religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1076. By Mr. HESELTON: Resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the Secretary of State to increase the status of the representative to the Irish Republic to that of an ambassador; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1077. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition signed by Charles B. Wallace and 93 other citizens of the State of Oregon, urging enactment of the railroad retirement bills H. R. 4282, 2741, 4334, and 2146; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1078. Also, petition signed by L. J. Berke and 73 other citizens of the State of Oregon, urging enactment of the railroad retirement bills H. R. 4282, 2741, 4334, and 2146; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1079. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition of residents of Springfield, Vt., requesting legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1080. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to enact the 75-cent minimum-wage bill; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 15, 1949

(Legislative day of Thursday, June 2, 1949)

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

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

Our Father God, again we bow at this altar of prayer, as into the calm and confidence of Thy presence we bring our drained and driven souls that the benediction of Thy peace may fall upon our restless lives. Let not any indifference or callousness in us make Thy presence unreal.

Make sensitive our spirits that through Thy grace and power we may be cleansed and strengthened. Come close to us one by one, for we can do nothing together unless singly we are clean and strong.

In a world that is a neighborhood and must be a brotherhood or perish, join us to that saving minority that across the boundaries of prejudice, intolerance, and hatred extends the dominion of understanding and good will.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 14, 1949, was dispensed with.

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 the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On June 14, 1949:

S. 835. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to James Madison Burton;

S. 836. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Clarence M. Scott;

S. 837. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Irene Scott Bassett;

S. 1036. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Lavantia Pearson;

S. 1037. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Virginia Pearson;

S. 1038. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Ethel M. Pearson George;

S. 1040. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Leah L. Pearson Louk;

S. 1057. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Kathleen Doyle Harris;

S. 1058. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to June Scott Skoog; and

S. 1142. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mrs. Pearl Scott Loukes.

On June 15, 1949:

S. 42. An act for the relief of Ellen Hudson, an administratrix of the estate of Walter R. Hudson;

S. 191. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Louis J. Waline; and

S. 408. An act for the relief of the estate of William E. O'Brien.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 242) extending for 2 years the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the armed forces of the United States on duty abroad, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

S. 1127. An act to amend sections 130 and 131 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to the notice to be given upon a petition for probate of a will, and to the probate of such will; and

S. 1134. An act to amend section 13-108 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia to provide for constructive service by publication in annulment actions.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE FILED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 14th instant,

Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5060) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, reported it on June 14, 1949, with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 502) thereon.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hayden	Morse
Anderson	Hendrickson	Mundt
Brewster	Hill	Murray
Bricker	Hoey	Neely
Bridges	Holland	O'Mahoney
Butler	Humphrey	Reed
Byrd	Hunt	Robertson
Cain	Ives	Russell
Capehart	Jenner	Saltonstall
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Connally	Kefauver	Sparkman
Cordon	Kem	Taft
Donnell	Kerr	Taylor
Douglas	Knowland	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Ecton	Lodge	Thye
Ellender	Long	Tobey
Ferguson	Lucas	Tydings
Flanders	McCarthy	Watkins
Frear	McClellan	Wherry
Fulbright	McFarland	Wiley
George	McGrath	Williams
Gillette	McKellar	Withers
Graham	Martin	Young
Green	Maybank	
Gurney	Millikin	

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent on official business, presiding at a meeting of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in connection with an investigation of the affairs of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] is absent on official business, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are in attendance at a meeting of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By order of the Senate, the following announcement is made:

The members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy are in attendance at a meeting of the said committee in connection with an investigation of the affairs of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be

permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, and incorporate routine matters in the RECORD, as would be done in the morning hour, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

METHODS OF COUNTERACTING BUSINESS RECESSION

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I wish to address an inquiry to the distinguished majority leader. It may seem irrelevant, but I think it bears on the national situation.

The Members of this body of both parties, and the people of the country as a whole, are grievously concerned and very apprehensive about the recession in business which has taken place. Last night I thought about a piece of legislation which Congress passed 3 or 4 years ago, known as the Full Employment Act.

The distinguished Vice President was chairman of the conferees on the part of the Senate at the time that bill was passed. The act was supposed to enable the Nation to meet an eventuality such as faces it today, with declining employment and recession in business, and to take time by the forelock, since we are aware that history has a bad habit of repeating itself. Under the program set forth in the act it might be well that plans be made to forestall such a recession as much as possible.

Under that act, as the Senator from Illinois knows, the Federal Government looked first to free enterprise to meet the need, and if that was inadequate, then to the States, to set up a program of public works of constructive value, then if such State programs were inadequate, the Federal Government itself would have ready a comprehensive program of worth-while public works to meet the challenge of unemployment, and hold the line.

I shall state the question which is in my mind. Perhaps the distinguished Senator from Illinois does not know the answer, but I should like to ask him, as the head of his party in the Senate, if he knows what steps, if any, constructively and genuinely, have been taken to forestall such an emergency under the terms of the Full Employment Act.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire that I cannot give a categorical answer to his question. From the information I have I am certain the Federal Government does have plans with respect to placing before the country a Federal works project program in the event the so-called recession which evidently the Senator from New Hampshire has in mind became serious enough to do so.

Mr. President, I am not one of those who believe that economic conditions are as bad as they are being painted. I appreciate the fact that a number of people are out of employment at the present time, and that perhaps more will be out of employment before conditions finally level off. But I am an optimist about the future of America. I am not in the category of those who are constantly predicting a major depression, or a recession in major terms. I believe the country will be much better off if the leaders of industry, labor, and officials of government will, instead of talking about a recession and a depression, try to bring about calm thought and judgment on the part of the people of America, rather than try to stress fear of the economic trend.

The Senator from New Hampshire knows there is plenty of consumer buying power in this country at the present time. There is plenty of money in this country at the present time. In my own individual judgment—and I do not say it is infallible, of course—all we have to fear is fear itself, as the great Franklin D. Roosevelt said during the depression in 1933.

Mr. President, it was only 9 months ago that many were complaining about high prices. The cry went forth, "Bring prices down." Now that prices are leveling off many are crying out that a depression is around the corner. I simply do not believe there is anything seriously disturbing about the Nation's economy at the moment. I am satisfied, however, that those who are now in charge of the executive branch of the Government are making plans to meet any emergency that might arise. It will be done expeditiously and effectively. I will say to my distinguished friend, that I shall make inquiry through the agencies of Government on the question he propounded and give him a complete answer.

Mr. TOBEY. I appreciate the Senator's cooperation. I share the feelings of the Senator from Illinois. I think he will credit me with no partisan political motive in rising to speak on this subject. I think it is up to the Members of the Senate, representing the 48 States, to be concerned with the signs and portents on the horizon, which in many ways are such as at least to excite our apprehension. We should take time by the forelock if we can.

I appreciate the kindness of the Senator from Illinois. I should be greatly pleased if some day at his convenience he would inform the Senate what steps have been taken under what I regard as a constructive piece of legislation. We should be taking some measures of preparedness. I quite agree with the Senator that the recession is a normal thing, and nothing to be excited about. It is perfectly natural that the extreme profits and high prices of the past 3 or 4 or 5 years should be only temporary. They do not represent the norm in America. At the same time, we would be derelict in our duty if we did not express our concern and try to see what can be done to build up an assurance against such an eventuality. Does not the Senator agree?

Mr. LUCAS. I wholeheartedly agree with the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. The very reason for passing the act was to meet any economic crisis which might arise. We passed the act at a time when America was strong financially and economically. I am satisfied, as I previously stated, that plans have been made. Exactly what the plans are, I cannot advise the Senator in detail. However, as I stated a moment ago, I shall be glad to make further inquiry and furnish the Senate with whatever information I can obtain.

Mr. TOBEY. In the inquiry which the Senator proposes to make, would he be so kind as to find out not only what the Federal Government has done, but whether or not the Federal Government has communicated with the 48 States to find out what they have done? There should be teamwork all along the line.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator that the entire question should be explored, not only from the standpoint of the Federal Government, but also from the standpoint of the State governments, to see what cooperation has been had between the Federal Government and the State governments, and what has been done.

Mr. TOBEY. I recall that when the bill was on the floor of the Senate—and I say it in no spirit of immodesty—I had a deep conviction of the need to anticipate direful times. I stood on the floor of the Senate and took the thrusts of the spears of many Senators on both sides of the aisle who minimized, decried, and ridiculed the legislation. I believed in it then. I believe in it now. It is a measure of prudence, taking time by the forelock and being ready for any appearance of evil along the lines of industrial decline.

I thank the Senator from Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This discussion is out of order. Under the unanimous-consent agreement Senators are permitted to present routine matters without debate. The Chair feels obligated to enforce the order.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

PROPOSED PROVISION AND SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR (S. DOC. NO. 84)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision and a supplemental estimate of appropriation, amounting to $500,000, Department of the Interior, fiscal year 1950, in the form of amendments to the budget (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Attorney General, withdrawing the name of Felipe Dominquez Hurtado from a report relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted by him to the Senate on April 1, 1949; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Legislative Assembly and the Municipal Council of St. Croix, and the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF OPERATION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, parts III and IV of the report of the Commission on the Operation of the Trade Agreements Program, June 1934 to April 1948, entitled "Trade-Agreements Con-

cessions Granted by the United States" and "Trade-Agreements Concessions Obtained by the United States," respectively (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

A letter from the president of the National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Academy for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California, relating to the use of the water of the Colorado River; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See text of joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. KNOWLAND on June 14, 1949, p. 7618, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

By Mr. McMAHON:

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolved by this assembly:

"Whereas war is now a threat to the very existence of our civilization because modern science has produced weapons of war which are overwhelmingly destructive and against which there is no sure defense; and

"Whereas the effective maintenance of world peace is the proper concern and responsibility of every American citizen; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Connecticut, while now enjoying domestic peace and security under the laws of their local, State, and Federal Government, deeply desire the guaranty of world peace; and

"Whereas all history shows that peace is the product of law and order, and that law and order are the product of government; and

"Whereas the United Nations, as presently constituted, although accomplishing great good in many fields, lacks authority to enact, interpret, or enforce world law, and under its present Charter is incapable of restraining any major nations which may foster or foment war; and

"Whereas the Charter of the United Nations expressly provides, in articles 108 and 109, a procedure for reviewing and altering the Charter; and

"Whereas several nations have recently adopted constitutional provisions to facilitate their entry into a world federal government by authorizing a delegation to such a world federal government of a portion of their sovereignty to endow it with powers adequate to prevent war; and

"Whereas the State of Connecticut has memorialized Congress, both through passage by the general assembly in 1943 of the so-called Humber resolution and through the world government referendum of 1948, overwhelmingly approved by the voters of the State, to initiate steps toward the creation of a world federal government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, That application is hereby made to the Congress of the United States, pursuant to article V of the Constitution of the United States, to call a convention for the sole purpose of proposing amendments to the Constitution which are appropriate to authorize the United States to negotiate with other nations, subject to later ratification, a constitution of a world federal government, open to all nations, with limited powers adequate to assure peace, or amendments to the Constitution which are appropriate to ratify any world constitution which is presented to the United States by the United Nations, by a world constitutional convention or otherwise; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the State of Connecticut is hereby directed to transmit copies of this application to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress, to the Members of the said Senate and House of Representatives from this State, and to the presiding officers of each of the legislatures in the several States, requesting their cooperation.

"Given under my hand and the seal of the State, this 1st day of June in the year of our Lord 1949.

"CHESTER BOWLES,
"Governor.

"By His Excellency's command:
"WINIFRED McDONALD,
"Secretary."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INTERSTATE TRAFFIC IN SUBVERSIVE TEXTBOOKS—PETITION

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a petition of the Pennsylvania Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, Pittsburgh, Pa., asking a congressional investigation into interstate traffic in subversive textbooks and teaching materials, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PETITION FOR REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States:

We hereby petition for an independent and impartial investigation of the interstate traffic in subversive textbooks and teaching materials as requested in the petitions now on file presented by the National Society and the California Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, and we do hereby join in and make ourselves a party to those proceedings.

We request the Congress to grant us all relief possible in this matter by determining the facts and giving them to the people with appropriate recommendations.

Dated this 7th day of June 1949 in the city of Pittsburgh State of Pennsylvania.

PENNSYLVANIA SOCIETY OF THE SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION,
By JOHN A. FRITCHEY II,
President.
EDWIN B. GRAHAM,
Secretary.

MUNDT-NIXON ANTICOMMUNISM BILL—MEMORIAL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a letter from Rev. Charles A. Hill, pastor of the Hartford Avenue Baptist Church, of Detroit, Mich., remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called Mundt-Nixon anticommunism bill, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

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

HARTFORD AVENUE BAPTIST CHURCH,
Detroit, Mich., June 13, 1949.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I wish to convey to you the complete opposition of my church of over 1,200 members to the Mundt-Nixon bill which will come up before this session of Congress.

We are as much opposed to organizations seeking to overthrow the Government by violence as anyone in America. On the other hand we are against this method of calling labor groups or any group, Communist or Communist fronts, without a fair hearing and if they so desire in a court where they can be tried by the peers. The latitude of this bill makes it possible for any party or group in power, to label their opponents regardless of the honesty of their motive, Communist or Communist front and as the bill now seems they have no redress. Such a bill will only create more confusion and unrest in the country. Just as no type of legislation could hold back the antislavery movement, neither will any type of legislation which has to be for free living people of America but which opposed to Jim Crow and segregation in any form, these individuals will give their life for democracy where everyone is equal regardless of race, creed, or color, or national origin. The Mundt-Nixon bill will only drive the subversive forces underground where other effectiveness will be much more dangerous.

Trusting that you will use your influence against any form of legislation that points to thought control, we are yours for a real democracy.

Rev. CHARLES A. HILL,
Pastor, Hartford Avenue Baptist Church.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM—LETTER FROM UNIVERSAL AFRICAN NATIONALIST MOVEMENT, INC.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from the Universal African Nationalist Movement, Inc., of New York, N. Y., signed by Benjamin Gibbons, president, and Benjamin W. Jones, executive secretary, relating to the unemployment problem, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

UNIVERSAL AFRICAN NATIONALIST MOVEMENT, INC.,
New York N. Y., June 11, 1949.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Inasmuch as we had replied to your of the 7th inst., it became evident to us, after its dispatch, that there are certain suggestions we can make; therefore we hasten to transmit them.

Since the list of unemployed is growing rapidly, it becomes the duty of the leaders and administrators of the Nation to find a solution to the problem; so when we turn to statistics furnished by the Government we find the situation quite appalling, for if we turn to the World Almanac and Book of Facts we will find on page 312, column 4, under the caption Beneficiaries, as of June 30, 1948, that there were 3,820,774 persons receiving unemployment compensation at the rate of an average of $18.17 per week; mark you, this does not represent all those whose status were of such that they were not covered by this insurance; but we will take that figure for the basis of our argument; if the ratio of 10 percent was used,

which represents the percentage of persons of African blood and descent in the Nation; from this we will get an average of 382,077 persons of our race receiving $18.17 per week, a total of $6,942,339.09 among them every week, or a grand total of $361,001,632.68 a year, if the number of unemployed is not increased; so in 5 years we will find a tremendous strain on the Nation's economy to the tune of the stupendous sum of $1,805,008,163.40 being spent to keep this vast amount of unemployed sapping and draining the life's blood of the Nation, which does not make good common sense.

This same amount of money, if used wisely, by being appropriated in one lump sum, would enable this same amount of people to go to Liberia to engage themselves in useful occupation, producing raw materials and other much needed goods that would serve as a stopgap in the increased list of unemployed; for this money, being used as dead wood, by only just going to the grocer and the rent man, would enable these people to purchase ships, machines, engines, tools, building materials, and things too numerous to mention, and would not only give these people a longer and better lease on life, but their productivity of much needed goods, and the industrialization of their newly established community, would build a mighty and formidable bridge of commerce between the two countries; thus killing two birds with one stone.

It must be borne in mind, no matter how great a Nation might be, it cannot continue peeling out dole to so vast an amount of unemployed, while being engaged in so great a responsibility, that of aiding and assisting almost two-thirds of the nations, without seriously impairing the fabric of its economy; so, while this opportunity presents itself, it is to the best interest of this Nation that advantage be taken of it, because, in this rapidly changing world, no one can guess from one day to the other what serious developments will ensue; people everywhere are crying and seeking for freedom, and if pushed in a tight corner, being squeezed to death, as it were, will seek a way out, and will take a chance of accepting any aid and assistance from any source, so long as it appears to be a helping hand; a desperate man loses the power to think discreetly and will do almost anything in the act of self-preservation.

We do think that if and when the bill comes up for a hearing, if these arguments would be advanced, it might be the means of enlightening many who might have a different view on the subject, for if there should be something done in behalf of the African peoples of the world it is now, because of their deplorable plight they are restive, very much so, and the only way a cancer can be cured is to attack it in its embryonic stage, lest it might develop and prove fatal.

We are hoping and trusting for the best, and are praying that the enactment of this bill will be hastened; so while invoking the care and keeping of a benign Father on you and yours, we shall expect an early reply, remaining as ever, most respectfully,

Yours very truly,

BENJAMIN GIBBONS,
President.

BENJ. W. JONES,
Executive Secretary.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

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

S. 1664. A bill to amend the National Bank Act and the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 504).

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report an original joint resolution to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and I submit a report (No. 505) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 109) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, was read twice by its title, and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

On June 14, 1949:

S. 1125. An act to amend section 16-415 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, to provide for the enforcement of court orders for the payment of temporary and permanent maintenance in the same manner as directed to enforce orders for permanent alimony;

S. 1129. An act to amend section 16-416 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, to conform to the nomenclature and practice prescribed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure;

S. 1131. An act to amend sections 260, 267, 309, 315, 348, 350, and 361 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, to provide that estates of decedents being administered within the probate court may be settled at the election of the personal representative of the decedent in that court 6 months after his qualification as such personal representative;

S. 1132. An act to amend section 137 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to the time within which a caveat may be filed to a will after the will has been probated;

S. 1133. An act to amend section 16-418 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, to provide that an attorney be appointed by the court to defend all uncontested annulment cases;

S. 1135. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, to provide a family allowance and a simplified procedure in the settlement of small estates; and

S. 1557. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional judge for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia.

On June 15, 1949:

S. 1127. An act to amend sections 130 and 131 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to the notice to be given upon a petition for probate of a will, and to the probate of such will; and

S. 1134. An act to amend section 13-108 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia to provide for constructive service by publication in annulment actions.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

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

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MCKELLAR:

S. 2081. A bill for the relief of William M. Greene; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 2082. A bill for the relief of Yan Wrobel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

S. 2083. A bill to provide for the preparation of a plan for the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the building of the Soo Locks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2084. A bill for the relief of Jackson Riley Holland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. FLANDERS):

S. 2085. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 with respect to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 2086. A bill transferring management of certain public lands from the Agriculture Department to the Fort Sill Indian School in Oklahoma for agriculture uses; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MCGRATH (for Mr. WAGNER):

S. 2087. A bill for the relief of Anna Bartok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an original joint resolution (S. J. Res. 109) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, and appears under a separate heading.)

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT OF 1949—AMENDMENTS

Mr. IVES submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by Mr. TAFT for title III of the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Utah dated May 31, 1949, to the bill (S. 249) to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and Mr. AIKEN) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the amendment proposed by Mr. THOMAS of Utah as a substitute for the committee amendment to Senate bill 249, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 242) extending for 2 years the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the armed forces of the United States on duty abroad, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

LABOR SITUATION IN THE HAWAIIAN ISLANDS—CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN SENATOR MORSE AND EARL B. WILSON

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD correspondence between him and Mr. Earl B. Wilson, of the California & Hawaiian Sugar Refining Corp., regarding the strike situation in Hawaii, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY REV. JOHN S. STRENG

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Memorial Day address delivered by Rev. John S. Streng, pastor of St. John's Lutheran Church, Beatrice, Nebr., before the American Legion post at Fairbury, Nebr., on May 30, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

VILLANOVA COLLEGE COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES P. McGRANERY

[Mr. McCARRAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the commencement address delivered by the Honorable James T. McGranery, judge of the United States District Court, Eastern Division of Pennsylvania, to the graduates of Villanova College, June 6, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

REMOVAL OF FEDERAL RENT CONTROL—EDITORIAL FROM CLEVELAND PLAIN DEALER

[Mr. BRICKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Thwarting Home Rule," published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of June 3, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TRUMAN-BYRD CONTROVERSY—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a series of editorial comments on the so-called Truman-Byrd controversy, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE COMMUNIST THREAT TO HAWAII—EDITORIAL FROM HONOLULU ADVERTISER

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Misguided Friend," published in the Honolulu Advertiser of May 31, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED BASING-POINT LEGISLATION

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Rankin Peck, president of the National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, relative to Senate bill 1008, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT OF 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 249) to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], for himself and other Senators, to the so-called Thomas substitute.

Mr. HILL obtained the floor.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question.

Mr. ELLENDER. I desire to ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 5060. I can assure the Senator that it will not require very long to enact the bill. I ask the Senator if he will permit me to submit that request at this time.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I do not think it will take more than a few minutes to dispose of the pending amendment. The amendment has been pending since a week ago last Monday. I was about to make a very brief statement on the amendment. I do not think there will be very much debate. I wonder if the Senator will allow us to dispose of the amendment first.

Mr. ELLENDER. How long will it take?

Mr. HILL. I assure the Senator that I do not think it will take very long.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I did not yield for that purpose. I said I would yield for a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question has been asked and answered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the amendment under consideration is very simple. It adds a new paragraph, subsection (3), to section 8 (b) of the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, as proposed to be reenacted and amended.

If this amendment were adopted, the language would read as follows——

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the distinguished Senator from Alabama if it is his intention, at the conclusion of his remarks, to try to obtain a vote on the pending amendment.

Mr. HILL. I very much hope that we may have a vote and dispose of the amendment.

If the amendment is agreed to, the subsection in the bill will read as follows:

(b) It shall be an unfair labor practice for a labor organization—

* * * * *

(3) to refuse to bargain collectively with an employer, subject to the provisions of section 9 (a).

It is well at the outset to compare this amendment with the provisions now in the bill which place upon employers the duty to bargain collectively. These are the provisions of the Wagner Act, as well as those of the present law:

(a) It shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer—

(6) to refuse to bargain collectively with the representatives of his employees, subject to the provisions of section 9 (a).

So far as possible, Mr. President, the same language is followed, therefore, with respect to labor organizations as is now written into the law with respect to employers. The same general duties of meeting and bargaining in good faith will be imposed by the amendment upon both groups at the bargaining table.

The amendment is consistent with the spirit, the policy, and the purpose of the proposed legislation now before the Senate. The purpose is the same as that of the original Wagner Act, namely, to remove obstructions in the path of free and peaceful collective bargaining in the interest of harmonious industrial relations.

Mr. President, if this country wishes to remain free, in my opinion, it must have a true national policy of free collective bargaining, which the Thomas bill would reestablish. By that, I mean that employers and employees must be encouraged to make their own private collective contracts. The history of the past 50 years has shown that individuals cannot go up single handed and alone and bargain with corporations, for when they attempt to do so, the result is dictation by management. If we fail to encourage equal and mutual collective bargaining, I fear the ultimate result will be dictation by the Government as to the terms and conditions of employment, enforced by law.

Collective bargaining is the middle ground between dictation by management, on the one hand, and dictation by Government, on the other hand. The more collective bargaining we have, the more freedom we shall have—freedom of true private contract with equal bargaining power, freedom from domination by Government or domination by management, freedom of enterprise in the face of modern industrial realities. That is what the pending amendment seeks to bring about.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, the present provisions of the bill, as now written, head in this direction. For example, section 204, dealing with mediation and arbitration, to be found on page 29, beginning in line 25, and continuing on page 30, contains the following:

It shall be the duty of employers and employees and their representatives to—

(a) exert every reasonable effort to make and maintain collective bargaining agreements for definite periods of time.

That provision, now written in the bill, reflects Federal labor policy, just as does another provision contained in section 8 (c) of the amendments of the bill to the Wagner Act. The latter provision appears on page 12, in line 22, reading as follows:

It shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer or a labor organization to terminate or modify a collective-bargaining contract covering employees in an industry affecting commerce unless the party desiring such termination or modification notifies the United States Conciliation Service of the proposed termination or modification at least 30 days prior to the expiration date of the contract, or 30 days prior to the time it is proposed to make such termination or modification, whichever is earlier.

The provision I have just quoted is in the interest of stimulating, encouraging, and assisting the collective-bargaining process, of seeking to encourage and assist both management, on the one hand, and labor, on the other hand, to come together and bargain collectively. Of course, normally, as we know, labor unions do not interfere with collective bargaining; in fact, it is not to their interest to do so, or not to wish to bargain collectively, or to refuse to bargain collectively. In fact, labor unions exist for the purpose of collective bargaining, and they must bargain if they are to serve their functions, both their functions as to the membership of the labor unions and their functions in our American society. It is only in the unusual case that the union fails to engage in collective bargaining, and it is to those unusual cases that this amendment is addressed. In other words, the amendment requires labor unions to bargain collectively.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the Senator from Alabama know of any political party which does not claim to believe in free collective bargaining?

Mr. HILL. Not only do I not know of any political party which does not claim to believe in free collective bargaining, but, as I recall, all political parties have declared in their platforms in favor of free collective bargaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the Senator from Alabama know of any management group or any industry which does not state that it favors free collective bargaining?

Mr. HILL. I say to the Senator from Colorado that in days past some management groups were very much opposed to free collective bargaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am speaking about today.

Mr. HILL. As of today, I think it can be stated with accuracy that, on the whole, management, as well as labor, believes in free collective bargaining, and recognizes that free collective bargaining is the cornerstone of what should be the American labor policy, and that if we are to continue our great free-enterprise system and are to maintain freedom in industrial and labor affairs, we must have free collective bargaining.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WITHERS. Does the Senator from Alabama know of any greater service which the Government can render than when it attempts to encourage both management and labor to proceed by way of collective bargaining?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Kentucky is correct; I think the Government can render no greater service either to management or to labor or a greater service to our free-enterprise system than by the encouragement of free collective bargaining.

Of course, Mr. President, if this amendment is adopted, the rules for collective bargaining by unions must be developed by the National Labor Relations Board, taking into consideration the traditions, customs, and practices of the particular union, its methods of bargaining, and the basic nature and purpose of labor organizations, as well as the problems they must face and overcome.

At all times the touchstone in regard to collective bargaining and whether there is free collective bargaining, whether both sides are engaging in the process in good faith, is whether there is a bona fide effort on the part of both sides to negotiate and agree to bring forth a contract. In that way, through such collective bargaining, it will be possible to avoid the tendency to pry into the internal affairs of unions and any attempt to regulate organizational relationships within the union itself, of course, will be rejected. It is the intention of this amendment that such a tendency should be as thoroughly avoided as it should be in the case of employers or corporations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Alabama yield for a few questions to clarify some features of this subject?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the Senator whether he understands the requirement for collective bargaining as being one which compels either party necessarily to agree to the proposals of the other side. Is that obligatory?

Mr. HILL. No. There is no obligation on the part of either the employer or the employee to agree. The obligation goes to an honest, bona fide effort on the part of both parties to try to agree.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, all the term "collective bargaining" means is that the parties agree that they will sit down around the table, compare relative demands, and try to reach an agreement; but there is no obligation upon either side to come to an agreement. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely right.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And there is no obligation to come to an agreement, either in whole or in part, upon the demands of either side?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely right.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, if an employer objects to the closed shop, for example, even though the union requests the closed shop, there is no obligation upon the part of the employer to grant the closed shop. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. There is no obligation whatever on the part of the employer to grant the closed shop. The employer does not have to grant anything. All he has to do is to sit around the table and, in good faith, discuss the problems, negotiate, and endeavor to arrive at an agreement between himself and his employees.

Mr. DOUGLAS. For example, with respect to seniority rules, to which a union may hold so strongly that it does not want to yield on them, and believes there is no obligation upon them to do so, if an employer wishes to compel the union to give up its seniority rules, there is no obligation upon the union to yield to the employer's demands. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. There is absolutely no obligation; none whatever.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may also ask the distinguished Senator from Alabama whether the process of collective bargaining requires a definite procedure. Must the topics be taken up in a given sequence, or are the parties free to discuss the various topics in any fashion which is mutually acceptable?

Mr. HILL. Absolutely no particular procedure is required, and I may say to the Senator, on the other hand, I think nothing would be more unfortunate than to try to prescribe any procedure. The whole essence of this thing is freedom on the part of people who are acting to try to reach some agreement in an atmosphere of freedom for both sides.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a further question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to inquire, in an industry where bargaining in the past has been primarily conducted on a multi-employer basis, namely, where unions meet with groups of employers, either on an industry-wide basis or or a regional basis, whether the term "collective bargaining" means that after the discussion has taken place on the multi-employer basis, is the union then compelled to go to each and every individual employer to negotiate with him separately?

Mr. HILL. Oh, no.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Or can there be an agreement for the group of employers as a whole?

Mr. HILL. There very definitely can be an agreement for the group of employers as a whole, certainly, and there is no obligation on the part of the union, no obligation whatever, to go to each of the employers in the industry separately.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, in the case of the coal industry, where bargaining has taken place on a regional basis and if an agreement is being negotiated on the regional basis, it is not then necessary for the union to bargain with each and every mine operator. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. It is not necessary. I can tell the Senator very definitely, it is not necessary.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Alabama for his very clarifying and very succinct answers.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will the distinguished Senator advise me whether the proposed amendment was presented to the subcommittee and to the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare?

Mr. HILL. We did not have a subcommittee on this particular subject at this session of the Congress. I may say to the Senator there was no vote or action on it by the full committee.

Mr. LANGER. Why was it not presented to the full committee?

Mr. HILL. There were no votes on amendments to the bill in the committee.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. What the Senator proposes to do, as I understand, is to take a piece of the Taft-Hartley law which he likes and to put it into the Thomas bill, which proposes to eliminate the provision from the existing law. Is not that correct?

Mr. HILL. No; I would not say that at all. I would say that long before we had the Taft-Hartley law, there were many who believed that the original Wagner Act should be amended to impose the obligation of collective bargaining upon labor as well as upon the employer. The fact is that the main criticism in many ways of the original Wagner Act through the years has been that there was not imposed upon labor an obligation to bargain collectively, such as was imposed by the act on employers. So this proposition, I may say, was born long before the Taft-Hartley bill was introduced. In fact, it had reached lusty

and full manhood before we ever heard of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. TAFT. Can the Senator refer me to any place where anybody ever introduced a bill to accomplish this objective until the Taft-Hartley Act provided for it?

Mr. HILL. I may say that the substitute bill which was offered by certain members of the minority—that is, the Democrats—2 years ago, at the time we had under consideration the Taft-Hartley Act, embodied this very provision. This very provision was in the substitute bill at that time.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator means, does he not, that it was drafted after the Taft-Hartley bill had been introduced in the Senate with the approval of the Senator from Alabama and myself, among others?

Mr. HILL. I may say to the Senator there was nothing new, there was no rabbit pulled out of the hat, when this provision was carried in the Taft-Hartley bill, because it had been in other bills, and had been suggested by many different people. It had been with us, certainly since the days of the enactment of the original Wagner Act.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Then, if that has been the position of the administration, how does the Senator account for the fact that the Thomas bill, on behalf of the administration, proposes to take the provision out of the Taft-Hartley law, the existing statute, and repeal it?

Mr. HILL. They were removing so many bad things, there was so much in the Taft-Hartley law that was bad, that, just as when a surgeon performing an operation finds a situation which is so bad that it is necessary for him to make a sweeping dissection to remove all the unhealthy tissues, this item went along with a great many bad features.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend.

Mr. TAFT. I understood the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] to say the other day that such a provision as this should not be included, and that he was still opposed to any amendment to the Thomas bill in spite of the proposal made by the Senator from Alabama. Was not that the Senator's understanding?

Mr. HILL. I understood that was the position of the Senator from Florida, and the Senator from Florida has just as much right to be against the amendment as the Senator from Ohio has to stand on this floor and advocate the bobtailed Taft-Hartley bill.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I am only trying to bring out the facts. It is true also, is it not, that Mr. Green, of the American Federation of Labor, in testifying before the committee, said that he thought this provision was wholly unnecessary? Was not that, in effect, his testimony with respect to this provision?

Mr. HILL. As I remember Mr. Green's testimony, whereas he thought the writing of this provision into the law was unnecessary, he did not feel that there should be any objection on the part of labor to the proposition that labor should bargain collectively. As I recall Mr. Green's testimony, he emphasized the fact that one of the principal purposes, one of the main reasons for having labor unions, was that they might bargain collectively.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. May I read to the Senator Mr. Green's testimony, in reply to my general question?

Mr. HILL. From what page is the Senator reading?

Mr. TAFT. I read from pages 1922 and 1923, part 4. I shall read merely the part at the end:

> Mr. GREEN. You must have information that I don't have. I never knew of a single union that ever refused to bargain collectively.
>
> Senator TAFT. The courts have found that they have. Mr. Green, in any event you don't think the unions should be subject to the obligation to bargain collectively under the law?
>
> Mr. GREEN. There is the obligation by our union to do it. So far as I am concerned, if there is anyone that refuses, I will see that he does.

Mr. HILL. The whole spirit and purport of Mr. Green's statement, whether he thinks this amendment ought to go into the law or not, is the spirit and purport of the pending amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Of course the Senator is aware of the fact that the actions against the ITU which have been so strenuously denounced by those representing the labor position of recent days, was due to their refusal to bargain collectively as found by the court. So that all the injunctions in that case were based primarily on their refusal to bargain under this provision of the Taft-Hartley law. Is the Senator aware of that?

Mr. HILL. I think so. So that the Senate and the RECORD may have the full facts, I will say that if they did not bargain, it is because they could not bargain collectively under the Taft-Hartley law.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Can the Senator tell us whether the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill will accept this amendment if there is no opposition on this side of the aisle?

Mr. HILL. I will say that the amendment is entirely within the spirit of the fundamental purposes of the bill and contributes substantially to achieving its main objective—collective bargaining. The Senator in charge of the bill can speak for himself better than I can speak for him, and I would much prefer that he speak for himself than for me to attempt to put words into his mouth.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I cannot answer the question "Yes" or "No." Being in charge of the bill, I represent the action of the committee on the bill. If I am faithful to what the committee has reported, the answer would have to be "No." I do not think it would be proper for me to accept an amendment of this kind, because while it is not a controversial amendment, while it would not destroy the unity of the bill in any way, I think each individual Senator should be free to vote as he pleases upon the bill.

If the Senator will yield further——

Mr. HILL. I shall be glad to yield the floor, if the Senator wishes to speak at length.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; I wish to speak only for a moment. I think we have missed the whole story of the purpose of the original National Labor Relations Act. No one assumed that labor, which was asking to bargain and asking to have its representatives, whom it might freely choose, represent it in bargaining with employers, would ever refuse to bargain. That was not the point at all. It was alleged by the opponents of the Wagner Act that the act was one-sided. Of course it was, in that regard. It was for the purpose of establishing rights for labor, and one of those rights was to bargain collectively with employers. That is the reason there was not a double provision. The assumption was completely and wholly covered in the National Labor Relations Act, and that is the reason why this provision found no place in the pending bill.

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

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

Mr. NEELY. Will the distinguished Senator from Alabama be good enough to explain the difference between his amendment and the comparable language of the Taft-Hartley law?

Mr. HILL. I would say that so far as the pending amendment is concerned, the phraseology is substantially the same. The Taft-Hartley law, however, goes into the matter of what collective bargaining is and seeks to prescribe what it is. This amendment does not go into those prescriptions or seek to lay down those rules or regulations laid down by the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. NEELY. Does the Senator mean that the only difference is that the Taft-Hartley law spells out the procedure, and the Senator's amendment does not?

Mr. HILL. I would not say the Taft-Hartley law spells out all the procedure, but it does lay down certain definite prescriptions and regulations which impairs the freedom of true collective bargaining and which my amendment does not contain.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Alabama takes the position that the adoption of this provision would cure the situation confronting the Nation with reference to labor and management relations?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Montana must think I am a greater optimist than I really am. I have not yet found any cure-all for anything. I think this

amendment would be beneficial and significant from the standpoint of laying down a basic national labor policy with its cornerstone, free from collective bargaining.

Mr. MURRAY. Does the Senator feel that the adoption of his amendment, without removing the other restrictive and punitive provisions in the labor law, would accomplish anything for the country?

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator that I am standing side by side with him, and shall do all I can to remove the restrictive and punitive provisions to which he has referred.

Mr. MURRAY. Does not the Senator feel that if, 2 years ago, we had undertaken to adopt an amendment of this kind, and a few other amendments which at that time appeared desirable, and had avoided the enactment of those punitive measures and provisions, we would be far ahead today in our labor relations?

Mr. HILL. I think the Senator is correct. If my memory is correct, the Senator was one of the authors of the substitute bill which was offered 2 years ago for the Taft-Hartley bill. That substitute bill carried this provision for collective bargaining. I thoroughly agree with the Senator that had the Senate passed the substitute offered by the Senator, instead of passing the Taft-Hartley bill, the whole labor-management situation would be much healthier and better than it is at this time.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator for that statement.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama is not copied from the Taft-Hartley Act, but is a return to the Murray amendment of 1947. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. The Senator has very accurately stated the situation.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the omission of this phrase from the Wagner Act of 1935 was a purely technical omission which is now being remedied by the perfecting amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. HILL. The distinguished Senator from Utah, the chairman of the committee, made what I thought was a very fine, concise statement as to why this provision was not put into the original act. In 1935, when the original act was passed, there was no question about labor not bargaining collectively. Labor was begging, petitioning, pleading to have the right to bargain collectively, to be able to bargain collectively. It was the denial on the part of management to bargain collectively with labor that brought forth the Wagner Act. In 1935 there was no question of any consequence raised with reference to labor bargaining collectively, because labor, throughout the country, was asking, petitioning, and begging to be allowed to be given the opportunity by management to bargain collectively.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. At no time during that period was there any position taken by labor that it would not bargain collectively, was there?

Mr. HILL. There certainly was no position taken by labor in that respect. On the other hand, labor's postion at that time was that it was asking for an opportunity to bargain collectively. That is exactly what it wanted to do, because labor was wise enough to recognize that there can be no free, worthwhile bargaining as between management on the one hand and the individual industrial worker on the other hand. That means, and has always meant, dictation by management. We either have dictation by management, free collective bargaining, or else we have some form of dictation by Government.

Mr. MURRAY. The adoption of this amendment, standing by itself, would not cure labor conditions in this country. If we continue to maintain the punitive and restrictive measures and processes which undertake to prevent the expansion of labor unionism and weakening its bargaining power, we shall continue to have such problems between labor and management.

Mr. HILL. I think the Senator is exactly right.

Mr. MURRAY. When we offered that amendment we were offering it as part of a program to bring about better relations between management and workers, and we would not have offered it as a part of a program that undertook to restrict and strait-jacket labor. Labor can never bargain collectively if it is going to be subject to the kind of provisions which were inflicted on it by the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. HILL. Knowing that that was the spirit, intent, and purpose of the substitute amendment offered 2 years ago by the Senator from Montana and some of his colleagues on the floor of the Senate, we who offer the pending amendment today went back to that substitute amendment and there received inspiration which brings us here today with the pending amendment.

Mr. MURRAY. If this amendment is incorporated in the Thomas bill and at the same time the Taft provisions are incorporated, we will not have fair, honest collective bargaining in this country.

Mr. HILL. I agree with the Senator; we should have this amendment, and then reject the unfair and punitive restrictions, referred to by the Senator.

Mr. President, I hope we may have a vote on the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, before we vote on the amendment I think I should say a word or two about it. I have been asked by the Senator from Ohio if I would accept the amendment on the part of the committee. The answer is "no." I should like to add that if the amendment is offered in the spirit of the Taft-Hartley law, the answer is of course definitely "No." If, on the other hand, it is offered in the spirit of the original Wagner Act, the National Labor Relations Act, or offered in the spirit of the amendment which was offered as a substitute in 1947, the answer is that it will be given serious consideration, and in giving it serious consideration, it should be said to the Members of the Senate, when they are called upon to vote for the amendment, that the amendment was offered by members of the committee who are friendly to the bill which is now before the Senate . It was offered by members of the committee who would have supported, had they been present, and who did support, the substitute bill offered in 1947.

It is a question, therefore, as to whether Senators want to put into the pending bill something representing the spirit that has developed since the National Labor Relations Act came into existence, when we did find some representing labor who refused to bargain. I think that refusal on the part of labor is entirely and wholly out of harmony with and not in any way in keeping with the spirit labor had in asking for the National Labor Relations Act, and it was out of harmony with the purpose of the National Labor Relations Act.

If advantage-taking comes into the bargaining room, and instead of bargaining to come to an agreement, there is an attempt to make agreement more difficult, those participating are not collectively bargaining, they are merely arguing and not attempting to bring about peace between employers and employees. If bargaining is not to be honestly done, why bargain at all? If men are merely going to be present, read magazines, and talk about other things, and then come to no agreement under any consideration, that is not collective bargaining.

The questions asked of the Senator from Alabama by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], give us the true purpose we are trying to accomplish by the bill which is before us, namely, to bring into life again the National Labor Relations Act as it was.

This amendment comes within the category of which I spoke toward the conclusion of my opening remarks, of the type of amendment which can be added to the committee bill without in any way destroying its spirit or purpose. It will not in any way affect that which is being done by the committee bill, except in this one particular, that it does assume a duality of responsibility under a bill which should be only unitary in its nature, because it is assumed all the time that labor will want to live up to its rights.

If, on the other hand—and this is a repetition—the amendment is offered for the purpose of keeping in the bill the spirit, the punitive nature, of all the Taft-Hartley law represents in the minds of labor, the amendment would be just as distasteful to the leaders of labor and to labor generally in the United States as any of the other amendments which are entirely out of harmony with what we are trying to do.

I trust, Mr. President, that when we have a vote on the bill each Senator will vote his convictions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, of course this particular amendment is taken out of the Taft-Hartley law. All the talk about it being in the spirit of the Wagner Act is complete nonsense. The Wagner Act did not contemplate any unfair labor practices on the part of the unions, it did not provide any machinery of any kind whatever against unions. The entire spirit was only of one nature, namely, to force an employer to recognize a union, and be subject to compulsion by the Board if he engaged in unfair labor practices. The Wagner Act was one-sided in spirit, it was always intended to be one-sided, and no suggestion was ever made in the act that a union should be compelled to do anything, or that there could be any unfair labor practice on the part of a union.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think we should out of fairness to everybody read the Taft-Hartley law and what it says, and interpret the spirit of it. I refer to page 7, subsection (3):

> To refuse to bargain collectively with an employer, provided—

And this is where the damage of the Taft-Hartley law comes in. It is assumed that labor is never honest, that labor is never straightforward, that labor is not acting properly, and it is this in the Taft-Hartley law to which labor objects.

> To refuse to bargain collectively with an employer.

We do not object to that, but we do object to the proviso. I am sure that every laboring man would object to it, because it carries a sting which hurts laboring men down to their boots.

Mr. TAFT. What proviso is the Senator talking about, if I may ask?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. In subsection (3), "provided it is the representative of his employees subject to the provisions of section 9 (a)."

Of course, that means that employers do not have to bargain with employees unless they represent a properly organized union.

Mr. TAFT. With due respect to the Senator, the two provisions mean exactly the same. The amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama does not obligate a union to bargain collectively if the union does not represent a majority of the employees. While words to that effect are perhaps unnecessary, the legal effect is exactly the same. There is no reflection on any union. There can be an unfair labor practice only when the union is the representative of the employees. If it is not so designated by the Board, it is no longer obligated to bargain collectively. Obviously it might have some difficulty in doing so if it did not represent a majority. Those words in no way change the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law. The amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama is exactly the same as the present law.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, we may say it would be exactly the same provided the part after the word "provided" in the Taft-Hartley law were not there.

Mr. TAFT. The words in no way get rid of the provision of the Taft-Hartley law. They mean substantially nothing except to make perfectly clear that a union which does not represent a majority of the employees is not obligated to engage in collective bargaining and to sign a contract.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. We are hitting at the very subject, the very principle, that labor objects to in the Taft-Hartley law. It is that the bill is wholly legalistic from start to finish; that even in mediation it is necessary to have lawyers present, which destroys mediation in a certain way, and opens up a chance for argument on any kind of point imaginable. Whenever a lawyer comes into a collective bargaining circle collective bargaining goes out and litigation comes in. It is that sort of thing which labor objects to, because laborers are not lawyers.

Mr. TAFT. Do I understand the Senator from Utah is supporting the Hill amendment, or is not supporting the Hill amendment? Is he supporting the amendment or opposing the amendment?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am trying to explain the effect of the amendment, Mr. President.

Mr. TAFT. The effect of the amendment is to put into the Thomas bill the exact provision of the Taft-Hartley law on the subject of requiring unions to bargain collectively. The Senator talks about legal language, but the Hill amendment says "subject to the provisions of section 9 (a)." So we have to turn to section 9 (a), which provides:

> Representatives designated or selected for the purpose of collective bargaining by the majority of the employees in a unit appropriate for such purposes shall be the exclusive representatives of all the employees in such unit for the purposes of collective bargaining in respect to rates of pay, wages, hours of employment, or other conditions of employment.

So I think that without the words which are in the Taft-Hartley Act the Hill amendment still is confined to unions which represent the employees under section 9 (a).

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

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

Mr. NEELY. Will the eminent Senator from Ohio inform us whether in his opinion the Hill amendment is anything but a paraphrase of certain language contained in the Taft-Hartley law?

Mr. TAFT. No, it is exactly the same. There are merely a few different words. But the meaning, so far as I can judge, legally and any other way, is just 100 percent the same as the provision in the Taft-Hartley Act, which was being removed by the Thomas bill until the Hill amendment was offered.

Mr. NEELY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Ohio. He has expressed the identical conclusion which I long since regretfully reached. He has also fortified my determination to vote against the amendment because it is, in effect, a part of the Taft-Hartley law.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not wish to split hairs, but I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator from Ohio if he will turn to section 8 (b) (3), which is the clause of the Taft-Hartley law which he alleges is identical with the provision in the Hill amendment. If the Senator does so he will find the qualifying words: "provided it is the representative of his employees"; whereas in the Hill amendment the Senator will notice that this limiting clause is removed. Therefore I think there is a very substantial difference between the two provisions. Is it not also true that the Hill amendment, therefore, merely returns to the spirit of the Wagner Act?

Mr. TAFT. No. I think anyone who examines it will find it means the same thing. So long as the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] left in his amendment the words "subject to the provisions of section 9 (a)," the meaning is exactly the same as in the clause of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. President, I do not think anyone, by this general argument, can really be deceived as to the exact nature of the words in the Hill amendment now under discussion, or in the next three amendments. What is obvious is that the authors of these amendments are willing to accept four provisions of the Taft-Hartley law. They propose to write those provisions into the Thomas bill, although the distinguished author of the bill refused to put them in his bill, and proposes to repeal them. That is the situation.

So far as I am concerned, I am delighted to have them in the bill. In substance they are all in the substitute bill which I propose to offer at a later time. So how could I possibly consistently oppose the amendments? I think we should vote them into the bill. There may be a few votes against them.

There are some differences in each one of the other three which I shall point out when they come before the Senate. They are not differences of principle, however, from the Taft-Hartley law. Obviously the other three amendments are provisions contained in the Taft-Hartley law. One deals with the filing of financial statements. Another deals with the filing of the non-Communist affidavit. That provision was put into the law on the floor of the Senate; not by the committee. The fourth one is the provision dealing with free speech, which came from the Taft-Hartley law. Those provisions were all written in the bill by the Senate Labor Committee. Witnesses came before us and suggested the provisions were really taken from the amendment of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], which was offered at the very end of the long debate on the Taft-Hartley law.

Of course, Mr. President, those provisions were obviously taken from the Taft-Hartley law. They were not prepared until long after the Taft-Hartley law had been adopted. So the situation is, and we might as well recognize it, that the sponsors of the amendments want to make the Thomas bill more acceptable by adding to it four provisions of the Taft-Hartley law, to which I have no objection. I am in favor of putting them all in the bill and getting on to the matters which are really in substantial controversy.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Is it not true that long before the Taft-Hartley Act was passed, this matter was discussed in the committee hearings, and some of the labor leaders even had discussed with us the question of whether or not there should be a corresponding obligation on the part of labor? That was before the Taft-Tartley Act was passed.

Mr. TAFT. Yes, I think so. I think there were some labor leaders then, as there are some labor leaders now, who are willing to accept some of these provisions. Others do not want them. We have had a continual complaint against any of the amendments from Mr. Lewis, representing the United Mine Workers. I do not know what Mr. Philip Murray's position, representing the CIO, is respecting them. I have not been able to find that out. I do not know whether he has stated that he is for or against the amendments. I do not know whether Mr. Green is entirely against them, although in his testimony before the committee he was opposed to them. But I think the A. F. of L. has modified its position.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. The point I want to make is that the subject was discussed in the committee long before the Taft-Hartley Act was passed.

Mr. TAFT. Oh, yes.

Mr. MURRAY. And some of the leaders of the labor organizations, as a part of a fair, just program, would not have had any objection to the proposal. But when it is proposed to place it in the bill as a part of a program designed to restrict and penalize labor and make it difficult for labor to carry on the bargaining processes, then I can agree with my friend, the Senator from West Virginia, that it is of no advantage to labor to have this provision in the bill. This is especially true if at the same time we are going to have in the bill provisions which would so penalize labor that it would not be possible for labor to bargain freely and fairly.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio if there is not another point of differentiation between the Hill amendment and the clause which the Senator from Ohio sponsors, namely, that under the Taft-Hartley law the obligation to bargain collectively on the part of the union is conditional upon section 8 (b), which defines in minute detail what the process of collective bargaining is; which imposes time limits, and a series of other matters, which are altered under the Thomas bill to which the Hill amendment is proposed? Does not that constitute a very substantial difference between the Hill amendment and this clause in the Taft-Hartley Act?

Mr. TAFT. No. I think the two things are exactly the same. Of course, this clause may be of more value against a union if used in connection with other provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. Yes, the Senator from Illinois states that condition very directly.

I may say, Mr. President, that, as I have heretofore said, I have placed on the desks of Senators a list of the important features of the Taft-Hartley Act which we retain in our substitute amendment, of which there are 22 listed. What the authors of the four amendments now in question are doing is to accept No. 2 in our list, that is the pending amendment; No. 6, with some change; number 15, with some change; and No. 16, with some change. The original Thomas bill accepted the outlawing of jurisdictional strikes. So that makes five changes accepted.

There remain 17 provisions in the Taft-Hartley law which are not accepted by these amendments. As the Senator says, the adoption of this amendment, while I think it is important, in no way retains the Taft-Hartley law as a whole. I quite agree that these amendments, while important each in itself, do not substantially change the Thomas bill from a bill which still undertakes to return to the general spirit of the Wagner Act, as opposed to the amendments which attempt to retain the spirit of the Taft-Hartley Act, with 28 corrections to meet objections which have been made or which have developed in the course of the operation of that act.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his characteristic candor in saying that these amendments retain the spirit of the Wagner Act, whereas he wishes to retain the spirit of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. TAFT. May I correct that statement? I do not say that the amendments retain it. I said that the Thomas bill, even though these amendments are made, retains the spirit of the Wagner Act.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. The one-sided spirit of the Wagner Act.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore, the fundamental issue will be joined, if these amendments are approved, as between the spirit of the Wagner Act and the spirit of the Taft-Hartley Act. I again congratulate the Senator on the candor and honesty with which he states his position, a candor and honesty which compels respect on both sides of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for himself and other Senators to the so-called Thomas substitute.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a few brief remarks in support of the pending amendment.

The proposed amendment would make it an unfair labor practice for a union to refuse to bargain collectively with an employer, provided it is the representative of his employees subject to the provisions of section 9 (a). By the amendment it is intended to impose on unions the same obligation to bargain collectively that is imposed on employers. Since trade-unions are chiefly organized for the purpose of bargaining collectively, there will be—or should be—little occasion for its employment. However, ever since the passage of the Wagner Act I have held to the point of view that the Wagner Act was in need of amendment in accordance with the principles of mutuality of responsibility, obligation, and rights. I think the failure of the Wagner Act to impose the affirmative duty upon the union to engage in good-faith collective bargaining has been one of the great weaknesses of the act. It has been pointed out in the debate thus far today that under the Taft-Hartley Act, section 8 (a) (5) and section 8 (b) (3), an attempt was made by language to establish an obligation of mutuality of bargaining on the part of the employer and of the union.

There has been considerable discussion in the debate today in regard to what good-faith collective bargaining is. Of course we must go to the act and look at the definition. I think it is important to place in the RECORD at this point the definition of collective bargaining. I believe that under the administration and enforcement of the Taft-Hartley Act to date this definition has not been as carefully followed by Government officials—as I shall point out later in my remarks—as I think the definition should have been followed.

Thus we find, in section 8, subdivision (d), the following language:

(d) For the purposes of this section, to bargain collectively is the performance of the mutual obligation of the employer and the representative of the employees to meet at reasonable times and confer in good faith with respect to wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment, or the negotiation of an agreement, or any question arising thereunder, and the execution of a written contract incorporating any agreement reached if requested by either party, but such obligation does not compel either party to agree to a proposal or require the making of a concession: *Provided*, That where there is in effect a collective-bargaining contract covering employees in an industry affecting commerce, the duty to bargain collectively shall also mean that no party to such contract shall terminate or modify such contract, unless the party desiring such termination or modification—

(1) serves a written notice upon the other party to the contract of the proposed termination or modification 60 days prior to the expiration date thereof, or in the event such contract contains no expiration date, 60 days prior to the time it is proposed to make such termination or modification;

(2) offers to meet and confer with the other party for the purpose of negotiating a

new contract or a contract containing the proposed modifications;

(3) notifies the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service within 30 days after such notice of the existence of a dispute, and simultaneously therewith notifies any State or Territorial agency established to mediate and conciliate disputes within the State or Territory where the dispute occurred, provided no agreement has been reached by that time; and

(4) continues in full force and effect, without resorting to strike or lock-out, all the terms and conditions of the existing contract for a period of 60 days after such notice is given or until the expiration date of such contract, whichever occurs later.

