities, and equipment and to assure their disposition in such manner as will best encourage and foster the development of civilian aviation and preserve for national defense purposes a strong, efficient, and properly maintained Nation-wide system of public airports, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 359).

By Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 3394. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the evacuation and return of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States," approved May 16, 1946, in order to provide for the shipment of the remains of World War II dead to the homeland of the deceased or of next of kin, to provide for the disposition of group and mass burials, to provide for the burial of unknown American World War II dead in United States military cemeteries to be established overseas, to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire land overseas and to establish United States military cemeteries thereon, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 358).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 3484. A bill to transfer the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture; without amendment (Rept. No. 357).

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

S. 136. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Stephanes; without amendment (Rept. No. 360); and

S. 409. A bill for the relief of Milan Jandrich; with an amendment (Rept. No. 361).

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 1087. A bill to amend section 502 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 362);

S. 1249. A bill authorizing additional research and investigation into problems and methods relating to the eradication of cattle grubs, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 363); and

H. R. 195. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain lands in Alaska to the city of Sitka, Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 364).

By Mr. AIKEN:

From the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 1326. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; with an amendment (Rept. No. 378).

From the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

S. 1350. A bill to authorize relief of the Chief Disbursing Officer, Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 379).

By Mr. REVERCOMB, from the Committee on Public Works:

H. R. 1610. A bill to amend the act of June 14, 1938, so as to authorize the Cairo Bridge Commission to issue its refunding bonds for the purpose of refunding the outstanding bonds issued by the commission to pay the cost of a certain toll bridge at or near Cairo, Ill.; without amendment (Rept. No. 365); and

H. R. 3072. A bill to authorize the preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of cost of for the erection of an addition or extension to the House Office Buildings and the remodeling of the fifth floor of the Old House Office Building; without amendment (Rept. No. 366).

By Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on Civil Service:

S. 1180. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of commemorative stamps in honor of Gold Star mothers; without amendment (Rept. No. 367).

By Mr. BUCK, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 612. A bill to amend section 35 of chapter III of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," as amended, so as to permit certain additional investments; with amendments (Rept. No. 371);

H. R. 1633. A bill to amend section 16 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia"; without amendment (Rept. No. 368);

H. R. 1634. A bill to amend section 1, and provisions (6), (7), and (8) of section 3, and provision (3) of section 4 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," and to add sections 5a, 5b, and 5c thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 369); and

H. R. 1893. A bill to authorize the sale of the bed of E Street SW., between Twelfth and Thirteenth Streets, in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 370).

By Mr. KEM, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 8. A bill to provide for the incorporation, regulation, merger, consolidation, and dissolution of certain business corporations in the District of Columbia; with an amendment (Rept. No. 372);

S. 1442. A bill to amend sections 235 and 327 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 374);

H. R. 494. A bill to reorganize the system of parole of prisoners convicted in the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 373);

H. R. 3235. A bill to amend the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, with respect to abandonment of condemnation proceedings; without amendment (Rept. No. 375); and

H. R. 3515. A bill to make it unlawful in the District of Columbia to corruptly influence participants or officials in contests of skill, speed, strength, or endurance, and to provide a penalty therefor; without amendment (Rept. No. 376).

By Mr. McGRATH, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 1402. A bill to authorize the parishes and congregations of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the District of Columbia to establish bylaws governing the election of their vestrymen; without amendment (Rept. No. 380);

S. 1462. A bill to authorize the official reporters of the municipal court for the District of Columbia to collect fees for transcripts, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 381);

H. R. 2470. A bill to authorize the establishment of a band in the Metropolitan Police force; without amendment (Rept. No. 382);

H. R. 3547. A bill to authorize funds for ceremonies in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 383); and

S. J. Res. 129. Joint resolution to provide for the appropriate commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the seat of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 384).

By Mr. ECTON, from the Committee on Public Lands:

S. 714. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Claude E. Milliken; with amendments (Rept. No. 385); and

S. 1317. A bill to give to members of the Crow Tribe the power to manage and assume charge of their restricted lands, for their own use or for lease purposes, while such lands remain under trust patents; without amendment (Rept. No. 386).

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Public Lands:

S. 1419. A bill to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation, to issue sewer bonds; without amendment (Rept. No. 387); and

S. 1420. A bill to authorize the issuance of certain public-improvement bonds by the Territory of Hawaii; without amendment (Rept. No. 388).

By Mr. BREWSTER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 1038. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act; with amendments (Rept. No. 389).

By Mr. BROOKS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

H. J. Res. 170. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Andrew W. Mellon; with amendments;

S. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution to include all general appropriation bills in one consolidated general appropriation bill; with an amendment (Rept. No. 391);

S. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution creating a joint committee to investigate certain matters affecting agriculture; with amendments;

S. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of proceedings at the unveiling of the statue of William E. Borah; without amendment;

S. Res. 123. Resolution requiring each committee of the Senate to report semiannually certain information concerning its employees and expenditure of funds; without amendment;

S. Res. 127. Resolution prohibiting, under certain conditions, the printing in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of matter offered as a part of the remarks of a Senator; without amendment; and

S. Res. 128. Resolution to pay a gratuity to Carolyn Crum Orbello; without amendment.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on June 24, 1947, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 751. An act to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia through June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to the Marine Corps dead of all wars.

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 and withdrawing the nominations of sundry postmasters, which nominations 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. LANGER, from the Committee on Civil Service:

Sundry postmasters.

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:

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming:

S. 1498. A bill to provide support for wool, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 1499. A bill providing for the conveyance to the State of South Carolina, or any political subdivision thereof, of that portion of the Fort Moultrie Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the War Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1500. A bill for the relief of Lt. Richard Park, United States Naval Reserve; and

S. 1501. A bill for the relief of W. Irving Lincoln; to the Committee on the Judiciary;

S. 1502. A bill to authorize the contribution to the International Children's Emergency Fund of the United Nations of an amount equal to the moneys received by the Selective Service System for the services of persons assigned to work of national importance under civilian direction pursuant to section 5 (g) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 1503. A bill for the relief of Charles L. Bishop; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1504. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the confirmation of the title to the Saline lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to D. H. Brush, and others," approved March 2, 1861; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 1505. A bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Boise, Idaho, to the Boise Chamber of Commerce; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1506. A bill for the relief of Max Albrecht Blank; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 1507. A bill authorizing the sale of undisposed of lots in Michel Addition to the town of Polson, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

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

S. 1508. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance," approved March 9, 1945 (59 Stat. 33); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 1509. A bill to raise the minimum wage standards of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1510. A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1511. A bill to provide additional inducements to physicians, surgeons, and dentists to make a career of the United States military, naval, and public health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 1512. A bill to improve accounting within the Federal Security Administration, to authorize intra-agency transfers and consolidations of appropriations by the Federal Security Administrator, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 1513. A bill to authorize the appointment of Sidney F. Mashbir as a colonel, Adjutant General's Department, United States Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1514 (by request). A bill to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act to accord free entry to bona fide gifts from members of the armed forces of the United States on duty abroad," approved December 5, 1942; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. FULBRIGHT):

S. 1515. A bill to make surplus property available for the alleviation of damage caused by flood or other catastrophe; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. J. Res. 137. Joint resolution for the relief of certain creditors of the Norwood Pulp & Machinery Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original joint resolution (S. J. Res. 138) to provide for returns of Italian property in the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, and appears under a separate heading.)

RESTRICTIONS ON TRAVEL BY AMERICAN AND FOREIGN CITIZENS

Mr. BREWSTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution (S. Res. 111) relative to modifying restrictions on travel by American and foreign citizens, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN POWERS OF THE PRESIDENT UNDER SECOND WAR POWERS ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. ELLENDER submitted an amendment and Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (S. 1461) to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CLAIRE M. PHILLIPS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MORSE submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1295) for the relief of Mrs. Claire M. Phillips, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

INVESTIGATION OF OPERATIONS OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. BALDWIN (for himself, Mr. BUCK, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. THYE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. ECTON, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. O'DANIEL, Mr. UMSTEAD, and Mr. O'CONOR) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20), which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Senate Committee on Civil Service and the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittees thereof, are hereby authorized and directed to make a joint study and investigation of the operations of the Post Office Department with particular reference to (1) the efficiency of the operations of the Department, (2) the existing postal rates and the extent to which each of the various types of services (including the carriage of different classes of mail) rendered by the Department is self-supporting, and (3) the necessity or desirability of changing the methods of conducting the operations of the Department and of increasing or adjusting postal rates in order to provide more economical methods of executing its functions and to eliminate the deficit resulting from operations of the Department.

SEC. 2. The committees shall report to their respective Houses, as soon as practicable during the present Congress, the results of the joint study and investigation together with such recommendations for necessary legislation, or for changes in methods of operation of the Post Office Department, as they deem advisable.

SEC. 3. (a) To carry out the purposes of this resolution, the committees are authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress; to hold such hearings; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; to procure such printing and binding; and to make such expenditures as they deem advisable. The cost of stenographic service to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

(b) In conducting the joint study and investigation, the committees are empowered to appoint and to fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and clerical and stenographic assistants as they deem necessary and advisable, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties.

(c) The expenses incurred under this resolution in conducting the joint study and investigation shall not exceed $150,000, and shall be paid upon vouchers approved by the chairmen of the respective committees, or by any member, duly authorized by the respective chairmen. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of disbursements so made.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO REPORTING OF MEASURES BY COMMITTEES

Mr. GURNEY (for himself, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. AIKEN) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 133), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That paragraph (3) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"(3) Each standing committee is authorized to fix the number of its members (but not less than one-third of its entire membership) who shall constitute a quorum thereof for the transaction of such business as may be considered by any such committee. No measure or recommendation shall be reported

from any such committee unless a majority of the members of such committee are actually present or have given proxies to a member or members of such committee.

"SEC. 2. After the date of adoption of this resolution, section 133 (d) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 shall not be effective with respect to the reporting of any measure or recommendation by any standing committee of the Senate."

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

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

H. R. 3342. An act to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries, and by means of public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people, and its policies; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H. R. 3830. An act to provide for the promotion and elimination of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3911. An act to continue temporary authority of the Maritime Commission until March 1, 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT OF 1947—LETTER BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter on the Labor-Management Relations Act, addressed by him to the workers of Wisconsin and working men and women of America, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. BERNARD M. BARUCH BEFORE INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF THE ARMED FORCES

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Bernard M. Baruch before the Industrial College of the Armed Forces on June 26, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR LEGISLATION—ADDRESS BY JOE A. WILSON

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on labor legislation by Joe A. Wilson, general representative of the International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union of North America, at the Southwest Conference of Printing Pressmen and Assistants, at Galveston, Tex., June 16, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRICE REDUCTION WITH INCREASED WAGES—STATEMENT BY FOWLER McCORMICK

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding reduction in prices with increases in wages, by Fowler McCormick, chairman of the board of the International Harvester Co., before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, on June 26, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE INTERSTATE OIL COMPACT—ADDRESS BY HIRAM M. DOW

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered recently by Mr. Hiram M. Dow, one of New Mexico's leading lawyers, before the Producers' and Royalty Owners' Association, at Amarillo, Tex., on the subject of the interstate oil compact and the work of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSERVATION FARMING—ESSAY BY JULIAN STOUTAMYER

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an essay entitled "Conservation Farming," written by Julian Stoutamyer, of the elementary school of Front Royal, Va., which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR LEGISLATION—TELEGRAPHIC COMMENT

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two telegrams urging the sustaining of the President's veto of the labor bill, one from the Joint Council of Teamsters, No. 37, Phil Brady, president; the other from M. E. Steele; which appear in the Appendix.]

THE PALESTINE SITUATION—LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT FROM BILLY ROSE

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter to President Truman from Billy Rose dealing with the Palestine situation, published in the Washington Times-Herald of June 25, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION IN COUNTRIES SOUTH OF THE RIO GRANDE—LETTER FROM SAMUEL E. GIUDICI

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Samuel E. Giudici, of Lima, Peru, regarding plans for preventive measures taken by the American Legion against Communist infiltration in the countries south of the Rio Grande, and resolutions pertaining thereto, which appear in the Appendix.]

NO LOAFERS, THEY—EDITORIAL FROM THE WILMINGTON (DEL.) JOURNAL-EVERY EVENING

[Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "No Loafers, They," published in the Wilmington (Del.) Journal-Every Evening of June 20, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE LABOR BILL—ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Truman and His 'Team' Stand Up to Congress," published in the New York Times of June 22, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT OF 1947—EDITORIAL FROM ARKANSAS DEMOCRAT

[Mr. McCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Labor Reform Bill Becomes Law," published in the Arkansas Democrat of June 24, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

TO THE BOARDS OF DIRECTORS OF AMERICAN BUSINESS — EDITORIAL FROM FORTUNE MAGAZINE

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "To the Boards of Directors of American Business," published in the June 1947 issue of Fortune magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS (H. DOC. NO. 365)

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

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 7728.)

EXTENSION OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

TITLE I—AMENDMENT TO RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION ACT

SECTION 1. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. There is hereby created a body corporate with the name 'Reconstruction Finance Corporation' (herein called the Corporation), with a capital stock of $325,000,000 subscribed by the United States of America. Its principal office shall be located in the District of Columbia, but there may be established agencies or branch offices in any city or cities of the United States under rules and regulations prescribed by the board of directors. This act may be cited as the 'Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act.'

"SEC. 2. The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a board of directors consisting of five persons appointed by the President of the United States by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Of the five members of the board, not more than three shall be members of any one political party and not more than one shall be appointed from any one Federal Reserve district. Each director shall devote his time principally to the business of the Corporation. The terms of the directors shall be 2 years but they may continue in office until their successors are appointed and qualified. Whenever a vacancy shall occur other than by expiration of term the person appointed to fill such vacancy shall hold office for the unexpired portion of the term of the director whose place he is selected to fill. The directors, except the chairman, shall receive salaries at the rate of $12,500 per annum each. The chairman of the board of directors shall receive a salary at the rate of $15,000 per annum.

"SEC. 3. (a) The Corporation shall have succession through June 30, 1949, unless it is sooner dissolved by an act of Congress. It shall have power to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal; to make contracts; to lease or purchase such real estate as may be necessary for the transaction of its business; to sue and be sued, to complain and to defend, in any court of competent jurisdiction, State or Federal: *Provided*, That the Corporation shall be entitled to and granted the same immunities and exemptions from the payment of costs, charges, and fees as are granted to the United States pursuant to the provisions of law codified in sections 543, 548, 555, 557, 578, and 578a of title 28 of the United States Code, 1940 edition; to select, employ, and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary for the transaction of the business of the Corporation, in accordance with laws, applicable to the Corporation, as in effect on June 30, 1947, and as thereafter amended; and to prescribe, amend, and repeal, by its board of directors, bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its general business may be conducted. Except as may be otherwise provided in this act, the board of directors of the Corporation shall determine the necessity for and the character and amount of its obligations and expenditures under this act and the manner in which they shall be budgeted, incurred, allowed, paid, and accounted for, without regard to the

provisions of any other laws governing the expenditure of public funds and such determinations shall be final and conclusive upon all other officers of the Government. The Corporation shall be entitled to the free use of the United States mails in the same manner as the executive departments of the Government.

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the right to recover compensation granted by the act approved September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C., sec. 751), shall be in lieu of, and shall be construed to abrogate, any and all other rights and remedies which any person, except for this provision, might, on account of injury or death of an employee, assert against the Corporation or any of its subsidiaries.

"SEC. 4. (a) To aid in financing agriculture, commerce, and industry, to help in maintaining the economic stability of the country and to assist in promoting maximum employment and production, the Corporation, within the limitations hereinafter provided, is authorized—

"(1) To purchase the obligations of and to make loans to any business enterprise organized or operating under the laws of any State or the United States: *Provided*, That the purchase of obligations (including equipment trust certificates) of, or the making of loans to railroads or air carriers engaged in interstate commerce or receivers or trustees thereof, shall be with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Civil Aeronautics Board, respectively: *Provided further*, That in the case of railroads or air carriers not in receivership or trusteeship, the Commission or the Board, as the case may be, in connection with its approval of such purchases or loans, shall also certify that such railroad or air carrier, on the basis of present and prospective earnings, may be expected to meet its fixed charges without a reduction thereof through judicial reorganization except that such certificates shall not be required in the case of loans or purchases made for the acquisition of equipment or for maintenance.

"(2) To make loans to any financial institution organized under the laws of any State or of the United States.

"(3) In order to aid in financing projects authorized under Federal, State, or municipal law, to purchase the securities and obligations of, or make loans to, (A) municipalities and political subdivisions of States, (B) public agencies and instrumentalities of one or more States, municipalities, and political subdivisions of States, and (C) public corporations, boards, and commissions: *Provided*, That no such purchase or loan shall be made for payment of ordinary governmental or nonproject operating expenses as distinguished from purchases and loans to aid in financing specific public projects.

"(4) To make such loans, in an aggregate amount not to exceed $25,000,000 outstanding at any one time, as it may determine to be necessary or appropriate because of floods or other catastrophes.

"(b) No financial assistance shall be extended pursuant to paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) of this section, unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available on reasonable terms. All securities and obligations purchased and all loans made under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) of this section shall be of such sound value or so secured as reasonably to assure retirement or repayment and such loans may be made either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate or by the purchase of participations, or otherwise.

"(c) The total amount of investments, loans, purchases, and commitments made pursuant to this section 4 shall not exceed $2,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time.

"(d) No fee or commission shall be paid by any applicant for financial assistance under the provisions of this act in connection with any such application, and any agreement to pay or payment of any such fee or commission shall be unlawful.

"(e) No director, officer, attorney, agent, or employee of the Corporation in any manner, directly or indirectly, shall participate in the deliberation upon or the determination of any question affecting his personal interests, or the interests of any corporation, partnership, or association in which he is directly or indirectly interested.

"(f) The powers granted to the Corporation by this section shall terminate at the close of business on June 30, 1949, but the termination of such powers shall not be construed (1) to prohibit disbursement of funds on purchases of securities and obligations, on loans, or on commitments or agreements to make such purchases or loans, made under this act prior to the close of business on such date, or (2) to affect the validity or performance of any other agreement made or entered into pursuant to law.

"(g) As used in this act, the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

"SEC. 5. Section 5202 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the words 'War Finance Corporation Act' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act'.

"SEC. 6. The Federal Reserve banks are authorized and directed to act as custodians and fiscal agents for the Corporation in the general performance of its powers conferred by this act and the Corporation may reimburse such Federal Reserve banks for such services in such manner as may be agreed upon.

"SEC. 7. The Corporation may issue to the Secretary of the Treasury its notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations in an amount outstanding at any one time sufficient to enable the Corporation to carry out its functions under this act or any other provision of law, such obligations to mature not more than 5 years from their respective dates of issue, to be redeemable at the option of the Corporation before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated in such obligations. Such obligations may mature subsequent to the period of succession of the Corporation. Each such obligation shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the obligation of the Corporation. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to purchase any obligations of the Corporation to be issued hereunder, and for such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of the Corporation's obligations hereunder.

"SEC. 8. The Corporation, including its franchise, capital, reserves and surplus, and its income shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, by any Territory, dependency, or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, except that any real property of the Corporation shall be subject to special assessments for local improvements and shall be subject to State, Territorial, county, municipal, or local taxation to the same extent according to its value as other real property is taxed: *Provided*, That the special assessment and taxation of real property as authorized herein shall not include the taxation as real property of possessory interests, pipe lines, power lines, or machinery or equipment owned by the Corporation regardless of their nature, use, or manner of attachment or affixation to the land, building, or other structure upon or in which the same may be located. The exemptions provided for in the preceding sentence with respect to taxation (which shall, for all purposes, be deemed to include sales, use, storage, and purchase taxes) shall be construed to be applicable not only with respect to the Corporation but also with respect to any other public corporation which is now or which may be hereafter wholly financed and wholly managed by the Corporation. Such exemptions shall also be construed to be applicable to loans made, and personal property owned by the Corporation or such other corporations, but such exemptions shall not be construed to be applicable in any State to any buildings which are considered by the laws of such State to be personal property for taxation purposes. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or any privilege or consent to tax expressly or impliedly granted thereby, the shares of preferred stock of national banking associations, and the shares of preferred stock, capital notes, and debentures of State banks and trust companies, acquired prior to July 1, 1947, by the Corporation, and the dividends or interest derived therefrom by the Corporation, shall not, so long as the Corporation shall continue to own the same, be subject to any taxation by the United States, by any Territory, dependency or possession thereof, or the District of Columbia, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, whether now, heretofore, or hereafter imposed, levied or assessed, and whether for a past, present, or future taxing period.

"SEC. 9. In the event of termination of the powers granted to the Corporation by section 4 of this act prior to the expiration of its succession as provided in section 3, the board of directors shall, except as otherwise herein specifically authorized, proceed to liquidate its assets and wind up its affairs. It may with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury deposit with the Treasurer of the United States as a special fund any money belonging to the Corporation or from time to time received by it in the course of liquidation, for the payment of its outstanding obligations, which fund may be drawn upon or paid out for no other purpose. Any balance remaining after the liquidation of all the Corporation's assets and after provision has been made for payment of all legal obligations shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. Thereupon the Corporation shall be dissolved and its capital stock shall be canceled and retired.

"SEC. 10. If at the expiration of the succession of the Corporation, its board of directors shall not have completed the liquidation of its assets and the winding up of its affairs, the duty of completing such liquidation and winding up of its affairs shall be transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury, who for such purpose shall succeed to all the powers and duties of the board of directors under this act. In such event he may assign to any officer or officers of the United States in the Treasury Department the exercise and performance, under his general supervision and direction, of any such powers and duties. When the Secretary of the Treasury shall find that such liquidation will no longer be advantageous to the United States and that all of the Corporation's legal obligations have been provided for, he shall retire any capital stock then outstanding, pay into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts the unused balance of the moneys belonging to the Corporation, and make a final report to the Congress. Thereupon the Corporation shall be deemed to be dissolved.

"SEC. 11. (a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of obtaining for himself or for any applicant

any loan, or extension thereof by removal, deferment of action or otherwise, or the acceptance, release, or substitution of security therefor, or for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Corporation, or for the purpose of obtaining money, property, or anything of value, under this act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

"(b) Whoever (1) falsely makes, forges, or counterfeits any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, in imitation of or purporting to be a note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, issued by the Corporation; or (2) passes, utters, or publishes, or attempts to pass, utter, or publish, any false, forged, or counterfeited note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, purporting to have been issued by the Corporation, knowing the same to be false, forged, or counterfeited; or (3) falsely alters any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, issued or purporting to have been issued by the Corporation; or (4) passes, utters, or publishes, or attempts to pass, utter, or publish, as true any falsely altered or spurious note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, issued or purporting to have been issued by the Corporation, knowing the same to be falsely altered or spurious, or any person who willfully violates any other provision of this act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000, by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

"(c) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Corporation, (1) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to it or pledged or otherwise entrusted to it; or (2) with intent to defraud the Corporation or any other body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Corporation, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the Corporation, or, without being duly authorized, draws any order or issues, puts forth, or assigns any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or draft, bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof; or (3) with intent to defraud participates, shares, receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefit through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Corporation; or (4) gives any unauthorized information concerning any future action or plan of the corporation which might affect the value of securities, or having such knowledge, invests or speculates, directly or indirectly, in the securities or property of any company, bank, or corporation receiving loans or other assistance from the Corporation, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

"(d) No individual, association, partnership, or corporation shall use the words 'Reconstruction Finance Corporation' or a combination of these three words, as the name or a part thereof under which he or it shall do business. Every individual, partnership, association, or corporation violating this prohibition shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not exceeding $1,000 or imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or both.

"(e) The provisions of sections 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, and 117 of the Criminal Code of the United States (U. S. C., title 18, ch. 5, secs. 202 to 207, inclusive), insofar as applicable, are extended to apply to contracts or agreements with the Corporation under this act, which for the purposes hereof shall be held to include loans, advances, discounts, and rediscounts; extensions and renewals thereof; and acceptances, releases, and substitutions of security therefor.

"SEC. 12. The Corporation is authorized to exercise the functions, powers, duties, and authority transferred to the Corporation by Public Law 109, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved June 30, 1945, but only with respect to programs, projects, or commitments outstanding on June 30, 1947.

"SEC. 13. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this act, and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby."

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 201. No provision of this act shall be construed so as to prevent the Corporation from disbursing funds on purchases, of securities and obligations, on loans made, or on commitments or agreements to make such purchases or loans, and liabilities incurred, pursuant to law prior to the effective date of this act.

SEC. 202. The succession of United States Commercial Company, a corporation created by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation pursuant to section 5d (3) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby extended through June 30, 1948.

SEC. 203. All assets and liabilities of every kind and nature, together with all documents, books of account, and records, of The RFC Mortgage Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Maryland, all the capital stock of which is owned and held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, shall be transferred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. With respect to the assets, liabilities, and records transferred, "Reconstruction Finance Corporation" for all purposes is hereby substituted for "The RFC Mortgage Company," and no suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against such corporation shall abate by reason of the enactment of this act, but the court, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within 12 months after the date of such enactment, showing a necessity for the survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a determination of the questions involved, may allow the same to be maintained by or against the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

SEC. 204. The Federal Loan Agency, created by Reorganization Plan No. 1 pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1939, approved April 3, 1939, is hereby abolished, and all its property and records are hereby transferred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

SEC. 205. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to transfer as soon as practicable after the effective date of this act, to the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to receive, all of the stock of the Federal home-loan banks held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel notes of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and sums due and unpaid upon or in connection with such notes at the time of such cancellation, in an amount equal to the par value of the stock so transferred.

SEC. 206. The following acts and portions of acts are hereby repealed:

(a) Sections 1, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, and 211 of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932, approved July 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 709), as amended;

(b) Section 304 of the act approved March 9, 1933 (48 Stat. 1), as amended;

(c) Sections 27, 32, 36, 37, and 38 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, approved May 12, 1933 (48 Stat. 41), as amended;

(d) Sections 5 and 19 (c) and the last two sentences of section 8 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, approved May 12, 1933 (48 Stat. 33), as amended;

(e) The act approved June 10, 1933 (48 Stat. 119), as amended;

(f) The last sentence of section 4 (b) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, approved June 13, 1933 (48 Stat. 129), as amended;

(g) Sections 301 and 302 of the National Industrial Recovery Act, approved June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 195), as amended;

(h) Section 84 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, approved June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 257), as amended;

(i) The act approved January 20, 1934 (48 Stat. 318);

(j) The fourth paragraph of the Emergency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1056), and section 202 of the Public Works Administration Extension Act of 1937, approved June 29, 1937 (50 Stat. 357);

(k) Sections 10, 13, 14, 15, and 16 of the act approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1105), as amended;

(l) So much of sections 4 and 602 of the National Housing Act, approved June 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 1247), as amended, as relates to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation;

(m) The first section and sections 2, 3, 9, 11, and 13 of the act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 1), as amended;

(n) The act approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat., ch. 646, p. 796);

(o) The act approved March 20, 1936 (49 Stat. 1185);

(p) The act approved April 10, 1936 (49 Stat., ch. 168, p. 1191);

(q) The first section of the act approved January 26, 1937 (50 Stat. 5), as amended;

(r) The act approved February 11, 1937 (50 Stat. 19), as amended;

(s) So much of section 32 (b) of the Farm Credit Act of 1937, approved August 19, 1937 (50 Stat. 703), as relates to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and so much of section 33 (b) of the said act as relates to the payment of the expenses of corporations formed by the consolidation of two or more regional agricultural credit corporations;

(t) So much of the act approved June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1193), as relates to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation;

(u) Section 12 of the Federal Highway Act of 1940, approved September 5, 1940 (54 Stat. 867);

(v) Section 5 of the act approved June 10, 1941 (55 Stat. 250);

(w) The act approved October 23, 1941 (55 Stat., ch. 454, p. 744);

(x) The act approved March 27, 1942 (56 Stat., ch. 198, p. 174);

(y) The act approved June 5, 1942 (56 Stat., ch. 352, p. 326); and

(z) Sections 1 and 2 of Public Law 656, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 7, 1946.

SEC. 207. The liquidation of the affairs of the Smaller War Plants Corporation administered by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation pursuant to Executive Order 9665 shall be carried out by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, notwithstanding the provisions of the last paragraph of section 5 of the First War Powers Act, 1941. The Smaller War Plants Corporation is hereby abolished.

SEC. 208. (a) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall have the power to purchase any surplus property for resale, subject to regulations of the War Assets Administrator or his successor, to small business when, in its judgment, such disposition is required to preserve and strengthen the competitive position of small business. The purchase of surplus property under this section shall be given priority under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, immediately following transfers to Government agencies under section 12 of such act, as amended, and disposals to veterans under section 16 of such act, as amended. The provisions of section 12 (c) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, shall be applicable to purchases made under this section. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not purchase any surplus property pursuant to this section

unless a small business had previously made application to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for such property. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not purchase any real property for resale to small business pursuant to this section in any case where any person from whom the property had been acquired by a Government agency, gives notice in writing to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that he intends to exercise his rights under section 23 of the Surplus Property Act, as amended.

(b) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is further authorized for the purpose of carrying out the objectives of this section to arrange for sales of surplus property to small business concerns on credit or time basis.

(c) For the purposes of this section the terms "persons," "surplus property," and "Government agency" have the same meaning as is assigned to such terms by section 3 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended.

SEC. 209. During the period between June 30, 1947, and the date of enactment of legislation making funds available for administrative expenses for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, the Corporation is authorized to incur, and pay out of its general funds, administrative expenses in accordance with laws in effect on June 30, 1947, such obligations and expenditures to be charged against funds when made available for administrative expenses for the fiscal year 1948.

SEC. 210. This act shall take effect as of midnight June 30, 1947.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. BUCK, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. MAYBANK, and Mr. TAYLOR conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I have been advised by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] that in view of other engagements he will not be able to act as conferee on the legislation involving the extension of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that he be excused and that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] be appointed in his place.

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

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 564) to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President, in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President.

Mr. WHERRY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the Presidential succession bill.

Mr. WHERRY. In order for that business to be displaced there must be unanimous consent or a motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. Matters transacted by unanimous consent do not affect the status of the bill to which the Senator from Nebraska refers.

PERMANENT BUILDING FOR THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I ask unanimous consent to report favorably from the Committee on Foreign Relations House Joint Resolution 193, to grant authority for the erection of a permanent building for the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia Chapter, Washington, D. C., and I submit a report (No. 355) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the report will be received.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the House joint resolution shall be enacted, title to the building and the property will remain in the Government of the United States. No expense is involved. The upkeep of the building will be a charge against the Red Cross.

There is great anxiety to complete certain details prior to July 1. The joint resolution has unanimously passed the House of Representatives, it has the approval of all the appropriate authorities of the District of Columbia, and I take the liberty of asking unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside for the consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object, I should be glad indeed to comply with the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Michigan, with the understanding that no controversy will be provoked in the consideration of the measure. If there is, I think the Senator will agree with me we should proceed with the regular order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is quite correct.

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

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 193) to grant authority for the erection of a permanent building for the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia Chapter, Washington, D. C., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RETURN OF ITALIAN PROPERTY IN THE UNITED STATES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I ask unanimous consent to report in lieu of Senate Joint Resolution 133 an original joint resolution to provide for return of Italian property in the United States, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 390) thereon.

There being no objection, the report was received, and the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 138) to provide for return of Italian property in the United States, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT OF 1947

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, a few days ago, on the occasion of the final debate on the Taft-Hartley labor bill, I expressed faith in the National Labor Relations Board, in the membership of the Board, and in the Board's willingness to cooperate in the administration of the new act. I felt sure, and I feel sure at this time, that there will be no question as to their desires and as to their activity in connection with that administration. I am sure that they will be 100 percent in their effort to carry it out, and to carry out the intent of the Congress in its passage.

In this connection I wish to read, because I think it should appear in the RECORD, a statement of the Board, which is very brief, indicating their desire in the matter. It reads as follows:

> Yesterday the Taft-Hartley bill was proposed legislation. Today it is the Labor-Management Relations Act, the law of the land. The people's representatives having spoken, the debate is over so far as this Board is concerned.
>
> The Congress has not only decided the policy issues, but has entrusted the effectuation of much of the new policy to the National Labor Relations Board. All who accept that trust must do so with single-minded purpose to carry out the congressional intent. Effective June 24, 1947, this Board will prepare to give the new act the fairest and most efficient administration that lies within its power.