The duties imposed upon employers, employees, and labor organizations by paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) shall become inapplicable upon an intervening certification of the Board, under which the labor organization or individual, which is a party to the contract, has been superseded as or ceased to be the representative of the employees subject to the provisions of section 9 (a), and the duties so imposed shall not be construed as requiring either party to discuss or agree to any modification of the terms and conditions contained in a contract for a fixed period, if such modification is to become effective before such terms and conditions can be reopened under the provisions of the contract. Any employee who engages in a strike within the 60-day period specified in this subsection shall lose his status as an employee of the employer engaged in the particular labor dispute, for the purposes of section 8, 9, and 10 of this act, as amended, but such loss of status for such employee shall terminate if and when he is reemployed by such employer.

In commenting on this definition of collective bargaining I wish to press the point that good-faith collective bargaining does not require the granting of concessions. I think that point is very much misunderstood. The notion is rather widespread that if one engages in collective bargaining he must necessarily show his good faith by making some concessions. I am inclined to believe that there is some indication, from the actions of the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board in respect to certain cases, that he and his staff have been laboring under the mistaken notion that the granting of concessions is almost a condition precedent to a finding of good-faith collective bargaining. I think we need to keep that in mind as we set forth this afternoon the legislative history and meaning of the amendment upon which we are about to vote. Whether we adopt it or not, we should vote on it with our eyes wide open as to what I think its clear meaning is.

The amendment does not propose to incorporate into existing law certain erroneous constructions which have been given the similar provision contained in section 8 (b) (3) of the Taft-Hartley Act. These interpretations have imposed a different standard upon labor unions than that applied under the Wagner and Taft-Hartley Acts upon employers; and in proposing the amendment we wish to make it clear that these constructions should be corrected.

For example, it has been contended by the general counsel of the NLRB and others that the obligation to bargain collectively resides only in local unions, or in the employees of a single enterprise, and that any supervision of local negotiations by the officers of national labor organizations constitutes an interference with the duty of local unions to bargain collectively. This view we reject, for if accepted by the National Labor Relations Board and the courts, its effect is to introduce into the law the Ball "anti-industry-wide bargaining" amendment which was defeated in the Senate at the time the Taft-Hartley Act was adopted. It is our national objective to encourage strong, stable and responsible labor organizations. If that purpose is to be achieved, it is important that we recognize the necessity that unions be permitted to devise and enforce methods for achieving stability and responsibility through their own procedures. The most usual method, common to all trade unions, is to empower officials of the union, by constitutional or other written provisions or by custom, to supervise and guide local negotiations and local agreements, in order to protect the interests of the union as a whole.

That practice is very common in industry. How many times do representatives of a union sit down with the representatives of an industry which has a far-flung, widely expanded organization throughout the country, an industry with a great many plants? Because I do not want to discuss any existing industry, even by way of mentioning it in connection with a hypothetical example, for fear that some unintended interpretation will be made of my remarks, I shall discuss industry X. We will assume that it has a plant in Albany, one in Cleveland, Ohio, one in Chicago, Ill., and one in Oakland, Calif. Labor trouble develops in the Illinois plant. The resident manager of the plant says, "I am very sorry, but my superiors have decided that the most we can offer is an increase of 10 cents an hour. That is tops, and any further discussion about even a half-cent above 10 cents is just a waste of time. I am not free to discuss it. It is 10 cents or nothing. That is going to be the standard pattern for our industry X across the Nation."

Cases such as that happen frequently. Is the local manager of the Illinois plant engaging in good-faith collective bargaining? Of course, he is. He is engaging in collective bargaining subject to certain limitations that his superiors have imposed upon him as to the offers he can make, and as to the terms of the contract to which he can agree. That is very common in industry. It has been involved in a great many cases over which I have presided as arbitrator, cases in which we were dealing, in effect, with the national pattern of the industry as to certain terms and conditions affecting wages, hours, and conditions of employment.

We may not like industry-wide bargaining, but industry-wide bargaining is perfectly lawful. I happen to be a strong proponent of it, because I believe it lends itself to stability in management-labor relations.

But assuming for the moment that one does not like industry-wide bargaining, the fact remains that large industries are engaging in it constantly by laying down certain terms and conditions beyond which their resident managers in their respective plants throughout the country cannot go in negotiating contracts with labor unions.

Mr. President, I believe in mutuality. Therefore, I think the principle of mutuality should be applied here, too. In view of the sections of the Taft-Hartley Act to which I have already referred, I do not think that act should be subject to interpretation by the General Counsel or by the Board or the court to the extent of having one meaning applied in respect to bargaining on the part of representatives of industry, but a much more restricted or limited meaning applied in respect to bargaining on the part of representatives of the union. So I say that since it has been the traditional practice over many years, it can hardly be said that such supervision or guidance is incompatible with collective bargaining, nor does it mean that a local union ceases to be the actual bargaining representative. But the construction which has been erroneously urged would make it impossible for labor organizations to achieve stability and responsibility, would preclude the carrying out of intraunion procedures and policies and inject the Federal Government into the internal affairs of unions, and would fragmentize each union into its smallest local components. It is worth emphasizing that we do not intend by this amendment to interfere in internal union affairs, and that under the proposed amendments unions may adopt such procedures or conditions with respect to bargaining as they deem wise, so long as they represent union decisions which the rank and file, through their democratic processes, by way of delegates to district conventions, State conventions, or national conventions, have expressed themselves as favoring, so that it can be said that the policy of the union is, after all, one which represents the point of view of the rank and file of the union.

Second. I point out that the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board has argued, and some trial examiners and courts have accepted the position, that a union demand that an employer recognize the rules or laws of the union is in and of itself a refusal to bargain collectively. The essence of trade-unionism, and particularly of democratic trade-unionism, is to be found in the rules or laws of the union. Union members, through their union procedures, adopt rules concerning the terms and conditions under which they will sell their labor. For example, they may agree that they will not work on unsafe premises, or for dangerously long hours, or for less than a specified minimum wage, or adopt many other rules or laws to abolish practices deemed detrimental to the union or its members or their job security. Through their officers, procedures are devised to carry out and enforce the contract so made. A demand for the recognition of these minimum conditions, even to the point of insistence through strike action, is not incompatible with collective bargaining in good faith. Employers have had a clear right, which has been recognized by the Board, to insist upon matters

which they deem fundamental in collective bargaining, and unions should be accorded the same right. Necessarily, unions must, in justice to the fair employers with whom they have agreements, insist on substantial uniformity in the agreements which are concluded. Many employers demand and receive in their agreements most-favored-nation clauses by which the union agrees to accord them any more favorable conditions granted any other employer. Underlying economic facts may, therefore, make it impossible for a union to do other than insist on a particular form of agreement. In no case has the Board held that an employer's insistence on the same agreement with several different unions constitutes a failure on the part of the employer to bargain, and it is intended that the same principle, in the interest of mutuality, shall apply to unions.

Mr. President, I wish to say something more about this problem, because as I make these remarks I am perfectly aware of the fact that here we are dealing with a situation which may be subject to grave abuse in the actual carrying out of the principle of mutuality, and I think it illustrates as clearly as anything can that we simply cannot legislate good faith. Men either have it in their hearts or they do not have it. Either they are going to sit down around the collective-bargaining table and engage in good-faith bargaining or they are going to attempt to "slip something over" on each other, and, rather than carry out the spirit and intent of free collective bargaining, they are going to be guilty of subjecting it to abuse. I simply do not know how we can by way of legislative language prevent men from acting in bad faith, but at the same time guarantee to the parties on both sides of the collective-bargaining table that mutuality of principle which permits them to engage in good-faith collective bargaining.

Let me illustrate that point by a hypothetical situation, because, just as I did not wish to indicate any particular industry by name, I do not wish to indicate any particular union by name. But all of us know that unions, as well as employers, too frequently are guilty of very arbitrary practices. The question as to whether the union is engaging in good-faith collective bargaining cannot be made a question of law; it is always going to be a question of fact, because it always involves an interpretation of human behavior around the collective-bargaining table. So let us consider a hypothetical situation. Let us suppose that the representatives of a union walk in and lay down its constitution and bylaws and some very arbitrary terms and conditions which they say must be the collective bargaining agreement between the union and the employer, if any collective-bargaining agreement is to be executed. Considering only that hypothetical situation, I wish to say for the RECORD today what I have said so many times outside the Senate, that within the framework of mutuality, within the framework of actual labor cases, I do not believe a "take-it-or-leave-it" attitude on the part of union negotiators or employer negotiators constitutes good-faith collective bargaining.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] sat with me, by the hour and the day and the week and the month, during the war, in connection with many labor cases, and I can offer him on this occasion as my best witness to the fact that I have always held to the proposition that arbitrariness on the part of either employers or union negotiators is not consonant with good-faith collective bargaining. We frequently say by way of the technical language used in labor cases that there of course must be a spirit of give-and-take. By that, as I pointed out earlier in my remarks I do not mean that there is any obligation to make concessions. There must be an open-mindedness. There must be a demonstration that the union negotiator is trying to negotiate a contract that is fair and reasonable in respect to the interests and the rights of the employers, on the basis of the surrounding facts, circumstances, and data that can be presented in the record of the case.

Thus I say it cannot be done by a legislative formula, it cannot be done by a legislative rule-of-thumb. All that can be done, it seems to me, is not much more than we seek to do by the amendment, namely, express a legislative intent that there shall be mutuality of collective bargaining as an obligation resting upon both employers and employees and their representatives. But when we start to break that down into a series of restrictions and mandates seeking to circumscribe the parties within the framework of technical legislative rules, we kill free collective bargaining. It cannot operate, and it does not operate, under such a legislative framework.

If it be true, as some employers contend—and I have much mail on this point—that the leaders of some unions take the position that they can walk into the shop of the employer and say, "Here it is—take it or leave it," I have always held to the view that there ought to be provision which entitled the employer in that case to come before the National Labor Relations Board, and charge that, in the light of all the facts of the case, bad faith was exercised in the alleged collective-bargaining negotiations. Labor does not like that, and labor has made very clear to me that it does not like it. But my point is that we are dealing here with a question of fact, and I do not think it is proper in legislation to provide, for example, that union constitutions and laws and rules and regulations cannot be made a part of the collective-bargaining agreement and if the union negotiators insist upon the union laws, rules, and regulations, they engage in bad faith collective bargaining. I say that cannot be done by automatic legislative provision. It remains a question of fact as to whether they are engaging in good faith collective bargaining. In the industry-wide situation I cited earlier in my remarks, employers have a perfect right under the law as it now exists to say, "It is this framework within which we propose to work as a matter of managerial policy of our industry, and beyond which we will not go." Likewise, the union, for the reasons I have stated, should, as a matter of general principle, have the right to say, "These rules, these regulations, and these constitutional provisions, which after all are the product of years of collective bargaining with employers, constitute the framework within which we say we are willing to sell our labor." As a general proposition I think that is a sound principle of mutuality for both sides.

Thus I find myself in increasing disagreement with what I think is the point of view that prevails in the Office of the General Counsel, to the effect that even the insistence upon the constitution and the rules of the union cannot be reconciled in the first instance with good faith collective bargaining, and is prima facie evidence of bad faith. I say that any such trend within the policies of the General Counsel's Office cannot be reconciled with the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law which I have already read into the RECORD and certainly is not intended to be perpetuated by this amendment.

The next point I desire to make in regard to the amendment is that it is intended that the same rules shall apply to employers and unions with respect to the appropriate bargaining unit. It has long been held that an employer who, in good faith, believed that a union was seeking to bargain collectively in an inappropriate unit was under no obligation to bargain until that question had been resolved. There is no reason why labor unions should not be accorded the same right.

Next, this amendment intends that genuinely free collective bargaining be encouraged. Bargaining in good faith means entering into negotiations for the purpose of reaching an agreement. We do not believe that the Board or the courts should undertake to pass on the reasonableness of proposals, or their desirability, or their legality, except insofar as necessary to determine whether the parties are genuinely trying to arrive at an agreement in good faith—which is again, I say, a question of fact. The legality of the substantive provisions of contracts, or of contract proposals, should be left as it has always been, it seems to me, to the ordinary machinery of the courts, when and if a question concerning legality arises in connection with the application of the specific contract clause to an actual situation.

Finally, some efforts have been made to use the corresponding section of the Taft-Hartley Act to deprive employees of real freedom in their choice of bargaining representatives. I may say, Mr. President, there is a considerable feeling on this point on the part of a certain segment of the American employers. I think it is fair to say that this particular group of employers do not like the idea that they have to bargain anyway, but, knowing that collective bargaining is here to stay, and having reconciled themselves to that unpleasant fact, they strenuously object to bargaining with anyone except men from their local shops, their local employees. So they would, if they could, either by statute or by administrative interpretation

of an existing statute, try to have established in American employer-employee relationships the principle that collective bargaining carries with it the limitation that the employer shall be required only to sit down with the employees from his own shop. Of course, organized labor has learned from sad experience that it cannot protect its legitimate rights in that way. They know that the local unions need the strengthening arm and the support of brother unionists in a national union, with its great economic powers stretching across the country, because, when we get down to the very essence of this question, we must face the fact that collective bargaining, in the last analysis, is enforced by economic force.

The right to strike or to lock out is, after all, an essential power that gives effectiveness to collective bargaining. As I have been heard to say previously, that right, that economic power, does not belong to employers and workers alone. It is exercised by them, but that freedom, the right to strike, is a precious right which belongs to all the American people. Frequently the public, because it is inconvenienced by a strike and has its economic toes stepped on a bit during such periods of economic inconvenience, seems to indicate at times that it is almost ready, at least for that period, to give up that very previous freedom. But from this desk I say to the men and women in all walks of life that I do not think, upon reflection, that they want to live in a society in which the basic economic right of employees to strike and employers to lock out have been eliminated. They must be willing as consumers, as citizens generally, to make the sacrifices we always have to make from time to time to preserve any of our great basic freedoms and rights.

So I say, Mr. President, the local union frequently would be at a tremendous disadvantage with a powerful employer if its representatives in the negotiations with the employer were limited to men from the local union. In the labor movement we cannot reconcile any other view with the theory that in union there is strength, or with the theory that, after all, there is an obligation resting upon the national union to come to the aid of the local union, especially when they get down to that last stand which they have to take sometimes—strike action. How many local unions could possibly survive in a strike against a powerful employer? Suppose there were a corresponding rule that in case of strike the only financial support would be from the local union treasury? We know that when a local union strikes over what the national union considers to be a fundamental principle which involves the welfare of the entire union, the funds of the entire union frequently are made available to the local union for the expenses of the strike in order to draw the contest to a successful close. We certainly would not want to restrict that, if we wish to preserve the right to strike.

So I say, in respect to the matter of representation and collective bargaining, it is the union's business. It is the union's business to decide who shall be its representatives in collective bargaining, and if it is the policy of the union to have a national officer or a district officer or a State official of the union participate in collective bargaining, I do not think that we, as the Congress, should seek to interfere by legislative restriction.

As I have been speaking on this point, Mr. President, my mind has been flashing back to a very interesting case which I had to decide in 1939 when the whole port of San Francisco was tied up by a strike. In that case the union objected to the selection by the employer of the employer's representative on the Port Labor Relations Committee. They did not like him. Because the union did not like him, since it felt he had been, in years prior to the great strike of 1934 in the maritime industry, one of the great industry leaders in the drive to prevent the unionization of the maritime industry, they did not want even to sit down with him at the collective-bargaining table. So they struck the port because the employer did not select an employer representative to the liking of the union. Of course, that was a reprehensible act on the part of the union. Of course it was a violation of their contract. Of course they could not reconcile it with the question of good faith in collective bargaining. In that case I think I wrote one of the strongest decisions against the union I have ever penned; but I could not tolerate that sort of arbitrary, unilateral conduct on the part of the union in that instance. I believe in mutuality. I believe that employers have the right to have come into the collective-bargaining room any person of their own choosing to help negotiate a collective-bargaining agreement. Likewise I think the union should have the same right.

I make these remarks because I do not want any Senator to vote for this amendment without at least knowing that these observations have been made, because, in my judgment, it should be clear that at least I, as one of the sponsors of the amendment, have no intention of having it interpreted as empowering any administrative officer of the Government subsequently to rule by way of administrative order, or regulation, that the negotiators for the union shall exclude the district, the State, or the national officials of the national or international union.

For example, it has been claimed that a national union, in fulfilling the duty imposed on it by the democratic action of union members to guide and supervise local negotiations, becomes the bargaining agent of employees who have selected a local union to represent them. We reaffirm the declaration in section 7 of the act that "employees have the right to bargain through representatives of their own choosing" and reject any implication that the Board or the courts may, under color of this provision, designate a representative for employees other than that selected by them.

Each of these observations is necessary to make the obligation to bargain exactly mutual as between employers and unions. We feel that this explanation is necessary to achieve the desire of the Congress that the law shall bear with equal weight on both parties in the bargaining process.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Alabama for himself and other Senators, to the so-called Thomas substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION, 1950

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 5060 making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes. I wish to say to Senators that it will not take very long to dispose of the measure. I think we can complete it in about 20 minutes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator from Louisiana ask unanimous consent temporarily to lay aside the unfinished business and to consider the bill which he has mentioned.

Mr. ELLENDER. 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 5060.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—I shall not object—I wish to say to the Senator from Louisiana that if protracted debate ensues I shall ask for the regular order, because I think we should dispose today of as many of the amendments to the labor bill as is possible.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5060) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Gillette	Long
Anderson	Graham	Lucas
Brewster	Green	McCarran
Bricker	Gurney	McCarthy
Bridges	Hayden	McClellan
Butler	Hendrickson	McFarland
Byrd	Hickenlooper	McGrath
Cain	Hill	McKellar
Capehart	Hoey	McMahon
Chapman	Holland	Malone
Chavez	Humphrey	Martin
Connally	Hunt	Maybank
Cordon	Ives	Millikin
Donnell	Jenner	Morse
Douglas	Johnson, Colo.	Mundt
Downey	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Eastland	Kefauver	Neely
Ecton	Kem	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Kerr	Reed
Ferguson	Kilgore	Robertson
Flanders	Knowland	Saltonstall
Fulbright	Langer	Schoeppel
George	Lodge	Smith, Maine

Sparkman	Thye	Wherry
Taft	Tobey	Wiley
Taylor	Tydings	Williams
Thomas, Okla.	Vandenberg	Withers
Thomas, Utah	Watkins	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, before the Senate proceeds to consideration of the committee amendments I should like to state that the net increase made by the Senate Appropriations Committee over the House bill is $61,405. The increase comes about partly through increases in a few salaries. The increases in salaries were made to low-paid clerks and laborers employed by the Sergeant at Arms and the Secretary of the Senate. The most substantial part of the increase was due to the fact that the committee received a budget estimate of $28,000 for emergency replacement of existing steam lines in the tunnel located under the Senate Office Building courtyard. These pipes have been in use for 40 years, and a recent failure has made it necessary to replace them.

Another addition of $10,210 was made necessary because of additional clerical assistants to the Senators from California and Virginia. The four Senators from those two States by virtue of increased population, are each entitled to an additional clerkship at $1,500 per annum, as authorized by law. The bill as a whole is 15.8 percent under the budget estimate.

I now ask that the amendments of the committee be considered.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator indicate that the bill as reported by the Senate committee is approximately 16 percent under the budget estimate?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. I have just stated that the bill as a whole is 15.8 percent under the budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Senate", on page 2, after line 1, to strike out the subhead "Salaries, mileage, and expenses of Senators", and in lieu thereof to insert the following: "Salaries and expense allowance of Senators, mileage of the President of the Senate and of Senators, and expense allowance of the Vice President."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 9, to insert:

For expense allowance of the Vice President, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Vice President," on page 2, after line 21, to strike out:

For expense allowance of the Vice President, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 25, after the word "month", to strike out "$47,640" and insert "$47,970."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Secretary," on page 3, line 4, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "$334,615", and insert "$334,730: *Provided*, That the basic annual rates of compensation of the following positions shall be: Printing clerk at $5,160 in lieu of $5,000; two assistants in the library at $2,100 each in lieu of two at $1,800 each; one laborer at $2,280 in lieu of $2,040; three laborers at $1,740 each in lieu of three at $1,500 each; one laborer at $1,740 in lieu of $1,440; one skilled laborer at $1,740 in lieu of $1,440."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Conference committees," on page 3, line 18, after the word "committee", to strike out "$28,030" and insert "$28,835."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 21, after the word "committee", to strike out "$28,030" and insert "$28,835."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Administrative and clerical assistants to Senators," on page 3, line 24, after the word "Senators", to strike out $4,786,155" and insert "$4,796,365."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper," on page 4, line 2, after the word "Doorkeeper", to strike out "$948,-210" and insert "$950,525: *Provided*, That the basic annual rates of compensation of the following positions shall be: Clerk at $2,280 in lieu of $2,120; clerk at $2,160 in lieu of $1,800; assistant janitor at $2,100 in lieu of $1,860; night foreman at $1,680 in lieu of one laborer at $1,320; laborer at $1,700 in lieu of $1,580; foreman in folding room at $3,600 in lieu of $3,000; chief cabinetmaker at $3,200 in lieu of $3,080; secretary at $3,540 in lieu of clerk at $3,300; one additional special employee at $1,000; superintendent of Radio Press Gallery at $4,020 in lieu of $3,660, two assistant superintendents at $2,580 each in lieu of two at $2,400 each, one assistant superintendent at $2,100 in lieu of $1,960."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Offices of the secretaries for the majority and the minority," on page 4, after line 16, to strike out:

For the offices of the secretary for the majority and the secretary for the minority, $44,940.

And in lieu thereof, to insert the following:

For the offices of the secretary for the majority and the secretary for the minority, including compensation for two chief telephone pages at basic rates to be fixed by the respective secretaries, but not exceeding $2,880 each per annum, in lieu of one clerk in the office of the Secretary of the Senate at $1,860 per annum and one messenger acting as assistant doorkeeper under the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper at $2,560 per annum, $54,340; and the compensation of the clerk to the secretary for the majority and the clerk to the secretary for the minority shall be at the basic rate of $3,000 each per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses of the Senate," on page 6, line 16, after the word "same", to strike out the comma and "exclusive of labor, and for the purchase of furniture, $12,000" and insert "$18,-000."

Mr. ELLENDER. Due to a printer's error in that committee amendment, it is necessary to offer an amendment to the amendment, which I send to the desk with the request that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 6, line 16, it is proposed to restore the language beginning with the comma after the word "labor" and ending with the comma after the word "furniture."

The PRESIDING OFFICER The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

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

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 4, after the figures "$674,750", to strike out the following proviso:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for per diem and subsistence expenses, except in accordance with the provisions of the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, approved June 3, 1926, as amended.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for per diem and subsistence expenses (as defined in the Travel Expense Act of 1949) at rates in excess of $9 per day except that higher rates may be established by the Committee on Rules and Administration in the case of travel beyond the limits of the continental United States: *And provided further*, That the paragraph relating to advances for the expenses of Senate committees, under the caption "Senate," in the act entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1879, and for prior years, and for those heretofore treated as permanent, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1879 (20 Stat. 419; 2 U. S. C., sec. 69), is amended to read as follows: "When any duty is imposed upon a committee involving expenses that are ordered to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the committee charged with such duty, the receipt of such chairman for any sum advanced to him or his order out of said contingent fund by the Secretary of the Senate for committee expenses not involving personal services shall be taken and passed by the accounting officers of the Government as a full and sufficient voucher; but it shall be the duty of such chairman, as soon as practicable, to furnish to the Secretary of the Senate vouchers in detail for the expenses so incurred."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 1, to strike out:

Postage stamps: For office of Secretary, $350; office of Sergeant at Arms, $150; in all, $500.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

Postage stamps: For office of Secretary, $500; office of Sergeant at Arms, $225; offices of the secretaries for the majority and the minority, $100; in all, $825.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, we have now completed action on the Senate items. The Senate committee refused to include an item which I think should be discussed on the floor to a certain extent. I wonder whether the Senator from Louisiana is willing to have discussion of that item at this time, or whether he desires that all the committee amendments be acted on first.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I prefer that all the committee amendments be acted on first.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well.

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

The next amendment was, under the heading "Office of the legislative counsel," on page 19, line 10, after the word "Representatives," to strike out "and so long as the position is held by the present incumbent, the legislative counsel of the House shall be compensated at the gross annual rate of $12,000" and insert "and so long as the positions are held by the present incumbents, the legislative counsel of the Senate and the legislative counsel of the House shall each be compensated at the gross annual rate of $12,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does that amendment propose a change in the basic salary?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. The amendment places the Senate legislative counsel on a parity with the legislative counsel of the House. It does not increase the appropriation at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is the current salary scale of those positions?

Mr. ELLENDER. The gross salary is $10,330.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then the amendment would increase the amount by $1,670?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, but it does not increase the amount of the appropriation whatsoever, as I have just indicated.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It increases the base salary scale, however?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is not this legislation on an appropriation bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that it would be, as applicable to the Senate provision only.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not press the point of order. The House made provision for its legislative counsel, and what we are doing is to make provision for the legislative counsel of the Senate, so that both will receive the same pay.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment go over for the time being, and I will discuss it later with the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be passed over. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Architect of the Capitol—Office of the Architect of the Capitol," on page 20, line 24, after the word "act", to strike out "$115,200" and insert "$120,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Capitol Buildings and Grounds," on page 23, line 3, after the words "in all", to strike out "$616,800" and insert "$643,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Library of Congress—Increase of the Library of Congress," on page 28, line 24, after the words "by the", to strike out "Marshal" and insert "Librarian."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, for several years Members of the United States Senate have come to the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration—to former Senator Brooks, of Illinois, when he was chairman of the commitee, and to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the present chairman of the committee—and they came to me when I was chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for 2 years, and impressed very sincerely and ably upon those Senators the necessity for additional space in order to operate the offices of Senators efficiently, and in order that committees may function effectively and efficiently. Acting in good faith, in the Eightieth Congress, legislation was introduced and passed authorizing the establishment of a Senate Office Building Commission. The members of that Commission at that time were Senator Brooks, of Illinois; Senator Revercomb, of West Virginia; the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the late Senator Overton, of Louisiana. After the sad passing of Senator Overton, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] replaced him.

As a result of the legislative plan, an authorization was made for the procuring of a site, the drafting of plans, and laying the basis for construction of a new Senate Office Building. The Eightieth Congress passed out of existence, and the Eighty-first Congress came in. The distinguished Vice President of the United States filled the vacancies on the Commission. He replaced Senator Brooks, of Illinois, and Senator Revercomb, of West Virginia, with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. So there are five members of the Senate Office Building Commission, three Democrats and two Republicans. The Commission made a study under the very able leadership of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and reached the unanimous decision that we should proceed as provided in the authorization bill passed by the Eightieth Congress.

Then things began to happen. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], chairman of the legislative subcommittee, started on a crusade to stop the building, which he had every right to do. After hearings before the Public Works Committee, of which the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is chairman, and after the presentation of evidence before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, the subcommittee and the full committee eliminated the provision for the Senate Office Building.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. At the hearing before the legislative subcommittee, under the leadership of the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], there appeared two members of the Senate Building Commission, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who testified as to the investigation made by the Commission established during the Eightieth Congress. They told how they had investigated the necessity of additional space for Senators, and suggested to the subcommittee that the item for the construction of the building be included, not only because it had been authorized by Congress, but also because of the necessity of more space for Senators, and because the item had the approval of the Bureau of the Budget at that time.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is correct.

Senator after Senator is complaining that he has not sufficient room. Senators have testified that they have had as many as 17 employees in three rooms. Bear in mind that every Senator has a minimum number of clerical employees. The number is increased according to the population of the State, so that a Senator like the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] has several more clerical employees than the minimum number. Moreover, some Senators are paying out of their own pockets the cost of additional employees. After they do that, they have no facilities for them.

I am for economy. If a movement were made in the United States Senate to limit all public buildings, including the Senate Office Building, I would be for it. But such a movement has not been started. I have in my files an item from the Washington Post of June 7. The headline is "Senate votes bill for $70,000,000 in new buildings." Recently we approved an item of $65,000,000 for the United Nations to erect a new building in New York. We are spending $20,000,000 to erect a new court building down town in Washington. We are spending $28,000,000 to erect a new building for the General Accounting Office. Yesterday or the day before we approved a new Federal Office Building in Nashville, Tenn. We are doing everything all over the world with our funds.

I shall not urge Members of the Senate to vote for a new Senate Office Building if they do not want one. However, I hope that no Senator who votes against it will complain that he has not sufficient office facilities, or sufficient facilities to hold hearings. If Senators wish to look after

everyone in this country and all over the world, and deny themselves the opportunity of functioning effectively when it comes to a Senate Office Building, that is perfectly fine so far as I am concerned. I shall get along. But this is a decision which we must make.

The chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration tells us that hardly a day goes by without demands being made upon him for additional office space. If Senators want to spend $20,000,000 for a new court building down town, $28,000,000 for a new General Accounting Office Building, $65,000,000 for new buildings for the United Nations, a million or two for a new Federal office building in Nashville, Tenn., and $70,000,000 for other new buildings around the country, that is all right.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I merely wish to ask the Senator if he does not recall that the item of $65,000,000 for the United Nations was a loan, and not a grant. My question does not indicate that I am not in full sympathy with the expression now being made by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I point it out merely to indicate that we did not hesitate a moment when we provided $65,000,000 for the United Nations organization.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York would like to point out that he is probably more affected by the scarcity of office space than is any other Senator.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. What is the Senator's estimate of our chances of being repaid the $65,000,000 for the United Nations office building?

Mr. BRIDGES. I dislike to make a prediction as to when or how we shall be repaid.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I believe the able Senator from New Hampshire will recall that there is a recapture clause in connection with that loan.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. In other words, we could recapture it and have a $65,000,000 office building in New York City.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I think the able Senator will remember that were we to acquire that property, we would be saving money because of the high rental cost in New York City at the present time.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I have been much impressed by the statements made by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] with regard to the lavishness of the plans for the proposed building. I am one of those Senators who have asked for more space. However, I should like to inquire of the Senator whether I have been personally remiss in not having been present in the Senate Chamber, or at some other place where the plans have been exposed to the criticism or approval of the Senate as a whole, or of its individual Members, amounting to the Senate in the aggregate. Probably I have been remiss. I know nothing whatever about the proposed new Senate Office Building. I am interested in it. Has it ever been displayed before this body at any time or at any place? Have I missed somehow seeing it?

Mr. BRIDGES. If the Senator from New Mexico wishes to answer the question, I shall be glad to have him do so. The Senator from Vermont asks whether the plan has ever been displayed to the Senate. I do not think it has ever been exhibited in the Capitol Building.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Hampshire will yield to me, I shall try to answer the question.

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Basic legislation was introduced in the early part of 1947, in the Eightieth Congress, providing that a preliminary survey be made first.

In 1948, after that preliminary survey had been made, more legislation was introduced, to provide for carrying out the conclusions arrived at in the preliminary survey. That basic legislation was enacted, and, as a result of it, a Senate Office Building Commission was appointed, according to law. That Commission was composed of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the then Senator Brooks, of Illinois; the then Senator Revercomb, of West Virginia, who at that time was chairman of the Committee on Public Works; the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]; and the late Senator Overton, of Louisiana. Under the basic law, that Commission was authorized to look into the matter, make arrangements for plans, and so forth. The Commission did so.

A New York firm of architects was employed, and a contract was let with that firm. It proceeded to make the plans. The Government purchased the property, took title to the property, and obtained possession of it.

When this Congress was organized—with a somewhat different organization as a result of the unpleasantness which the Republicans experienced last fall—Senator Revercomb and Senator Brooks could no longer be members of the Commission. Under the new set-up, the Vice President appointed the senior Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], from the Committee on Public Works, to serve on the Commission under the basic law.

The work to which I have referred had already been done by the Commission. The appropriation was made by the Eightieth Congress.

Plans were made, were submitted to the Commission, and were approved by the Commission. The basic law provides for that. Until it is changed, it is the law; and we do not have to appropriate one additional penny, because a contract can be let at this particular time. Under the law passed by the Eightieth Congress, in which a majority of the Senate was composed of members of the political faith of the Senator from Vermont, the Commission could proceed to accept a contract for a total obligation in the amount of $20,600,000.

However, it was impossible to do all the work at one time, and thus spend all the $20,600,000 at one time. So the Architect of the Capitol, proceeding under the law passed by Congress, requested the Bureau of the Budget to allow, in the legislative appropriation bill, an item of $10,000,000, to permit the work to be proceeded with.

The work has been proceeded with to such an extent that $345,000 has already been spent for architectural fees alone.

Until the new building is constructed, that land will be wasted. Sufficient funds are available to pay for the land and for the preliminary work of razing the existing structures on the land. All that work was done prior to the time when we took over. We are simply carrying through with the work which previously had been begun.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his explanation. He has cleared my mind of any doubt that the work done thus far has been done legally and in order.

But I say to the Senator from New Hampshire that although in this case I am in the market for a young, healthy pig, yet it seems to me that I am being asked to buy a pig in a poke. I have not seen the plans of this building.

As I have said, I am very much impressed with the criticism which has been made by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] that if the building is constructed as it is planned, it will be extravagant, that it is supposed to contain many things which we do not need and which, as a matter of fact, we ought not to have.

However, I cannot now pass my own judgment on those matters. I could do so if I were to go to the Architect of the Capitol and see the plans.

However, it seems to me that this matter is and has been of sufficient importance that one of the easels, which occasionally appear on the floor of this chamber for the display of diagrams and similar matters, should be set up to display to us a diagram of the proposed new Senate Office Building, with which we are asked to proceed.

I want more room; I am one of those who do. However, I do not want another swimming pool or an out-door restaurant, or this or that.

Am I now asked to agree to appropriate money for things which I do not want? That is what I should like to know.

Mr. BRIDGES. Of course, Mr. President, a new Senate Office Building could be built for much less than the sum of money proposed; but here we have the Capitol of the United States, the House Office Buildings, the Senate Office Building, the Supreme Court of the United States, the Congressional Library—all of

them buildings which are in keeping with the dignity of the United States and its Government.

Let me say that a year ago I traveled in various countries of Europe to which we are furnishing aid, and also at previous times I have traveled in various other parts of the world. Every foreign country I have visited has as good or better facilities for its national government than we have here in Washington for the Government of the United States, at least insofar as the legislative branch of Government is concerned.

I favor economy, and if a resolution providing for the cessation of all Federal building is submitted, I shall favor having the proposed new Senate Office Building included under its provisions. However, when we are going ahead with the Federal building program, it seems to me that it would be foolish to single out our own Senate Office Building and prevent its construction.

I admit that so far as I am concerned, I can get along with the space I have. I am not pleading for myself in any way in that connection. I am pleading on the basis of the argument which has been made to me, not by one Senator, but by dozens of Senators in the past few years—Senators who have presented their appeals to me because of the position I have held.

Of course, it may be possible to revise the plans, if the Senator from Vermont wishes to have that done; but to abandon the project entirely would be quite a different matter.

Of course, the Senator from Vermont has not had a chance to pass on all these plans. The only way that would have been possible would have been to have had a Senate Office Building Commission composed of all Members of the Senate. On the other hand, in order to function efficiently, it is necessary to have a small group handle these matters.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, it seemed to me that I might explain a misconception which seems to be common among some of the Senators as to the disposition of space in the proposed annex to the Senate Office Building. It is not the idea that most of the Senators will move into it or a considerable number of them. The idea is to make more space in the Senate Office Building for the most of us, the common or garden variety of Senators, by giving special space in the annex for all the standing committees. That is one reason why all the Senators were not consulted individually. The chairmen of all the standing committees were consulted as to how much space they need. There would be provision there for each chairman, for each committee, and for the committee staff, and, for convenience sake also, for the Senator as an individual, and his private staff. When those accommodations are made available for those 15 individuals, there are some other common rooms for all the Senators, and hearing rooms. A great deal of additional space will be available, so that all Senators can spread a little, and not be compelled to have three or four or five employees trying to work under distracting conditions in our own offices. I suppose that each Senator may still occupy his own office, or a corresponding office for himself. The new building is not for the Senators principally but for the staffs of Senators, and also for the staff of the Senate. It is only necessary to go across the corridor in order to see the congestion. There is one room there with 13 employees in it; another with 10, and in a very small room outside the Office of the Secretary of the Senate there are 3 employees.

When some of the committee rooms are moved out of the Capitol there will then be more room here to expand, more room for the restaurant to expand, more room for the office staff of the Senate to expand. That is the theory on which the building was planned.

I thought it would perhaps be a little helpful if I added that bit of information.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. As in the case of the Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from Rhode Island has enlightened me, and I know more than I did when I first rose to my feet. I should like however to say again that I see the need for more space. For instance, the Small Business Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency needs a room of its own, with the name on the door, to which small-business men can go and feel that that is their spot. The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is a standing committee, whenever we have a hearing, because there is no room to sit down. That committee needs more room. In some way, out of this new office building I should like to make a swap, a dicker, or something or other, to get another room for myself.

I am not arguing against a new office building. I do want to know whether it is being provided extravagantly or not. And when I say extravagantly, I do not mean a concrete block, with windows and doors and rooms. It seems to me we can have a dignified building, a building which probably would not draw down upon itself the objections which were raised by the Senator from Louisiana. I can form, with respect to these points, no personal opinion as to whether the objections are warranted. They sounded a bit serious to me. I am not asking to sit in on any committee, or to be a member of a committee of 96 for determination of what the building should be, but I feel very strongly that every Senator should have a chance to see, in some public place, a sketch or plan of what it is that we are buying.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator voted for $65,000,000 for the United Nations building in New York, did he not?

Mr. FLANDERS. I did.

Mr. BRIDGES. Did the Senator see the plans before he voted?

Mr. FLANDERS. If I had seen the plans, or the exterior, I doubt that I would have voted the money. It is the most god-awful piece of architecture which has ever been perpetrated upon the nations of the world.

Mr. BRIDGES. Did the Senator vote for the General Accounting Office Building?

Mr. FLANDERS. I did.

Mr. BRIDGES. Did the Senator see the plans of that building before he voted?

Mr. FLANDERS. I did not. That is different. I am a tenant of the Senate Office Building, and I am not a tenant of the General Accounting Office.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may remind the Senator of his remark about not wishing to buy a pig in a poke.

Mr. FLANDERS. Does the Senator know what a pig in a poke is?

Mr. BRIDGES. I know the expression very well. But let me say, the Senator has bought many a pig in a poke on all these other things. Now, when it comes to the Senate Office Building, he raises a question.

Mr. FLANDERS. It is something in which I have a personal interest.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. I should like to remind the Senator from Vermont that he will not have a personal interest in this building. There is no expectation, unless he is made the chairman of a standing committee, that he will have any space in that building. He will probably have the same office he has now, with perhaps an additional room or two. That is all.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not want to engage in any controversy with my friend, the Senator from Rhode Island, because we are on the same side, but I may say we hope to complete the building in time for the Republicans to take over the chairmanships 2 years from now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is not a question. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in order to bring the matter to a head, I now offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The amendment offered by Mr. BRIDGES was, at the proper place in the bill insert:

Construction and equipment of an additional Senate office building: To enable the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, to continue to provide for the construction and equipment of a fireproof building for the use of the United States Senate, in accordance with the provisions of the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1948, $9,000,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Connally	Fulbright
Anderson	Cordon	George
Bricker	Donnell	Gillette
Bridges	Douglas	Graham
Butler	Downey	Green
Byrd	Eastland	Gurney
Cain	Ecton	Hayden
Capehart	Ellender	Hendrickson
Chapman	Ferguson	Hickenlooper
Chavez	Flanders	Hill

Hoey	McCarran	Robertson
Holland	McCarthy	Russell
Humphrey	McClellan	Saltonstall
Hunt	McFarland	Schoeppel
Ives	McGrath	Smith, Maine
Jenner	McKellar	Sparkman
Johnson, Colo.	McMahon	Taft
Johnson, Tex.	Malone	Thomas, Okla.
Kefauver	Martin	Thomas, Utah
Kem	Maybank	Thye
Kerr	Millikin	Tobey
Kilgore	Morse	Vandenberg
Knowland	Mundt	Watkins
Langer	Murray	Wherry
Lodge	Neely	Williams
Long	O'Mahoney	Withers
Lucas	Reed	Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senate in reaching final action on the pending bill. I made a speech in the Senate on May 24 in which I presented my views and the results of my study regarding the proposed new Senate Office Building. I do not believe the building is needed. I do not believe the Senate should appropriate money at this time, when we are calling upon all Government agencies to economize, to build an extravagant, luxurious building to house its committee chairmen and their staffs. The Committee on Appropriations by a vote of 14 to 4 refused to add $10,000,000 to the pending bill for the project. I hope that the Senate will sustain the committee's action.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the roll was called.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senators from Idaho [Mr. MILLER and Mr. TAYLOR] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] is absent on official business, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] is absent because of illness.

On this vote the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay," and the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are absent because of illness. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—29

Anderson	Ives	Millikin
Bricker	Jenner	Morse
Bridges	Kefauver	Murray
Cain	Kem	Schoeppel
Chavez	McCarthy	Smith, Maine
Cordon	McFarland	Sparkman
Ecton	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Green	McMahon	Thye
Hayden	Malone	Tobey
Hill	Martin	

NAYS—52

Aiken	Hendrickson	Maybank
Butler	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Byrd	Hoey	Neely
Capehart	Holland	O'Mahoney
Chapman	Humphrey	Reed
Connally	Hunt	Robertson
Donnell	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Downey	Kerr	Taft
Eastland	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	Knowland	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Langer	Watkins
Flanders	Lodge	Wherry
Fulbright	Long	Williams
George	Lucas	Withers
Gillette	McCarran	Young
Graham	McClellan	
Gurney	McKellar	

NOT VOTING—15

Baldwin	Miller	Stennis
Brewster	Myers	Taylor
Frear	O'Conor	Tydings
Johnston, S. C.	Pepper	Wagner
Magnuson	Smith, N. J.	Wiley

So Mr. BRIDGES' amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment passed over.

The amendment passed over was, on page 19, line 10, to strike out ", and so long as the position is held by the present incumbent, the legislative counsel of the House shall be compensated at the gross annual rate of $12,000" and insert "and so long as the positions are held by the present incumbents, the legislative counsel of the Senate and the legislative counsel of the House shall each be compensated at the gross annual rate of $12,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

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

The bill (H. R. 5060) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. SALTONSTALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that Mr. MCGRATH and Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, had been appointed additional managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3734) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3083) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and concurred therein, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 6, and 7 to the bill.

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 amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4046) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 67, 68, 69, and 79, and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 9, and 26, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 10, and 12 to the bill.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT OF 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 249) to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall speak rather briefly in regard to emergency dispute procedures because I intend at a later time in the debate on the pending labor legislation to discuss this subject at greater length. However, in fairness to certain of my colleagues on the floor of the Senate, as well as in fairness to myself, I wish to make some explanatory remarks in connection with offering, in my own capacity, an amendment relating to the subject of emergency disputes. I offer the amendment, and ask that it be printed and lie on the table until that subject is before the Senate for debate and consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in offering this amendment I wish to say that

I do not think there is any completely satisfactory legislation which can be passed for the handling of emergency disputes. The problem, because of its very nature, is one which for the most part lies outside the field of legislation.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, may we have order? I am very anxious to hear the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not think anyone has the answer to the question: What should be the procedure to be followed in the handling of emergency disputes? I believe no answer to that question can be framed, at least in the form of a legislative rule of thumb capable of blanket application to all the emergency disputes which the imagination of the Senate of the United States can conjure up during the course of this debate.

Here again, as I said earlier this afternoon in my remarks on another phase of the labor legislative problem, I think we are dealing with a subject which can be treated only on a case-to-case basis. The moment we try to fit this subject matter into a legislative strait-jacket, the moment we try to lay down any legislative language or any stereotyped set of rules and procedures to be followed in the handling of emergency disputes, it seems to me we have undertaken to prescribe a legislative form which will prove not to be workable and applicable in future cases which are likely to arise under facts and circumstances we cannot at the present time foresee.

At the same time I am perfectly aware of the fact that in the problem which confronts us in the Senate in respect to proposed labor legislation, the one question above all others constantly put to us by our colleagues and by the public generally is: What is Congress going to do about emergency disputes?

Many Members of Congress, and certainly many of the American people, are looking for and they are expecting some magical automatic formula which will settle emergency disputes in a manner that will avoid sacrifice and some suffering and considerable inconvenience on the part of the people. Mr. President, in my judgment, there is no such magical formula. There cannot be, for the simple reason that we are dealing here with a subject which goes to a basic American freedom and right, namely, the freedom and the right to exercise economic force on the part of management and labor in respect to disputes which arise over wages, hours, and conditions of employment.

Yet there does fall upon the Congress, as I see it, an obligation to provide machinery or a procedure which will make possible the quick and careful consideration of individual emergency disputes as they arise from time to time. However, I would caution the Senate to remember what William Davis so soundly pointed out, I think, during the course of the hearings, that—and I paraphrase him, but I know I quote his meaning accurately—if more than one or two emergency disputes occur within a generation, then whatever machinery we set up is bound to break down.

It seems to me that in trying to devise a framework of procedure for handling emergency disputes we should face the fact that what is essential in the handling of emergency labor disputes is just as essential in the handling of minor labor disputes. That is to say a procedure must be found which will give the parties ample opportunity to change their course of action during the period of attempted settlement of the dispute, or as some in this field so frequently say, a procedure which will give the parties plenty of chance to save face. Let us not forget that in the handling of labor disputes under an administrative law process the parties must always have available to them, if we are wise in the action we take, a procedure which will make it possible to change their course of action, to save their face, in respect to a former or more undesirable course of action which they have been following, to rationalize, yes, Mr. President, even alibi, a previous position which they have taken.

If I say nothing else during the course of this labor debate, I hope I can make plain that, for the most part, in the handling of labor-management problems we are not handling legal issues at all. We are handling economic and social and human-relations problems. We are dealing with conflicts which frequently develop between management and labor based upon emotional differences which sometimes develop between the parties. Strict rules of procedure, rules of thumb, formulas, will not work, no matter how plainly written into the law. We need to give the parties a procedure which will offer them adequate opportunity to think a second time about the course of action they are following.

We need to keep in mind also the relationship between the representatives of the unions and their constituency, and the representatives of the employers and their constituency. I have seen it frequently happen that a representative of the employers was certain his principals wanted him to follow a certain course of action, only to find that he was wrong. I recall a case in San Pedro not so many years ago in which the spokesman for the employers was perfectly satisfied that a certain mandate he issued to the Board of Arbitration was the wish of his principals. As an arbitrator in that case, I remember I said, "I should like to suggest to counsel, before he takes a position of absolute finality on the basis of the statement he has just made to the Board that he had better check with his principals to make certain that that is the course of action they want him to follow, because the statement counsel makes, if it becomes the final position of the employers in this case, amounts to tearing up this contract, and the employers will be responsible not only for having breached the contract in the first instance, but they will be responsible now for taking a course of action which amounts to a complete abrogation of the contract."

Even as I was making that statement, representatives of the employers were frantically whispering in the ears of the spokesman for the industry, and by the time I had finished my statement, counsel, with a smile on his face said, "Mr. Arbitrator, I have already heard from my principals. I withdraw my statement, and I inform the Board that the industry will accept the ruling."

I give that illustration from my own personal experience and I hope I will be pardoned for doing so because I want to drive home the point that we must provide the parties in labor cases with an informal procedure, not a strict strait-jacket procedure which makes it possible for them easily to retrace their steps and follow another course of action, once they have had a chance to think the matter over a second or a third time. There is a tendency in the thinking of too many members of the Senate in connection with emergency disputes, to subject the parties to a labor dispute to fixed, inflexible, automatic rules of procedure which will operate irrespective of the intangible human face-saving factors which I submit must be kept in mind as we come to consider the procedure we should adopt for handling emergency disputes. I have tried to draft a procedure which will permit of considerable flexibility, and afford ample opportunity and latitude for representatives of industry and labor to change their course of action before the final action under my amendment may be imposed upon them.

Next I point out that in discussing the procedure which I am offering in this amendment, the American people should be told—and I have said this in another way on another occasion—that they are wrong in thinking that every major strike constitutes a national emergency. Likewise they are wrong in thinking that a major dispute which results in a considerable amount of public inconvenience or economic loss or sacrifice constitutes a national emergency. They are wrong in thinking that they can have all the benefits of freedom and not at the same time recognize that they must also pay some of the cost which goes along with enjoying freedom.

On this premise I am either right or wrong. The right to strike or lock-out is either a basic American freedom and right, inseparable from the operation of a free economy and a system of democratic self-government, or it is not. But let the American people be aware of the fact that if they propose in the legislation now pending before the Senate to adopt procedures which make the right to strike or lock-out only a token right, then they have dealt a very serious blow to the principles of a free economy and a system of democratic self-government. If they wish to make that right merely a token right, they should recognize now, before it is too late, that what they are advocating, is really a restriction upon a free economy. Any such course is likely, in my judgment, to lead to further and further restrictions upon both workers and industry, and therefore automatically and inescapably upon the public as well, until finally we have the government in the business of determining the wages, hours, and conditions of employment which shall prevail in American industry. The pattern will first appear in major industry, in those industries which so many speakers talk about as

vitally affecting the national health and safety. But a pattern would be set. I submit that once we have the Government, in any number of major industries, setting the economic pattern for those industries, it will be only a matter of time until such patterns will become standard patterns which will, to a substantial extent, determine the wages, hours, and the conditions of employment for all industry.

I warn American employers today that they not only have little to gain, but in the long run, nothing to gain, from a procedure which, in respect to individual cases, may seem to put the Government on their side of the table. Such a precedent, or the establishment of such a policy, can spread. I fear the danger that with the passage of time American industry would come to realize that by seeking to give the Government such blanket authority as some would have the Government exercise in connection with emergency disputes, they would bring about a situation in which the Government would become the determiner not only of wages, hours, and conditions of employment with respect to labor, but the determiner as well of what has heretofore been believed to be managerial rights in respect to production, prices, and the terms and conditions under which industry shall operate.

It is no alarmist argument to warn industry in all seriousness today that it ought to join with labor in a united effort to keep Government participation in employer-labor relationships at a bare minimum, consistent with the basic obligation of government. In my view, that obligation is to see to it that no segment of our economy, be it labor, management, or any other can use the principles of our free enterprise system in such an abusive manner as to jeopardize the legitimate rights of any other segment of the economy or of the public.

To find that balance, and to determine for a certainty just how far the Government can or should go as a matter of public policy is the test which is ahead of us in this debate. Would that I thought I knew the answer. I do not. Would that I could be sure that the amendment I am now offering would provide the answer. I am not. There are implications of my own amendment which I do not like, but I have come to the conclusion that it is worth a trial, if we will only keep in mind the flexible features of it, to which I shall shortly direct my attention.

I conclude this point by saying that I think there is need for a little greater consideration on the part of my colleagues in the Senate of the danger of establishing in statute law Government regulations and procedures for the handling of labor disputes which may lead, whether we will it or not, to a gradual taking over by the Government of employer-labor relations.

I saw it practiced during the war. As a member of the War Labor Board I saw the Government, through that Board, decide more and more matters in the field of collective bargaining which should have been reserved to labor and management. There is no doubt about the fact that during the war, with the no-strike, no-lockout obligation resting upon labor and management, good faith, free collective bargaining broke down in many thousands of cases. The break-down was such that the Board itself for a certain period of time completely failed in its work, until we set up a series of regional offices and adopted certain policies in regard to turning cases back for collective bargaining.

What happened was that in certain individual cases the employer and union representatives reached a deadlock; and instead of remaining at the job and trying to reduce to a narrower and narrower area their differences of opinion, they "passed the buck" to the War Labor Board. The members of that Board were, in effect, writing the collective-bargaining agreements in thousands of cases. Of course that is dangerous. There were many things about our work on the Board which, if extended into peacetime, would represent a very dangerous policy. Speaking very frankly, I am frightened about the danger of having the Government take over more and more in this field, under some of the proposals which will be made during the course of this debate. The tendency is here now in the present operations of the Taft-Hartley law.

One of my objections to the Taft-Hartley law, among many others, is that I think it goes too far in putting the Government in the business of determining wages, hours, and conditions of employment. That is a job for the parties to the dispute to determine, not for the Government to decree. Even under the Taft-Hartley law we already see an increasing tendency of the parties to a dispute, when they reach a deadlock, to "pass the buck" to the National Labor Relations Board. During the course of this debate it has been said—and very aptly, I think—that the real purpose of the Wagner Act was to make perfectly clear that free collective bargaining through unionization was a legal right in the United States and that it had come to stay.

As I have said so many times, and as I said earlier this afternoon, it is unfortunate that when the Wagner Act was passed, the draftsmen did not give greater consideration to the principle of mutuality of rights and obligations to and between the parties to labor disputes. That is one of the great weaknesses of the Act. We should correct it, and we should give to both parties the same procedural rights. In my judgment, however, we should not go to the extent that so many are advocating, namely, of setting up a complex, detailed, procedural structure which in fact amounts to governmental determination and decision of a host of issues which should be left to the parties to the dispute, under the good old American system of voluntarism. I shall have more to say about that by way of giving specific examples and cases when we take up other amendments to this measure; but I give this general warning this afternoon in regard to enacting at this session of Congress labor legislation which will have the effect, in the last analysis, of making the Government the final determiner of a great many of the relationships between management and labor, which ought to be determined, not by the Government, but by the parties to the dispute, through good-faith collective bargaining. I repeat that we cannot legislate good-faith collective bargaining, we cannot put good will into the hearts of men, by means of legislation.

I wish to make another point before I take up the amendment. I said earlier in my remarks that Will Davis pointed out in the committee hearings that if in a generation there are more than one or two emergency disputes, which have to go through some governmental procedure for final determination, the system and procedure will break down.

He said something else which supported a point of view which some of us expressed during the 1947 debate, namely, that under our free economy in an emergency dispute case the public is not entitled to be protected in the same degree of economic enjoyments—I do not say rights, Mr. President—which they enjoyed prior to the existence of the emergency dispute. The public must realize that it too, is a partner in this free economy, and if the public is going to permit the exercise of the basic freedom to strike and lock-out, it must expect, when that right is exercised from time to time, that it, the public, will suffer some inconvenience.

So let us consider a coal case or a utilities case or a railroad case, and let us apply to some hypothetical facts the general proposition to which I am referring. Suppose there were a widespread strike in a certain utility. It could be of such proportions as to affect the national health and safety. To the extent that it affected the national health and safety to the detriment of the public, in that it really endangered health and safety, I believe the Government would have an obligation to move in and protect that public interest. However, that does not mean Mr. President, that you and I would be entitled, each night during the course of the dispute, to have for our reading lamps sufficient electric current to enable us to read our daily newspaper. It does not mean that every economic establishment in the community would be entitled to the same amount of electric power it previously had. It means that in such a case if we are going to preserve the right to strike, the Government should take the necessary steps, through whatever procedure it can use to accomplish the desired results, to see to it that sufficient power is available to protect health and safety, but no more. That is true, because if the Government were to go further than that, the public and thus the Government would then be allied on the employer's side of the dispute.

As I have said before, that is one reason why I cannot go along with the stereotyped blanket-injunction procedure in such disputes. It must be remembered that an injunction is not handed down on the merits of the case—because the merits would not yet have been determined. We do not know who is more at fault, in such cases, until there has been a hearing on the merits. Under the injunctive process, the Government would automatically be put on the side of the employer, and the employer

would know it. Consequently, if he felt he had a good chance to obtain an injunction, he would have a weapon, in his negotiations with the workers, which would be superior to any which the workers might have.

The public wants to be fair, and unless it is fair, in the long run it will jeopardize its own basic freedoms. Any injustice or unfairness, even when exercised by the general public, sooner or later reaps a costly toll, threatens national unity, forces upon us class-conscious conflict, and breeds great discontent within our country. It is only by the public's remaining fair that such trends in our society can be prevented. So I say that the public should recognize, in the handling of emergency disputes affecting national health and safety, that the only thing for which it has the right to ask is the operation of our economy during the course of such a dispute and only to the extent necessary to protect health and safety. The public should not expect that every factory in the town will continue to operate, or that the elevators in every office building will run, or that the average Mr. and Mrs. Citizen will be able to go through their daily economic lives unaffected by the dispute. If that is not the standard we are proposing in handling emergency disputes, then why does not someone forthrightly say that the objective is to do away with the right to strike or lock out? They do not say that, Mr. President, and I will tell you why I think they do not say it. They do not say it because they know that even the public upon reflection would not approve of such a course. I am afraid the public is somewhat in the position of the little boy who really wants to eat his cake and have it, too.

Let us apply my premise to the railroads. Suppose there were a railroad strike. The health and safety of the Nation—and I think this was completely missed in the last threatened railroad strike—do not call for the operation of every railroad train in the country. The health and safety of the Nation do not call for the maintenance during the dispute of the same economic intercourse which took place through the operation of the railroads prior to the dispute. If it is health and safety we are seeking to protect, then let us face the fact that the obligation of the Government should be to take such steps as may be necessary to protect health and safety, and stop there. Of course, that means sacrifice to the public. It means loss to the railroads. But it is necessary to come to grips with this whole business of what the right to strike and lock-out means.

Take the question of coal. Suppose a shut-down occurs because of a strike in the coal industry. Does that mean that we should have an emergency-dispute procedure which makes it mandatory upon the part of the Government to insist that all the coal mines shall operate? How much coal must the Nation have in order to protect its health and safety during the period of a coal strike? That is a question of fact. Some would make it a conclusion of law, by adopting a procedure which would in effect place upon the Government the duty of taking whatever steps within its powers it thinks it has to operate all the coal mines.

The difference of opinion that exists over this one premise partly explains why it is so difficult for us to reach some reasonable agreement upon emergency-dispute procedure. I am so convinced that the fundamental right of workers and employers to use economic force, if necessary, is essential to maintaining a free society, and avoiding the development of governmental dictation of our economic life, that I am willing to make the very impolitic statement—and well do I know how impolitic it is, Mr. President—that during the emergency the public is not entitled to enjoy all the economic conveniences which it enjoyed prior to the development of a deadlock between management and labor. Certainly I want to see that essential services are maintained.

That leads me to point out that we are dealing here with a field of human relations that cannot be separated from the exercise of wise discretion and objective judgment. It cannot be done by a cold legal rule. Mr. President, we may disagree as to what discretion should be exercised and what judgment should be reached on the facts as to how much of an industry must be maintained in operation in order to protect national health and safety, but I am willing, on a case-to-case basis, to entrust that judgment, with reasonable checks against the exercise of arbitrary caprice, to public servants who are charged by the Congress with the task of doing whatever they can within a very flexible framework of rules and procedures to lead the parties to their better senses and to settle disputes on the basis of rules of reason rather than on a continuation of the rules of economic force. And that usually happens.

Oh, the hypotheticals that are thrown at us, Mr. President. If John L. Lewis, for example, closes down all the coal mines of the country, and adamantly says, "I will go to jail," or if 150,000 coal miners say, "We will go to jail," what are we going to do? I shall propose to treat that case when we reach it, because that is the only way we can ever solve the problem. We must be in position to treat that case on the basis of the individual facts existing at the time it arises. I do not think there is any other answer to it. I certainly shall not vote for a blanket injunctive process in such cases. There are a great many reasons why I shall not vote for a blanket-injunction process in such cases.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. If I may ask the Senator a question, I should like to know how he would deal with strikes in connection with hospitals and city water supplies. I am keenly interested in what the Senator is saying, and I ask the question only in order that I may have a broader understanding of what the Senator would recognize as the essentials of the emergency.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate the Senator's question. I think it is very pertinent. I will simply say that I would have the facts of the individual case determined by a competent board, handing down a decision as to what services need to be rendered in order to maintain the minimum services essential to public health and safety.

Mr. THYE. The question would be submitted to a board before the shut-down or the lock-out or the cessation of the work, and then the board would have an opportunity to act. For example, if the electric switches were to be pulled at a given hour, the board would have a right to determine whether the switch of the hospital or of the city water pumps could be pulled. That is what comes to my mind, because it could occur any day or night, at any hour of the 24 hours.

Mr. MORSE. I want, first, to eliminate one assumption that the Senator has in his hypothetical question. I may say to the Senator that I do not know of anything by way of a law which can stop men, if they will, and if they become so lacking in full appreciation of their responsibility to the public, from quitting work. But if they do, and if it is a real national emergency, I propose to have the matter submitted to the board so that we can have the benefit, as quickly as possible, of the board's decision as to what the solution of the particular case should be, and also to have the matter submitted by the President to the Congress. If a dispute is so serious as to constitute a menace to national health and safety, I believe it should be considered on the floor of the Senate. The representatives of the people have an obligation to proceed to consider it on its merits, aided by such expert advice and decision as such a board would be able to give to the Congress.

Mr. THYE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. THYE. The mechanics of the board, as proposed in the Senator's amendment, would be such that the board would be aware of the threatened shut-down. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. The moment the shut-down is threatened, the President would issue a proclamation calling on the parties to maintain the status quo and appoint an emergency board which would report within 30 days. If the status quo is not maintained, the President would be required to lay the matter before Congress.

Mr. THYE. In the event Congress were in recess, it would take some time to reassemble the Congress, would it not?

Mr. MORSE. Not more than from 12 to 24 hours.

Mr. THYE. So the union could not pull the switch on a hospital for 12 hours, or could not pull the switch on a city water system for 12 hours.

I am very much interested in what the Senator is saying, and I ask these questions in order to enlighten myself as to how we could protect ourselves in situations of that kind.

Mr. MORSE. I know of no rule of procedure which would protect us from such gross irresponsibility as that which the Senator has included in his hypothetical question. I care not what procedure may be adopted, if there is any group of workers so completely asocial in

their attitude toward the public as to endanger a hospital or to endanger a water supply of a city, as is suggested by the Senator, without taking the steps necessary to protect health and safety, I do not know of any law which would prevent the workers from walking out. If they are so asocial that they are going to follow that course of action, what can we do with them? Put them in jail? That is why I object to the injunctive process. If we have the injunctive process, the choice we give the individual is either to follow the mandate of the court or go to jail for contempt. Coal cannot be mined in a jail. A public utility cannot be operated if the workers are in a jail.

The Senator can disagree with me to his heart's content and let history determine whether I am right or wrong, but if we make the American pattern for the handling of emergency disputes the process of injunction, we shall have to send many persons to jail, if we attempt to make it really effective. On this point I am convinced that American workers are so certain that the injunctive process endangers their basic rights to economic freedom that they will go to jail before they will allow that pattern to become a pattern of public policy.

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

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. If I may be allowed to make a comment along with my question, I recognize that under the injunctive procedure, if an injunction is imposed for 60 to 90 days, at the end of that period the dispute immediately continues, and there may be a second injunction imposed. Would there not come a time when we would actually be proceeding under a constant injunction? The same idea could be applied to seizure. At the end of the seizure period, if the question arose again, there could be imposed another seizure. Would not the plant, under those circumstances, be under the supervision of the Government or a board or a commission established by law to maintain control and operate the plant?

Those are two questions which come to my mind in connection with the injunctive process, and the question of seizure, with respect to which I am greatly disturbed. I am seeking, as earnestly as a man can seek, an answer which will satisfy my own mind and conscience on the point. I wish the Senator would stress the danger of processes of seizure and injunction, and explain each of them, as I know the Senator so ably can explain them if he takes a few minutes on each one of the points.

Mr. MORSE. It is my personal view that the adoption of the injunction pattern in emergency-dispute cases will not work satisfactorily. If we make that the policy of the Government, labor will be of the opinion that it must contest it, because labor looks upon it as destructive of its basic right to free collective bargaining. As I have said before, labor looks upon it as putting the Government on the employer's side of the table, and it has the effect, to all intents and purposes, of permitting the court to decide the ultimate case against labor, for the reason that the issuance of an injunction, whether we will it or not, causes the average American citizen to say, "Well, labor certainly must be wrong in this case, because an injunction has been already issued against labor." On the other hand, seizure and Government operation threaten the rights of employers and may, in like manner, tend to prejudice the employer's case in the public mind.

Mr. President, I should like to hold to the coal case, because I think we should face the facts frankly. Very many of these proposals for the handling of emergency disputes are the direct result of the discussion within the Senate of the hypothetical "What are you going to do about John L. Lewis?" It seems to me we are letting that hypothetical case cause us to consider some legislative patterns which are not in the public interest.

Of course, I might reply to those who ask the question "What are you going to do about John L. Lewis in an emergency-dispute case?" by asking a second question, "Well, what have we done?" Under the Taft-Hartley law we had an injunction. We did not put a single man in jail. We did not put John L. in jail. So, if we want to deal in conjecture and hypothetical, I can give one, "What do you think would have happened if we had?"

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I recognize that coal is not so critical as a utility that deals with electrical current for a city, electrical current for a hospital, or electrical current to operate city pumps controlling the water supply. If such a utility were shut down for 1 hour or 2 hours, or for any time, the situation would be critical, as it would be if the members of a union were so irresponsible as to pull a switch on a pump controlling the water for a city. I am not concerned so much about coal, because there could be a shut-down in the coal supply for a week and people could survive and there would be no endangerment of the welfare of the public.

But I conceive that the pulling of a switch on an electrical utility could be very serious, and could endanger the welfare and the health of a great number of people. If a union were irresponsible and did such a thing, how would we deal with that situation?

Mr. MORSE. Assuming the facts of the hypothetical, and adding to it the condition that there is the worst possible set of facts——

Mr. THYE. That is what I intended.

Mr. MORSE. That we have a condition endangering the health and safety of the public, then we would all agree with Will Davis' testimony when he said in effect, before our committee, "Under those circumstances, of course, people have to protect themselves." They cannot do it by law, it seems to me, except by way of a proclamation by the President to whatever citizens' committees are necessary to protect health and safety in helping to operate the waterworks, for instance. Under our system of free government, a city has the right to protect itself, and if the situation is so bad that the governmental processes break down, then of course there must be martial-law procedure.

I say to my good friend from Minnesota that it seems to me that he is thinking in terms of that rare and exceptional case which, if it does come to pass, must be dealt with on its own terms. He is permitting that rare possibility, I think, to influence him greatly in the determination of what procedure should be written into the law, which, if it is written into the law, will be automatically applied to a host of cases which are not of so serious a nature as the one the Senator from Minnesota fears may occur.

Mr. THYE. I am not being influenced; I am inquisitive; I am searching; I am trying to find all the answers to problems which I can imagine could arise. I am merely trying to find the answers. I have not been influenced. I am as inquisitive as a person possibly could be in these matters.

Mr. MORSE. My choice of language was probably bad. What I am trying to say is that I assume the Senator from Minnesota is troubled in his thinking, as I am troubled in mine, and as I think most of my colleagues are troubled in theirs, as to what if anything we can do by way of blanket legislation to cover the rare and exceptional case which may arise sometime in the future. The best answer I can make is to say that I do not believe we can meet the situation by blanket legislation, other than by providing a procedure which will permit the Government at such a time to consider the case on its individual facts and merits.

Mr. THYE. I am happy the Senator said he was troubled, because I am troubled, and the only reason why I am asking the questions is that I am troubled.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. With reference to the hypothetical question given by the Senator from Minnesota, would it not be true that if such an emergency occurred and electricians, let us say, went on strike in a hospital, we would probably see the same public response we see when a person is dying in a hospital, even though he may be a criminal, and the hospital calls over the radio for blood, and it comes from all directions? My guess is that when the public feels that way about it, there would be very little difficulty, if union members could be induced to close the hospital down.

Mr. MORSE. On the basis of the assumptions raised by the Senator from Louisiana, I wish to say that the conclusion he has reached is the same conclusion reached by Mr. Davis when—paraphrasing him—he talked about the importance of citizens' committees really proceeding to protect the public.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder whether the Senator from Oregon does not make a distinction between what we may call local disputes, those which may be dealt with under local State laws and regulations, as compared with those which require national legislation.

Mr. MORSE. I have certainly meant to make that distinction, in remarks I made earlier this afternoon, but I am glad the Senator raised the question as it gives me an opportunity to make it clear in the RECORD.

I said earlier this afternoon that one of the great dangers we face is passing legislation which will result in a great many disputes being called national emergency disputes when in fact they are not national emergency disputes. They may be serious disputes, but not disputes in which one can say that the national health and safety are involved, or that the safety and health of a large area of the country are involved. There are a great many measures on the books at the State level which many people would like to have written into the Federal law to cover a good many of the situations.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. My only reason for referring to electricity in connection with utilities was that I was thinking of some large utilities such as the TVA, the Columbia Valley Authority, and other large installations such as those, which stretch across many States and involve electric power for large cities, wherein, many hospitals might be involved if a switch were pulled. It was for that reason that I asked the question. I know the Senator from Oregon is possibly one of the best qualified judicial minds to discuss and to explain these questions, and it was for that reason that I propounded the questions to him.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota has a higher regard for the thinking of the Senator from Oregon on this matter than the Senator from Oregon has himself, because I am so perplexed and disturbed about it, so concerned about its importance to our whole economy, that I want to make perfectly clear that I do not claim what I am offering to be the answer which should be adopted. I do claim it to be a suggestion which is deserving of very serious consideration as we study the other proposals made, such as the one made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the one made by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the one made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], which I understand will subsequently be offered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question in regard to the national emergency proposition?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from Oregon believe that the provisions outlined under the national emergency section of the Taft-Hartley Act, or any other national emergency section, have the tendency to create at least artificial situations, or situations which are termed national emergencies? I do not recall that there was a labor dispute which was particularly termed a national emergency from the beginning of our Nation, until about 1947. We had railroad strikes in connection with which troops were used. We had a half a dozen serious major industry-labor relations problems. But all at once, with the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act there were seven instances within 2 years of national emergency disputes. In all these years from 1935 to 1937 I do not think there were seven instances of cases which we termed or even thought of as national emegencies.

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree with the Senator from Minnesota. I think in the public's thinking, since the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act, there has been a tendency to assume that every major dispute partook of a national emergency character. I think the public has not drawn the distinction among the disputes which I seek to draw here this afternoon. I do not consider the last coal strike was a national emergency case.

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

Mr. MORSE. I will yield in a moment. I do not believe the proof was available that, at the time the Government took the drastic action it took, the shutting down of the mines, a threat to national health and safety had been established to exist.

Let me refer to a wartime coal case. I wish the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] were present to check the statement I now make. It was in the spring of 1943. The Nation was at war. A serious coal dispute occurred. Some of us held to the position that during the course of the war the Government should use every force at its command to maintain coal production. I sat in the office of the President of the United States one afternoon with the membership of the War Labor Board to discuss the procedure and the strategy which should be followed in case the contest should be drawn between the miners and the Government as to whether the mines should be kept open during the course of the war. I heard men who had been called there, and who knew the facts, state, and I heard the President of the United States himself agree, that as of that time we could stand a coal strike of 3 months' duration. I am satisfied that in the case of the last coal strike the national health and safety would not have been jeopardized if the strike had been of several weeks' or months' duration.

Now what is happening is that every time a dispute occurs in one of the major industries which may look like it is going to lead to a stoppage, the hue and cry goes up in the land, "Right now health and safety are in danger." What those who cry out in that language really mean is some economic sacrifices will have to be made by a great many people if workers and management exercise the free right to use economic force. I simply do not think we can ignore the significance of that fact.

I now yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I wish to ask the Senator from Oregon a question. Does not the Senator think that it should be made clear that the procedure we are now talking about applies and should apply only when there is a very real national emergency which imperils the health and safety of the Nation?

Mr. MORSE. I do, but I insist that that is a question of fact, and in the last analysis, after the President's proclamation, it should be determined on the floor of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator from Oregon mean to say that we can write out a definition?

Mr. MORSE. No. Just the opposite.

Mr. HILL. The Senator does not mean that at all?

Mr. MORSE. That is what I am urging against, that we do not attempt to write a rule of thumb into this legislation. I urge that we must recognize, that we must consider these matters on a case-to-case basis, and that we should not provide a blanket injunctive procedure for the handling of any cases.

Mr. President, I am obliged to leave by 5 o'clock to attend the graduation exercises at the school from which my daughter is graduating, which is the most important thing for me to do just now. I am going to conclude my speech quickly, but I will yield to the Senator for another question.

Mr. HILL. The Senator will agree that the injunctive procedure in and of itself is only the machinery, or would only be the machinery. It would not define what is or what is not a national emergency imperiling health and safety of the Nation, would it?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct. Under the present law it is automatic. A decision is not made on the merits. It is automatic.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The Taft-Hartley Act provides:

> If the court finds that such threatened or actual strike or lock-out—
>
> * * * * *
>
> (ii) if permitted to occur or to continue, will imperil the national health or safety, it shall have jurisdiction to enjoin any such strike or lock-out.

Does not the Senator agree with me that that is not at all automatic, but that it requires proof, and that the courts must find that the threatened or actual strike or lock-out, if permitted to occur and continue, will imperil the national health and safety?

Mr. MORSE. That is one of the points on which the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Missouri disagree—the application of literal language in the statute to the practice of the courts. The Senator has read language that is typical of temporary injunction language which has appeared in the law for decades. It has been labor's experience that in practice it is automatic. In practice the injunction is obtained. As a lawyer, I speak most respectfully of the bench, but in practice those seeking the

injunction appear before men on the bench who from experience and conditioning are not the ones who in our society should be entrusted with the determination of whether disputes should be handled or stopped or suspended by way of injunction.

I care not, I may say to the Senator from Missouri, even if there is placed in the statute the language, "And they must consider the case on the merits," the result would still be that injunctions would practically, as a matter of practice, automatically follow, and labor would be back again on the road that leads to government by injunction. It does not make any difference whether you and I or millions of other people in this country think labor ought to accept that procedure; we are confronted with a fact, not a theory. We are confronted with the fact—impolitic again as this statement may be—that organized labor is not going to accept, without a deep and abiding sense of injury, a law which requires the settling of labor disputes, even for a 60- or 80- or 90-day period, by way of an injunctive process, because the choice given labor, from labor's sights, is that it must either work under the conditions laid down in the injunction or go to jail for contempt. And labor says, "There is something about that which violates a basic American freedom. There is something about that which says in effect, 'For whatever period of time the injunction is going to last the court gives us a choice of the bars of a jail or working for an employer under his terms and conditions, for his profit, for such period of time as the injunction lasts.'" Whether the American people like it or not, they must face the fact that the workers will not take it without protest or bitterness.

We are then confronted, it seems to me, with a situation which we should always seek to avoid in a democracy if we want to keep democracy strong. We must find methods which will accomplish socially desirable results without imposing upon any large segment of our population a procedure which that segment conscientiously believes is unacceptable to it because of what it does to its rights. What are we going to do, if we wish to talk in terms of hypotheticals, if 150,000 of John L. Lewis' coal miners say, "We will go to jail"? What are we going to do if we put Lewis in jail, and the 150,000 coal miners say, "Either Lewis goes out of jail or we go out of the coal pits"? It is a hard hypothetical.

I do not care what misinterpretations may be made of my position on this question. I say frankly to the American people that I think I understand labor's psychology sufficiently well to be convinced that labor will go to jail before it will accept a pattern of the injunctive process for the settlement of disputes.

My good friend from Missouri and I differ on several features of the injunctive processes of the Taft-Hartley law, including the question as to whether, under existing law, miners can be put in jail. If I correctly recall, the Senator from Missouri does not agree with my conclusion on that point. I still think that under the Taft-Hartley law we could put not only the leaders, but the workers themselves in jail. I would prefer to debate that question with the Senator from Missouri in greater detail, as I am sure it will be debated in great detail when we have the issue before us in an amendment. I am trying to get away in time to attend a high-school commencement. I seek only to explain my own amendment today. I thought the public was entitled to this brief explanation of the theory, at least, of my amendment. I say to the Senator from Missouri today only that I do not think we are going to solve the emergency dispute problem by way of injunction.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I certainly shall not interfere with the Senator's getting away. I fully appreciate his desire. He is always conscientious in wanting to perform his full duty, and I honor his desire to perform the duty to which he refers this afternoon.

If I may be pardoned for a moment or so, I should like to ask one or two questions.

In the first place, the Senator from Oregon stated that the matter of the issuance of an injunction in the case of threatened impairment of national health or safety is virtually, in fact, automatic. Does not the Senator think that the courts, impressed with the dignity of the oath of office which they take, are fully aware of the fact that when a statute of the United States says that if the court finds that the threatened or actual strike or lock-out, if permitted to occur or continue, will imperil the national health or safety they shall have jurisdiction, the judge of the court, impressed with the oath of his office, will realize that before he can make such a determination he must have valid evidence in support of it? Before the Senator answers that question, let me ask, in connection with that question, whether or not he denies that the courts are fully competent to decide questions of this kind.

Mr. MORSE. I will take the first question first.

I have no doubt that the courts will think they have adequate evidence on which to render their decisions; but I must judge them by the results. The injunctions requested under the Taft-Hartley law to date have, in practice, been virtually automatic. I think the coal case is a good example to show wherein the court erred in finding that the national health and safety were so jeopardized as to justify the injunction. I think it would have been weeks, and possibly several months, before a conclusion could have been reached that the national health and safety were involved in that case. What the court did, in my judgment—and I say this with the greatest respect for the court—was to project into the future what the court thought might be the facts some weeks or months hence. But on the date the court handed down its injunction in the coal case, I say that on the facts the national health and safety were not in danger. The then existing supply of coal above ground was a complete answer to the court.

Now let me answer the second question. Again, with the greatest of respect for the courts, and as a lawyer, I say that I do not believe that judges of America, by their common-law court training, their experience, and their conditioning, are the officers of the Government who ought to pass judgment upon the facts and merits of labor disputes. I do not believe that they are qualified as a group to render decisions on the social and economic questions of labor disputes. In my judgment, there is extending over decades, a sordid record against the courts in what they did to American labor through temporary injunctions which, in effect, constituted strike breaking by American courts. Labor went through that experience. I am proud that my party was the party which sought to put an end to it through the Norris-LaGuardia Act. I am going to stand on the Norris-LaGuardia Act completely, even to the extent of proposing that in the case of national-emergency disputes it shall be applicable also to the Government.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I understood the Senator to say that the courts would think that they had adequate evidence on which to base a judgment of injunction. Did I correctly understand the Senator?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. Does not the Senator think that in all other matters of human dispute, involving property rights, the rights of the individual, the rights of liberty, and so forth, we have found that the courts have functioned, and that they are not mistaken when they think they have gone to the bottom of the issues involved? In that connection, if the Senator will pardon me for interpolating this statement, the case from which I shall read is not the second coal case. This was the one in 1946. I should like to have the Senator tell us whether or not he thinks the Supreme Court was capable of formulating correctly this statement, which it made in the first coal case. It said, immediately following the finding of guilty:

> Defendant Lewis stated openly in court that defendants would adhere to their policy of defiance. This policy, as the evidence showed, was the germ center of an economic paralysis which was rapidly extending itself from the bituminous coal mines into practically every other major industry of the United States.

I ask the Senator from Oregon if the Supreme Court was capable of drawing the conclusion which it drew when it said:

> It was an attempt to repudiate and override the instrument of lawful government in the very situation in which governmental action was indispensable.

Mr. MORSE. My answer to the Senator from Missouri is that in that case, as in other cases, the Court did not sit as a court of equity. In my judgment the Court did not have available to it—and we cannot expect, under the procedure of the Supreme Court, that it will have available to it—the great mass of techni-

cal and economic evidence which would be available under the administrative law processes, for which the Senator from Missouri has heard me plead so frequently, in determining the question whether or not, at a given time, we had yet reached a point where the national health and safety were in fact being jeopardized.

Mr. DONNELL. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that in the case from which I read the Court was not sitting as a court of equity? Before the Senator answers that question, let me read to him this one sentence:

Alleging that the November 15 notice was in reality a strike notice, the United States, pending the final determination of the cause, requested a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunctive relief.

Is not that conclusive evidence that the Court was sitting as a court of equity?

Mr. MORSE. Procedurally, yes; but the Court did not have available to it the type of evidence which a Board ought to have in determining the question of whether there is a national emergency. It is an economic question, a social question; and it should be determined by a group of men who could go into the question of how much coal was above ground at that time, how many mines needed to be operated in order to protect the national health and safety, and so forth.

But the case the Senator has presented illustrates my point. In its findings in that case, the Court was ruling that the coal industry should be kept in operation. That will be the legal attitude of judges generally. They will not draw the distinctions which should be allowed to be drawn by a board which would determine how many units of an industry would need to be kept in operation in order to protect the national health and safety.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further inquiry?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. In the case from which I have read, which ultimately terminated in a contempt proceeding and very large fines against both the union and Mr. Lewis, the Court said:

The defendants thereupon pleaded not guilty, and waived an advisory jury. Trial on the contempt charge proceeded. The Government presented eight witnesses, the defendants none. At the conclusion of the trial on December 3, the Court found—

And so forth. Does not the Senator agree with me that there was adequate evidence on which the lower court acted, and that the Supreme Court sustained the view of the lower court as to the conclusions reached on the evidence adduced before it?

Mr. MORSE. I completely disagree with the Senator from Missouri. I submit that the type of evidence adduced in that case by the Government did not establish the economic facts which should have been before the Court when it was determining the question of whether the national health and safety were being jeopardized.

Can the Senator from Missouri point to anything in that case to show that the Court was informed as to how many thousand tons of coal were above ground at that time?

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I do not have before me a transcript of the testimony in that case, but in the decision of the case by the Supreme Court there are a number of pages in which the Court sets forth the facts as it found them from the evidence before it. The Court said:

This policy, as the evidence showed—

In other words, not according to some wild vagary of the Court or some prejudice that the Court might have determined upon; but the Supreme Court of the United States said:

This policy, as the evidence showed, was the germ center of an economic paralysis which was rapidly extending itself from the bituminous coal mines into practically every other major industry of the United States.

Does the Senator from Oregon disagree with the finding of fact thus made by the lower court and sustained by the Supreme Court of the United States?

Mr. MORSE. I disagree with the conclusion the Court reached; and, with all due respect, I say it was not a finding of fact, because although the Court referred to evidence, my question is, What evidence?

In legal decisions we constantly encounter statements by the Court, "On the basis of the evidence which was presented"; but I say we must go into the evidence itself and must determine whether it was shown that the national health and safety were endangered.

I respectfully say to the Senator from Missouri that in the coal case I do not think the conclusion of the Court that the national health and safety were endangered at that time can be sustained by the facts. The Court spoke in prospective terms in futuro. The Court said that if the strike continued, it would be likely to cripple the sinews of the American economy, or words to that effect. That illustrates a point I made earlier this afternoon, namely, how far should we be willing to go, by way of making economic sacrifices, in order to preserve the basic right to strike and lock-out? I say we must be willing to go much further than we shall ever find the courts generally willing to go if we give them the injunctive power, because their whole history has been one of a willingness to crack down—as they are willing to do now—on labor by way of issuing an injunction, and usually saying in the temporary order something to the effect that an ample opportunity will be allowed for a consideration of the case on its merits.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I do not wish to detain the Senator unduly.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to have the Sentor proceed.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator from Oregon has asked what kind of evidence was before the Court. I take it that all the testimony in the earlier coal case—which was not under the Taft-Hartley Act—as reported in Three Hundred and Thirtieth United States Reports, page 258, will not be found to be set forth in the decision of that case; but on page 267 this is stated by the Court:

A gradual walkout by the miners commenced on November 18—

That statement follows earlier recitals by the Court—

and, by midnight of November 20, consistent with the miners' "no contract, no work" policy, a full-blown strike was in progress.

Then I call to the Senator's attention the next line of the decision, which I think is significant as indicating whether the injunction was issued without valid evidence. The Supreme Court, in speaking through the language of Chief Justice Vinson, then said:

Mines furnishing the major part of the Nation's bituminous coal production were idle.

When the Supreme Court of the United States said that, as the evidence showed, the policy of Mr. Lewis, which he had stated openly in court the defendants would adhere to, was—

The germ center of an economic paralysis which was rapidly extending itself from the bituminous coal mines into practically every other major industry of the United States—

I submit that the Court itself did not say the paralysis would extend in that way, but said that the paralysis was extending itself in that way; and I submit that the Court was setting forth facts as found from the valid evidence before the trial court.

Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator from Oregon has spoken of the necessity of showing that a present condition of national emergency exists. Is it not a fact, I ask the Senator, that under the Taft-Hartley law it is not necessary to show that at the minute the injunction is granted the injury has already resulted; but does not the Taft-Hartley Act say that if the court finds that the threatened or actual strike or lock-out, if permitted to occur or to continue, will imperil the national health or safety, the court shall have jurisdiction?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Missouri that in my judgment I could not have asked for a better witness in support of the position I have taken this afternoon than the Senator from Missouri, in the statements he has made and the quotations he has read from the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. I wish to repeat that the Senator from Missouri and the Supreme Court of the United States in my judgment are basing their conclusions upon the point of view that a national dispute which disrupts the economy of the Nation constitutes a dispute which endangers the national health and safety; and the decision of the Court showed—when the Court talked about what would happen if the dispute continued in operation—the hunches of the Court as to what would happen. It showed that the Court was not acting then and there upon the basis of a finding that national health and safety were in danger, but on the basis of an honest belief as to what might

happen at some time in the future if the parties did not reach a settlement.

If we are to take the position which the Court takes and which the Senator from Missouri takes, then I say that the conclusion should be to stand for a law which outlaws completely strikes in major industries. There cannot be a strike in a major industry which does not have some of the effects about which the Court is talking. But it is possible to have a strike in a major industry for a considerable length of time without endangering national health and safety, provided there is a method of procedure available to assure that the minimum services which are necessary in order to protect health and safety will be maintained. In this instance we have the Court doing what the courts generally do—laying down merely a blanket-injunctive ruling which has the effect of killing the strike and putting labor "behind the 8 ball," so to speak, as far as public opinion is concerned. It is a good example of the injunction being used as a strike-breaking weapon. I shall not be a party to it. If I can prevail on the Senate, I am going to be a party to a provision in the law which will make it perfectly clear that our courts cannot exercise the strike-breaking weapon that the United States Supreme Court affirmed in the coal case.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield further to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Does not the Senator think that it is much wiser to give authority such as the Taft-Hartley Act gives to secure an injunction against the occurring or continuance of a strike or lock-out before the national health or safety shall have been imperiled, than to wait until after it shall have been imperiled and the damage done; particularly when by the very language of the statute, the court, in order to have jurisdiction, must find that if permitted to occur or continue, the strike or lock-out will imperil the national health or safety?

Mr. MORSE. My answer to the Senator from Missouri is, the injunctive process is not needed at all in order to accomplish the objective which the Senator has in mind. There are much better procedures for handling national emergency disputes than the injunctive process. The injunctive process will purchase for us industrial conflict, not industrial peace. This strike and that strike may be broken, but we shall not change the determination of American labor to be protected from what I think is the very unfair choice the court has to give them under the Taft-Hartley law, and will inevitably and invariably give them. In most cases counsel for the Government will be found saying that a prima facie case was established in the court below and should be sustained by the Supreme Court, in its final decision justifying an injunction. I ask, what did the union do in the particular coal case under discussion? It stood mute.

Mr. DONNELL. May I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the decision we are discussing, which is the first coal case, was not under the Taft-Hartley Act? The Senator recalls that, does he not?

Mr. MORSE. It has no bearing upon the objection of the junior Senator from Oregon to the injunctive process. I simply say that wherever the injunctive process is used, we confront the very dangers I am trying to warn the Senator about this afternoon.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator referred to the fact, did he not, as he indicates, that in his opinion labor will not stand for this type of remedy, or words to that effect?

Mr. MORSE. I say, if it is imposed upon labor, there will be industrial conflict.

Mr. DONNELL. Perhaps I am mistaken, but as I understood the Senator, I thought he said in substance that labor will not stand for this, that there is a point at which it will not stand for it.

Mr. MORSE. I shall endeavor to make it perfectly clear, if I can, that labor will not stand for it, in the sense that compliance by labor cannot be expected in many cases in which there is an exercise of the injunctive process.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. First, does the Senator consider that labor is above the law? Second, does he agree to the proposition laid down by the Supreme Court in the case from which I have read, that "it"—the action of Mr. Lewis—"was an attempt to repudiate and override the instrument of lawful government in the very situation in which governmental action was indispensable"?

Mr. MORSE. I am very glad the Senator from Missouri asked that question, because it is perfectly obvious that the position taken by the junior Senator from Oregon this afternoon, unless thoroughly understood, would be twisted by some—I make no reference to the Senator from Missouri, I assure him—into supporting a premise that labor should be considered above the law. I want to say to the Senator from Missouri that in a great many decisions I have held that, once the courts speak, or once the board renders its decision, once the determination has been handed down, then all the forces of government necessary must be used to compel compliance. Of course, I believe in government by law, and of course I believe that labor must be brought under government by law. If we lay down a national policy that the injunctive process shall be the procedure for handling these cases, and if the Eighty-first Congress adopts that as a matter of policy, no one will be more insistent than the junior Senator from Oregon that the forces of government be used, so long as that policy is on the statute books, to compel labor's compliance. I add, however, that the Senator from Missouri has raised a question of fundamental policy, a question as to whether it is desirable in a democracy to lay down a rule of law or procedure, when we well know that such rule or policy will not have the sympathy of a large segment of our population, and thereby will force upon us a contest over government by law. Rather than meet that issue and force that issue we should see whether we have exhausted all our possibilities for other procedures by which we can accomplish the same results, without drawing that contest. Before this debate is over, I shall have a direct quotation from the great Brandeis, but I call the attention of the Senator from Missouri to a writing of his, which I at least interpret to mean, in effect, that in a democracy we must be very careful that we never get the law out so far ahead of the people or of a large segment of our population that the law cannot be successfully enforced without creating very serious consequences of conflict within our society.

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

Mr. MORSE. In a moment. Thus I say to my good friend from Missouri, I do not think I would be true to my convictions if I did not say here this afternoon that I think trying to lay down a policy for handling these disputes by the way of the injunctive process is undesirable in our democracy, first, because I do not think it is necessary to accomplish our objectives; and, second, because I think it draws a contest with Government by law which we should not draw and which I do not believe it is necessary to draw. I want the American people to know that if they do draw it, through their elected representatives in Congress, by way of the proposals which I understand the Senator from Missouri is going to espouse on the floor of the Senate during the debate, we are headed for serious industrial strife in America.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one final question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield further to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. If I may trespass for a moment further on the Senator's time, does he, in his amendment, which I have not yet seen, propose a seizure by the Government as the plan under which he would seek to solve difficulties of this kind?

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will permit me, I shall explain the amendment in a moment, and the Senator will see the type of seizure which is proposed in the amendment.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WITHERS. I think perhaps the Senator from Missouri is confused about the remedies. I want to ask, when a temporary injunction is obtained, is it not a ministerial procedure?

Mr. MORSE. It is.

Mr. WITHERS. Is it not a ministerial act by which the clerk of court issues a temporary restraining order?

Mr. MORSE. It can be. But I think, in fairness to the Senator from Missouri, we should admit that in disputes such as these there is no question about the fact

that the court itself is going to give consideration to the petitions.

Mr. WITHERS. But that is a temporary restraining order granted as a ministerial act of the court, and not as a judicial act. It was not a final determination of any issue.

Mr. MORSE. It was not a final determination.

Mr. WITHERS. It is only maintaining the status of the parties until a final determination can be had. Is not that correct?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. WITHERS. So it was not a court of equity at all, but a court acting in a ministerial capacity, granting an injunction to maintain the status quo until a final determination could be had. Is not that correct?

Mr. MORSE. I think that is in large part correct.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator contend that in the Lewis case the clerk of the court issued the injunction?

Mr. MORSE. No—if the Senator is asking me the question.

Mr. DONNELL. I am asking either one of the Senators. I am sure the Senator from Kentucky would likewise say "No."

Mr. MORSE. In this case we should be sure that the court itself acted——

Mr. WITHERS. And that it was not simply a ministerial act.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator from Oregon agree that the issuance of a temporary injunction by a court, after hearing is held, is the performance of a ministerial duty, or is it the performance of a judicial duty.

Mr. MORSE. If the court passed upon the evidence, I suppose we would have to say that it was clearly a judicial function. Issuance of the injunction, once a determination has been made to grant it, may be regarded as carrying out a ministerial obligation on the part of the court.

Mr. DONNELL. Does not the Senator agree that under the statute—I am talking about the Taft-Hartley Act—it is provided that if the court finds that the threatened or actual strike or lock-out, if it is permitted to occur or to continue, will imperil the national health or safety, it shall have jurisdiction to issue an injunction, and that the court, in issuing the injunction, is acting in the performance of a judicial duty? The Senator certainly would agree to that.

Mr. MORSE. I would not deny that, but I would hasten to add that I think our whole experience under that act to date bears out my statement that, in practice, it amounts to an automatic operation on the part of the court.

Mr. DONNELL. I think there is some room for disagreement on that point.

Mr. MORSE. Yes, I understand. But I must look at the results. If the Senator could bring in many refusals on the part of courts to issue injunctions, we might be a little nearer to his point of view. But I am willing to suggest this afternoon that I think, under the Taft-Hartley law, almost invariably requests for injunctions will be automatically granted.

Mr. DONNELL. In cases in which a national emergency is involved.

Mr. MORSE. Yes. But all it amounts to, in my judgment, is for counsel for the Government to appear before the court and present what he thinks is a prima facie case in support of his contention, and the court will grant the injunction. That has been the whole history of our temporary-injunction procedure, which labor so greatly fears.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator disagree with the conclusion at which the Supreme Court of the United States arrived, in the case from which I read, namely, that a paralysis was creeping over the country—I do not have the book at hand at the moment; I think one of the reporters has it——

Mr. MORSE. I think that was an assumption on the part of the court.

Mr. DONNELL. Did not the court say that its conclusion was derived from the evidence?

Mr. MORSE. I still say I think it was the assumption of the court. I do not think the court presented any evidence in its decision which supported the assumption that the national health or safety of the country was endangered in the coal case.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I should like it to be noted in the RECORD that the excerpt to which I am referring appears at page 303, and states that the policy of Mr. Lewis, as the evidence showed, was the germ-center of an economic paralysis which was rapidly extending itself from the bituminous coal mines into practically every other major industry of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. I think what it shows is that the court did not like, any more than the rest of us like the idea of economic loss and inconvenience being suffered by American industry as the result of a long continuation of the coal strike. That is the point I have tried to raise this afternoon. On the question of emergency disputes, Government participation in them should be limited to whatever the point is at which it is necessary to protect national health or safety, but not to the point of guaranteeing a continuation of the full operation of the economy without loss to various industries and to the American people generally. I repeat, the American people must make up their minds whether they want to pay the price for some of our basic freedoms. When those freedoms are being exercised there is a governmental obligation to protect the national health and safety, but there is no governmental obligation, and there should be none, to guarantee to American industry and the American people generally the continuation of the economic processes without any loss to those concerned. The two things are incompatible. We cannot exercise the right to strike and have a continuation of our economy without loss to someone. Certainly, as American citizens, we are entitled to have the Government protect us in respect to health and safety.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask the Senator a question. I realize that I am treading on sacred and hallowed ground when I address myself to such a distinguished attorney as the Senator from Oregon and to those Senators who have gathered in his immediate proximity. But is it not possible that just the sort of debate we are hearing this afternoon as to what the Taft-Hartley law means, what the legal provisions are, and what the interpretation is, constitute one of the things which has caused a considerable amount of the confusion in the whole picture of labor-management relationship? In other words, the constant inability of men of good will, of education, of learning in the law, ever to be able to agree fully as to what some of the provisions mean.

Mr. MORSE. I agree.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, the law has complicated the problem.

Mr. MORSE. I agree. I shall at a later time speak at some length on my criticisms of the Taft-Hartley law. I think they are pretty well known, but I must make the record again. I shall go into detail as to those criticisms. Suffice it to say this afternoon that I think among the many unfortunate results of the operation of the Taft-Hartley law have been the political implications and consequences. I think it has been more responsible than has any other thing Congress has done for a quarter of a century for stirring up within the ranks of American labor a politically class-conscious spirit which will manifest itself at the polls for some elections to come. It is very unfortunate that we have the labor issue now reduced in no small measure to a straight political issue. Two great major organizations as well as the independent unions in this country are participating in political campaigning to a degree never before practiced by them. That is one of the direct results of the Taft-Hartley law. I do not believe we can solve the question in the realm of partisan politics. We must try to solve it on the basis of the facts, separately and distinctly from the political implications of the law.

Mr. President, I desire briefly to describe the emergency-dispute amendment which I am offering for the consideration of the Senate. I am not married to it. My mind is open as to modifications of it. I want to make it perfectly clear that as I listen to the debate, if I become convinced that my proposal would not be helpful in accomplishing the result we all desire, I shall vote against it. I think, however, that there are some suggestions in my proposal which are entitled to the careful consideration of the Senate. Frankly, I am in somewhat of an embarrassing position in regard to the whole question, because, as the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], could very well point out to the Senate, I conferred with him on a number of occasions in regard to the type of approach which is presented in his amendment. I may finally vote for his

amendment as modified. I think it probably will be somewhat modified on the floor.

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

Mr. MORSE. In a moment. As I said the other day, there is great merit in the provisions of the amendment offered by the Senator from New York, but I try to adjust my thinking constantly to new facts and new arguments as I come in contact with them, and I have decided, as a matter of judgment, that the amendment I am offering this afternoon contains some features which are preferable to some of the features of the amendment of the Senator from New York.

I shall yield to the Senator from New York in a moment, but I desire to make a reference to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. In a group of Republican and Democratic Senators the Senator from Illinois sought to work out a set of bipartisan amendments to the Thomas bill which might make the Thomas bill, as amended, more acceptable to a majority of the Members of the Senate. There was some division of sentiment. I wish to say that I think that bipartisan approach, as I have said before, should have been made in the committee, but now that is water over the dam. I think it is fortunate that at least before we have gotten to a final vote a bipartisan attempt has been made to reach some compromises on the legislation.

During my absence last week a temporary, a very tentative, understanding was reached that the compromise on emergency disputes should be by way of the type of seizure amendment which has been discussed in the press, and which this bipartisan group tentatively agreed upon in conference. I returned to Washington and studied the language of the amendment. It has many good things in it, but here again, Mr. President, I could not go along with it completely. I could not go along with it completely because in my judgment it, too, would result in an automatic injunctive process.

I think it is true that there is not a single Member of this body who has more consistently argued against the injunctive process as an instrumentality of settling labor disputes than has the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I was interested in the Senator's statement just made because of my recollection, which may be in error, to the effect that he was one of those who reported and supported the committee bill which came in during the last Congress, in 1947, which did include in title II, having to do with national emergency matters, a provision for the use of the injunction. Am I correct in my recollection in regard to that?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. But the Senator's question necessitates an explanation on the part of the Senator from Oregon. The fact is that in 1947 the junior Senator from Oregon did everything he could to work out a compromise bill which would be acceptable to the Senate, and the committee hearings are perfectly clear that as a matter of policy the Senator from Oregon was just as opposed in 1947 to the injunctive process as he is today. But, after all, when we considered the many conflicting points of view within our committee in 1947, the junior Senator from Oregon was confronted with the task of making some concessions in order to get out of the committee a bill which he thought would be at least less dangerous and less undesirable than the Taft-Hartley proposals.

I wish to say that one of the great problems which confronts a liberal in the Senate is whether he should ever make a compromise on any issue when he finds himself in disagreement, whether in committee he should ever do "horse trading," as we say. There have been those in the Senate who have taken the position that never would they compromise. I do not think they are very constructive and helpful in drawing legislation when they take such an adamant position. So, in 1947 reluctantly I went along with the injunctive process to the extent that it was written in the committee bill.

The Senator from Florida is quite wrong if he seeks to give the impression that in 1947, as a matter of principle, the junior Senator from Oregon approved of or agreed to the injunctive process or found it acceptable. He went along with the bill because seven votes were required to get it out of the committee, and we could not have made the compromises necessary if I had not agreed to that provision of the bill, because most of the sections of the committee bill, certainly most of the controversial sections, were adopted by the committee either 7 to 6 or 8 to 5. The final bill, as the Senator knows, was ordered to be reported from the committee by a vote of 11 to 2. But that was only after the minority had lost on each one of the controversial issues.

Therefore, for the record, I want to make it perfectly clear that the junior Senator from Oregon in 1947 was no more friendly to the principle of the injunctive process than he is today.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the answer the Senator has just given, and which I appreciate, apply equally to the provision for injunction contained in title II, in the committee bill of 1947, applicable to emergency disputes, and to the provision to which he has referred, by which the injunction could be used by the National Labor Relations Board to enforce its findings on any question of unfair labor practices?

Mr. MORSE. That was my view in 1947. Let me tell the Senator what my present view is. Once a finding has been made, against the union, for example, that it is guilty of an unfair labor practice, and after having taken all the advantages of the act the union then defies it, I am very much open to conviction, if we are to have the Government participate in labor cases, whether or not at that point, once the decision has been rendered on the merits, the Government should not have available to it the injunctive process. I say that today I am much more open-minded on that question than I would have been in 1947; but in 1947 I went along with the provision by way of the compromise procedure I have just mentioned.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator mean by his last answer that he now, after 2 years' experience under the act, is in doubt as to whether or not the people of the United States should have the protection of an injunction, or any other effective machinery, to support a finding in the case of a threatened shutdown of a vital national industry, or whether the Government should have available the injunctive process to enforce a finding that an unfair labor practice has been under way by a union?

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will hear me through my explanation of my amendment, he will have a complete answer to his question.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to proceed to outline briefly the major provisions of my amendment. But I yield first to the Senator from New York, and apologize to him for keeping him waiting so long.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Oregon if he is aware of the fact that the Senator from New York plans to offer an amendment relating to national emergencies which does not contain any seizure provision or any injunctive provision.

Mr. MORSE. I understand that is the position taken by the Senator from New York. He may find me with him on the final vote.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York will be very grateful.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to the Senator from New York that I think what we need to do is to bring all these proposals onto the floor of the Senate, because this is really where we are going to have to write the bill, instead of in the committee. But after the pros and cons of each proposal have been considered, I then for the first time will reach my final decision as to each provision.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York would like to point out to the Senator from Oregon that he may also offer his other proposal, which has already been printed and is on the desks of the Members of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. I understand that is also the position of the Senator.

Mr. President, the first part of my amendment follows the common procedure which runs through all these proposals, namely, that whenever, in the opinion of the President of the United States, a threatened or actual strike or lock-out affecting an entire industry will imperil the national health or safety, he shall issue a proclamation to that effect; that he shall appoint an "emergency board," and the board shall have the obligation to make recommendations which, so far as I am concerned, will amount to making a decision, because it

is the decision, I say, that is so important in these cases.

I may add that I think Senators will find that in the overwhelming majority of the cases—and simply for comparative purposes, I will say 9 out of 10 cases—the decision of the board itself will be accepted by the parties in any dispute.

Then I provide the usual procedure as to the powers of the board, as is provided for in the Ives amendment, to exercise the power of subpena, and contempt powers.

Then following the proclamation of the President and the recommendations of the board, I provide in this amendment, that in any case in which a strike or a lock-out occurs or continues after the issuance of the proclamation, the President shall submit immediately to the Congress for consideration and appropriate action a full statement of the case, including the report of the emergency board if such report has been made, and such recommendations as it may see fit to make, including a recommendation that the United States take possession of and operate the business enterprise or enterprises involved in the dispute. If the President recommends that the United States shall take possession of and operate such enterprise or enterprises, the President shall have authority to take such action unless the Congress by concurrent resolution within 10 days after the submission of such recommendation to the Congress determines that such action should not be taken or enacts legislation designed to resolve the dispute and terminate the national emergency if Congress finds such an emergency exists.

In other words, Mr. President, I say that if there is truly a national emergency, the determination should be made by the Congress and not by the courts, and under the amendment the Congress itself has the primary responsibility by way of concurrent resolution to determine the procedure by which the individual and particular case shall be settled.

Then I use this language:

Provided, That during the period in which the United States shall have taken possession, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service and the emergency board shall continue to encourage the settlement of the dispute by the parties concerned, and the agency or department of the United States designated to operate such enterprise or enterprises shall have no authority to enter into negotiations with the employer or with any labor organization.

That removes the possibility of the example we had not so long ago of the so-called Krug agreement with respect to the Coal case, where the employers were not given an adequate opportunity, it seemed to me, to have a voice in the negotiations.

Then I add the further provision:

If the Congress or either House thereof shall have adjourned sine die or for a period longer than 3 days, the President shall convene the Congress, or such House for the purpose of consideration of and appropriate action pursuant to such statement and recommendations—

Of the board and the President.

Much has been said already in the present debate to the effect that we cannot wait for the Congress to return in order that action be taken. I deny that, because Congress can return to Washington within from 12 to 24 hours. In my judgment, no showing can be made that the economy or the health and safety of the country will be jeopardized by the lapse of that period of time.

Then I add the following important provision:

That the Norris-LaGuardia Act shall be applicable to the United States acting under the provisions of this title unless Congress by concurrent resolution provides otherwise in the particular case.

Mr. President, I cannot stress too strongly that difference with the Douglas proposal, because what that difference means is that the Norris-LaGuardia Act shall be applicable to the Government unless Congress by way of concurrent resolution, on the basis of the facts of a particular case, decides in respect to that case to make an exception to the Norris-LaGuardia Act. I cannot say and I do not see how anyone can say, that there may not be circumstances and facts which in a particular case might demand of the Congress that it make an exception to the Norris-LaGuardia Act. But the difficulty, as I see it, with the Douglas proposal is that the use of the injunction would become automatic in effect in case the Government, after seizing a plant, sought to make use of the injunction.

SEC. 304. (a) In the event that the Government shall take possession of and operate any business enterprise or enterprises involved in a given dispute, the President shall designate the agency or department of Government which shall take possession of any business enterprise or enterprises including the properties thereof involved in the dispute and all other assets of the enterprise or enterprises necessary to the continued normal operation—

I feel that the injunction puts the Government on the employer's side of the table, and I feel also that seizure, unless very carefully qualified, puts the Government on labor's side of the table. Therefore I have worked out in this amendment a procedure whereby the Compensation Board can take into account the fact that labor, for example, stood in violation of the emergency board's recommendation, and if the finding of fact is that labor stood in violation of the emergency board's recommendation, then I do not think it is fair for the Government to penalize the industry by giving to the industry only what it might think to be just compensation for the use of its facilities short of the profits it otherwise would have made.

If the responsibility for the defiance and noncompliance is labor's, then I think industry is entitled to be kept whole as the result of the Government's seizure. If on the other hand, the industry seeks to make use of the procedure in order to force the Government to seize its plant, thinking that by so doing it can break the back of the union, then I believe the compensation board should take that into account in fixing the compensation which should be paid.

In other words, what I am trying to do in the amendment is to keep the Government in a position where it does not join either labor on one side of the table or industry on the other, but keeps itself in the middle by way of judgment, believing, that if these extraordinary powers are written into the law to be used by the Congress, as Congress sees fit to use them in the particular case, we will find in practically all the cases, with a rare exception now and then that, as Will Davis said, not more than once or twice in a generation will both parties to the dispute fail to accept the findings and recommendations of the emergency board.

Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be printed. I submit it with an open mind, and I am perfectly willing to consider amendments to it which Senators can convince me are needed; and if it can be demonstrated in the argument that the whole amendment is without merit, I shall be glad to vote against it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator offering the amendment, or does the Senator submit the amendment to be printed and lie on the table?

Mr. MORSE. I submit the amendment and ask that it be printed and lie on the table, as well as printed at the conclusion of these remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Amendment submitted by Mr. MORSE to the bill to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, viz: Strike out all title III of the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Utah dated May 31, 1949, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE III—NATIONAL EMERGENCIES

"DECLARATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCIES

"SEC. 301. Whenever in the opinion of the President of the United States, a threatened or acutal strike or lock-out affecting an entire industry or a substantial part thereof engaged in trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States or with foreign nations, or engaged in the production of goods for commerce, if permitted to occur or to continue, will imperil the national health or safety, he shall issue a proclamation to that effect and urge the parties to the dispute to refrain from a stoppage of work, or if such stoppage has occurred, to resume work and operation in the public interest.

"SEC. 302. (a) After issuing such a proclamation, the President shall promptly appoint a board to be known as an 'emergency board.'

"(b) Any emergency board appointed under this section shall promptly investigate the dispute, shall seek to induce the parties to reach a settlement of the dispute, and in any event shall, within a period of time to be determined by the President, but not more than 30 days after the appointment of the board, make a report to the President, unless the time is extended by agreement of the parties, with the approval of the board. Such report shall include the findings and recommendations of the board and shall be transmitted to the parties and be made public. The Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service shall provide for the board such stenographic, clerical, and other assistance and such facilties and services as may be necessary for the discharge of its functions.