Mr. President, that is the statement. The same night on which this statement was issued, the Chairman of the Board, Mr. Paul M. Herzog, appeared on a radio program and pledged again not only his own cooperation, but the cooperation of all the members of the Board. At that time Mr. Herzog not only made this pledge in behalf of himself and of the Board, but he also indicated his willingness to cooperate fully with the joint congressional committee which is to be appointed under the provisions of the act, to aid in carrying it out, to aid in the study of all labor relations in this country, and to ascertain not only what changes in administrative techniques may be needed in the way of implementing the new act, but also what changes may be needed in the act itself following a period of experience with its administration.

Mr. President, to me that is a fine beginning for the new act. I am sorry that there are those in this country who seem to want to take issue with it immediately, and perhaps to try to circumvent its operation.

Personally, I believe the new act can be made to work successfully. I believe we can remove whatever defects it contains. I believe that those defects need not interfere with its operation in the year 1947, and I believe that, with a proper attitude of cooperation between labor and management, out of this act we can build in this country the kind of management-labor relationship which is so essential, and which, unfortunately, has been lacking up to the present time.

CANCELLATION OF STOCK OF FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. For what purpose, may I ask the distinguished Senator?

Mr. CAPEHART. I desire to ask unanimous consent to take up Senate bill 1070, Calendar No. 305.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall be glad to comply with the request of the distinguished Senator from Indiana, if the bill will provoke no controversy. If there should be prolonged debate upon the bill, I should like to have the regular order.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider Senate bill 1070, Calendar No. 305.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1070) to provide for the cancellation of the capital stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the refund of moneys received for such stock, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. BUTLER. May we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I want to yield to the able Senator from Michigan for an amendment to the bill. He was the original author of the bill, and I should like to hear from him.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I think this is a perfectly sound measure, down to section 6, on page 5. At that point I very violently disagree with the bill. Down to that point, the bill proposes to retire the Federal investment in the capital structure of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, under certain safeguards. Down to that point, I think the situation is precisely as it ought to be. But, when section 6 is reached, it is proposed for the first time to classify the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation among the other general corporations of the Government, and submit it to the jurisdiction of the Bureau of the Budget. Fundamentally, I think that is a grave error—just as grave an error as it would be to submit the Federal Reserve banking system to the jurisdiction of the Bureau of the Budget.

Furthermore, after the preceding sections of the bill have taken effect, there will cease to be a penny of Government investment in the FDIC; there will cease to be a penny of revenue involved in the operation of the FDIC; there will cease to be any capital stock; the FDIC will become a private trust, operated under public authority. I submit that the FDIC will cease to be a Government corporation, in any sense of the word, comparable with the other Government corporations, which I agree ought to be brought under the Bureau of the Budget.

The FDIC is audited by the General Accounting Office and the Comptroller General. On the board of the FDIC sits the Comptroller of the Currency. In my view, the FDIC is the most important single factor in the maintenance of public confidence in the fiscal system of the Government of the United States, and under no circumstances should its independence, its complete, total, and utter independence, be handicapped or mortgaged by any sort of political interference; and the Bureau of the Budget is a political institution.

I submit that the experience of the country under the FDIC for the past 12 years indicates the complete necessity for the maintenance of its independence, so that it in turn may maintain without impairment the complete public confidence which America today has in its banking institutions; and I submit that when the first step has been taken toward subordinating the FDIC's independence to political administrative control, the first step has been taken in tearing down the basis of the most essential source of public confidence in our public fiscal affairs. I submit to the able Senator from Indiana that, in the spirit of the remainder of the bill, section 6 should be deleted, and the independence of this institution should be completely preserved. I shall move to strike section 6 from the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, as author of the bill, I accept the amendment.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, was this matter submitted to the committee, or is this now a motion being made for the first time on the floor?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I appeared before the committee in connection with the remainder of the bill, at which time this particular proposition had not been proposed; therefore I had no opportunity to testify in respect to it. But it is the united opinion of the Treasury Department, of the Bureau of the Budget itself, and of the FDIC, and particularly of Mr. Crowley, expressed in a very moving message received from him a few days ago, that the independence of the FDIC must not be mortgaged in any such fashion.

Mr. HATCH. The proposition was not first acted upon by the committee?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No, it was not.

Mr. CONNALLY. If this was not considered by the committee, on whose responsibility is it being offered?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The committee considered it.

Mr. CONNALLY. As I understood the Senator, he stated that when he appeared before the committee, this matter was not before it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It was not a part of the bill at the time I testified.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, if I may answer the inquiry of the able Senator from Texas, this was not in the bill which I originally offered. It was later put in the bill by the committee. In my opinion, the section should not be a part of the bill. I am perfectly willing to have it withdrawn, and to agree to the amendment offered by the able Senator from Michigan, because I am in hearty accord that the section should not be in the bill.

I may say further that the Chairman of the FDIC is opposed to its being in the bill. I do not know who was the author of the suggestion that the section be placed in the bill, but certainly the opinion was not unanimous that it be put in the bill. I do not believe it is a controversial subject, so far as the committee is concerned.

Mr. President, may we have a vote on the bill?

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1070) to provide for the cancellation of the capital stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the refund of moneys received for such stock, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments.

The first amendment of the committee was, in section 1, line 3, to strike out:

That the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is directed to repay to the Secretary of the Treasury, to be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, and to each of the Federal Reserve banks the amount received, respectively, from the Secretary or from such bank for the capital stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; and all stock and subscriptions for stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation shall be canceled upon the enactment of this act.

And insert:

That the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is directed to retire its capital stock by paying the amount received therefor (whether received from the Secretary of the Treasury or the Federal Reserve banks) to the Secretary of the Treasury as hereinafter provided, to be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. As soon as practicable after the enactment of this act, the Corporation shall pay to the Secretary so much of its capital and surplus as is in excess of $1,000,000,000. The balance of the amount to be paid to the Secretary shall be paid in units of $10,000,000 except that the last unit to be paid may be less than $10,000,000. Each unit shall be paid as soon as it may be paid without reducing the capital and surplus of the Corporation below $1,000,000,000. As each payment is made a corresponding amount of the capital stock of the Corporation shall be retired and canceled and the receipt or certificate therefor shall be surrendered or endorsed to show such cancellation. The stock subscribed by the various Federal Reserve banks shall be retired and canceled, pro rata, before the stock subscribed by the Secretary is retired and canceled.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to strike out all of section 3, as follows:

SEC. 3. Section 12B (h) (1) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 264 (h) (1)), is amended by striking out the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"The assessment rate shall be one-twelfth of 1 percent per annum until such time as the surplus of the Corporation on the 1st day of January or July of any year may equal or exceed $1,000,000,000; and thereafter no further assessments shall be made, except that if on the 1st day of January or July of any year the surplus of the Corporation does not exceed $990,000,000, the Corporation is authorized to make an assessment for the 6-month period beginning on such date at a rate not in excess of one twenty-fourth of 1 percent per annum. The Corporation may, with respect to any period for which assessments are not required to be made, waive such of the reports required by this

paragraph (h) as the Corporation may deem advisable."

And insert a new section 3, as follows:

SEC. 3. Section 12B (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 264 (b)), is amended by striking out "$10,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$12,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to strike out all of section 4, as follows:

SEC. 4. The first sentence of section 12B (o) (1) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 264 (o) (1)), is amended to read as follows:

"The Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding its notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations, in a par amount aggregating not more than three times the sum of (A) the amount of the capital stock of the Corporation outstanding on January 1, 1947, and (B) the amount received by the Corporation in payment of the assessments upon insured banks for the year 1936."

And to insert a new section 4, as follows:

SEC. 4. Section 12B (o) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 264 (o)), is amended to read as follows:

"(o) The Corporation is authorized to borrow from the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to loan to the Corporation on such terms as may be fixed by the Corporation and the Secretary, such funds as in the judgment of the Board of Directors of the Corporation are from time to time required for insurance purposes, not exceeding in the aggregate $3,000,000,000. For such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds of the sale of any securities hereafter issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, are extended to include such loans. Any such loan shall be used by the Corporation solely in carrying out its functions with respect to such insurance. All loans and repayments under this section shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to insert a new section 5, as follows:

SEC. 5. Subsections (b) and (c) of section 5e of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, secs. 606a (b) and (c)), are hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to insert a new section 6, as follows:

SEC. 6. The Government Corporation Control Act is amended by—

(a) inserting in section 101 after "Panama Railroad Company" a semicolon and "Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation";

(b) inserting at the end of section 102 the following new sentence: "The budget program of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, however, shall not be required to contain estimates of (1) amounts to be used to pay insurance claims or to purchase, or make loans on, assets of insured banks, (2) expenses in connection with receiverships for banks becoming insolvent after the preparation of such budget program, or (3) borrowings for the purposes specified in (1) and (2).";" and

(c) striking out of section 201 the following: ", and (4) Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation."

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, this is the amendment which I ask be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment inserting a new section 6 in the bill.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Indiana whether or not the rates or the charges for auditing the various banks have been changed in the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. They have not been changed in the bill. The rates in the bill remain as they were formerly.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1070) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is directed to retire its capital stock by paying the amount received therefor (whether received from the Secretary of the Treasury or the Federal Reserve banks) to the Secretary of the Treasury as hereinafter provided, to be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. As soon as practicable after the enactment of this act, the Corporation shall pay to the Secretary so much of its capital and surplus as is in excess of $1,000,000,000. The balance of the amount to be paid to the Secretary shall be paid in units of $10,000,000 except that the last unit to be paid may be less than $10,000,000. Each unit shall be paid as soon as it may be paid without reducing the capital and surplus of the Corporation below $1,000,000,000. As each payment is made a corresponding amount of the capital stock of the Corporation shall be retired and canceled and the receipt or certificate therefor shall be surrendered or endorsed to show such cancellation. The stock subscribed by the various Federal Reserve banks shall be retired and canceled, pro rata, before the stock subscribed by the Secretary is retired and canceled.

SEC. 2. Section 12B (d) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 264 (d)), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. Section 12B (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 264 (b)), is amended by striking out "$10,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$12,500."

SEC. 4. Section 12B (o) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 264 (o)), is amended to read as follows:

"(o) The Corporation is authorized to borrow from the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to loan to the Corporation on such terms as may be fixed by the Corporation and the Secretary, such funds as in the judgment of the Board of Directors of the Corporation are from time to time required for insurance purposes, not exceeding in the aggregate $3,000,000,000. For such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds of the sale of any securities hereafter issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, are extended to include such loans. Any such loan shall be used by the Corporation solely in carrying out its functions with respect to such insurance. All loans and repayments under this section shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States."

SEC. 5. Subsections (b) and (c) of section 5e of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, secs. 606a (b) and (c)), are hereby repealed.

SUPPORT FOR WOOL—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 68)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 814, entitled "The Wool Act of 1947."

This bill contains features which would have an adverse effect on our international relations and which are not necessary for the support of our domestic wool growers.

As originally passed by the Senate, the bill directed the Commodity Credit Corporation to continue until the end of 1948 to support prices to domestic producers of wool at not less than 1946 levels. It further authorized the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell wool held by it at market prices. I have no objection to these provisions.

As passed by the House, the bill carried an amendment intended to increase the tariff on wool through the imposition of import fees. This was done to provide a means of increasing the domestic market price for wool to approximately the support price, thus shifting the cost of the support from the Treasury to the consumers of wool products. The prices of these products are already high.

The conferees of the two Houses agreed upon a measure closely following the House bill, but empowering me to impose import quotas as well as import fees.

The enactment of a law providing for additional barriers to the importation of wool at the very moment when this Government is taking the leading part in a United Nations Conference at Geneva called for the purpose of reducing trade barriers and of drafting a charter for an International Trade Organization, in an effort to restore the world to economic peace, would be a tragic mistake. It would be a blow to our leadership in world affairs. It would be interpreted around the world as a first step on that same road to economic isolationism down which we and other countries traveled after the First World War with such disastrous consequences.

I cannot approve such an action.

The wool growers of this country are entitled to receive support. There is still ample time for this Congress to pass wool legislation consistent with our international responsibilities and the interests of our economy as a whole. I urge that the Congress do so promptly.

A bill based on the general principles and policy of the original Senate bill would be acceptable to me, although I would prefer a more permanent wool program, as suggested in my memorandum which was made public on March 12, 1946.

For these reasons I am returning S. 814 without my approval.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 26, 1947.*

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the veto message of the President together with the bill be printed and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the veto message together with the bill will be printed and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Chair hears no objection.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be permitted to meet at 2:30 o'clock this afternoon.

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

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIEN FIANCÉES OR FIANCÉS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 3398, order No. 358, to extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States.

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

There being no objection, the bill H. R. 3398, an act to extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STRIKES FOLLOWING THE PASSAGE OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, something ugly has developed since the new labor bill became law last Monday, something in violation of the American spirit of majority rule. In my own State of Pennsylvania and in other States some 200,000 men have marched out of the coal mines.

They have laid down their tools and have declared they will not work because they do not like the law.

Elsewhere, in some sections of the labor movement, there have been threats against the Congress and against the Government by men who think themselves bigger than our laws and our Constitution. These leaders see themselves as an invisible government within the Government. They have grown defiant and arrogant by reason of the immunities thrown about them by a one-sided labor law.

This is not the American way. I hope the rank and file of labor will not permit itself to be led down this blind alley by these blind so-called labor leaders. Such defiance of the law could set back the cause of labor 50 years. If continued, such conduct will arouse resentment in the minds of millions of American citizens, hurting not only the real leaders of labor, but also the fine Americans who constitute its rank and file. I hope that they will act as sane citizens, and obey the law. I would remind these people of the American tradition of accepting the decision of the majority.

Mr. President, I would remind them also that for more than a decade when the New Deal was riding high, there were millions of Americans who were unalterably opposed to its philosophy. But since that party was then in power, because it reflected the expressed will of the majority of Americans, the verdict was accepted in the true American spirit. We did not stage a sit-down strike against our country; we worked for a change through the orderly processes prescribed by the Constitution. That was sound citizenship.

Last Monday, the great majority of the American people spoke through their elected Representatives. This verdict should be accepted in the same spirit.

There have been threats to dig in and organize a last-ditch fight to defy and obstruct the operation of this law. The kind of labor leaders who talk that language are unscrupulous men. They cannot speak for the rank and file of loyal Americans. Defiance of the law is not the way of our people.

I regret that the labor union whose stronghold is in my State—and to which I have been so close—has elected to flout the law with a walk-out. It is significant that there have not been such walk-outs by other unions. But they have been widespread by this union.

Mr. President, that kind of development does not mean spontaneous action by the workers. It means one thing, and one shameful thing only: In this union, of all the unions of the Nation, the leadership elected to lead its people off the job and into defiance of the law and the will of the majority. This so-called spontaneous walk-out has obviously been inspired and carefully planned. This is what I mean by "invisible government."

The labor bill was no partisan bill. Nearly 50 percent of the Democrats in the Senate joined the Republican majority to override the President's veto by a 2½-to-1 margin. At the other end of the Capitol, some 60 percent of the Democrats helped to override the veto by 4 to 1. There is no doubt that Congress acted in accord with the wishes of the majority of our population.

In view of this impressive vote, and of the desire for labor legislation by the country as a whole, it is simply good citizenship and the duty of all to accept the new law and to give it a fair trial. I know that with such an opportunity this law can substantially benefit every element of labor and management except the unscrupulous labor leader who seeks to boost himself to labor dictatorship by riding the shoulders of the men who work, sweat, and pay dues.

But let me say now, if the process of trial and error should show that one or more provisions of the law will not operate as desired, even under proper conditions, then I shall vote for a change. I am sure that all of Congress feels as I do, and will act to correct the law wherever it may fail. In the meantime, it is the duty of all Members of Congress—those who have supported this law and those who have opposed it—to remind their people back home that this is the law of the land passed overwhelmingly—and that it must be given an honest opportunity to prove itself.

I would feel much better if I were certain it would get such a chance. Unfortunately, there are those in the labor movement who will set booby-traps in its path. There are those in the Administration who, for political purposes, will go all out to discredit it. The law cannot get a fair chance if the National Labor Relations Board sets out to sabotage it and make it fail.

All of Congress and much of the country know that some members and employees of the National Labor Relations Board, the very men who are to administer the law, declared their opposition to it long before it was passed. They worked to poison the President's mind against it. All Congress and much of the Nation know that the Secretary of Labor opposed this measure privately and publicly. We know that two Assistant Secretaries of Labor have been out on the stump for months, rabble rousing against this legislation.

They did not see it in final form—they did not give it a chance. These people just flatly declared the bill unworkable. They roused labor against it, and they indicated how they intend to treat it when they get their hands on it.

Mr. President, they are not the proper people to administer this law. It seems to me that the President's first move should be to remove them and to replace them with people whose minds are not turned against the law. Impartial, middle-of-the-road men should be brought in to give the law a fair start in life. Such action is necessary as confirmation of the President's recent statement that he intends to enforce the law.

This is an important law. The future of labor relations for years to come hangs upon its administration.

It depends also upon getting to the workingman the truth about the provisions of the law and upon dispelling the malicious untruths which have been spread by enemies of the legislation. Whether we are to go on to greater production and to greater harmony between management and labor depends upon these two things.

Mr. President, this is serious business. The people were not fooling when they told their elected representatives they wanted legislation to correct the glaring abuses which had grown out of the Labor Relations Act. The Congress was not fooling when it passed this law overwhelmingly—not once, but twice.

We must not and will not permit sabotage by those who think themselves greater than the Nation's laws, whether those people occupy positions within the Federal Government or whether they are labor racketeers.

Mr. President, if these men want to defy the law, it is time our people knew it. If any invisible empire has been set up within our country to sabotage the

legislation demanded by the people, it is time this fact was brought to light.

But I cannot believe that these things will continue. In my mind there can be only one test of good citizenship, and that is to obey the law, and give it a fair and honest opportunity to work. I am convinced that the rank and file of labor and the sound leaders among them will see to it that common sense and true Americanism prevail.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, we have just listened to the very able speech delivered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. As one of those who opposed the Taft-Hartley bill, I wish to repeat now what I said last Saturday, namely, that once the bill became the law of the United States, I could always be found among those insisting that, until changed, the bill should be enforced in its entirety.

I said on Saturday, and I repeat now, that we cannot have government by law in this country unless we, as the representatives of the people, take the position that the laws shall be enforced. I also said that of course we are not going to change human nature by merely putting a law on the statute books which a large minority of our people consider to be unjust and in violation of their rights and freedoms.

I am not at all surprised—although I do not condone any of it—at the reaction which today has occurred among the rank and file of American workers. I wish to say that the reaction in opposition to this bad law is not limited to the level of the labor leaders. I think it is perfectly clear that bitter resentment is felt throughout the rank and file of American labor. I think the situation calls for a tremendous amount of patience and understanding on the part of all.

I think that as time passes—next week, 2 weeks from now, or a month from now—things are bound to settle down. I think the leaders of labor and the workers of this country are going to recognize the soundness of the basic principle which I think was set out in the speech of the Senator from Pennsylvania, namely, that after all, in this system of government of ours we must express our opposition to laws legally. I think there is plenty of good legal procedure for such an expression of opposition to this law. Let it be tested in the courts—not on the picket lines. I think there will be plenty of opportunity to point out to the proponents of this legislation that they did make a grievous mistake last Saturday when they put on the statute books a law which is going to prove to be grossly unjust to the legitimate rights of labor, and in the long run will prove to be unworkable, as the President said in his veto message.

Nevertheless, we, as lawmakers, must back up the President in the statesmanlike statement he made after his veto was overridden, namely, that it is the obligation of all of us to see that the law is administered fairly, efficiently, and as effectively as possible. It is going to have to be changed in many respects in order to prevent grave abuses and injustices.

As to the coal miners' walkouts, I regret them; but here, again, let us keep our heads as we now proceed to go into what I think it is perfectly obvious is going to be another coal crisis in America. If we take time to investigate the situation, I think we shall find that for some weeks past it has been very difficult for the representatives of the workers to carry on good-faith collective bargaining in the coal industry, for a number of reasons, one important reason being that in that important industry there have been a number of operators who have taken the position, "We are going to wait until we see what the Congress does with the Taft-Hartley bill before we agree to anything."

Mr. President, they now have that bill as the law of the land. Question is being raised as to whether it is at all applicable to the coal situation. Lawyers in this country today are very much in dispute as to whether in passing the Taft-Hartley bill the Congress passed a law which will have any effect on the coal situation, as some of us forewarned about in the speeches we made prior to the overriding of the President's veto on last Saturday. Mr. Lewis has never used the National Labor Relations Board at any time. He does not have a single local that has ever been certified by the National Labor Relations Board.

There is another angle to this coal situation that I think we need to examine, that is, whether we in Congress have, after all, been fair to the coal miners of America, or whether we have all too frequently shown a resentment toward a leader, rather than an appreciation of the working problems of the coal miners of America. Not only must we recognize that today, as I said once before on the floor of the Senate, the production of coal is vitally basic to the stabilization of our economy here at home, but we must not ignore the fact that the production of coal in the United States and in the Ruhr and in England and in other places in the world is basic to the peace. We are not going to help international relations any, we are not going to help the cause of peace any if we proceed to take an emotional attitude concerning the workers' problems in the coal fields of this country. If there ever was a time when the coal problems in America should be faced in a spirit of calm reflection and determination to try to work out an arrangement in the weeks ahead which will result in fair and just treatment to the coal workers of America, that time is now.

I, for one, wish to say in closing that I do not think the American people have ever been sufficiently fair to the coal workers of America. Our whole industrial system depends upon what those workers bring out of the bowels of the earth. Every wheel that is turning in America today is dependent, insofar as its future turning is concerned, upon the black gold that our miners will bring out of the earth at such tremendous personal risks to themselves in the months ahead. We, the public, owe them more consideration than we have yet given them. We owe it to them to give them fair wages, decent working conditions, and the safety protections necessary to protect their limbs and lives. They are entitled to Federal safety legislation. We should give such legislative protection to them. Mr. President, we must give them the protections to which they are entitled from an industry which for too long has been more interested in antilabor legislation than in industrial peace.

I say that if our entire economy is dependent upon coal and the work of the coal miners then we had better proceed to see to it that now, this time, the miners get a fair and square deal. We the public, the users of coal, should stop asking the coal workers of America to subsidize the rest of us by working under conditions which none of us would work under without objections too. In fact I wish the critics of the coal miners would just have to work for about a month in the coal mines of America; they would soon stop talking about passing Taft-Hartley bills. Rather they would wake up to the fact that get-tough attitudes will not settle our coal problems.

We shall settle the coal problems of America when, but not until, we, the people, insist that the coal workers get a fair and square deal. They have never yet had it in the history of the country; they do not have it now. They will not work without a contract. Coal cannot be mined with force of arms. Negotiations, not threats, are needed in the coal industry. Union-busting techniques will not produce coal.

REPORT ON AIR POWER—ARTICLE IN NEWSWEEK

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to an important article, as I believe, which is published in Newsweek magazine of June 30, appearing on the newsstands today. The article is entitled "Report on Air Power," and the subheading is "Weakened wings: How much Washington has let the Air Force wane, and how Russia works to be stronger in men, planes, and ideas."

I submit, Mr. President, that in view of the delicate situation abroad and our current international policy, the implications of this sober, fact-filled article must be carefully pondered by all of us.

It tells us that the United States has fallen behind Russia in numbers of combat planes. It declares that we are lagging in research. It asserts that our marvelous aircraft-production facilities, which achieved a miracle of wartime production, are being allowed to disintegrate.

I am particularly interested in the emphatic warnings contained in this article, because they buttress the statements which leading representatives of the Nation's aircraft industry presented to a Senate committee just a few weeks ago. These representatives included Mr. Robert Gross, president of Lockheed Aircraft Corp., and Mr. Harry Woodhead, president of Consolidated Vultee Aircraft Corp., spokesmen for the California industry, which produced almost one-third of all the airframes turned out during the war.

In their appearance before the Senate committee, the leaders of the aircraft industry did not petition for any particular appropriation for the Army and Navy air forces. Each of them emphasized, instead, the need for a consistent continuous long-term air policy. They contended that prompt adoption of a sound national air policy was absolutely imperative to prevent a further dangerous deterioration of our air power, and to avoid the threatened disintegration of our aircraft-manufacturing industry.

Mr. President, the facts contained in Newsweek's authoritative report on air power substantiates the contentions of the leaders of the aircraft industry. Certainly this article emphatically supports the need for prompt action to establish a national air policy for America that will assure we obtain and preserve American leadership in the air.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

REPORT ON AIR POWER—WEAKENED WINGS: HOW MUCH WASHINGTON HAS LET THE AIR FORCE WANE

(Army Air Forces requests for appropriations for the coming year barely squeaked through the Congressional filter this month after severe reductions had been made both by the War Department and the Bureau of the Budget. Making all due allowances for exaggerations designed to impress reluctant Congressmen, it is a fact that air-force leaders are genuinely worried over the threatening decline in this country's air power. Checking and weighing their warnings and arguments, Newsweek's Washington Bureau sends the following summary report of the present and prospective facts about American air strength.)

American military airpower is on its way to becoming a myth. Two years ago it was incomparably the greatest in the world. Today, in the language of the Compton Commission report, it is a "hollow shell." In the foreseeable tomorrow, if present trends continue, it will be in danger of being hopelessly outclassed.

Paradoxically, this relative disarmament in the air is taking place at a time when lack of confidence in long-range security is inspiring demands in many high quarters for American superarmament. While pursuing a foreign policy dependent upon American military weight in world councils, the Government is in fact whittling down that weight to a level that many Army officers, at least, find alarming.

The Compton Commission, which four weeks ago reported to President Truman on universal military training, said this country needed a mobile striking force consisting mainly of air power and capable of operating around the globe and in both arctic and tropical regions. Such a force does not now exist and is not in prospect.

Responsible military sources have compared the needs and the current realities in the following terms:

The air force in being must be large enough to cope with the initial emergency of another war. Since it is understood that in such an emergency the United States might well be the first and primary target, this force must be larger than any ever maintained in peacetime before.

The fact is that in numbers of combat airplanes, the United States has fallen behind Russia. Russia is believed to have a combat air force today larger than the American and British air fleets combined.

It has to be possible, industrially speaking, to expand swiftly in case of emergency. In the two previous wars, the American period of grace was measured in months and years. In the future, it may be limited to weeks and days and, indeed, may not exist at all.

The fact is that production facilities, so prodigiously expanded during the recent war, are being allowed to disintegrate.

American planes must be technically superior to those of any other potential enemy. Such superiority will depend on successful research and development over a period of years.

The fact is that in research—the real key to all future air strength—the United States is lagging.

AIR POWER IN BEING

The Army still has nearly 25,000 planes of all types and the Navy 15,000. These are huge air fleets. But they are not the actual dimensions of present American air power. Many of these ships are obsolete or obsolescent. Large numbers are stored in pools, shops, and other forms of storage. With passage of time, these planes are largely in the process of becoming useless.

At the present time, the Army Air Forces says that its immediately usable front-line combat air fleet consists of 1,500 aircraft. The Navy's total in the same category is given as 1,400. Both are far below the estimated minimum strengths the services want. The AAF plan for its immediate postwar air force called for 70 groups, including roughly 50 groups of combat craft and 20 of supporting carriers, weather, mapping, and reconnaissance ships. This would call for a total of about 4,000 planes. Budget cuts forced reduction of this plan to 55 operational groups and 15 skeletonized groups.

In actual practice, the Army's 55 groups are not up to strength, and most of them are classified as having low combat efficiency. They are equivalent, it is said, to about 30 wartime air groups.

If a sudden emergency were to arise today, the United States could probably call on its reserves of trained men and stored planes and hold its own against an attack. But the passage of a few years will change this picture radically.

RUSSIAN STRENGTH

Russian active combat-plane strength is believed to be about 14,000. Even though kept operational, many of these planes may be of relatively low combat efficiency.

The Russians have no important naval air force. Neither do they as yet have any long-range strategic bombing force, although the big plane seen in the air over the May Day parade was taken as a sign that the Russians are hard at work in this field as well. That plane, incidentally, was not a "captured" American B–29, as reported at the time, but is now believed to be a new type of Russian bomber better than the B–29 although not so effective as the B–36 now in production in this country.

The Russians captured 75 of Germany's best twin-jet fighters and a number of others and, more important, captured the principal centers of German jet development and production. One guess is that they now have between 300 and 500 front-line jet fighter planes.

MANPOWER

In personnel, the plan is not quite so far behind. Against a projected total of 401,000 men, the AAF now has 380,000. But the program for training reserve pilots and other specialists is far in arrears. It was planned to have an air force of 44,000 pilots, for example, with 48,000 in reserve. The latter were to be kept "fresh" at 130 special bases. Actually, only 70 bases were activated and 22,500 reserve pilots were trained. Economy then forced elimination of all but 41 training centers where just under 10,000 reserve pilots are now being handled. An additional 19,000 reservists who have applied are out in the cold. The picture as to pilots holds generally true as to bombardiers, navigators, engineers, and other flight-crew personnel.

Fliers trained in the recent war will, with age, lose their effectiveness. The AAF wanted to plan a training program for new cadets that would turn out 4,000 new graduates every year. The current program is limited to 1,500 a year.

Naval aviation is suffering from similar headaches, although it is considerably better off than the AAF because more of the Navy was retained intact and the Navy Bureau of Aeronautics has fared better in budget matters than the Army has.

RESEARCH

After VE-day AAF experts in Germany made the sobering discovery that American aviation science was just about 10 years behind in certain vital fields. This was due in part to the fact that when war came the American high command decided to concentrate on production rather than research. The Germans, on the other hand, were far ahead on jet and supersonic plane design and missiles like the V–1 and V–2 when the war ended. The American victory was acknowledgedly a "close squeeze," and the AAF now urgently wants to close the research gap.

Much of Germany's research set-up was concentrated in the east, out of bomber range, and hence fell into the hands of the Russians. Many German specialists are now working in Russia, involuntarily perhaps, but under excellent conditions. Considerable information and some experts fell to the Americans, but Germans have been brought to this country only over the opposition of many American scientists and with technical status as prisoners of war.

The actual extent of Russia's research program is not known. There is enough information to suggest that the Russians are expending prodigious effort in this field, as in the field of atomic energy, but the progress of the work can only be surmised. If it has not already lost research leadership, the United States may be in danger of doing so and consequently must put forth its maximum effort.

The United States is not exactly inactive in the matter of new aircraft development. The new Aircraft Yearbook for 1947 lists no fewer than 37 types of jet planes being developed here. One of these, the P–80R, set a new speed record last week. But the overall program, in the AAF's opinion, is too weak.[1] This is a matter strictly of money.

After VE-day the AAF drafted a plan calling for $272,000,000 to be spent on research annually. In 1946 it received $200,000,000, in 1947, $110,000,000. For fiscal year 1948 it asked for $347,000,000, but this has been pared down, by the War Department and Budget Bureau, to $123,000,000 and there is no certainty of how much of this it will get from Congress.

Taken together with the general decline of aeronautical research under industrial auspices, this adds up to dangerous future weakness.

PRODUCTION

In the decade after the First World War the American aircraft industry withered away to a total of only three producers. As late as 1939 the industry still ranked forty-fourth in dollar value of product. From this it rose, in a few years, to mammoth proportions. In 1944 the American

[1] In March Maj. Gen. Curtis LeMay, head of AAF development programs, told a House appropriations subcommittee: "The United States is far behind * * * particularly in the sciences and techniques associated with guided missiles. * * * We definitely are a year or more behind in some phases of jet power-plant development."

plane industry turned out 96,000 aircraft, or about one every 5 minutes.[2]

The problem of cushioning the industry against the inevitable stoppage and of keeping facilities working on a minimum security basis was taken up by the governmental Air Coordinating Committee in 1945. Its report recommended annual military plane production at the rate of 3,000 to 5,700 a year, with employment for 206,500 to 315,000 workers. The lower and upper levels in these figures were to be determined by world security conditions. While these conditions would seem now to suggest the need for a level as far up as possible, the fact is that in 1946 the industry manufactured a total of 1,330 military planes and 467 transports. It was employing 180,000 workers, a total that was dropping off every month.