"(c) An emergency board shall be composed of a chairman and such other members as the President shall determine, and shall have power to sit and act in any place within the United States and to conduct

such hearings either in public or in private, as it may deem necessary or proper, to ascertain the facts with respect to the causes and circumstances of the dispute.

"(d) Members of an emergency board shall receive compensation at the rate of $75 for each day actually spent by them in the work of the board, together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses.

"(e) For the purpose of any hearing or inquiry conducted by any board appointed under this title, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (U. S. C. 19, title 15, secs. 49 and 50, as amended), are hereby made applicable to the powers and duties of such board.

"(f) Each emergency board shall continue in existence after making its report for such time as the national emergency continues for the purpose of mediating the dispute, should the parties request its services. When a board appointed under this section has been dissolved, its records shall be transferred to the director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

"(g) A separate emergency board shall be appointed for each dispute. No member of an emergency board shall be pecuniarily or otherwise interested in any organization of employees or in any employer involved in the dispute.

"PROCEDURE FOLLOWING PROCLAMATION

"SEC. 303. (a) At any time after issuing a proclamation pursuant to section 301 the President may submit to the Congress for consideration and appropriate action a full statement of the case together with such recommendations as he may see fit to make.

"(b) In any case in which a strike or lockout occurs or continues after the issuance of the proclamation pursuant to section 301 the President shall submit immediately to the Congress for consideration and appropriate action a full statement of the case, including the report of the emergency board if such report has been made, and such recommendations as he may see fit to make, including a recommendation that the United States take possession of and operate the business enterprise or enterprises involved in the dispute. If the President recommends that the United States shall take possession of and operate such enterprise or enterprises, the President shall have authority to take such action unless the Congress by concurrent resolution within 10 days after the submission of such recommendation to the Congress determines that such action should not be taken or enacts legislation designed to resolve the dispute and terminate the national emergency if Congress finds such emergency exists: *Provided*, That during the period in which the United States shall have taken possession, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service and the emergency board shall continue to encourage the settlement of the dispute by the parties concerned, and the agency or department of the United States designated to operate such enterprise or enterprises shall have no authority to enter into negotiations with the employer or with any labor organization for a collective-bargaining contract or to alter the wages, hours, or the conditions of employment existing in such industry prior to the dispute, except in conformity with the recommendations of the emergency board or a concurrent resolution of the Congress. If the Congress or either House thereof shall have adjourned sine die or for a period longer than 3 days, he shall convene the Congress, or such House for the purpose of consideration of and appropriate action pursuant to such statement and recommendations; Provided further, That the act entitled, "An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes" (Norris-LaGuardia Act), approved March 24, 1932 (U. S. C., title 29, secs. 101-115) shall be applicable to the United States acting under the provisions of this title unless Congress by concurrent resolution provides otherwise in the particular case.

"SEC. 304. (a) In the event that the Government shall take possession of and operate any business enterprise or enterprises involved in a given dispute, the President shall designate the agency or department of Government which shall take possession of any business enterprise or enterprises including the properties thereof involved in the dispute and all other assets of the enterprise or enterprises necessary to the continued normal operation thereof.

"(b) Any enterprise or properties of which possession has been taken under this title shall be returned to the owners thereof as soon as (1) such owners have reached an agreement with the representatives of the employees in such enterprise settling the issues in dispute between them, or (2) the President finds that the continued possession and operation of such enterprise by the United States is no longer necessary under the terms of the proclamation provided for in section 301: *Provided*, That possession by the United States shall be terminated not later than 60 days after the issuance of the report of the emergency board unless the period of possession is extended by concurrent resolution of the Congress.

"(c) During the period in which possession of any enterprise has been taken under this title, the United States shall hold all income received from the operation thereof in trust for the payment of general operating expenses, just compensation to the owners as hereinafter provided in this subsection, and reimbursement to the United States for expenses incurred by the United States in the operation of the enterprise. Any income remaining shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. In determining just compensation to the owners of the enterprise, due consideration shall be given to the fact that the United States took possession of such enterprise when its operation had been interrupted by a work stoppage or that a work stoppage was imminent; to the fact that the owners or the labor organization, as the case may be, have failed or refused to comply with the recommendations of the emergency board or the conditions determined by the Congress to constitute a just settlement of the dispute; to the fact that the United States would have returned such enterprise to its owners at any time when an agreement was reached settling the issues involved in such work stoppage; and to the value the use of such enterprise would have had to its owners in the light of the labor dispute prevailing, had they remained in possession during the period of Government operation.

"(d) Whenever any enterprise is in the possession of the United States under this section, it shall be the duty of any labor organization of which any employees who have been employed in the operation of such enterprise are members, and of the officers of such labor organization, to seek in good faith to induce such employees to refrain from a stoppage of work and not to engage in any strike, slow-down, or other concerted refusal to work, or stoppage of work, and if such stoppage of work has occurred, to seek in good faith to induce such employees to return to work and not to engage in any strike, slow-down, or other concerted refusal to work or stoppage of work while such enterprise is in the possession of the United States.

"(e) During the period in which possession of any enterprise has been taken by the United States under this section, the employer or employees or their duly designated representatives and the representatives of the employees in such enterprise shall be obligated to continue collective bargaining for the purpose of settling the issues in the dispute between them.

"(f) (1) The President may appoint a compensation board to determine the amount to be paid as just compensation under this section to the owner of any enterprise of which possession is taken. For the purpose of any hearing or inquiry conducted by any such board the provisions relating to the conduct of hearings or inquiries by emergency boards as provided in section 302 of this title are hereby made applicable to any such hearing or inquiry. The members of compensation boards shall be appointed and compensated in accordance with the provisions of section 302 of this title.

"(2) Upon appointing such compensation board the President shall make provision as may be necessary for stenographic, clerical, and other assistance and such facilities, services, and supplies as may be necessary to enable the compensation board to perform its functions.

"(3) The award of the compensation board shall be final and binding upon the parties, unless within 30 days after the issuance of said award, either party moves to have the said award set aside or modified in the United States Court of Claims in accordance with the rules of said court.

"SEC. 305. When a dispute arising under this title has been finally settled, the President shall submit to the Congress a full and comprehensive report of all the proceedings, together with such recommendations as he may see fit to make.

"SEC. 306. The provisions of this title shall not be applicable with respect to any matter which is subject to the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, as amended from time to time."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS], and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont for himself and other Senators will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 13, following line 5, in the Thomas substitute, it is proposed to insert a new subsection (d), to read as follows:

(d) The Board shall not base any finding of unfair labor practice under any provision of this act upon any statement of views or arguments, either written or oral, if such statement contains under all the circumstances no threat, express or implied, of reprisal or force, or offer, express or implied, of benefit.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, this is the so-called free-speech amendment. There is no reference made to free speech in the bill of the Senator from Utah. Under the Taft-Hartley Act it has been found that the free speech provision goes too far. The amendment which I have offered is an effort to correct the situation and provide in the law that both employers and unions shall have the right of free speech.

This amendment is almost like the one submitted by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], but differs in this respect: This amendment refers to unfair labor practices only, whereas the amendment of the

Senator from Ohio would extend the rule to elections as well. It seems to the sponsors of this amendment that the choosing of a bargaining agent is something over which the unions themselves should have full jurisdiction and that that is not the proper place to permit the employer to enter the picture and argue for or against any particular union or bargaining agent.

It is believed that this amendment would give the employer free speech in full degree so long as such speech does not contain any threats, implied threats, or promises or reward. With this amendment it would seem that both unions and employers would be on equal terms, and be treated fairly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I have no objection to the amendment. As the Senator from Vermont says, it is similar to the provision in our substitute bill. It involves a slight modification of the original terms of the Taft-Hartley law, which prohibited the use in evidence of statements by the employer. We feel, after a study of the cases, that it is proper to use them in evidence, so that, taken in connection with other evidence, they may throw some light upon the determination as to whether other acts are in fact unfair labor practices. However, we have felt that it differs from our amendment, in that we specifically apply the rule to election cases. When we drew the Taft-Hartley Act we intended to apply it to election cases, but since then the Board has held, in the General Shoe case, that it does not apply in election cases. So the amendment which we have submitted in our substitute would apply in election cases. Otherwise, our amendment is identical with that offered by the Senator from Vermont.

Back in 1939, when the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and I sat on the Labor Committee and heard the testimony of Mr. Madden, he stated that in his opinion it would be an unfair labor practice for an employer to tell his employees, in an election case, that the leaders of the union who were seeking their votes in that election were Communists, even though they were Communists. In his opinion it would still be an unfair labor practice on the part of employers. I think that ruling has been in effect reversed by the Supreme Court action on the subject.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the early ruling by Chairman Madden was later reversed by the Board? A short time after that the Board, by its own administrative ruling, adopted the provision which is contained in the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is correct. That ruling was upheld by the Supreme Court. However, the point I am making is that the question of free speech arose in election cases, and not only in unfair labor practice cases. If the employer is to have free speech, it seems to me that he should have the right to present to his employees reasons why they should not join a union or should not organize, or why one union is a better union than another. That is his right of free speech; and if it contains no threat of retribution I do not see why it should be used later in throwing out an election case. That is what happened in the General Shoe case.

So I have no objection to the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Vermont to the Thomas substitute. I do not desire to oppose it, and am quite willing to vote for it. I think it could go further, and I believe that the provision contained in our substitute amendments is a better amendment dealing with the subject of free speech.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I think I should say a word or two about this amendment.

I am very glad that the distinction has been made between the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont and the provision in the Taft-Hartley Act.

There is another thing that should be said. In the administration of the Board the position of the Board with respect to free speech has developed to the point where the Board has made proper rulings, and has a proper understanding. In the beginning the problem of the Board was quite different from what it is today. I do not criticize Chairman Madden for the stand which the Board took in regard to free speech at that time. The big question confronting the Board at that time was how to combat the company unions, and questions of that kind. The manner in which employers were using the right of free speech had circumvented and stopped the real process of bringing about collective bargaining in an honest way. Since the Board has ruled, and since the Supreme Court has ruled, and since the practice has come to be what it is, this amendment does not carry with it any offense. It does to a great extent contribute to what was said about the former amendment, that it recognizes the spirit of mutuality.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] for himself and other Senators, to the so-called Thomas substitute.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to call up the amendment with reference to financial statements, and I desire to make a statement in connection with the amendment to the Thomas substitute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator now offering the amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It has been offered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has not been offered. It was only ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I now offer the amendment, on behalf of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is that the amendment lettered "D"?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator wish to have the amendment read?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not believe it is necessary to have it read, unless it is the desire of the Senate to have it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD without reading.

The amendment offered by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. WITHERS, Mr. TOBEY, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. DOUGLAS) to the Thomas substitute is as follows:

On page 16, following line 2, insert three new subsections (f), (g), and (h), to read as follows:

"(f) The Board shall not issue notice of hearing, conduct an election, or certify any labor organization as bargaining representative under this section nor issue any complaint under section 10 of this act based upon a charge filed by a labor organization under subsection (b) of section 10 of this act unless such labor organization and any national or international labor organization of which such labor organization is an affiliate or constituent unit (A) shall have filed with the Secretary of Labor copies of its constitution and bylaws and a report, in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, showing—

"(1) the name of such labor organization and the address of its principal place of business;

"(2) the names, titles, and compensation and allowances of its three principal officers and of any of its other officers or agents whose aggregate compensation and allowances for the preceding year exceeded $5,000, and the amount of the compensation and allowances paid to each such officer or agent during such year;

"(3) the manner in which the officers and agents referred to in clause (2) were elected, appointed, or otherwise selected;

"(4) the initiation fee or fees which new members are required to pay in order to remain members in good standing of such labor organization;

"(5) the regular dues or fees which members are required to pay in order to remain members in good standing of such labor organization;

and (B) can show that it has—

"(1) filed with the Secretary of Labor, in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, a report showing all of (a) its receipts of any kind and the sources of such receipts, (b) its total assets and liabilities as of the end of its last fiscal year, (c) the disbursements made by it during such fiscal year, including the purposes for which made; and

"(2) furnished or made available to all of the members of such labor organization copies of the financial report required by paragraph (1) hereof to be filed with the Secretary of Labor.

"(g) It shall be the obligation of all labor organizations to file annually with the Secretary of Labor, in such form as the Secretary of Labor may prescribe, reports bringing up to date the information required to be supplied in the initial filing by subsection (f) (A) of this section, and to file with the Secretary of Labor and furnish or make available to its members annually within 120 days after the end of their respective fiscal years or such other reasonable period of time as

may be prescribed by the Secretary of Labor finanacial reports in the form and manner prescribed in subsection (f) (B). No labor organization shall be eligible for certification under this section as the representative of any employees, and no complaint shall issue under section 10 with respect to a charge filed by a labor organization unless it can show that it and any national or international labor organization of which it is an affiliate or constituent unit has complied with its obligation under this subsection.

"(h) The Board shall not issue notice of hearing or conduct an election on petition of an employer under this section or issue any complaint based upon a charge filed by an employer under subsection (b) of section 10 of this act unless such employer and any local, regional, or national employer association of which such employer is an affiliate or member shall have prior thereto filed with the Secretary of Labor information such as is required to be filed by labor organizations by the provisions of paragraph (A) (2), (A) (3), (B) (1), and, in case of employer associations, paragraph (B) (2) of subsection (f) of this section and by the provisions of paragraph (A) (4) and (5), where applicable, of subsection (f) of this section and shall have filed reports bringing up to date the information thus required to be filed in the manner provided in subsection (g) of this section."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement in connection with the amendment. I point out that this is an amendment to the so-called Thomas substitute. It is one of the amendments which we feel are within the spirit and general framework of the substitute offered by the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and concurred in by the majority of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The amendment is designed to require labor unions, employers, and employer associations who wish to invoke the processes of the National Labor Relations Board to file financial statements and publish those financial reports, making them available for use of their members.

In its basic requirements, this amendment is similar to the requirements under the existing Taft-Hartley law, with the very important added requirement, however, that the filing of such statements be mutually obligatory on employers, and also with the understanding that it corrects certain unreasonable procedural difficulties which now exist in the Taft-Hartley Act.

Most of the opposition to this provision in the Taft-Hartley Act until now has been that it imposes an obligation on one side of the bargaining table only, and not on the other. As such, it was unequal and unfair. Surely, if the duty to file and furnish financial information is laid upon labor organizations it ought similarly to apply to employers and to employer associations, whose membership choose to make effective use of National Labor Relations Board procedure. Under those conditions of mutuality, I know that much of the opposition to the requirement for filing financial statements would be gone. The majority of American labor unions now file, and have for many years filed, financial statements, fully accredited and audited, and have made such statements public, not only to their members, but to the citizenry as a whole. The majority of American labor unions have nothing to fear in bringing their statements to their members, and they have always done so. They do have something to fear, however, from making those financial statements public in view of the fact that many employers still do not recognize the principles of collective bargaining and might make use of the information as to the financial status of unions in a manner detrimental to the health and welfare of such unions. Nevertheless, Mr. President, I know that my amendment will receive the support and approval of the organized labor movement as well as the support and approval of the American people. Certainly employers who request that financial statements be filed by unions ought to have no objection to filing such financial statements themselves.

A number of procedural difficulties in the Taft-Hartley Act are corrected by this amendment. Let me briefly mention them:

At the present time, annual financial reports are required immediately at the end of the fiscal year. Under the amendment, provision is made that such statements may be filed within 120 days after the end of the fiscal year or within such other reasonable period as the Secretary of Labor may prescribe. This provision is essential because the requirements of the Taft-Hartley law is impossible to fulfill, except in the case of an extremely small enterprise. In other cases, no accountant or auditor can possibly prepare financial statements immediately upon the end of the fiscal year. Under the present requirement, an administrative practice has developed which permits 90 days of grace. The amendment we are offering merely meets the very obvious necessity of providing some kind of discretion.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not true that General Counsel Denham ruled that they did have 90-days grace under the Tart-Hartley law?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is true, and I mentioned that there had been an administrative ruling or practice which provided a 90-day period of grace, which was proven to be necessary. In the amendment, we extend that to a period of 120 days, as simply an optional or discretionary period.

Under the present bill, also, the National Labor Relations Board is prohibited, when faced with a representation proceeding or an unfair labor practice, from making any kind of an investigation or issuing any kind of a complaint until the financial filing requirements are met. This appears to be an unreasonable requirement, in view of the frequent immediacy for action in these cases, and also in view of the fact that experience has demonstrated occasional difficulty in fulfilling all the technical requirements for filing.

Our amendment suggests, therefore, that the Board be prohibited from actually issuing a notice of hearing or conducting an election of making a union certification of issuing a complaint until such time as the financial requirements are made, but it does not prevent the Board from making an investigation. Surely the Board ought to be free to investigate a charge or a petition until such time as the final, formal requirements are met.

In connection with this question, I wish to point out that the Taft-Donnell-Smith amendments also recognize that the Board ought to be free to entertain a petition, but they do not allow the Board to investigate a question raised by labor organizations until all filing requirements are met.

There is one other provision to which I wish to refer: Under by amendment, we propose that financial reports may be furnished to members of labor organizations, as is now required; but, in addition, we add that they may, in the alternative, be made available to them. This, of course, also applies to employer members and employer associations. Particularly as regards labor unions with hundreds of thousands of members, to furnish financial statements to each member is impossible, since to some extent membership is a continually changing process. Our amendment, therefore, in effect conforms to administration interpretation of the Taft-Hartley law, which the Secretary of Labor has given since 1947, by allowing financial statements to be made available to members.

Mr. President, I make note of the fact that there has been this administrative interpretation. We felt that it has been effective and in the amendment we are now making it a statutory provision.

One final word about the mutuality provision of this amendment and about our requirement that employers who file petitions or charges shall likewise file financial reports and the requirement that employer associations to which they belong shall file those reports before the Board may issue a notice of hearing, conduct an election, or issue a complaint. This provision places no greater responsibility on the employer or his association than the present law places on labor organizations. It simply requires the employer to file information just as the labor union does. It is true that the employer in some measure has an advantage over the union, in that when a large union provides financial reports to its thousands of members, the report becomes virtually public, and usually is quite available to the employer. On the other hand, financial reports which employer associations send to their members rarely, if ever, become available to unions.

Mr. President, we submit this amendment in the spirit of the Thomas bill. The amendment is designed to stimulate and encourage collective bargaining and to eliminate any punitive elements from the labor law of our land. By making these provisions mutual, the punitive element disappears. Therefore, I urge the adoption of this amendment, in the spirit of providing a constructive, workable framework of labor-management law for the good of the collective-bargaining process.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered D, of June 6, offered by the Sena-

tor from Minnesota on behalf of himself and other Senators.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I merely wish to point out, again, that this amendment provides for the adoption of a section of the Taft-Hartley law, with some procedural amendments, and with an additional provision requiring employers to file such reports, and if an employer files such a report, requiring any national employer association of which such employer is an affiliate or member to file a report. Of course, that provision goes further than the provisions regarding labor unions, because employer associations have not the same relationship to individual corporations that the A. F. of L. or CIO have to individual unions. Employer associations do not have with member employers the relationship which an international union has to a local union, for of course the international union can direct the local union as to what it shall do, or can approve or disapprove its contracts.

So in the case of the employer, this provision goes further, as it applies to employer associations, than the Taft-Hartley Act does in the case of unions, because the Taft-Hartley Act does not require the filing of affidavits with the Board by the CIO or the A. F. of L. So, Mr. President, if such a provision is to be made at all, I think a similar provision should be made as to both groups.

We omitted a requirement that the employers file, simply because there are so many laws which already require employers to file, that certainly no large corporation, no corporation listed on the stock exchange, no corporation which is subject to the SEC regulations, can escape the filing of reports, or does escape. Nearly all those reports are made public. There are, however, a few corporations that do not file reports.

Furthermore, our interest in the labor unions in connection with this matter was, rather, that every member of a union should have the right to see the reports, which are required to be filed with the Secretary of Labor, so that he may know that they are in proper form to give the information to the members of the union, whereas under existing law any stockholder of any corporation can obtain such information regarding the corporation by going into court, if necessary, although I do not know of any corporation that refuses such information to a stockholder. So there did not seem to be any need for such a provision in the case of corporations.

I have no particular objection to having such a provision made in the case of corporations, although as to them it would be a cumulative provision, and one which I think is unnecessary.

The fact has been that any member of a labor union who tried to obtain a financial report about his union was told where he could go; and if he did not choose to go there, he was very likely to lose his place in the union, if he made too much noise about the matter or if he went to court to try to get a statement of the dues which had been paid to the union by its members.

Many unions—particularly, I may say, I think, the more recent CIO unions—furnish a complete report. Many unions said they had no objection to such a requirement. On the other hand, a good many of the older unions furnished no such reports, and their financial expenditure statements were wholly unavailable to their members. That was the reason for the provision.

However, as to the other provisions of the amendment, many of them do not go to the heart of the matter; and certainly I have no objection to the addition of this part of the Taft-Hartley law to the Thomas bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to make an observation at this point, rather than have the RECORD contain an undisputed statement that this amendment would simply constitute an addition of a part of the Taft-Hartley law to the Thomas bill. The Senator from Ohio has well pointed out that this is a mutual proposition and that it bears upon the element of fairness, by applying the requirement to the parties on both sides of the bargaining table. This amendment provides a requirement, as has been made plain, that is protective to the union members and to the public and, if need be, to the stockholders and officers and trustees of a corporate enterprise which might be affiliated with a national organization.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am in accord with the amendment which is pending, and expect to vote for it, as well as for each of the four amendments which have been offered as the so-called compromise amendments, each of which comes out of the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. At this time, however, I wish to speak briefly on a proposed amendment which I shall offer, only for the purpose of having it printed and lie on the table, so that it may be taken up in proper time. My amendment proposes to include in the so-called Thomas bill now pending, S. 249, the provision which appeared in the Taft-Hartley Act, under which the enactments of the various States—17 in number—that is, either constitutional enactments, in some cases, or statutory enactments, in others—which in their purpose and effect banned in the several States the so-called closed shop—were recognized, validated, and affirmed in interstate commerce by the Taft-Hartley Act, and are so validated at this time under the provisions of that act.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Railway Labor Act, passed long before the Wagner Act, by its specific terms banned the closed shop, and has been recognized as a sound expression of both law and public policy in that particular field for a great many years, without causing any serious consequence of which I have ever heard. I further call attention to the fact that the Wagner Act when it was adopted, in 1934, was silent on this question, and at least made no move toward banning provisions of the several States within their own jurisdiction and affecting their own citizens, as to this particular subject matter.

I call further attention to the fact that following the enactment of the Wagner Act, 17 States, including Florida, acted to write into their State laws, either by the adoption of constitutional amendments or by the passage of statutes on the subject, the policy which is called anti-closed shop, which bans the requirement, as a condition for employment or continuation of employment, that an individual must belong to any labor organization, and bans the inclusion of such a provision in an agreement between industry and labor.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that since the enactment of those several State laws, whether by constitutional amendment or statute, the matter has gone to the highest court of the land, the United States Supreme Court, and has been passed upon in three cases, going up from the States of North Carolina, Nebraska, and Arizona. In two of those States there were constitutional provisions of the State constitutions on this subject. In one of those States, there was a State statute on the subject. In the three cases, decided only a few months ago by the United States Supreme Court, the Senate will recall that the court showed, for these days and times, remarkable unanimity, remarkable unity in its logic and decisions. As I recall the decisions, two of them were unanimous, by action of nine members of the Supreme Court, and the other one was by action of eight members of the Court; only one member, Mr. Justice Murphy, dissenting from the action of the other eight justices. As the result of those decisions the Court affirmatively found, as a matter of sound Federal law, that the States had a perfect right, whether by constitutional amendment or by statute, in the absence of a contrary Federal enactment on the subject, to write this particular requirement into their laws, and that such laws did have sound and salutary effect and were valid and binding, and of course they were upheld by those decisions of the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. President, I ask the Senators to note that in spite of the fact that the Thomas Act by some, though not by its sponsors here, is widely heralded as an effort to go back to the fundamental principles of the Wagner Act, that in this provision it is sought by the Thomas bill to go much further than was gone by the Wagner Act, by specifically banning the effect and force of State statutes or State constitutional amendments in this particular field, and the result of the adoption of the Thomas bill as drawn and presented here would be to undo what has been done by the 17 States in question, and what has now been upheld by decisions of the United States Supreme Court.

It is quite clear that it is sought by this bill either to ask 17 States to give up what they have done, or to coerce 17 States into giving up what they have done, by Federal action which will, if it is enacted here, override and destroy the rightful acts of those States executed in a valid State field, which has been upheld as such since that time by the Supreme Court of the United States.

I remind every Senator that it is sought by the pending act to undo three important things which have been done heretofore to confirm and uphold these provisions of the State laws, which I shall

mention. First, the 17 States, exercising their own State rights, have found this to be a field in which they felt there should be a State law, and whether by constitution or by statute, have specifically enacted, and in the case of the State constitutions, the people of those States have actually voted, that here is sound public policy which they regard as such and which they wish to make, and have made, a part of their fundamental State law. It is sought by the provisions of the Thomas bill to undo those dignified, solemn, and honorable decisions made by the people of 17 sovereign States. Secondly, it is further sought to undo the additional step affirming, and confirming the action taken by the 17 States, when the United States Supreme Court held, with unusual unanimity, that the States were within their rights in so acting, and the arguments in those decisions show that the distinguished members of the Court thought there were excellent reasons for upholding the soundness as well as the legality of those particular enactments.

In the third place, it is sought to undo what was done here when the Taft-Hartley law was passed in 1947, by which the Federal Congress followed, to a degree, what had been sound Federal policy in the field of railway labor relations for many years, in that the Taft-Hartley Act included a provision which respected and confirmed, and to that extent made it a matter of Federal law, that the action taken by these several States should be validated and should not be overturned by the Federal law which was then enacted. And so it is proposed by this one act not to go back to the Wagner Act, but to take action which far transcends the field of the Wagner Act, and to undo these three things which have been done or accomplished for the benefit of the sovereign States which I have just mentioned.

I am therefore, Mr. President, without arguing the matter at greater length, sending forward at this time an amendment which, if it is adopted, will engraft upon the provisions of the so-called Thomas bill, S. 249, the identical provisions now contained in the Taft-Hartley Act, and will strike other words which were placed in the Thomas bill and which must be stricken in order to give validity and effect to that identical provision of the Taft-Hartley Act which is proposed in the amendment. I ask that the amendment be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Florida will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, just a word before the vote is taken. Perhaps we all know about the provision in the Taft-Hartley law requiring labor unions to file reports. We have learned that it has not been burdensome, and of course we did not find labor unions were holding back or hiding anything. Therefore, the continuation of the practice will not in any way harm labor unions. The amendment suggests that it be made mutual, that both sides must file reports. Since the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has more or less accepted the spirit of that mutuality, I feel that I should not oppose it.

I must say that the Thomas bill, as it has been called, contains no provision like this one, so that the amendment is an amendment not only to the Taft-Hartley Act, but to the Thomas bill, and, furthermore, it is an amendment to an amendment which would have been suggested by the Senator from Ohio; if this amendment were not adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to the so-called Thomas substitute.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which has been printed and is sponsored, in addition to myself, by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS].

The VICE PRESIDENT. In order that it may be identified, is it the amendment of the Senator which is marked "B"?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 16, following line 2, it is proposed to insert a new subsection (i) to read as follows:

(i) (A) No investigation shall be made by the Board of any question affecting commerce concerning the representation of employees, whether raised by a labor organization or employer, and no complaint shall be issued pursuant to a charge made by a labor organization or employer under section 10 unless there is on file with the Board the affidavits required in paragraph (B) hereof, executed contemporaneously with the filing of any petition or charge, or within the preceding 12-month period, by the persons required to file such affidavits, as set forth in paragraph (B) hereof: *Provided*, That no such affidavit shall be required of any lobar organization or employer or employer association whose constitution or governing laws have the effect of prohibiting any officer or officers thereof from being a member of, or affiliated with, any organization specified in paragraph (B) if upon request of the labor organization, employer, or employer association for the waiver of such affidavits, the Board determines that such prohibition is being enforced in good faith.

(B) The affidavits required in connection with paragraph (A) hereof shall, in the case of a petition or charge by an employer, be executed and filed by the employer and each officer thereof (including each owner, partner, receiver, or trustee, or, if a corporation, each officer thereof), and the officers of any local, regional, or national employer association of which the employer is an affiliate or member; and, in the case of a petition or charge by a labor organization, by its officers, and by the officers of any national or international labor organization of which it is an affiliate or constituent unit. For the purposes of this subsection, "officer" means those persons designated as officers by the constitution and bylaws, and members of all executive policy-forming and governing bodies of an employer and any local, regional, or national employer association of which the employer is an affiliate or member, or of a labor organization and any national or international labor organization of which it is an affiliate or constituent unit.

Such affidavits shall state that the person making such affidavit is not a member of the Communist Party or affiliated with such party, or a member of or affiliated with any fascist or totalitarian organization, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods. The provisions of section 35A of the Criminal Code shall be applicable to such affidavits.

EXPANSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF RURAL TELEPHONE SERVICE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on last Saturday morning the Hon. Claude R. Wickard, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, appeared before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and made an excellent statement in behalf of Senate bill 1254, known as the Rural Telephone bill. The bill was introduced in the Senate by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senators from North Dakota, and myself.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement of Administrator Wickard be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am thankful for your invitation to present my views on Senate bill 1254 which would enable local, private telephone enterprises with the aid of a self-liquidating Federal loan program to meet a most urgent need for the expansion and improvement of rural telephone service. Through experience gained from having spent most of my life on the farm and a lifetime association with farm people, I know how essential reliable telephone service is to rural people. It is far more than a convenience; it is an absolute necessity. With the possible exception of electric power it is hard to conceive of anything that means more to the health, happiness and economic well-being of farm people than good telephone service. In time of sickness, fire or other emergencies a farmer without a telephone is practically helpless, isolated by miles from a doctor or other assistance in his hour of need.

The farm is a place of business as well as a place of residence and the farmer must have fast, dependable communication service if he is to be able to produce efficiently and economically the food and fiber upon which this Nation depends for its existence. For example, during the harvest season a quick call into several towns in the area may be the only means of locating an essential repair part for a piece of machinery and of saving a crop, the product of a year's labor.

Prompt veterinarian service and adequate and detailed local market information can be

quickly and effectively made available only through a reliable telephone.

From a social standpoint the farmer's wife and family, because of their isolation, have much more need of telephone service than any other group of citizens.

Looking at it from every angle, no group of people needs telephone service as much as farmers. Despite this obvious and urgent need for good telephone service the rural telephone situation in this country is deplorable. Much less than half of our farmers, perhaps somewhere between 37 and 42 percent, have any kind of a telephone at all. Many of those who do have telephones are forced to put up with inadequate, unreliable, obsolete equipment and service.

Some of us had been hopeful that with the end of wartime shortages some improvement would take place. As a matter of fact, the performance has been very disappointing and, under present conditions, there seems to be little hope for further improvement so far as typical farm areas are concerned. Today the number of farms having telephones is actually smaller than it was 30 years ago. The 1920 census showed 2,498,000 farms with telephones. In 1945 the number had decreased to 1,866,000. Today, by liberal estimates, the total is 2,473,000, or about 25,000 fewer than in 1920.

This leaves 3,380,000 farms in this country without any telephone service at all. The quality of service on most of the systems in the typical farm areas continues to deteriorate.

May I draw upon a recent personal experience which is not an unusual one for farm people. I have on the walls of my Indiana farm home the same telephone-instrument that was installed there when I was a small boy, almost a half century ago. This service, to be as charitable as possible, is uncertain. On the morning of May 17 of this year my small granddaughter was badly scalded in this farm home. At best, doctors are hard to find in a typical farm area. The telephone had been practically useless for several days. However, by heroic effort and urgent pleading my daughter was able to enlist the aid of the operator who relayed her request for help. Only through this extraordinary effort was a doctor obtained and first-aid administered. When I arrived a few hours later I was not able to get any use out of the telephone at all. A man who repairs the line on a part-time basis told me that it would be a day or two before he could get it back into commission. He told me that the line was in such condition that it was getting very difficult to repair, and referred to the fact that the old wire had become so hard and brittle through age that it was very difficult to splice. I told him that after the experience of that day I was hopeful that the service could be improved quickly as I had visions of other emergencies which might arise. He volunteered the information that at least $10,000 was needed on this small mutual system to put it in usable order. He did not venture an estimate as to how much more would be required to really modernize the system.

We are getting letters from all over the Nation describing situations similar to the one which I have just told about. A great number of these letters tell how people have sought telephone service in vain. Some of them relate how the telephone systems that were in the neighborhood have gone completely out of commission. Their letters bear out the fact that little is being done today to improve farm telephone service and that the prospects for the future are dark.

Ever since the first telephone legislation was introduced in 1944 we have been hearing a lot about the plans that the large companies had for expanding their farm service. We had hoped that the announcement of these plans was not merely a gesture in response to the legislation which had been introduced.

We, in REA, worked out a model agreement for joint-use of telephone and power facilities with the Bell Telephone officials. We hoped that this would be a means of cutting costs and expediting rural telephone service. Two hundred and six REA cooperatives have entered in these agreements. Yet, the 146 cooperatives which have reported the results, indicate that a total of less than 12,000 telephones have been installed through the use of their facilities.

We were hopeful that the telephone companies would take advantage of the increased supplies of materials and labor to bring about an improvement in rural telephone service as has been done in the field of rural electrification. When the war was over, 45.7 percent of farmers had electric service. Today over 73 percent have electric service.

On the other hand, a survey by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture, which was released on May 4 of this year, indicates no significant change between July 1, 1947, and July 1, 1948, in the total proportion of farms having telephones. I am filing a copy of this survey for the record. The survey points out that during the 3-year period 1945 to 1948 the increase in the proportion of farms with electricity was four times the increase in the farms with telephones. The survey also indicates that the percentage of our farms having telephones today is about 2 percent less than it was in 1920. These are the reasons that farm people are appealing for a program to do the job in the rural telephone field that has been so successfully done in the rural electrification field.

The Farm Bureau, Grange, Farmers Union, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, Missouri Farmers Association, and other farm organizations have all called attention to the seriousness of the telephone problem and have urged that national legislation be enacted to solve it.

There is unmistakable evidence that the A. T. & T. and the large independents are not going out into typical farm territories where a high financial return is not in prospect. On the other hand, the small independents and mutual companies simply cannot get adequate financing today to enable them to take care of these territories.

If it had not been for these small companies, both independent and mutual, most of the farmers who today have telephone service never would have had it, and I would like to pay a word of tribute to them. These small companies have struggled against great odds over the past half century to bring an essential service to farm people. They were undercapitalized to begin with and they did not have the opportunity to set up adequate reserves such as has been done in the REA program. Today a great number of these small companies are in desperate financial circumstances; they need help and whether they get it or not depends upon enactment of this legislation.

To put it another way, whether farmers get adequate telephone service depends in a great majority of the cases upon this legislation. I know that a number of these small independent companies and mutuals have been told that enactment of this legislation would socialize the industry, that their lines would be duplicated and they would be put out of business. This is a complete distortion of the provisions and purposes of the bill. In the first place, lending Federal money to local independent and mutual companies is not socialism by any definition of the term. I might point out that the cry of socialism is not raised when thousands of banks, the railroad companies, and large commercial and industrial enterprises borrow money from the RFC.

This is a program for getting telephone service to farmers. It will be accomplished by lending Government funds to the privately owned, locally managed enterprises which will do the job. It will be done on a self-liquidating basis. This is specifically required by the bill.

As to duplication, the bill provides for all the safeguards that can be written into legislation. In addition, there are some very practical reasons why the alarm over duplication is unwarranted. To be self-liquidating loans must be economically feasible. I don't see how I can possibly certify as to the economic feasibility of loans for facilities to serve people who are already receiving adequate and reliable service. I don't expect to receive applications for such loans. But even if I do, the provisions of the bill which require recognition of State regulatory laws will take care of such applications. Let me point out that this provision is precisely that recommended by the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners.

I personally want to state that if I were in charge of a program to make loans for rural telephone service, I would think it wise to give preference to those people who are already in the business and who are willing to do everything practicable to furnish satisfactory telephone service. And I can assure everyone that there is no intention on my part to make loans to rural electric co-ops which would put existing telephone companies out of business. As a matter of fact few if any electric co-ops have a desire, or are in a position to enter the telephone field at all. Furthermore, it should be remembered that any administrative action that is unwise, unfair, or not in the public interest can always be halted by the Congress through its continuous control over appropriations.

I am submitting for your consideration a résumé of the farm telephone situation. This résumé bears out in detail the statements that I have made that farm people are not getting adequate telephone service and are not likely to get adequate telephone service under existing conditions.

To sum up, there is a most urgent need for improvement and expansion of telephone service for farmers. This improvement is not taking place and, in my estimation, it will not take place unless there is enactment of legislation such as proposed in S. 1254.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is now 5:55 o'clock, and I am about to move that the Senate take a recess, if there be no further business to be transacted at this time.

I now move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, June 16, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 15 (legislative day of June 2), 1949:

HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Oscar Kent La Roque, of North Carolina, to be a member of the Home Loan Bank Board for a term of 4 years expiring June 30, 1953. (Reappointment.)

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of

lieutenant subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment in the line of the Navy:

Donald L. Abbott
Stanley F. Abele
William F. Abernathy
William H. Abney
James D. Ackerman
Gladys J. Adams
Joseph E. Adams, Jr.
James H. Agles
John D. Alden
Alfred C. Alder
Ralph Alford
Ralph M. Alford
Walter W. Alldredge, Jr.
Milton O. Allen
Albert A. Anderson
Wallace I. Anderson
Bernard A. Andrade
Leo V. Andrecht
George G. Andrews
Mary M. Angas
Frank D. Armstrong, Jr.
Joseph F. Arrigoni
Robert E. Arthur
James K. Athow
Randal N. Atkinson
Helen Augustiny
Lee A. Bagby
James R. Bagshaw 3d
Carl W. Baker
Lawrence H. Baker, Jr.
Morton S. Baker
George O. Baldock
James L. Ball
Edward P. Barkley
Floyd M. Barkley
Paul H. Barkley
Frank D. Barlow
James B. Barnette
Leon V. Barr
Bruce C. Barry
Edwin J. Bates
Lawrence F. Baumgaertel
Jerome W. Beaudoin
Maurice E. Beaulieu
Troy C. Beavers
George M. Bell
Darrell C. Bennett
Thorval L. Berg, Jr.
Franklin S. Bergen
Irma E. Bibens
Gladys Bickmore
John R. Bicknell
Jene M. Bixler
Sherman C. Black
Ralph E. Blad
Frank W. Blake, Jr.
William F. Bland
William F. Bley
Stanley H. Blumenthal
Clarence A. Borley
Woodrow J. Borne
Edgar J. Boudinot, Jr.
Vivienne F. Boudreau
Charles H. Bowen, Jr.
James E. Boyle
Charles R. Bradford
Rosa A. Brannon
Trond G. Brekke
William F. Brennan
John W. Brex
Benjamin F. Briant
Richard W. Briggs
William I. Bristol
Samuel J. Brocato
Charles L. Brooks
Frances L. Broughton
Guy C. Brown
Melvy M. Brown
Robert N. Brown
Russell E. Brown
Orville S. Brownlee
George E. Buker
Jack H. Burch
Calvin Burkhart
John Burkholder
Robert M. Burnell
Russell O. Burnham
Robert J. Burns
Willard L. Bushy
George K. Bywater
Sherman C. Cagle, Jr.
Charles W. Callahan
John C. Callahan
Robert J. Callahan
Robert E. Carl
Robert D. Carleton
Billie Carroll
Eleanor M. Casey
James C. Caskey
Lucian M. Cayce
William B. Chamberlin
Terry M. Chambers
Murray L. C. Chandler
Harlan R. Cheuvront
Robert D. Chilton
Louis D. Chirillo
Bryce L. Clack
Walter C. Clapp
Constance E. Clark
Leslie A. Clark
Richard M. Clark
Marvin L. Claude
Henry G. Cleland, Jr.
Jesse S. Cleveland
George M. Clingan
Paul W. Cobb
Fred T. Cockrell
June M. Cogswell
George Cole
R. K. Stewart Cole
Raymond E. Coleman
Robert G. Coleman, Jr.
Francis L. Collins, Jr.
Ralph W. Collins
Walter V. Collins
Luke O. Conerly, Jr.
Parker C. Cooper
Catherine V Cronin
Gerald P. Corrigan
Kenneth J. Cory
Marion L. Courtney
John E. Cousins
Louis L. Cowsert
Maley O. Cramer, Jr.
Merdin C. Criddle
Jack O. Crites
Catherine V. Cronin
Francis Cronin
Robert H. Curtin
Jess L. Curtright
Hector C. Cyr
Beatrice E. Dalier
Frank C. Daniel
Charles E. Davis
John W. Davis
Richard L. Davis
Tharrell W. Davis
Clifford Deets
Doris A. Defenderfer
Richard D. Delauer
Vernon J. Deroco
Robert F. P. Desel
Morris M. Devlin
Lawrence A. Dewing
Raymond H. Dick
Richard G. Dickerson
Charles B. Dickson
Thornwell M. Dillard
Donna S. Doe
Raymond J. Dooley
Richard H. Doolittle
Robert L. Dormer
John F. Dow
Wayne L. Dowlen
Richard S. Downey
Murray E. Draper
Brand W. Drew
Thomas H. Drinkwater
Robert E. DuBois
Allen W. Duck, Jr.
Willis P. Duhon
Olive I. H. Dunham
Charles A. Dunn, Jr.
Richard J. Dunn
Harvey K. Dunning
Jesse C. Durham
David M. Durkee
Edward M. Eakin
Billy O. Earl
Frances E. Earle
William R. Eason
Kenneth H. Eaton
Louise L. Edelmann
Wesley N. Edmunds
William E. Edwards
Milton L. Elchinger
Laurence M. Ellefson
Homer S. Elliott
Carl E. Ellis
Clayton M. Emery
John H. Epps
Florence L. Erickson
William H. Etter
Patricia C. Evans
Simpson Evans, Jr.
Donald D. Everman
John K. Everson
James W. Ewing
John A. Fahey
George W. Fairbanks
Betty M. Fannan
Langdon S. Farrand
Ferris L. Farrell
Joseph R. Faulk
Joseph E. Feaster
Robert E. Felten
Vernon R. Fierce, Jr.
Harry W. Files, Jr.
Dale W. Fisher
Harry E. Fitzwater, Jr.
Donald W. Fledderjohn
Walter A. Foley
Oscar Folsom, Jr.
Edward J. Foote
Forrest B. Forbes
David "L" Forrester, Jr.
Ellis M. Foster
Vera V. Foster
William I. Foster, Jr.
Ira A. Francis
Dean M. French
Paul V. French
Louis J. Frketic
Joseph M. Frosio, Jr.
Gurney E. Frye
Robert D. Fulton
Francis E. Gahagen
Marion R. Gallagher
Ralph W. Gant
James E. Garlitz
Roland M. Garner
Robert R. Garrett, Jr.
William A. Gatlin
George M. Gauen
Robert E. Gayle, Jr.
Harold R. Gentry
Edgar L. George
Clifford L. Giebler, Jr.
Glen W. Gilbert
Olen G. Giles
Donald R. Gillespie
Clyde Gilmore
Joseph T. Glab
Wesley A. Gleason
Edmund Glennon
Hollis Goddard
Arthur R. Goodall
Harold J. Goodnow
Joseph H. Goodpasture
Harold R. Gordinier
Raymond Gorman
Gordon F. Gossman
Ranald F. Graham
Arnold M. Granat
Samuel W. Green
Marvin W. Greenstein
Barbara L. Greenwood
Juel Griffin, Jr.
Ralph I. Grigsby
George V. Gross
Albert R. Groves
Peter T. Gurtler
Harris E. Gustafson
Charles E. Guthrie
George F. Guyer
Robert B. Hager
Edmund C. Haley II
Alfred J. Hall, Jr.
Lloyd A. Hammer, Jr.
Mary E. Hannan
John G. Hansen
Donald M. Hanson
Harold G. Hanson
Louis I. Hardman
George B. Hargan, Jr.
William C. Hartung
Donald C. Harvey
Derald E. Haugh
John F. Hawkins
Rex E. Hawkins
George M. Hayes
Robert G. Hazlewood
George A. Hecker
Robert S. Heid
Charles W. Henderson
James C. Henderson
Robert R. Henry
William D. Henry
Alton R. Henson
John S. Herman
Saul W. Herman
Ralph R. Herms
Franklin I. Heule
Charles E. Hilgel
Robert D. Hilbish
Hubert J. Hillesheim
Herbert J. A. Hillson
Charles M. Hoblitzell
John W. Holcomb
Raymond E. Hollomon
Evald Holmgaard
Eleanor R. Homan
James A. Homyak
Louie B. Hoop, Jr.
Samuel Hopkins, Jr.
Benjamin C. Horton
Edward H. Howard
Macauley Howard
Arthur W. Howe III
Lee V. Howe
Billie Hubard
James L. Hughes, Jr.
Clyde G. Hunt
George A. Hutchinson, Jr.
James D. Ingram
Bryce D. Inman
William F. H. Irwin
Mercer L. Jackson, Jr.
Robert C. Jackson
William H. Jakes
John Jan
Darrel H. Jay
Sutton L. Jaynes
Henry C. Jenkins
James D. Jenkins
John W. Jenkins
Lewis L. Jennison
Franklin D. Johnson
William S. Johnston
Raymond F. Jones
LeRoy K. Jordan
Robert Juarez
Floyd Juillard
Frank E. Kadel
Gordon L. Kallenberg
Myron R. Kalnitzky
Peter Karonis
Gordon L. Kearsey
Wally K. Keller
Arthur R. Kelley
Lawrence W. Kelley
John L. Kellogg
Joseph F. Kelly, Jr.
Edmond D. Kemp
Robert R. Kidwell, Jr.
Jasper C. Kilgore
Joseph L. King
Frank G. Kingston
Orson A. Kinney, Jr.
Richard E. Kipe
Betty J. Knighton
Richard C. Knoeckel, Jr.
George Koen
Jackson L. Koon
Herman W. Kreis
Duane M. Krueger
Ira K. Kruger
Lloyd A. Kurz
William B. Kyle
John LaCava, Jr.
Kenneth B. Lake
Kenneth E. Lampkin
Lester B. Lampman
Frederick E. Lane
Virgil V. Lane
Gerald J. Langevin
Jack A. Larsen
Herbert Latch
Eston D. Lawrence
Merrel Lemons
Walter F. Lilly
William Lindsay
Edgar L. Lindsey, Jr.
Charles E. Little
Wesley E. Lizotte
John G. Long
Vincenzo Lopresti
Warren H. Love
James H. Lotzgesell, Jr.
David W. Ludwig
Mary J. Lynch
Clarence D. Lynn
Robert F. Lyons
Lewin A. Maberry
Gordon C. MacKenzie
Edmund J. Maddock
Robert J. Maghan
Dorothy L. Maraspin
Jerrold P. Marsh
Byron S. Marshall
Walter Marusa
Herbert S. Matthews, Jr.
Ralph J. Mattus
Herbert A. May
William C. May
Herman Mayencourt
Anthony J. Mazur
Paul H. McAfee, Jr.
Thomas D. McBride
Howard G. McCain
Kendall C. McCallum
Arthur J. F. McCarthy
William H. McCarty
Nolan H. McDade
Edwin A. McDonald
William E. McDonald
Richard C. McEwen
Joe M. McFadden
John F. McGinnis
Charles V. McGlothing
Virginia K. McKinley
Harding C. MacKnight
Thomas R. McLenaghan
Robert J. McMahon
Alfred N. McMillian
Gerald McMorrow
Birton E. McMullen
Emmett T. McNair
Robert W. Mead
James T. Meadows, Jr.
Warren T. Meadows
Allen C. H. Merz
Eldon L. Michel
Glen G. Miller
Harry R. Miller
Ned Miller
Robert W. Miller
Allen W. Mills
Howard R. Mitchell
Leroy R. Mix
Alfred E. Monahan
Edwin C. Moore
Robert H. Morris
Marvin A. Mosely
Milo W. Mosser, Jr.
Hampton E. Mulligan
Arthur H. Munson
Thomas J. Murnighan, Jr.
John T. Murray
Robert E. Murray
Laverne F. Nabours
Harold Nagel
Alfred E. Nauman, Jr.
Robert S. Neasham
Lewis H. Neeb
Victor J. Neil
James A. Nelson
Roger D. Nelson
Roy E. Neufeldt
Charlotte P. Nevers
Muriel E. Neville
Floyd A. Newell
Reed H. Nielson
Robert A. Niles
Robert J. Norman
Franklin C. Northrup
Clifford J. Oas
John D. Oliver
Paul O'Mara, Jr.
John W. O'Neill
Robert E. Orcutt
Vincent P. O'Rourke
John K. Ostermiller
Charles L. Otti
Clarence E. Otto
Sidney R. Overall
John D. B. Pamp
Robert C. Parker
Elbert W. Parrish
Clarence L. Parsley
William H. Pattillo
James A. Payne
Clayton A. Paulding
Joseph V. Pavela
Alvin E. Pawelczyk
Joe Pedigo, Jr.
Albert J. Pelletier, Jr.
Eugene R. Perry
Grace S. Person
Chester L. Petersen
Frank P. Petrik
Charles W. Pfiester
James E. Phalan
Bryce W. Phillips
Donald M. Phillips
Harley J. Pierce
Raymond G. Pierre
Gloria R. Pignatelli
Jeanne E. Piper
Richard J. Plante
James W. Porter, Jr.
Loran R. Porter
Jerry K. Pounders
Mary M. Pritchard
Russell K. Prout
James P. Pruitt
Thomas J. Quick
Thomas D. Quinn
Robert W. Ramey
Bruce C. Rasche
John E. Raymond
Robert G. Read
William L. Reardon, Jr.
Charles J. Reidl
Ronald R. Reiland
Adrian B. Rhodes, Jr.
James L. Rice, Jr.
Robert L. Rice
Robert C. Rich
Floyd D. Richards
Robert L. Richardson
Thomas H. Riggan
Dorothy Riggle
Alden S. Riker
Horace Riley, Jr.
Robert D. Rinesmith
Gilbert A. Riodan
Peter Rippa
Jack H. Robcke
Kester M. Roberts
Marlin D. Roberts
Thomas L. Roberts

Charles D. Robinson
Joseph H. Roche
William E. J. Rohde
Joseph Rolleri
Robert D. Romer
Harry E. Rorman
Edwin R. Ross
James L. Rothermel
Ernest J. Rowett
Ernest Roycraft
Fred C. Rucci
Stephen L. Rusk
George R. Rymal
Nelson W. Sanders
Viola B. Sanders
Veriel E. Sanderson
Stanley D. Saska
Joe M. Sassman
Theodore Sawick
Joseph M. Scarborough
Albert Schellenberg
Robert L. Schexnayder
Max A. Schlecht
Lavon C. Schmidt
Stanley C. Schold
Mathew J. Schwartz
Vernon R. Shaw, Jr.
Richard M. Shay
John E. Schlembach
Ray E. Scholl
Walter E. Scholz
Bob Scott, Jr.
Lucile A. Seielstad
Robert L. Severns
Milner N. Shannon
Mary Sharples
William H. Shaw
Frank S. Siddall
James B. Sinquefield
Vernon J. Sistrunk
Thelma W. Sites
Thomas G. Slattery
Bruce B. Smith
Carl E. Smith
Delbert M. Smith
John J. Smith
Thurman E. Smithey
Robert P. Smyth
George W. Snediker
Harold F. Snowden
Charles A. Soderlund, Jr.
Arthur L. Soholt
Sybil M. Space
Samuel A. Sparks
Frank O. Spencer
Norman W. Spurgeon
William E. Stanton
Francis A. Stark
Mary M. Stark
Frederick A. Staub
Edward J. Steffen
Joseph E. Stenstrom
James E. Stevenson
Harold E. Stewart
Marlar E. Stewart
James F. Stone
Ruth M. Streeter
Eugene R. Stroup
Patrick L. Sullivan
Robert C. Sullivan
Harry J. Sundberg
Donald A. Swanson
Harry W. Swinburne, Jr.
George Swint III
Harold R. Tall
Carl B. Tanner, Jr.
George L. Tarleton
Claude D. Tate
Hugh J. Tate
Neal M. Tate, Jr.
Edward A. Taylor
James E. Taylor
Charles L. Teevan
Betty R. Tennant
Gene C. Tenold
William P. Terrill
Ted R. Tharp
John B. Thomas, Jr.
Boyd Thomson
Robert M. Thomson
Christopher S. Thompson
Eleanor A. Thompson
Harold V. Tibbitts
John F. Tierney, Jr.
Albert R. Tiffany
Lewis A. Tomkins
Orville L. Tomlinson
Eugene J. Tougas
Margaret E. Tracy
Vern W. Tracy
Harold D. Trettin
Ross R. Truesdale
Beatrice M. Truitt
Frank H. Tucker
Thomas Turnbull
Earl J. Turner
Frederick C. Turner
Jack A. Turner
James F. Tuttle
Robert F. Vales
Benjamin J. Van Blake
Wallace V. Van Pelt
Charles M. Vehorn
Albert W. Vittek
Robert W. Vollenweider
Harold K. Von Egger
Margretta vonSothen
William J. Wacker
Elizabeth D. Waddington
George C. Wadleigh
Elinor J. Wagner
John R. Wagner, Jr.
William H. Wagner, Jr.
Edwin J. Walasek
Harvey M. Waldron, Jr.
Earl P. Walker
George T. Walker, Jr.
Helen H. Walker
Jack A. Walker
John S. Walker
Ralph L. Walker
Thadeus F. Ward
Richard L. Warren
Orval J. Washburn
Robert C. Wattenburger
Daniel C. Wells
Saxton A. Weir, Jr.
Carl Weisse
John D. Welsh
William J. Westmoreland
Robert E. White
Stephen J. Whitemen
Duane L. Whitlock
Richard W. Widdicombe
Dicky Wieland
Charles E. Wilcox
Howard F. Wiley
Charles R. Wilhide
William L. Wilkinson
Malcolm W. Williams
Reginald M. Williams, Jr.
Harold A. Willyard
John C. Wilschke
Ernest E. Wilson
Jerome L. Wolf, Jr.
James Wood
Edward C. Woodward
Lamar L. Woodward
Jackson E. Woolley
Robert C. Woolverton
Ellen Word
John D. Working
John C. Wouters
Albert G. Wright
Clyde A. Wright
William W. Writt
James R. Zeitvogel
Ernest L. Zimmerman

The following-named officers for permanent appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

William M. Adamson
John E. Aicken
Mary J. Aplin
Frank E. Baldwin
Margaret E. Barton
Donald F. Baumgartner
Philip Beilock
Robert L. Bisset
Bascom B. Boaz
James D. Bordwell
Edwin E. Bramhall
Roland W. Breault
Betty J. Brown
Roger W. Brown
Rita P. Brychel
Joseph E. Bulfer
Lewis C. Chamberlin
John J. Connor, Jr.
William H. Conry
Robert W. Cooil
George A. Cookinham
John J. Danko
Richard M. Davis
Warren R. DeYoung
Edwin L. Duke
Virginia G. Finney
Rupert E. Graham
Herbert J. Hackmeyer
Wayne S. Henderson
Vincent H. Higgins
Warren G. Hopkins
Ross P. Hubert
Charles W. Ireland
Frank L. Jenne
William A. Johannesen
Herbert L. Johnson
William B. Kerfoot
Richard R. Koontz
George J. Kost
Rosemary Lafferty
William S. Langley
Jay E. Larson
John C. Leach
Leslie E. Lobaugh
John J. Long
Robert H. Madden
Charles A. Matthews, Jr.
Frank O. Maugans
Merlin L. McCulloh
Thomas J. McDermott
Howard C. Milliren
Jean I. Moon
Eugene I. Murray
Donald A. Needham
Browder G. Nelson
John G. Ooyman 3d
Walter Parry
Robert H. Pilkinton
Raymond E. Purviance, Jr.
John H. Robison
Dealton Russell
Albert V. Scaturro
Frederick D. Schaer
"T" Lane Skelton
Jay A. Slover
Harry O. Smith, Jr.
Wainard H. Sparks
Lyle A. Stearns
Roy P. Strange, Jr.
John P. Szyperski
James O. Tillman
Donald G. VanRiper
John A. Whitver
Robert W. Wilson

The following-named officers for permanent appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

William C. Anderson, Jr.
Vern E. Atwater
John F. Clarke
Henry S. Grauten
Roland D. Hill
Richard O. Jones
William R. Reese, Jr.
William E. Sinclair

The following-named officer for permanent appointment in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Ira Goldstein

The following-named officers for permanent appointment in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Maria E. Aquino
Harold G. Donovan
Elizabeth Reeves
Lester K. Thompson

The following-named officers for permanent appointment in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Jennie E. M. Brusick
Corinne J. Buckley
Myrtle F. Butt
Catherine I. Cameron
Helen N. Chandler
Lummie G. Coker
Mary C. Coody
Myrtle V. Cricher
Desiderata Disante
Delima M. M. Dumas
Elva R. Faucher
Katherine M. Fleck
Martha E. Hallman
Jane Higginson
Olive C. Hurlock
Eileen Hux
Dortha M. Johnson
Mildred J. Kahl
Annis J. Kaylor
Isabelle C. Kiehl
Elizabeth E. Kinzer
Rutl. M. Lawler
Edith F. MacMillan
Margaret McCall
Evelyn M. McDermott
Ann E. McPhillips
Evelyn Moore
Nora A. Mulkern
Dorothy A. Naviaux
Emerald M. Neece
Mary A. O'Meara
Francis M. Parker
Albertus V. Pekarski
Helen Polohovich
Anna K. Purtell
Rita F. Rein
Josi H. E. A. Richmond
Mary H. Schnez
Dorothy R. Shaffer
Ada E. Shaw
Elmira J. Snowden
Evelyn D. White

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve on active duty for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment in the line of the Naval Reserve:

Vernon R. Adrion
Harry Ault, Jr.
William J. Bailey
Lonnie M. Barrow
George W. Berrian
John G. Bonvillian
Ernest J. Coppola
Paul B. Crow
Freddie L. Evans
Donald F. Fernan
Arthur L. Flanagin
John H. Franklin
Adolph J. Furtek
Allen G. Gilmore
John D. Haigler
Hamilton D. Hearn
Lewis P. Holland
Francis L. Kirkland
Richard R. Kite
Noel J. P. Koger
Edmond E. Leber
Robert E. Leckrone
John F. Maroney
John L. Martin
Edward R. Masterson
John F. Mathers
LeRoy McArthur
John E. McNelis
Dean H. Sanders
Stanley M. Sherwen, Jr.
Robert A. Stade
Douglas R. Swenson
Ralph E. Swisher
Robert W. Taylor
Arthur R. Tye
John H. Whitehouse
John H. Wolf

The following-named officer for permanent appointment in the Supply Corps of the Naval Reserve:

Joseph Allecretti

The following-named officer for permanent appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Naval Reserve:

George T. Fedor

The following-named officer for permanent appointment in the Dental Corps of the Naval Reserve:

John A. Johnson, Jr.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment in the Nurse Corps of the Naval Reserve:

Vivian R. Baldwin
Mary B. Bucher
Rosalie L. Kruse
Leona T. Radzai
Marietta Rogers
Nila J. Wallace

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary appointment to the grade of lieutenant subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the line of the Navy:

James W. Ables
Theodore M. Abucevicz, Jr.
Thomas E. Acton
William D. Acton
Willard E. Adams
William F. Adams
Frederick S. Addy
Lawrence E. Adwell
Edwin F. Aeschliman
James N. Agee
Joseph L. Agnes
Abner Akemon
Charles D. Albers
Doyle E. Albright
George A. Ales
Benjamin F. Allen
Charles C. Allen
James H. Allen
Joseph F. Allen
William W. Allen
Archie G. Allison
Henry C. Alvord
Eugene Ambroziak
Carlyle E. Amory
Andre R. Andersen
Kenneth A. Andersen
John C. Anderson
John P. Anderson
Harvey E. Anderson
Ralph H. Anderson
Theodore A. Anderson
Thomas K. Anderson
Verner C. Anderson
William T. Anderson
George P. Andrews
Anthony A. Angelino, Jr.
Rupert L. Angier
Robert E. Anglemyer
Ronald Anthony
William O. Armstrong
Ed D. Arnold
Harry E. Arnold, Jr.
James M. Arnold, Jr.
Samuel B. Arnold
Earl Z. Arthur
James G. Arthur
John C. Arthur
Richard J. Arthur
Hayes M. Ashenhurst
Elmer J. Atchison
John R. Atkins
Maury L. Atkins
Ellis R. Atwell
Thurman J. Austin
Dennis H. Ayers
Carl G. W. Axberg
James H. Badgett
Thomas E. Bager
Ronzel L. Bailey
Edward S. Bair
Burdell J. Baker
Earl R. Baker
E. David Baker, Jr.
Harrison H. Baker
Ozrow G. Baker
Robert F. Baker
Merritt W. W. Baldwin, Jr.
Robert J. Baldwin
Frank P. Banks
Leroy Banks
Milton W. Banks
George E. Barber
Santo J. Barca
Paul Barefoot
Louis A. Barich
Donald W. Barker
William E. Barker
Don L. Barnes

Horace L. Barnes
Robert J. Barnes
William H. Barnes
Robert E. Barnier
Donald W. Barnum
William B. Barrier
Clarence J. Barry
Leroy E. Bartels
Lloyd G. Bartels
John C. Barth
Jack D. Bartlett
Arthur L. Barton
Kiah A. Barton
William N. Bass
Lester G. Bast
Elmer J. Bates
John V. Bates
Kenneth O. Bates
Hugh N. Batten
James E. Battles
Ronald D. Batty
Leo R. Bauer, Jr.
Lawrence E. Bauman
James L. Baxter
Thomas J. Baxter, Jr.
Thomas I. Bayliss
Roland C. Beal
Trinigan E. Beal
William E. Beall
Thomas E. Beals, Jr.
Joe H. Beard
Luther G. Bearden
Darrell E. Beason
Chancy B. Beaty
Pierce W. Beauzay
Clarence W. Beavers
Frank J. Bebko
James D. Beck
George R. Becker
Joseph C. Beckham
Robert M. Beckley
Stephen J. Bednarck
Lawrence L. Beese
John Beland
Alonzo E. Belch, Jr.
Carrol F. Bell
Joseph G. Bell
Louis W. Bell
Ralph W. Bell
Roy T. Belotti
Ivan S. Benjamin
Ezra R. Bennett
William O. Bennett
Hugh L. Benton
Robert J. Berens
Frederick E. Berg
Royal D. Berg
Maurice Berger
Frank F. Bernhardt
Raymond A. Berning
Lamar S. Berry
Gabriel G. Bertok
Victor C. Besancon
Steve Besco
Robert F. Bidwell
Reuben V. Bieri
Wladyslaw Biernat
Joseph Bigger
Charles A. Bilbo
Anthony C. Binder
Byrum C. Bingham
Patrick J. Bingham
James B. Birtch
George S. Bisgrove
William D. Bishop
Bruce L. Black
Raymond A. Black
Roy A. Black
Murray L. Blade
Richard D. Blair
Garth M. Blakeslee
Benjamin J. Blanton
Leland Blehm
Delmar E. Blevins
Earl B. Blevins
Claus A. Block
Lyman C. Bloom
Emile G. Blouin, Jr.
Robert D. Blyth
Robert B. Bodenheimer
Henry M. Bodes
Carl E. Boggs
John R. Bohlken
Myron Boice
John K. Boles
Joseph P. Boller
Leon Bonatta
Arden P. Bonner, Jr.
Roy R. Bonser
Willis J. Boo
Malcolm J. Booker
Irvin S. Bookman
Roderick Bookout
James W. Boone
Ross O. Booth
Louis Bootow
Joseph Boriotti
Walter B. Borkowski
Edward J. Boskovich
Del William Bossio
James L. Bostwick
William D. Bottenhorn
Howard S. Boughton
James M. Bouldin
John R. Bourchier
Alfred V. Boutin
James W. Bowen
Harlan L. Bowman
Ira N. Bowman
Marvin K. Bowman
Robert S. Bowser
Charles A. Boyd
Harold L. Boyd
Arford C. Boyett
Robert G. Boylan
Mack M. Boynton
James L. Braden
John R. Bradley
Charles W. Brandenburg
Warren B. Brann
Melvin H. Brantley
Richard K. Bransom
"J" "F" Branson, Jr.
Frank A. Bratkovic
Clarence F. Brazeal
Lester F. Breaux
Curtis B. Breeding
Paul J. Breidecker
Woodson P. Bremer
Joseph H. Bresnahan
Ryburn Brewer
Sam H. Brewer, Jr.
William I. Brewington
Vernon S. Brewster
Bernard H. Bridges
John W. Briley, Jr.
Frank L. Brimmer
William E. Brister
Vallie E. Brock
Cecil T. Brooks
Laurence G. Brooks
George Brothers
Eduardo P. Brown
James F. Brown
Joe F. Brown
Leonard T. Brown
Louis M. Brown
Ralph J. Brown
Robert S. Brown
Thomas S. Brown
Wallace G. Brownell
John F. Brumfield
Donald E. Brunner
Leighton J. Brunson
Robert E. Brunson
William A. Bruwer
James L. Bryant
Stanley E. Bryant
William J. Bryant
Albert Buccini
William D. Buckbee
Zygmond Budzaj
Henry T. Bugg
Paul Bugg
John T. Bumgardner
Jerry J. Bunch, Jr.
Floyd A. Buntin
Basil C. Bunyard
Edward W. Burdick
Ambrose L. Burek
Bernard L. Burgener
Carlton E. Burgess
Vesper E. Burks
James F. Burns
Lloyd R. Burns
Roy D. Burns
John P. Burris
Leland N. Burnside
George R. Burton
Francies B. Busch
Rudolph M. Buselmeier
Charles W. Busey
Harold D. Butcher
Robert E. Butterbaugh
Frederick S. Butz
Leslie J. Buzzelle
James L. Byrum
Ferdinand J. Byzet, Jr.
Howell A. Cade
Gilmour H. Calderwood
Richard A. Caldwell
Sherman L. Cale
Melvin E. Call
James L. Callaghan
Edward G. Callas
Don M. Cameron
Oliver J. Cameron
Robert B. Cameron
Henry A. Camp
Cleo W. Campbell
George J. Campbell
Hugh L. Campbell
Leo O. Campbell
William H. Campbell
Charles W. Cannon
Edwin J. Cantelope
Anthony Carboni
Robert V. Card
Paul R. Carleton
Allen B. Carlson
Elmer P. Carlson
Nils A. A. Carlson
Thomas A. Carman, Jr.
Kenneth E. Carmichael
James V. Carney
Francis E. Carnicom
Gustave L. Caros
Edward Carozza
Harold K. Carpenter
Charles P. Carr
Howard W. Carr
John E. Carr
Lloyd W. Carr
Andrew J. Carrillo, Jr.
Charles H. Carroll
Herbert C. Carroll
Edward N. Carruth
James D. Carson
Allen E. Carter
Edward Carter
Harry E. Carter
Homer W. Carter
John F. Carter
Leonard J. Carter, Jr.
Lester D. Carter
Louis T. Carter
Lyle E. Carter
Robert J. Carter
Wilbur W. Carter
Harold S. Cartwright
Ralph R. Caruthers
Michael J. Carvan
Pulvio J. Casagrande
Floyd W. Casebeer
John W. Casey, Jr.
Thomas A. Casey
Eugene Cash
Leonard A. Caslow
John J. Cassidy
Melvin W. Cassidy
John D. Casteen
Bartholomew Castrichine
Charles H. Caswell
Joseph Catanzarito
Frederick W. Cely
Ralph S. Cerney
Carmine J. Cerullo
Malcolm H. Chadwell
Milton W. Chambers
Nicholas M. Chandler
Clarence M. Chaney
Peter Chapola
Charles M. Chappelle
Dale J. Charles
Wilfred G. Chartier
Eugene F. Chase
Howard E. Chase
Gurley P. Chatelain
Vernice T. Cheek
Richard R. Cheney
Raymond M. Chester
Rene B. Chevalier
Herbert E. Childers
Henri P. Chinn
Colin R. Chisholm
Randall F. Chormicle
Keith J. Christensen
Leo D. Christie
Merle P. Christensen
Joseph W. Church
Clinton F. Churchill
Jack G. Churchill
Lewis R. Claar
John L. Clanton
Eugene F. Clark
Floyd W. Clark
Joseph R. Clark
Warren L. Clary
Lyle O. Clausen
Orel Clendening
Hugh A. Cleveland
John E. Clunie
Floyd K. Clymer
Ralph J. Cochran
Joseph E. Codemo
Albert E. Coffland
Perry C. Cofield
Lyle G. Cogswell, Jr.
Herbert W. Cole
William R. Cole
Thomas R. Colbeck
Joseph L. Coleman
Jack D. Colhouer
John M. Collier
Delbert H. Collins
Frank C. Collins
Frank Colonna
Charles W. Combs
Donald E. Compton
Richard B. Comstock
Charles L. Confer
Roy Coniam
Stanley C. Connor
Theron A. Conolly
Walter E. Constance
James P. Conway
Arthur W. Cook
Godfrey D. Cook
Homer T. Cook
Kenneth F. Cook
Robert J. F. Cook
Walter J. Cook
George E. Cooke
Paul Cooke
Chester L. Coons
Claude B. Cooper
Oran J. Cooper
John B. Copeland
Gene A. Coray
Herbert E. Cornely
Martin V. Cornetta
LaVerne C. Corning
Robert H. Cosper
Thomas L. Costello
Joseph J. Cote
Leo R. Coughlin
Frank M. Coven
Earl W. Cox
Howard D. Cox
Ivan L. Cox
Kenneth L. Cox
Perry Q. D. Cox
Charles L. Craig
Thomas E. Craig
Max A. Crain
Micajah H. Cranmer
Leonard M. Craven
James H. Crawford, Jr.
Walter L. Crawford
Virgil Y. Crawley
Anthony S. Creider
David W. Crippin
Gentry S. Cripps
Waldo H. Croner
Derrill P. Crosby
Edward O. Crosby
Robert E. Crosnoe
Ralph J. Cross
Bernard P. Crossno
Leon M. Crouch
John S. Crow
Clyde E. Crowder
William M. Crowe
Fred R. Crumbaugh, Jr.
Edgar J. O. Crutchfield
George W. Culbert
Joe Joe Culotta
James D. Culp
Andrew D. Culver
Robert H. Cummings
David E. Cummins
William H. Cunningham
Joseph H. Cupp
Wade E. Cupp
Norman P. Currin
Raymond R. Curry
Leonard Curtis
Roy E. Curtis
Irving Cushman
John S. Cwynar
Carl C. Dace
Arthur L. Daigle
Roy M. Dallman
Pierze H. Dalton
Anthony S. D'Angelo
Alfred E. Daniel
Stewart A. Daniels
Manford J. Danielson
Milton R. Dankenbring
Jesse R. Darnell
Fred W. Davenport
Alvin N. Davidson
William O. Davidson
Albert Davis
Charles H. Davis
Duane L. Davis
George W. Davis
Hugh P. Davis
John F. Davis
Lester H. Davis
Richard M. Davis
Dale W. Davison
Paul D. Davidson
Floyd W. Dawson
William S. Dawson
Ernest J. Deal
Charles J. Deasy
James E. Deaton
Vernon E. Decker
Allison E. Deer
Robert N. Delahunt
John A. Delaney
William F. Delaurantis
Emory L. Dell
Daniel B. Delly
Joseph G. Demel
John T. Dempster, Jr.
Edward C. Denham
Wesly O. Denison
George E. Dennis
Ernest E. Dent
Joseph O. Denton, Jr.
Dominic Deremigio
John P. Dermanoski
Harry Derr
Duane E. W. Devaney
William B. Dever
Joseph M. Deville
John B. Dexter
Charles E. Dick
Kenneth S. Dick
Elmer Dickey
Bradley W. Dickinson
Raymond T. Diedrichsen
Charles M. Dill
"J" "W" Dillon
Joe Dimes, Jr.
Leonard B. Dinapoli
Lowell E. Dinwiddie
Carl B. Ditto
Gerald L. Dix
Thomas W. Dixon
Telofil D'Moch
Earl B. Dodge
James D. Dodge
Marcellus H. Dodge
Lyle W. Doore
"R" "H" Dorman
Stanley P. Dornblaser
Theodore P. Dorr
Charles M. Dorris
James B. Doster
Arthur F. Doty, Jr.
Guy L. Doty
George M. Dougan
John W. Downing
Clement C. Doyle
Paul A. Doyle
Walter J. Doyle
Teddy F. Drag
John V. Draggie
Elmer E. Dreiling
Leon J. Drelicharz
John R. Dressor
Elmer O. Drew
Walter H. Drew
Leigh E. Driskill
William C. Drotleff
Walter D. Dubienny
Philip C. DuBois
Jerome C. Dubourg
Harold M. Dubree
Edward W. Duckworth
William F. Ducoing
Howard E. Dudley
Robert H. Dudley
Harold E. Duffield
Peter A. Duffy
John C. Dullaghan, Jr.
Willis H. Dunagan
Warren J. Dunaway
Robert C. Dunbar
Norman V. Duncan
Richard E. Duncan
Larry E. Dunlap
Lynn A. Dunlap
William A. Dunn
Laverne H. Dunning
Donald D. Dunton
Edward H. Dunwoody
Jesse W. Dunwoody
Herbert E. Duquette, Jr.
Clyde C. Durant
James E. Durham
Charles L. Duss
George B. Dutch
John P. Dutton
Robert W. Dye
Robert E. Dyer
"Y" "J" Dyson
Lyle W. Eads
Hugh L. Earhart, Jr.
Juston H. Early
Elmer H. Earnhardt
Arthur B. Eastman
Arthur H. M. Eaton
John F. Ebersbaker
Robert H. Ebersole
Willis Ebner
John E. Echterling
Dave E. Eckhardt
Edward G. Eckstein
Lloyd G. Edgerton
Robert H. Ehm
Hubert W. Eldred
Robert C. Elfstrom
Glenn Ellis
William A. Ellis, Jr.
Clarence G. Ellington
James B. Elzey
Louis R. Emme
John L. Emory
Harry W. Enabnit
Addison R. English
Lawrence Enos

Ray Entwistle
Donald C. Enyeart
Arthur G. Erb
George W. Erickson
Jack L. Erickson
Charles A. Erishman
Werner G. Ernst
William H. Escott
Frank E. Estes
Henry E. Ethier
Robert E. Euliss
Glenn A. Evans
Glenn E. Evans
John M. Evans
Keith J. Evans
Russell A. Evans
Harold R. Eyer
Irvin R. Fahrbach
Sherman T. Faircloth
Henry W. Falbe
Eugene R. Fancher
Floyd E. Farley
Lawrence A. Farquhar
Jack M. Farwell
Thomas A. Feather-stone
Vladimir Fedorowicz
William E. H. Felch-ner
Edward N. Fenton
John A. Ferguson
William E. Ferguson
William V. Ferguson
Adrian J. Ferris
Andrew O. A. Feske
Harold J. Fidler
Frederick E. Field
James L. Field
James A. Fielder
Thomas Fields
John W. Fietsch
Joseph E. Filipowicz
Forrest Finders
Werner C. Fischer
Albert A. Fisher
Joseph H. Fisher
James B. Fitzgerald
Dean G. Fleming
Edwin H. Fletcher
Keith G. Fletcher
Glenn W. Flickinger
Elton E. Flowers
Wesley Floyd
Sam Fodor
Claude C. Fogle
Lawrence H. Foisy
John J. Foley
Riley T. Folsom
Yourick N. Fontenot
Norman C. Foote
Donald G. Ford
John W. Fordemwalt
James M. Forehand
Eugene R. Forsht
Joseph E. Fowles
Ralph E. Fowler
George L. Fox
Harry E. Fox
Lyle B. Fox
Wilmer L. Fox
George J. Fraise
Herbert A. Franck
George E. Franklin
Laron S. Franklin
Joseph J. Frano
Charles W. Fraser
John K. Freeman
John T. Freeman
Gustave J. Freret, Jr.
Max G. Freudenberg
William H. Frieden
Roland P. Frodahl
Ronald E. Frohman
Frank B. Frost
James G. Frost, Jr.
Elmer C. Fry
Leonard J. Fullan
Bert C. Fuller
Jesse B. Fulton
Laurence J. Furey
Joseph O. N. Gagnon
Louis C. Gallaher
Maurice A. Gambill
Robert R. Gardner
Sylvester L. Gardner, Jr.
Lorin P. Garlinger
John J. Garrity
Vardy D. Garvey
Vaughn H. Gary
Milton Gaschk
Howard P. Gasmann
Clyde W. Gassaway
Edward F. Gaudet
Joseph T. Gautreau
Eugene M. Gavigan
Burner D. Gaylord
Norman L. Geer
Emile R. Gemoets, Jr.
Peter E. Gergen
Harold Gerock
Bemig F. F. Gerszew-ski
Walter S. Getz
William J. Gibbons, Jr.
Archibald Gibson
Robert C. Gibson
Warren L. Gibson
Homer A. Giddens
Lewis G. Gifford
Albert K. Gilbert
Calvin R. Gilbert
Howard J. Gilfoil
James J. Gill
Robert L. Gill
Max M. Gilliland
Francis D. Gillis
George A. Gilmore
Robert Gilmour, Jr.
Frederick L. Gimbert
Roy L. Ginther
Louis P. Giordano
Conrad Giantschnig
Joseph A. Glass
Robert L. Glasscock
David E. Glassman
John T. Glenn
Will F. Glenn, Jr.
Glenn F. Glezen
Matthew J. Glica
Willard E. Glidewell
Robert E. Goeb
Robert G. Goff
Charles L. Golden
Frank S. Golding
Karl A. Gollatz
Jerome J. Golnik
William W. Goodall
Alphonse G. Goodber-let
Harold L. Goodman
Burton J. Goodrich
Chester S. Goodson
Frank E. Goodwin
Don C. Goolsby
Arthur D. Gordon
Dale M. Gordon
John T. Gordon
William J. Gore
David E. Goudy
Anthony L. Goulart
Ralph C. Gourgues
William C. Grace
David A. Graddy
Inslee E. Grainger
William L. Grandia
Clair S. Granger
Ralph F. Grant
Robert C. Grant
Herman A. Graven
Morris E. Graves
Albert E. Gray
Edward F. Gray
Franklin J. Gray
Hubert D. Gray
James F. Gray
Arthur E. Graybill
William T. Grayson
William M. A. Greene
Thomas E. Greenwood
Roscoe W. Greer
John D. Gregory
Carl O. Grewe
George S. Grey
Averill G. Griffin
Marion E. Griffin
Lyle T. Griffis
Gene H. Grigsby
Levi A. Grissom
George M. Grist
Gaylord L. Grozier
Truman F. Grubl
Frederick F. Guertin
John C. Guidos
Ernest L. Guirey
George W. Gulbran-son
Irving T. Gumb, Jr.
Andrew Guna
James O. Gundrum
Edward A. Gurry
Wilbert T. Gustafson
Francis M. Gutten-berger
Ralph H. Habecker
Raymond W. Hafler
Charles C. Hagner
Robert G. Haigler
Lawrence I. Haines
Clarence R. Hale
William C. Hale
Edwin W. Hall
Harry D. Hall
Rayborn M. Hall
Richard F. Hall
Victor Hall
William R. Hall
Louis P. Halloran
Edwin P. Halverson
Richard L. Halverson
Louis C. Hambley
Roy A. Hamblin
George T. Hamilton
Lewis G. Hamilton
Robert E. Hamilton
James C. Hammond
Zacharie T. Hampton
Frank R. Hankey
John F. Hanlon
Dale V. Hansen
Eugene E. Hansen
Ivol E. Hansen
Ray L. Hansen
Leonard M. Hanson
Edgar M. Hantsche
Walter C. Harbridge
James N. Harbilas
Joe T. Hardee
Kermitt C. Hardin
Willis E. Hardy
Arnold W. Harer
James Harper
Thomas E. Harper, Jr.
John E. Harrell
Russell A. Harrell
Harold L. Harriman
David D. Harris
Noel M. Harris, Jr.
Roger L. Harris
Vernon R. Harris
William A. Harris
Willie W. Harris
Wilson E. Harris
Alpha R. Harrison
George S. Harrison
Glenn C. Harrison
Lamar F. Harrison
Carl G. Hart
James V. Hart
Keith C. Hart
William A. Hart
Albert W. Hartin
Walter F. Hartnett
Robert S. Harward
James A. Hashberger
Benjamin Hashmall
Joseph T. Haslinger
Floyd H. Hatcher
Earl W. Hauer
Howard G. Havens
Ernest L. Haver
Harold P. Hawker
Ralph M. Hawkins
Victor N. Hawkins
Harry E. Hawver
Cecil R. Haycraft
Henri L. Hayes
Arvil Heath
Philip R. Heath
Robert P. Heekin
William J. J. Heffernan
Reaves S. Heflin
Theodore J. Heine
Glenn G. Heller
Ervine J. Helm
Lewis S. Helmeci
Lloyd E. Helwick
Hainsworth J. Hend-son
Henry H. Henderson
James L. Henderson
Russell L. Hendrick-son
David Hendry
Walter J. Henning
John L. Henry
Warren Herman
Charles C. Harold
Thomas C. Herrick
Donald E. Herrmann
William S. Hertig
Joseph R. Herzog
Finis Hess
Harold Hess
William J. Hess
John B. Hessley
Jack O. Heustis
William B. Hevener
Joe B. Hiers
Arthur E. Higgins
John I. Higgins
Winford T. Higgins
Harold C. Highfill
Charles W. Hill
Harold C. Hill
Milton R. Hill, Jr.
Newton D. Hill
Sam A. Hill
William C. Hiller
Ross F. Hinckley
Donald L. Hindes
Rex Hinman, Jr.
Wesley Hirons
Theodore Hladik
Frank M. Hoak, Jr.
Charles H. Hoar, Jr.
Harry K. Hoch, Jr.
Ashley R. Hodges
Lyle E. Hoffman
Peter N. Hoffos
Wilbur F. Hoffstadt
Roy A. Hogan
Forrest G. Hogg
Joe W. Holland
Hugh Hollar
James F. Holley
Clifford S. Holmes
Glenn W. Holmes
Harris K. Holt
Leahman J. Holt
Lee H. Holtzclaw
Reo M. Hood
Rufus M. Hood
Ralph L. Hooton
Herbert L. Hope
Richard M. Hopfinger
Gordon E. Hoppe
Woodrow N. Horick
Richard J. Hornbrook
Francis E. Horobetz
Andrew J. Horton, Jr.
Bennett H. Horton
Metro Horoschak
Earl F. Hosack
John R. House
William C. House
Trumond E. Houston
Jerome O. Hovland
Clarence H. Howard
Harvey J. Howard
Vernon Howard
William M. Howard
Elmer C. Howe
Roy A. Howell
Frank S. Howland
Myrle G. Hoyt
George Hrib, Jr.
Donnie W. Huckaby
Frank Huckell III
James B. Hudson
Ray G. Hudson
Raymond L. Hudson
Landon W. Huffman
Albert N. Hughes
John O. Hughes
Morris L. Hughes
Robert M. Hughson
Richard H. Hull
Andrew Hulshof
Loren R. Humphrey
Robert C. Humphreys
David W. Hunt
Joe H. Hunt
Lionel J. Hunter
Lawrence H. Hunts
Ellis L. Hurley
Thomas B. Hurtt
Fred J. Huser
Clarence H. Hutchison, Jr.
Lawrence H. Ickes
Edward Iglesias
Lewis C. Ihrig
James W. Ingalls
Merrill D. Ingram
Dominic J. Ioli
Michael G. Irano
Harold E. Isakson
Everett E. Ishie
Alfred C. Israel
James E. Ivy
Carl S. Jackman
Edward E. Jacks
Hugh M. Jackson
Paschal M. Jackson
Walter Jackson
Wilbur J. Jackson
Clyde W. Jacobs
William A. Jacobs, Jr.
Robert G. Jacobson
Martin J. Jaeger
Llewellyn E. Jalbert
William R. James
Fabus Janise
Walter J. Jarock
Evan A. Jarboe
Robert P. Javins
Robert F. Jeffett
James E. Jenkins
Edwin R. Jenks
Harold Jennings
Lafayette F. Jensen, Jr.
Robert W. Jensen
David M. Jeter
Harry E. Johns
Charles E. Johnson, Jr.
Claud A. Johnson
Clayton F. Johnson
Earl C. Johnson
Earl M. Johnson
Edward G. Johnson
Francis F. Johnson
Garvis D. Johnson
Gordon E. Johnson, Jr.
James E. Johnson
Julius M. Johnson
Lauren M. Johnson
Ralph R. Johnson
Richard Johnson
Robert H. Johnson
Robert Howard John-son
Roy E. Johnson
Theodore W. Johnson
Warren L. Johnson
William H. Johnson
Douglas M. Johnston
Roy S. Johnston
James R. Joiner
Arthur H. Jones
Dean R. Jones
Donald H. Jones
Edward G. Jones
Evan E. Jones
Forest M. Jones
Frank M. Jones
Gordon W. Jones
Harvey B. Jones
Howard W. Jones
Kenneth L. Jones
Mack C. Jones
Robert E. L. Jones
Robert F. Jones
Joseph E. Justice
Hugh W. Kahlbau
Conrad L. H. Kaiser
Joseph F. Kakol
Frank Kalasinsky
George D. Kaley
Alex J. Kalinoski
William G. Kalinowski
Alvin R. Kall
William W. Kalmbach
Nicholas R. Kalynych
Harold J. Kamps
Martin A. Kasworm
Gordon E. Kaufman
William A. Kauzlarich
Jack G. Kaye
William J. Kayser
John A. Keating
John T. Keenan
Luther G. Keenum
Galen D. Kees
Walter Kehm
Wilbur E. N. Keil
Ruben G. Keller
Fonvill Kelley
Ford S. Kelley
Stephen F. Kelley
Edward G. Kelly
Harold H. Kelly
John C. Kelly
Leo Kelly
Charles E. Kelsey
Edward J. Kenney
Charles J. Kent, Jr.
John D. Keogh
Homer W. Kepler
Clifford D. Kerns
Stuart W. Kerr
Nicholas Kersbergen
John R. Kersey
Matt T. Kershall
Walter R. Kershaw
Roy B. Ketchum
Francis R. Kidder
Francis C. Kiefer
William M. Kilcoyne
Charlie T. Kincaid
Edgar F. Kincaid
Arthur W. King
Nathan H. King
Hugh J. Kirkpatrick
Warren E. Kirkpatrick
Valdimir Kisak
John A. Kisner
Charles E. Kleinert
Robert L. Kline
John W. Klohck
Joseph E. Kloppenberg
John C. Klotzbach
Frank L. Knight
Adolph A. Knotek
William W. Knotts
Arnold C. Koch
John L. Koch
Jack Y. Kochen
Arthur F. Koeppen
Carl B. Kole
John C. Kolisek
Willard Koone
"C" "B" Kossert
Mike Kostelnik, Jr.
Chester M. Kotsmith
John E. Kramarcy
Vito Krancevich
Edward J. Kratochvil
Paul E. Krebs
Clayton L. Krejci
Charles W. Krieger

Chester M. Krol
Frank Krysynski
Melvin F. Kuba
Leo F. Kucharski
Melvin W. Kugler
Raymond A. Kulig
Ray Kuntz
William B. Kurlak
Paul Kurovsky
Raymond W. Kurz
George D. Lachance
Norman M. Lambertsen
Clarence L. Lambing
William F. Lair
Archie J. Lance
Harry L. Lane
Russell A. Langdon
Harry D. Lange
Robert G. Langland
Ben G. Langley
Mark Lanham
Carl B. Lankford
William D. Lankford
Charles E. Lareau
Herman C. Larsen
Stanley L. Larsen
James O. Larson
Theodore R. Larson
Richard M. LaRue
Edward C. Lashus
Daniel L. Lassiter
Kenneth W. Laughlin
Leonard R. Laughlin
Kermit F. Lavender
Joseph E. LaVoie
Clement P. Lavoy
Edward J. Lawrence
George E. Lawson
"J" "L" Lawson
Harold E. Layman
Jake W. Layton
Charles J. LeBlanc
Louis S. LeBlanc
Ulric J. LeBlanc
Joseph W. Ledoux
Gordon T. Ledyard
Allen W. Lee
Ellis E. Lee
John D. Lee
John W. Lee
George D. Leffingwell
John LeHoy
Charles G. Leidhold, Jr.
Russell E. Leighton
John F. Leinen
Henry P. Lelito
Andrew T. Levering
Henry N. Levy
Albert W. Lewis
George W. Lewis
Grady L. Lewis
Herbert S. Lewis
Julian H. Lewis, Jr.
Leslie E. Lewis
Emeryk Lichnerowicz
Chester E. Lichtenberger
Wayne M. Liebert
Arthur A. Liedtke
Herbert N. Lightle
Vernon A. Lileks
Richard M. Lillig
Kenneth E. Lindley
John F. Lindquist
Robert W. Lindsay
Clifford O. Lines
Paul W. Lines
"J" "A" Linn
Robert B. Linn
Wayne W. Litchfield
Kenneth J. Little
William J. Lloyd
John D. Loeffler
Eugene P. Loflin
Donald B. Long
Leonard H. Long
William E. Longe
Thomas B. Longley
Anthony Lops
Paul F. Lorah
Arnold S. Lott
Paul E. Loughlin
William D. Loughner
Donald S. Loughran
John T. Lovell
George W. Loveridge, Jr.
Elroy P. Lowe, Jr.
William B. Lower
Kenneth M. Lucas
Charles E. Ludiker
Harold H. Lusk
Victor W. Lusson
Walter Luttmer
John W. Lutzelman
Frank W. Lux
Albert T. Lynch
Francis K. Lynch
Anthony J. Lyons
Harold T. Lyons
John MacDonald
Wallace E. MacDonald
Michael Maciolek
Oscar S. Maddox
Charles W. Maier
William C. Malone
Harry I. Maltz
Troy C. Manchester
Arthur J. Manger
Harrison D. Manhart
Claude L. Manke
Howard E. Mann
Richard W. Mann
Fletcher A. Manning
Wesson A. Mansfield
Cecil Manship
Benjamin J. Marafino
Charles B. March
James D. March
Earl J. Marconnet
Phillip Marcozzi
Raymond K. Marker
Thomas B. Markham
Eino J. Markkanen
Thomas W. Marks
Norman R. Markwell
Newton M. Marler, Jr.
Albin Marn
Howard M. Marquardt
Louis S. Marshall
Robert W. Marshall
James J. Marta
Clarence R. Martin
David G. Martin
Herman P. Martin
Merrill K. Martin
Orvin A. Martin
Truman R. Martin
Wilfred X. Martin
Michael V. Martini
David J. Martino
Jessie L. Mashburn
Grady C. Mason
Wilson L. Mason
Robert J. Massey
Howard W. Masterman
Irvin W. Matlock
Johnnie W. Matt
Edwin W. Matthews
Lloyd Matthews
John A. Mattison
Andre A. Maurel
George R. Maxwell
Riley F. Maxwell
Arthur L. May
Frank T. May
Harold A. May
Albert Mayfield
Lawrence P. Maynard
Vincent D. Maynard, Jr.
Thomas E. Mays
Louis A. Mazoway
John J. McAuley, Jr.
Francis A. McCain
Carr C. McCall
Laurence L. McCall
Virgil M. McCall
Floyd R. McClanahan
Arrie J. McClaskey
Bert R. McClelland, Jr.
Roy P. McCloskey
Edward P. McConnon
John P. McCormick
Roy W. McCotter
Gordon H. McCrea
Donald H. McCrosky
Thomas V. McCullock
Hector S. McDaniel
Vern E. McDermet
Joseph A. McDermott, Jr.
James C. McDonald, Jr.
James H. McDonald
John B. McDonnell
Roy L. McDowell
Stanley W. McEowen
John G. McFarlane
Frank C. McGinley
James F. McGinnis
Richard L. McGuffin
Donald E. McGuire
Herbert W. McGuire
Marcus McHenry
Richard G. McIntire
John C. McIntire
John H. McKeever
Charles A. McMahon
John J. McMenimon
James E. McMullen
Joseph McNaughton
Leo H. J. McNeil
Edgar L. McNett
Clyde C. McPherson
William F. McSharry
Joseph M. McSpadden
Hugh F. McStay
James T. McTigue
Addison E. Medefind
Vern Meek
Clarence R. Meissner
Carol O. Mekkelson
Martin Mellish
Gerald W. Mendenhall
Norman F. Mennecke
Clayton W. Merrill
LeRoy Merryman
Orville V. Messenger
Harry T. Messick
Roger C. Metz
Richard K. Meyer
Chester Michalek
John Mihalko
Donato Milano
Charles M. Miller
Clay R. Miller
David Miller
David L. Miller
Harry S. Miller
Henry K. Miller
John G. Miller
John R. Miller, Jr.
Peter S. Miller
Robert C. Miller
Rolland E. Miller
Samuel J. Miller
David R. Mills
Stewart A. Mills
Roland A. Milot
George L. Miner
William A. Minkler
John L. Minnick
Chester C. J. Minton
Thomas G. Miskill
Pete Mitchell
Anthony R. Modica
Charles R. Modlin
Lloyd W. Moffit
Joseph J. Molter
Victor D. Moomey
Donald D. Moore
Elisha B. Moore
Elmer K. Moore
George J. Moore
James D. Moore
Kenneth L. Moore
Lavern C. Moore
Lee R. Moore
Lewis M. Moore
Robert H. Moore
Vernon L. Moore
William B. Moore
Milton B. Moreland
Chauncey J. Morgan
James E. Morgan
Lindsay E. Morgan
Theodore L. Morgan
William M. Morgan
James B. Morris
Lester Morris
Robert C. Morris
Robert E. Morris
Basil T. Morrison
John M. Morrison, Jr.
John R. Morse
Raymond M. Mortimer
William H. Morton, Jr.
Francis G. Moses
Gerald E. Mote
Arthur W. Motley, Jr.
Francis S. Mott
Joseph W. Mross
Robert P. Mudd
Leon P. Mudgett
Arthur Muench
Gustav J. Muenich
Walter Muhlethaler
Champ C. Mulligan
George A. Mullinix
Richard J. Mumford
John L. Murphy
Rex L. Murphy
Paul J. Murray
Denzil E. Myers
Edward J. Myers
Oscar W. Myers
Frank C. Nall
Jack H. Napier
John F. Naylor
Joseph A. Neal
Joseph B. Neely
William D. Neeper
Arthur Neill
Raymond K. Nelsen
Donald D. Nelson
Frederick A. Nelson
Loyd C. Nelson
Marvin J. Nelson
Oscar B. Nelson
Roy E. Nelson
Clifford I. Nettleton
Keith E. Neuneker
Clifford R. Nevins
Denny A. Newberry
Harry M. Newcity
David G. Newell
Thurman E. Newell
William M. Newell
George A. Newport
Alexander Niblock
John E. Nichols
Dave Nicholson
Ray C. Nieman
Donald H. Nitz
Walley H. Noel
Leo Nolan
Gustaf O. Nordgren
Derrell D. Norris
Hale W. Northup
Alfred F. Norwood
Raymond A. Novelli
Edward E. Nowak
Vernis L. Nowell
Dohnea L. Nygren
John N. Obermier
Vern E. Oberndorfer
Eugene A. O'Brien
John P. O'Brien
Thomas W. O'Bryan
Harry N. O'Connor
Thomas J. O'Connor
Theodore R. Odenath III
Robert E. Ogden
Francis H. Ogle
Salvatore Ognibene
Charles C. O'Hearn
Thomas K. O'Kelley
Elliott E. Okins
Lewis A. Oldfather
Ednia H. Oldham
Herron Oldham
Arthur W. O'Leary
Willard F. Oleson
Almon P. Oliver
Albert R. Olliffe
David Olson
Francis L. Olson
George B. Olson
Gilbert W. Olson
Joseph C. Olson
Irvin W. O'Neill
Lyle F. Orcutt
Thomas B. O'Rourke
Lowell O. Orr
Kenneth P. Ostrander
Casper D. Ott
Otto A. Ottesen
James C. Owen
Elmer L. Owens, Jr.
Archie E. Owings
Junius I. Padgett, Jr.
Myrl G. Page
Irvin M. Page, Jr.
Charles S. Paine
Allen E. Painter
Ben F. Palmer
Ivan L. Palmer
Warren F. Paris
James K. Parish
Denison A. Parker
Edward V. Parker, Jr.
Raymond Parker
Robert L. Parker
Stanley W. Parker
David P. Parks
John W. Parks
John L. Parlette
Gaecoma A. "G" Parolini
Douglas G. Parramore
Paul O. Parris
George Patterson
Harold L. Patterson
Irving L. Patterson
John V. Patterson, Jr.
Ward L. Patterson
William B. Patterson
Daniel R. Paul
John Pavlow
Robert E. Peacock
Frank C. Peck
Eli B. Peeples
Benjamin D. Pennington, Jr.
Ross C. Pennington
James L. Penola
Robert L. Peoples
Homer M. Percifield
John F. Perkins
Walter V. Perkins
LeRoy Perkins
Edward A. Pernal
Maurice M. Perrine
Clarence E. Perry
John L. Perry
Michael L. Perry
Walter I. Perry
William B. Perry
Irving J. Person
Alfred D. Perucci
Hans J. Petersen
Frank F. Peterson
Gordon I. Peterson
Howard P. Peterson
Ray A. Peterson
Jerry J. Petranek
Conner M. Petrie
Denzil H. Pfaffly
Arthur R. Phillips
Clarence B. Phillips
Harold Phillips
Marion G. Phillips
Orville H. Phillips
Robert S. Pickens
Carlton E. Pierce
Everett E. Pierce
Robert L. Pierce
Kenneth D. Piercey
Alden M. Pierpoint
William H. Pierson
Arthur T. Pingree
Harry B. Pitcher, Jr.
Guy L. Pitsenberger
James P. Pittman
Ulysses B. Pitts
Patrick C. Pizzuto
Arthur C. Plambeck
James E. Plowden, Jr.
Lewis J. Polansky
Byron A. Polen
Lawrence C. Pollock
Walter F. Pollock
Aquilin L. Ponciroli
James W. Ponsford
John J. Ponzuric
Stuart G. Poole
"R" "A" Pope
Sigmund Popko
Orvis J. Porche
Eugene V. Posey
Horace C. Post
Charles A. Potts
Guy E. Powell
William J. F. Powers
Arthur P. Pratt
Casmer E. Preble
Oral G. Prescott
Alton E. Prevost
John A. Prew
Howard R. Price
"L" "F" Price
Stanley V. Price
Warren L. Price
Glen F. Pritchett
Michael M. Pritzos
Gregory J. Privitelli
John B. Pruden
Verlen E. Pruess
Henry H. Pruett
Plynn J. Pulliam
Samuel C. Purcell
Richard B. Purdy
James H. Pyle, Jr.
Frank N. Quarles, Jr.
Carl O. Quarterman
Walter P. Queck
Lawrence J. Quinn
Rayburn M. Quinn
Charles Raczkowski
Carl E. Radcliffe
John R. Rader
John L. Radford
Raymond V. Raehn
Robert A. Railsback
James C. Raines
Harry E. Ramsey, Jr.
Gilbert W. Rappelt
Thomas Ravesi
Earl F. Rawlings
James M. Ray
Carl G. Ream
Johnnie W. Reams
Kenneth J. Rearick
Joel T. Reasoner
David B. Reavis, Jr.
Fredrick A. Redeye
George L. Redford
Clarence R. Redman
Richard E. Redmond
Irvin W. Reed
James M. Reed
Robert F. Reed
Victor W. Reed
Wilbur E. Reed
Charles W. Reeder
William E. Reeder
Joseph S. Reedy
Robert W. Reeve
Roy E. Reeves
Charles R. Reidel
Conrad H. Reifel
William E. Render
Claude L. Rescola
Calvin D. Reutter
Wilford A. Rexroad
Bruce H. Reynolds

Robert W. Rhea
George A. Rhine
Donald J. Rhoades
William S. Rhymes
Leslie B. Rice
Floyd E. Richards
Carl C. Richardson
Hobart Richardson
Kenneth Richardson
Chesley W. Richey
Roderick H. Rickard
Paul E. Rickey
Warren C. Richison
Walter E. Riddle
Russell D. Rider
Harry J. Riggar
Virgil Riggs
George R. Rinehart
Henry W. Ring
Victor B. Rink
Russell W. Rinker
Maurice O. Rishel
David C. Ritchie
Harry E. C. Ritter
Jesse M. Ritter
Robert Rizzone
Lewie A. Robb
William H. Robb
Berthel L. Roberts
Earle E. Roberts
Graton R. Roberts
Harry D. Roberts
Michael D. Roberts
Owen A. Roberts
Floyd Robertson
Herber L. Robertson
James H. Robertson
Edgar O. Robinson
Fred R. Robinson
George E. Robinson
Golden P. Robinson
Louis D. Robinson, Jr.
Frank Rocker
Orville W. Rockwell
James R. Rodman
James P. Roe
John C. Roe
Charles E. Rodgers
Francis J. Rodstrom
Bayard R. Rogers
Franklin W. Rogers
Michael F. Rogus
Max F. Rolih, Jr.
Edward L. Rollins
James T. Rominger
Arthur D. Ronimus, Jr.
David A. Roop
William T. Roscoe
Ivan O. Rose
Harris J. Rosenfeld
Warren W. Rosier
Albert J. Ross
Dwight E. Rossiter
David S. Rotchstein
Paul Roth
Carroll W. Rothermel
William C. Roughton
Walter H. Routledge
Leonard L. Royer
Joseph N. Rozycki
John W. Rucker
Olin R. Ruff
Roscoe Ruffin
John F. Rule
Michael J. Rura
Lester R. Russ
Robert T. Rustad
Fred W. Ruthven
Edwin L. Ryan
Edward W. Sabol
William H. Sager
Harley G. Salisbury
Aloysius Sally
Dan W. Samek
Crissie C. Sanders
Elmer L. Sanders
Emmett O. Sanders
Merl J. Sanders
Edward Sanderson
Joseph D. Sandling
Joseph Sanfilippo
Joel H. Santrock
Frank J. Sarris
Guilford W. Satterthwaite
George E. Saunders
Kirk Y. Saunders
Homer D. Savage
Vann E. Savage
Frank M. Sawyer
John B. Saylor
Charles N. Scarborough
"O" "D" Scarborough
Frank C. Scesney
Gerald E. Schaff
Everett A. Schappals
William G. Schaufler
Fred J. Schlecht
Harry W. Schlosberg
William J. Schleis
Richard L. Schiller
William E. Schneider
Louis J. Schoenfeld
Jerome J. Schrick
Edward M. Schroeder
Elwood C. Schuler
Harry N. Schultz
George E. Schwenter
Lawrence H. Schwock
James N. Scofield, Jr.
Benedict J. Scott
Frank T. Scott
George A. Scott
Kenneth W. Scott
Russell M. Scott
Stanley W. Scott
Walter P. Scott
Wesley B. Scott
Frank R. Scruggs
James R. Seamans
Alfred R. J. Sears, Jr.
Raymond B. Sears
Tony Secovitch
Albert Seder
Carl J. Seiberlich
Robert C. Selby
Edward O. Sentar
Andrew Serrell
Eugene I. Settle
Earl H. Severns
Edmond W. Seward
Russell T. Sexton
Earl P. Seymour
Horatio Seymour, Jr.
Chester T. Shablowski
Elroy J. Shafer
John N. Shamburg
Andrew J. Shannon
John R. Shannon
Robert Shannon
Ralph H. Sharp
Dean G. Shattuck
Boyd Shaw
Garlin V. Shaw
Robert A. Shelton
James D. Shepard
Ronald W. Shepard
Lloyd L. Sherard
Laurence W. Sheridan
William J. Sheridan
Robert S. Sherman
George G. Sherry
Louis L. Sherry
William T. Shipes
Angus M. Shirah, Jr.
John P. Shiveley
Vaun G. Short
Lenard M. Showalter
Anderson V. Showen
Harold F. Shripka
Charlie Shuford
Kenneth L. Shurtleff
Roger F. Shurtz
Victor J. Sibert
Carl F. Sigrist
Alfred E. Simmons
Charles B. Simmons
Robert L. Simmons
James M. Simpson
Cletis D. Sims
Larue E. Sims
Ra'ph E. Sims
Tom M. Sleek
Einar E. Sletto
Raymond P. Sluyter
Blaine A. Smallwood
Deward Smallwood
John J. Smies
Andrew M. Smiley
Arthur A. Smith
Andrew R. Smith
Clifford C. Smith
Donald R. Smith
Elvin M. Smith
Grant P. Smith
Henry G. Smith
Hiram E. Smith, Jr.
Homer L. Smith
James W. Smith
Leonard L. Smith
Leroy M. Smith
Maurice R. Smith
Newel W. Smith, Jr.
Ralph T. Smith
Raymond K. Smith
Richard E. Smith
Robert M. Smith
Rodger F. Smith
Walter R. Smith
William H. Smith
Bruce Smithee
Willis G. Snyder
William G. Sohlich
Harold E. Sommers
William M. Somerville, Jr.
Harold O. Sones
Harry M. Sonner
John P. O. Sorenson
Joseph M. Sousa
Roscoe P. Spearman
Gerald O. Spears
Harold R. Speece
Paul Spencer
Paul L. Spiel
Grant R. Squire
Paul C. Stadler
Edgar Stafford
Robert A. Stahl
Wilbur L. Stallings
Will L. Stalnaker
Joseph F. Stanfill, Jr.
Joseph F. Stankiewicz
Thomas J. Starling
Charles W. Starr
Henry J. Statchen
Arthur W. Steel
Clyde H. Steele
Robert F. Steele
Robert L. Stegall
Oscar Steinke, Jr.
Henry J. Stempski
Henry E. Stephenson
Ernest W. Sterling
Lloyd V. Sternberg
Elvin L. Stevens
John A. Stevens
Russell N. Stevens
John R. Stevenson
John S. Stewart
Robert B. Stickles
Elmer J. Still
James M. Stingle
Gerald E. Stitzer
William A. Stivers
Paul Stjerne
Raymond St. John
Howard J. Stockert
Gerald W. Stoddard
Ralph F. Stoll
Courtenay M. Stone
Donald D. Stone
Lester T. Story
Clarence N. Stout
Robert E. Strahl
Jack P. Strickland
William E. Striplin
Joseph R. Stroupe
"Z" "T" Stuart
Clinton F. Stuart
Harold H. Stuart
George Stubblefield, Jr.
Max G. Stucker
John M. Suddreth
Charles R. Sullenger
Archie L. Sullivan
James T. Sullivan
Joseph E. Sullivan
Patrick H. Sullivan
Woodrow Sullivan
Frank Sulewski
Lewis C. Sunday
Fred V. Sutton
Donald E. Swanson
Richard A. Swarts
John W. Sweeny
William D. Sweet
Floyd W. Swedlund
James E. Sykes
Noble L. Taber
Edward J. Takitch
Edward P. Tamassia
James E. Tanner
Oliver Tardy
Michael F. M. Tarker
Zemo C. Tarnowski
"L" "C" Tarver
Stanley R. Taskey
Clarence P. Taylor
Kenneth D. Taylor
Raymond E. Taylor
Robert W. Taylor
Thomas W. Teal
James W. Tenbrink
John A. Tennant
James V. Terrio
Harry H. Tetrick
William L. Thede
Charles L. Theiss
Conrad C. Theiss
Irvin H. Thesman
Arthur R. W. Thomas
Harold B. Thomas
James R. Thomas
Patrick T. Thomas
Ralph C. Thomas
Robert W. Thomas
Arthur E. Thompson
Gerald R. Thompson
Lee R. Thompson
Leslie Thompson
Marcum C. Thompson
Ogden L. Thompson
Warren A. Thompson
Wendell D. Thompson
George C. Thornton
James N. Thornton
Herschel B. Thorpe
Raymond O. Thuftedal
Joseph B. Tiara
Joseph P. Tidwell
Charles E. Tiernan
Raymond J. Tierney
Adolf H. Tietjen
Joel E. Tilley, Jr.
Richard C. Timm
Dennis P. Tinsley
Richard G. Tobin
Merle E. Tomlin
Clifford S. Tomlinson
Ray L. Tomlinson
"J" "L" Tompkins
James F. Toner
Dwight L. Torlay
Gordon E. Townsend
Don M. Tracey
Francis J. Trefero
Henry R. Tribble
Cecil W. Trice
Laverne C. Triplett
Albert E. Tripp
John R. Troike
John B. Trost
Howard H. Troup
Raymond H. Tschirgi
Ray H. Tucker
Otto A. Tuenge, Jr.
Charles Tufts
Francis J. Tuggle
Anthony Tuna
Richard H. Turja
John R. Turner, Jr.
Robert C. Turner
Roger M. Turner
Robert F. Turney
Evert V. Tuttle
John S. Tuttle
Fred H. Tweedy
Ernest B. Twiss
Joseph W. Tyler
Mitchell L. Udick
Arthur F. Ullyot
Thomas E. Ulmer
Clarence E. Ulrich
Maurice J. Underwood
Jake Urech
John C. Valek
John Valletta
Robt. W. Vandenburgh
Edward (n) Van Horn
Arthur H. Van Norden
Earl D. Varnado
Merwyn E. Vasey
Elwood Vaughan
Roy L. Vaught
Norbert P. Vegelahn
Angelo G. Ventresco
Paul A. Veres
Lee H. Vernon
Lansing A. Viccellio
Vincent J. Vlach, Jr.
Donald J. Vlasnik
Stanley P. VonAchen
Donald A. Vonah
Taylor Von Aspern
Earl E. Vroman
John W. Vroman
Fred L. Wadleigh
Walter E. Wadsworth
Armin S. Wagner
James H. Wagner
Clarke B. Walbridge
John S. Walden
Reginald C. Walke
William F. Walker
Howard K. Wallace
Johnnie L. Wallace
Clay D. Wallen
Harold T. Walling
Donald E. Walport
Merle W. Walton
Paul C. Walton
Erling Wangsnes
Dale E. Ward
Dalton C. Ward
Lyttleton T. Ward
William J. Ware
Bueston E. Warf
Wilbur W. Warlick
Lawrence E. Warneke
Vernon L. Warner
Alburn A. Warren
Parker V. Warren
Robert E. Warren
Robert H. Warren
Frank W. Warrick
William T. Waters, Jr.
James C. Watkins
David B. Watson
Tom Watson
Wayne E. Watson
Lowell A. Watts
Wallace S. Weaver
Harry E. Weber
Theodore R. Weber
Warren L. Weekley
Richard M. Wehr
Dick Weidemeyer
Robert W. Weinman
Herman L. Weitz
Gerald G. Weland
Leonard D. Welch
William I. Wellons, Jr.
Ebbie D. Wells
James E. Wenger
Warner L. Wenger
Carl R. Wenz, Jr.
Thomas P. Wesson
Amos E. West
Donald L. West
Thomas L. Westcott
Frank C. Westgate
Hector R. Weston
Robert E. Wheeler
Robert I. Wheeler
William A. Wheeler
William G. Whisler
Dale White
Donald T. White
Edward White
Ernest L. White
Ferlin E. White
Floyd L. White
Gordon C. White
Jack E. White
John D. White
Lloyd R. White
Ray C. White
Thomas A. Whitlock
Homer C. Whittaker
John P. Wicks
Everett E. Wigington
Frank A. Wigner
George Wilder, Jr.
Theodore J. Wildman
James L. Wilkerson
Charles F. Wilkie
Howard F. Wilks
Vincent L. Willerton
Finley C. Williams
Gordon W. Williams
Harold W. Williams
Harry G. Williams
Hatch W. Williams, Jr.
Ivan R. Williams
Milo M. Williams
Roger L. Williams
Wesley R. Williams
Wilmot L. Williams
Harold F. Williamson
Perl B. Williamson
Oscar R. Willingham
Henry C. Willis
Louis A. Wilson
Robert E. Wilson
Vernon Wilson
Walter O. Wilson
William R. Wilson
Henry F. Windle
Clayton C. Windsor
Robert E. Winfield
Boyd E. Winfree
James W. Winkler
Wilton Winne
George H. Winslow
Charles H. Wittman, Jr.
Matthew J. Wojcicki
Matthew A. Wojdak
Peter T. F. Wolf
George K. Wolfes
Stanley E. Wolford
Donald E. Wommer
Clifford A. Wood
Olen T. Wood
William W. Wooden
Vernon A. Woods
Robert B. Wooster
Edmund L. Wortley
Francis J. Woznack
Walter J. Wraga
Dudley C. Wray
Walter Wrigglesworth, Jr.
Joseph L. Wright
Neil Wright
Robert R. Wright
George R. Wrigley
Joseph J. Yakich
Paul F. Yates
Norman E. Yenter
Edward M. Yonts, Jr.
Daniel A. York
Joe T. York
Charles E. Young, Jr.
Elza H. Young
Frederick J. Young
James L. Young
Thomas C. Young
William A. Young
Stanley W. Yount