The result is bright red ink in the books of the aircraft companies. Seven of the 12 leading air-frame manufacturers showed operating losses in 1946 despite heavy tax carry-backs allowed by the Government. Their combined deficit ran to more than $8,000,000. Hearings held in Washington last month abounded with dire prophecies of mergers and bankruptcies in the industry unless something drastic were done.

The paradox is that the industry is still turning out perhaps the best combat and transport planes in the world. The trouble is that orders are insufficient to make the operation pay, John C. Lee, of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce aviation committee, caustically summed it up in a speech this month when he declared that the aircraft companies are building better and better planes in smaller and smaller quantities at greater and greater financial loss.

SIGNIFICANCE

The argument for economy, in military as well as other budgets, is not always merely myopic. During the war the Government, and especially the armed services, acquired the habit of being prodigal in the use of the country's wealth and resources. Those habits may take some breaking. There is always some evidence to support the view that money is spent wastefully and that a great deal can be achieved by husbanding resources and increasing efficiency rather than by bludgeoning through by sheer size and weight.

While these arguments have to be considered, it is also necessary to give all due weight to the views of responsible men charged with no small part of the Nation's security. The main implications of their argument come down to this:

If armed force is to remain the principal ingredient of world influence, then the United States is bound to lose some of its international weight if the air-power situation is as black as the AAF believes it is. If the threat of another war should become real 5 years hence, the United States would be at a serious disadvantage and may not be given the chance to put its industrial genius to work at another miracle.

If this is true, and another war should come and its main weapon is still air power, then the United States might well lose the war.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 564) to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President, in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska whether or not it is intended to continue discussion on the Presidential succession bill for the rest of the day.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I am not sure what the Senate will do when I yield the floor, but if I have an opportunity I should like to present my argument in favor of Senate bill 564. It is the unfinished business, and it is our intention to continue with its consideration. A vote on the measure is to be had tomorrow at 2 o'clock.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator know about how long he will require?

Mr. WHERRY. If there is no interruption, I believe I can conclude my presentation within an hour.

Mr. ELLENDER. My reason for asking is that I was wondering whether or not an effort would be made this afternoon to take up Senate bill 1461. That is the bill to extend the power of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act.

Mr. WHERRY. My understanding is that there will be considerable controversy over that bill. Its consideration would require unanimous consent. For the information of the Senator, at least for the day, I should be inclined to object to its consideration, or to the consideration of any other measure with respect to which there is controversy. I feel that we should proceed with consideration of the Presidential succession bill. We have been very lenient. Inasmuch as we have unanimous consent to vote at 2 o'clock tomorrow, I feel that the proponents and opponents should have ample time for discussion.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then, so far as the Senator is concerned, if a request were made for the consideration of Senate bill 1461, he would object?

Mr. WHERRY. If there is controversy over it, and I believe there is.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand there is.

Mr. WHERRY. If a controversial situation arises, I certainly would ask for the regular order, even though unanimous consent had been granted for the consideration of Senate bill 1461. I am inclined to feel that it should not be brought up until after 2 o'clock Friday.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to Senate bill 1461, and ask that it lie on the table and be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska has been rather patient in setting aside the pending business, the Presidential succession bill, for the consideration of so-called urgent or must legislation. Inasmuch as there has been a unanimous consent agreement to vote upon the succession bill, and all motions and amendments relating thereto, at 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon, I feel that unless measures are of the "must" variety, I shall be forced to object to any further unanimous consent request, because it is my opinion that the proponents and opponents of the bill feel that there should be ample time and opportunity to debate its provisions.

Of course, if the Senate feels that some measure which comes along should have priority, it will be perfectly agreeable to me to take it up, but I should not like to have it said at 2 o'clock Friday afternoon, when, under the unanimous consent agreement, the Senate is to vote, that ample time was not given to a discussion of the provisions of Senate bill 564.

With that idea in mind, Mr. President, I should like to present the provisions of the bill, and debate them upon the floor of the Senate. If the debate runs out, it will be perfectly agreeable to me that other measures be taken up, but unless ample opportunity is given for all to take part in the debate, I feel that unanimous consent requests should not be granted until after tomorrow afternoon at 2 o'clock.

Senate bill 564, which was introduced February 11, 1947, was reported out of the Committee on Rules and Administration March 28, 1947, with amendments. It deals solely with the question of Presidential succession.

The bill does two things: First, it places the Speaker of the House of Representatives or the President pro tempore of the Senate, in the order named, ahead of the Secretary of State in the line of succession.

Second, it adds to the list of Cabinet Officers eligible to succeed the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor, who, under the present law, are not included, their positions having been created since the date of enactment of the existing statute which was enacted in 1886.

Out of the 32 Presidents of the United States, 7 have died in office. They are as follows: William Henry Harrison, Zachary Taylor, Abraham Lincoln, James A. Garfield, William McKinley, Warren G. Harding, and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

During our entire history, no Vice President, while acting as President of the United States, has died in office, and, thus, there has never been a succession under either of the succession laws. By that I mean the law passed in 1792 and the law passed in 1886. However, each and every time we are without a Vice President, legislation along the line of the pending bill becomes of deep concern.

Under the existing law, succession descends through the President's Cabinet to and including the Office of Secretary of the Interior, all members of his Administration. Under the bill, succession would be down through the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate, both of whom are elective officers, and closer to the people, followed by Members of the Cabinet, including the 3 offices created subsequent to the enactment of the present law, namely, Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Commerce, and Secretary of Labor.

The deaths of approximately one-fifth of our Presidents has brought Vice Presidents into the office of President, which means that approximately one-fifth of the time we have had no Vice President to succeed to the Presidency of the United States.

Succession legislation has been inaugurated in periods such as that we are experiencing now, when there was no

[2] In the last year of the war Russia produced 40,000 planes. Additional facilities captured from Germany are estimated to have a potential capacity of 60,000 planes a year.

Vice President to succeed to the Presidency, and it is at such a time that the question of succession becomes of deep concern. It is that condition in which we find ourselves today.

VIEWS OF THE PRESIDENT

President Truman, realizing the seriousness of this situation, recommended to the Congress, in a special message dated June 19, 1945, the enactment of new legislation covering the subject of succession. I desire to read the message, which was sent to the Congress on June 19, 1945. The President stated in the message:

To the Congress of the United States:

I think that this is an appropriate time for the Congress to reexamine the question of the Presidential succession.

The question is of great importance now because there will be no elected Vice President for almost 4 years.

The existing statute governing the succession to the office of President was enacted in 1886. Under it, in the event of the death of the elected President and Vice President, members of the Cabinet successively fill the office.

Each of the Cabinet members is appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. In effect, therefore, by reason of the tragic death of the late President, it now lies within my power to nominate the person who would be my immediate successor in the event of my own death or inability to act.

I do not believe that in a democracy this power should rest with the Chief Executive.

Insofar as possible, the office of the President should be filled by an elective officer. There is no officer in our system of government, besides the President and Vice President, who has been elected by all the voters of the country.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives, who is elected in his own district, is also elected to be the presiding officer of the House by a vote of all the Representatives of all the people of the country. As a result, I believe that the Speaker is the official in the Federal Government, whose selection next to that of the President and Vice President, can be most accurately said to stem from the people themselves.

Under the law of 1792, the President pro tempore of the Senate followed the Vice President in the order of succession.

The President pro tempore is elected as a Senator by his State and then as presiding officer by the Senate. But the Members of the Senate are not as closely tied in by the elective process to the people as are the Members of the House of Representatives. A completely new House is elected every 2 years, and always at the same time as the President and Vice President. Usually it is in agreement politically with the Chief Executive. Only one-third of the Senate, however, is elected with the President and Vice President. The Senate might, therefore, have a majority hostile to the policies of the President, and might conceivably fill the Presidential office with one not in sympathy with the will of the majority of the people.

Some of the events in the impeachment proceedings of President Johnson suggested the possibility of a hostile Congress in the future seeking to oust a Vice President who had become President, in order to have the President pro tempore of the Senate become the President. This was one of the considerations, among several others, which led to the change in 1886.

No matter who succeeds to the Presidency after the death of the elected President and Vice President, it is my opinion he should not serve longer than until the next congressional election or until a special election called for the purpose of electing a new President and Vice President. This period the Congress should fix. The individuals elected at such general or special election should then serve only to fill the unexpired term of the deceased President and Vice President. In this way there would be no interference with the normal 4-year interval of general national elections.

I recommend, therefore, that the Congress enact legislation placing the Speaker of the House of Representatives first in order of succession in case of the removal, death, resignation, or inability to act of the President and Vice President. Of course, the Speaker should resign as a Representative in the Congress as well as Speaker of the House before he assumes the office of President.

If there is no qualified Speaker, or if the Speaker fails to qualify, then I recommend that the succession pass to the President pro tempore of the Senate, who should hold office until a duly qualified Speaker is elected.

If there be neither Speaker nor President pro tempore qualified to succeed on the creation of the vacancy, then the succession might pass to the members of the Cabinet as now provided, until a duly qualified Speaker is elected.

If the Congress decides that a special election should be held, then I recommend that it provide for such election to be held as soon after the death or disqualification of the President and Vice President as practicable. The method and procedure for holding such special election should be provided now by law, so that the election can be held as expeditiously as possible should the contingency arise.

In the interest of orderly, democratic government, I urge the Congress to give its early consideration to this most important subject.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 19, 1945.*

It was on June 19, 1945, that the special message came from President Truman, recommending in principle provisions almost identical with those of the bill I am now discussing. No action was taken, so again, on January 21, 1946—please get the date, nearly 8 months later—President Truman, in his message on the State of the Union, as appears at page 21 of House Document No. 385, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, specifically referred to succession legislation, and asked for its early consideration. He listed such legislation as tenth on the list of 21 specific proposals which he urged upon the Congress for early consideration. The tenth item on this list reads:

(10) Legislation making provision for succession to the Presidency in the event of the death or incapacity or disqualification of the President and Vice President—as recommended by me on June 19, 1945.

I hold in my hand the 21 proposals listed by the President in his message on the State of the Union. They include the creation of fact-finding boards for the prevention of stoppages of work in Nation-wide industries, they provide legislation to supplement the unemployment insurance benefits; they provide legislation for the domestic use and control of atomic energy. But No. 10 of the 21 proposals is to provide the very legislation known as Senate bill 564, the provisions of which are in accord with the statement and the recommendations made by the President.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the 21 proposals, taken from the President's message on the State of the Union of January 21, 1946, be incorporated at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

LEGISLATION HERETOFORE RECOMMENDED AND STILL PENDING

To attain some of these objectives and to meet the other needs of the United States in the reconversion and postwar period, I have from time to time made various recommendations to the Congress.

In making these recommendations I have indicated the reasons why I deemed them essential for progress at home and abroad. A few—a very few—of these recommendations have been enacted into law by the Congress. Most of them have not. I here reiterate some of them, and discuss others later in this message. I urge upon the Congress early consideration of them. Some are more urgent than others, but all are necessary.

1. Legislation to authorize the President to create fact-finding boards for the prevention of stoppages of work in Nation-wide industries after collective bargaining and conciliation and voluntary arbitration have failed—as recommended by me on December 3, 1945.

2. Enactment of a satisfactory full-employment bill, such as the Senate bill now in conference between the Senate and the House—as recommended by me on September 6, 1945.

3. Legislation to supplement the unemployment-insurance benefits for unemployed workers now provided by the different States—as recommended by me on May 28, 1945.

4. Adoption of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Act—as recommended by me on September 6, 1945.

5. Legislation substantially raising the amount of minimum wages now provided by law—as recommended by me on September 6, 1945.

6. Legislation providing for a comprehensive program for scientific research—as recommended by me on September 6, 1945.

7. Legislation enacting a health and medical care program—as recommended by me on November 19, 1945.

8. Legislation adopting the program of universal training—as recommended by me on October 23, 1945.

9. Legislation providing an adequate salary scale for all Government employees in all branches of the Government—as recommended by me on September 6, 1945.

10. Legislation making provision for succession to the Presidency in the event of the death or incapacity or disqualification of the President and Vice President—as recommended by me on June 19, 1945.

11. Legislation for the unification of the armed services—as recommended by me on December 19, 1945.

12. Legislation for the domestic use and control of atomic energy—as recommended by me on October 3, 1945.

13. Retention of the United States Employment Service in the Federal Government for a period at least up to June 30, 1947—as recommended by me on September 6, 1945.

14. Legislation to increase unemployment allowances for veterans in line with increases for civilians—as recommended by me on September 6, 1945.

15. Social security coverage for veterans for their period of military service—as recommended by me on September 6, 1945.

16. Extension of crop insurance—as recommended by me on September 6, 1945.

17. Legislation permitting the sale of ships by the Maritime Commission at home and abroad—as recommended by me on September 6, 1945. I further recommend that this

legislation include adequate authority for chartering vessels both here and abroad.

18. Legislation to take care of the stock piling of materials in which the United States is naturally deficient—as recommended by me on September 6, 1945.

19. Enactment of Federal airport legislation—as recommended by me on September 6, 1945.

20. Legislation repealing the Johnson Act on foreign loans—as recommended by me on September 6, 1945.

21. Legislation for the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin—as recommended by me on October 3, 1945.

Finally, on February 5, 1947, no action having been taken by Congress on the recommendations of the President of June 1945, or in the message on the state of the Union in 1946, we find that the President again called to the attention of Congress the necessity for action, in a strongly worded letter covering the urgency of the situation. I quote his letter verbatim:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 5, 1947.

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
President of the Senate Pro Tempore,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On June 19, 1945, I sent a message to the Congress of the United States suggesting that the Congress should give its consideration to the question of the Presidential succession.

In that message, it was pointed out that under the existing statute governing the succession to the office of President, members of the Cabinet successively fill the office in the event of the death of the elected President and Vice President. It was further pointed out that, in effect, the present law gives to me the power to nominate my immediate successor in the event of my own death or inability to act.

I said then, and I repeat now, that in a democracy, this power should not rest with the Chief Executive. I believe that, insofar as possible, the office of the President should be filled by an elective officer.

In the message of June 19, 1945, I recommended that the Congress enact legislation placing the Speaker of the House of Representatives first in order of succession, and if there were no Speaker, or if he failed to qualify, that the President pro tempore of the Senate should act until a duly qualified Speaker was elected.

A bill (H. R. 3587) providing for this succession was introduced in the House of Representatives and was passed by the House on June 29, 1945. It failed, however, to pass the Senate.

The same need for a revision of the law of succession that existed when I sent the message to the Congress on June 19, 1945, still exists today.

I see no reason to change or amend the suggestion which I previously made to the Congress, but if the Congress is not disposed to pass the type of bill previously passed by the House, then I recommend that some other plan of succession be devised so that the office of the President would be filled by an officer who holds his position as a result of the expression of the will of the voters of this country.

It is my belief that the present line of succession as provided by the existing statute, which was enacted in 1886, is not in accord with our basic concept of government by elected representatives of the people.

I again urge the Congress to give its attention to this subject.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

ACTION OF THE SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

To carry out the recommendations of the President's message of June 19, 1945—as pointed out by the President in his letter of February 5, 1947, written after the Eightieth Congress had convened, and after it had been in operation for more than a month—Representative Hatton W. Sumners, of Texas, then chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress a bill—H. R. 3587.

The Sumners bill was reported to the House on June 27, 1945, came up for consideration, and was passed by the House of Representatives on June 29, 1945.

For the purposes of the RECORD, so the Senate may have the complete record before it, I ask unanimous consent that the so-called Sumners bill, H. R. 3587, together with the very brief report upon it, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill, together with the report, were ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows.

[Union Calendar No. 241—79th Cong., 1st sess.—H. R. 3587—Report No. 829—In the House of Representatives—June 25, 1945—Mr. Sumners of Texas introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary; June 27, 1945, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed]

A bill to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) (f) if, by reason of death, resignation, removal from office, inability, or failure to qualify, there is neither a President nor Vice President to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President, then the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall, upon his resignation as Speaker and as Representative in Congress, act as President until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected.

(2) The same rule shall apply in the case of the death, resignation, removal from office, or inability of an individual acting as President under this subsection.

(3) An individual acting as President under this subsection shall continue to act until a President shall be elected in the manner prescribed in subsection (f), or, if no President shall be so elected, then until the expiration of the then current Presidential term, except that—

(A) if his discharge of the powers and duties of the office is founded in whole or in part on the failure of both the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect to qualify, then he shall act only until a President or Vice President qualifies; and

(B) if his discharge of the powers and duties of the office is founded in whole or in part on the inability of the President, Vice President, or individual acting under this subsection, then he shall act only until the removal of the disability of one of such individuals.

(b) If, at the time when under subsection (a) a Speaker is to begin the discharge of the powers and duties of the office of President, there is no Speaker, or the Speaker fails to qualify as Acting President, then the President pro tempore of the Senate shall, upon his resignation as President pro tempore and as Senator, discharge the powers and duties of the office of President until a President shall be elected in the manner prescribed in subsection (f) or, if no President shall be so elected, then until the expiration of the then current Presidential term, but not after a qualified and prior entitled individual is able to act.

(c) (1) If, by reason of death, resignation, removal from office, inability, or failure to qualify, there is no President pro tempore to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President under subsection (b), then the officer of the United States who is highest on the following list, and who is not under disability to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President, shall discharge such powers and duties: Secretary of State, Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of War, Attorney General, Postmaster General, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of the Interior, Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of Labor.

(2) An individual discharging the powers and duties of President under this subsection shall continue so to do until a President shall be elected or until a Speaker is qualified in the manner prescribed in subsection (f) or, if no President shall be so elected, then until the expiration of the then current Presidential term, but not after a Speaker of the House is qualified and prior-entitled individual is able to serve, except that the removal of the disability of an individual higher on the list contained in paragraph (1) or the ability to qualify on the part of an individual higher on such list shall not terminate his service.

(3) The taking of the oath of office by an individual specified in the list in paragraph (1) shall be held to constitute his resignation from the office by virtue of the holding of which he qualifies to serve as President.

(d) Subsection (a), (b), and (c) shall apply only to such officers as are eligible to the office of President under the Constitution. Subsection (c) shall apply only to officers appointed, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, prior to the time of the death, resignation, removal from office, inability, or failure to qualify, of the President pro tempore, and only to officers not under impeachment by the House of Representatives at the time the powers and duties of the office of President devolve upon them.

(e) During the period that any individual serves as President under this act, his compensation shall be at the rate then provided by law in the case of the President.

(f) (1) If the event by reason of which the Speaker is required by subsection (a) to act as President shall have occurred more than 90 days immediately preceding the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November in the year in which the next regular election of Representatives to the Congress is to be held but in which there is to be held no regular quadrennial election of a President and Vice President, the Secretary of State shall forthwith cause a notification of such event to be made to the executive of every State, and shall specify in such notification that electors of a President and Vice President to fill the unexpired terms shall be appointed in the several States on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November in the year in which the next regular election of Representatives to the Congress is to be held. Electors appointed pursuant to such notification shall be appointed in the same manner as is provided by law for the appointment of electors for a regular quadrennial election of a President and Vice President, and shall meet and give their votes on the first Monday after the second Wednesday in December following their appointment, at such place in each State as the legislature of such State shall direct. Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, all provisions of law relating to the choosing of a President and Vice President at a regular quadrennial election shall apply with respect to the choosing of a President and Vice President to fill the unexpired term as provided in this subsection; and the terms of the President and Vice President so chosen shall begin on the 20th day of January immediately following their election.

(f) Sections 1 and 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President in case of the removal, death, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President," approved January 19, 1886 (24 Stat. 1; U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 3, secs. 21 and 22), are repealed.

[79th Cong., 1st sess.—House of Representatives—Report No. 829]

QUESTION OF THE PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

(June 27, 1945, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed)

Mr. BRYSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the following report to accompany H. R. 3587.

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3587) to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President, after consideration, report the same favorably to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

"GENERAL STATEMENT

"On June 19, 1945, the President of the United States addressed a message to the Congress making recommendations for legislation with respect to succession to the Presidency in case of the removal, death, resignation, or inability to act of the President and Vice President. The message reads as follows:

"'MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TRANSMITTING REQUEST FOR LEGISLATION DEALING WITH THE QUESTION OF THE PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

"'*To the Congress of the United States:*

"'I think that this is an appropriate time for the Congress to reexamine the question of the Presidential succession.

"'The question is of great importance now because there will be no elected Vice President for almost 4 years.

"'The existing statute governing the succession to the office of President was enacted in 1886. Under it, in the event of the death of the elected President and Vice President, members of the Cabinet successively fill the office.

"'Each of these Cabinet members is appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. In effect, therefore, by reason of the tragic death of the late President, it now lies within my power to nominate the person who would be my immediate successor in the event of my own death or inability to act.

"'I do not believe that in a democracy this power should rest with the Chief Executive.

"'Insofar as possible, the office of the President should be filled by an elective officer. There is no officer in our system of government, besides the President and Vice President, who has been elected by all the voters of the country.

"'The Speaker of the House of Representatives, who is elected in his own district, is also elected to be the presiding officer of the House by a vote of all the Representatives of all the people of the country. As a result, I believe that the Speaker is the official in the Federal Government whose selection, next to that of the President and Vice President, can be most accurately said to stem from the people themselves.

"'Under the law of 1792 the President pro tempore of the Senate followed the Vice President in the order of succession.

"'The President pro tempore is elected as a Senator by his State and then as presiding officer of the Senate. But the Members of the Senate are not as closely tied in by the elective process to the people as are the Members of the House of Representatives. A completely new House is elected every 2 years, and always at the same time as the President and Vice President. Usually it is in agreement politically with the Chief Executive. Only one-third of the Senate, however, is elected with the President and Vice President. The Senate might, therefore, have a majority hostile to the policies of the President and might conceivably fill the Presidential office with one not in sympathy with the will of the majority of the people.

"'Some of the events in the impeachment proceedings of President Johnson suggested the possibility of a hostile Congress in the future seeking to oust a Vice President who had become President, in order to have the President pro tempore of the Senate become the President. This was one of the considerations, among several others, which led to the change in 1886.

"'No matter who succeeds to the Presidency after the death of the elected President and Vice President, it is my opinion he should not serve any longer than until the next congressional election or until a special election called for the purpose of electing a new President and Vice President. This period the Congress should fix. The individuals elected at such general or special election should then serve only to fill the unexpired term of the deceased President and Vice President. In this way there would be no interference with the normal 4-year interval of general national elections.

"'I recommend, therefore, that the Congress enact legislation placing the Speaker of the House of Representatives first in order of succession in case of the removal, death, resignation, or inability to act of the President and Vice President. Of course, the Speaker should resign as a Representative in the Congress as well as Speaker of the House before he assumes the office of President.

"'If there is no qualified Speaker, or if the Speaker fails to qualify, then I recommend that the succession pass to the President pro tempore of the Senate, who should hold office until a duly qualified Speaker is elected.

"'If there be neither Speaker nor President pro tempore qualified to succeed on the creation of the vacancy, then the succession might pass to the members of the Cabinet as now provided, until a duly qualified Speaker is elected.

"'If the Congress decides that a special election should be held, then I recommend that it provide for such election to be held as soon after the death or disqualification of the President and Vice President as practicable. The method and procedure for holding such special election should be provided now by law, so that the election can be held as expeditiously as possible should the contingency arise.

"'In the interest of orderly, democratic government, I urge the Congress to give its early consideration to this most important subject.

"'HARRY S. TRUMAN.

"'THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 19, 1945.*'

"H. R. 3587, introduced by Mr. Sumners of Texas, is designed to carry into effect the recommendations of the President.

"ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

"The bill provides in subsection (a) that in the event there is neither a President nor a Vice President to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall, upon his resignation as Speaker and as Representative in Congress, act as President until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected. The Speaker, upon succeeding to the Presidency, would continue to act until the expiration of the unexpired current Presidential term or until a President is elected at a special election pursuant to the provisions of subsection (f). It is provided, however, that if the occasion for the succession of the Speaker to be Acting President is the failure of the President-elect and Vice-President-elect to qualify, or to the inability of the President or Vice President, the Acting President shall continue as such only until the President or Vice President qualifies or until the removal of the disability.

"In the event there is no Speaker or the Speaker fails to qualify as Acting President, it is provided in subsection (b) that the President pro tempore of the Senate shall, upon his resignation as such and as Senator, discharge the powers and duties of the office of President until the President is elected pursuant to subsection (f) or until the expiration of the current Presidential term, but in no case after a qualified and prior-entitled individual is able to act. Thus the President pro tempore of the Senate would not continue to serve after a duly qualified Speaker is available to serve as Acting President. For this reason subsection (b) describes the function of the President pro tempore in relation to the Presidency as simply the discharge of the powers and duties of the office of President.

"In the event there is no President pro tempore of the Senate to serve pursuant to subsection (b), it is provided in subsection (c) that the powers and duties of the office of President shall be discharged by the officer of the United States who is highest on the following list and who is not under disability: Secretary of State, Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of War, Attorney General, Postmaster General, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of the Interior, Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of Labor. As in the case of the President pro tempore, a member of the Cabinet thus discharging the powers and duties of President is to serve until the expiration of the current Presidential term, or until a special election is held pursuant to subsection (f), but in no event after a qualified Speaker of the House is able to serve.

"Provision for special election is contained in subsection (f). It is therein provided that if the event by reason of which the Speaker is required to act as President occurs more than 90 days immediately preceding the regular congressional election in November, in a year in which there is no regular Presidential election, a special election is to be held on the Tuesday after the first Monday in November in the year of the next regular congressional election. This provision for an election at the usual time for congressional elections would apply in the event of a vacancy occuring in the period between the beginning of a Presidential term and 90 days prior to the next regular November congressional election. Should a vacancy occur during the second biennium of a Presidential term, no special election is provided. If a vacancy should occur less than 90 days prior to a regular congressional election in November, there is likewise no provision for a special election, in the view that there would be inadequate time to hold such election in conjunction with the next regular congressional election, and hence the individual succeeding to the Presidency would continue to serve until the next regular Presidential election.

"The procedure to be followed in relation to a special election is to conform to the procedure for regular Presidential elections. The term of the President and Vice President chosen at a special election is to begin on the 20th of January immediately following their election and is to end with the close of the unexpired term for which the special election was held.

"CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE BILL

"The Constitution provides in article II, section 1:

"'In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President, and the Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death,

resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly, until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected.'

"In designating the Speaker as the 'officer [who] shall then act as President' in the contingencies described in the Constitution, the bill resembles the original statute governing succession to the Presidency. That statute, enacted by the Second Congress on March 1, 1792, provided that in the contingencies stated 'the President of the Senate or, if there is none, then the Speaker of the House of Representatives for the time being, shall act as President until the disability is removed or a President is elected.' This statute remained in force almost a century until 1886, when the present law was enacted. The act of 1792 thus represents a construction by an early Congress, whose views of the Constitution have been long regarded as authoritative, of the provision empowering Congress to designate the officer who shall act as President. The act of 1792 reflects also a long-continued acquiescence in the construction of the Constitution under which the Speaker and the President pro tempore of the Senate are deemed to be officers within the meaning of article II. Their resignation as a condition of serving as President is required by the provision in article I, section 6, that no person holding any office under the United States shall be a member of either House during his continuance in office.

"The provision of the bill for a special election is founded upon the provision of article II, section 1, that the officer acting as President shall so act 'until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected.' It is quite clear that this constitutional clause was intended to authorize a special Presidential election. The original proposal in the Constitutional Convention was that the designated successor should act 'until the time of electing a President shall arrive.' This wording was changed to the present form on motion of Madison on the ground that the original proposal 'would prevent a supply of the vacancy by an intermediate election of the President.' While the Constitution is not explicit on the question whether a special election may be for the unexpired term rather than for a full 4-year term, it does not provide that the term of each incumbent shall be 4 years, but that the President shall hold his office 'during the term of 4 years.' This language appears to have reference to a fixed quadrennial term, permitting the filling of an unexpired portion thereof by election. The tradition of special elections for unexpired terms of other officers also supports the provision of the bill in this regard.

"CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

"The bill repeals sections 1 and 2 of the act of January 19, 1886 (24 Stat. 1; U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 3, secs. 21 and 22):

" 'SEC. 21. In case of removal, death, resignation, or inability of both the President and Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of State, or if there be none, or in case of his removal, death, resignation, or inability, then the Secretary of the Treasury, or if there be none, or in case of his removal, death, resignation, or inability, then the Secretary of War, or if there be none, or in case of his removal, death, resignation, or inability, then the Attorney General, or if there be none, or in case of his removal, death, resignation, or inability, then the Postmaster General, or if there be none, or in case of his removal, death, resignation, or inability, then the Secretary of the Navy, or if there be none, or in case of his removal, death, resignation, or inability, then the Secretary of the Interior, shall act as President until the disability of the President or Vice President is removed or a President shall be elected: *Provided*, That whenever the powers and duties of the office of President of the United States shall devolve upon any of the persons named herein, if Congress be not then in session, or if it would not meet in accordance with law within 20 days thereafter, it shall be the duty of the person upon whom said powers and duties shall devolve to issue a proclamation convening Congress in extraordinary session, giving 20 days' notice of the time of meeting.

" 'SEC. 22. Section 21 of this title shall only be held to describe and apply to such officers as shall have been appointed by the advice and consent of the Senate to the offices therein named, and such as are eligible to the office of President under the Constitution, and not under impeachment by the House of Representatives of the United States at the time the powers and duties of the office shall devolve upon them respectively.' "

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it will be noted that the President's message recommended a change in the act of 1886, which would in effect place the succession essentially where it was under the act of 1792, which was the first law on the subject, except that it reverses the order of succession as between the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate.

In other words, under the act of 1792, the President pro tempore of the Senate was first in order of succession.

H. R. 3587, known as the Sumners bill, which I have just asked to have inserted in the RECORD, carried into effect the recommendation of the President. The bill reported out by the House committee is substantially the same as S. 564, which was introduced by me in February of this year, and which was reported to the Senate by the Committee on Rules and Administration, Report No. 80, Calendar No. 79, except that H. R. 3587 provided for a special election, whereas S. 564 does not so provide.

When H. R. 3587 was considered by the House of Representatives, the requirement that the Speaker of the House of Representatives resign as Speaker and as a Member of the House was deleted. In other words, the House sent a bill to the Senate which provided that the Speaker of the House could not only act as President, but he also could act as the Speaker. This deletion was, I believe, the result of a misunderstanding. The debates on the floor of the House indicate that the Members of the House of Representatives were of the opinion that a later provision in the bill covered the question of resignation.

At this point, I should like to call attention to the colloquy engaged in on June 29, 1945, by Mr. LEWIS, as found on page 7134 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day. Mr. LEWIS, chairman of a House judiciary subcommittee, said:

Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendment offered by Mr. LEWIS: Amend by striking out the words in lines 7 and 8 on page 1 as follows: 'Upon his resignation as Speaker and as Representative in Congress,' and insert in lieu thereof the following: 'as hereinafter provided.' "

The provision "hereinafter provided" in the Sumners bill referred only to the Cabinet officers, and it is my opinion that when they adopted the amendment the House felt they provided that not only Cabinet officers but the President pro tempore and the Speaker of the House would be required to resign. I think that is borne out by the further statement:

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, the language of this amendment, I believe, helps to correct a little of the criticism which the gentleman from New York made about this situation when he said we would have an anomalous situation of a Speaker having to resign before becoming President. The language which would take care of that situation is already in the bill provided we strike out the words that this amendment would strike out in lines 7 and 8. The language that covers this is found on page 4, lines 3 to 6, inclusive, and reads as follows:

"The taking of the oath of office by an individual specified in the list in paragraph (1) shall be held to constitute his resignation from the office by virtue of the holding of which he qualifies to serve as President."

So it is my opinion that it was the intention of the House when it adopted the amendment that it was to apply to the Speaker and the President pro tempore with just the same force as it applied to the Cabinet officers.

The later provision in the bill, to which I referred, provided that under certain circumstances, if a person succeeded as Acting President, the taking of the oath of office would constitute his resignation from the office by virtue of the holding of which he qualified to act as President.

However, the provision in question related only to Cabinet officers in the line of succession. Furthermore the House did not strike from the bill the provision specifically requiring that the President pro tempore of the Senate should resign as President pro tempore and as a Member of the Senate. Certainly, if the arguments used on the floor of the House of Representatives were sound, the specific provision insofar as the President pro tempore was concerned should also have been deleted.