Wallace E. Zabler
Howard C. Zangel
Roland J. Zavodny
Otto B. Zemke
Bernard L. Zentz
Maurice W. Zink
Leo J. Zok
Gerard P. Zornow
Baselio G. Zorzanello
Daniel P. Zylla

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Bruce B. Barnhill
Robert J. Fleischaker
Robert B. Green
John I. F. Knudhansen
Robert C. Lehman
Robert W. Mackie
Walter S. Matthews, Jr.
Harry C. Nordstrom
Edwin Shapard III
Frank M. Thornburg
William C. Turville

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Walter B. Adams
Charles C. Alexander
Leslie R. Allen
Sidney C. Allison
Melvin S. Amundsen
Paul L. Anderson
James F. Armlin
Conway C. Baker
Claude F. Bartlett
Cornelius Baumann
Hugh J. Beadnell
Arthur N. Beausoleil
Paul N. Bentley
Richard Bergen
Thomas W. Bevans
Elwood M. Bevins
John Bielot
Hubert A. Blankinship
William J. Brask
Richard C. Brown
Thomas M. Brown
John Burk
Fredrick J. Cadotte
Frank C. Caplinger
Loren E. Caraveau
Clarence E. Carlson
Whitney A. Chamberlain
Myron W. Charles
Marsden Christiansen
Earl G. Clement
John W. Clift
Ivan A. Coler-Dark
John Cozy
Reginald E. Daniels
Robert W. H. Darrow
Edgar B. Doles
Mark W. Douthit
John M. Dunn
Paul W. Eldridge
Thomas J. Emmett, Jr.
Rae D. Endorf
Robert L. Evans
Ray S. Ewing
William B. Farley
Paul B. Fitch
John L. Foil
Earl G. Fossum
William L. Foster
Homer G. Galliher
Richard F. Gascoigne
Paul Gertiser
Levi T. Gootschall
John H. Gorman
Gerald W. Green
Eugene G. Greene
Gordon L. Groover, Jr.
Albert E. Grover
August J. Harter
Robyn H. Henderson
James E. Hickey
Earl F. Hilderbrant
George A. Johnson
James E. Johnson
Orville A. Johnson
Robert C. Johnson
Willis B. Jones
Bernard Kambeitz
Ernest C. Knight
Michael B. Kozik
Raymond M. Kroger
Richard J. Kronberger
Alfred G. Lachmann
Luther R. Lane
Charles M. Lanford
Edwin B. Lauderdale
Arthur W. Lazcano
Francis Leribeus
James H. Lewis, Jr.
Anthony V. Liburdy
William D. Little
George Lott
Charles E. Lowe
Robert C. Lyons
Alfred V. B. Marrin
Alexander P. Martin
Adolph Mathews
Martti O. Mattila
Wendell McCrory
Roy M. McDaniel
Huston W. McGlothlin
Tadeus T. Merritt
Dewayne C. Miller
Edward J. Miller
Joseph A. Morgan
William J. Mosley
Fred Murphy
Finley A. Nash, Jr.
Merlyn A. Nelson
John H. Nuck
John E. C. Ott
George L. Owen
Frank L. Pearce, Jr.
Albert R. Phillips
Rodney K. Purnell
John E. Rafferty
Charles P. Ramsey
Dean W. Rhoads
Richard G. Rowley
William H. Settle
Leonard A. Schuman
Felix A. Sharek
Bennie J. A. Sidoti
James F. Simpson
Joseph J. Snapp
James W. Stinnett
Cecil Suarez
Martin K. Thomas
Philip A. Tremblay
Eugene L. Tucker
Berry F. Turner
Lennus B. Urquhart
Byron Uskievich
Charles A. Vasey
Arthur F. Wall
Jessie J. Ward
Nephi J. Ward
John S. Weaver
Robert B. Webster
Robert A. Wells
Albert E. West
James W. Wheeler
George K. Wilcox
Marion E. Wilcox
Everett B. Wiley
Harold J. Williams
Bentley L. Wilson
William H. Wright
Warren H. Young
Felix S. Zych

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

Soren H. F. Andresen
Joseph P. Cusack
Edgar A. Day
Arthur L. Dominy
William F. Doyle
Carl Elwood
James E. Emerson
Robert C. Fenning
Elmo M. T. Hawkins
Richard P. Heyl
Jackson D. Hunter
James W. Lewis
James W. Lipscomb
George L. Martin
Edward R. Martineau
Bernard J. McDonnell
Harold E. Meade
Stanley A. Mroczka
Wendell S. Palmer
William G. Sodt, Jr.
William G. Tennant
Thomas B. Uber 2d
Oscar Weber

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

John M. Bannister, Jr.
Robert C. Coffin, Jr.
Francis F. Conners
John M. Daniels
Earl F. Gibbons
Leo Liberman
Cushing Phillips, Jr.
O'Neill P. Quinlan

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Robert A. Anderson
Elwood R. Bernhausen
Ralph M. Bishop
Joseph G. Chudzinski
John W. Lieuallen, Jr.
Glen H. McGee
Kenneth R. Pfeiffer
Jerome J. Steinaur

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Willie R. Barnett
Carter G. Brooks
Carl P. Calhoun
Anthony N. Diaz
Edward Dominguez
Clinton H. Dutcher
Benjamin F. Edington, Jr.
Daniel F. Horne
William B. Hull
Eugene V. Kadow
James W. Kinder
Warren L. Miller
Russell S. Nance
Clair L. Patterson
Charlie A. Rice, Jr.
John J. Sarsfield
Jack M. Shirley
Milfred E. Sims
Lauren J. Smith
Emmett L. Van Landingham
Charles R. Wannemacher

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Nellie R. Backlin
Louise J. Bartlett
Mary R. Becker
Nellie B. Burock
Elois M. Duffy
Marguerite L. Durnwald
Lillee E. Elledge
Marguerite Good
Helen L. Kuebler
Helen A. Mieras
Lucile P. Miller
Eugenia L. Moseley
Catherine O'Donnell
Mary E. Orlando
Gloria C. Parisi
Elizabeth L. Pollock
Mary A. Prescott
Carolina M. Prunskunas
Ellen E. Fullekinus
Alma R. Ross
Phyllis A. Scungio
Verona B. Sprecher
Veronica A. Stein
Kathryn A. D. Trayers
Martha A. VanWye
Inez Watson
Emma R. Wing
Kate Young

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve on active duty for temporary appointment to the grade of lieutenant subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the line of the Naval Reserve:

Wilbur R. Brooks
Philip W. Clemens
Forrest R. Colebank
William L. Connell
Joseph J. Currier
Harvey A. Drake
Howard J. Forsgren
Walter I. Gille
Edward K. Gross
Walter E. Hiner
Frank W. Holub
Robert N. Hurt
Robert P. Jones
Dale F. Mabry
Frank J. Manno
Jack A. Martin
James M. Martin
John J. McGrath, Jr.
Clifford C. McLean
Harold P. Merrill
Anthony M. Mettes
William W. Milleson
Mark N. Newcomb
William S. Norris
Billie E. O'Brien
Arthur J. Perkett, Jr.
Edward J. Scharnikow
Howard A. Schlundt
Edward S. Shahin
Leroy A. Sundberg
Elmer N. Thompson
Rex J. Tucker
Dana A. Turpin
John A. Volk

The following-named officer for temporary appointment in the Medical Corps of the Naval Reserve:

Norvell L. Peterson

The following-named officer for temporary appointment in the Supply Corps of the Naval Reserve:

Demetris J. Peppones

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Chaplain Corps of the Naval Reserve:

Warren L. Bost
Thomas A. Clayton
Carlton C. French
Charles F. Karnasiewics
Raymond J. Talty

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Nurse Corps of the Naval Reserve:

Bertha M. Davis
Mary E. Dyer
Ursula M. Fox
Rose A. Gallagher
Dorothy M. McAleer
Dorothy J. O'Neill
Ruth M. Scanlon

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment in the line of the Navy:

James H. Ackiss
Algred E. Adams
Daniel B. Adams
Donald F. Adams
Frank M. Adams
Joseph L. Adelman
Warren E. Aeschbach
Luther A. Ahrendts
William J. Aicklen, Jr.
Edward T. Alberta
John G. Albright
Charles K. Allendorf
George A. Amacker, Jr.
Robert W. Ambrose
Robert L. Amelang
Richard D. Amme
Charles R. Anderson
James L. Anderson
Richard W. Anderson
Roy T. Anderson
David D. Ansel
Edward P. Appert
Richard O. Applebach
Grant P. Apthrop
John R. Arguelles
Francis L. Armstrong
Roy C. Atkinson
Victor K. Aubrey, Jr.
Gerald J. August
William H. Austin, Jr.
Frank S. Averill
Arnold W. Avery
James E. Ayres
Francis M. Bacon
Robert B. Bade
Joseph Baer, Jr.
Worth H. Bagley
Wallace B. Bagwell
Daniel L. Bailey
Emera S. Bailey
Ralston Bailey
Harold J. Baker
James J. Baker
Paul B. Baker
Raymond N. Baker
John M. Balfe
Erwin J. Ballje, Jr.
Bernard J. Bandish
Daniel L. Banks, Jr.
Neil G. Barbour
Robert N. Barker
Cecil E. Barley
Ralph E. Barnard
Alan F. Barnes
George B. Barnett
James H. Barr
Robert M. Barr, Jr.
Franklin M. Barrell, Jr.
Bruce O. Barrington
James H. Barry
William Barry
Paul F. Basilius
James D. Baskin, Jr.
Charles G. Batt, Jr.
James A. Baxter
Edward R. Beane
Robert G. Beck
William Beck, Jr.
Bradford A. Becken
Marvin J. Becker
Terrill F. Becker
John Bell, Jr.
Thomas I. Bell
Walter F. Bennett
Robert D. Bergman
Burton E. Berilund
Raymond R. Bernier
Fred J. Bernstein
David P. L. Berry
Carl O. Best
Byron N. Bettis
Delbert A. Beyer
Henry J. Beyer
Richard A. Bihr
Lawrence Bilder
Comer H. Bird, Jr.
Lloyd I. Biscomb, Jr.
Billy P. Bishop
Homer R. Bivin
Marvin L. Black
Ira W. Blair
William P. Blair
Harvey N. Blakeney
Carl A. Blank
William D. Blevins
Arthur B. Bliesener
David H. Blumberg
William E. Blythe
Ralph A. Bobsin
Clarence E. Boger
Robert L. Bolling
John C. Bond, Jr.
Merson Booth
Fredric G. Bouwman
John L. Bowden, Jr.
Floyd D. Bowdey
James W. Bowen
Thomas J. Bowen
Richard L. Bowers
James C. Bowes
George R. Bowling, Jr.
Robert J. Brabant
Frederick G. Bradshaw
Ray H. Bradshaw
Donald P. Brady
Ralph Brandt

Lloyd L. Brassaw, Jr.
John S. Brayton, Jr.
Thomas B. Brenner
Winston D. Briggs
Thomas B. Brittain, Jr.
Louis M. Brizzolara
Frederick B. Bromley
Rupert Brooke
Bryan B. Brown, Jr.
Kenneth C. Brown
Louis F. Brown
Moody B. Brown, Jr.
Walter A. Brown, Jr.
Thomas J. Bruck
Dale C. Brumbaugh
James W. Brummer
George H. Bryan, Jr.
Robert E. Bublitz
Maurice D. Buck
Samuel J. Bunger
Sumner W. Burgess
Thomas J. Burgoyne
John C. Burkart
Edwin J. Burke
James A. Burke
Lorenzo G. Burton, Jr.
Philip R. Bush
Charles I. Buxton II
Ward G. Byington
Arthur D. Caine
John D. Callaway, Jr.
Gene I. Campbell
Richard D. Campbell
Charles S. Carlisle
Frederick Carment, Jr.
Ralph H. Carnahan
Norris W. Carnes
Alfred C. Carpenter
Harold L. Carpenter
Felix R. Carr
Charles J. Carroll, Jr.
John L. Carroll
Kent J. Carroll
James E. Carter, Jr.
Wallace R. Carter
Edson G. Case
Charles W. Causey, Jr.
Stanley M. Cecil
Frank A. Cermak, Jr.
Daniel Chadwick
Raymond E. Chamberlain, Jr.
Donald E. Chandler
James H. Chapman
Frank J. Christopher
Albert H. Clark
Carroll D. Clark
Robert T. Clark
Robert E. Classen
John W. Clayton
Marwood R. Clement, Jr.
Robert R. Clement
Reginald D. Clubb
Warren R. Cobean, Jr.
Milo G. Coerper
Joseph P. Cofer, Jr.
Carl R. Coggins
William P. Cohn
John E. Cohoon
Kenneth J. Cole
Robert C. Collier
Peter Colot
Richard G. Colquhoun
Vernon W. Condon
Robert H. Conn
Robert F. Conway
Edward L. Cook, Jr.
William J. Cook
James B. Copenhaver, Jr.
John O. Coppedge
John D. Corse
Carl S. Costanzo
Robert Cowell
Calvin C. Cowley
John H. Cover
John W. Crane, Jr.
Richard T. Crane
Jackson B. Craven, Jr.
Bentley B. Crawford
Bert H. Creighton, Jr.
Robert E. Creque
Robert A. Cressman
Charles B. Crockett, Jr.
William J. Crowe, Jr.
Seymour F. Crumpler
Charles W. Cummings
Donald E. Cummings
Robert E. Cummings, Jr.
Douglas T. Cummins
Peter P. Cummins
David R. Cundy
William C. Curran
Hal L. Curry
Lawrence J. Curtin
Harry L. Curtis, Jr.
Harland B. Cutshall
Richard A. Dadisman
Duilo D'Albora
Paul H. Dallmann
Howard B. Dalton, Jr.
Keith C. Darby
Lynn A. Davenport
Thomas T. Davenport
Alan N. Davidson
James B. Davidson
John D. Davidson
Ray E. Davis
Richard P. Davis
Theodore F. Davis
William J. Davis
Dale B. Deatherage
Frank A. Deaton
Donald J. DeBaets
Ronald M. DeBaets
Albert R. Deckert
Robert M. Deffenbaugh
James A. de Ganahl
Harry M. De Laney
John J. Dempsey
George M. Dent
Jeremiah A. Denton, Jr.
Carlos Dew, Jr.
Theodore J. DeWerd
Ward A. DeWitt
John L. Dickey
Robert M. Dickey
James G. Dickson, Jr.
Richard D. Dickson
Philip C. Diem
Jarl J. Diffendorfer
Allen F. Dill
William R. Dillen
Alva L. Dixon
Robert E. Dobyns
Willard C. Doe
John F. Doheny
Charles E. Donaldson III
William I. Donaldson
Donald L. Donohugh
William K. Doran
William R. Dougherty
Stephen P. Douglas
Walter M. Douglass
James H. Doyle, Jr.
Eugene A. Drabent
Jack V. Drago
John F. Drake
David I. Draz
Harold M. Dryer
John P. Duckett
Henry R. Duden, Jr.
Peter H. H. Dunn, Jr.
Vernon M. Dupy
Walter D. Durden
Michael F. Durkin
Charles J. Eadie
Joseph E. Earl
Harold L. Edwards
Edward J. Eisenman
Kenneth O. Ekelund, Jr.
Frank L. Elefante
Joseph M. Ellis
Samuel S. Ellis
Joseph S. Elmer
Leslie A. Else
Robert E. Enright
Charles W. Epps
Herman J. Estelman
Robert W. Etcher
Joseph D. Evans
William B. Evans
Donald W. Everett
Philip B. Fairman
Donald W. Fantozzi
James E. Farley
George W. Farris
Frederick A. Farris
Donald D. Farshing, Jr.
Verne J. Feeney
James P. Fellows
Wilbur G. Ferris
Reginald V. Ferry
Gerald C. Field
Norman L. Finch
Gordon R. Finke
John P. Finley, Jr.
John G. Finneran
David W. Fischer
John R. Fisher
Paul E. Fisher
Paul F. FitzGerald
Edward L. Fitzgibbons
William R. Fitzwilson
Joseph P. Flanagan, Jr.
Robert E. Fleischli
Gene C. Fletcher
Robert P. Fletcher III
Guy W. Ford, Jr.
Wendell C. Forehand
William E. Forsthoff
Thomas E. Fortson
William L. Foster
Robert E. Fredricks
Harold H. Freeland
Ernest S. Fritz
Richard Fuller
Gerald A. Gafford
Donald M. Gaines
John D. Gantt
Edwin T. Garbee
Richard S. Gardiner
David L. Gardner
James S. Gardner
Walter T. Gardner, Jr.
Stanley P. Gary
Robert P. Gatewood
William H. Gatts
William W. Gay
John T. Geary
Richard L. Gehring
Robert M. George
William M. Georgen
Mark H. German
James T. Gibbs
Joseph M. Gibson
Muscoe M. Gibson
Frank Gilliand
Joseph D. Gleckler
Charles O. Glisson, Jr.
Noah W. Gokey III
Robert R. Goldsborough, Jr.
Donald V. Gorman
Harry T. Gower, Jr.
Robert F. Gower
Ferdinand A. Graham, Jr.
Horace E. Graham
William T. G. Granat
William J. Grant
Dalbert D. Grantham
Leland T. Gray, Jr.
Oscar Greene, Jr.
Wallace A. Greene
John I. Gresham
"J" "C" Grieb
Boyce H. Grier
James W. Griffin
William E. Grimes
Robert O. Groover, Jr.
James R. Gross
George S. Grove
Louis H. Guertin
Rex Gygax
Robert B. Hadden
Donald W. Haggerty
George C. Hahn
Arnold A. Hahnfeld
John W. Haizlip, Jr.
James R. Hale
Donald M. Hall
Harold D. Hall
James F. Hall
Richard L. Hall
Orval K. Hallam
Oliver S. Hallett
Joe Hamilton
David L. Hancock
John W. Handel, Jr.
Richard J. Hanley
Jerome W. Hannigan
Albert B. Hansen
Edgar G. Hanson
Wayne B. Harbarger, Jr.
Guy C. Hare
William C. Harmon
John R. Harper
William L. Harris, Jr.
James B. Harsha
Harry S. Hart
Richard V. Hartman
Willard R. Hartman
James C. Hatch
Donald L. Hathway
Erwin E. J. Hauber
Glenn N. Hawley
Saymore T. Hays, Jr.
William G. Hearne
Edward J. Hedbawny
George F. Hedrick, Jr.
Howard G. Heininger
Edgar H. Hemmer
Eugene M. Henry
George L. Henry
Carl A. Henzel
Francis C. Hertzog, Jr.
James H. Herzog
John A. Hess
Lawrence E. Hess, Jr.
William S. Hewitt
Wilbur M. Hickman
John R. High
Edward C. Hill
Elmer R. Hill, Jr.
James M. Hill, Jr.
John W. Hill
Robert E. Hill
William L. Hinkle
Bruce R. Hoefer
Jack G. Holbrook
William P. Holden
Ansel C. Holland
Daniel L. Hollis, Jr.
Richard S. Hollyer
John R. Holm
John R. Hoover
Jack A. Horst
George W. Hosking
Donald F. Houck
William L. Hough
Donnell Howard
John M. Howard
"T" "R" Howard
Robert E. Howe
David B. Hubbs
Verne R. Hubka
Norman P. Huddle
Thomas J. Hudner, Jr.
Charles B. Huggins
Thomas Hughes, Jr.
Thomas J. Hughes, Jr.
Harold E. Huling
Guy E. Hunter
Perry F. Hunter III
Ralph R. Huston, Jr.
Robert Irving
Byron M. Jackson, Jr.
Lee S. Jackson, Jr.
Thomas E. Jackson
John W. Jahant
James N. Jameson
Charles R. Jeffs, Jr.
Merlin F. Jenkins
Robert T. Jenkins
Verne H. Jennings, Jr.
Svend I. Jenson
Donald R. Jermann
Malvern H. L. Jester
Frederick F. Jewett II
Donald R. Jex
Arnol Johnson, Jr.
John D. Johnson, Jr.
John T. Johnson
Lester F. Johnson
Peter Johnson, Jr.
Richard C. Johnson
Theodore R. Johnson, Jr.
Walter F. Johnson
Walter M. Johnson, Jr.
William M. Johnson, Jr.
John W. Johnston
Richard C. Johnston
Frank L. Johnstone
Addis T. Jones
Richard S. Jones
Stanley W. Jones
Charles T. Joy, Jr.
Harry A. J. Joyce
Scott M. Julian, Jr.
Martin S. Kaluza
Howard F. Kane
Mitchel J. Karlowicz
Robert H. Karsten
Edward F. Kaska
Allen P. Kauffman
Stuart D. Kearney
Robert B. Keating
Timothy J. Keen
Francis L. Keith
William T. Kelleher
Harry S. Keller, Jr.
William F. Keller, Jr.
Quinten A. Kelso
William R. Kent
William A. Kern
Lawrence B. Kidder
Kaye R. Kiddoo
Elmer H. Kiehl
Joseph F. Kimpflen
Harry W. King
Ogden D. King, Jr.
Stewart A. Kingsbury
Ralph H. Kinser, Jr.
George G. E. Kirk
James Kirkpatrick
Charles A. Kiser
Charles C. Kitchen
Roy F. Kleist
William E. Knaebel
Thomas C. Knight
Cline H. Knowles, Jr.
Don R. Koch
Peter C. Kochis
William H. Koenig
Frank J. Korb
Joseph T. Kosnick
Edwin R. Koster
Donald J. Krejcarek
Walter J. Krstich
Robert J. Kubiszewski
Philip Kwart
Walter J. Kwitkoski
William S. Lagen
James D. LaHaye
Humphrey L. Laitner
Keith G. Lakey
Tomme J. Lambertson
Nathaniel B. Land
James C. Landes, Jr.
John D. Langford
Howard N. Larcombe, Jr.
George M. Larkin, Jr.
Norman E. Larsen
Charles R. Larzalere
William M. Lavelle
Robert E. Lawrence
Richard G. Layser
Roth S. Leddick
Earl B. Lee
Gerald A. Lee
James F. Lee
Robert E. Lee
Neale E. Leete
Alan E. LeFever
Donald D. Lemmon
Jeremiah E. Lenihan
Gerard T. Lennon
John C. Lewis
Richard G. Lilly, Jr.
Harlan W. Lindenmuth
Isham W. Linder
Ivan L. Linder
George B. Lingren
Eugene R. Lippman
Robert E. Lloyd
John A. Logan II
Charles R. Longo
Ollie J. Loper
Donald Loranger
Joseph D. Lorenz
Percival D. Lowell, Jr.
Walter R. Luoma
Robert A. Lusk
Donald C. Lutken
William J. Lutkenhouse
Robert E. Lynch
Robert L. Lyon
John T. Lyons, Jr.
Ivan L. MacDonald
Mark M. Macomber
Benjamin H. Macon
Joseph W. Maguire
John Q. Mahon
Daniel R. H. Mahoney
Max E. Malan
George Maragos
George P. March
Louis A. Marckesano
Earl J. Marks, Jr.
Robert A. Marmet
Lawrence A. Marousek
Frank D. Marsall
Frank J. Marsden, Jr.
Barney Martin
Claude F. Martin, Jr.
Frederick V. Martin
Peter Maruschak
Stephen D. Marvin
John M. Mathews
William R. Mathews, Jr.
Evan T. Mathis, Jr.
Howard L. Matthews, Jr.
Pierce Matthews, Jr.
Valentin G. Matula
Herbert W. Maw
William T. Mawhiney
Allen F. Maxfield
Jack A. Maxwell
Donald R. Mayer
Allison L. Maynard
Walter M. Maginniss
Emiel R. Meisel
Robert W. Meissner
Joseph H. Melesky
John B. Melton, Jr.
Harry E. Menconi, Jr.
Ray D. Mering, Jr.
Marcus P. Merner
John A. Merritt III
Edmund D. Mesloh
Jeffrey C. Metzel, Jr.
Isaac W. Metzger
Oliver F. Midgette
Bernard L. Miles
Paul G. Miller
Eugene J. Minger

Ralph H. Minor
Lester L. Mische
Eugene B. Mitchell
Randolph Mitchell, Jr.
Robert W. Mitchell
Arthur W. Moesta, Jr.
Kent B. Moneypeny, Jr.
Charles M. Moore
Harold D. Moore
William G. Moore, Jr.
Lawrence E. Morgan
Newton H. Morgan
Daniel J. Morgiewicz
Norbert L. Moriarty
John R. Morris
Joshua R. Morriss, Jr.
James L. Moss
Walter G. Moyle, Jr.
David G. Muller
Maurice O. Muncie
Henry F. Munnikhuysen
Daniel J. Murphy
Wilburn D. Murphy
William F. Murphy, Jr.
Donald S. Murray
Harrison C. Murray
Kenneth A. Murray
Stuart G. Murray
Robert L. Murrill
Clyde J. Musholt
Murdock M. McLeod
Joseph E. McConnell
Edward J. McCormack, Jr.
Dale W. McCormick
David A. McCoskrie
William H. McCracken
Ellis P. McCurley
Charles B. McDaniel
William O. McDaniel
Heyward E. McDonald
Roble A. McDonald, Jr.
Wesley L. McDonald
Robert H. McDougal
Edward S. McGehee
James F. McGowan
Joseph W. McGrath, Jr.
Joseph F. McKenzie
Lawrence H. McKenzie
William W. McKenzie, Jr.
Jay G. McKie
Robert T. McKinley
Robert H. McKinney
Norman H. McLaughlin
James P. McMahon
Frank D. McMullen, Jr.
Robert B. McNatt
Richard D. McNeil
Gordon E. McPadden
Kenneth M. McVay
Don C. McVey
Arthur D. Napior
Ernest Natke
Richard H. Nelson
Frank R. Nesbitt
John H. Nicholson
Anthony L. Nicolais
Charles E. C. Nimitz
Alfred B. Nimocks, Jr.
William Nivison
Louis W. Nocklod
Delbert W. Nordberg
Roy F. Norment
Jerry J. Nuss
Paul M. Nutter
Owen H. Oberg
Edmund W. O'Callaghan
Thomas A. O'Connell
Thomas J. O'Connell
Ralph E. Odgers
Edward F. O'Dougherty, Jr.
Samuel B. Ogden, Jr.
John P. O'Grady
Henry F. Ohme
Bruce J. Oliver
Richard A. Olson
Edward Onofrio
John Ortutray, Jr.
Carl J. Ostertag, Jr.
Harold R. Outten, Jr.
Robert E. Otto
Albert T. Owens
John D. Owens
Lewis F. Ozimek
Duncan Packer
Ronald D. Pankratz
Donald R. Patch
John J. Pavelle, Jr.
Andrew J. Peacock, Jr.
George R. M. Pearson
Jack B. Pearson
Norman E. Penfold
Robert C. Peniston
John P. Peterson
William S. Peterson
Warren E. Pettee
Thomas D. Pfundstein
John J. Phelan, Jr.
Aloysius J. Pickert, Jr.
George W. Pitcher
Otto G. Pitz, Jr.
Joseph E. Pline
Robert R. Poitras
Robert D. Pollard
Leslie K. Pomeroy, Jr.
John E. Pope
William R. Porter
Earl E. Portz
James A. Powell
Robert A. Powell
William C. Powell, Jr.
John H. Pownall
Thomas G. Pownall
Robert J. Poynter
James C. Purcell
William C. Rae, Jr.
John J. Raftery
William O. Rainnie, Jr.
James C. Rappenecker
Henry B. Rathbone
John H. Ratliff
Charles E. Rawson
Francis J. Readdy
Francis P. Reardon
Lynn D. Reed
William C. Reeder
Clyde V. Reese, Jr.
Walter H. Reese
William F. Regan
Jeremiah D. Reilly, Jr.
Warren S. Reinschmidt
Conrad J. Renner, Jr.
Louis T. Renz
James F. Rex
John L. Reynolds
Ivan F. Rezny
William W. Rhoads
Harold G. Rich
George F. Richards, Jr.
John P. M. Richards II
Jewitt E. Richardson
William G. Ridgway
Julian W. Riehl, Jr.
Edward E. Riley
Arthur D. Robbins
Edwin B. Robbins
Louis V. Roberts
Joe P. Robertson, Jr.
Robert F. Roche
Clyde R. Rockwood
Henry P. Rodgers, Jr.
Hollis T. Rodgers
Charles R. Roe
David G. Rogers
Edmund D. Rogers, Jr.
William H. Rogers
Henry G. Rollins, Jr.
Louis A. Romatowski, Jr.
Charles J. Rose
Jack D. Rose
Vernon D. Rose, Jr.
Royal R. Ross
Emil S. Roth
Ernest D. Ruff, Jr.
James D. Rumble
Henry D. Ruppel
Albert H. Rusher
Loren H. Russell
William M. Russell
Robert T. Ruxton, Jr.
Donald F. Ryder
Frederick C. Sachse, Jr.
Robert R. Salyard
Herman J. Sanders
William T. Sanders, Jr.
Wilton T. Sanders, Jr.
Andrew R. Sansom
James O. Saul
Mimo L. Scappini
William N. Schaefer
John B. Schafer
Ralph Scheidenhelm
William F. Scheller
Leonard F. Schempp, Jr.
Robert E. Schenk
Stanley J. Schiller
Robert F. Schneidwind
Robert E. Schock
John A. Schomaker
Arnold R. Schuknecht
Foster R. Schuler
Robert E. Schwartz
Edward A. Scoles
Robert L. Scott
Edwin W. Sellman
Joseph Senkow
John A. Serrie, Jr.
Chester H. Shaddeau, Jr.
John J. Shanahan, Jr.
Fletcher H. Shaw
John Shea
George M. Sheldon
John P. Shelton
Martin J. Sheridan
Donald L. Shield
Charles W. Sholes
Donald E. Shorts
Charles M. Shuey
John R. Shunny
Andrew B. Sides, Jr.
Albert W. Sieloff
John A. Simmons, Jr.
Joseph T. Simons
William M. Simpich
Luther B. Sisson
Fernando Sisto, Jr.
Donald K. Skinner
Robert W. Sloan
Charles E. Slonim
Will F. Small
Aubrey H. Smith
Bernard E. Smith, Jr.
Bertram C. Smith
Carlton B. Smith
Charles W. Smith
Frank B. Smith
Griffin P. Smith, Jr.
John C. Smith
Philip C. Smith, Jr.
Robert H. Smith, Jr.
Robert S. Smith
Stanford S. Smith
Stuart S. Smith
Thomas W. Smith
William C. Smith
Winfield S. Smith
Leonard A. Snead
Robert O. Snure
James G. Snyder
John E. Snyder
Frank G. Sorensen, Jr.
Richard B. Southwell
Arthur G. Spahr
Willis L. Spann
William A. Spencer
Donald D. Spoon
Ernest R. Stacey
Leroy G. Stafford, Jr.
James B. Stagg
Robert N. Stair
Hilton L. Stanley
Stewart M. Steen
Robert S. Stegman
Arthur S. Steloff
George C. Stevens
Jack M. Stevens
William R. St. George
James B. Stockdale
Francis K. Stone
John H. Stone, Jr.
Robert S. Stone
Richard E. Storey
Robert W. Strickler
James K. Stuhldreher
John M. Sullivan
Charles K. Summitt
George C. Sup
Kermit R. Sutliff
Milton L. Sutter, Jr.
Stanley L. Sweeder
Henry G. Swicord, Jr.
John L. Switzer
John P. Sydow
Gordon P. Talcott
James F. Tangney
John F. Tarpey
David J. Taylor
Robert H. Taylor
William A. Teasley, Jr.
John Teed
Leonard A. Tepper
Wirt C. Thayer
Frank R. Thienpont
Edward W. Thomas
Paul B. Thomas
John C. Thompson
Robert W. Thompson
William F. Thompson
Neil W. Thomson
John L. Thornton
Gerald F. Thummel
Frank A. Thurtell
Thomas J. Tiernan
Herbert I. Tilles
James T. Timidaiski
Edmund B. Titcomb
George Tkach
David R. Toll
Donald L. Toohill
Wycliffe D. Toole, Jr.
John W. Townes, Jr.
Earl N. Trickey
Roscoe L. Trout
Ralph M. Tucker
Merritt D. Tuel
John C. Turner
Stansfield Turner
John C. Turnier
Frederick W. Ulbright
Richard P. Umbel
Howard S. Unangst
Archie J. Updike
Henry Urban, Jr.
Paul R. VanMater, Jr.
Robert C. Van Osdol
John R. VanSickle
Irwin J. Viney
Kenneth H. Volk
Robert L. VonGerichten
Chandler L. VonSchrader
Frederic H. E. Vose
Stephen J. Vose
William D. Wallace
William Waller, Jr.
Wayne P. Warlick
Harry L. Warren, Jr.
Victor G. Warriner
Leo B. Warring
Robert W. Watkins
Reid B. Watt
Arthur V. Weaver, Jr.
John K. Weaver
Joseph D. Weed, Jr.
Robert E. Weeks
William K. Weidman
Howard A. Weiss
Timothy F. Wellings, Jr.
Donald M. Wells
John T. Wells
John W. Wells
Marvin G. Wells
Luther Welsh
Donald D. Welt
Donald B. Wenger
David A. Wente
Thomas N. Werner
Kent J. Weber
Robert B. Whitegiver II
Vivien C. Whitmire
Donald B. Whitmire
Gordon S. Whittaker
Henry D. Whittle, Jr.
Herbert E. Whyte
William F. Wicks
Bryan D. Wiggins
Charles F. Willett
Buck D. Williams, Jr.
Hexter A. Williams
James S. Williams
John G. Williams, Jr.
Joseph L. Williams, Jr.
Richard C. Williams
Thomas C. Williams
Preston C. Wilmoth
James B. Wilson
Joseph R. Wilson
Virgil M. Wilson
Lionel L. Winans
James W. Winston
Edward G. Wood
William D. Wood
David A. Woodard
William L. Woods, Jr.
Patrick L. Working
Walter Wysocki, Jr.
Wallace N. Yates
Richard P. Yeatman
Austin V. Young.
George E. Young, Jr.
Laurence R. Young
Douglas J. Yuengling
Philip Zenner IV
George M. Zieber, Jr.
Richard E. Ziegler
Marvin W. Zumwalt

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Bernard Abrams
Richard T. Allan
Richard F. Babler
Roger S. Bagnall
Arthur H. L. Barlow
Roger I. Bateman, Jr.
John A. Bellan, Jr.
Robert W. Bender
Robert G. Bigham, Jr.
Robert S. Blassic
Alfred P. Bollens
Robert G. Bollman
Jack M. Brennan
"J" Randell Bridges, Jr.
Lowell E. Brown
George O. R. Brungot
Robert E. Buntain
Robert L. Butchart
Arthur G. Butler, Jr.
Peter Calcagno
John C. Carlson
William C. Carpenter
George O. Case
Author E. Charette
Arthur L. Child III
Anthony F. Chupalio
Richard Claussenius
John F. Cohen
LeRoy E. Coon
Perry B. Crouch
Hoyle H. Daniels II
Robert D. Day
Ralph E. Deem
Charley P. Dellinger
Robert W. Depew
James V. DeSanto
Grover C. Dixon
Joseph A. Donnelly
Andrew S. Dowd
James G. Downey
Hubert W. Duffie
Stuart J. Evans
George W. Fairfield, Jr.
Robert H. Ferris
Robert D. Fisher
Julius W. Fitzpatrick
John E. Fjelsta
James H. Forbes, Jr.
Robert G. Ford
Vincent Forlenza
George O. Fowler, Jr.
Alan J. Frankel
Samuel E. Frock
Robert E. Fronke
Roy A. Frye, Jr.
Edward F. Gaetz, Jr.
Alton C. Gallup
Gerald H. Goldstein
Carlton E. Hamel
Frank L. Hanson
Melvin W. Harris
Billy W. Hart
Roy E. Hatton
Richard H. Hauck
Herbert S. Hillard, Jr.
John Hiza
Carl M. Hobkirk
Rex V. Hoffman, Jr.
Arthur W. Holfield, Jr.
Robert O. Holt
Earl W. Horngren
Richard P. Howard
James F. Huntress
Karl A. Johnson
Richard D. Johnson
Warren B. Johnson
John F. Jones
William B. Kash
Joseph I. Keenan
Bruce W. Keller
Dean L. Kellogg
Patrick F. Kennedy
Floyd O. Kenyon
Reed H. Knight
John D. Knipple
Jaromir J. Kolinsky
Henry F. Kramp
William K. Lampman
George H. Laning
Bob R. Lindsey
Edward B. Longmuir, Jr.
Herbert M. Lundien, Jr.
John F. Marshall
Donald V. Martin
James H. Marx
Ivan B. Maxon
Robert J. McAdams
Thomas O. McDonald
James F. McGarry, Jr.
John J. McGee
James E. McKenna
Marvin E. McMullen
Ralph E. Moon, Jr.
William A. Murauskas
Paul T. Murray
William T. Nash
Enoch W. Nunn
Harry W. O'Brien, Jr.
William N. Oller
Raymond J. Orr
Donald P. Orrill
Frank T. Owen, Jr.
Martin W. Paquette
Ralph P. Parker
Walter T. Pate, Jr.

Le Vern E. Peck
William G. Peck
LaRue D. Penny
Samuel A. Pillar
Raymond J. Pluto
William J. Podrouzek
Donald E. Polk
Robert B. Polk
George S. Pope, Jr.
John L. Prehn, Jr.
Jules R. Primm
Charles B. Prosuch
Robert H. Pylkas
James F. Reeves, Jr.
George D. Riley, Jr.
Maynard R. Roberts
Kenneth M. Robinson
Paul F. Rocque
William D. Ronayne
Elliot R. Rose
Joel E. Ross
Louis P. Rossi
Richard G. Salter
Charles M. Schoman, Jr.
Milton H. Selekman
Alexander D. Senulis
Eugene A. Shaw
Robert H. Shaw, Jr.
John C. Shepard
David P. Sherrell
Raymond W. Sitz
Waldo D. Sloan, Jr.
William C. Smith
Charles E. Snoddy
Richard J. Sowell
John L. Starbody
Donald R. Stewart
George G. Strott
William L. Taylor
Edwin H. Thompson
"J" Philip Tice
Jesse R. Tippin
Oscar G. Tucker II
Robert E. Turnage
John S. Urban
Richard L. Verdow
Robert E. Vogel
Hinton C. Walker
Thomas C. Waller, Jr.
Robert G. Walsh
Andrew J. Wasko
Howard R. Weiss
Jack H. Whitlock
John D. Whitsell
Lloyd R. Widney
Hawey L. Wilder
Edward H. Wilhelmi
George W. Williams
James C. Williams
Shelley S. Williams, Jr.
Roger M. Wilsie
Robert M. Wilson

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Carl D. Alberts
James D. Andrews
William W. Barron
Bobby F. Burch
Earle M. Cassidy
Joseph D. Cochran
James R. Collier
Neff T. Dietrick, Jr.
Darl A. Ellis
Paul O. Gaddis
Dalton Hoskins
James P. Marron
Larry C. McGuire
Bergen S. Merrill, Jr.
Robert W. Mix
William H. Mulder
Leroy F. Nichalson
Edward S. Nuss
Carl W. Otto
Kenneth P. Sears
Peter C. Spoolstra
Lewis G. Timberlake
Billy C. Wallace
Richard D. White
Kenneth Woods

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Emily J. Beard
Muriel L. Bzennan
Elizabeth U. Campbell
Lila L. Caretti
Ellen H. Connelly
Betty Kirkman
Virginia A. Langford
Patricia J. Murphy
Brenda Powers
Mary Russo
Rose H. Rychtarik
Aileen A. Salisbury
Leonora Sauciunas
Mary C. Seaton
Margaret J. Sullivan
Caroline Surles
Donna B. Swaney
Ruth E. Ureel
Rita B. Voth
Shirley M. Woodworth

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary appointment to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the line of the Navy:

David T. Avery
Bertram E. Barker
Ralph S. Barnett
Jack L. Bohner
Gordon D. Bothell
Claude Boyd, Jr.
James D. Breedlove
Kenneth B. Brisco
Charles F. Brown
Donald "D" Butler
Barclay F. Calhoun
Eugene C. Chase
Craig M. Coley
Frank A. Dandrea
Marvin R. De Mille
Joseph Dugger
Thomas E. Durham
Lennis H. Dyer
Philip M. Dyer
Carl C. Echols
Calvin R. Engle
Floyd A. Faircloth
Leroy W. Faulkner
Frederick W. Finn
James P. Garner
James E. Goodman
William L. Hackett
Claude E. Hale
Donald C. Hamilton
William P. Haney
Robert C. Harris
Charles F. Herman
Leo C. Hester
Claude M. Hicks
Delois V. Holloway
Clinnie M. Hunt
Donald C. Jackson, Jr.
Richard F. Johnston
George L. LaMere
William H. Larson
Bernard L. Laurance
Linwood L. Leftwich
Mason G. Maddox
Nicholas Mandzak
Charles H. McMakin, Jr.
Richard E. Meyer
Samuel A. Minervino
William R. Mott
Frank E. Moy
Bradford H. Patterson
Claude E. Pearce, Jr.
John F. Pierce
Harold J. Shapard
Ralph N. Shaver
Ira L. Shellhart
Willard M. Shepard
Jack D. Smith
Casimir J. Suchcicki
Carroll Y. Thomas
George E. Twarog
William H. Watson, Jr.
Arthur C. White
Samuel E. White
Frederick Zeier
Walter T. Zebrouski

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve on active duty for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment in the line of the Naval Reserve:

Hadwen B. Addington
Roy W. J. Agnew, Jr.
Joseph W. Akins, Jr.
Aubrey R. Anderson, Jr.
Daniel W. Anderson
Roy A. Anderson
Benjamin E. Ashby
Kenneth C. Aspinall
Charles R. Babcock
James F. Bangham
Edwin L. Barkley
Dowdell A. Barnes, Jr.
Thomas G. Barry
George F. Bauer, Jr.
LeGrande G. Beatson
Loyd D. Belk
Roy A. Bjorklund
Sam L. Black
George H. Blackwood, Jr.
Roy R. Blackwood
William H. Blackwood
Carlton A. Bonner, Jr.
Howard A. Bornemeier
Kenneth T. Bratt
James F. Bridges, Jr.
William M. Brooks
Dedriche M. Broome
Berle E. Browne
Henry M. Buerckholtz, Jr.
Arthur J. Bujnowski
Richard C. Butler
Ernest E. Callaway
Ivan R. Campbell
Donald M. Carlgren
John F. Carr
John T. Carter, Jr.
Lowen V. Casey
Robert R. Chapman
Angelo E. Clemente
William J. Cox
Richard F. Culver
Dennis W. Dalan
Charles F. Dale
Ralph E. Darby
Donald L. Darrow
Walter M. Davis, Jr.
Henry J. Denk
John M. Denkler
Charles E. Devonshire
Twyman "B" V. Dial
Paul T. Dietz
Gerald M. Disch
William N. Donnelly
Elmer C. Due
William F. Duemmel
Jerome M. Dunlevy
John R. Eaton
Robert M. Epperly
Donald W. Fausner
Edward A. Feifert
Frank E. Fergeson
Robert L. Fielder
David L. Flohr
John F. Fox
Francis C. Funk
Marion P. Gantt
Erwin L. Garrett
Wayne E. Garrison
Wilbur C. Garvin
Raymond C. Gembala
William L. Good
Horace G. Goodell
Floyd B. Grace
Furman B. Greene
Norton T. Gretzler
Jerald L. Griffin
Max A. Gschwind
Harold C. Gustafson
Halsey L. Hackett
Theodore M. Hanna
Palmer W. Hanson
Delbert Harris, Jr.
Jack H. Harris
William H. Harris
Paul A. Hauer
Robert F. Haven
Walter A. Hayes, Jr.
Nelson E. Heckert
Robert M. Hendricks
James M. Hitch
James F. Holliman
Charles F. Holm
Robert R. Holman
Donald R. Holson
William J. Holtzclaw
Hamilton J. Hulsey
J. Harold Hunt, Jr.
Robert S. Hurley
Thomas H. Hybiske
Milton Hyman
William J. Ilvento
Leonard M. Ivarson
Charles R. Jelleff II
Frederick E. Johnson
Leslie R. Johnson
Robert L. Johnson
Leon Jones
Reuben M. Jones, Jr.
Philip A. Judd, Jr.
James H. Karr
Reynold V. Keim
Lawrence "W" Kendrick, Jr.
Harold G. Kennedy
Thomas A. Key
Gordon P. Kinney
Robert L. Kinsey
Bernard J. Klees
Raymond P. Kluger
Albert E. Knutson
Frederick M. Koch
Richard M. Kramer
John E. Krimmel
Reinert Kvidahl
Gregory M. "J" Lambert
Walter D. Lambert
Hugh L. Landrum
James C. Leak
Floyd Lee
George H. Lee
John B. Lingerfelt
George W. Lockwood
Don E. Logsdon
Laddie F. Long
Donald Loranger
Jesse P. Lott
Bruce M. Lovelace, Jr.
Charles T. Luczak
Gunnar Madsen
Harry V. Madsen
Frederick W. Mahnken, Jr.
James H. Margeson
Robert S. Martin
Floyd E. Masek
Jerome McCabe
Joe J. McCadams
Theodore R. McClure
John H. McConnell, Jr.
Dougald S. McCormick, Jr.
Ray E. McGuffin
Max McHenry
Ronald D. McMasters
Paul J. McVeigh
Charles H. Meyers
Donald L. Miller
Robert E. Miskosky
Rodney T. Mooney
Earl Moore, Jr.
Emerson E. Moore
James D. Moore
Melvin H. Moore
Frank L. Morecock
Delmer L. Morris
Richard J. Morrison
Raymond K. Morrow
George L. Muirhead, Jr.
Claude Navarrette, Jr.
Reed M. Neumann
Wayne A. Nomer
Arthur E. Norton
Raymond E. Novotny
Ralph E. Nupp
Thomas W. O'Brien
Paul S. Olmsted
Robert D. Olson
Richard Ostlie
William E. Palmer
John B. Paradis III
Robert E. Parsons
Donald Perry
Cyril W. Peterson
Billy Phillips
Jesse L. Poole, Jr.
Charles I. Porter
Meredith K. Price
James T. Prucha, Jr.
Mike Putinta
Terrence R. Rager
Gordon R. E. Ranney
Harold E. Ream
William L. Reinhard
Leonard V. Rohrer
Joseph Rolecki
Robert E. Rostine
Richard R. Rothermel
Marvin E. Russell
Everett G. Ryder
George E. Sanctuary
Edwin D. Sayre
Colin F. Shadell
Joseph Shekerow
John C. Sinex
Chester A. Skeen
Daniel S. Smith
David E. Smith
Donald D. Smith
Harry R. Smith
Ronald M. Smith
Thomas D. Smith III
Arthur Snell
Orville H. Snyder, Jr.
Richard F. Soliner
Richard L. Stallings
Francis R. Stanford
John W. Stillwell
John G. Stranlund
John P. Struhsaker
Billie L. Study
Charles B. Sturm
Francis X. Sullivan
Robert B. Sullivan
Robert J. Sullivan
Edward F. Swartz, Jr.
Gerald E. Terry
Lawrence J. Thibault, Jr.
Milton O. Thompson
Fred Thorn
George F. Trudeau
James R. Vanlandingham
Andrew J. Van Tuyle, Jr.
Darrell G. Walls
George D. Watters
Charles J. Weber
Clarence E. Wenzel
Carl Wesenberg
James W. Wettengel
Clarence E. White
Joyce A. Wohlberg
Herbert A. Wohlert
Milton L. Wray
Charles E. Zimmerman, Jr.

The following-named officer for permanent appointment in the Supply Corps of the Naval Reserve:

Henry W. McGuire

IN THE NAVY

Leif O. Torkelson (Naval R. O. T. C.) to be an ensign in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949.

Midshipman Richard R. Allmann (aviation) to be an ensign in the Navy from the 3d day of June, in lieu of ensign in the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed, to correct name.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 3d day of June 1949:

Bruce W. Arden
Charlie J. Clarkson, Jr.
Wynn F. Foster
Donald B. Hall
Lloyd W. Harmon, Jr.
George Kramer
Bruce B. Lloyd
Charles H. Mohr
Charles E. Myers, Jr.
John J. O'Rourke
William M. Place
Thomas N. Porter
Wayne N. Pressler
Thomas H. Wilson

The following-named (women) (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Orlean L. Babich	Georgia R. Keller
Gloria J. Baker	Roberta M. Kirkpatrick
Margaret L. Boyce	Catherine J. Miles
Claire M. Clark	Eleanor E. Minkler
Nancy A. Dutton	Catharine Morris
Virginia A. Dyer	Hope C. Nesbit
Margaret M. Fitzgerald	Marion L. Plum
Mary L. Fletcher	Mabel L. Royar
Leona J. Fox	Elizabeth B. Russell
Nancy E. Gleaton	Elizabeth A. Swingler
Sally A. Gould	Allyn R. Thompson
Mary A. Hawbolt	Margaret H. Thompson
Eleanor A. Jenkins	Mary J. Walker
Bonnie J. Jenks	Gretchen M. Ward
Marjorie H. Kaff	Alice J. Wardenga

Earl R. Peters (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949:

Harry "E" Barker	Leo R. Hamilton
Jack F. Biehl	Neil K. Hansen
William A. Chadwick	Robert J. Stevens

The following-named women (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Debbie P. Belka
Betty J. Ibach
Constance J. Praeger

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

Robert H. Beckley	Howard H. Groover, Jr.
Homer T. Connolly	Bernard L. Hickey
Garson Goodman	Eugene W. McCarthy

Philip S. Birnbaum (civilian college graduate) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Emmet D. Anderson	Robert W. Puddicombe
David M. Feinman	William F. Russell, Jr.
Frederick E. Lennox	Robert J. Schneider
Cornelius Lindholm, Jr.	

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Carlo A. DeLaurentis
Claude D. Duncan.

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Charlotte L. Blythe	Rose M. Mahoney
Ruth A. Bovard	Dorothy S. Mathewson
Barbara M. Buehler	Mary E. Natter
Irene N. Dowe	Rose M. O'Malley
Elizabeth L. Evans	Lois A. Prothero
Mary E. Farber	Mary V. Redfern
Beryl M. Frantz	Agnes Sarna
Alberta M. Gabardi	Clarissa M. Shaw
Justine L. Gutzler	Claire V. Wilson
Eileen Hanes	Mary E. Wyatt
Virginia L. Hockens	
Eleanor D. Ledwidge	

The following-named officers to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line of the Navy, limited duty only, in lieu of lieutenant in the line of the Navy, limited duty only, as previously nominated and confirmed:

Vane M. Bennett	James W. McBrier
Paul E. Dignan	Robert L. McClaren
William J. English	Walter Schimmelpfennig
William S. Hall	Clarence M. Taylor
Robert N. Huey	William Williamson
Arthur H. Larson	
James S. Lees	

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 15, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou who hast known the way of sorrow and, through it, the way of immortal triumph, let Thy spirit be upon us. Take from us all fear, fear of the present and fear of the future. Endued with clear thinking, cool judgment, and spiritual heroism, clothe us with a compelling faith as to the outcome of our destiny.

O Christ, we are poor and needy; give us Thy grace and patience that we may do no harm to our convictions and impulses. Restore all things to their noble use, and purify them from the taint of lust and selfishness. The Lord bless and preserve the ideals of our Republic and establish the work of these Thy servants. In the name of our Saviour we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on Teacher's Day by Rabbi A. M. Hershberg, president, Federated Rabbinical College of Cachmey Lublin.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech on the Crisis in Sino-American Relations by Prof. Russell Fifield, of the University of Michigan, despite the fact that it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $168.75.

Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the Secretary of the Navy, with introductory remarks by Admiral J. L. Holloway, Jr., Superintendent, United States Naval Academy.

Mr. HEDRICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by one of his constituents concerning the House of Representatives.

CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF SOO LOCKS

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which will authorize the President to appoint a Commission for the Centennial Celebration of the Soo Locks. Our senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is introducing a companion bill in the other body. This Commission is to be composed of nine members who will serve without pay. The Soo locks, as you know, is the lifeline to our economic well-being. There is more tonnage going through the Soo locks in a year than through the Panama Canal and the Suez Canal combined. As a matter of fact, 85 percent of our Nation's ore goes through the Soo locks.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope the House will give serious consideration to this bill and will pass it in the very near future.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Altoona Tribune, entitled "Subsidizing the World Against Us."

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one, to include an address by Mrs. Norman K. Beals, of Franklin, Pa.; and in the other, an article relative to his very good and able friend and colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania, JAMES VAN ZANDT.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted me for tomorrow may be vacated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Christian Science Monitor of June 8.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ZABLOCKI addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. CROOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Mr.

and Mrs. Orville Sherman, who are working to assist dispossessed European immigrants in Venezuela, the letter dealing with the subject of dairying difficulties in South America.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include an address by Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer at New Brunswick, and in the second to include an editorial which appeared in the Boston Post last Sunday.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN SHOULD REMOVE DR. CONDON AT ONCE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, President Truman should remove Edward U. Condon from his position as head of the Bureau of Standards. I regard him as one of the most dangerous men on the Federal pay roll.

His attempt to discredit J. Edgar Hoover is an outrage. I was a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities for many years, and I can say, without fear of contradiction, that there is not a more patriotic man in America than J. Edgar Hoover, nor a man who has rendered greater service to his country.

One hundred and thirty-five years after the Revolutionary War closed the British Government revealed the fact that Benjamin Franklin's secretary, Bancroft, was a British spy, and was furnishing information to the British Government all during the Revolution.

It is about time that we stopped educating Communists at the expense of this Government, especially in the secrets of the atomic bomb. It is about time that we quit leaving questionable characters in charge of the secrets of this Government the revelation of which might result in the death of millions of our people.

President Truman should remove Dr. Condon without delay.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURPHY (at the request of Mr. GORSKI of New York) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an excerpt from the Staten Island Advance.

CONFEREES ON THE CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that two additional conferees on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H. R. 3734, the civil functions appropriation bill, be appointed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following additional conferees: Mr. MCGRATH and Mr. ENGEL of Michigan.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the appointment of the additional conferees.

SECOND DEFICIENCY BILL, 1949—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4046) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 791)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4046) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 7, 29, 37, and 38.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 28, 30, 32, 33, 34, 36, 39, 40, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78 and 80, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"GRANTS TO STATES FOR MATERNAL AND CHILD WELFARE

"For an additional amount for 'Grants to States for maternal and child welfare' for services for crippled children as authorized in Public Law 42, approved April 15, 1949, $750,000, to be matched by the States in accordance with Section 512 (a) of the Social Security Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum contained in said amendment insert "$4,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum contained in said amendment insert "$2,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,747,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"EMERGENCY FLOOD PROTECTION AND REPAIR

"To enable the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse applicable appropriations for the cost of personnel, supplies, and facilities diverted for the repair and construction of flood-protective works; and for the repairs, reconstruction, rehabilitation, or replacement of structures, buildings, or other facilities, including equipment, damaged or destroyed by floods, $275,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT

"Funds appropriated under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, shall remain available until June 30, 1950."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK AND LEVEE SYSTEM

"For an additional amount for 'Colorado River front work and levee system', $75,000, to remain available until June 30, 1950."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"GETTYSBURG NATIONAL CEMETERY, PENNSYLVANIA

"For the acquisition of approximately five acres of land in the Borough of Gettysburg, Adams County, Pennsylvania, as an addition to Gettysburg National Cemetery, in accordance with the provisions of the Act approved June 19, 1948 (Public Law 704), $5,000, to remain available until June 30, 1950."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum last contained in said amendment insert "$7,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 12, 26, 67, 68, 69, and 79.

CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
JOHN TABER,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
STYLES BRIDGES
(except No. 7),
CHAN GURNEY
(except No. 7).
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4046) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1 appropriates the usual gratuity to the widow of a Member of the House.

Amendment No. 2 authorizes expenditure of $2,800 for travel by the Architect of the Capitol, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 4 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 5 appropriates $750,000 for maternal and child welfare instead of $1,500,000, as proposed by the Senate, and requires that the full amount thereof be matched by the States.

Amendment No. 6 allows expenditure of existing appropriations of $4,000 for conservation of securities instead of $8,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7 strikes out an appropriation of $150,000 for purchase of a site for a Federal building proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8 is reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 9 and 10 are reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 11 appropriates $2,250,000 for the Office of the Housing Expediter instead of $2,500,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 13 appropriates $36,900 for the National Mediation Board, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14 appropriates $136,238,000 for veterans pensions, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15 appropriates $36,800 for the Assessor's Office, District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16 appropriates $15,000 for District employees' compensation, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17 appropriates $26,175 for the Office of Rent Control, District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18 appropriates $82,000 for operating expenses of public schools, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19 appropriates $50,000 for the Police Department, District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $75,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 20 appropriates $110,000 for the Health Department, District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21 appropriates $57,500 for Gallinger Hospital, District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $65,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 22 appropriates $30,550 for the Home for Aged, District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23 appropriates $75,000 for the Central Garage, District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $67,500, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 24 appropriates $19,431.65 for claims and judgments, District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $9 481.65, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 25 appropriates $300,000 for agricultural research in Alaska, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $150,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 26 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment Nos. 27 and 28 appropriate $750,000 for forest-pest control instead of $500,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, and makes such fund available until September 30, 1949, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29 strikes out an appropriation of $250,000 for national-forest protection and management proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30 appropriates $142,000 for forest roads and trails, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31 appropriates $1,747,500 for emergency reconstruction instead of $1,500,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,995,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32 appropriates $432,384 for the settlement of claims by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment Nos. 33 and 34 appropriate $2,586,000 for reimbursement of appropriations for expenses of relief in storm-bound areas, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35 appropriates $275,000 for emergency flood protection, as proposed by the Senate, but restricts the expenditure to fiscal year 1949.

Amendment No. 36 appropriates $330,000 for education of Indians, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 37 and 38 strike out an appropriation of $80,000 for construction of Indian schools, proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39 inserts language proposed by the Senate authorizing payment of tuition of dependents of construction workers.

Amendment No. 40 appropriates $46,000 for Klamath project, Oregon, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41 continues appropriation for rehabilitation and betterment, 1949, available "until June 30, 1950" instead of "until expended" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42 appropriates $75,000 for Colorado River front work, as proposed by the Senate "until June 30, 1950," instead of "until expended" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43 appropriates $27,300 for river-basin studies, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 44 appropriates $5,000 for purchase of land at the Gettysburg National Cemetery instead of $10,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 45 and 46 appropriate $40,500 for insane of Alaska, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47 appropriates $970.80, as proposed by the Senate, for government in the Virgin Islands.

Amendment No. 48 appropriates $1,625, as proposed by the Senate, for the Territory of Hawaii.

Amendment No. 49 increases amount available for attendance at meetings to $7,500 instead of $11,525, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50 appropriates $50,000 for printing and binding, Department of Justice, instead of $100,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 51 appropriates $1,225.30 for salaries and expenses, Lands Division, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,185.30, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 52 appropriates $93.37 for miscellaneous salaries and expenses, field, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 53 appropriates $1,025.19 for salaries and expenses of marshals, 1946, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $476.04, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 54 appropriates $996.00 for salaries and expenses of marshals, 1947, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $592.20, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 55 appropriates $150,000 for salaries and expenses of marshals, 1949, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 56 appropriates $40,000 for fees of witnesses, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 57 appropriates $100,000 for support of prisoners, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 58 appropriates $3,500,000, to be derived by transfer, for retired pay, Army, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 59 and 60 appropriate $563,000 for rivers and harbors, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 61 and 62 appropriate $12,575,000 for flood control, general, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 63 appropriates $500,000 for flood control, Trinity River, Tex., as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 64 appropriates $90,000 out of the Soldiers' Home permanent fund for the United States Soldiers' Home, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 65 authorizes transfer of $105,000 from aviation, Navy, 1949, to the naval procurement fund, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 66 appropriates $38,630 for international commissions, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $8,630 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 67, 68, and 69 are reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, and 76 provide funds for meeting the cost of increased compensation of Federal employees under Public Law 900, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 77 and 78 provide for the payment of claims and judgments as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 79 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 80 corrects a section number.

CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
JOHN TABER,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: Page 3, line 20, insert the following:

"FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT
"RELIEF OF PALESTINE REFUGEES

"To enable the President to carry out the provisions of the joint resolution of March 24, 1949 (Public Law 25), authorizing a special contribution by the United States to the United Nations for the relief of Palestine refugees, $14,000,000, and an additional $2,000,000 to the President for the same purposes as prescribed in the joint resolution of March 24, 1949 (Public Law 25), upon the President finding that the other nations party to such United Nations agreement have met their obligations to the United Nations Relief for Palestine Refugees, to remain available until June 30, 1950, of which $8,000,000 shall be used to repay, without interest, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for advances made pursuant to section 1 of said public law."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

"RELIEF OF PALESTINE REFUGEES

"To enable the President to carry out the provisions of the joint resolution of March 24, 1949 (Public Law 25), authorizing a special contribution by the United States to the United Nations for the relief of Palestine refugees, $12,000,000, and an additional $4,000,000 to the President for the same purposes as prescribed in the joint resolution of March 24, 1949 (Public Law 25), to such extent as the President from time to time finds that the other nations party to such United Nations agreement have met their obligations to the United Nations Relief for Palestine Refugees, to remain available until June 30, 1950, of which $8,000,000 shall be used to repay, without interest, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for advances made pursuant to section 1 of said public law."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 4: Page 6, line 9, strike out "$308,000" and insert "$570,300."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4.

Mr. Speaker, the House was requested to appropriate $658,000 of which $308,000 was necessary to meet the cost of pay increases under Public Law 900. The remainder of the fund was intended, according to the presentation to the House Appropriations Committee, to undertake work under the Water Pollution Control Act of 1948, for which no appropriations has been made. Inasmuch as a substantial amount had been requested for the same purpose for the fiscal year 1950, beginning July 1, the House committee felt that it was better to defer undertaking this new program until the next fiscal year. Without prior knowledge or consent of Congress, the Public Health Service had already diverted $129,000 of its other funds to begin this new project. The intent of the Senate amendment is to restore to the appropriation the funds so diverted and to initiate a larger program pending availability of funds for 1950. The Public Health Service was rather severely criticized in the hearings in the Senate Committee on Appropriations for their action in this connection. The project which was undertaken is authorized by law and doubtless is meritorious. Nevertheless, any agency which diverts funds from the purposes for which appropriated to another purpose, however legal or worth while it may be, must know that there is a day of reckoning. Certainly, the House cannot condone the expenditure of public funds for any purpose other than that for which the appropriation is made.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 8: Page 8, line 13, insert the following:

"Federal Office Building, Nashville, Tenn.

"In addition to the appropriation provided for under this head in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946, the Federal Works Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of said appropriation in an amount not exceeding $1,200,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 9: On page 8, after line 18, insert the following:

"Renovation and Modernization, Executive Mansion

"For all expenses necessary for and incident to the renovation, repair, and modernization (without change of present architectural appearance of the exterior of the Mansion or the interior of its main floor) of the Executive Mansion, including the preparation of drawings and specifications, and the purchase of furniture, furnishings, and equipment, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes or the civil-service and classification laws, $5,400,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That any cost-plus-a-fixed-fee general construction contract entered into in pursuance of this authority shall be awarded on competitive bidding among responsible general contractors upon the amount of the fixed fee to accrue from the performance of such contract: *Provided further*, That with the exception of the subcontract to be made by the general contractor for the underpinning and foundation work and work incidental and appurtenant thereto, which may be a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract, all other subcontracts made by the general contractor shall be fixed price contracts awarded on competitive bids received from responsible subcontractors."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 9 and concur in the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"Renovation and Modernization, Executive Mansion

"For all expenses necessary for and incident to the renovation, repair, and modernization (without change of present architectural appearance of the exterior of the Mansion or the interior of its main floor) of the Executive Mansion, or for such other provision for remodeling or rebuilding the Executive Mansion and for construction of a separate residence for the President as may be determined upon by the Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion established pursuant to Public Law 40 (81st Cong.), including the preparation of drawings and specifications, and the purchase of furniture, furnishings, and equipment, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes or the civil-service and classification laws, $2,000,000, to remain available until expended, and in addition contracts may be entered into in amounts not exceeding $3,400,000: *Provided*, That any cost-plus-a-fixed-fee general construction contract entered into in pursuance of this authority shall be awarded on competitive bidding among responsible general contractors upon the amount of the fixed fee to accrue from the performance of such contract: *Provided further*, That with the exception of any subcontract to be made by the general contractor for underpinning and foundation work and work incidental and appurtenant thereto, which may be a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract, all other subcontracts made by the general contractor shall be fixed price contracts awarded on competitive bids received from responsible subcontractors."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 10: Page 9, after 14, insert the following:

"Federal Real Estate Inventory

"Salaries, equipment, and other expenses necessary to bring up to date the information contained in the inventory of Federal real estate heretofore compiled, $42,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 12: On page 10, after line 9, insert the following:

"NATIONAL CAPITAL SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

"For expenses necessary for the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission to prepare and carry out a program, for the commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the seat of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia, as authorized by the act of July 18, 1947 (Public Law 203), and any laws enacted to carry out plans proposed pursuant to said act, including personal services and rent in the District of Columbia; travel expenses of employees; travel, hotel, and other necessary expenses of the Commissioners; printing, binding, and other related work to be done by contract or otherwise at establishments other than the Government Printing Office; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and such construction or other expenses as may now or hereafter be authorized by law; $2,000,000: *Provided*, That the appropriation of $15,000 under this head in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948, and any other funds received by the Commission as authorized by law, are hereby consolidated with and made a part of this appropriation, the total thereof to be disbursed and accounted for as one fund which shall remain available during the existence of the Commission."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 26: Page 18, line 18, insert the following:

"BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

"Research Facilities

"Research facilities: For preparation of plans and specifications of laboratory buildings and related facilities for scientific investigations of foot-and-mouth and other

animal diseases in accordance with the provisions of the act of April 24, 1948 (Public Law 496), $500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture, when the request for appropriations for building said laboratories and related facilities is made, shall submit with said request the plans and specifications to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate together with detailed information as to the estimated total cost of such facilities as well as the location of the site proposed to be selected."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

"Research Facilities

"Research facilities: For preparation of plans and specifications of laboratory buildings and related facilities (all within a limit of cost of not to exceed $25,000,000) for scientific investigations of foot-and-mouth and other animal diseases, including the purchase of an option on suitable land, in accordance with the provisions of the act of April 24, 1948 (Public Law 496), $500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture, when the request for appropriations for building said laboratories and related facilities is made, shall submit with said request the plans and specifications to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate, together with detailed information as to the estimated total cost of such facilities, as well as the location of the site proposed to be selected."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 67: Page 42, line 3, strike out "$44,210" and insert "$74,210," of which latter amount $30,000 shall remain available until expended for the Passamaquoddy tidal-power project, Maine."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I think that probably the RECORD should show something as to what we had in mind in connection with the amendment which has been offered here with reference to the White House. I think for the guidance of the members of the Commission, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], they should know just exactly what the House had in mind in connection with that.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in response to the suggestion of the gentleman from New York, a Commission has been appointed under authority of an enactment of the Congress to supervise and superintend the work on the White House. The Commission consists of six members, two of whom were appointed by the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. Two were appointed by the Presiding Officer of the Senate, Senator MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, and Senator MARTIN, of Pennsylvania, and two were appointed by the President, Mr. Dougherty, an eminent engineer, of New York, and Mr. Orr, a prominent architect, from New Haven, Conn.

Under the language of the enactment the duties of the Commission were so circumscribed that the commissioners had very little to say about what should be done. And, in particular, they had nothing whatever to say as to whether the White House should be remodeled or whether it should be rebuilt. The Commission was largely a figurehead.

The language carried in the amendment which has just been agreed to by the House makes the Commission a responsible agency and clothes it with authority to determine what course they shall pursue, in planning the work, and authorizes them to determine whether the building shall merely be patched up or whether it shall be rebuilt in replica, preserving the outward form and the floor plans with all the interior decorations, doors, paneling, mantels and appurtenances that can be salvaged.

Washington is amply supplied with museums. But the White House is a workshop. It is one of the busiest workshops in the country and handles daily matters of the greatest importance. The President and his staff should have every facility afforded by the most modern business office in the Nation.

Even if the remodeling projects are carried out, every vestige of the rooms where the Presidents lived and worked is to be torn out. Not a splinter or a brickbat will remain. Only the outer wall of standstone would be left and it would have to be painted every year.

It is a question of whether the Nation prefers to build a new White House within those bare and crumbling walls at exorbitant expense, or build a new White House that will be complete throughout—at less cost and in less time—and house the Chief Executive of the greatest Nation on earth in a complete and perfect building which will constitute the administrative nerve center of the Nation.

The six commissioners have been carefully chosen. They are perhaps as well qualified to pass on all the questions incident to the rehabilitation of the White House as any six who could be selected. This amendment permits them to review the whole problem. Under the House amendment they can leave the walls or keep them.

I yield now to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], who is one of the House members of the White House Commission.

I shall be glad to yield later to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], the other commissioner from the House of Representatives.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Probably my inquiry should be made of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] or the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], but I am very eager to know if the Commission has ever met and organized, and if so, what steps have been taken.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman from Michigan will explain that in detail. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] such time as he may require.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that will be very important, and I hope the gentleman from Michigan will advise the House as to how far the Commission has gone, whether there has been an organization of the Commission, a chairman elected, and various things done, because certainly time is of the essence and it is a matter of great importance to the people of America. We want to have that work done as quickly as possible.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I would say in answer to the inquiry of the majority leader that the Commission for the Renovation of the White House had its first informal meeting at the White House with the President on Friday, the 3d day of June. At that time all members of the Commission were present with the exception of Senator MCKELLAR. The Commission, as you know, is established under Public Law 40, Eighty-first Congress. The President was present at the meeting and spoke of his eagerness for dispatch in the matter of the renovation or reconstruction of the White House. He is eager for the Commission to proceed under its authority.

At that time we had a general talk as to what personnel would be necessary for the Commission and also as to the schedule of meetings to be held by the Commission, and arranged at that time for the first formal meeting of the Commission, which took place this morning in Senator MCKELLAR'S office, at which all members were present.

There are some things to be ironed out as to the authority of the Commission, and my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is checking the law to a considerable extent. We are working in great harmony in this matter. The question now comes, and I think the House will be very interested in this, as to what is really to be done with the White House. The members of the deficiency subcommittee on appropriations—not the Commission—but the House Members went to the White House one day recently to make a thorough inspection. We went through the White House from the basement to the peak of the roof. I should have had my camera with me so that I could have taken pictures for you to see the members of the committee standing on the very peak of the White House roof. We learned to our surprise that the foundation of the White House is constructed of stones from Rock Creek. Those stones can be removed by the pressure of the human hand. Some are small stones. The backing of the main walls of the White House is in such condition that the material can be crumbled by hand. The so-called mortar in the White House consists of burnt oyster shells. When Calvin Coolidge was President of the United States he renovated the attic of the White House and constructed therein what I would call a New England sum-

mer hotel. There are several small bedrooms with a big corridor in the center and a toilet at each end. It was constructed of steel and concrete. Whoever did the job at that time paid little attention to what the center foundation of the building would support, and, as a result, the building is sagging in the center.

The condition became so aggravated that the Public Buildings Commission ordered certain inspections of the White House to be made. They tore out the floors in different places on the second floor for inspection purposes. There we saw huge timbers cracked in two. Really it is not a safe building at all today. You know that when the White House was originally built it had neither water, gas, nor any of the other facilities which exist today and everything that is in the building now has been put in since and every artisan of the different trades who went in to do his job paid little attention to the over-all situation. We have some examples in the construction where huge brick columns of primary support for the building have been cut right through to make place for an air-conditioning duct. As a result the Bureau of Standards is taking measurements twice a week as to how much this structure is giving way. As you can see, the White House is in bad shape. The proposal is to go down beneath the walls of the White House 18 feet, thereby creating a basement in this underpinning fashion. No power machinery is to be used if we are to remedy these conditions, because there is a danger that the walls may crumble with the rumbling of machinery nearby. Then there is the problem of what it will cost to build an iron or steel structure inside the walls. If we take off the roof, the shell structure consisting of exterior walls should be protected by a temporary roof, because it would not do for the elements to get at the inside of those walls. Moreover, this morning, to the consternation and surprise of the committee we were informed that there was some question as to whether or not a windstorm would demolish the walls if the roof were removed. So we have a problem. We decided this morning to have a thorough study made immediately so that we can continue our deliberations as to whether or not we will rebuild the White House only in the interior, or whether we will take it down, carefully, with due regard for its historical significance, lay the stones on the White House lawn and rebuild, stone on stone, the Executive Mansion in its entirety as a sound edifice, both as a memorial, and as a practical structure where the functions of state can take place in the building which is the official residence of the President of the United States.

Let it be remembered that the beautiful paneling, the doors, and fireplaces, the ornate plaster, the furnishings, however old or historic, and anything else of historic interest and memory which are held as objects of esteem by the American people will be preserved intact and treated with all the care and respect so richly due them, and incorporated into the renovated building.

I think my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is anxious to say something about the condition in which the Commission finds itself under the law.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. You say you met this morning and organized. Who is Chairman?

Mr. RABAUT. The chairman of the Commission is Senator MCKELLAR. The vice chairman is Mr. Orr. Mr. Orr represents the public and Senator MCKELLAR represents the legislative bodies.

Mr. McCORMACK. You say that on June 3 all were present but one member. Why did you not organize then?

Mr. RABAUT. Because it was the first meeting of the Commission and we did not think it quite proper to proceed without the senior Member of the Senate.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a frank answer.

Mr. RABAUT. We want to have peace and harmony, I will say to the distinguished majority leader. I think we are proceeding along these lines and I feel we are moving with dispatch. Our next meeting is called for next Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. How many sets of plans have been approved; does the gentleman know?

Mr. RABAUT. There is some conflict about the plans. The last word on all plans is the Commission. I do not know how many, but I understand there are two.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the Commission intend to have its own architect?

Mr. RABAUT. We plan to have consulting architects and engineers as well.

Mr. McCORMACK. And the Commission will approve its own plans?

Mr. RABAUT. No. The Commission will not approve its own plans. The Commission will approve plans and suggest changes if necessary. I presume this is what the gentleman would like to know: The first floor is to be reestablished as it has been. That is the historical part of the White House. The living quarters of the President will be reestablished on the second floor. There is no historial significance at all to the third floor.

And a further problem confronts the committee whether to remove the third floor and the roof rather than to sustain it with interior temporary construction pending the new erection of the interior of the White House. This is a problem because the interior temporary construction, would of necessity have to be removed, and then there would be the shifting of the load of the third floor to the new permanent construction, which is anything but a normal way to proceed with a building of this type. All of this should be considered in the light that the third floor at the present time is nonhistorical and not adapted for present-day usage without a great deal of renovation. Thus the choice lies between removing the third floor or retaining it, and if removed nothing but the outside walls remain and then we come to the problem that these walls require 18 feet of underpinning, so the decision for the committee resolves itself as to whether or not to renovate the building as expressed herein, or to rebuild an Executive Mansion soundly and properly from the ground up.

Mr. McCORMACK. My purpose is to find out if there is going to be action. Assuming there are meetings of the Commission in the future, I, of course, recognize the position of the gentleman, but a Senator is just a coequal of any Member of the House. But suppose they are absent; are you going to make plans for a quorum?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know the gentleman will, and so will the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. But we are very much concerned and the President is very much concerned. Assuming that men are busy and cannot attend the meeting and there is a quorum present, will they go ahead?

Mr. RABAUT. We expect to have an executive director that will be on the job all the time.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, this courtesy that has existed will not be prevalent on this Commission?

Mr. RABAUT. No; the first meeting was on the 3rd. The second meeting was today, and the next meeting is next Monday. I think that gives evidence of dispatch and the active interest of this committee.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. When I was a member of the Committee on Buildings and Grounds, we inspected the White House. We made it possible for an elevator to be placed in there. In view of the fact that the British came here and burned that White House and bombarded it in 1812, how is it that we just find out it is so dangerous?

Mr. RABAUT. Well, I found out the condition of the White House when I was appointed to this Commission.

Mr. STEFAN. Well, we have had an architect down there since 1934 on the pay roll. Why could he not have found that out before this time?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], the other member of the Commission from the House of Representatives, such time as he may require.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, there is tremendous public interest displayed in the work of this White House Commission. The people of this country revere that building. It is the most historic building in the world today. Therefore the responsibility of dealing with it becomes a very grave one.

I may say to the distinguished majority leader and the Members that under no circumstances, of course, could this Commission function effectively until plans and specifications have been prepared in alternative form. I am advised that the Public Buildings Administration will be the beneficiary of the appropriation suggested in the amendment that the House has adopted this afternoon, $5,400,000. They will draw the plans and specifications cooperating, I assume, with the Architect of the Capitol; and they will submit them to this Commission for approval or ratification. The matter of rules for advertising for bids and the

awarding of bids will be the function of this Commission. But let me tell you that while these things are more or less perfunctory in character they will require some profound decisions to be made. There is another problem in this whole situation that is attracting the attention of the Nation: What are we going to do with all of the material, the historic material that will be left, even a little block of wood from the White House, or a brick, or a stone? And who will have charge of its disposition? How shall that be handled? The Commission is giving serious consideration to all of these problems in the public interest.

May I say to you also that before this Commission was established and commenced to function, everything of a movable character in the White House was removed; the wall coverings have been taken off, all the furniture, all the bureaus, all the beds, and the bric-a-brac have been removed; and about the only things that have not been removed are one or two remaining fireplaces and the beautiful burl oak paneling in the West Room of the White House. That is going to come down ultimately, and all those beautiful plaster ceilings, and everything else. We are advised that those things are being taken down under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol and other agencies of the Government and that they are stored in various places, all these valuable woods, valuable doors, and other things that would be of inestimable value to those who are interested in antiques and in antiquity, and history. These items have got to be carefully checked and looked after, and this Commission will demand that before it starts to function at all it shall have an itemized list of everything that was in the White House before it was removed and checked with the proper authorities, and an itemized list of everything that has been taken out so that in the future it cannot be said by somebody that he has a chair, a cup, a saucer, or something else that came from the White House, and have a lot of antique dealers and other people capitalizing and making money out of this situation. It presents a very difficult problem. There are even proposals now for the disposition of the surplus lumber, to cut it up into mementoes, and to sell the surplus brick and material around the country; and there are agencies of the Government that are seeking to dispose of this material. If you think it is a very simple job, I may say to the majority leader that there are a tremendous number of basic problems that have to be solved by this Commission, and we are at work on them. In order to do it we have got to have the right kind of architectural and engineering services and advice. We propose in our organizing efforts to set this Commission up in a manner in which it will function in the public interest.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I hope the gentleman realizes that my questions were asked in an effort to be of help and assistance.

Mr. KEEFE. Let me say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I am just as interested as he is in seeing that this matter moves along; and I have suggested to the Commission, suggested it at its very first meeting, that there must be rules and regulations adopted providing for quorums and all that sort of thing; and that is being done.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts is thoroughly aware of that fact, because the gentleman from Wisconsin talked with him several days ago. I am indebted to the gentleman from Wisconsin for the basis upon which I predicated my questions today.

Mr. KEEFE. We want to see this thing get along, but I may say to my colleagues that it is not the easy task which some people might think. It is a very difficult problem from an engineering and architectural standpoint that confronts those who have the responsibility. Until we see the plans and specifications that are suggested in order to comply with the former hard-and-fast rules expressed in Public Law 40 I do not see how the Commission could have hardly operated until the adoption of this amendment today.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The Commission was appointed for the purpose of determining what should be done with the White House?

Mr. KEEFE. No; we were not appointed for that purpose at all. Public Law 40 determined that the White House should be remodeled. This Commission is designated as a commission for the remodeling of the White House. Then we get into the question, if you are going to completely take out the entire interior of the White House and rebuild it—that is what they proposed to do—leaving nothing but the four walls standing, then have to dig down 18 feet below the walls and put in footings to sustain the building so that you will have nothing left of the old White House except the four walls, with the interior completely removed and rebuilt on the first floor to simulate the White House as it previously existed, using such material as is usable, you would have a completely rebuilt White House on the interior with the exception of this thing they call the third floor.

I wish every Member of Congress could go down there and that every citizen could go down there and go through that White House as it appears today. I was shocked beyond all measure of expression, I am frank to say. It is an unsafe building, tremendously unsafe, and somebody has been guilty of dereliction over the years in the various modernization programs that have been conducted in allowing that building to get into such a state of disrepair and insecurity that exists at this time.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. Does the gentleman agree with me that the personnel of the Commission appointed to supervise this work is most capable and obviously anxious to do as good a job as possible?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; and I am happy to say that the suggestion made by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee as to the intent of the amendment that has been offered to the deficiency bill this morning is an excellent one; otherwise the Commission is almost hamstrung in its power under Public Law 40 and could not really do much of anything. That is the fact of the matter.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. This Commission was appointed for the purpose of looking after this matter. As I understand it, an architect has been employed for the last 10 or 12 years, and has resided almost continuously at the White House. Why did he leave it in such a situation or condition as it is?

Mr. KEEFE. I cannot answer those questions and I do not want to get into that matter. That is all water over the dam. I can assure the Congress and the people of the country that this Commission is going at this thing in an intelligent manner. We are going to get proper architectural and engineering service and advice and we are going to build a building that will be a credit to the people of the United States and a place where the President and his family can live in safety. I think anything short of that would be criminal at this time.

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHESNEY. It was my pleasure to be a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. We visited the White House and had two conferences with the President. At that time he specifically stated he would like to have the building in its original state, keeping everything original in the building, that he did not want a new building at all.

Mr. KEEFE. That is very true, and it is an easy thing to say that you do not want any new building at all, that you just want to patch up here and there. That is what they have been doing for the last 100 years and that is why you have the building in the shape it is, may I say to the gentleman. We might as well realize and understand this situation now. We might as well lay all the cards on the table. Every plan that has been submitted by the Public Buildings Administration or the Architect of the Capitol contemplates an entirely new building inside the four walls.

Mr. CHESNEY. Then it is not the intention of the President to change the building whatsoever.

Mr. KEEFE. I am not saying anything about what the intention of the President is. I am saying what the Public Buildings Administration and the Architect of the Capitol think is the proper thing to do now. It will be up to this commission to say what the thing shall be, and they certainly will consult with the President. May I say that I found the President, in the 30 minute

conference we had with him the other day, to be magnificent in his attitude. He said that he requested the appointment of this commission, and he will be 100 percent for whatever determination this commission makes. No commission could ask for any better or more cooperative support than we received from the President.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does the gentleman think that any commercial company would ever attempt to rebuild an old building that is in the shape that this is in?

Mr. KEEFE. I am not going to express any opinion on that. I must act in a judicial capacity in connection with the ultimate determination, and when the facts are assembled we will give them to you. Under the amendment this commission will be charged with the responsibility of determining what shall be done in the light of those facts.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 68: Page 42, line 8, insert the following:

"INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

"The appropriations under this head in the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1949, shall be available for the purchase in the name of the United States of America, for a consideration not in excess of $1,500, of a tract of land within lot 4 and the southwest quarter southeast quarter of section 28, township 8 south, range 24 west, Gila and Salt River meridian, Yuma County, Ariz., containing seven and eighty-two one-hundredths acres, more or less, needed for the east abutment of the Morelos Diversion Dam across the Colorado River, being constructed in accordance with article 12 of the treaty of February 3, 1944, between the United States and Mexico, the acquisition of which land by the United States is required by the provisions of article 23 of said treaty."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 69: Page 45, line 14, insert the following:

"ACQUISITION OF VESSELS AND SHORE FACILITIES

"Not to exceed $3,000,000 of the unobligated balance of funds heretofore appropriated under this head shall be available for conversion and repair of the icebreaker *Eastwind*."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 79: Page 77, line 9, insert the following:

"SEC. 402. The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations in this act in whole or in part for the fiscal year 1949 shall be available from and including March 1, 1949, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between March 1, 1949, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment, and pending that motion, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, just a word of explanation in order that the House may better understand what is contained in the bill and the action of the conferees.

The total of the estimates considered by the House in connection with this bill is approximately $698,028,000. The bill as passed the House contains a total of $671,069,000.

Additional estimates received by the Senate on this bill totaled approximately $217,396,000 which amount includes $136,238,000 for veterans' pensions. Accordingly the total of the estimates considered by the Senate is $915,924,000.

The bill as passed by the Senate contained increases over the House figure of $193,261,891 or a total for the bill as passed the Senate of $864,331,563.

The action of the conferees reduced this total by $1,624,500 or to an amount of $862,707,000.

In addition to this saving there are still four amendments in disagreement involving $2,192,000.

I might point out that in addition to the amount of $136,238,000 for veterans' pensions which I previously mentioned, the bill includes $92,619,888 for pay increases under Public Law 900 and $12,205,679 for claims or a total for these three uncontrollable items of $241,063,567.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1950

Mr. GARY. Mr Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3083) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 815)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3083) "making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 13, 14 and 34.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 11, 12, 17, 18, 19, 29, 30, 39, 40, 41 and 50; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,020,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$35,150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$15,660,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,925,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$76,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$39,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,255,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,490,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$907,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$302,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$440,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$98,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$556,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,780,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$629,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$33,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,625,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$393,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$31,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$128,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$650,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$17,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$51,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$52,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,205,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$25,775,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the word proposed by said amendment insert "forty"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 5, 6, 7, and 49.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
A. M. FERNANDEZ,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
CLARENCE CANNON,
G. CANFIELD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

BURNET R. MAYBANK,
CARL HAYDEN,
HARLEY M. KILGORE,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
GUY CORDON,
CLYDE M. REED,
STYLES BRIDGES,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3083) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $750,000 for salaries in the Office of the Secretary, instead of $700,000 as proposed by the House, and $800,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $1,150,000 for salaries in the Office of Administrative Services, instead of $1,100,000 as proposed by the House, and $1,200,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Authorizes the expenditure of not to exceed $1,020,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia under the Bureau of Customs, instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House, and $1,040,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $35,150,000 for salaries and expenses of the Bureau of Customs, instead of $35,000,000 as proposed by the House, and $35,300,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 5, 6, and 7: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates $1,610,000 for salaries and expenses of the Bureau of Narcotics, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,560,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $15,660,000 for salaries and expenses of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, instead of $15,000,000 as proposed by the House, and $16,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $1,925,000 for salaries and expenses of the Secret Service Division, instead of $1,900,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,950,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 11 and 12: Clarify the provision relating to handling proceeds from the sale of surplus property by the Bureau of Federal Supply, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 13 and 14: Strike out a proposal of the Senate for a trade-in program of typewriters which are eight or more years of age. Between now and the consideration of the next budget for the Bureau of Federal Supply the Committee on Appropriations of the House will have its investigative staff make a study of the utilization and general situation with respect to purchase and repair of typewriters in the Government.

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $76,250,000 for pay and allowances of Coast Guard personnel, instead of $74,500,000 as proposed by the House and $77,445,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $39,400,000 for general expenses of the Coast Guard, instead of $39,225,000, as proposed by the House and $39,988,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II—POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Departmental service

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $437,100 for salaries in the Office of the Postmaster General, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $435,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $132,300 for salaries in the Office of Budget and Administrative Planning as proposed by the Senate instead of $125,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates $1,297,000 for salaries in the Office of the First Assistant

Postmaster General as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,290,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $1,255,000 for salaries in the Office of the Second Assistant Postmaster General instead of $1,250,000 as proposed by the House and $1,261,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $1,490,000 for salaries in the Office of the Third Assistant Postmaster General instead of $1,485,000 as proposed by the House and $1,519,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $907,000 for salaries in the Office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General instead of $900,000 as proposed by the House and $927,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $302,600 for salaries in the Office of the Solicitor instead of $300,000 as proposed by the House and $305,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates $440,000 for salaries in the Office of the Chief Inspector instead of $435,000 as proposed by the House and $446,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates $98,000 for salaries in the Office of the Purchasing Agent instead of $95,000 as proposed by the House and $101,400 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates $556,000 for salaries in the Bureau of Accounts instead of $550,000 as proposed by the House and $562,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates $2,800,000 for contingent expenses instead of $2,700,000 as proposed by the House and $2,865,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Field service

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates $4,780,000 for salaries of inspectors instead of $4,750,000 as proposed by the House and $4,810,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates $958,000 for miscellaneous expenses, inspection service, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $950,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates $1,333,000 for salaries of clerks in the inspection service as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,325,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates $629,000,000 for clerks, first- and second-class offices instead of $625,000,000 as proposed by the House and $633,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates $33,250,000 for clerks, third-class offices instead of $33,000,000 as proposed by the House and $33,750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33: Appropriates $4,625,000 for miscellaneous items, first- and second-class offices instead of $4,500,000 as proposed by the House and $4,843,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates $375,000 for village delivery service as proposed by the House instead of $383,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates $3,300,000 for carfare and bicycle allowance instead of $3,250,000 as proposed by the House and $3,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates $393,000,000 for city delivery carriers instead of $392,000,000 as proposed by the House and $394,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates $31,000,000 for star route service instead of $30,000,000 as proposed by the House and $33,475,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates $128,750,000 for salaries, railway mail service instead of $128,500,000 as proposed by the House and $129,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39: Amends an appropriation title as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40: Adds clarifying language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41: Appropriates $8,150,000 for travel, railway mail service as proposed by the Senate instead of $8,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 42: Appropriates $650,000 for miscellaneous expenses, railway mail service instead of $600,000 as proposed by the House and $737,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates $11,300,000 for supplies and equipment instead of $11,000,000 as proposed by the House and $11,550,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates $17,200,000 for rent, fuel, and utility services instead of $16,800,000 as proposed by the House and $17,580,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates $51,500,000 for vehicle service instead of $51,000,000 as proposed by the House and $53,418,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 46: Appropriates $52,800,000 for salaries, custodial service instead of $52,300,000 as proposed by the House and $53,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates $8,150,000 for supplies, public buildings instead of $8,000,000 as proposed by the House and $8,523,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 48: Appropriates $1,205,000 for equipment, public buildings instead of $1,125,000 as proposed by the House and $1,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 50: Corrects a section number.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Amendment No. 51: Authorizes the expenditure of not to exceed $25,775,000 for administrative expenses instead of $25,400,000 as proposed by the House and $26,150,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 52: Allows for the purchase of not to exceed forty passenger motor vehicles instead of thirty as proposed by the House and fifty-five as proposed by the Senate.

AMENDMENTS REPORTED IN DISAGREEMENT

The following amendments are reported in disagreement:

Amendments Nos. 5, 6, and 7, relating to the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The House managers will move to insist upon disagreement.

Amendment No. 49 requires that the Postmaster General shall make quarterly reports to the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations relating to payments for overtime. The House managers will move to recede from disagreement and concur in the Senate amendment.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
A. M. FERNANDEZ,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
CLARENCE CANNON,
G. CANFIELD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONRONEY). The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments numbered 5, 6, and 7 be considered en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5: On page 10, strike out all after the word "including" in line 21 down to and including "Columbia" in line 23 and insert "personal services in the District of Columbia, and elsewhere."

Senate amendment No. 6: On page 11, line 15, strike out "$220,500,000" and insert "$232,768,000."

Senate amendment No. 7: One page 11, after line 15, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That the amount for personal services in the District of Columbia shall not exceed $17,509,000."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 6, and 7.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Do these amendments relate to the number of employees in the field service?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand that the difference between the two branches is between 1,500 additional employees, on the part of the House, and 7,000, on the part of the Senate.

Mr. GARY. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Can the gentleman give any information to the House that he can disclose properly as to what the situation is at the present time in relation to the differences that exist?

Mr. GARY. As the distinguished majority floor leader well knows, about 2 years ago the Congress made a large cut in the personnel of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The present chairman of this subcommittee was then a minority member of the subcommittee and opposed the reduction at that time. Last year the Bureau of Internal Revenue asked for additional employees. Our committee recommended, and the House and Senate approved, approximately 2,000 additional employees for the Bureau for the fiscal year 1949. The Bureau of Internal Revenue now has approximately 50,000 employees.

This year they asked for 7,000 additional employees for the fiscal year 1950. That is approximately a 13-percent increase in the employees of the entire Bureau. The increase involves an expenditure of approximately $12,000,000. Our committee went into the matter very carefully and finally decided to recommend 1,500. When the matter was considered in conference, the Senate insisted on 7,000. The House conferees agreed, during the conference, to go as high as 2,500 employees for the next year.

We have several thoughts in connection with the matter. In the first place we do not believe that 7,000 efficient employees can be recruited in one year. We feel that, if the Bureau is understaffed, we ought to begin to increase the staff gradually so that the employment of personnel can be made on a selective basis in order to obtain the services of the better qualified applicants. In the second place, while it is unquestionably true that these men do bring in a substantial amount in taxes, sooner or later we are bound to reach a point of diminishing returns so far as the effectiveness of these employees is concerned. Therefore, we think that we should approach that point of diminishing return gradually and not

at one swoop add 7,000 employees to the Bureau's personnel.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I understand the present situation, the question is between 1,500 and 7,000 employees. I assume there will be, as there has been, some effort at compromise, and the House conferees going in with an open mind will try to adjust the differences between the two branches in this respect.

Mr. GARY. Unquestionably.

Mr. McCORMACK. I assume that the gentlemen would be prepared to go higher than any figure discussed heretofore in conference.

Mr. GARY. Our committee agreed to go to 2,500, which they thought ought to be the maximum for next year.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with the gentleman that we ought to effect all the economies that we can. I want to see such economies effected. But I invite attention to the fact that it is very doubtful whether the action recommended by the House conferees is really going to effect economy in this instance. Of course, the effect of the motion made by the gentleman is to put the matter back in conference so that the differences may be adjusted. I sincerely hope the House conferees will seriously consider agreeing to the provisions recommended by the other body or at least come as near as possible to it. It is my privilege, as the gentleman knows, to be a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. We have the responsibility primarily of trying to provide the revenue necessary to run the Government. It is likewise my privilege to be a member of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue taxation. We had a special study made by an outside group of distinguished business and professional men. They recommended to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation that the Bureau of Internal Revenue vitally needed additional personnel. I invite the attention of the gentleman to the fact that in 1940 there were more than 8,000,000 income-tax returns filed in this country.

It is estimated that in 1949 there will be more than 73,000,000 income-tax returns filed. Consider the enormous increase in the volume of work, from around 8,000,000 returns in 1940 to more than 73,000,000 returns this year.

Further, I invite the gentleman's attention to the fact that in 1940 we had about 22,000 employees. Now we have only about 54,000. In other words, the increase in the volume of number of tax returns has increased more than 900 percent, and the increase in the number of employees to handle all those returns has only been about 140 percent.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I suggest that for every dollar in salary received they bring back on an average of $20 to the Government.

Mr. COOPER. That is true. I also invite attention to the fact that with this item of $12,000,000 difference that is involved here it is estimated we will receive about a half billion dollars additional revenue. Some competent authorities estimate that we might receive an additional $2,000,000,000 of revenue. Now, when we are facing a deficit and a request is made for additional taxes, certainly you gentlemen ought to make every effort to see to it that we get all the taxes that are due the Government. I believe these additional employees are necessary to accomplish that purpose.

Mr. GARY. May I say to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] that I have the very highest regard for his opinion of this subject. I know he has given very great study to our revenue system. I might say that I, too, have spent about 30 years of my life in the field of taxation. I had the privilege for some years of serving as the head of the Tax Department of the State of Virginia. I know how vital it is to have an adequate force to collect taxes. At the same time I believe that when you begin to recruit a force of this kind it should be done gradually. I reiterate, I do not believe that we could get 7,000 additional efficient men during the next year. What we would do, therefore, would be to load up the Department with a lot of inefficient men so that we would not obtain maximum results. Our policy has been—and we started it last year—to gradually increase the force. We provided for an increase of approximately 2,000 last year. We recommended 1,500 additional this year, and we feel that is a better approach to the problem than adding 7,000 in 1 year, which would amount to a 13-percent increase of the personnel of the entire Department.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Certainly I agree with the gentleman that we want efficient employees, but I invite attention to the fact that the report of the Civil Service Commission shows that in the fourteen civil-service districts they have from 2 to 10 times the number of qualified people for these positions as to the number that are being requested by the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The people are available, and the Civil Service Commission has qualified employees on its rolls now to provide from 2 to 10 times the number that the Bureau of Internal Revenue says it needs to do this work.

Mr. GARY. I have no doubt in the world the people are available. I think you would find thousands of them available, but whether they are qualified is another question, certainly among available men there should be some selectivity.

Mr. COOPER. In this group there are thousands of college graduates, many of them veterans, who have especially qualified in this particular field. I am sure the gentleman knows, as it is common knowledge, that in recent years there has been a great number of young men attracted to this field of endeavor, more than ever before. The Civil Service Commission report that they have the largest number of well-qualified people for this type of work that they have ever had at any time.

I further invite attention to the fact that even after they qualify under Civil Service and are eligible for these positions, then the Bureau of Internal Revenue, as the gentleman well knows, conducts a thorough schooling and course of training to qualify them especially for this type of work.

Mr. GARY. They have to be specially trained, and that is another reason; it is doubtful whether the Bureau can give as high-quality training to 7,000 in 1 year as they would be able to give to a smaller number in the same time.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I call my friend's attention to this large and important group of employees in Internal Revenue who are not zone deputy collectors but who are in classifications CAF–2, 3, 4, and 5. They have been promoted. They study for the position of zone deputy collector; they have taken the examination and passed; they have had experience over a number of years as permanent employees, and in that status they have passed the zone deputy collector's examination. Under civil-service laws they could be promoted, and certainly they will qualify. There must be quite a large number. I know that in the Boston office we have quite a large number who could go ahead.

Mr. COOPER. And we all know that some of them have been let out.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Men who have had several years of successful experience and who have splendid efficiency ratings.

Mr. McCORMACK. Just one observation; the gentleman has answered my inquiry. I join with the gentleman from Tennessee, and I state the Speaker's position also, in the hope that when the bill goes back to conference and an adjustment is made that the adjustment of the differences will come as close to the number provided in the Senate bill as possible.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], a member of our committee.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I disagree with the observation just made by the majority leader; I think we have gone far in agreeing to a compromise of 2,500 additional men. I am glad that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], who is a member of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, has referred to the report that committee made to the Eightieth Congress, and I am going to quote from that report.

The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation in its report to the Eightieth Congress said:

> Your committee recommends equal priority in action be given to reorganizing the management of the Bureau with a view to greater economy and efficiency and to more effective utilization of enforcement expenditures. The present Bureau organization is not the one best suited to the task. There is too great an emphasis on protecting the revenue, too little on protecting the taxpayer.

The report goes on to say:

> Even though the work load imposed by voluntary compliance cannot be lessened, substantial reductions in the cost of such service are entirely feasible, given time, talent, imagination, and the determination to discard obsolete procedures and controls no matter how venerable they have become. Almost every phase of this work can be re-

organized and performed in a more economical fashion. The really substantial savings do not lie in a face-lifting patchwork job but in complete reorganization of the entire administrative machinery. The Bureau is still using prewar procedures which are unsuitable to the dimensions of its present job. Diffusion of responsibility characterizes the organization, making it awkward for the Commission to exercise effective management controls. The actual task of tax collection and enforcement is also inadequately coordinated in the field. The entire tone and atmosphere of the enforcement procedure need to be reconditioned—the point of view of many in the enforcement staff reoriented.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman has not said a thing in the world about employees; that is what we are talking about.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am going to get to that.

Referring to problems of internal management the report goes on to say:

Analysis of the organization and operations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue reveal many unsolved problems of internal management. It is not strange that the Bureau has been slow in effecting substantial improvements in its housekeeping. Unnecessarily cumbersome, outmoded, and wasteful practices have continued unchanged in the Bureau for decades. Some proposed improvements in administrative methods have been discussed at length without result, other changes have been put into effect, but only after overlong discussion. Managementwise, the Bureau, because of lack of a balanced and adequate planning group, has not yet come to appreciate the tools that are necessary to administer effectively the present-day Federal tax system.

When the Bureau has carried out the recommendations contained in this report to improve its service, it will then be time for Congress to consider the additional personnel now requested. It would be extravagant for Congress to add thousands of employees to the Bureau pay roll before such action is taken.

On page 48 of the Senate hearings this year, Mr. Wiggins, former Under Secretary of the Treasury, testified that on October 1, 1949 the Bureau will put into effect a new system of reports, saving 2,000,000 man-hours. Why cannot this saving in man-hours be diverted to enforcement work without additional appropriations at this time? Unless Congress insists, the savings in man-hours will never be converted to a dollar savings in any estimates submitted. The Bureau has hastened to request the additional personnel the surveys recommend. Why has not the Bureau been equally fast in making the management improvements recommended by the surveys?

It is also pertinent to point out that the argument that enforcement men bring in $20 for every $1 expended, is open to great question. Such figures never embrace overhead nor do they consider the large amount of refunds made as a result of faulty assessments. The agent, in other words, gets credit for the levy or additional assessment while the refund, if made, is never subtracted.

What kind of a job can the Bureau do when it gets a jacking up on the part of Congress? In 1947 the Bureau was drastically cut, yet in 1948 with fewer employees, it collected $2,800,000,000 more than it did in the preceding year.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. May I say to the gentleman that we must give a lot of credit to the Under Secretary of the Treasury at that time, Mr. Wiggins, because he came before the Ways and Means Committee and he pleaded with us to help him get enough funds for modernization of the entire Bureau. His greatest plea, Mr. Speaker, was for more agents. He said that for every additional agent we put on we get an additional $20. These agents are used for the purpose of checking up on suspected chiselers. They are not the regular collectors, they are not part of the regular office force or the zone collectors. They are the agents. Mr. Wiggins made such an impressive showing before our committee that Mr. Knutsen, then chairman of the committee, and I think every Republican member of the committee, was in the forefront urging this additional personnel.

Are we going to go back and do less than Mr. Wiggins requested? Mr. Wiggins has been largely responsible for the great improvement made in the internal management of the Bureau. We all knew it was a little outworn in its methods, that it was not modern, but we tried to help in every way we could to get this modernization that has helped save money. We assisted them in getting new, modern machinery. But, one of the most important things, the thing that brings in the additional money, the gravy, you might say, that the chiselers keep in their pockets, is the use of sufficient personnel to frighten these chiselers so that they will know not to take a chance on cheating the Federal Government, and thereby making the honest taxpayer pay more money in order to get sufficient revenue to keep us from operating at a deficit. Mr. Speaker, I think it is penny-wise and pound-foolish not to give the Revenue Bureau the agents that they say they need in order to have an honest enforcement of the revenue laws of this country.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am glad that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has referred to Mr. Wiggins, who told me, as chairman of the subcommittee, last year, that he could not possibly recruit the number of men recommended in the survey conducted by this committee. That is why the able gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], has taken the position that he takes in the House today.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman from Tennessee has just stated the official figures of the Civil Service Commission show that there are plenty of qualified persons now to fill these positions.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Let us get this straight. There is no question of increase in personnel involved here at all. It is a question of restoration, and on that question I do not believe we will be able to restore what we have already partially destroyed, because too many of these efficient employees are today in business as tax experts on their own. But, we can bring back into the Treasury organization a certain substantial number of them. Now, when the gentleman refers to what Mr. Wiggins had in mind, I remember what Mr. Wiggins said on that score before the Committee on Ways and Means. He said that they were willing to give him more employees than he had asked for, more than he thought he could absorb in any one year, but that was more than the 7,000 who were cut off. But, he did not say that they could not absorb up to 7,000 or that it was more than they wanted. I want to make clear here and now that any number, even up to the full restoration of the 7,000—and I hold to that figure no less—that the Treasury will not put on inefficient, incompetent, or unqualified individuals to perform this very complex task any faster than they can absorb them. So, it resolves itself into this one thing: Do we want to, for the sake of a senseless paper economy, contrary to the intent and the wishes of the members of the Committee on Ways and Means, who have lived with this sort of problem, and the joint committee, the report of the experts of the joint committee, make this arbitrary cut stand and only partially restore it, when we know that for every dollar expended for employees' salaries in the restoration of this figure that there will be not $20, there may be $50, there may be $100 coming into the Treasury? Now, you men and women sitting out there before me understand one thing. Are you going to get what belongs to your Uncle Sam, and abide by the seasoned opinion of members of the Committee on Ways and Means who have lived with this problem and do not just treat it as a matter of appropriation for an hour or two, or are you going to face an increase in taxation on the legitimate taxpayer who is not a tax chiseler and tax evader? Remember that this group is intended to stop chiseling and collect the money honestly due your Government.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I do not know why the gentleman from Michigan uses the word "destructive" in talking of the action of this committee 2 years ago.