There can be no question that the Speaker and President pro tempore should resign, in view of the provision in article I, section 6, clause 2 of the Constitution, that no person holding any office under the United States shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office. The provision is:

No Senator or Representative shall, during the time for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil office under the authority of the United States which shall have been created or the emoluments whereof shall have been increased during such time; and no person holding any office under the United States shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office.

Thus, I feel safe in saying that the provisions of S. 564 are substantially the same as those previously approved by the House of Representatives, and substantially carry into effect the recommendations of the President of the United States.

The bill as originally introduced by me is an exact duplicate of H. R. 3587, the Sumners bill, which passed the House in the Seventy-ninth Congress, and is that portion of S. 564 which is lined through. If Senators want to examine the Sumners bill they will find it in the language lined through in the Senate committee bill.

I quote from the report:

The amendment offered as a substitute differs from S. 564 as introduced in the Senate in the following respects:

1. S. 564 originally provided that in cases where the President pro tempore shall act as President, he should so act upon his resignation from the office of President pro tempore and as Senator; however, it did not require the resignation of the Speaker in cases where he is to act.

The amendment provides that the Speaker shall also resign both as Speaker and as Representative in Congress before acting as President.

Certainly there is no need for argument on that amendment, because if we are to insist upon the President pro tempore resigning when he becomes Acting President, we should require the same thing of the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

2. S. 564 provided that in cases where the President pro tempore acts as President he shall not continue to act after a Speaker becomes able to act.

Under the amendment, when a President pro tempore acts as President he will continue to act until the expiration of the then current Presidential term, unless in the meantime a President or Vice President qualifies.

To make it perfectly clear, in the substitute amendment, when once the President pro tempore qualifies, he cannot be supplanted by the Speaker of the House, even though he becomes qualified. The President pro tempore can be displaced only by the President or the Vice President. Certainly no further argument is needed to show that that is just and fair.

3. The original bill provided that where a Speaker is acting as President and becomes disabled, and a new Speaker then acts as President in his place, the new Speaker would continue so to act only until the first Speaker recovered from his disability.

Under the amendment, the new Speaker would continue to act as President notwithstanding the recovery of the first Speaker.

That is, he is not to be supplanted by anyone other than the President or the Vice President of the United States, and should not be, in view of the fact that he resigns and qualifies to fill the unexpired term of President of the United States.

4. The original bill as introduced provided with reference to Cabinet officers that where a Cabinet officer is acting as President by reason of there being no Speaker or President pro tempore and a Speaker subsequently qualifies, then the Cabinet officer is displaced by the Speaker.

The amendment, in the nature of a substitute, provides that the Cabinet officer shall be displaced either by a Speaker or a President pro tempore of the Senate in that order upon their qualifying.

5. Under S. 564 as originally introduced, a Speaker, acting as President, would, with certain exceptions, act "until a President shall be elected in the manner prescribed by law, and until the expiration of the then current Presidential term."

The amendment provides that he shall, with certain exceptions, act only until the expiration of the then current Presidential term, thus simplifying the language and avoiding the possibility of a particular Speaker continuing to act beyond the then current Presidential term.

6. A corresponding change is made to cover the case of a Cabinet member acting as President.

7. A number of minor changes in language have been made for purposes of consistency and clarification. For example, the original bill as introduced provided that the Speaker would "act as President," but that the President pro tempore and Cabinet members would "discharge the powers and duties of the office of President." Wherever the latter phraseology appears in the original bill, the amendment substitutes the word "act" throughout.

That gives the difference between the bill originally introduced in the Senate, Senate bill 564, and the substitute amendment which is now before us for consideration.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

Under the provisions of the bill, when, by reason of death, resignation, removal from office, inability, or failure to qualify, there is neither a President nor a Vice President to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President, the following order of succession shall prevail.

First, the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall, upon his resignation as Speaker and as Representative in Congress, act as President. Attention is invited to the fact, in connection with the provision for the succession of a Speaker, that the Speaker of the House of Representatives, if there is one, will always be first on the list in the order of succession. It is only when there is no Speaker of the House of Representatives, or when the Speaker cannot or does not qualify, that the order of succession devolves upon the President pro tempore of the Senate, or any other officer of the United States.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Suppose a Speaker were under 35 years of age. Would we not then have a President who was not of the required age, and therefore could not hold the office?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. I will say to my distinguished colleague that in that event the Speaker no doubt would not resign. Therefore the office would pass to the next person in succession, who would be the President pro tempore of the Senate.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator stated that in his opinion the Speaker would not resign. I have the highest regard and respect for the opinion of the Senator from Nebraska, but what does the bill provide?

Mr. WHERRY. The bill provides that when a Speaker qualifies, and there is no disability, he succeeds——

Mr. HATCH. Where are the words?

Mr. WHERRY. On page 6, line 18:

Subsection (a), (b), and (d) shall apply only to such officers as are eligible to the office of President under the Constitution.

Mr. HATCH. That would apply also in case the Speaker of the House were not a Member of the House.

Mr. WHERRY. That is a question which I shall answer later in my argument. To answer quickly the question which the Senator from New Mexico asked, if the Speaker could not qualify, or were under a disability, no doubt he would not resign. If he were under 35 years of age he would know before resigning that he could not qualify, and therefore he would not resign as Speaker. He would continue in that office. But if for some reason he should resign and not qualify, until a new Speaker were elected the succession would be in the person of the President pro tempore of the Senate. If the Speaker then qualified, he would take over. But in the event he did not qualify, or did not meet the constitutional provisions, the office would pass on to the Secretary of State, and the same qualifications would apply—whatever the qualifications are for holding the office.

Mr. HATCH. I have several questions in my mind about the bill, but I anticipate that the Senator is going to discuss them. I shall reserve further questions until the Senator shall have finished, and see if they are not answered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have made a diligent review of the question of succession, and I have presented it to the full committee. Most of the questions which have been asked here were asked before the committee. I am satisfied that if Senators will hear me through, most of the questions which they may raise will be answered. At least they will be answered as I think they should be answered. However, I wish my distinguished colleagues to know that I am glad to yield to them for any question.

Second, if at the time a Speaker would, under the proposed law, begin the discharge of the powers and duties of the office of President, there were no Speaker, or the Speaker failed to qualify as acting President, then the President pro tempore of the Senate would, upon his resignation as President pro tempore and as Senator, act as President.

When the Speaker of the House of Representatives or the President pro tempore of the Senate qualifies, such person will continue to act until the expiration of the current Presidential term, except that if his discharge of the powers and duties of the office is founded in whole or in part on the failure of both the President-elect or the Vice President-elect to qualify, then he shall act only until a President or Vice President qualifies; and if his discharge of the powers and duties of the office is founded in whole or in part on the inability of the President or Vice President, then he shall act only until the removal of the disability of one of such individuals.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I do not know whether the Senator will discuss the word "disability" in his remarks, but that word has given me considerable trouble.

Mr. WHERRY. I am going to discuss it all through the debate, but I should like the Senator to know that the bill deals with inability just as the succession law now deals with inability. We are providing only for succession legislation, and whatever question is in the mind of the distinguished Senator now relative to what the disability might be in the legislation has been in the minds

of Senators and House Members who have considered this matter for 164 years.

Mr. HATCH. That is in my mind, but I do not think the present law is at all satisfactory, even though it has existed for many years. I think there is a grave defect in it which ought to be corrected, and I hope the Senater will discuss it.

Mr. WHERRY. May I digress from my presentation to answer briefly the question which has been raised by the distinguished Senator, which, of course, all of us agree is one of the most difficult questions with which we have to deal in any succession law. The question whether a President is unable to perform the functions and duties of his office due to a mental or physical condition is, as I have said, not germane t. the bill, because we are speaking only about succession as provided for in Senate bill 554. But it is an important question, because the Constitution provides what might happen under the wording of the Constitution. The bill deals with the subject of the line of succession, but not with the procedure for determining when succession shall take place. Under both the act of 1792 and the act of 1886, the same question would have been involved, just as the Senator is asking it now. It will be remembered that the act of 1886 is the present law, which prescribes no specific procedure for determining inability of the President to act. There was a great deal of debate on it. No doubt the Senator has read it. There are reams of arguments advanced in defining what disability is. Nevertheless, it is not provided for in either of the acts. It seems sufficient to say that in the entire period of approximately 164 years of the existence of this country, the issue has never officially been presented for settlement.

Mr. HATCH. It has never been officially presented, but it has been presented to the people of the country and, to my mind, in a most disgraceful way.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall mention that later, and I want to do it as kindly as I can. It did come up for consideration. In only two instances did it rise to the point of discussion. I say this with deepest respect for the ones who might have been laboring under a disability.

The first was the case of James A. Garfield, who survived between 2 and 3 months after being shot by an assassin. During that period he was unable fully to perform the duties of the office of President. However, the issue was never officially raised, because, finally, he passed on, and the situation was clarified.

The second case was that of former President Woodrow Wilson. It will be remembered by the Senator from New Mexico and other Senators that a committee of Senators was selected, but not formally appointed, to call upon President Wilson after affliction came upon him in 1920. History records reveal that the President was in bed, propped up, and he joked with the Senators present. So the report of the committee was that there was nothing to report and, further, "The President seems to be mentally capable," and so forth.

Thus, again, the question was not officially presented for decision. In the case of Garfield, as I mentioned a moment ago, he died before the issue became acute. In the case of Wilson, his term of office expired prior to such time.

Those are the only two cases during the existence of our country relative to disability which the records of history reveal.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator has made a great study of this question. If the committee which called upon President Wilson had found the contrary, what would have been the procedure?

Mr. WHERRY. That issue must be settled sometime.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator will further yield, that emphasizes one of the objections I have to a bill of this nature. I think this entire subject—and there is no more important subject before the country—should be carefully studied and a complete and comprehensive bill passed which would take care of all these matters, instead of merely providing the line of succession.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I appreciate very deeply the words of the distinguished Senator. He is a student of history, and he knows that a committee was appointed as long ago as 1856 which went into the debates and the arguments of the Constitutional Convention. They followed the history of succession. The report is elaborate. I spent many nights at home reading through the report of the Judiciary Committee appointed in 1856. When the report was finally made, four recommendations were included, but it will be found that there is an absence of anything relative to disability.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator is entirely correct in what he has said, but I am not one of those who subscribe to the philosophy that if a thing never has been done it never can be done. I think the very evidence the Senator has given us illustrates the necessity for a complete overhaul of the entire plan of succession, defining "disability" and how it is to be determined, even including the Electoral College. I think that ought to be looked into also.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall have something to say about that also. That very statement has been made time and time again on the floor and in committee hearings. I think I have handled this bill as well as it can be handled until some superbody gets together to bring in suggestions. With the exception of disability, the subject has been overhauled from A to Z and back again, and I am satisfied that if a committee were appointed now to do the very thing which the Senator has asked be done, it would probably result in their throwing up their hands and saying that it is not only difficult to say when there is a disability, but report that it is impossible to formulate a plan by which we can accomplish the very arduous task of compelling the one who is holding the office to forego the office and declare it vacant and put someone else in in his stead. As I said a moment ago, in all the history of the United States such disability has occurred only twice, and, as I pointed out, the subject was elaborately discussed by the Judiciary Committee in 1856. Yet in 1886, when Senator Hoar debated this matter for days on the floor of the Senate, with his colleagues and also in the committee, the matter of disability was thoroughly discussed.

I should like to suggest to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that in the amendment which now is offered as a substitute, it is required that the Speaker of the House of Representatives or the President pro tempore of the Senate must resign. I say to the Senator that even though the accession to the Presidency is a duty and an honor, nevertheless, as I shall point out later, to my mind one of the safeguards and one of the ways of determining disability is to provide that the Speaker or the President pro tempore, whichever comes first, shall determine whether the disability is only temporary or whether it is permanent, and whether, under those conditions, he would like to risk his seat in the Senate or in the House of Representatives by resigning and then ascending to the position of Acting President of the United States. I think that is one way to solve the problem.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MALONE in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Suppose it is not a question of disability, but is a matter of a vacancy on account of death. Is it the spirit of the amendment that it will be the duty of the Speaker to resign, or will that be an option?

Mr. WHERRY. It will be an option on the part of the Speaker or the President pro tempore; it will not be mandatory. The same situation will apply in the case of disability.

Of course, as I have already stated, the question of disability has not yet arisen. As I said earlier in my remarks, seven Presidents have died and seven vice presidents have succeeded to that office, but we have had no difficulty in regard to succession. However, when there is a vacancy in the office of Vice President, as is the case at the present time, the question becomes acute. That is what is in my mind.

I think the President was most sincere in stating to the Members of the Congress that now is the time—at least during his period of service as President—to make provision, so that in the future a succession law will take care of any such situation.

In regard to the matter of having the office go to the Secretary of State, as provided in the present law, the Act of 1886, the President felt that because of the fact that the Speaker of the House of Representatives is elected from his own district every 2 years, and, in addition, is elected by the Members of the House of Representatives, he is the official who is closest to the people of the United States. It is solely upon that premise that I believe that the Speaker of the House should come ahead of the President pro tempore of the Senate.

Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for raising the question of disability. It is a deep question. Even though we proceed to enact this legislation, such action on our part would in no way hinder or deter the making of a complete study of the very subject to which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has referred. In fact, if that is the will of the Senate, I should be glad to join in moving for the creation of a joint committee, composed of members of both the House of Representatives and the Senate, to do exactly what the Senator from New Mexico has suggested. However, I suggest that before that study would be completed, the emergency now confronting us would be over, in my opinion; and then the subject would be dropped, just as was done in 1886. The result would be that in 1956 nothing would come from the study of the joint committee.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HATCH. I say to the Senator that what he has just stated about the emergency being over and the study being dropped, is what has prompted me to take the very strong view which I now have taken, namely, that the time to act is while the emergency still exists—right now. I think we can get the study and the report, and thereupon we shall be able to enact the necessary over-all legislation.

But if we let the emergency pass, as the Senator from Nebraska has said, inasmuch as we are all inclined to put off and procrastinate, I am satisfied that the Senator from Nebraska is exactly right in saying that nothing will be done after the emergency has passed, if the study has not been made by that time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall be glad to have support from both sides of the aisle in connection with the passage of the proposed legislation before July 26, so as to take care of the situation as I see it. I should also be glad to join with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, who has made such a forceful argument to us, in respect to a joint resolution calling for the making of a study such as the one he has mentioned; and certainly that could be done before 1949.

I say frankly that, based upon the precedents, if such a joint committee were to take as much time as previous joint committees have taken, the Congress would not receive its recommendations in sufficient time to permit of the enactment of legislation on the subject before January 20, 1949, in my opinion.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me once more?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HATCH. I regret that the forceful argument to which the Senator from Nebraska has referred did not make clear to him what I have in mind.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, yes; it did.

Mr. HATCH. What I have in mind is simply that if Congress now enacts such legislation, the Congress then will be saying, "It is all taken care of; the emergency is over," and we shall continue on this new basis in the future. Then the study will not be made, and we shall wind up by finding ourselves in exactly the position we now are in.

Mr. WHERRY. I say to the distinguished Senator that I understand his position very clearly. He is a forceful debater. He raised the question of disability; but, in fact, the question of disability is not raised by the succession legislation now before us.

If it is the desire of the Senator from New Mexico to have a joint committee study the question of succession as it applies to disability—and I regard that as a big question—that will be perfectly agreeable to me. But the question of disability has not been raised by the pending bill, as I have previously stated; and it is my thought that if before July 26 we can carry out the suggestions of the President of the United States in respect to this emergency legislation we shall have accomplished much, as I shall point out later in my remarks, because the law has been changed by various measures, including the lame-duck amendment; since 1886 there have been various changes in respect to the question of how we shall provide by statute what is proposed in the pending measure. But the disability matter, as described by the Senator from New Mexico, could be studied. If and when a vacancy should occur, so that determination of the question would have to be made, I should be glad to give that matter definite study.

The emergency now confronting us does not involve that matter. The present emergency calls for having the Congress provide for a succession down the line, as the President suggested, in the event that something of that sort should occur between now and January 20, 1949.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Senator for yielding, and I do not wish to take up too much of his time; but I do not wish to be limited to the question of disability.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course not.

Mr. HATCH. My thought is that the study should necessarily include all the troublesome and vexatious problems, including that of the line of succession itself.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course.

Mr. HATCH. Frankly, I am not satisfied with the proposal as to the line of succession, as contained in this measure. I am not even satisfied as to its constitutionality; and in that respect I think there are grave and serious questions which should receive the most profound study and consideration that we can give to them. I say that the time to do that is now that the emergency exists; for if we pass the measure now before us without making such a study, probably another 100 years will pass before the Congress again will become acutely aware of the necessity of the enactment of the legislation to which I have referred; and of course at that time those of us who are now in Congress will not be here.

Mr. WHERRY. But at least we shall have passed this bill, and then 100 years from now something else can be done.

I say to the Senator that if he has any doubt in regard to the constitutionality of this measure, let him attempt by legislation to define disability and the vacating of the office, and that will be an act upon which the question of constitutionality will hinge. It is for that reason that I say to the Senator that the disability feature is not a part of the legislative proposal presented in this amendment.

In other words, Mr. President, when either the Speaker of the House of Representatives or the President pro tempore of the Senate once qualifies to act as President, he can be displaced only by the President or Vice President. That is the statement I had just concluded when the distinguished Senator from New Mexico raised the question of disability.

Third, if by reason of death, resignation, removal from office, inability, or failure to qualify, there is no President pro tempore to act as President, then the officer of the United States who is highest on the following list, and who is not under disability to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President, shall act as President: The Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, the Attorney General, the Postmaster General, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor.

I point out here that the positions of Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Commerce, and Secretary of Labor were created subsequent to enactment of the act of 1886.

Any of the persons named in that list, when acting as President, would continue so to do until the expiration of the then current Presidential term, but not after a qualified and prior-entitled individual was able to act, namely, the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, or the President pro tempore of the Senate. By that I mean that if the Secretary of State has become qualified and has taken the oath to act as President, he can be displaced only by the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, or the President pro tempore, provided that they, in order, become qualified to act as President of the United States.

The removal of the disability of an individual higher on the list of Cabinet officers, or the ability to qualify on the part of an individual higher on such list, shall not, however, terminate his service. By that, I mean that if the Secretary of the Treasury qualifies because the Secretary of State had a disability, and if subsequently there was a removal of the disability, if the Secretary of State thereupon wish to qualify, under this measure he would not supplant the Secretary of the Treasury, once the Secretary of the Treasury became qualified and became the Acting President.

The taking of the oath of office by one of the persons named in the list of Cabinet officers would be held to constitute his resignation from the Cabinet office, by virtue of the holding of which he qualified to act as President.

Persons in the line of succession would have to be eligible to hold the office of President under the Constitution and Cabinet officers on the list would have had to be appointed by and with the

advice and consent of the Senate prior to the time of the death, resignation, removal from office, inability, or failure to qualify, of the President pro tempore, and must not have been under impeachment by the House of Representatives at the time when the powers and duties of the office of President devolved upon them. During the period when any person acts as President, his compensation is to be at the rate then provided by law in the case of the President.

That, briefly, Mr. President, is a statement of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as compared to the original Sumners bill and also as compared to the original Senate bill 564, which was in reality the Sumners bill, but was amended by me and was adopted by the committee after we made a study of this situation.

Now I should like to make a brief statement regarding the historical background upon which I base the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Both the original succession act of 1792, and the act of 1886, which is the present law, were enacted in the light of the provisions of article II, section 1, paragraph 5, of the Constitution, which reads as follows:

> In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President, and the Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation or inability, both of the President and Vice President—

I should like to emphasize that—

> declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly, until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected.

The act of 1792 enacted in the Second Congress, provided that the Vice President pro tempore—President pro tempore of the Senate—was the first in order of succession, and the Speaker of the House, second.

At that time, there was some discussion as to making Cabinet members the first successors, beginning with the Secretary of State, who at the time was Thomas Jefferson. However, this move was blocked by Alexander Hamilton, then Secretary of the Treasury, who was bitterly opposed to Jefferson and his policies. Hamilton's recommendations prevailed, and the act of 1792, which was in effect for almost a century, placed the President pro tempore of the Senate as first in the line of succession, followed by the Speaker.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HATCH. From what the Senator has said, I think he will agree that the true historical explanation of the reasons for passing the act were connected with the personal animosities which then existed.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct; it grew out of the animosities existing between two men. But for that, I think the Senator will agree with me, the succession would then have proceeded through the Speaker to the President pro tempore. The personal animosities to which the distinguished Senator refers brought about the act of 1792, placing the President pro tempore ahead of the Speaker. That act was in vogue and in full force until 1886, at which time the act itself was changed.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator will yield, the law was on the books, but it was never invoked and never came into play during that period.

Mr. WHERRY. I stand corrected. I said "in vogue," not "invoked." I mean that there was no change in the statute from 1792 until 1886, and during that long period the succession was first to the President pro tempore and then to the Speaker. As I stated before, it resulted solely from the differences between the two statesmen, Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton.

Mr. HATCH. If my recollection does not play me false, that subject was discussed in the speech of the late Senator Hoar mentioned by the Senator a while ago, was it not?

Mr. WHERRY. That is true; and also in 1886, because, in the hearings conducted by both of the committees, the question always came up as to who should be in the line of succession.

Mr. HATCH. I mean that at that time the same historical background was given as that which the Senator has given today.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Following the death of President Taylor July 9, 1850, and the succession of Millard Fillmore, the question of succession legislation again came into prominence.

I now mention the committee that studied the matter; and we are now speaking about the committee that was appointed to study all the angles the Senator from New Mexico would have liked to study again. In 1856 the Judiciary Committee of the Senate made a careful inquiry into the subject of succession to the Presidency. Their report—and it is an interesting report, as Senators will find if they will read it—dated August 5, 1856, indicates that they considered all possible eligible persons in this connection, not only the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives but also Members of the Senate in the order of their seniority, Cabinet members, and members of the Supreme Court.

After considering the matter the committee recommended that the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, in that order, succeed to the Presidency, followed by the Chief Justice and other Justices of the Supreme Court. That was their recommendation, and they certainly considered volumes of evidence—reams of it.

In accordance with their recommendation, a bill was submitted to the Senate carrying the recommendations into effect. However, the legislation was never approved. The emergency was over, finally, and, just as I stated a moment ago, when these emergencies end and a new President or Senator or Vice President is elected, then the legislation is allowed to drop until an acute situation or an emergency again arises.

The fact remains that the Judiciary Committee, in its report, recognized the desirability of continuing, as first in the order of succession, the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Throughout the subsequent years, from time to time, especially when a Vice President was called upon to take over the duties of the Presidency, bills were introduced in the Congress to provide for amendments or revisions of the act of 1792. But it was not until the death of President Garfield that the matter was forcibly brought to the attention of the country and the Congress, and a new succession law enacted.

In 1886, the Congress passed the present law, which provides for the succession of the Secretary of State, Secretary of the Treasury, and other members of the Cabinet in the order of their rank as the Cabinet existed at that time.

As I said a moment ago, at that time there was no Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Commerce, or Secretary of Labor. Those three Cabinet officers have now been added to the list I proposed in the substitute amendment.

The reasons for the enactment of the act of 1886, the present law, as stated by Senator Hoar on the floor of the Senate, in the debates December 15, 1885, Forty-ninth Congress, first session, and I want to give a synopsis of those arguments, were as follows:

First. Because, from time to time, there was no officer in being who could succeed to the Presidency. I should like to restate that because, unless the legislation has been carefully studied, it is possible to overlook this very important point. From time to time, there was no officer in being who could succeed to the Presidency. That is why the law was changed in 1886. The Senator was then referring to situations between sessions of the Congress when no President pro tempore or Speaker of the House of Representatives was in being under the then existing organizational rules of the Senate and the House.

Second. That it was awkward and repugnant to one's sense of propriety for the President of the United States to sit in the chair of the Senate, and preside over and listen to discussions in regard to his own nominations, voting upon them himself, as an equal in the Senate, and presiding over and listening to the severe criticism of executive policy, which Senator Hoar stated in times of high party antagonism must be always heard in the Senate—and ought always to be heard in the Senate, may I suggest.

This criticism was aimed at the situation which existed under the act of 1792, which had no provision requiring the President pro tempore of the Senate or the Speaker of the House to resign upon assuming the office of Acting President.

I should like to point out again to the Senate that at that time this situation was regarded as it is now, as it was regarded in 1886, or as we view it now. The act of 1886 changed that particular feature, and it has been changed once again. So it makes the measure which has been offered in line, I think, with all the constitutional barriers that have been previously erected.

CONCLUSION

Today we are again confronted with a situation in which the United States has a President but no Vice President. Indeed, if anything, the situation is more critical in that the duties—I think the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] will agree with me on this point—imposed upon not only the President of the United States, but the Secretary of State, require both officials to do extensive traveling within and without the United States. Under the present succession law the Secretary of State would first succeed to the Presidency, in the event of the death of the President.

Proof of the importance of this matter was forcibly before the country when from March 2, 1947, to March 6, 1947, President Truman was away from Washington, yes and he was outside the United States—he was on a visit to Mexico. We are not condemning that, but I simply want to give the Senate the facts, to show that the President was outside the United States for 4 days. But another important point is that at that very time, namely, on March 5, Secretary Marshall left Washington for Moscow, and remained away from the United States until April 26, 1947.

Such things occur by reason of the increased duties that have been forced upon the shoulders of the President and also upon the Secretary of State. I have given one instance in which both were outside the United States for nearly 5 days. If anything had happened to the President of the United States, the country would have been in an acute situation, insofar as the succession was concerned.

It seems to me that we should face the facts and enact into law a bill which takes into consideration modern conditions and the changes which have taken place in the Constitution of the United States and in the organizational set-up of the Senate and House since 1886.

Senator Hoar's argument as to the periods of time during which there would be no Speaker of the House of Representatives or President pro tempore of the Senate has been answered by the adoption of the so-called lame duck amendment to the Constitution, which changed the terms of office of Members of the House and Senate so that they run from January 3d, for a period of 2 years in a case of a Member of the House of Representatives, 6 years in the case of a Senator.

Previous to the adoption of the 20th amendment, there were periods from 12 o'clock March 4th of each odd year to the succeeding December, in the absence of special session, when there was no Speaker of the House of Representatives.

In addition, under the rules of the Senate, which existed prior to 1901, the President pro tempore of the Senate was only appointed when the Vice President was absent from the Senate. Since that time, the rule has been changed and the President pro tempore is elected to hold office at the pleasure of the Senate, and until his successor is elected.

Thus, in the absence of death, there would never be a period of time when there would be no Speaker of the House of Representatives or President pro tempore of the Senate, except for the period between the date of convening of the new Congress and date of election of its officers.

Of course, that still happens. Congress assembles at noon on the 3d day of January, and from the time the senatorial term of the President pro tempore expires at that time and before he is reelected by the Members of the Senate and takes his oath of office there is no President pro tempore, and the argument of Senator Hoar would apply for that brief space of time. But there is no difficulty now respecting that issue, and if for any reason there should be a delay in the election of a new President pro tempore of the Senate, the Secretary of the State could step into the breach, if there were no Speaker of the House, and serve as Acting President 3 or 4 days, until a President pro tempore was elected.

Since 1886 a change has occurred. That change came about by reason of the adoption of the lame duck amendment, by reason of which there is no time when there is a vacancy, unless on the death of a Speaker of the House or a President pro tempore of the Senate, except that intervening time between the time the term of a Representative expires in the House and a Speaker is elected, or the time in the Senate between the time of convening at 12 o'clock noon and when a President pro tempore of the Senate is elected.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. First I wish to say that I think the Senator from Nebraska is making one of the finest contributions I have heard on this very important subject. I have attempted to read up on it extensively. I have never heard the subject more thoroughly discussed than it has been today.

There is one question which has arisen, and to which I am sure the Senator has given thought, and on which he may be able to add enlightenment to those of us who want to do what is best for the country, as does the Senator from Nebraska.

Has the Senator taken into consideration the following situation: The new Congress convened on January 3 of this year. The individual who was elected to be Speaker of the House has been elected for only 2 years. If he should succeed to the Presidency, and if he were required to serve out the remaining time in the Presidency, he would actually be serving a period of time at the end of the 2 years for which he was not an elected officer.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have that point covered in my presentation, and I shall come to it in a short while.

Mr. O'CONOR. I do not want to anticipate what the Senator is to say.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall cover it later in my remarks. I should like to say to the Senator from Maryland that the bill provides that when the Speaker of the House once qualifies as acting President, he does so for the remainder of the unexpired term for which the President was elected.

Mr. O'CONOR. Conceivably that may be for 3 years, or some other period of time.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; whatever the period of time may be. When the individual who is elected Speaker of the House is elected to the Congress, he is an officer elected from his own district. During all the time there has been a House of Representatives no one has been elected Speaker of the House who was not a Member of Congress. All during the time there has been a Senate of of the United States no one has been President pro tempore who was not a Member of the United States Senate.

The bill provides that if the Speaker qualifies as acting President, he immediately becomes the acting President, and continues to be the acting President for the unexpired term of the President, that is, for the remainder of the time the President would have served had he lived.

It should also be remembered that the moment he qualifies and becomes Acting President he resigns as an officer of the House of Representatives. He must do so in order to meet the constitutional requirement that no one can hold two offices in the Government. No one can act as President and also be the Speaker of the House at the same time.

I wish to say, at this point, that no one is closer to the people than the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and that therefore he is the logical individual to place in line of succession after the Vice President. That is the point President Truman strongly emphasized in his message. I certainly think the President made one of the finest statements I ever heard when he said that the democratic processes would not be met if he were to nominate a Secretary of State, who might belong to his party, which might be the minority party, who would then be next in line, after the President's death, for the Presidency. The same would be true with respect to the Republican Party, if it were the minority party and a similar situation should exist. If the Secretary of State were next in line of succession, the people would be denied, in an emergency, an acting President who was so close to the people as is the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Not only is the Speaker elected from his own congressional district, but the House composed of 435 Members, each of whom comes directly to the House by vote of his constituents, in turn elects one of the Members to be Speaker of the House.

Another point I wish to emphasize is that the Speaker of the House serves for a long period of time before he is elected to that position. I cannot conceive of a Member who has not served a long apprenticeship in the House being elected Speaker. The individual who becomes Speaker is well qualified with respect to appropriations. He has much knowledge of general legislative matters. The same is true with respect to the Senate. A Senator who is elected President pro tempore has served a long period of apprenticeship. I think that by virtue of his long period of apprenticeship, no officer is better qualified than the Speaker of the House, from the stand-

point of length of service and experience, to become Acting President. I thank the Senator for his observations.

Mr. O'CONOR. I thank the Senator for his very clear exposition of the question.

Mr. WHERRY. One further point which I wish to call to the attention of the Senator from Maryland is that the same situation would apply to a Senator. It applies not only to a Speaker, but also to a Senator. A Senator may have served 5 years, or 3 years, before becoming Acting President and serving for an additional length of time. The same thing would apply to the Secretary of State, if he were appointed by the President, and the President died. Under the present law the Secretary of State would succeed to the Presidency. He would fill out the unexpired term.

Mr. O'CONOR. I readily understand that, and the Senator is undoubtedly correct. The only reason the question occurred to me was that with a Member of the House of Representatives elected for only 2 years, there was greater likelihood that he might serve a period for which he was not elected.

Mr. WHERRY. The same thing might be true of a Senator. Suppose he had served 5 years of his 6-year term, and then became President pro tempore of the Senate. If the President should die and if there were no Vice President and the Speaker could not qualify, the President pro tempore of the Senate would succeed to the Presidency. If the President should die within the first year for which he was elected, and the Vice President should die, the Senator would serve as Acting President for 3 or 3½ years, or whatever the unexpired term of the President might be. But he would serve only for that period. I think the point which the Senator raises is a good point; but I wish to make it clear that it applies not only to the President pro tempore, but to others. When a Secretary of State is appointed, if he serves faithfully, we assume that he will continue to serve during the administration in which he was appointed. So in reality the same point could be made with respect to the Secretary of State or the Secretary of the Treasury.

The twentieth amendment of the Constitution changed the terms of office of Members of the House and Senate. This is what makes the pending measure important, because we are now in a different situation from that of 1886, at the time Senator Hoar was able to present formidable arguments, which the Senate accepted, in passing the legislation relating to Presidential succession now on the statute books. The twentieth amendment to the Constitution provides:

SECTION 1. The terms of the President and Vice President shall end at noon on the 20th day of January, and the terms of Senators and Representatives at noon on the 3d day of January, of the years in which such terms would have ended if this article had not been ratified; and the terms of their successors shall then begin.

SEC. 2. The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall begin at noon on the 3d day of January, unless they shall by law appoint a different day.

SEC. 3. If, at the time fixed for the beginning of the term of the President, the President-elect shall have died, the Vice-President-elect shall become President. If a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or if the President-elect shall have failed to qualify, then the Vice-President-elect shall act as President until a President shall have qualified; and the Congress may by law provide for the case wherein neither a President-elect nor a Vice-President-elect shall have qualified, declaring who shall then act as President, or the manner in which one who is to act shall be selected, and such person shall act accordingly until a President or Vice President shall have qualified.

That is exactly what is done in this amendment. We have followed the provisions of the twentieth amendment, the so-called lame-duck amendment.

SEC. 4. The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them—

That has reference when there is not a majority situation in the electoral college, and the election of a President devolves upon the House of Representatives—

and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them.

In case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them, we have the right to say who shall succeed to that office.

SEC. 5. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect on the 15th day of October following the ratification of this article.

SEC. 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Perhaps the question which I was about to ask the Senator from Nebraska has been answered. Assume, for instance, that the Speaker of the House did not possess the constitutional qualifications to become President. Does the bill take care of that situation?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska has answered that question. The bill does take care of the situation. As the Senator pointed out a while ago, there is language in the bill, which the Senator read to me, and which I had not read up to that time, which provides, in substance, that only persons eligible under the Constitution may act as President. In other words, a Speaker of the House must possess the constitutional qualifications in order to act as President before he is eligible to succeed to that office. I think that is the provision of the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. It is found on page 6, line 18.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Following up that question, assume that neither the Speaker of the House nor the President pro tempore met the qualifications laid down in the Constitution for eligibility to the office of President of the United States. What would happen, under the terms of the bill?

Mr. WHERRY. The Secretary of State would be next in line of succession. If he were not qualified, or if his nomination had not been confirmed when he was appointed, or if any qualification were lacking, the next in line would be the Secretary of the Treasury, and so on through the list of Cabinet officers. Those provisions are found in the second part of the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate the Senator's questions. They are very pertinent. I am satisfied that they are answered by the various provisions of the bill.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I have not heard all of the Senator's address on this question. I am wondering how this bill compares with the Succession Act of 1792. As I understand, it was somewhat similar to the bill before us. It remained the law for a considerable period of time, and I am wondering whether or not the Senator has made a comparison with that act, and whether he can tell me briefly what the difference is.

Mr. WHERRY. I can tell the Senator in one or two sentences. The main difference is that the Succession Act of 1792 provided that the President pro tempore should succeed to the office of President, and that the next in line should be the Speaker of the House, followed by the Cabinet officers.

Mr. LUCAS. That is practically the only difference. In other words, with that difference, we are moving back to where we were in 1792, when the first Succession Act was passed by Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. I think that is the only difference. I think there was a provision for a special election, but the law was never invoked, so there is no precedent on that score.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand, it was that provision which later caused some of the long debates in Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. In 1856 a subcommittee was appointed by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. That subcommittee made an exhaustive research into the question of succession. It considered all the questions involved, and among them the question of disability, which has been raised by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]. I have made a long argument which answers all those questions. As I see it, the main reason why the succession act of 1792 provided first for the succession to the Presidency by the President pro tempore and then by the Speaker of the House was the fact that there were differences between Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton.

I believe that one of the finest statements that has ever been made, and one of the best arguments that has ever been advanced for the bill, has been made by President Truman, the head of the Democratic Party.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not happen to agree with the position of the President.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not wish to inject politics into this question. I have the highest regard for my friend from Illinois; but I wish to avoid the consideration of politics. On both sides of the aisle there are distinguished statesmen who have taken a great interest in succession legislation. I admit that if death should overtake our President at this time, or if he should become disabled, if the bill were on the statute books the next in line of succession would be the Speaker of the House, who happens to be Mr. MARTIN, a Republican. But let me say to the distinguished Senator that if he will follow the history of the proposals to change the law, he will find that the political considerations are about evenly balanced. We are passing long-range legislation. Even at the very next session the tables may be turned. I am satisfied that if the Senator will follow the history of the debates on this question he will see that in instance after instance the emergency finally terminated, and then nothing further was done until a new situation arose, such as that we face today, with no Vice President. I am sure that if the Senator will examine the history of the question impartially he will not press the political argument, because it has no place in this debate.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to disabuse the Senator's mind of the impression that I am injecting politics into the argument, because apparently it involves no political considerations. Strange as it may seem, the Senator from Nebraska is quoting a Democratic President in his speech. He is all for President Truman.

Mr. WHERRY. So far as this particular piece of legislation is concerned, that is true. I will say further to the Senator that I shall always be with the President when he is right, and I shall certainly be against him when he is wrong.

Mr. LUCAS. That is a wonderful spirit. That spirit always has characterized the Senator from Nebraska. However, to show that there is no politics in this question, the Senator is an ardent Republican—one of the best—and he is for the President of the United States, who is a Democrat. I am an ardent Democrat, and I am against the President of the United States in his position on this bill, so there cannot be any politics.

Mr. WHERRY. That is interparty politics, which is the worst kind.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator knows more about interparty politics than does the Senator from Illinois.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I am gratified to hear the Senator from Nebraska speak so highly of the President of the United States and of the message from which he quoted as convincing and overwhelming proof of the desire for this type of legislation. I am delighted to see that the Senator from Nebraska is such an ardent admirer of the President. But that does not convince me of the soundness of the position which the President took. The President takes as his main reason, in effect, the tragic death of the late President, and the desirability of nominating the person who would be the President's immediate successor in the event of his death or inability to act.

I have a high regard, of course, for this reasoning of the President; but is it not true, as a matter of fact, that in both of our political conventions, when we have nominated our choice for the Presidency, that man usually dominates the convention and makes his own choice of Vice President?

Mr. WHERRY. I am not as apt in politics as were the Democrats in Chicago. I really cannot answer that question. I should certainly think that the man who was nominated for the Presidency would have something to say about who should run with him on the ticket. I do not know anything about that kind of convention politics. I have not been in one in which my judgment was invited. I would say to the Senator that I certainly would think that the President would have something to say as to who his running mate should be.

Mr. HATCH. While the Senator is making this rather extreme concession, will he not further agree that no man could be nominated for the Vice Presidency if the one nominated for the Presidency opposed him?

Mr. WHERRY. I am sorry, but I was disturbed for a moment and did not get all of the Senator's question.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator would not go the full length with me?

Mr. WHERRY. I will say that I will go the full length with the Senator every time he is right, and when he is wrong I will go to the full extent the other way.

Mr. HATCH. Then this debate should end, because I am right.

Mr. WHERRY. We shall get above this political proposition, and I think we should. I think the Senator from New Mexico has a brilliant legal mind. I have been with him on the Committee on the Judiciary, and when he started in with his questions, which were basically constitutional and legal, I deeply appreciated them, because I feel that this is a big subject. I am sorry that we can take only this afternoon and tomorrow until 2 o'clock to debate this matter, because I have reluctantly given way time and time again, and I am just as sure as I could be sure of anything that this Presidential succession is emergency legislation. I am satisfied that the President has suggested a piece of legislation that is sound; and I want to reassure the Senator that while he has as good a right to differ with the President as I have, this is one time when I think the President has recommended legislation which Congress ought to pass. I would say that whether Mr. MARTIN were Speaker of the House, or Mr. RAYBURN, for whom I have a high regard.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator will further yield, I do want to continue this discussion along the lines of the question I have asked, because it is an extremely important and practical matter. When I said I was right, I meant that what little experience I have had and what I have read convinces me that both political parties, when they nominate their choice for the Presidency, are moved largely in their choice of a Vice-Presidential candidate by what the nominee for the Presidency says. They certainly would not nominate a man for Vice President who was opposed by the nominee for President. Therefore, it means simply this, that the nominee for President does name his own immediate successor; and the argument of the President of the United States in his message falls completely flat, although I know how earnest and sincere he is.

Mr. WHERRY. I disagree with my distinguished friend. What I think the President meant was that he had a right to nominate to be Secretary of State the man who would succeed him. The Secretary of State is appointed; he is not elected. The fact that the Secretary of State belongs to the same party contradicts the very idea and principle which the President has suggested to the Senate, that is, that the Speaker of the House, being elected by the people, even though he come from a different party, is the man who is closer to the people, and, therefore, should be the President. That is what the President means, I take it.

Perhaps I did not get the Senator's point correctly, but it seems to me that if I correctly understand what the President is talking about, it is that in reference to the nomination of one to succeed him he feels he is a nonpartisan. He said it was in order to carry out the democratic policies and processes. The one closest to the people of the United States, as I stated before, is the Speaker of the House, and not an appointed Secretary, who belongs to the same party, which might become the minority party, and therefore he is not as close to the people, regardless of his qualifications or his ability, as would be the Speaker who is elected each 2 years, and then, in turn, elected Speaker by the House of Representatives.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield further to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HATCH. I will say that the point which the Senator is now discussing is set forth in another paragraph of the President's message, in which he says that the man who acts as President should be one who has been elected by the people; but it was another reason which he mentioned with which I disagree, because, as a matter of practical politics, a President does actually choose the Vice President, and thereby does nominate his immediate successor.

Mr. WHERRY. I will let the Senator go ahead and have his Presidential nominee select whom he wants for Vice President, provided the Senator will support this legislation, so that in the event the Vice President dies and the President wants a successor, he will come from the Speakership of the House, under the theory, as the President pointed out, that the Speaker is the elected officer closest to the people, and therefore is to be preferred over the Secretary of State or some other Cabinet officer.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator asked if I would support the legislation. I cannot support it, for the reasons which have been thus far discussed. There is a far more grave reason that would forever preclude my supporting the legislation.

Mr. WHERRY. And what is that, may I ask the Senator?

Mr. HATCH. The constitutional provision.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall come to that in just a moment.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Is it not true that in the last two Republican conventions, which are the only two of which I have any personal knowledge from having attended them, while the Vice-Presidential nominee may have had the approval of the man who had been nominated for President, he was in neither case directly selected by the man chosen to head the ticket? In the case of the 1940 convention and in the case of the 1944 convention, after the nomination was made for the Presidential office, there was considerable discussion as to who should be the Vice-Presidential candidate, and it was a matter of the free and open choice of the convention. Of course, the choice had the approval of the Presidential nominee, but it fell far short of a deliberate and direct designation by the Presidential nominee as to who should have second place on the ticket. I think it is highly probable, I say in all deference to my learned and distinguished friend from New Mexico, that that might not always have been true in the Republican Party, but it certainly was true, to my personal knowledge, in the last two Republican conventions.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator therefore will agree that neither of those Vice Presidents was selected over the opposition of the Presidential nominee?

Mr. BALDWIN. I think that is true, but I think it is entirely different from the Democratic National Convention, where it is certainly a pretty generally accepted fact that the man who was President at the time and was renominated had the biggest voice as to who should run with him on the ticket. The fact that he was in the Presidential office might very well distinguish the two cases. I am not critical of the situation. However, I think that my learned friend's argument falls short of effectiveness, because what he says about the designation of the Vice-Presidential nominee by the Presidential nominee does not always hold true, so that the Presidential nominee does not in effect select who might ultimately turn out to be his successor, if the election is successful.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HATCH. I think the Senator from Connecticut has correctly outlined the situation. However, if he has ever attended a Democratic convention he knows it is a pretty free and open affair, in a way. However, the point I make is that whether there is an outright designation or not, it still remains true of both of the parties, I think, that the nominee for President has the moving voice in the selection of the nominee for Vice President, and I think that should be true.

Mr. BALDWIN. I agree with the Senator. I think it is a vital factor, and I think it should be. However, there is just one intervening fact between the nomination and the actual election relative to the selection of the nominee for the Vice-Presidential office. The people in the meantime have a chance to pass upon the whole matter.

The argument advanced for the pending bill is that the Speaker of the House has stood before the electorate and has, in turn, been chosen by a majority of the other 434 Members of the House of Representatives, who themselves also stood for election, in this case fairly recently.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I simply wish to observe to the Senator from Nebraska that he has been very generous in yielding, and I think we are getting a little away from his discussion, so I shall not interrupt him further along these lines. I am very hopeful that he will soon get to a discussion of the constitutional features, because I am very much concerned about them.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Connecticut for his observation, Mr. President. Let me say that for the life of me, I cannot understand what the matter of selection of the Vice President by the Presidential candidate or by anyone else has anything to do with the matter of succession. Of course, I am glad to have the benefit of the Senator's observations.

I was present at both the Republican Conventions which the distinguished Senator from Connecticut attended, and there was much interest in the selection of the Vice President in each case, and there were some very close votes in that connection. So I think those who did make that selection gave the matter every consideration. But I wish to point out that we are now considering the matter of succession, not the nomination of a Vice President at a party convention.

It is my opinion that the succession should occur in the manner provided in the amendment, namely, that in the event of the death of the President and Vice President, the order of succession should be, first, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, for the very reason given so forcibly by the Senator from Connecticut, namely, that the Speaker of the House is first elected as a Representative in Congress from his district every two years, upon the issues that are involved, and the segment of the people who vote for that candidate, vote for him because of the platform upon which he stands, and his character, and his ability to carry out his promises. When that candidate becomes a Member of the House of Representatives, representing that district, and thereafter, while a Member of the House, is nominated to be Speaker of the House, if he is elected, he is elected by the votes of a majority of the 434 other Members of the House of Representatives, on both sides of the aisle, Republican and Democratic as well; it is they who select their Speaker.

So I join not only in the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, but also in the able words of the President of the United States: That the Speaker of the House of Representatives is the elected officer of the Government closest to the people. I say "elected;" and for that reason, and only for that reason, I place the Speaker of the House of Representatives ahead of the President pro tempore of the Senate, in the matter of succession.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong the discussion of this matter, and let me say that it may well be that the able Senator from Nebraska has covered this particular point. Nevertheless, let me ask whether it is not a historical and traditional fact that, really, the first President of the United States was the President of the Constitutional Convention; and, as I recall, he came from Delaware.

Mr. WHERRY. Once again I thank the Senator for his observation.

Mr. President, I wish to conclude my discussion of this point with as much force as I possibly can. I say that the only reason why we provide that the succession shall go first to the Speaker of the House of Representatives is because he serves an apprenticeship in the House before he is elected Speaker of the House. We find that all the Speakers who have come up from long years of service are men in whom the House of Representatives has confidence, and are men who are prepared to handle all types of legislation. In view of that fact, and the further fact that they are more closely riveted, I believe, to the principles at the grass roots than is any other elected official of the Government, in short, that the Speaker of the House, as the President has pointed out, is closer to the people—I believe that the succession should go first to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to point out what I think is the fallacy of the Senator's argument on that point. The Senator has been stressing it with a great deal of energy all afternoon. Under our system of government we elect a President for a period of 4 years. From the beginning the people have said that they would like to have the President exercise his theories or philosophies of government uninterrupted for that period of time.

Through the present bill, the Senator from Nebraska is trying to introduce a new theory, one very much like that of the English system. In other words, the other day the President vetoed the labor bill, but his veto was overridden both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, by an overwhelming majority. If that situation had occurred under the British system, the President would have called for a vote of confidence and no doubt there would have been a new President under those conditions.

But under our theory, whether right or wrong, we have proceeded for a century and a half under the principle that once the people elect a President of the United States for a term of 4 years, the political theories and philosophies of that particular person are to apply for 4 years.

However, under this amendment, that situation would be reversed in the event there was a Democratic President and a Republican Congress—the situation which exists at the present time. If something should happen to the President of the United States, after the amendment were enacted into law, overnight a new political party would come into power before the 4 years expired. This should not happen under our present system of free government.

I contend that today of all times in the history of our country, is a time when, in view of the present situation in the world, those who now are in power should continue in power for the period for which they were elected by the people in 1940. That is my answer to the Senator's argument.

Senators can talk about the Speaker of the House of Representatives as being close to the people, and I agree with that point of view. I also point out, likewise, that the President pro tempore of the Senate is close to the people. But that does not meet or fit in with the long-standing governmental theory under which the American people have been operating from the very beginning of our Government. No amendment which the Senator could propose would convince me that we should make a change in the middle of the 4-year period, by adopting an amendment of this kind. I do not believe that is what the people intended to have done, and I do not believe they now intend to have it done. I do not believe they ever expected that a Republican Congress would take over in the middle of the term of a Democratic President; and, likewise, I do not believe that they expected that the reverse would ever occur.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, to permit me to ask a question following the remarks of the learned Senator from Illinois?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I should like to ask if it is not highly improbable that during the 2 years immediately following the election of a President, there would be a President of one political party and a House of Representatives controlled by a majority of another political party. I do not recall an instance of that sort in all the history of the United States. Under our system, that is highly improbable, if not well-nigh impossible.

That means that if the President and the Vice President were to die or become incapacitated during that 2-year period, and if the Speaker of the House of Representatives were then to become President, the chances would be 999 out of 1,000 that he would be of the same political party as the President and Vice President who had died or had become incapacitated.

Mr. President, assuming that the President and Vice President do die or do become incapacitated in the second 2-year period of the Presidential term under an unusual situation such as those obtaining at the present time, when the President is of one political party and the majority of the Congress of another. In the present Congress we have such a situation and one which has not often developed in our history, although it did develop last November. It seems to me that the election last November demonstrated to everyone who has considered the matter that the policies being followed by the administration—that is to say, the President and the Vice President in this particular case—did not meet with the approval of the people. For that reason, the control in Congress was given to a party in opposition to the administration in power. That election was the latest opportunity the people had had to express their opinion in regard to the policies being followed by the administration then in the White House.

Why is there anything wrong with the proposition that if the control of the newly elected Congress should be of a different political complexion than the administration in the White House, the Speaker of the House would then be reflecting more nearly the point of view and opinion of the electorate by and large, than would a President or Vice President, whose administration had been repudiated at the most recent election?

Mr. LUCAS. If I may answer, Mr. President, the argument of the Senator from Connecticut makes no impression upon me whatever, because if the theory laid down by the able Senator from Connecticut is to be followed, a constitutional amendment should be presented providing that when either Republicans or Democrats take over both branches of Congress, it then becomes necessary to have either a Republican or Democratic President in order to carry out the policies of the Congress of the United States at such time.

Mr. BALDWIN. If I may interrupt there, just a moment, Mr. President, it is perfectly apparent, in what has happened in the last 2 weeks, that the administration in the White House and the majority of the Congress more recently elected can be in complete disagreement.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator may draw any conclusions from that situation he desires. Two weeks is a very short time, I will say to my able friend, in which to draw on his imagination or in which to draw any conclusion as to what may or may not happen, but I reiterate, with all the emphasis at my command, that so long as we continue to follow the Constitution of the United States, given to us by the founding fathers, directing that nominees should be elected President for the term of 4 years, the Congress, in my judgment, should not disturb the right of the party in power, whether it be Democratic or Republican, to continue with their theories and their philosophies during the said 4 years; because the people spoke. The people spoke in 1944, right or wrong, and whatever may be said about the congressional election last fall, the people again spoke, but not upon a number of theories and a number of laws and a number of policies, and things that are being done, by the present Congress of the United States.

Of course, the pending matter was not discussed at any time in the 1946 election. I say, with all due deference to my good friend, if the situation were not as it is in both Houses of Congress, the pending bill would not be here today.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Illinois for his contribution. I say emphatically that there is no fallacy in the argument I have presented here in behalf of the succession going to the Speaker of the House. As the distinguished Senator from Connecticut has so ably pointed out, the situation in the first 2 years would be, in 999 times out of 1,000, I think, as the Senator has described it.

Mr. HATCH. No; not that many; that is not the history of the country.

Mr. WHERRY. I could not quote figures that would be too excessive. At any rate, I do not recall an instance in the country's history when it has happened differently. But I will say there is no fallacy in the argument, because if the people in the third year, or in the second year, have elected a Congress, either Democratic or Republican, then it is because the people have renounced the policies of the platform on which the President and the Vice President were elected; and, because Representatives are closer to the people, they should have a President who more nearly represents what the people, at the election and just prior thereto, indicated they wanted. There is no fallacy in that. Whether it be a Democratic or Republican administration make no difference. Such things are about even all the way through. The pending legislation must be viewed on a long-range basis. Of course, it is possible to hurl a charge that it is politics, now, but just as soon as the emergency is over—and I will leave it to the distinguished Senator—we shall forget it; we shall not change it; and then it will go on and on, and nothing will be done about it. The next time perhaps the situation will be reversed. But certainly no one can dispute the fact that the Speaker of the House of Representatives is closer to the people than is any other elective officer. I believe we could get an agreement on that. Whether he has the ability some other person has is another question; but his long service of apprenticeship, the fact that he is elected every 2 years, the fact that he is elected by the entire membership of the Congress, ought to be convincing evidence that there is no other elected officer that is closer to the people. Certainly he is closer than an appointed officer, than the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of the Treasury, or whoever might be named.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I will yield to the minority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Speaker of the House may be closer to the Members of the House than any other officer in the Government, but he cannot be any closer to the people, because he represents only one district, just as any other Representative does.

Mr. WHERRY. I have covered that.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator covered that?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know whether the Senator covered it correctly or not. I was called out of the Chamber at the time the Senator covered it. I may uncover it when I come to my remarks. Has the Senator discussed, or has anybody argued, whether the pending bill solves this problem: The Constitution of the United States requires the President of the United States to be native born and 35 years of age. The Constitution does not require the Speaker of the House either to be native born or 35 years of age. The Constitution does not even require him to be a Member of the House.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will yield, it is unnecessary to go into that argument. On page 6, line 18, in the first subsection, it is provided that he must be qualified to be President of the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, if the Speaker of the House is not 35, and is not native born, then the bill is a nullity so far as he is concerned?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; the office then passes on to the next in line, the President pro tempore.

Mr. BARKLEY. The President pro tempore can come into the Senate at the age of 30, and he does not have to be native born. He is required to be 30 years of age. It is provided in the bill that he must be qualified. So, if the House should elect an unqualified Speaker, and if the Senate should elect an unqualified President pro tempore, neither of them could become President?

Mr. WHERRY. It would then go to the Secretary of State. This is exactly correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then the succession would finally pass to the Secretary of State, as the third in line?

Mr. WHERRY. The situation described by the minority leader would never happen.

Mr. BARKLEY. Perhaps that is so; but, under the Constitution, it could happen?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; it could happen temporarily, only, because it would take but a very few minutes for the House to elect a new Speaker if the Speaker did not qualify or if he resigned. The Senate could do the same thing with the President pro tempore; or, if he did not qualify, then the Secretary of State could continue to act as President until the President pro tempore qualified.

Mr. BARKLEY. During those few minutes, when the House would have to discharge its Speaker and reelect one, who would be President?

Mr. WHERRY. The Secretary of State.

Mr. BARKLEY. He could be President, then, for a few minutes, and then the House would unhorse him?

Mr. WHERRY. He would serve only for the emergency. The bill provides that there shall be no time when there will not be an officer eligible to become President of the United States, and we are having difficulty now with that very provision.

The bill provides that whenever a Speaker becomes qualified, he is the first in the line of succession. If he cannot qualify according to the terms of the Constitution, the people would not want him as President of the United States, even though he were a Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BARKLEY. They absolutely would not. I would not want him as President, anyhow.

Mr. WHERRY. If he were unable to qualify, then the next in line would be the President pro tempore. I cannot conceive of either a Speaker or a President pro tempore serving in that office who would not qualify as President of the United States. But if he did not qualify, then the Secretary of State would be called upon to serve during the emergency, or until either the Speaker or the President pro tempore could qualify to act as President of the United States.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I would like to ask a question, as a matter of interest. As I understand, under the Constitution there are certain age requirements and residence requirements for both Senators and Members of the House of Representatives. Is there any law whatever that makes provision for any requirements as to the qualifications of the Secretary of State, who is an appointee of the President?

Mr. WHERRY. None whatever.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I will answer the question: none whatever.

Mr. HATCH. I did not want to answer that question.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will pardon me, I wanted to answer the question asked by the Senator from Connecticut, and I would like to say, with all the force that is in me, that there is none whatever. I want to thank the Senator for bringing that to my attention. One more thing, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Cabinet officers are not elected by the people; they are appointed. How anyone can say that there is a defect in the line of succession suggested in the bill, I just cannot understand, because the Speaker is closer to the people today than any other official.

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

Mr. WHERRY. The Speaker is closer to the people, he is elected by the people, he is an elective officer, and the Secretary of State is not an elective officer. He is appointed, and he does not have any different qualifications than has the Speaker.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator, to ask one other question?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I am always glad to yield to the minority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the event the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect should both die, after they have been elected by the electoral college, and before assuming the duties of office, in January, what would happen? There is no law that authorizes the reassembling of the electoral college. They are like the salmon, to which I referred the other day; they spawn, and they die. The electoral college elects a President, and then it dies, and nobody has power to reconvene it. If both the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect should die, what would happen?

Mr. WHERRY. The provision in the bill, which I think answers the question, will be found on page 4, beginning with line 19, that, in the event a President fails to qualify, or a Vice President fails to qualify, then the succession goes to the Speaker. It goes to the Speaker, then to the President pro tempore, then to the Secretary of State.

Mr. BARKLEY. Suppose the Congress has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Congress had expired, and if there were no Speaker, and if it should happen that there were no President pro tempore of the Senate, then under the provisions of the bill the Secretary of State would become the acting President until such disability or disqualification was removed.

Mr. BARKLEY. The bill provides that the position of acting President shall finally come to the Secretary of State, but it makes it just as hard as possible for the Secretary of State to become acting President. Everyone else has to die before the succession comes to him.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Kentucky raises technical points which may never arise. The bill provides for protection against every emergency that can be conceived of so that organized civil government shall continue.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not asking these questions facetiously. I am asking them because I believe there are many gaps in the whole situation which, fortunately, we have never had to bridge, but which ought to be considered, so that all the holes and all the gaps to a legitimate succession to the Presidency may be closed, either before an individual takes his office or after he takes his office, and it seems to me that instead of bringing before the Senate a bill which contains piecemeal legislation, the whole question ought to be gone into and investigated by the committees of the Senate in order that we may fill every gap that may conceivably exist in respect to an emergency or exigency such as exist at present.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have the highest regard for the Minority Leader, and I believe I have several times this afternoon answered the points raised by him. I agree that there is no perfect piece of legislation. I suppose there may be some gaps which are not provided for by the pending bill. I want the distinguished Senator to know, however, that the bill does not represent piecemeal legislation. To begin with, the bill contains the legislation recommended by the President of the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. I may say at that point that I was opposed to the proposal when the Democrats were in power. I was opposed to it when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] was Speaker

of the House, and when the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] was President pro tempore of the Senate. I was opposed to the proposal then just as I am opposed to it now. So no one can accuse me of having any political bias in regard to it.

Mr. WHERRY. I have not accused the distinguished minority leader of anything.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is getting ready to. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I see the Senator from Vermont is in his seat. I know what he wants to propose. I have a matter which I am anxious to speak of, but I would rather the Senator from Vermont were allowed to proceed now. I can take up my matter later.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont, providing the legislation he wishes to propose is not controversial. I have been very lenient, I will say, in connection with my presentation respecting the succession bill. I want to accommodate every Senator. I deeply appreciate the questions that have been asked respecting the succession bill, of which I have made a considerable study. If in any respects the legislation can be improved, we shall be very glad to attempt to do so. I am satisfied that the legislation has been carefully analyzed and studied. We have carefully analyzed the exhaustive study and work done by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary in 1856; we have carefully analyzed the work of the committee in 1886. Our research men and our counsel and the committee members have carefully analyzed the changes that have resulted from the adoption of the lame-duck amendment, which changes completely the status of the office of the Speaker and President pro tempore during the years for which they are elected.

I think the bill provides a complete answer to the question as to what line of succession is needed in order to continue an orderly Government, with a possible definition of disability. The matter of disability was not contained in the provisions of the law of 1792, was not contained in the law of 1886. Until someone can satisfactorily define what a disability is, and draft provisions to compel a person having a disability to vacate an office to which he is elected, even though he thinks he is not suffering from any disability, I think a constitutional question will exist, one which has not been solved. But I am satisfied that aside from the question of disability, the matter is handled fairly well in the bill before us, that is, that a Speaker does not have to resign, or that a President pro tempore does not have to resign, if he feels in his own mind that the disability is only temporary. I think that making the decision optional with the Speaker and the President pro tempore practically solves the question of disability.

As I said before, never in the history of the country have we had to make a decision of that kind. The matter of disability is not a part of this particular legislation in connection with Presidential succession. I agree, however, with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that it is a perplexing problem.

I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Vermont with the understanding that the matter which he proposes to bring up will not be controversial and consume any considerable length of time.

SUPPORT FOR WOOL

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I ask unanimous consent to report Senate bill 1498, to provide support for wool, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the report is received.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, this new bill, ordered by the committee to be favorably reported, provides for support for wool at the 1946 support price. It gives the Commodity Credit Corporation authority to dispose of the accumulated wool stocks, amounting to some 450,000,000 pounds, at less than parity, if it is found necessary to do so.

The President's veto message on the wool bill was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The committee met at 2:30 by permission of the Senate. It was decided it would be futile to attempt to pass the legislation over the President's veto. Therefore, no action was taken on the veto. Instead the committee voted unanimously to report favorably Senate bill 1498, introduced by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON].

The bill contains just two provisions. It puts a support price on wool equal to the 1946 support price, until December 31, 1948, and permits the Commodity Credit Corporation to dispose of the stocks on hand at whatever price they have to sell them for in order to get rid of them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). The bill will be reported by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1498) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Senate bill 1498 is a bill to provide support for wool. The President today vetoed the wool bill, which was the result of the conference between certain members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and certain members of the House Committee on Agriculture, and agreed to by both the House and the Senate recently. The new bill, S. 1498, is the same as the conference report with one exception, that is, that section 4 of the conference report bill has been omitted from Senate bill 1498. The new bill accepts the House amendment to the support price provision of the Senate bill. The Senate bill carried a support price of not less than the price paid in 1946. The House amended that by striking out the words "not less than" and merely inserting the price of 1946.

The only other provision in which there is any change from the original Senate bill, which was amended slightly by the House, is in section 3 of Senate bill 1498. The original Senate bill provided that:

> The Commodity Credit Corporation may, without regard to restrictions imposed upon it by any law, dispose of any wool produced prior to January 1, 1949, at prices which will permit such wool to be sold in competition with imported wool. The disposition of any accumulated stock under the provisions of this section, however, shall be made at such rate and in such manner as will avoid disruption of the domestic market.

That was in the original Senate bill 814. Section 3 of the new bill is the House amendment, which reads:

> The Commodity Credit Corporation may, until December 31, 1948, dispose of wool owned by it without regard to any restrictions imposed upon it by law.

Those are the only differences between the new bill and the original Senate bill 814.

Section 4 has been omitted. It was because of that section, Mr. President, that the President of the United States said, in his veto message, he was forced to veto the bill. That was a provision giving the President the option to impose import fees or quotas on the importation of wool.

I do not think there is any need for me to say anything more. I hope the Senate will accept the bill, as some such bill is most urgently required. The shearing of the 1947 wool clip is already 80 percent completed. Most of the wool is lying sacked in warehouses all over the country. In many instances the small producer has been forced to sell his clip at some 10 to 15 cents below the price he would receive under this measure. It is an urgent measure, and I again remind the Senate that wool is a critical material. That was brought home to me forcibly this morning when I was sitting as a member of the subcommittee considering the War Department appropriation bill, and we heard the representatives of the National Guard crying for new uniforms. They said they needed 300,000 woolen uniforms for the troops. I could not help thinking that if our domestic wool producers were put out of business, as they might well be unless we have some legislation to keep them in business, the result, in case of war, might be disastrous.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Senator from Wyoming have discussed this bill with me. I shall not object to its consideration at this time. However, I should like to point out that there are several factors concerning the bill which I believe do not make for the best type of legislation.

As the Senator from Wyoming has stated, the bill does three things. First, it sets the price of domestic wool at the minimum of the prices obtained in the year 1946. Second, it permits the Com-

modity Credit Corporation to buy wool at this price until December 31, 1948——

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. The Senator from Massachusetts said "at the minimum of the prices obtained in the year 1946." It is at the 1946 prices.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is what I intended to say.

Second, it permits the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy wool until December 31, 1948, at the 1946 prices. Third, it permits the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell the wool it has on hand at less than it cost the Commodity Credit Corporation.

I respectfully point out that the bill in effect does three things. First, it puts and keeps the Government in the domestic wool market. In reality, it makes the Goverment the sole buyer of the domestic wool crop unless the price exceeds the price of 1946. Secondly, it is the only commodity, I believe, which the Government buys at a price greater than parity. That is a new formula for Government purchases of commodities. Third, I wish to point out that it puts the cost of clothing, so far as wool is concerned, at a high price, and will maintain it there.

It is fair to say that the prices of wool today are high. It is fair to say that the price of wool is substantially above the 1946 levels. But this bill means that that price will be obtained until December 1948 and that if the prices fall off at all, the Government must stay in the wool market and become the purchaser of wool which is produced domestically. It will then sell such wool at a loss in order to compete with the foreign market.

For these reasons we who come from Massachusetts, where the wool trade is to a large extent concentrated, and where there are large textile mills, certainly do not like this bill. But the Senate has debated it in full in the past. We have stated our objections. The bill is substantially the bill which the Senate originally passed. That bill was amended in the House to include the tariff provision, and with the tariff provision the bill has now been vetoed.

For these reasons I shall not object to unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. However, I still say that if I had my way the bill would not become law in its present form.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. There is one thing which I should like to mention in connection with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. He referred to the high prices of wool clothing. I wonder if the Senator realizes how little wool there is in a suit of clothes. Take, for example, a three-piece suit of clothes of the finest wool, heavy weight, winter clothing. At the outside, the total weight of wool in that suit is 2½ pounds. If the support price were doubled and the manufacturers had to pay double the price they pay today, it could not increase the price of the Senator's suit more than $1.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, there is nothing in the bill but what has been considered and overwhelmingly approved by the Senate earlier in the session. For that reason I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to point out that when we pass this bill it is not so much a question of the cost of this particular piece of legislation as it is a question of establishing the precedent of guaranteeing to one group of farmers for 2 years the highest prices which they received for their commodities during wartime. We now have on the statute books laws guaranteeing prices on certain basic commodities, according to a parity formula. This proposal exceeds that. Other groups of farmers now under the parity formula have just as much right to ask the Government to guarantee 125 or 150 percent of parity as do the wool producers.

Also, at least one-third of our agriculture is not under any support program at all, but is on a free market. To me it is not fair to pick out one small group of farmers and try to enact legislation to take care of them at the expense of the rest of the country.

During recent years much has been said on both sides of the aisle about returning to a free-enterprise system. If we pass this bill, we shall be entirely eliminating all the wool buyers of the country and placing the purchase of wool entirely in the hands of the Government, as was pointed out by the Senator from Massachusetts. Therefore, at this time I object to unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. Do I correctly understand that objection was made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Delaware registered an objection.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I was hopeful that no objection would be made. I wish now to express my thanks to the Senator from Vermont and other members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for the sympathy with which they have treated this subject, and the promptness with which they have acted. I trust that the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] will make a motion at the earliest possible moment to take up this bill and dispose of it.

Mr. AIKEN. I can assure the Senator from New Mexico that I would make such a motion, but I do not care to impose upon the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and ask him to yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to comply with the Senator's request.

Mr. AIKEN. The small wool growers of the West will have to continue to be at the mercy of the speculators.

The Government has supported other commodities at higher-than-parity prices. All during the war it supported poultry at higher-than-parity prices. It has supported dairy products at higher-than-parity prices. It has supported other commodities. We are not singling out wool.

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

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is willing to yield to me at this time for the purpose of making a motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1498.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not wish to be in the position of holding up the wool growers of western Nebraska. I think I have been as lenient as anyone could be with my time. I have yielded time and again for more than 10 days. I have permitted other legislation to displace the unfinished business.

We have a unanimous-consent agreement to vote tomorrow afternoon at 2 o'clock. I feel that Members of the Senate ought to be able to read my speech in the RECORD. I am convinced that we should enact the pending legislation. I do not wish to be placed in the position tomorrow afternoon at 2 o'clock of having Senators say, "We have not had ample time to discuss this question." I am perfectly agreeable to permitting the Senate to do what it wishes to do, but I do not want Members of the Senate to be under any misapprehension when the vote comes tomorrow. I do not want the impression to be gained that I have in any way delayed consideration of the succession bill.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest that if the motion is made now, in all probability it will be agreed to. There seems to be a disposition on the part of all Senators except the Senator who objected to allow the bill to be considered. I hope the Senator from Nebraska will yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, the only question pending is a unanimous-consent request for the present consideration of the bill. My question is this: If the wool bill is taken up by unanimous consent, will those of us who do not like it have an opportunity to vote "no" on the passage of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN obtained the floor.

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

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if I have the floor, before yielding to the Senator from Delaware I wish to say that when it comes to a matter of saving money, the United States Government has probably $170,000,000 tied up in 460,000,000 pounds of wool. That wool could be released and made available for use if we could only pass this bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have no objection whatever to the Senate considering the bill. However, I do not want it done under a unanimous-consent agreement for a vote on the passage of the bill. If the Senate wishes to consider the bill at this time, I am not planning to delay its passage, if the Senator will make a motion to bring the bill before the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. There is a unanimous-consent request to take up this particular bill. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Vermont if it involves final passage of the bill this afternoon?

Mr. AIKEN. It does.

Mr. WHERRY. Then am I correct in thinking it would require a quorum call before unanimous consent is made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that a quorum call will be required if final passage of the bill is intended this afternoon.

Mr. AIKEN. Then, Mr. President, I move that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate bill 1498.

Mr. BARKLEY. It seems to me that the ruling of the Chair is a little different from what it should have been. If unanimous consent is given for consideration of the bill by unanimous consent it does not thereafter require a roll call to pass it, or even a quorum call, unless some Senator makes the point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] incorporated in his unanimous-consent request a declaration of intention to pass the bill today.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was a mere declaration of intention, but it was not a part of the unanimous-consent request, as I understand it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood that it was a part of the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BARKLEY. That would be fixing a definite time for a vote, which would require a quorum call, unless it were waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont, as the Chair understands, can withdraw the unanimous-consent request in the form in which he entered it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, inasmuch as the unanimous-consent request was not granted, anyway, I subsequently made the motion that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1498. I do not know of any protracted speeches which are to be made for or against the bill. It seems to me that we can get a vote on it so that those who want to keep their record of opposition clear would have a chance to make that record in a very short time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it seems to me that we might vote on it without any further discussion, and it can probably be passed, as it was passed before, without much delay.

A parliamentary inquiry. If it is done by way of motion, will it or will it not set aside, not temporarily, but set aside, the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would set aside the pending business until 12 o'clock tomorrow. But there is nothing to prevent the pending business, which then would be set aside, from being taken up again this afternoon.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as I understand the parliamentary situation, the motion made by the Senator from Vermont would only displace the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the Chair's understanding.

Mr. WHERRY. And when it is concluded the Senate will return to the pending business.

Mr. BARKLEY. Why can we not vote on it now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the motion of the Senator from Vermont to be that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1498.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1498) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, there is one statement which I should like to correct, and that is the statement of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] in relation to the support price enjoyed by poultry farmers. I should like to call to his attention the fact that poultry farmers do not enjoy a support price at all on broilers. The support price on other poultry is the lowest of any support price on any of the basic commodities. In the western States farmers enjoy some support price on their fowls, but in the East there is no support price on poultry, or turkeys, nor has it ever been requested. Wool is the only agricultural product to my knowledge which has ever had a support price so far in excess of parity level. In other words, we are asked to establish a precedent if we pass the wool bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield for a question on that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Is not this an aftermath of the war condition.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is true.

Mr. THYE. It is a situation brought about by the war?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is true but the same situation exists as to other agricultural products.

Mr. THYE. It is a situation brought about by the fact that the waters around Great Britain were blocked because of the war, and the wool coming from Australia had to come to the United States. Then, because there was need for a high inventory of wool, Great Britain as well as the United States built a large inventory. With the ending of the war we commenced to market that wool. Great Britain's high inventory came to the United States just a few cents under our own domestic wool price, with the result that the Commodity Credit Corporation's holding of domestic wool was left on the shelf, and the imported wool took the market day by day, month by month. We must either pass legislation like this or we shall have a situation in which we have 460,000,000 pounds of wool going on the market at the level at which it is today, and as the market becomes depressed because of that huge volume, the Federal Government will be holding indefinitely the wool which the Commodity Credit Corporation now has.

So I say again to the Senator that it is an aftermath of the war, and we might as well pass the legislation now. We do not want to break every man in the sheep business. Unless we want to break them we should pass this legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. He has said that the situation is an aftermath of the war. But the war was a world-wide affair and all of the farmers in the United States participated in it. I cannot understand why he should suggest that we select one group of farmers and propose to extend to them for two more years wartime prices for their crop, when we are not supporting this other group of farmers either at parity or at cost of production. Under this bill we would be supporting the price of wool at the highest price in the history of the wool industry.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator will yield for another question——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The Senator will admit that the price is not an unjust or unfair price because it happens to be parity. We find ourselves, after the ending of the war, with a situation which the war brought about, when we had to have a high inventory of wool on tap. Because of the condition in which Great Britain found itself at the conclusion of the war, with approximately 2,000,000,000 pounds of wool on hand, it placed that wool on our market, which compelled our producers to go to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the Commodity Credit Corporation had to buy the wool and maintain parity for the wool producer. That is why the Commodity Credit Corporation has the 460,000,000 pounds of wool today.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator is perfectly right. The reason that we have 460,000,000 pounds of wool is because the Commodity Credit Corporation was buying wool at an artificially high price, and as the Senator pointed out also, Australia was putting wool on this market at just a few cents below the price which was fixed, and as a result most of the woolen mills in the country, instead of using American wool, were using British wool, which we were buying at 1 or 2 cents below the high price established. The result is that we have 400,000,000 or 500,000,000 pounds of wool, or enough to last us almost a year, and we are still using British wools, to a large extent. To cor-

rect this situation, as I see it, it is proposed that we continue for 18 months in the same direction, hoping that something will happen in the meantime whereby we can correct a situation which was brought about by the same piece of legislation which it is now proposed we extend.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. The Senator has stated that there is a stock pile of approximately 1 year's consumption in the United States. The consumption in the United States this year is around 1,000,000,000 pounds, and it was approximately that last year. Of that 1,000,000,000 pounds, 800,000,000 pounds is being shipped in from foreign countries.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But a large proportion of that which is included in consumption is reexported.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. No; that is the consumption in this country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] quoted the figures from the Department of Agriculture last week when we discussed the bill. At that time I placed in the RECORD figures showing that we were importing and consuming foreign wool at inflated prices while our own wool was backing up in storage. That condition is economically unsound.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. The consumption of domestic wool and imported wool in the United States had for many years not been below 600,000,000 pounds. We ourselves were producing 450,000,000 pounds before the war, but owing to the conditions which exist and which this bill is designed to remedy, the wool-producing industry in this country dropped from 450,000,000 pounds to approximately 300,000,000 pounds. This bill is designed to try to bring about the figure which prevailed in prewar days.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator from Wyoming feel that we can offer a reasonable explanation to the other farmers as to why we cannot guarantee to them a price similar to that?

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am ready to yield the floor in a few minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Delaware asked a question as to what explanation could be given to the other farmers of the United States. The explanation is entirely simple. With respect to no other agricultural product have we the situation which exists with respect to wool. The British Government has established a state monopoly for the sale of British-produced wool in the United States, and unless this bill is passed we shall be condemning the individual wool producers of the United States to competition with the British state monopoly, a selling monopoly that exists with respect to no other agricultural commodity. It is a complete justification for the action which we ask.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to ask the Senator from Wyoming this question. When the President vetoed the legislation which was sent to him recently, did he not veto the instrument by which we might prevent the situation which the Senator is discussing?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. When the President vetoed the bill he said that if it were in the form in which it had been introduced by my colleague, he would have signed it. So we hope the Senator will permit the Senate to proceed on that basis.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have no intention of blocking the consideration of the bill at this time. I shall vote against the bill because I think it would have a highly undesirable effect, for it does establish a precedent of taking care of one group of farmers at wartime prices for their product, while at the same time other groups of farmers would be operating in a free market.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate for more than 2 minutes further. I merely wish to say that I oppose this bill and shall vote against it for the reasons I have already stated, and for the additional reason that I believe it will result, as the Senator from Delaware has pointed out, in a very substantial cost to the Government. How many millions of dollars it will cost the Government no one can say at the present time, because no one knows what will be the price of wool in the next year and a half. But presumably the 460,000,000-plus pounds of domestic wool which is in the hands of the Government will have to be sold, and a substantial amount will have to be sold at a loss.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. GREEN] and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 4, it is proposed to strike out "December 31, 1948", and insert "June 30, 1948."

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, it seems to me that this bill, which again is hurriedly brought before us, is at best a matter of extreme controversy between two forces that are materially affected by it, namely, the producers of wool, on the one hand, and the manufacturers who use wool, on the other hand. I come from a section of the country where the product of the wool growers is used in manufacturing. We are advised by our folks that this support legislation is unnecessary and undesirable. The Senator from Massachusetts has expressed his opinion regarding his constituents, and I may say that ours are similarly situated.

It seems to me that since we are dealing with something that is of an emergency nature, we would be dealing quite fairly if we were to pass support legislation which would take care of the wool growers until June 30, 1948. The Congress will be in session again beginning in January 1948, and it will then have ample time to look into the supply situation, the price situation, the views of the growers, and the views of the manufacturers.

So it seems to me that it would be only a fair compromise of an issue which is highly controversial, to say the least, for us to set the date of termination of this support price measure as of June 30, 1948, instead of December 31, 1948. Therefore, I have offered the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to say, briefly, that I am fearful that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH] and his colleague [Mr. GREEN] have not read the bill. The amendment will not in the slightest degree affect the price at which the manufacturers of Rhode Island may purchase wool, because one of the principal portions of this measure is to be found in section 3, reading as follows:

> The Commodity Credit Corporation may, until December 31, 1948, dispose of wool owned by it without regard to any restriction imposed upon it by law.

The effect of that provision is that the Commodity Credit Corporation may sell this wool competitively with foreign wool, so that the price of the foreign wool will govern the price at which the Commodity Credit Corporation disposes of the domestic wool, and the manufacturers of New England will not be injured in that respect at all.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to point out to the Senator the statement he made just a few minutes ago about the English trading corporation. I most respectfully disagree with what the Senator has just said; and I do so for the following reason, and I should like to ask the Senator whether there is merit in it: If the domestic price of wool is held up to the 1946 value, and if one foreign corporation controlled by the English authorities is trading with us, obviously they will keep their price higher than they would if there were a free market, and if the domestic supply sold at a lower price.

We do not want to take a floor away from the domestic producers of wool. We in New England believe that certainly they should have a floor, but we do not believe that it should be so high that the prices of foreign products, as well as our own products, will be kept at an artificial level.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I say to the Senator from Massachusetts that there cannot be a free market as long as the British selling monopoly exists, so that portion of the Senator's argument is out.

With respect to the second portion of his argument, as I see it, let me say that the British selling monopoly will reduce its price in order to take whatever portion of the domestic market it can take; and under this bill the Commodity Credit Corporation will proceed to meet the reduction of the British selling monopoly, with the effect, in my judgment, that the manufacturers will receive a much better price than the one they are entitled to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island. Its effect would be to give the Texas sheep growers the support price for 1948, but to deny it to the Montana sheep growers, because the Texas sheep growers would get their sheep sheared in time to get the wool to market before June 30, which is the date proposed by the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island, but the Montana and Wyoming and the

other Rocky Mountain wool growers, who do not finish shearing until June, would be denied the support price which the amendment would grant to growers in the more southern States. Therefore, I shall oppose the amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island. It seems to me that the entire question of the support program must be reviewed in 1948. The Steagall amendments, which provide parity for not only one commodity but many agricultural commodities, expire in 1948, so at that time that question must be reviewed. The Commodity Credit Corporation will expire in 1948, and at that time the entire question of the renewal of that Corporation, as well as the period of time during which its life shall be extended, must be examined and studied, and at that time we must reestablish it, if there is to be such legislation after the year 1948.

For that reason, it seems to me inconsistent to establish the date of termination of this particular support price as of June 30, when all the other support prices of the agricultural program are now established under different dates.

In view of the question which the able junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] raised once before about the support price on wool, let me say that there are support prices on many agricultural commodities. The Senator has in mind the more recent potato-support price, but in the near future he will hear much about the peanut-support price, and it concerns the Eastern States.

So I suggest that the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Rhode Island would be somewhat inconsistent with the entire agricultural program as now provided by the Steagall amendments.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to say this about the amendment, that in the pending bill it is proposed to confer upon the Commodity Credit Corporation power to carry out the supporting of this product during all the next year. I should like to call attention to the fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation ceases to exist on June 30, 1948. I wonder what position we would be in with these conflicting dates.

Mr. THYE. It was extended to December 31.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think that should be checked. I understood it was possibly June 30. Anyway, I considered what position we would be in if we were to extend this law until December, and, at the same time, the Commodity Credit Corporation ceases to exist on June 30. Could the Senator from Vermont answer that question?

Mr. THYE. If the Senator would care to have me answer that question, relative to the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Senate has passed the bill, and the House Banking Committee has reported it favorably today, so that there is no question that the bill will be passed, extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation until December 31, to comply with the provisions of the Steagall amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The truth of the matter is, we are conferring upon an agency which does not exist power to carry out the proposed law; is not that correct?

Mr. THYE. It would be hardly conceivable for me, as a Member of the Senate, that the Congress, having passed a measure under which the producer geared himself to the high production he attained in order to meet the war demands upon him, would fail to make possible a continuance of the provision of the Steagall amendment, that would assure Congress carrying out that which Congress undertook in previous acts.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not suggesting that we would fail to do it, but I am merely suggesting that legislation is being proposed before that has been done. We have the cart before the horse.

Mr. AIKEN. The reason the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation was extended 1 year instead of 2 was that, under the law passed by Congress last year, the Commodity Credit Corporation is required to write and take out a Federal charter before July 1, 1948, and therefore it was impossible to extend it for more than 1 year.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still open for amendment. If there be no amendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before the so-called wool legislation was taken up I was engaged in a discussion of the succession bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that, because of the action that has just been taken, there is no pending business, and it is suggested to the Chair that the Senator from Nebraska should move to consider the succession bill.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now resume the consideration of Senate bill 564, the succession bill.

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

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 564) to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President, in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, prior to the consideration of the so-called wool bill, the minority leader propounded to me a question. During my attempt to answer the question, the Senator made a statement that I was about to accuse him of something, I am not sure what. I should like to say, as genially as possible, that I was not accusing the minority leader of anything, and that I protest the fact that he feels that he can read my mind. I was about to complete the answer to the question. I am sorry the Senator is not on the floor.

As I recall the Senator's question, it was this: If a President-elect and a Vice President-elect died, how would the Congress be convened? How would a Speaker and a President pro tempore be obtained to fill the office of President? I should like to point out to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that, having considered the changes in the Constitution since 1886, eliminating those hurdles, I have in my prepared speech the answer to his question. But, because the Senator asked it at this point, I should like to answer, briefly.

Section 2 of the twentieth amendment to the Constitution provides:

> The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall begin at noon on the 3d of January, unless they shall by law appoint a different day.

So that Congress now assembles on the 3d day of January. The Senate would be in session. Another thing that I want to state as a premise, before answering the Senator's question, is that a President would be serving as of January 3; because the Senator's query runs only to what would happen if a President elect and a Vice President elect should die before qualifying, before taking office, but after their election.

A President performs the duties of the Presidency until when? Until January 20. So that, in the intervening time from January 3, when the Congress is assembled, the Senate, by rule of the Senate, under the twentieth amendment, on January 3, would become organized, and a President pro tempore would be elected. The President pro tempore would be qualified. I mean he would be elected, and, as far as the necessary organization is concerned, he would be available to succeed, in the event that the Speaker of the House of Representatives were not qualified.

The same thing would be true relative to a Speaker of the House of Representatives. The House is assembled. The Speaker would be elected. The President-elect and the Vice President-elect do not take office until the 20th of January. So that, available in the line of succession would be the Speaker of the House of Representatives. I regret that the minority leader is not present, because it is impossible to imagine a situation that would not be covered by the pending legislation. The succession would be provided for in any emergency.

It is not merely a question of whether it is the present Speaker, or whether it is a Democrat or a Republican. The situation requires a long range view, with provisions to meet any emergency—the emergency that now exists, and the emergency that might exist within another year or two, under situations that may not be exactly similar, so far as parties are concerned.

Let me restate for the benefit of the distinguished minority leader, who is not present, that a President will hold over until January 20, that the Congress, under the twentieth amendment, as laid down in the Constitution, convenes on January 3. A Speaker would be elected in the organization of Congress, likewise a President pro tempore. In the event

that either the Speaker or the President pro tempore could not qualify during that intervening period, then the succession would go to the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State holds over until his successor is appointed, so there is no gap, there is no hurdle to be crossed, that has not been covered by the proposed amendment, which provides for succession through the Speaker, the President pro tempore, and then on to the Cabinet officers.

Mr. President, I think that I have given the complete answer to the queries that have been directed to me, relative to the succession. I should like to call attention to the changes in the rules of the Senate, that bolster the case and bolster the amendment that I have offered. As to the change in the rules of the Senate, I have before me a memorandum from the Parliamentarian, which reads as follows:

TENURE OF PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

From the First Congress until March 12, 1890, in the various absences of the Vice President, the Senate on each occasion chose a President pro tempore, who in each instance held the office only until the Vice President returned and resumed the chair.

Because of the law providing for the succession to the office of the President of the United States, which was in force prior to 1886, it was important that there be an incumbent of the office of President pro tempore during the sine die adjournments of the Senate. In order to permit the Senate to choose a President pro tempore whose tenure of office would extend beyond the final adjournment, it was the practice of the incumbent Vice President, shortly before such an adjournment, to vacate the chair and absent himself from the Senate for the remainder of the session. The Senate would then proceed to choose a President pro tempore. With only four exceptions, which occurred in the early Congresses, the tenure of the President pro tempore thus chosen was not terminated by the adjournment of the session, but continued into the next session until the Vice President resumed the chair, or until the Senate chose another for the office.

At the short, or final, session of a Congress, which expired on March 4 of the odd years, the Senate would choose a hold-over Senator, due to the fact that the expiration of the term of a Senator automatically terminated his tenure as President pro tempore, even though he had been reelected to the Senate for the ensuing term. Where there was a vacancy in the office of Vice President, the President pro tempore continued to hold his office until the Senate elected a successor, or until his term of office as Senator expires.

On March 12, 1890, the Senate adopted the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That it is competent for the Senate to elect a President pro tempore, who shall hold the office during the pleasure of the Senate and until another is elected, and shall execute the duties thereof during all future absences of the Vice President until the Senate otherwise order."

Since the above date the President pro tempore has held the office continuously during the pleasure of the Senate, irrespective of absences of the Vice President. As above stated, however, if his term as Senator expired his tenure as President pro tempore was simultaneously terminated. This situation prevailed on several occasions since 1890, with the result that there would be a vacancy in the office from March 4, following the adjournment of a Congress, until the Senate would fill the vacancy in the session which convened in the following December, unless a special session of the Congress, or the Senate only, was called by the President. A vacancy might also arise during a sine die adjournment by reason of the death of the President pro tempore or of his resignation as a Senator.

On February 6, 1933, the twentieth, or so-called lame-duck amendment, became a part of the Constitution of the United States. This amendment provided that the terms of Senators and Representatives should begin on January 3 instead of March 4, and that the regular sessions of Congress should also begin at that hour. Under this amendment, therefore, except in the case of the death of the President pro tempore during an adjournment, or of his resignation as a Senator, there can normally be only a brief period of time that a vacancy will exist in this office, and that would occur when the term of the President pro tempore as a Senator expired, inasmuch as it is reasonable to assume that the Senate very shortly after it convened would proceed to fill the vacancy.

That is the statement of the Parliamentarian, which verifies the statement I made to the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from New Mexico relative to this particular situation, that the twentieth amendment, the "lame duck" amendment, provides that a Representative is elected and serves until the 3d day of January at noon, at which time his term of office expires. The same is true with respect to the President pro tem. It is only in the time intervening, after the convening of Congress, during which the Senate and the House organize, that we are without the services of a Speaker or a President pro tem.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Prior to the adoption of the twentieth amendment, the terms of all Members of the House of Representatives expired on March 4 of the odd years. There would therefore be a vacancy in the office of Speaker until the next Congress met (ordinarily in the following December) and election of that official was had by the House. This situation obtained in the House every 2 years. Where the Speaker died, or the office for any other reason was vacated, during a sine die adjournment or recess other than the short session ending on March 4, the vacancy would continue until a Speaker was elected at the next session.

Since the adoption of the twentieth amendment, however, a vacancy in the office of Speaker occurring by expiration of a Congress is analogous to that of the termination of the office of President pro tempore by reason of the expiration of his term as Senator, and usually would be of very short duration, inasmuch as the Representatives-elect, after the roll call of States and the ascertainment that a quorum is present, can immediately proceed to the election of a Speaker. This is done prior to the administration of the oath to the Members-elect.

So the situation which arose in January in the Senate over the question of confirming the Senator from Mississippi, Mr. Bilbo, would not arise in the House. My statement to the minority leader that the House would be without the services of a Speaker for only a few minutes is not an exaggerated one. The credentials of the Members are presented to the proper officer of the House, and if there is any question respecting the credentials of any Member he stands aside until after the oaths of the others are taken. Immediately thereafter the House is organized. So a new Speaker would be chosen within a very short time.

Thus, the first point of contention raised by the proponents of the Succession Law of 1886 is eliminated.

The second point of contention made by Senator Hoar, as the proponent of the act of 1886, which is the present law, that the President pro tempore of the Senate should not continue as the President pro tempore of the Senate and act as President of the United States at the same time, which argument would be equally applicable to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, is covered in the bill I propose by the provision requiring the Speaker of the House of Representatives or the President pro tempore of the Senate to resign prior to entering upon the duties of President.

I am in accord with the views of those Members of Congress who heretofore took the position that it was awkward and repugnant to one's sense of propriety for the President of the United States to sit in the chair of the Senate and preside over, and listen to discussions in regard to his own nominations, and so forth.

I likewise agree with those Members of Congress who heretofore have taken the position that in view of the constitutional provision against a Member of either House of the Congress holding any other Federal office, it is improper for the Speaker of the House of Representatives or the President pro tempore of the Senate to continue in such office and assume the office of the Presidency. It was for this reason that I inserted in the proposed bill a specific provision requiring the resignation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives or the President pro tempore of the Senate, as the case may be, prior to assuming the office of the Presidency.

The argument has been presented that it is unfair to require of the Speaker of the House of Representatives or the President pro tempore of the Senate that they resign at the time of assuming the office of acting President, particularly in those cases where the reason for taking over the office is the disability of a President.

This argument, in my mind, has little merit. In the first place, when any officer of the United States, particularly an elective one, is called upon during an emergency to act as President, there should be no hesitation or doubt on his part as to his duty.

The honor of being President of the United States, even for a temporary period, is sufficient, but, in addition, there is the duty that everyone holds to serve his country in time of emergency wherever he is called to serve.

In the second place, once this legislation is enacted into law every Speaker and President pro tempore will know that it is a part of the responsibilities of the office he has assumed or will assume that he may be called upon in time of emergency, even for a temporary period, to act as President, and that in order to qualify it will be necessary for him to resign. He is put on notice.

However, if there be a man who is Speaker of the House of Representatives or President pro tempore of the Senate who, for his own reasons, does not see fit to accept the Presidency, it is his privilege under the bill to decline to qualify, in which event the succession will descend next in order to the Secretary of State

and so on through the Cabinet, as provided for in the bill.

As I said a few hours ago on the floor of the Senate in answer to a question by the Senator from New Mexico relative to what has been provided with respect to disability, it seems to me this is the answer, because if one is called upon to resign as Speaker and resign as a Representative, or if one is called upon to resign as President pro tempore and also as a Senator, that individual is going to be very careful to know whether or not the disability is only of a temporary nature before he resigns his office. I think that is the answer to the question of disability, which has not been defined and is really not a part of this succession legislation.

The question as to who shall succeed to the Presidency of the United States where there is no President or Vice President qualified to act, has been a long-controverted one. This is the question raised by the minority leader, which I have already answered. There never has been any unanimity of opinion in any Congress where it has been discussed. I believe that the President of the United States in his message was right in recommending that the Speaker of the House of Representatives be the first in line of succession.

I have given my reasons more than half a dozen times this afternoon on that point.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives is the officer of the Government closest to the people of the United States upon whom might properly fall the duties of President. While it is true that the Speaker of the House of Representatives is not elected by the people, the Members of the House of Representatives are elected by the people every 2 years and in turn elect their Speaker.

Thus, he is the ranking officer of the Government who holds his office more nearly as a result of the wishes of the people than any other.

He is elected to the House. He is elected by the people of his own district. The House of Representatives, composed of 435 Members from both parties, elects a Speaker each 2 years. So the Speaker is elected by those who stand for election in the congressional districts throughout the United States of America. That is a total answer to those who raise their voice against this legislation, who say that we should provide a succession down through the Secretary of State and the Cabinet officers, who are appointive officers, who are not elected by the people—in fact who may be appointed by the head of a minority party in power, appointments which would not properly reflect the sentiments and the voice of the people in a succeeding legislature a majority of whose Members might be composed of Representatives of another party. If a President should die in the first or the second year of his term, as was pointed out by the Senator from Illinois, why should the people of the United States, during the second or the third or the fourth year, when there might be a complete change of opinion and when the House was controlled by the opposing party—why should the people of the United States be bound by having an acting President who is not of the party then in control? Instead of waiting up to 4 years it would be necessary to wait only 2 years to put into the Presidency an individual who properly and rightly reflects the opinions of the people, and that is done through having the succession come through the Speaker.

Likewise, I think the President pro tempore of the Senate is the next in line of properly eligible Government officers who for the same reasons should be selected to serve if there is no Speaker of the House of Representatives to take over. In the event there is no Speaker of the House of Representatives or President pro tempore of the Senate, then, I believe, by force of necessity only, succession should devolve upon the members of the Cabinet in the order of their precedence, commencing with the Secretary of State.

There is no reason in the world why I should object to our present President pro tempore serving as President. I am speaking now of the office. The President pro tempore is not as close to the people as is the Speaker of the House of Representatives. A Senator is elected for a term of 6 years. During that time a Member of the House must be elected three times. So I certainly need go no further than to say that a Member of the House is closer to the people than is a United States Senator.

Another point which I have made, and which I wish to emphasize, is that a Member of the House is elected. In many cases Senators are appointed, and do not stand for election. They might not properly reflect the viewpoint of the constituencies from which they come, as compared with Representatives from the same States.

Not a single hurdle can be mentioned that we have not passed over in considering the question of the line of succession. I invite any Senator who has any different opinion, or any suggestion he wishes to make, to rise now upon the floor of the Senate and tell what is wrong with the succession bill as it has been presented. Why should not the officer closest to the people be designated to represent the people of the country? That is why I agree with the President of the United States. As I stated earlier, I have not agreed with the President on many occasions. But I have the courage to support the President when I think he is right; and I have the courage to oppose him when I think he is wrong. In this case I believe he is right, and I intend to support him. I hope every Democratic Senator will feel the same way and that Republican Senators will come to the same conclusion .

Actually this is not a political question. Attempts have been made to drag in politics, but I am looking at the question from the long-range viewpoint. The succession law has not been changed since 1886, and it ought to be changed. The twentieth amendment changed the rules of the Senate and of the House of Representatives. A change in the succession law is in order. It is long past due.

Mr. President, this is not piecemeal legislation. This presentation is an analysis of the work done by the Senate Judiciary Committee in 1856. It is an analysis of all the debates. It is a complete analysis of the twentieth amendment, and it is a complete analysis by the Parliamentarian and by our research counsel of the rules of the Senate and of the House of Representatives.

The bill before us is not piecemeal legislation. It contains every provision that can properly be written into a succession law. The only question which is not covered is the question of disability, and such a provision cannot be written until someone is smart enough to clear the constitutional hurdle. Why should that question hold up the proper line of succession? The question of disability has never arisen in 160 years, and possibly never will.

It has been argued that the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate are not officers eligible to succeed to the Presidency. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] wanted to know about the constitutional argument. Here it is.

This argument is largely based on the so-called Blount case, wherein it was alleged by Blount that the Senate of the United States did not have jurisdiction to act as a court of impeachment for the reason that he was not a Senator of the United States at the time of the trial, and for the further reason, that the alleged violations—if committed—were committed at the time he was a Senator and not a civil officer.

The Senate found—and rightly so—in sustaining his demurrer, that the plea was sufficient in law to sustain the demurrer but the Senate made no specific determination as to which of the grounds raised by Senator Blount were controlling.

They did not settle anything so far as concerns the definition of an officer under the succession bill. So why go further with that argument?

I say that there was no determination by the decision in the Blount case of the constitutional question as to who is or who is not an officer.

Other considerations entered into the then Senate arriving at its decision—particularly that there is specific provision in the Constitution for each House of the Congress to discipline its own Members, so far as impeachment is concerned.

Regardless of the grounds upon which the Senate decided this case, the important fact remains that the Senate did not make a finding as to whether or not Blount was an officer for the purposes under which we are now considering the succession bill.

In opposition to the theory that a Member of Congress is not an officer within the meaning of the Constitution, I invite the attention of the Senate to the case of *Lamar* v. *United States* (reported in 241 U. S. 102). The decision was handed down on May 1, 1916, 32 years after the present law, sponsored by Senator Hoar, was enacted.

This decision holds that a Member of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States is an officer acting under the authority of the

United States within the meaning of the United States Criminal Code.

I quote from the Court's argument:

Guided by these rules, when the relation of Members of the House of Representatives to the Government of the United States are borne in mind, and the nature and character of their duties and responsibilities are considered, we are clearly of the opinion that such Members are embraced by the comprehensive terms of the statute. If, however, considered from the face of the statute alone, the question was susceptible of obscurity or doubt—which we think is not the case—all ground for doubt would be removed by the following considerations:

(a) Because prior to and at the time of the original enactment in question the common understanding that a Member of the House of Representatives was a legislative officer of the United States was clearly expressed in the ordinary, as well as legal, dictionaries. See Webster, verbo "office"; Century Dictionary verbo "officer"; 2 Bouvier's Law Dictionary, 1897 edition 540, verbo "legislative officers"; Black's Law Dictionary, second edition, page 710, verbo "legislative officer."

A Member of the House or Senate is a legislative officer.

(b) Because at or before the same period in the Senate of the United States, after considering the ruling in the Blount case, it was concluded that a Member of Congress was a civil officer of the United States within the purview of the law requiring the taking of an oath of office. (CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, 38th Cong., 1st sess., pt. 1, pp. 320–331.)

That was the record we had prior to the time when we had the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

(c) Because also in various general statutes of the United States at the time of the enactment in question a Member of Congress was assumed to be a civil officer of the United States, Revised Statutes, sections 1786, 2010, and subdivision 14 of section 563.

(d) Because that conclusion is the necessary result of prior decisions of this court, and harmonizes with the settled conception of the position of members of state legislative bodies as expressed in many State decisions.

So there is not a shadow of doubt that from the Lamar case until now, a Member of the House of Representatives or a United States Senator has been considered a legislative officer. There has not been a contrary decision since that time.

It seems to me that this decision removes any doubt as to the question of whether a Member is an officer of the United States.

It might be urged that an interim election would be the solution to this vexing problem. I know that there are those who believe in a special election. However, when one takes into consideration the primary and other laws of the States relating to the election of Presidents, and the fact that it would be necessary to amend the laws or constitutions of the 48 States, in addition to enacting a Federal law, it is a lengthy process and one fraught with difficulties.

Furthermore, to throw the United States into the turmoil of an election when such a catastrophe as the death or inability to act of both a President and Vice President occurs would not only in my judgment be unwise, but might lead to such chaotic conditions as almost to be tantamount to a revolution. That could happen, because of the total state of confusion which a special election, coming right after a regular election, might cause among the people.

Certainly, at such a time, there should be an orderly, smooth-working, quick-acting remedy for the situation, to the end that the United States would not be without an acting President, who, once qualified, would continue to act without the necessity of going to the country for election.

Under the terms of the bill the Speaker of the House of Representatives is next in line of succession. If the Speaker does not qualify, the President pro tempore is next in line. If he does not qualify, the Secretary of State is next, followed by other Cabinet officers. What could be smoother than that kind of succession? What could be suggested that would accomplish the purpose better than that kind of succession? What could be better calculated to inspire confidence among the people? A special election would inject all kinds of chaotic conditions throughout the country, especially if it were held at a time when there might be a national emergency.

Everything that the acting President would do would have to be in the light of the pending interim election.

Another phase of this matter is the fact that the Constitution of the United States provides for terms of four years for President. I have heard that statement over and over again. I have heard it at least a dozen times this afternoon.

The question would quickly arise as to whether an interim election for an interim period is constitutional, or whether the elected President, elected at an interim election, should serve for 4 years. If the latter situation obtained—and certainly a President elected at an interim election would contend that the tenure of his office was for 4 years—this would throw the Presidential elections completely off of the schedule which has existed since the beginning of the country.

So those who are advocating an election for a term of 4 years are running head-on into a constitutional question which would throw the country into a total state of confusion. I feel that the one who succeeds should only fill out the unexpired term, and that when that term has been completed we should proceed with the general election now provided by law.

Mr. President, the constitutional questions which are involved in legislation of this kind have not only been argued since time immemorial, but will continue to be argued in the future indefinitely.

I do not believe that we can ever get a unanimity of opinion on all of the questions which will arise in a consideration of this matter. That fact has been in evidence this afternoon. To put this question off for further study would be only hypocrisy. It would simply prolong the disagreements and arguments of 160 years, and would accomplish no good purpose.

If that is the route we want to follow we should take our time and do it long after the emergency has developed. I mean the fact that we have now no Vice President, and will continue in that state until January 20, 1949.

So the matter before us requires action now, as we are faced with a fact and not a theory; namely, that we have a Vice President serving as President, and the question, Suppose anything should happen to him?—and God knows we hope it will not—should be settled. He has recognized the urgency of the situation and has frankly recommended that immediate legislation be enacted. We cannot, by putting it off and procrastinating, solve this question of succession. I say that it should be done now. But no matter when it is done, the party which is opposing it, I suppose, from a political angle, will say, "Wait until we get into power." We cannot select an opportune time but what that argument will be advanced.

I am looking at this matter in a long-range way. We have to step over the immediate hurdle. If we do, there is no place in this bill where one can find fault with the succession. If there is, I should like to have some Senator now point it out to me. This is not piecemeal legislation, as I said before. It is legislation which has been prepared with a great deal of thought, not only in 1947 but in years gone by. The matter demands immediate attention. The President has recommended that immediate legislation be enacted. That is all that is asked for. I join with the President in that request. So I say, with all the force that is within me, that each and every one of us should consider this legislation overnight, and when we vote tomorrow at 2 o'clock let us vote unanimously to carry out the recommendation of the President of the United States.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. President, the action Congress takes on the agricultural appropriation bill can have a very definite bearing upon the future prosperity of our Nation.

Since I became a Member of the United States Senate a few months ago I have diligently devoted my time to work in my office, attending committees, studying legislation, becoming acquainted with my colleagues and the procedure of the Senate, attending meetings of the Senate, listening to debate, and voting. However, when I consider what the agricultural appropriation bill, as it passed the House, proposes to do to a farm program which, after many years of thought, effort, time and money, has come to be a well established and essential part of our national economy, I feel that I must protest such action. My father was a farmer all of his life. I grew up on a tobacco farm. With the exception of 1 year, I worked on the farm until past my twenty-first birthday. By my own experience I have first-hand knowledge of the hardships and problems of farm life. With my own hands I have helped to wring from soil that was none too willing

enough of the fruits of the earth to sustain life on a decent scale. I am proud that I learned the hard way. My interest in agriculture is deep-seated and sincere, not because it is based upon some theory or hearsay but upon my own experience.

Another reason for my opposition to the drastic cuts in the appropriations for agriculture is the fact that I was a Member of the House when most of the legislation upon which the farm program now rests was being formulated and passed. From my own experience I knew how badly it was needed. In much of it, it was my privilege to take an active part. I was a member of the subcommittee on appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, and for some years had the opportunity to keep check on the success of a farm program which has meant so much to the entire country.

It seems to me that our own experiences have demonstrated beyond controversy that in any recession or depression following a period of inflation, agriculture suffers first and most severely. It has been proven, in my judgment, that we cannot hope to enjoy in this country any sound or stable economy unless agriculture is prosperous. These considerations are so important that they must be considered when we come to deal with a bill that proposes under present conditions to slash approximately $341,000,000 from appropriations for agriculture.

When I returned home from military service in 1919, after an absence in the service of approximately 23 months, there was an appearance of general prosperity. We soon learned how inflationary and false it was. In the deflation of 1920, agriculture was the first business activity of any size which felt the blow. How quickly and how hard it hit bottom needs no recital here. When prices in other lines fell to unprofitable levels, producers withheld goods from the market and curtailed production. The farmer could not follow a similar method. He was struggling to meet pressing demands, frequently involving loss of his property. He had to have money. His only recourse was to produce more of cash crops. The more he produced the lower prices went. Millions lost all of their property and other millions saved something by borrowing heavily on long and hard terms. At that time there was no farm program, not even a policy of assisting important surplus farm commodities in finding foreign markets where they were badly needed. There was no medium through which the farmers could, by voluntary cooperation on any reasonable basis, bring production in line with consumption.

Agriculture continued to suffer. By 1929 the situation had become so desperate that a special session of Congress was called to relieve the farmer. It did relieve him of about all that he had left. Congress passed a tariff act so high as to eliminate foreign trade from the picture at the very time when many surplus cash crops needed to find a foreign market. It is painful to recall what followed. Only by frank admission of an unevenly balanced economy, with the odds against it, can we understand how agriculture in this land could have suffered the distress; bankruptcy, and ruin that fell to its lot between 1929 and the time the recovery program began. This was bad for the farmers, driving them in many sections almost to the point of desperation. Its effect did not stop there. No thoughtful person can doubt that the distress of agriculture through so many years exerted direct influence upon the awful day in 1933 when it became necessary to close the doors of every banking institution in America.

We do not wish to travel that road again. We should profit now by these experiences and do everything that is reasonable to keep a broad and well-considered agricultural program on a sound basis. For more than 25 years we have sought to obtain equality for agriculture. Any action to weaken the existing program and organization strikes at the heart of the farm and national economy. The party in control of the Government from 1929 to 1933 is now again in control of Congress. I feel bound to warn it against carrying its economy drive to the point where it endangers the security of agriculture and, if pursued, will ultimately undermine the prosperity and general welfare of the Nation.

Again we are in another era after a war. Again we have inflation, the end of which is not in sight. Again we are without assurance of dependable foreign markets. Certainly there is sufficient similarity between general conditions that confront us now and the bitter experiences through which we passed after World War I to require that we exercise the greatest of care in the consideration of any proposal that would hurt an agricultural program that has proven its worth and dependability. It would be foolish to throw away our lifeboats just because our ship is at the moment strong.

Mr. President, time does not permit me to discuss all the items which have been reduced in the agricultural appropriation bill. I do wish to call attention to a few.

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM—TRIPLE A

The act creating the triple A was passed when I was a Member of Congress. It was my privilege to have the opportunity of participating to some extent in the preparation of this legislation, and especially the tobacco-control program, and I voted for its passage. I believed in the triple A program then, and believe in it more strongly now after having seen it in operation during the intervening years. This program for 1947 is already under way. The pending bill would cut appropriations for this year about one-half. The bill proposes to cut out the program altogether in 1948. Since farmers plant by the season, it has been customary for Congress to appropriate funds available around July 1, to cover practices under a program actually put into effect the preceding fall. At the same time, Congress has set limits within which the next year's program could be developed. That is how the bill now before Congress covers appropriations for payments to farmers under the 1947 agricultural conservation program, which has been under way for almost one-half of the program year. Some practices have been under way since last August. The Department of Agriculture was told by the Congress last June to proceed to develop a program which would cost $300,000,000. Congress did not say "up to" $300,000,000; Congress said $300,000,000. On the basis of that language, farmers and the Department of Agriculture started the program machinery moving. In my State the practices for which farmers could earn payments in 1947 were approved last September. Allocation of funds was made in December, and to date about 180,000 farm operators have completed farm plans for carrying out conservation practices on their farms.

The bill now before the Senate Appropriations Committee, as it came from the House, proposes to appropriate only $165,000,000 to take care of the $300,000,000 program authorized by Congress. It would drastically reduce both the payments already promised and the machinery for administering the law. The State offices and the county and community-farmer committees would be unable to function properly. The county-farmer committees would be able to serve only 12 days a year and the community committees only 1 day a year. These committees operate as leaders, and it is largely through their leadership that the farmers of the country have increased agricultural production to record levels. Today the use of agricultural products is one of our most important means of trying to build world peace. The proposed reduction not only would break faith with the farmers who relied upon the promises of the Government, but it would have the effect of tearing down the splendid organizations which have been built in the country among the farmers themselves.

This is a matter of tremendous importance to the farmers of North Carolina because of its possible effect upon the tobacco-control program which has been so eminently successful. Anything which would adversely affect that program would seriously injure North Carolina's tobacco growers. In this connection, I wish to quote what the Secretary of Agriculture has said:

> The House recognized the need for the committees in administering 3-year tobacco-marketing quotas, which are now in effect. It allowed special funds for this purpose. The funds represent the approximate cost of administering the marketing quotas for the 1947 crop, if the State and county offices in the tobacco areas could continue operating about normally. If these offices are cut down so that the work on quotas cannot be handled on a part-time basis along with the conservation program, the cost of administering the quotas will go up. If the committee system is abolished, as the bill provides, special offices will have to be set up to handle the tobacco-marketing quotas that will be in effect on the 1948 crop, and this will raise the cost. Furthermore, some special means would have to be set up to take the place of the committee system in establishing acreage allotments for marketing quotas.

Mr. President, if the majority party wants to discontinue this program which helps farmers conserve and build up the present and future fertility of the soil, the only fair and reasonable thing to do is to fulfill existing promises and contracts of the Government and give the

farmers sufficient notice. It simply is not fair to change the rules in the middle of the game.

It is difficult for me to understand the action taken on the agricultural conservation program. This program is not based upon paying a farmer not to do something. On the contrary, it has offered encouragement, assistance, and help to the farmer who wished to improve his soil, diversify his crops, and prevent his land from washing away. North Carolina has a large number of small farms. This program has been of far-reaching effect. It has added to the value of farm lands. It has increased productivity. It has been the heart of a great program which has been enforced by the farmers themselves. It would be a tragedy to destroy it. The entire $300,000,000 should be appropriated for this program, and it should be continued in the future.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

The Soil Conservation Service is too well known to require detailed discussion here. In the few years of its existence it has pointed the way toward the elimination of soil erosion and the conservation of the fertility of the soil and of water resources. It has contributed to better methods of farming. Its original projects demonstrated the value of the program. Perhaps the greatest enemy of agriculture throughout the ages has been the washing away of the soil. This, it is said, is more responsible than any other thing for the present poverty in China. In North Carolina some of the richest counties of the eighties and nineties became impoverished by soil erosion. Where rivers run red with the soil from the hills, erosion is doing its work. This service is and has been for many years headed by an eminent North Carolinian, Dr. H. H. Bennett. He has literally given his life to the cause of the conservation of the soil. He has made a permanent contribution to the welfare and prosperity not only of farmers but of the entire Nation.

In North Carolina today there are 22 soil conservation districts which include 83 percent of all of the farms in the State. The Soil Conservation Service supplies technical advice and information to assist the farmers in carrying out plans designed for the prevention of erosion and the plans designed for the conservation of the soil. The Soil Conservation Service also cooperates with the State experiment station in matters of research, looking toward the solution of practical farm problems. In these days when floods threaten to destroy, and frequently do destroy, land, property, and human life, it is well to remember that sound soil conservation practices such as strip-cropping, pasture coverage, tree planting, and the planting of grasses and legumes are practical methods of assisting in the control of water flow, the prevention of soil erosion, and the prevention of floods.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

When I became a member of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, early in 1935, it was at first difficult for me to understand the necessity for many types of agricultural research being carried on by the Department of Agriculture. The necessity of this work was soon apparent, and from my studies and observations I became an ardent advocate of agricultural research. Private industry has learned that research pays large dividends. So has agriculture. As I look back upon my efforts to serve the agricultural interests of my State and country, I get much personal satisfaction from the fact that I was able to render some assistance beginning in 1935, in obtaining funds for the tobacco research program at the Oxford Tobacco Experiment Station in North Carolina. Millions of dollars have been saved the tobacco farmers of North Carolina by the experiments conducted at the station. A wilt-resisting type of tobacco, known as Oxford 26, has been developed at the Oxford Experiment Station, after years of experimentation. It has been estimated that in 1946, alone, about $50,000,000 worth of the Oxford 26 variety was produced on land that could not have made a tobacco crop if that particular variety had not been developed.

I recall another small item which, at the request of Hon. GRAHAM H. BARDEN, of North Carolina, and myself, was inserted in the agricultural appropriation bill in 1936 or 1937, in the sum of $10,000, for the purpose of conducting research in connection with cucumbers. In spite of the small amount of funds I am told that the results of the investigations which were begun with that $10,000 practically revolutionized the pickle industry in the United States and brought tremendous benefits to the producers of cucumbers, as well as to the manufacturers of pickles. These two items illustrate the tremendous benefits resulting from agricultural research.

The work of the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering, the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, and the other divisions of the Agricultural Research Administration have done and are still doing splendid work in the field of many kinds of agricultural research. Every day that passes reminds us more acutely of the necessity of appropriating funds for carrying out the purposes and objectives of the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, known as the Hope-Flannagar bill. I understand that only one-half of the amount authorized by that bill has been provided in the pending appropriation bill. With surpluses already piling up in many farm commodities, this program of research and marketing cannot get underway on a broad basis too soon.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

In my days on the farm, there was no such thing, generally speaking, as rural electrification. My own attitude toward this program is one of great appreciation. I voted for it when I was a member of the House some years ago, and eagerly looked forward to the carrying out of the program. I have seen what it can do for rural people. In 1935 when the REA program got underway, the North Carolina power lines reached only 3 farms out of every 100. Fewer than 10,000 farms had electricity. Since then, I have watched the lines extend themselves until now they reach 50 out of every 100 North Carolina farms. There are 35 REA financed rural electric systems in my State. They now have plans for installing many more miles of power lines. I assume that the situation in my State is typical of other States. Farmers want electricity. They want to enjoy its comforts and benefits. They have confidence in the REA and, furthermore, they pay for the program. It should not be reduced because the amount requested in the budget was $20,000,000 less than was necessary to meet existing applications. The loans are not gifts. This money contributes vastly to rural welfare and it is paid back to the National Treasury with interest. About a billion dollars of Federal funds is already involved in the rural-electrification program. The records show that the investment to date has been sound. It is administered by the farmers themselves through cooperative organizations. It has the expert advice of the REA. To reduce the administrative appropriation would not only delay the progress of the program but it would endanger the investment the Government has already made. About one-half of rural America now has the blessings of electric light and power. The program should go on until those blessings are extended to the other one-half of our rural people, and the full amount recommended by the Budget Bureau should be appropriated; and even this amount will be inadequate to finance existing applications.

FOREST SERVICE

In my opinion, the Forest Service is one of the most efficient divisions of the Department of Agriculture. America's timber resources are declining. We are paying scarcity prices for lumber. National forests are managed for permanent production. They can help us in meeting our present needs and serve us in emergencies in the future. National forests afford watershed protection which aids in flood control. Floods and streams full of red mud the year round in North Carolina indicate the need for watershed protection. This is true of many States in the Nation. Nearly 60 percent of the total area of North Carolina is wood and forest land. Many industrial plants in the State depend directly or indirectly on the forest for raw materials, and our woods-products industries are second only to textiles as a source of employment in manufacturing. Many hydroelectric power developments and most of the municipal water supply systems in the State are dependent on forest watersheds.

The three national forests in North Carolina are looked upon with great pride by the people of our State.

The bill as reported has eliminated all funds for wildlife management. When most of the States are devoting more and more thought and attention to the utilization of wildlife resources, it appears to be eminently unwise for the Government to go in the opposite direction and eliminate its essential services in this connection.

I also wish to call attention to the Forest Products Laboratory located at

Madison, Wis. Its work is national in its effect and is of extreme importance to the entire Nation, especially to States like North Carolina, where there are so many industries that depend on forest products and where so many farmers sell forest products.

The Southeastern Forest Experiment Station, located in North Carolina, has done a great work in the field of better forest management.

The entire program of the Forest Service is so interwoven with the whole agricultural program that if it is seriously crippled anywhere its disastrous effect will be far reaching.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

I now desire to call attention to an item in the bill which, to me, has been one of the outstanding achievements of the past few years in agriculture. It has helped those who could not have otherwise helped themselves. The Farmers Home Administration, previously the Farm Security Administration, and before that known as the Farm Tenant Purchase Program, has during the past 10 years to some extent offered solution to one of the greatest problems of American agriculture through the years; namely, the tenant problem. Government loans, first authorized in 1937 by the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, for the purpose of enabling tenants to buy farms, is entirely eliminated by the House action. In eliminating funds to carry out this provision of the Farmers Home Administration Act, the House invalidates section 505b of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, which opened opportunities to qualified veterans. The Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946 further extended opportunities to veterans by giving them preference for the loans. Not only this, but severe reductions have been made in funds to provide farm operating loans and, unless restored, will deprive many farmers in my State and throughout the Nation of their only source of credit for purchasing and successfully operating farms. I understand that the House committee report and statements made on the floor indicate that no fault is found with the program or with its administration.

From the beginning, tenant purchase loans have been on a sound basis. The value has been determined by appraisers and by the local committees which pass upon the eligibility of each applicant. Only farmers and veterans who cannot borrow elsewhere on reasonable terms are eligible, and this is true of the operating loans also. In North Carolina, 2,727 families have bought farms with direct Government loans. Almost 30 percent—797 families—have already repaid their loans in full. This means that the families have become home owners and taxpayers. The Government has given them an opportunity, of which they have taken full advantage.

The national loss to the Government on tenant-purchase loans has been negligible. Since it began 10 years ago, the net loss on loans totaling more than $282,000,000 has been only $50,830, or about one-fiftieth of 1 percent. The continued need for this program is shown by the fact that in the Nation there were 92,000 applications on file at the end of December 1946. Sixteen applications were on hand for every loan that could be made from funds available. At present there are about 41,000 unfilled applications for veterans alone. Time will not permit me to further discuss the reduction in funds for operating and subsistence loans except to say that 57 percent of the adjustment loans during the first 7 months of the fiscal year were made to veterans. The demand and need for these loans is still widespread and urgent. The full amount recommended by the budget should be appropriated for the Farmers Home Administration. The money helps people who cannot otherwise help themselves and, furthermore, it is paid back to the Government with interest.

SCHOOL LUNCHES

My discussion has, up to this point, been devoted to items which are either repaid to the Government or else make a substantial and continuing contribution to the physical assets of our country, increase the wealth, add to the farmers' income, and in many ways contribute to the soundness of the national economy. I feel that I would be derelict in my duty if I did not now call attention to the school-lunch program which, in the main, deals with the health and education of children. Even in times of prosperity, it is a well-known fact that the health of children is not always solved by higher incomes. Under the program heretofore in force, school children of the country have been assisted in getting at least one good, nutritious meal each day. The effectiveness of the program has been reflected in the health of the children and their progress in school, and it has the interested support of most of the organizations throughout the country which deeply concern themselves with the well-being, health, and education of the school children of the Nation. The House bill proposes to reduce the amount available for this purpose from seventy-five million to forty-five million, ten million of which is earmarked for nonfood assistance, leaving available for food assistance $35,000,000. Furthermore, the language now in the appropriation bill would make it impossible for more than about 21 States and the District of Columbia to take advantage of its benefits. The full amount should be restored, and the language changed so as to permit full participation in its benefits. There can be no reasonable excuse at this time for cutting down an item which so vitally affects the citizens of tomorrow.

CONCLUSION

There are many other items in the agricultural appropriation bill which I should like to discuss and in which I am vitally interested, such as adequate funds for the Solicitor's Office and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the services of which agencies are essential to the effective administration of the farm program.

I subscribe to the doctrine that economy should be practiced by the Federal Government and that unnecessary expenses should be eliminated. I have voted for many reductions and expect to vote for others. However, I cannot subscribe to a course which will seriously cripple and may well destroy the efforts of a generation in building a sound, helpful, and sensible agricultural program. The agricultural conservation program, triple A, the Soil Conservation Service, the REA, the Farmers Home Administration, Forestry Service, Research and Experimentation all are a part of what we have come to call our farm program in this country. The proof of its effectiveness is seen on every hand. Improved methods of farming, betterment of the soil, cooperation of the farmers, increase in taxable values, preservation of the soil, results flowing from scientific research, all point to the success of the program. Furthermore, the fact that the farmers of America were able during 5 years of war to produce more with less labor and with less machinery than had ever been produced before is the greatest testimonial which can possibly be offered as to the effectiveness of the program to which I have referred. I was a farmer when we had no real farm program. I know by experience and observation what these things have meant to the rural people of North Carolina and to the Nation. It would be a tragedy to this generation and an utter disregard for the generations to come for this program to be destroyed.

The effectiveness and success of a farm program depend in a substantial degree upon the type, character and ability of the people who enforce it. There are many patriotic people in the Department of Agriculture who regard their jobs not just as a way to make a living but as an opportunity to serve agriculture and the Nation. The cuts made in the pending bill are so drastic as not only to eliminate such unnecessary personnel as there may be in the Department, but also many able men who have been and are devoting their lives toward making worthwhile contributions to the effectiveness of the farm program.

I make bold to assert that the Nation cannot long operate without a prosperous agriculture. The bill in its present form strikes at the heart of agriculture and this, in turn, will constitute a body blow to our entire national economy. I, therefore, urge the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Members of the Senate with all the earnestness I possess, to amend the agricultural appropriation bill so as to maintain the policies, programs, and services authorized by law; to carry out the agreements made with the farmers of America; to maintain the integrity of Congress; and to serve the best interest of our Nation.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CERTAIN HOUSE REPORTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 35, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed 1,500 additional copies of House Report No. 541, Seventy-ninth Congress, entitled "The Postwar Foreign Economic Policy of the United States," of which 500 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the House; 1,500 additional copies of House Report No. 1205, Seventy-ninth Congress, entitled "Eco-

nomic Reconstruction in Europe," of which 500 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the House; and 5,000 additional copies of House Report No. 2729, Seventy-ninth Congress, entitled "Final Report Reconversion Experience and Current Economic Problems," of which 500 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 4,500 copies shall be for the use of the House.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 39, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, as amended, the Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 2,000 additional copies of the hearing held before said committee on February 6, 1947, pursuant to Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE REPORT 209, RELATING TO UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 40, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, as amended, the Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, be, and is hereby authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 25,000 additional copies of House Report 209, Eightieth Congress, first session, entitled "The Communist Party of the United States as an Agent of a Foreign Power."

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I send to the desk a telegram relating to the necessity for appropriations for combating the foot-and-mouth disease. I ask that the telegram be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

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

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *June 25, 1947.*

Hon. CARL A. HATCH,
Senate Office Building:

Following wire addressed Chairman Senate and House Appropriation Committee:

"Following full day session with Mexican delegates and Department of Agriculture officials our national advisory committee views with alarm delay in action on foot-and-mouth disease appropriation bill and information which indicates that further delay may continue pending committee investigation of Mexican situation. We believe $65,000,000 appropriation must be acted upon before this session of Congress adjourns and that sufficient deficiency appropriation as might be recommended by Department of Agriculture must be provided to serve in interim. Any relaxation of this program will be disastrous to entire campaign in Mexico and in turn disastrous to entire economy of this Nation. Million and one-half appropriation approved yesterday adequate only until June 30."

NEW MEXICO CATTLE GROWERS' ASSOCIATION,
GEORGE A. GODFREY, *President.*
HORACE H. HENNING, *Secretary.*
ALBERT K. MITCHELL.

EXPENDITURE OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I ask unanimous consent to report favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 130, and ask for its immediate consideration. The resolution was previously unanimously approved by the Appropriations Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 130), submitted by Mr. BRIDGES on June 12, 1947, and favorably reported by the Committee on Appropriations, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eightieth Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

EMPLOYMENT OF TEMPORARY ASSISTANTS, ETC., BY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably, without additional amendment, Senate Resolution 129, and I request its present consideration. The resolution was previously unanimously approved by the Appropriations Committee, with an amendment.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 129) submitted by Mr. BRIDGES on June 18, 1947.

The amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 1, line 10, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$50,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. How large an appropriation of additional funds is involved in the two resolutions?

Mr. BROOKS. One is for $10,000 and the other is for $50,000.

Mr. HATCH. Which is the resolution providing for $50,000?

Mr. BROOKS. The resolution providing for $50,000 is to make an investigation of the very subject concerning which the Senator just asked to have a telegram printed in the RECORD. The purpose is to make a survey of the hoof-and-mouth disease in the United States.

Mr. HATCH. I have no objection to the resolution. I do think it is proper for the Senate to be advised when these requests are made as to how much money is involved, and what is the purpose of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on Appropriations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

VOLUNTARY ENLISTMENTS IN THE REGULAR MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I submit the conference report on House bill 3303, to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3303) to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following: "That effective July 1, 1947, the Secretary of War is authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of the last paragraph of section 127a of this Act, to accept original enlistments in the Regular Army from among qualified male persons not less than seventeen years of age for periods of two, three, four, five, or six years, and to accept reenlistments for periods of three, four, five, or six years: *Provided*, That persons of the first three enlisted grades may be reenlisted for unspecified periods of time on a career basis under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe: *Provided further*, That anyone who serves three or more years of an enlistment for an unspecified period of time many submit to the Secretary of War his resignation and such resignation shall be accepted by the Secretary of War and such person shall be discharged from his enlistment within three months of the submission of such resignation. Except if such person, other than an enlisted member of a Regular Army Puerto Rican unit submits his resignation while stationed overseas or after embarking for an overseas station, the Secretary of War shall not be required to accept such resignation until a total of two years of overseas

service shall have been completed in the current overseas assignment, and in the case of anyone who has completed any course of instruction pursuant to paragraph 13 of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 535), or pursuant to section 3 of the Act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 556), as amended (10 U. S. C. 298a), the Secretary of War shall not be required to accept such resignation until two years subsequent to the completion of such course. The Secretary of War may refuse to accept any such resignation in time of war or national emergency declared by the President or Congress, or while the person concerned is absent without leave or serving a sentence of court martial. The Secretary of War may refuse to accept a resignation for a period not to exceed six months following the submission thereof if the enlisted person is under investigation or in default with respect to public property or public funds: *Provided further*, That no person under the age of eighteen years shall be enlisted without the written consent of his parents or guardian, and the Secretary of War shall, upon the application of the parents or guardian of any such person enlisted without their written consent, discharge such person from the military service with pay and with the form of discharge certificate to which the service of such person, after enlistment, shall entitle him: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to deprive any person of any right to reenlistment in the Regular Army under any other provision of law. No person who is serving under an enlistment contracted on or after June 1, 1945, shall be entitled, before the expiration of the period of such enlistment, to enlist for an enlistment period which will expire before the expiration of the enlistment period for which he is so serving: *Provided further*, That any enlisted person discharged from the Regular Army who upon such discharge is recommended for reenlistment shall be permitted to reenlist with the rank held by him at the time of his discharge if he reenlists within a period to be specified by the Secretary of War but not to exceed three months from the date of such discharge: *And provided further*, That any enlisted person discharged from the Regular Army by reason of acceptance of his resignation shall not be entitled upon subsequent reenlistment to the rank, rating, or grade held at the time of discharge.

SEC. 2. Any person who enlists or reenlists in the Regular Military Establishment on or after June 1, 1945, in the seventh grade, upon the completion of recruit training, but not later than four months subsequent to the date of enlistment, shall, unless sooner promoted, be promoted to the sixth grade, provided he meets such qualifications as may be prescribed in regulations promulgated by the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That no back pay or allowance shall accrue to any person by reason of enactment of this section.

"SEC. 3. Section 2 of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 4, 602), is further amended by deleting the last sentence thereof.

"SEC. 4. Paragraph 4 of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 is hereby amended by substituting a colon for the period at the end of such paragraph and by adding immediately after such colon the following: '*Provided further*, That in addition to such enlistment allowance, any person enlisting for an unspecified period of time shall be paid the sum of $50 upon the completion of each year of service of such reenlistment, and any person who resigns or is discharged from such enlistment for an unspecified period of time shall not thereafter be entitled to any additional enlistment or reenlistment allowance based on any period served in such enlistment for an unspecified period of time."

"SEC. 5. Effective July 1, 1947, sections 653 and 653a of title 10, United States Code, are repealed and all other laws and parts of laws insofar as they are inconsistent with or in conflict with the provisions of this Act are likewise repealed.

"SEC. 6. Subsection 1 (b) of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 (38 U. S. C., Supp. V, 691a) is amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of subsection (7) thereof, inserting a semicolon in lieu of the period after subsection (8) thereof, and adding the following: "and (9) any person entering upon active service, or enlisting, on or after the first day of the first month after the approval of the Act adding this subsection."

"SEC. 7. Sections 57 and 58 of the National Defense Act, as amended, are further amended by striking out the words "eighteen" therefrom and substituting therefor the words "seventeen" in each of the said sections."

And the Senate agree to the same.

CHAN GURNEY,
STYLES BRIDGES,
E. V. ROBERTSON,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

W. G. ANDREWS,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
DEWEY SHORT,
CARL VINSON,
P. H. DREWRY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

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

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDINGS BY CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINSTRATION

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on page 10 of the committee report on the appropriation bill, House bill 3311, which will probably be taken up tomorrow, or soon thereafter, there is certain language with reference to the curtailment of the construction of buildings at airports. It seems to me the language was unhappily selected with regard to construction of buildings at airports. For myself I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD my views with reference to the construction of buildings at airports.

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

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT ON H. R. 3311

It is felt that the recommendations of the Senate Appropriations Committee on H. R. 3311 wherein suggestion is made that the Civil Aeronautics Administration should not proceed with the construction of administration buildings on airports during fiscal year 1948 is unduly restrictive and limits the authority of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to exercise discretion in administering the Federal Airport Act.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration proposes a balanced program whereby each specific project is evaluated on the basis of needs and in comparison from a priority standpoint with other airport development projects.

The figures contained in the committee report concerning buildings are misleading. The $25,200,000 quoted represents total costs of buildings in a contemplated 1948 budget of $65,000,000. Actually the Federal money represented in the proposed building construction is approximately $12,500,000 of the $65,000,000. With the 1948 appropriation reduced to $32,500,000 from the $65,000,000 it is likely that the portion of the funds to be expended on buildings will also be reduced 50 percent or $6,500,000.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration proposes to construct buildings only at those points where they are urgently needed due to the special conditions applicable to the specific airports. At some places scheduled air lines are using inferior airports where airports with better runways are available but which have no facilities for handling passengers, mail, and cargo, and it would be in the interest of safety to provide administration buildings in order that scheduled air-carrier operations could be transferred to the already existing new airport. There are other cases where existing buildings are improperly located and do not permit utilization of an existing airport, and where buildings should be torn down and replaced in order to provide more clearance for operations, particularly for instrument landings.

At some localities there are several existing airports but nearly all traffic is trying to crowd into one airport because no facilities such as administration buildings exist at the second airport, and it would be in the interest of safety to encourage segregation of flight activities and distribution of various types of traffic between the several landing areas.

An analysis of the list of projects and a little inquiry into the details of each of the projects listed in Senate Document 14 leads me to believe that the CAA proposes to expend its airport funds wisely, that it has given most careful consideration to the various projects of high priority and selected for development those for the fiscal year 1948 which are most urgently needed. I have known Mr. Wright, the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, for several years and have found him to be one of the most able administrators and public servants in whom I have the utmost confidence and trust for the carrying out of such a program. I do not believe that he will expend Government money on buildings which are not urgently needed for the furtherance of civil aviation.

I further believe that he will carry out in the highest degree and in the most efficient manner the intent of the Federal Airport Act as passed on May 13, 1946.

In view of these conditions I feel that the CAA's airport program should not in any way be governed by the recommendations in the Senate Appropriations Committee report relative to construction of buildings.

The $25,200,000 figure quoted in the Senate committee report represents total cost for buildings in the contemplated 1948 program, both sponsor and Federal funds. In comparing the amount needed for buildings with the total amount of the appropriation, it should be stated that $12,500,000, approximately, of Federal funds would go toward administration buildings if we had a total appropriation of $65,000,000, that is to say, about 20 percent of the total program involves buildings. With a $32,500,000 appropriation, it is logical to suppose that from five to seven million dollars might be needed for buildings.

In some instances a provision of an administration building is vitally necessary at the present time. Seattle-Tacoma (Bow Lake) is a good example. Unless an administration building is provided there the air lines will probably continue to use Boeing Field in Seattle. There is no comparison, from a safety standpoint, between the runway at Boeing and the much better landing area at Bow Lake. Indirectly, therefore, the provision of an administration building at Bow Lake will increase the safety and probably the regularity of air-line service into the Seattle-Tacoma area. In the Northeast,

Worcester, Mass., provides a fair example of another aspect of this question. The city of Worcester has proceeded without Federal aid to construct an airport. They, like many other cities, are anxious to receive Federal assistance in finishing the job. Construction of an administration building is one of the items that still remains to be done.

I have examined the program for the State of Minnesota and I find that, although buildings were provided for at Duluth, Bemidji, and Alexandria, these are relatively low-priority projects. I do not see, therefore, how we could show Senator BALL that his State would be affected seriously. So far as Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, is concerned, there are no buildings proposed in the 1948 program for his State.

The Senator from Illinois might be concerned with the administration building proposed at Quincy. The Third Region has pointed out that the Quincy airport was built under the DLA program. Three paved runways were provided, each 150' by 5,400'. It was not possible to spend any money for administration buildings or other necessary facilities under the DLA program. The Third Region has therefore requested that Federal funds be allocated now for construction of the first unit of an administration building, paving additional apron, providing adequate access roads, and furnishing utilities to the building area. This is a certificated air-line stop but service has not been inaugurated due to the lack of adequate facilities.

The Senators from Michigan might be interested in Saginaw and Battle Creek. At Saginaw-Bay City, the situation is similar to that at Quincy, Ill. This is a DLA airport and funds are needed now to convert certain military buildings to civil use and to provide the first unit of a permanent administration building. This is a scheduled stop on PCA and is also used by several interstate carriers. At Battle Creek the prewar administration building and certain other facilities are deemed inadequate. They should be rehabilitated or replaced now.

The Senators from Nebraska might be interested in Omaha and North Platte, Nebr. The fifth region has included in Senate Document No. 14 a $400,000 administration building. They do not, however, mention it in their justification. At North Platte the fifth region proposes development of a new building area to permit adequate clearance between runways and buildings so that an instrument-landing system can be installed. Included in the project is a terminal building.

The Senators from Massachusetts might be interested in the project at Worcester, Mass. There is no adequate administration building on the airport at the present time. We have set up $100,000 for this purpose.

The Senators from Tennessee might be interested in Memphis, Tenn. The second region says, "A new administration building is sorely needed at this station in order to accommodate the passengers from 52 scheduled flights daily, provided by 5 major air lines." At Nashville, Tenn., the region has this to say: "Berry Field is now served by two air lines with 52 scheduled flights daily. This field needs relief from the passenger-handling standpoint, which can be accomplished by the construction of an administration building. The existing building is entirely inadequate to accommodate present-day air travel."

The Senators from Maryland could be interested in the administration building proposed for Cumberland, Md. A temporary frame building, which is grossly inadequate, serves as an administration building at the present time. This is a class 5 airport and TWA has applied to the Board for permission to operate there. If TWA is granted permission to operate, a permanent ad building will be needed. A similar situation exists at Salisbury, Md. There is no administration building there at the present time. Chesapeake Airways are now operating interstate schedules there and have filed a preliminary application with the Board for interstate operation. Several other air lines have expressed the desire to operate from Salisbury. The Senators from Arizona might be interested in the building proposed for Tucson (Municipal No. 2). This project includes construction of a medium-sized administration building suitable for handling the air-line traffic which will use this airport in the near future. Davis Monthan, which is being used by the air lines at present, is to be a strictly military field and the air lines will move over to Municipal No. 2. At Nogales, an administration building is needed to handle air traffic from Mexico, in addition to local use. Adequate customs and health inspection services are not available at the present time for this port of entry. American Airlines, Arizona Airways and LAMSA, a Mexican air line, operate into this field now. There are several other airports with similar problems in the State of Arizona. It is only necessary to run down the list shown in Senate Document No. 14. Phoenix, I believe, is the only one that does not contain an administration building as part of the project.

FLOODS ON THE UPPER MISSISSIPPI AND MISSOURI RIVERS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago I presented to the Senate a graphic picture of the disastrous floods then raging on the upper Mississippi-Missouri Rivers. Then it was apparent to all observers that this was a flood of more than usual proportions. But subsequent events have produced more floods so that today we face one of the major flood disasters of all time, and the end is not yet in sight, for the waters are now spilling over in the tributaries of the Missouri and deluging the vast fertile lands along the main river.

The flood toll has reached an estimated $200,000,000 and laid waste 3,800,000 acres of land in these United States this year.

Mr. President, this spells ruin to many thousands of families directly in the flood's path. Its ultimate effects go far beyond that, however, creating consequences of Nationwide and international import.

The Congress of the United States cannot afford any longer to brush these floods aside by passage of a bill to provide some money with which the Army Engineers can rebuild broken levees and dikes. This is not a flood whose debris can be mopped up as the tired housewife sweeps out the mud and filth left in her parlor when the waters recede. No; this is a flood caused by our neglect, by our refusal to plan so as to use the God-given rains for the benefit of mankind, by our shortsighted and selfishly induced continuance of a completely discredited piecemeal approach to flood control which not only fails to prevent floods, but which competent engineers say actually increases them.

Why do I say that the present floods are not local in their effects? Because, Mr. President, these floods have drowned out the 1947 corn crop.

From Davenport to the Missouri—

Reports the Washington Post this morning—

through the center of the greatest grain-growing belt in the world, corn is drowned out. The situation isn't confined to Iowa. This writer has just finished driving 1,300 miles through the best growing sections. He has yet to see one field of corn of average development.

The poorest corn crop in 20 years is predicted.

Corn shortage means that meat will be scarce and prices will skyrocket. Yet how much higher they can go since the Republican leadership of the Congress removed price controls last year, without becoming strictly a luxury item found only on the menus of our rich citizens, I do not know.

The corn shortage calls into question any plans we might develop for the export of foodstuffs and wheat to famine-stricken foreign countries. Hence, our international policy is directly affected by the wasteful, but wholly preventable floods of the Missouri-Mississippi Basin.

And do not think for one moment that the people in the farming area now under water are not looking toward Congress for an explanation of its conduct in ignoring the plight over the years of the vast grain-growing lands of this Nation. The Post reporter sampled public opinion on his trip.

In a small roadside feed store yesterday—

He says—

I heard a pious old Iowa farmer blame this year's wild weather upon interference with nature in the use of the atom bomb. Another disagreed. He blamed it on the Republican Congress.

Mr. President, I have before the Senate a measure dealing with the present flood emergency, which I introduced on June 12, and which was referred for action to the Committee on Public Works. That measure calls for a field investigation of these floods now, and for the formulation of plans which will prevent such floods ever occurring again. Moreover, it requires that a program be developed now for the rehabilitation of the areas inundated and for the relief of the victims of these floods.

This is an emergency, Mr. President, one which will not wait upon the pleasure of a small body of men in the United States Congress. If we do not act now, the suffering of a large section of our fellow citizens will become unendurable. If we do not investigate the flood conditions now, gain a first-hand knowledge or their extent and character, and ascertain their causes, then the tendency will be to put off any investigation until next year's floods rage once more.

The press of the Nation is aware of these conditions. They, too, have called upon the Congress for action now. This is not a partisan issue. Both Republican and Democratic newspapers urge action. I have previously submitted for the RECORD items of news and editorial comment which fully substantiate these assertions. I now ask permission to insert in the RECORD additional materials. One is an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for June 17, 1947, quoting the Missouri Farmer, titled "After the Floods Come."

Another is a news story from the Washington Daily News of June 24, 1947, titled "Flood Toll: $200,000,000 and 3,800,000 Acres."

The third is an editorial appearing in the New York Daily News for June 16, 1947, titled "Rivers on the Rampage."

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

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 17, 1947]

AFTER THE FLOODS COME

New Missouri floods are "a monument to years of tinkering by Army engineers," farm paper says; they deal with floods only after these occur, as Chinese have done for ages; urges TVA-type plan to prevent high water, aid conservation, and help public power.

[From the Missouri Farmer]

"This year's flood, which has forced hundreds of farm families to move; which has destroyed their crops, fences, and other property; which has interrupted rail, bus, and truck transportation as well as other communications; which has washed away and damaged scores of bridges and miles of roads, is a monument to the years of tinkering on the part of the Army engineers.

"For nearly a hundred years the Army engineers have been building levees that melt away year after year before the floods like lumps of sugar. They have been building dams to hold back the water.

"Lately they have choked up the Missouri River with dikes, reducing the carrying capacity of the stream, until when a rainy spell comes along the water has no place to go except out over the land.

"DAMS, LEVEES, AND DIKES

"In other words, the engineers have been dealing with effects instead of the causes of floods. They have been attempting to deal with the waters after they have swept down into the lowlands, dealing with them by building dams, levees, and dikes, the same kinds of measures used by the Chinese more than a thousand years ago.

"There is not a small farm boy in this State who does not know that the recurring floods begin when the rain falls upon the uplands. The rainfall gathers into little rivulets, then rushes down into the branches and creeks, then into the larger streams, carrying away the rich top soil upon which future generations must depend for food.

"Why cannot the Army engineers see this? Why cannot Congressmen see it? Why cannot all the people see it? Why do we keep on appropriating enormous sums for these ineffectual measures—keep on dealing with effects rather than working on the causes of floods?

"ATTACK ON ALL FRONTS

"The TVA has solved this flood problem by attacking it upon all fronts, by the extensive use of fertilizers and other soil-conservation practices, then by building dams. Unlike the dams proposed by the Army engineers under the Pick-Sloan plan, these TVA dams do more than just control floods * * * they generate power for cities and farms to take the drudgery off the backs of mankind and to comfort the people by lighting up their homes and keeping them warm.

"Why do not the people of Missouri, and the whole Missouri River Basin, which takes in several States, learn from this outstanding example which has met with universal approval throughout the Tennessee Valley, and which has attracted the favorable notice of people all over the world?"

[From the Washington Daily News of June 24, 1947]

FLOOD TOLL: $200,000,000 AND 3,800,000 ACRES

The fourth, and most disastrous, flood crest in a month moved relentlessly down the Missouri River Valley today, ruining all hope of a 1947 crop in the inundated areas.

The new flood was expected to drown almost 300,000 fertile acres. This would give the Nation a total loss to floods this year of 3,800,000 acres with an immediate monetary loss of almost $200,000,000 in crops, equipment, and personal possessions.

Estimates do not take into account the amount of topsoil ripped away, ruining the land forever. The floods have driven 20,000 persons from their homes in 4 weeks.

The new swell of high water was expected to reach St. Joseph, Mo., today, shoving the United States Engineers' surface markers to a height of 21.5 feet. Flood stage is considered 17 feet at St. Joseph.

As it juggernauted down river, the flood ruined some of the finest corn and wheat farm land in America. About 400 miles of bottom land was expected to be overrun in the section where Missouri, Kansas, and Nebraska join.

The weather was clear and residents hoped it would hold long enough to permit the river to discharge the overload of water it received from torrential rains last week.

Engineers predicted the river would go over the top of the levee protecting the St. Joseph Municipal Airport. They said the dike probably would collapse under the strain, permitting millions of gallons of water to overspread the field.

At Boonville, Mo., engineers and city officials were attempting to keep the municipal waterworks intake pit from collapsing. The engineers said that if the foundation walls collapsed, the intake would be buried, shutting off the town's water supply.

The crest was moving through the valley like a long, low wave. The river was falling above and below the rise.

At Nebraska City, Nebr., 70 miles above St. Joseph, the surface level fell two-tenths of a foot. At Kansas City, 45 miles downstream, the river dropped slowly to 19.2 feet from the crest to 19.4 feet hit by the previous flood, which was still moving down the river in advance of the new rise.

Verne Alexander, regional river engineer for the Kansas City weather bureau, said the new flood would "beat anything we've had so far this month and clean out the valley for this year as far as crops are concerned."

The Platte River was leveling off at Agency, Mo., where only the housetops showed above the surface.

Rescue workers still sought five persons at Cambridge, Nebr., where eight persons died in a flash flood Sunday. The waters of Medicine Creek and the Republican River had receded today, leaving the streets and houses full of silt.

The week end flash floods in Iowa and Nebraska were pouring their burden of water into the larger rivers today. Alexander said the Missouri would rise to 6 feet above flood stage at Kansas City tomorrow.

[Fom the New York Daily News of June 16, 1947]

RIVERS ON THE RAMPAGE

The latest of the old familiar Mississippi-flood news stories broke last week with all the conventional details—thousands of people chased out of their homes to higher territory, 1,000,000-odd acres under water, crop and property damage mounting into millions of dollars, levees torn out by the dozen.

These were no record-breaking floods, at that; just run-of-the-mill results of some rather heavy rains.

A good part of the flooding originated in the upper Mississippi River itself, above St. Louis. What we'd like to recall to the customers is that another considerable part was contributed by the Mississippi's biggest and most rambunctious tributary, the Missouri.

This, too, happens frequently.

The Mississippi's biggest feeder from the east, the Ohio, did not in this case contribute to the floods. But it often does.

And still another Mississippi tributary, the Tennessee, sometime ago got over its old habit of pouring excess water at will into the United States biggest river. This is because the Tennessee Valley Authority, better known as TVA, sometime ago roped and hog-tied the Tennessee all the way back to its beginnings.

In addition to tying efficient flood-control knots in the Tennessee, the TVA has brought cheaper electric power—meaning rising standards of living—to its large southern region of operations, and has sharply slowed down the soil erosion which not long ago was gutting the area.

TVA, too, is so prosperous a Government enterprise that the House voted last week to require the Authority to pay back to the Government $348,000,000, or the major part of its original cost, in the next 40 years.

The moral of all this seems plain to us. It is that we need at least two more agencies like the TVA. We need an MVA—Missouri Valley Authority—and an OVA, or Ohio Valley Authority.

Of the two, the NVA would seem to be the more urgently needed, because the Missouri River system is so much bigger than the Ohio complex of rivers.

The Missouri itself is 2,470 miles long. With its feeders—the Yellowstone, Big Horn, Cheyenne, Platte, etc.—it drains about one-sixth of the Nation's land area.

THE WILD MISSOURI

In three recent flood years, 1942–44, inclusive, the Missouri dealt $150,000,000 worth of flood damage. You can repair most flood damage; but you can't restore the 550,000,000 tons of valuable soil, sand, silt, etc., that the Missouri washes away every year, for the Mississippi to carry in large part to the Gulf of Mexico.

An MVA, with as much luck and successful management as the TVA has had, should be able to do a good job on the Missouri River system.

Of course, the TVA is a Socialist device, as would be an MVA and an OVA. Most of the Socialist philosophy, in our estimation is crackpot stuff, and is now proving itself so before Americans' interested eyes in Russia and Great Britain.

But it seems impossible that the Socialist philosophy can be 100 percent cockeyed. Further, we have in TVA one working example of the success of a big interstate Government agency to promote flood control, soil conservation, reclamation, and power production.

"SOCIALISM"—SO WHAT

As to these things being socialistic, our feeling is: So what? If they work, why worry about their correct economic label? What matters is that TVA is working, and that proper variations on TVA ought to bring the Missouri and Ohio River systems under control.

MVA and OVA are in a coma in Congress at this time. We hope it won't be long before they come to life again.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 564) to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President, in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President.

TEMPORARY CONTINUANCE OF AUTHORITY OF THE MARITIME COMMISSION UNTIL MARCH 1, 1948

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3911.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3911) to continue temporary authority of the Maritime Commission until March 1, 1948.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the bill is designed to extend authority of the Maritime Commission in the operation of tankers and other vessels until March 1, 1948. When VJ-day came we had some 5,000 vessels of one type or another operated by our Maritime Commission. That number has been reduced until in the middle of June of this year the Maritime Commission was operating 332 vessels. Of that number 258—I believe that is the correct figure—were tankers, carrying petroleum not only from this country to ports of the world, but from ports of the world to other ports of the world, and in some cases bringing petroleum into this country. These tanker operations and the passenger- and dry-cargo operations which are now going on must cease and terminate by the 30th of June unless we pass this extending legislation. I think it is imperatively necessary that we do so. The legislation is approved by the President. The Secretary of State appeared before the Merchant Marine Committee of the House in behalf of the legislation. Mr. Clayton also urged upon the House committee its passage. It was unanimously reported by the House committee and was unanimously passed by the House itself. I hope it may have similar treatment here.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator from Maine.

I understand that the employees of the Maritime Commission are on a 5-day payless furlough during the whole of this week, beginning on Monday last. Would the passage of this extension bill have any effect upon the payment of those employees?

Mr. WHITE. No direct effect, but it would assure the continued operation by the Maritime Commission of our fleet, and I think would indirectly make a substantial contribution to the employees in the matter of their pay and otherwise.

Mr. GEORGE. I am advised that the employees have been asked to work on a voluntary basis, and that they have been at work part of the time. As the Senator knows, it is not a large organization.

Mr. WHITE. That is quite true.

Mr. GEORGE. They have been working part time on a voluntary basis. They have the impression—or at least they have given me the impression—that if they are not paid out of the appropriation for the fiscal year 1947, which will expire July 1, they will not be paid at all for those 5 days.

Mr. WHITE. That matter has not been brought to my attention. The proposed legislation does not specifically deal with it, but it seems to me that the indirect effects of the legislation must be to give better assurance to the employees.

Mr. GEORGE. I had the impression that possibly the payment of those employees was contingent upon the extension of the work which the Senator is now asking to have extended until March of next year.

Mr. WHITE. I hope it will insure prompt payment of those who have worked during the lean period.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, as I understand, one of the purposes of the bill is to make available tankers to bring petroleum products to this country. We in New England are tremendously interested. I was advised by the Governor of Connecticut that unless this service with the tankers is continued there may be a fuel shortage in our part of the country.

Mr. WHITE. There is very real danger of it. The tankers which are involved constitute about one-fourth of the entire world tonnage of tankers.

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

The bill (H. R. 3911) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RECESS

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, June 27, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 26 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Carl Birkeland, of Illinois.
Lyle C. Himmel, of South Dakota.
Ralph H. Hunt, of Massachusetts.
Gerald G. Jones, of South Dakota.
Foster H. Kreis, of Minnesota.
Joseph E. Maldonado, of Arizona.
John H. Marvin, of Florida.
John H. E. McAndrews, of Minnesota.
Harold D. Pease, of California.
Henry T. Unverzagt, of Virginia.
Stephen B. Vaughan, of New Jersey.
Harold C. Wood, of Massachusetts.

John H. Madonne, of Texas, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 3 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Russell M. Brooks, of Oregon.
U. Alexis Johnson, of California.
Robert P. Joyce, of California.

T. Eliot Weil, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

Charles C. Gidney, Jr., of Texas, 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.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

W. A. Ayres, of Kansas, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for a term of 7 years from September 26, 1947.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 6th day of June 1947:

Ralph H. Blaylock, a citizen of Mississippi.
Michael M. Spark, a citizen of New York.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate June 26 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

POSTMASTERS

The nominations sent to the Senate on various dates during the present session of the Congress of persons listed below to be postmasters at the offices indicated with their respective names:

ALABAMA

Fred W. McLaurine, Fitzpatrick.
Mrs. Alma Coaker, Fruitdale.
Otis L. Headrick, Pyriton.
Thomas S. Edwards, Remlap.
Robert Thomas Coffman, Veto.
Mrs. Margaret C. Phillips, Wellington.

ARKANSAS

Luther P. Gentry, Mayflower.

CONNECTICUT

Vincent P. Kelley, Lebanon.
Mrs. Lillian M. Cooper, Middle Haddam.

COLORADO

George J. Peterson, San Acacio.

GEORGIA

George T. Love, Jr., Morganton.

ILLINOIS

Irwin C. Stoltz, Bellmont.
Charles H. Lawler, Cortland.
Mrs. Pauline M. Hutchison, Shirley.

INDIANA

Mrs. Hazel Runner, Cross Plains.
Harold E. Collings, Kingsbury.
Miss Zula G. McBride, Mays.
Lee V. Johnson, New Goshen.
Mrs. Ruth M. Slevin, Nineveh.
Charles E. Rodenberg, Pershing.
Mrs. Mabel E. Deel, Rockfield.
William C. Bunner, Springport.

IOWA

Jasper H. Frogge, Numa.

KANSAS

Mrs. Nellie C. Lucas, Dearing.
Ira B. Armstrong, Hiattville.

KENTUCKY

Claud E. Taylor, Balkan.
William O. Hopper, Willisburg.

LOUISIANA

Miss Rosa M. Owens, Frierson.
Mrs. Ruth C. Barentine, Longville.
Mrs. Pearl H. Campbell, Pine Prairie.
Mrs. Emma H. Andermann, Saint James.

MARYLAND

Mrs. Grace H. Hudson, Bishop.
Miss Cornelia W. Hickman, Point of Rocks.

MICHIGAN

Hiram M. Terry, Leonard.
Mrs. Fern A. Pierce, Oakley.
Carmo A. Nichols, Sagola.

MINNESOTA

Melvin R. Henrickson, Guthrie.

MISSISSIPPI

Albert L. Mills, Kossuth.
David L. Rodgers, Randolph.

MISSOURI

Paris M. Hill, Glenwood.
Floyd J. Strain, Louisburg.
Mr. Stella Siebert, Pilot Knob.

NEBRASKA

Irvin C. Conkel, Burr.
L. Wayne Spainhourd, Thurston.

NEW MEXICO

Mrs. Clyda Morrow, House.
O. K. Sanders, Willard.

NEW YORK

Mrs. Rebecca E. Traynor, Breesport.
Mrs. Bessie A. Benjamin, Speonk.

NORTH CAROLINA

Robert White, Bunn.
Mrs. Esther H. Bullock, Delco.
Mrs. Myrtle B. Smith, Hays.
Mrs. Bettie V. Wall, Pee Dee.
Samuel L. Sanderlin, Shawboro.

NORTH DAKOTA

Mrs. Alice C. Kelly, Rogers.

OHIO

Mrs. Minerva S. Gray, Baybridge.
Miss Esther Swerlein, Dola.
Mrs. Nonnie B. Irwin, Goshen.
S. Albert Culbertson, New Athens.
Mrs. Marie L. Ruff, Thurman.
Mrs. Alice Marguerite Corder, Trinway.

OKLAHOMA

Mrs. Florence S. Campbell, Castle.
Mrs. Hettie O. Russell, Loco.

PENNSYLVANIA

Mrs. Ida L. German, Andreas.
Roy R. Miller, Berrysburg.
Miss Thelma B. Kelley, Brier Hill.
Mrs. Adeline Lobb, Brisbin.
Mrs. Margaret E. Dell, Broad Top.
George E. Myers, Cowansville.
Mrs. Elizabeth Claycomb, Imler.
William G. Phillips, Joffre.
Miss Ellen E. Malmberg, Kinzua.
Mrs. Gertrude M. Brown, Leckrone.
Lewis W. Cordell, Marion.
Mrs. Evalyn S. Gates, Mattawana.
Miles W. Miller, New Berlin.
Mrs. Florence D. Porter, Spring Creek.

PUERTO RICO

Miss Blanca Rosa Gomez, Las Marias.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Loyd H. Johnson, Gramling.
Howard H. Kemp, Jr., Pineville.

TENNESSEE

Mrs. Hazel S. Wheaton, Allardt.
Mrs. Myrtle Mae Atkinson, Grimsley.
Albert Keathley, New River.
Dorsie G. Bailey, Reagan.
Mrs. Eliza Cooper, Rickman.

TEXAS

Clovis W. Cummings, Ivanhoe.
Louis G. Harrell, Knott.

UTAH

Mrs. Grace E. Stokes, Cleveland.

VIRGINIA

Mrs. Lila M. Critcher, Beach.
Charles Clagett Wells, Matoaca.
Mrs. Mamie B. Keesee, Sycamore.

WASHINGTON

Harry S. Burlingham, Redondo.
Raymond D. Spurrell, Willapa.

WEST VIRGINIA

Miss Martha Jane Perry, Anjean.
Mrs. Cora B. Dearth, Bens Run.
Charles A. Cabell, Carbon.
Harry F. Jackson, Clothier.
Mrs. Lillian M. Brown, Dunlow.
Miss Doris R. Hood, Folsom.
Herbert G. Goddard, Laurel Creek.
W. Leslie Warden, Stanaford.
Mrs. Laura H. Coleman, Victor.

WISCONSIN

Mrs. Carolyn Stoxen, Bassett.
Mrs. Estelle H. Beck, Rolling Prairie.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 26, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. William Kailer Dunn, assistant pastor, St. Edward's Catholic Church, Baltimore, Md., offered the following prayer:

Almighty Father, the Members of this House are gathering to legislate for the welfare of their fellow men during anxious days in our national life. The supreme law given us by Thy Divine Son was one of love: "This is My commandment, that you love one another as I have loved you." Grant that this principle may guide the deliberations today. Help these lawmakers to see in every American citizen one of Thy creatures, watched over by Thee with a care and solicitude that numbers even the hairs of the head.

Into the hands of these Congressmen Thou hast delegated some of Thy care for precious human beings. May nothing selfish or evil prompt their decisions. Let them see the face of Thy Son reflected in the countenance of each employer and employee in this land. Let them receive from this House the same respect as would be given to Jesus Himself, for He once said:

As long as you did it to one of these, my least brethren, you did it to Me.

Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 23, 1947:

H. R. 1221. An act for the relief of Eva Bilobran; and

H. R. 3792. An act to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes.

On June 25, 1947:

H. R. 468. An act to amend section 115 of the Internal Revenue Code in respect of distributions by personal holding companies;

H. R. 1624. An act 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;

H. R. 2368. An act to amend paragraph 8 of part VII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to authorize an appropriation of $3,000,000 as a revolving fund in lieu of $1,500,000 now authorized, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2872. An act to amend further section 4 of the Public Debt Act of 1941, as amended and clarify its application, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3143. An act to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Paonia Federal reclamation project, Colorado;

H. R. 360. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Francis Eugene Hardin, a minor;

H. R. 651. An act for the relief of the estate of Rubert W. Alexander;

H. R. 888. An act for the relief of certain owners of land who suffered loss by fire in Lake Landing Township, Hyde County, N. C.;

H. R. 1065. An act for the relief of the estate of Thomas Gambacorto;

H. R. 1237. An act to regulate the marketing of economic poisons and devices, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2207. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands within the Shiloh National Military Park, Tenn., and for other purposes;

H. R. 2353. An act to authorize the patenting of certain public lands to the State of Montana or to the Board of County Commissioners of Hill County, Mont., for public-park purposes;

H. R. 2852. An act to provide for the addition of certain surplus Government lands to the Otter Creek recreational demonstration area, in the State of Kentucky;

H. R. 3151. An act to grant a certain water right and a certain parcel of land in Clark County, Nev., to the city of Las Vegas, Nev.;

H. R. 3197. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Mancos Water Conservancy District increasing the reimbursable construction cost obligation of the district to the United States for construction of the Mancos project and extending the repayment period;

H. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to the dead of the First Infantry Division, United States forces, World War II; and

H. J. Res. 210. Joint resolution to extend the time for the release, free of estate and gift tax, of certain powers, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 616. An act to authorize the creation of a game refuge in the Francis Marion National Forest in the State of South Carolina.

STRENGTHENING THE COMMON DEFENSE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 260, Rept. No. 706), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 125) to strengthen the common defense and to meet industrial needs for tin by providing for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry, and all points of order against said joint resolution are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amend-