Mr. DINGELL. It certainly is not constructive.

Mr. CANFIELD. Because the Bureau was not destroyed. It came back next year and collected billions more than it collected the prior year.

Mr. DINGELL. In spite of the cut?

Mr. CANFIELD. In spite of the cut, yes.

I want to say this to the gentleman from Michigan, and I can point the finger, too. Conditions worsening, it will not be long before in the New York metropolitan area where I live there will be 1,000,000 unemployed. What are these men going to think of action on the part of this Congress putting thousands and thousands of men on the pay roll at this time? They are not going to stand for it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The reason they collected that money was that the action of the gentleman's committee put more efficiency in the organization.

Mr. CANFIELD. There is no question about it. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, backed by the testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury, said that very thing when he appeared before the committee. We were thanked by the Treasury for helping the Bureau.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 49: Page 44, line 1, insert the following:

"SEC. 207. During the fiscal year 1950 the Postmaster General shall make quarterly reports to the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations, showing for each quarter the amount paid from each appropriation for overtime, the number of employees receiving such overtime, and the number of hours of overtime worked by such employees, together with a statement as to the necessity for such overtime work."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. DELANEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 238, Rept. No. 827), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Whereas the Committee on the Judiciary under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 has been given jurisdiction as a standing committee over legislation pertaining to immigration and naturalization; and

Whereas in the course of activities conducted in pursuance of section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in the course of hearings held on legislation amending the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, it has been ascertained by the committee that the slowness of repatriation and resettlement of displaced persons, combined with the continuing influx of new refugees, tends to perpetuate this problem; and

Whereas the presence of over 10,000,000 refugees and "expellees" in the western zones of occupation in Germany and Austria, and in Italy, in addition to the problem of displaced persons and the surplus of population in Italy, is resulting in continuous pressure upon the very foundations of the United States immigration system; and

Whereas there is a considerable number of public and private legislation pending before the committee which tends to place upon the United States almost the entire burden of resettlement of this surplus population while the American taxpayer is already being called upon to bear the burden of the expenditures involved in the care, the maintenance, and the resettlement of these masses of migrant population; and

Whereas the International Refugee Organization is unable under its limited constitutional authority to provide for the solution of the problems above outlined; and

Whereas the above-outlined problems, in addition to considerable expense for the American taxpayer, involve a heavy burden for the devastated countries of Europe which the United States is assisting to rehabilitate, and a deterrent to a peaceful solution to Europe's economic, social, and racial difficulties; and

Whereas there is, therefore, an obvious need for a broad plan of international cooperation which would provide for a satisfactory solution of this emergency and for relieving the American economy of the expenditures involved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by duly authorized subcommittee or subcommittees appointed by the chairman of the said Committee on the Judiciary, is authorized and directed to conduct such studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the purview of the preamble of this resolution as will be deemed appropriate by the committee.

SEC. 2. That upon the completion of such studies and investigations as provided for in section 1 of this resolution, but not later than within 6 months next following the effective date of this resolution, it shall be the duty of the committee to submit to the House of Representatives a report for appropriate legislative action with such recommendations as may be deemed desirable by the committee.

SEC. 3. That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee or subcommittees thereof as designated by its chairman, may sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or without the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings and to conduct such investigations as it deems necessary.

SEC. 4. That in making such studies and investigations and in holding such hearings as provided for in section 3 of this resolution, the committee is authorized to include the services and travel of the requisite staff to accompany the committee or its subdivisions on such study missions, investigations, and hearings within the United States or abroad; and to procure the advice and assistance of such officials of the Federal Government as deemed necessary by its chairman.

SEC. 5. That the expenses of conducting the studies, investigations, and hearings, including travel expenses and subsistence expenses, as incurred by the committee, or by its members, or by the members of its staff, not to exceed $45,000, including expenditures for printing and binding, employment of experts and clerical assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by the committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 4, strike out lines 1 through 9, inclusive.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 108]

Barden	Burleson	Dawson
Barrett, Pa.	Byrne, N. Y.	Frazier
Bates, Ky.	Case, S. Dak.	Fugate
Blatnik	Christopher	Gilmer
Breen	Clevenger	Gore
Brehm	Cole, N. Y.	Granahan
Buckley, N. Y.	Coudert	Hall,
Bulwinkle	Davenport	Edwin Arthur
Burke	Davies, N. Y.	Hart
Heffernan	McMillen, Ill.	Phillips, Calif.
Heller	Macy	Poage
Hoffman, Ill.	Miller, Nebr.	Powell
Holifield	Morrison	Redden
Kee	Morton	Reed, Ill.
Kennedy	Murdock	Ribicoff
Kilburn	Murphy	Smith, Ohio
Kirwan	Murray, Tenn.	Taylor
Klein	Norrell	Thomas, N. J.
LeCompte	O'Konski	Werdel
Lichtenwalter	O'Sullivan	Wigglesworth
Lodge	Patterson	Withrow
Lucas	Pfeifer,	
Lyle	Joseph L.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 362 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CAREER COMPENSATION ACT OF 1949

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5007) to provide pay, allowances, and physical disability retirement for members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Public Health Service, the reserve components thereof, the National Guard, and the Air National Guard, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H. R. 5007, with Mr. HARRIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read through line 4 on page 1 of the bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a petition that I have just received from Reserve officers in the Norfolk, Nebr., area sets forth clearly the aspirations of these men respecting the legislation presently under consideration, also, their interest in other pending measures deemed by them to be in their appropriate interest. Accordingly, the petition is herewith incorporated in these remarks:

Hon. KARL STEFAN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

We Reserve officers in the Norfolk (Nebr.) area request your favorable consideration of H. R. 3039, amending the Reserve retirement law (sec. 302 (c) Public Law 810, 80th Cong.). We believe that many Reserve officers will be unjustly penalized in their retirement rights unless this amendment is passed. Although an attempt is being made to provide a large number of training assemblies to permit the reservists to earn the necessary 50 points before June 29, 1949, in order to have a year of satisfactory service for the fiscal year 1948–49, many of the Reserve officers in this area will not be able to complete them. Many of our officers will be unable to devote sufficient time, during this last month, to attend enough training assemblies to earn those points, either because of their civilian occupations and civic duties, or because they live many miles from Norfolk. If they had had sufficient notice they could have so budgeted their time and so arranged their affairs over a period of a year as to permit them to earn those points. This law, as passed, with the delay in disseminating the requirements, failed to give them that op-

portunity. The passage of H. R. 3039 would correct that injustice.

We also recommend the passage of H. R. 4570, the Reserve Training Facilities Act of 1949, now pending before the House Armed Services Subcommittee No. 3. We believe that an adequnte training program for the Reserves can be provided only with training facilities, which this act provides.

We further recommend passage of H. R. 4591 to provide increased pay for officers of the armed services. As Reserve officers, we should like to see such a pay increase, and to receive the protection for injuries incurred when attending drills or when on active duty for periods of less than 30 days, which that bill provides. As citizens interested in the promotion of a strong national defense, we believe that such increase in pay is necessary to our national security, to induce high-caliber men to make the armed services their career.

We solicit your support of these measures in the House of Representatives.

Rev. Bethel N. Bengtson, Wausa, Nebr.; Dudley L. French, Glenn F. Zobel, Guy B. Stinson, Kenneth G. Turk, LeRoy R. Strasheim, Wayne W. Hilkemeir, Norfolk, Nebr.; Eugene M. Sire, Humphrey, Nebr.; Joseph J. Morris, Dr. Ora C. Schreiner, Fred R. Lammert, Wesley S. Hansing, Horace W. Gomon, Norfolk, Nebr.; Ranley W. Connell, Neligh, Nebr.; Jerry J. Brown, Norfolk, Nebr.; Robert L. Swanson, Stanton, Nebr.; Duane K. Peterson, Wausa, Nebr.; Richard W. Gillette, Robert E. Felt, Clayton L. Andrews, Thomas C. Campbell, Richard E. Nordhues, Dennis W. Ballant, Darrel D. Dudley, Norfolk, Nebr.; John J. Adkins, Battle Creek, Nebr.; Wayne A. Jaeke, Clearwater, Nebr.; A. L. Broberg, Newman Grove, Nebr.; Elwin O'Neal, Creighton, Nebr.; Paul E. Imlander, Stanton, Nebr.; George Uhrenholdt, Clearwater, Nebr.; Albert R. Murdoch, Tilden, Nebr.; Benjamin F. Johnson, Wausa, Nebr.; Robert W. Adkins, Norfolk, Nebr.; Aage B. Petersen, Battle Creek, Nebr.; Chauncey B. Scott, Tilden, Nebr.; Floyd I. Foreman, Norfolk, Nebr.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—TABLE OF CONTENTS AND DEFINITIONS

SEC. 101. This act is divided into titles and sections according to the following table of contents:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 102. For the purposes of this act—

(a) The term "uniformed services", unless otherwise qualified, shall be interpreted to mean and include the Army of the United States, Navy, Air Force of the United States, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and all Regular and Reserve components thereof.

(b) The term "member," unless otherwise qualified, means a commissioned officer, commissioned warrant officer, warrant officer, flight officer, and enlisted person, including a retired person, of the uniformed services. As used in this subsection the words "retired person" shall include members of the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve who are in receipt of retainer pay.

(c) The term "officer," unless otherwise qualified, means a commissioned officer, commissioned warrant officer, warrant officer, and flight officer, either permanent or temporary, of the uniformed services. As used in this subsection the word "temporary" shall include temporary officers whose permanent status is that of an enlisted person.

(d) The term "commissioned officer" means a member of the uniformed services having rank or grade of second lieutenant, ensign, or junior assistant grade, or above, either permanent or temporary, in any of the uniformed services, except that for purposes of section 203 of this act such term shall be limited to the definition prescribed in subsection (a) of said section.

(e) The term "warrant officer" means a commissioned warrant officer, warrant officer, or flight officer, including a master, chief engineer, first mate, second mate, assistant engineer, or second assistant engineer of the Army Mine Planter Service.

(f) The term "Secretary," unless otherwise qualified, shall be construed to mean the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, or the Federal Security Administrator, as the case may be.

(g) The term "dependent" shall include at all times and in all places the lawful wife and unmarried legitimate children, under 21 years of age, or any member of the uniformed services, except as hereinafter limited in this subsection. Such term shall include the father or mother of such member, provided he or she is in fact dependent on such member for over half of his or her support and actually resides in the household of said member. It shall also include unmarried legitimate children, over 21 years of age, of such member who are incapable of self-support because of being mentally defective or physically incapacitated, and who are in fact dependent upon such member for over half of his or her support: *Provided*, That the term "children" shall be held to include stepchildren and adopted children where such stepchildren or adopted children are in fact dependent upon such member: *Provided further*, That in the case of female members of the uniformed services, the term "dependent" shall include a husband in addition to those persons otherwise defined as dependents in this subsection, but only when such husband, or children, as defined above, are in fact dependent upon said female member for over half of his or her support.

The term "father" or "mother," as used in this subsection, shall include a stepparent, or parent by adoption, and any person, including a former stepparent, who has stood in loco parentis to the person concerned at any time for a continuous period of not less than 5 years during the minority

of such member: *Provided*, That a stepparent-stepchild relationship shall be deemed to be terminated by the stepparent's divorce from the blood parent: *Provided further*, That no member claiming a dependent as defined in this subsection may be paid increased allowances on account of such dependent for any period during which such dependent is entitled to receive basic pay for the performance of duty as defined in section 201 (e) of this act.

(h) The term "basic allowance" shall be interpreted to mean only the "basic allowance for quarters" and the "basic allowance for subsistence."

(i) The term "inactive duty training" shall be interpreted to mean any of the training, instruction, duty, appropriate duties, or equivalent training, instruction, duty, appropriate duties, or hazardous duty performed with or without compensation by members of the reserve components of the uniformed services as may be prescribed by the Secretary concerned pursuant to section 501 of this act or any other provision of law, and in addition thereto shall include the performance of special additional duties, as may be authorized by competent authority, by such members on a volunteer basis in connection with the prescribed training or maintenance activities of the unit to which the members are assigned: *Provided*, That the term "inactive duty training" shall not include work or study performed by such members in connection with correspondence courses of the uniformed services: *Provided further*, That any inactive duty training performed by members of the National Guard of the United States or of the Air National Guard of the United States, while in their status as members of the National Guard, or the Air National Guard, of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia pursuant to section 92 of the National Defense Act, as amended, or pursuant to any other provision of law, shall be deemed to be inactive duty training in the service of the United States.

(j) The terms "he," "his," and "him" include the terms "she" and "her."

(k) With respect to the Army and the Air Force, the term "reserve component" or the term "reserve components," unless otherwise qualified, shall include but not be limited to those members, officers, or enlisted persons who are not appointed, enlisted, or inducted in a regular or reserve component of the Army of the United States or of the Air Force of the United States but are appointed, enlisted, or inducted in the Army of the United States or the Air Force of the United States without specification as to any component thereof pursuant to any provision of law.

Mr. KILDAY (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the table of contents and definitions contained in this title be regarded as read and be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, there are going to be some amendments offered to this bill a little later on, but I thought it was important at the outset to try to clear up a few matters that were mentioned when the chairman of the subcommittee took the floor yesterday. In his opening remarks the chairman of the subcommittee left the impression with the members of the committee that after the bill had been recommitted for reconsideration of it by the committee, that the new bill included what was expressed to be the sentiment of the House with reference to some of these amendments. I want to point out at the outset that as far as most of the amendments that are in the bill are concerned, that at least two of them have improved the bill considerably. But, I do not want anyone here to be under any sort of misapprehension or misconception as to whether or not what the committee has done with this bill represents what was the expressed will of the House during the last debate. Let me illustrate.

In the first place, this new bill includes the so-called Case amendment that was offered the last time the bill was under consideration, which provided for a percentage pay cut all the way down the line. When the Case amendment was presented here 3 weeks ago the members of this committee went on record against it and defeated the Case amendment, but the Case amendment is in this bill now. So, at least in that respect what the chairman of the subcommittee told you about expressing the will of the House is not correct.

One other thing. Back during the last debate I offered an amendment to increase the pay of the lowest grade enlisted man, the only person in the entire military who was not given an increase by the pay bill. That amendment is now in this bill, and I am in favor of its being in the bill. However, may I point out that the members of this committee went on record 3 weeks ago as being against the inclusion of that amendment. It was voted down by something like 72 to 27. So in that particular the committee has not seen fit to follow the judgment of the House.

With reference now to family allowances, I offered an amendment in connection with family allowances and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] also offered an amendment with reference to family allowances. My amendment was defeated. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] was adopted by the Committee of the Whole, but this bill does not have the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado, as I interpret it; as a matter of fact, the family-allowance provisions of this bill are more in line with my amendment, which was defeated. I am for a family-allowance provision, and I am glad that at least some sort of family-allowance provision is in this new bill. But what I want to do is convey to the members of this committee the fact that the bill that has been presented here today does not represent in any way what was the expressed will of the House 3 weeks ago. This new bill does not have the Carroll amendment that was passed by the Committee of the Whole during the last debate.

As a matter of fact, the very three amendments that were defeated by this committee are in the bill today. While I approve of at least two of those amendments that are in the bill today, we are going to offer some other amendments, and I know the committee will oppose the amendments we offer. When they oppose the amendments we offer, I do not want to have the members of this committee feel that in the bill that has been presented the committee has tried to express the will of the House as it was expressed 3 weeks ago.

There will be amendments offered that have to do with some change in the entire pay schedule. An amendment will be offered that has to do with the so-called hazardous pay or incentive pay, and an amendment affecting some of the low-grade enlisted men on quarters allowance.

One of these amendments I think will tend to show, as far as the pay schedule is concerned, that the emphasis will be placed where we feel it should be placed, from the lowest grade enlisted man on up through the junior officers. All the remarks I have heard here the last few days about the fact that they cannot get junior officers in the service, that men are quitting, and so forth, tend to show one thing. As the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] pointed out in his remarks of yesterday, men are refusing commissions. He gave one illustration, where about 1,000 men had qualified and only 79 men had accepted. It is the junior officers who are not accepting commissions. The reason is that apparently the junior officers are not getting enough consideration and incentive to have them join.

I think it is also interesting to point out that the gentleman's figures and the figures of the committee as shown in the committee report show that the men who are not going into the service, the men who are refusing to accept employment in the service, are also the enlisted men, some of the high-grade petty officers and some of the lower grades. Those are the Armed Services Committee's own statistics on these facts. I would be interested to hear some member of the committee give some statistics to show how many men above the rank of major or above the rank of lieutenant colonel are not staying in the service but are leaving the service for other employment. They have made a pretty good case, which we agree on, of showing that the lower grade officers and the lower grade enlisted men and the top-grade enlisted men are not staying in the service or are not going into the service because there is not enough incentive. We maintain that if there is to be a pay raise, the emphasis should be placed from the lowest grade enlisted man on up through the junior officers.

The amendment which will be offered will have to do with some increase in connection with the men in those grades, as well as other revisions. Those are the men who have to be considered, the men who are determining whether they will make a profession of the military or not. In my own humble judgment, if a young man who probably will be going in with the rank of second lieutenant or first lieutenant, or some comparable grade, is considering making the military his career, the main question that he and his wife and family are

going to have to consider is how much they are going to get in the next 7, 8, or 10 years. I think that is where the inducement should be and that is where the incentive should be. I also feel without question that the most important thing in this entire discussion is going to be the morale of the Armed Services. You have to have a bill which is going to improve and help that morale, rather than hurt it. Some of these amendments are going to cost more money than the committee bill, and some of them less money than the committee bill. But I am inclined to think that every single amendment which will be offered here today has in mind first of all what is the best thing for the security of the country, for the morale of our armed forces, and secondarily, what is the best from the point of view of economy. Very frankly some of the amendments will cost some more money, some I think will save money. I probably will have some remarks to make at the time the amendments are offered, but I did feel this was the time to point out that there have been some remarks made that are not so, and there has been an impression given that this new bill which has been brought back here today represents what the House expressed some 2 or 3 weeks ago. I think you ought to have in mind that every single amendment that is in the bill today, amendments which were referred to as being the expression of the will of the House were all defeated and now they are back in here. I hope you will have that in mind when the committee, as I know they will, opposes some of these amendments which will be offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WELCH of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, two splendid young men whom I appointed to the United States Military Academy at West Point were graduated with honors a few days ago. They intend to make the Army a career.

Second Lt. William J. Kennedy, one of these appointees, was married in the chapel at West Point the day following his graduation. This fine young specimen of soldier, who stands well over 6 feet, has been assigned to duty at Fort Riley, Kans., where he has taken his young bride. He, like other young men who are making the Army a career, is entitled to compensation which will afford him the comforts of a proper home and an inducement to raise a family.

Second Lieutenant Kennedy, as is the case with many other young men who are graduated from West Point and Annapolis, was not raised in the lap of luxury. He comes from a fine family. Our Government owes these young officers the comfort of such a home as they left when they entered the academy.

Mr. Chairman, we have reached a time in the progress of our country when it is imperative that we should have the best type of young men the country can afford who will make the Army and Navy a career and they should have pay commensurate with the requirements.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield for a question—what salary will the officer receive?

Mr. WELCH of California. It is written in the bill. A base pay of $213.75 a month.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think a fair analysis of the last bill, that was recommitted, would be that a substantial number of the members who voted for recommittal were not against a bill passing, but they were not satisfied with the provisions of the bill as it emerged from the Committee of the Whole. I think, in justice to those who voted for recommittal and who favor legislation, that this statement should be made; and, to place the construction upon the last vote that all Members who voted for recommittal were against any legislation passing, would be absolutely incorrect. I think it is also fair to say, from my talks and my observance of the bill and the other bill when it was before the House, that the great majority of the Members of the House believe that legislation of this kind should be passed. I think there is a general recognition that there should be a pay raise for the officers and enlisted men of our armed services.

I speak as one who served as a buck private in the First World War. I think I got $30 a month then. Later, when I was a sergeant, I think I got $38 a month. I can approach this from the angle of one who served in the enlisted ranks.

I thank God that we have young men who want to make a career of the various branches of our armed services, both as officers and as enlisted men. I would serve any period of time that my country was at war, but I would not want to serve 5 minutes in peacetime. But I am thankful that we have young men and young women who are willing to make a career of the armed service, because they are the ones to whom we must look in case of another war. I can say I thank God that we had the leaders in the last war that we had, in the Army, the Navy, the Air Corps, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, and all branches of our armed services. I think it is safe to say that the best fighting army in the world cannot compete with another good fighting army that is also well officered, unless the fighting army is also well officered. We may have the finest fighting army in the world of enlisted men, but how effective can they be unless we have officers—men who are trained?

I think it is wrong to try to separate the enlisted men from the officers or the officers from the enlisted men. I think it is wrong to blame all officers for what one or two or a small percentage might do. I got some rough deals when I was an enlisted man, but I did not overlook the great majority of officers who were gentlemen and who treated the enlisted men decently. I reacted to such uncomfortable happenings. We are all human. But when I meet somebody who does something I do not like, I do not think, if I would react in a manner that I would direct myself adversely against the entire group of which the individual who wronged or hurt me, that I am doing the right thing. I think the average enlisted man will agree that the average officer is decent and that he is a gentleman and wants to do the right thing. And this observation also applies to the enlisted man. They have a job to do. The enlisted man has a job to do. I think we ought to send a message to those who are making a career, both as officers and enlisted men, today in the passage of this bill, that we appreciate the problem that confronts them and that the recommittal of the last bill is not to be construed by them that the House of Representatives is adverse to justifiable increases. It seems to me that legislation is essential. It is justice. The officers have their problems. The enlisted men have their problems. This is a mere corrective compensation bill. It has been very carefully studied. The last bill was recommitted, and the experiences of the last one has been considered. I recognize that every Member is not satisfied with every provision of this bill. Opportunity will exist and should exist for Members to offer amendments. I ask those Members whose amendments may be defeated, should they offer amendments, nevertheless to vote for the bill; and I ask the Committee, notwithstanding the fact that amendments may be adopted to the bill, not to be opposed to the amended bill. The objective I speak for today, the second time a bill of its kind comes before the House, is a bill, no matter how the bill emerges from the Committee of the Whole. Personally, I am satisfied with the bill as reported out of the Committee on the Armed Services. My desire is that we pass a bill and send it over to the other Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. WELCH of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I was asked by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] the amount of pay that a second lieutenant would receive. At the time I could not give him the exact answer. But I have the answer now. Under the bill now before us a second lieutenant would receive $213.75 a month; they now receive $180 a month. This gives them a basic increase of $33.75 a month.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a question to the chairman of the subcommittee: Will the gentleman from Texas tell the House, and particularly tell me, what this bill will cost as compared to the former bill.

Mr. KILDAY. The present bill for the fiscal year 1950, remembering that that would be practically nine months of 1950 because the bill under its terms does not go into effect until the first day of Oc-

tober, would be $78,000,000 less than the bill that we had before us some weeks ago which was recommitted. It will increase a bit on the fiscal year basis during the next 2 years because of the continuance of family allowances; but by the time we level off, in 1953, it will cost $302,000,000 as compared to $401,000,000 under the other bill.

Mr. VURSELL. I thank the gentleman and wish to ask him another question: In the reconsideration of this bill the gentleman has gone into the matter to where it would be his judgment as chairman of the subcommittee, I take it, that this is a refined product that will pretty well meet the needs, the compromise needs, may I say, of the officers and men of the armed forces at the present time; am I correct?

Mr. KILDAY. I think the gentleman has expressed it very well when he said "the compromise needs." I am still sincerely of the opinion that the other bill was the proper bill. This bill is still a good one, particularly insofar as the bill maintains the formula worked out by the Hook Commission after careful, thorough, and detailed study. The formula of the Hook Commission is very well worked out and very basic. Should adjustments be necessary in the future they can be made percentagewise, reductions or increases. It would be a very simple matter to make out a new schedule should it become necessary, for all that would be needed would be to raise it or lower it by a simple matter of a percentagewise increase or decrease.

Mr. VURSELL. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, when this bill was considered recently there was so much general confusion and objection that while I had great confidence in this splendid committee I felt that probably I would be justified in voting to recommit the bill for further study. That seemed to be the sentiment of the House at that time. Reluctantly, I cast that vote.

We have seen the statements of various top flight military leaders, particularly of General Bradley, one of our great military leaders in the last war. They say that legislation of this kind is imperative for the morale of the personnel of our armed forces. I am not willing to go against their judgment at this time. I think we have some of the greatest military leaders of the world. I hope the time will not come when we will have to cast the lot of this Nation and put it wholly in the hands of these men, but should that time arrive, I do not want it to be said that I as a Member of the Congress, or that the Congress of the United States itself, interfered with or made less efficient the military arms of our Government.

I have confidence in the committee that brings this bill to the House after a thorough study of the whole situation. Therefore, I shall support the bill and I think that the House will be justified, now that the matter has been fully reconsidered, in passing the present bill. In my opinion, we should brush aside any amendments that may be offered and get on to the passage of the bill in the form that it comes from the committee.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I am in accord 100 percent with our great majority leader in his statements about action on H. R. 4591. As I stated on the floor of the House in the discussion of the bill, I favor a pay raise, but I am for an equitable and fair one. The reason I was against the other bill was because I did not think it was fair. Every statement I made before, I reiterate again today. Every observation I made at that time, concerning prerequisites, I repeat. I am not retreating on any of them. In fact, I could give numerous additional instances. Since that time I have visited two Army camps and two Navy bases, so I know whereof I speak. However, I am not going into that. I am going to try to be constructive, not detrimental.

For one, I go along with the majority leader in the hope that we can pass an impartial pay-raise bill. I have no malice toward any top brass. Three of the greatest fighters I have ever known, the three men who I consider had more guts than any other men I have ever known, were generals, General Cramer from the Twenty-fourth Division, General Mudge from the First Cavalry, and General Chase from the First Cavalry Division. I have the greatest respect and admiration for our leaders. But regardless of what it may be, military legislation, tax legislation, labor legislation, or any other form of legislation, my people of the great Volunteer State of Tennessee want fairness and justice, and as one of the Representatives from the Volunteer State, I will always shoot for fairness and equity. That is the reason I was fighting against H. R. 4591. I did not think it was equitable, and I was not alone in that position. Even though much criticism has been directed against me by the Army and Navy bulletins and some of the Army and Navy wives, as well as some of the papers, there were 227 of this body who did not like that bill.

I am glad to see that the Committee on Armed Services, for whose members I have the greatest respect and admiration, have reconsidered and reported an improved bill. In fact, it was my second choice to be elected to the Committee on Armed Services. I first asked for the Committee on Agriculture, and my second choice was the Committee on Armed Services. I would have enjoyed serving with those gentlemen because I consider them statesmen—as I say, I am glad to see that they have repented in this bill. But, I think they should be baptized and accept a few amendments, then we will have a good pay bill, an equitable and fair pay bill.

My contention all along, together with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO], and along with some of the other gentlemen who have spoken before, has been and is today that your incentive pay should go to those boys that are in financial distress. They need a pay increase to stay in the services, to make our armed forces the greatest in the world. Your second lieutenants, your first lieutenants, your captains and your majors, those are the boys that are to be our future ranking officers, and they are having a hard time. Take your enlisted men, they are having a hard time. If you get those men over the hump, so to speak, and give them a fair pay incentive where they will stay in the service until they become lieutenant colonels and colonels, you will not have men resigning from the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Air Corps, but you will have competent and efficient men in the armed services of America. You will have men who will be proud to say that they represent the armed services of our country. But, until the time comes when we can enact a pay raise which is fair and equitable, and until the time comes that we take care of those boys, who actually are suffering financially, they will be tempted to go into industry, until that time comes we are going to continue to lose our best men out of the ranks of second lieutenants, first lieutenants, captains, majors, sergeants and corporals. For that reason and that reason only, they are leaving the services. To say nothing of the family situation. By the way, they have to rear them on their present pay, and they cannot properly rear and educate them without more money. The recommendation of the Hook commission should be an incentive pay raise for those junior officers and enlisted men more than for your top ranks.

I shall offer an amendment, and I hope that each Member of the House will get a copy of the amendment. I hope the pages will pass it around. As to this amendment, I had Mr. Lattimer from the Hook Commission, who has been with them for the last 18 months, figure out what it would cost. I have those figures here, and when I discuss this amendment I will tell you exactly what it will cost according to Mr. Lattimer, who figured it up for the Hook Commission. His estimate is that it will cost more than H. R. 5007 but will cost less than H. R. 4591. I do not say that this is an economy drive. We should think of the morale of our men. We should think of our country. You cannot measure the security of America in dollars and cents. You cannot measure what a second lieutenant is worth in dollars and cents to the American people. The most patriotic people in the world are the boys and girls in the armed services of the United States of America. When you are looking for a Communist, you will never go to the military services of America. Those are the people that are willing to and have sacrificed their lives for this Nation. Your junior officers and enlisted men have been making great sacrifices for a long time. They are willing to continue to die for America. Those are the most patriotic people we have in the United States of America, not even excluding the Members of the Congress. They are the people we can look up to as true, great Americans. We should think of their morale, we should think of the incentive to keep them in the services to protect our country and our people. They have chosen the armed

services as their career. Let us take care of them. Let us economize on something that is foolish and not necessary. Let us have a pay raise, but let us have an equitable, impartial, just, and fair raise. I am not going to burden you longer on this.

There are two major amendments that will be offered. We are interested in more, but these are the main ones. One is the discrimination between the line officers and the flight officers. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCULO] will offer an amendment on page 19 which will save $23,000,000 and will be equitable, that is economizing. On the other hand, the pay-scale amendment that will be offered later will cost more than the bill now before us, but we will have a saving over all, in the protection of America, protection of the enlisted men, protection of the junior officers, protection of the senior officers, as well as protection for the brass.

With due respect to all, I am hopeful that this committee and the House will pass a pay raise for them, one that is fair, one that is equitable, and one that is just.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the committee on bringing out this bill and also the original pay adjustment bill. I supported the original pay-adjustment bill and will support this bill, although I would have preferred the former piece of legislation.

It does not quite make sense to me when we spend billions and billions of dollars to equip the Army, Air Force, and Navy with the latest weapons and the best equipment we can purchase, and then are niggardly when it comes to providing an incentive to the men who make the Army, Navy, or Air Force a career.

It was my lot to have served during World War II as an enlisted man, a junior grade officer, and a field grade officer. As a matter of fact, 17 of my first 24 hours in the United States Army were spent on KP, so I know a little bit whereof I speak. My greatest concern as an enlisted man was in knowing that I had competent officers and NCO's. There is nothing more demoralizing, there is nothing that will dishearten the enlisted man more than to deny him the possibility of securing the best officers and NCO's the Government can provide him.

We talk about the money this is going to cost. I am inclined to agree with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, my friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] in his statement yesterday that he predicts that in the long run this bill will actually be an economy measure. If we provide an adequate pay schedule for our officers and NCO's, I as one Member of Congress will hold the military services responsible for doing an adequate job. However, if we deny them the pay adjusment that they consider adequate, then I cannot in good conscience go to them and say, "You are doing a poor job," when that situation comes up. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, in justice to the enlisted man, let us not be niggardly about a pay increase as far as our military structure is concerned. I understand that truck drivers around New York City are earning $10,000 a year or more. I do not begrudge the truck driver earning his $10,000 a year salary, but I am wondering if it would not be possible to give, say, a major in the Army at least half of what the truck driver receives.

I have been concerned about the opposition to this bill and the former bill, referring to the so-called brass and anybody who has a star or a bar on his shoulder and using them as a whipping boy. Unfortunately, I have not lived long enough to have experienced what happened after the last war, but I understand that has been a common procedure, to hold up the officers of your military branches, put them on a pedestal when you need them and then after the war is over put them in a dark closet and use them as a whipping boy for everyone who wants to take a crack at them. It is true perhaps politically that we do not get many votes from officers, while there are a large number of enlisted men. Perhaps politically it is wise to bombast the officers to create an illusion that you are the great friend of the enlisted man. But to be honest and to do what is right by the enlisted man, let us give them some good officers so that the lives of the enlisted men will not be endangered by a lack of good officer material.

It is not my understanding of a democratic army that the private should receive as much salary as the general. It is my belief that in a democratic army a private should be able, if he has the ability and puts in the effort to rise to the rank of a general, and by so doing be able to receive adequate pay increases as he develops in the service.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this Committee will see fit to pass the bill without amendment.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, not being available yesterday during debate, I should like to ask the gentleman from Texas a few questions about this new bill. At the outset I may say that I am not interested in opposing this bill because it is a wage-increase bill. As a matter of fact, I think the other bill which was before this body would have been a more equitable bill than some of the provisions in the present bill from the standpoint of a wage increase. In asking these questions there is no desire on my part to offer any obstructing amendments which may send the bill back to committee.

During the debate on the original bill I offered an amendment which was adopted by the House. That amendment was designed to insure equitable treatment of the enlisted man who enlisted prior to July 1, 1946, and the enlisted man who came into the service after that date. It was the consensus of this body that those men should be treated equitably. I want to ask the gentleman from Texas whether or not in this revised bill we have afforded those enlisted men, either before or after July, the same treatment as was set forth by my amendment.

Mr. KILDAY. The provisions of the bill are not exactly the same as the one offered by the gentleman from Colorado when the bill was before us for consideration before.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt at this time? As I remember the bill which came before this body, those who enlisted prior to July 1, 1946, were to retain the family allowance under the act of 1942, in addition to which they were to receive the wage increase.

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct, as to those enlisting prior to July 1, 1946.

Mr. CARROLL. As I understand the provisions of this act, this bill now before us has been revised and those who came in before July 1, 1946, have had taken away from them the wage increase, is that not so?

Mr. KILDAY. That is not my understanding of the provision. My understanding of the provision is we recognize that the law having been in existence as to those enlisting prior to July 1, 1946, they have a definite fixed contract under which they are to continue to draw that throughout the period of their enlistment and under this provision they would not be deprived of anything.

Mr. CARROLL. Is the gentleman not saying that these men who entered the service before July 1, if this bill becomes effective, will not receive an increase?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct. They would not receive an increase, but their family allowance will be carried on in accordance with the provisions of previously existing law. We regard that as being a contract which we made with those men, and we propose to see to it that the Government abides by it.

Mr. CARROLL. Now, you will remember that in the amendment which I offered we said that those who enlisted after July 1, 1946, should be treated equitably and equally. Under this bill, as I understand it, after 1946 they not only do not get the wage increase but you have modified the family allowance. Is that not true?

Mr. KILDAY. We have modified it. I am going to have to answer that in my own time, when I will have adequate time to do it. We were under the necessity of reducing the cost of the bill. The amendment which the gentleman wrote into the bill increased it over $100,000,000 above previous proposals. I regard the adoption of the gentleman's amendment the other day as an outstanding example of the fallacy of attempting to write this type of legislation on the floor of the House.

Mr. CARROLL. I am happy to have the gentleman's comment. This is tremendously important, and the gentleman has unwittingly placed his finger upon the great weakness of this bill. I have no desire to obstruct the passage of the bill. All I want is an equitable measure incorporated into this bill. If you will look in the report you will find that

they have saved, according to their statement, $183,000,000. From where? From the family allowances. Well, who have family allowances? The enlisted men have the family allowances. So $183,000,000 is saved, according to them, so they can take it away from these men and their dependents who had the protection, as the gentleman has used the term, "of a contract of enlistment."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARROLL. They have pulled away $183,000,000 from this small group, and they have loaded it on top. That was the amendment I offered before. I said it was not fair and equitable and should not be permitted by this body. I charge you, that when you effect this saving you can take it away from the enlisted man and his family, notwithstanding that he had entered into a contract of enlistment with this Government, and this Government said to him, under the 1942 act, "If you go into the service we will take care of your wife and your child, and if necessary we will take care of your dependents." By this act they are modifying the act of 1942 and they are modifying the contract of enlistment.

Perhaps there is a saving of $100,000,000. However, I do not stand here joining with the economy group. That is why I say, as the gentleman who preceded me has said, if we invest $16,000,000,000 in the defense of this Nation, then we ought to have an officer personnel and an enlisted personnel that can measure up to the responsibility of safeguarding our national defense.

Now as to pay cuts in the present bill. There is a cut of $895,000 in the generals. There is a cut of over $42,000,000 from officers below the class of general officers. There is a $32,000,000 cut from the enlisted personnel. But under the previous bill the enlisted man who entered service before July 1, 1946, received a pay increase. That bill was sent back to committee. Now a bill is brought to this floor taking away from him his wage increase. That is not fair. As to these enlisted men who have come into service after July 1, 1946—not only his wage increase but his family allowance is materially reduced. I believe the gentlemen on the committee are unduly concerned regarding the passage of the bill. If they did this thing equitably the economy bloc could not defeat the bill.

I say that we ought to put in the original amendment. If it costs $100,000,000, that is an obligation of this Government, a contractural obligation which the Government entered into. The committee cannot deny that. If we grant these wage increases now it will be at the expense of some of the enlisted personnel and their families.

The gentleman from Massachusetts and I engaged in some colloquy on the previous debate. He asked: "Do you mean by your amendment that you are going to give wage increases?" And I said: "That is exactly what I mean." Because, when we consider increases to the generals, the colonels, the majors, the junior officers, and the enlisted personnel, it must go all the way up the line, everybody getting a wage increase; and then, eventually, in 1952—and this is the provision of this bill—we shall not further continue the present family-allowance benefits. But we should not shut them off when men are under a contract of enlistment. We could eliminate them gradually by 1952.

Therefore, to make the issue crystal clear, any saving that we make out of current expenditures, that is to say the sum of $183,000,000 as is set forth in the committee report, is that amount of money taken away from the families or dependents of enlisted men which has been heretofore established in favor of enlisted men and their dependents by an act of Congress passed in 1942. The purpose of my amendment is merely to retain the present provisions of existing law until such time as an enlisted man ends his current term of enlistment. I say that the Government has a moral obligation to fulfill its contract and that in good faith and in good conscience we should not discriminate against those categories of enlisted men who have families or dependents now drawing benefits under an act of Congress. It seems reasonable to me to permit them to serve out their present enlistment before subjecting them to new laws and new provisions which will not be beneficial either to them, their families, or dependents, and which materially violate their contract for military service in the Government of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, during general debate on yesterday we attempted to explain exactly what we have done in reducing this bill. I regret that an issue has arisen over what I said with reference to the directive to the Committee at the time the bill was recommitted for further study. My statement was that the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from South Dakota was in effect a directive, and I call your attention to the fact that the motion to recommit merely recommitted the bill to the committee for further study, not to report it back with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado, which added $100,000,000 to the bill. That provision was added to the bill on the floor of the House with comparatively little consideration. The motion to recommit, rather than being a directive to your committee to bring back the bill exactly as it had been written on the floor with little consideration and debate was a directive to give the bill further study. I certainly do not feel that we then had a directive to bring it back in accordance with exactly what had been written into the bill on the floor of the House. I am also quite familiar with tactics followed by some in the House at times to so burden a bill with amendments that it will be defeated. So we cannot undertake to evaluate the motion to recommit as a specific direction to the committee to bring the bill back as it was.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. Not at this time; I will yield later.

The fears expressed about those who enlisted before July 1, 1946, is theoretical. A man who enlisted prior to July 1, 1946, is in the higher rated class; he moves into a higher income bracket because of increases in allowances which we give him in this bill which give to some about $60 a month. We never made a contract with those men that their pay would be increased or that it would be increased because the pay of others was increased. We made a contract as to family allowances which was definitely provided by law, which said that it would terminate 6 months after the war was declared over. We said to the man that if he enlisted prior to July 1, 1946, we would not permit his family allowance to terminate during the period of his enlistment. We are carrying out the commitment we made at that time. The bill which we have brought back is in accordance with what we deemed to be the instructions of the House that we further study the matter and bring in a bill with such revisions as seemed to us to be proper.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. The gentleman indicates that the wage increase is not important to those who came in before 1946?

Mr. KILDAY. I never indicated anything of the kind and the gentleman knows I have not.

Mr. CARROLL. I thought the gentleman's comment was that it was not important.

Mr. KILDAY. I said nothing of the kind and no one can so construe.

Mr. CARROLL. That was my understanding, but it is not important. May I say to the gentleman from Texas that if I thought my amendment would defeat this measure I would not be willing to offer it because I want to see this measure passed, but I believe the committee is unnecessarily apprehensive. I believe if we give equitable treatment here, even though it costs more money, this group is not so economy minded that they will defeat it.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman misconstrues the temper of this House very materially. It will not stand for a bill that costs up to $406,000,000. If we attempted to do what the gentleman is talking about on family allowances, then you are going to get it back to $400,000,000 and the bill is going to be recommitted just as surely as I stand here.

The gentleman referred to the fact that we reduced the generals in this bill only, I think he said $890,000. It is about $900,000. He points that out as showing what little bit we are reducing

the generals. The proper construction of that is that applying a 10 percent decrease to everything that we attempted to give them in the other bill you save approximately $900,000 because there is not any money in that bracket. The total increase that would be given to generals in this bill is less than $2,000,000 and if you were to take every cent that it is proposed to give in increases to the colonels and the generals and distribute it among the enlisted men you would increase their pay only 74 cents a month.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, we save $40,000,000 on officers other than generals, but we reduced what we tried to give them by half as much as we reduced the generals, still saving about $40,000,000, showing clearly that the vast majority of the money appropriated in this bill for officers goes to officers below the rank of general.

So far as the enlisted men are concerned, we reduced them but 2 percent. In other words, in the $200 bracket we reduce them $4 a month, but we save almost $40,000,000, proving again that all of the money in the bill is in the classes of officers below general and in your enlisted grades. That is where the money is in this bill.

Mr. CARROLL. The gentleman is absolutely right, and that is why I made the statement. I said it is such a piddling reduction that we should not pay so much attention to it and should be concentrating our attention on this apparent inequity. The gentleman has by his remarks, I think, indicated that he is concerned about the passage of this bill because of this increase, or because of the family-allowance matter, and that we ought to abandon the family-allowance proposition to pass the bill.

Mr. KILDAY. I said nothing of the kind. A proper construction of the family-allowance provision contained in this bill is not subject to attack as being inequitable. It is perfectly equitable and the thing that should be done. There is the question of the moral obligation we owe to other men in the service who qualify for allowance for quarters and subsistence the same as we propose to compel others to qualify.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Colorado seems to be concerned about elimination of the family allowances given prior to July 1, 1946, yet he says in the same breath, at least he intimates, that if the amendment of his would jeopardize passage of the bill he would not offer it. The fact is that he did offer such an amendment the last time the bill was being considered, the amendment was adopted, and the gentleman from Colorado voted to recommit the bill.

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct. And, after he got what he wanted for family allowances, he voted to recommit the bill, after he played into the hands of those who did not want to go beyond a certain figure on this legislation. I will ask the gentleman, did he not vote against it after he got his amendment adopted?

Mr. CARROLL. When we debated this thing on the floor of the House, many of us felt that this bill had not been thoroughly considered and, as I say, as it comes back to the House, I think I know as much about the bill as the gentleman who is the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. KILDAY. I think the gentleman knows as much about any subject as any Member of the House.

Mr. CARROLL. I think that this bill is a fine bill. I admit that there are many fine provisions, but I do not like this particular provision. And, I said to the gentleman from Texas, rather than have this bill defeated, I would not press my amendment. But, I do not agree with the gentleman. I think he is unnecessarily alarmed.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Colorado said that the first bill we brought in, in his opinion, was a better bill than we brought in today, and yet the very amendment he now offers or speaks about is the same amendment he presented two weeks ago, which was adopted, and he voted against the bill.

Mr. CARROLL. I was referring to your increase and the further point that the gentleman from Texas makes, that there was only a small reduction on the generals, and I said I thought we should not be demagoging on the brass, because there are only $900,000 involved.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. The gentleman from Colorado said that the original bill had not been thoroughly considered. I submit that this program was considered over a year by the Hook Commission. Our subcommittee studied it for over 3 months, and I think we gave exceptionally fair consideration to the original legislation.

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

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Colorado, in view of the great interest that he is manifesting on the floor of the House, why he did not come before the Committee on Armed Services when this bill was being considered and express his objections at that time?

Mr. KILDAY. I am going to request you gentlemen to carry on your argument in your own time. My time is about gone.

Mr. GAVIN. I would like to ask him that question.

Mr. KILDAY. Well, the gentleman can take time and ask him that question.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, because he offered the other amendment, and this follows the pattern of his amendment.

Mr. FURCOLO. I would like to ask this question. The gentleman has put in this bill without any question the Case amendment; is that not right?

Mr. KILDAY. No, not exactly. His amendment was 5 percent for officers and 3 percent for enlisted men, and we have used the formula of 10, 5, 3, and 2. We took the position that to preserve the work of the Hook Commission you could only apply your reduction percentagewise.

Mr. FURCOLO. You put in the theory of the Case amendment that makes a percentage cut all the way from top to bottom.

Mr. KILDAY. That is right.

Mr. FURCOLO. Is it not a fact that that amendment was presented here and defeated in the committee?

Mr. KILDAY. It was defeated, but at the same time the gentleman from South Dakota was able to recommit the bill, and his total argument was to reduce the bill by $100,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss briefly a matter I have discussed with the chairman of the full committee, the chairman of the subcommittee, and the ranking member of the subcommittee, as well as with other members of the committee. I think it is extremely important to some of us who voted to recommit the bill on May 24, because we were confronted then with a situation which I think also confronts us today, unless there is definite assurance given by the committee that this problem is going to be solved. Too, I think it is of vital importance to the Congress, to the personnel of the armed services, to other Federal employees and to the American people.

I know the gentleman is aware of the fact that the Bureau of the Budget furnished several tabulations with reference to the previous bill on May 12, which was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on that date from pages 6218 to 6228, inclusive.

When the previous bill, H. R. 4591, was before the House on May 24, I voted with those in favor of recommitting that bill to the Committee on Armed Services for further study. I did so because, after studying the committee report, the hearings, and that bill, in terms of the comparable tables and other data prepared by the Bureau of the Budget, I believed that it was most important for the House to have the benefit of a further study of the over-all problem by the committee. I was particularly concerned with the

information contained in those tabulations as to the value of what was described as the present annual value of deferred benefits. Under the permission which I secured in the House, I am including here the table described as 2 (B):

TABLE 2 (B).—*Military compensation rates as proposed by Advisory Commission on Service Pay (H. R. 2553)*

[Entrance rates for married personnel—Annual rates in dollars]

Military grade or rank		Active duty compensation									Present annual value of deferred benefits
Expected entry year	Rank	Base pay	Longevity	Subtotal basic pay	Quarters allowances (tax free)	Subsistence allowances (tax free)	Food, clothing, and shelter to enlisted "in kind"	Subtotal: Active duty gross pay (including pay "in kind")	Tax advantage on cash allowances	Total active duty compensation	
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Officers:											
30	General	$11,700	$360	$12,060	$1,800	$2,740		$16,600	$1,100	$17,700	$3,256
30	Lieutenant general	11,700	360	12,060	1,800	1,040		14,900	650	15,550	3,256
30	Major general	11,700	360	12,060	1,800	540		14,400	530	14,930	3,256
30	Brigadier general	9,720	720	10,440	1,800	540		12,780	520	13,300	2,819
25	Colonel	7,200	900	8,100	1,440	540		10,080	350	10,430	2,187
19	Lieutenant colonel	5,670	990	6,660	1,440	540		8,640	340	8,980	1,798
13	Major	4,860	540	5,400	1,260	540		7,200	290	7,490	1,458
7	Captain	3,960	360	4,320	1,080	540		5,940	240	6,180	1,166
3	First lieutenant	3,144	186	3,330	990	540		4,860	220	5,080	899
0	Second lieutenant	2,700		2,700	900	540		4,140	200	4,340	729
Enlisted:											
15	Master sergeant (1)	2,430	540	2,970	810	378	$240	4,398	170	4,568	921
11	Technical sergeant (2)	2,070	360	2,430	810	378	240	3,858	170	4,028	753
7	Staff sergeant (3)	1,710	270	1,980	810	378	240	3,408	170	3,578	614
3	Sergeant (4)	1,440	90	1,530			1,296	2,826		2,826	474
1	Corporal (5)	1,170		1,170			1,296	2,466		2,466	363
½	Private first class (6)	990		990			1,296	2,286		2,286	307
0	Private (7)	900		900			1,296	2,196		2,196	279

It is my understanding that H. R. 4591, in general, followed rather closely the pay schedules and retirement benefits provided in the original bill, H. R. 2553.

I want to emphasize the fact that this is an analysis based on the actuarial estimates of the Hook Commission. You will find in the RECORD for May 12 a number of interesting annotations to the several columns but I want to direct the Committee's particular attention to the annotation with reference to column 10. It is as follows:

These estimates cover the cost to the Government of disability, retirement, severance, and death benefits provided to military personnel on a noncontributory basis. Based on the actuarial estimates of the Hook Commission (averaging its high and low assumptions, and assuming 2½ percent interest per annum) the present annual value or discounted cost of these deferred benefits for Regular nonflying officer would be about 27 percent of basic pay. For enlisted personnel the cost to the Government would be about 31 percent of basic pay. (If not discounted for interest, the cost would be much higher.) The figures shown in column 10 represent the amounts the Government would have to lay aside for each employee for each year of active service, assuming 2½ percent interest per annum would be earned by the retirement fund, to ultimately pay the retirement and other benefits to be provided to the employees who qualify for benefits. Viewed from another standpoint, these are the extra annual rates the Government would have to pay its military employees if they all took our private insurance policies (at cost, without loading, and assuming 2½ percent interest) to give them the same protection now provided by the Government.

Let me further call your attention to the reported annual benefit to the individuals ranging from $279 in the case of the private, to $3,256 in the case of the general.

It is my understanding that this was the first time that the Budget Bureau had provided an estimate of the discounted annual value of retirement, as well as other deferred benefits, to the military personnel. These benefits appear to add a substantial percentage to the gross amount received by the military personnel in the course of a year, since the Government clearly pays the entire cost of military retirement benefits. In contrast to that, I understand that civil-service employees contribute approximately 6 percent of their total annual pay and the Government contributes another 6 percent on an average. Therefore, it seems we are confronted with the fact, even in terms of the present revised bill, that civilian employees receive retirement benefits which appear to be only one-half to one-third the benefits the military personnel receive. It is my further understanding that the computation of military retirement pay is on the basis of the highest grade held for 6 months while the basis in civil service is the average salary for 5 years. But, the most important factor, is that military personnel have not been required to contribute anything toward their retirement and my study of the pending bill leads me to the conclusion that there is no change incorporated in this bill. May I call your attention to the language at page 2 of the committee report on this bill as follows:

While the committee has accepted many of the recommendations of the Hook Commission, it has not accepted them all and, in some instances, fundamental changes were made in the initial legislative draft. Originally the proposed act contained revisions of voluntary and involuntary retirement laws. The committee was of the opinion that the subject of voluntary and involuntary retirement was so complex, so vast, and would have such far-reaching effects upon the services that an attempt to revise or rewrite these laws should be held in abeyance until some future date, when it could be made as a separate study.

I emphasize these words, "that an attempt to revise or rewrite these laws should be held in abeyance until some future date." Now, may I turn to a tabulation which I prepared and which the committee staff has been kind enough to revise for me in part. Under the permission granted in the House, I include that tabulation in full:

	H. R. 4591	H. R. 5007	Classified civilian Federal (Classification Act revision)	Comparable industrial pay rates according to Commission survey in 1948
General	$20,956			
Lieutenant general	18,806			
Major general	18,186	$16,934.00	$15,900	$33,204
Major general			13,780	
Brigadier general	16,119	15,039.00	12,190	22,284
Brigadier general			10,600	
Colonel	12,617	12,176.00	9,964	11,844
Colonel			9,328	
Lieutenant colonel	10,778	10,409.00	7,956	7,428
Major	8,948	8,642.00	6,784	6,852
Captain	7,346	7,094.00	5,724	6,180
Captain			5,300	
First Lieutenant	5,979	5,812.56	4,876	4,644
First Lieutenant			4,252	
Second lieutenant	5,069	4,848.00	4,029	4,644
Master sergeant	5,489	5,429.60	4,028	4,752
Technical sergeant	4,781	4,632.40	3,604	4,020
Staff sergeant	4,192	4,147.40	3,180	3,792
Sergeant	3,300	3,296.40	2,915	3,564
Corporal	2,829	2,805.60	2,650	3,240
Private 1st class	2,593	2,593.00	2,438	2,820
Private	2,475	2,475.00	2,226	2,820

[1] In addition, the amounts under H. R. 5007 must be reduced by a reduction of tax exemption and a reduction in the value of individual retirement benefits.

References: Report, U. S. Bureau of the Budget, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 12, 1949, pp. 6218-6228.

I am advised that the total amounts of additional reductions in the second column would be comparatively small in any case possibly ranging from $100 to, at the highest, $500. I regret that neither the committee staff nor I have been able to develop this minor point with exactness.

I have furnished copies of this tabulation to the chairman of the subcommittee, the chairman of the full committee, the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee, and to other members of the full committee with whom I have had an opportunity to discuss this matter.

You will find a marked difference in terms of the over-all benefits to be re-

ceived under this bill in every category from major general to private in contrast to the over-all benefits under the pending Classification Act revision in comparable categories. I realize that there is some difference of opinion as to the priority of such comparable classifications but I insist that when you study the contrasts in the two categories covering colonel, lieutenant colonel, major, captain, first lieutenant, second lieutenant, master sergeant, technical sergeant, staff sergeant, and sergeant, with comparable categories in the classified civilian employees in the Federal Government, it raises a very important question for the consideration of this Congress.

Next, you will find an even more marked spread between the over-all benefits received in every category from colonel through staff sergeant in contrast with comparable industrial pay rates according to the Hook Commission survey itself. Again, I recognize that differences of opinion will arise over the kind of responsibilities required as well as relative advantages or disadvantages involved. However, in terms of creating a situation, without reference to the second important and, in my opinion, equally vital problem to which the Hook Commission addressed itself, I think we must recognize that we have an important task only partially completed and perhaps coming to us somewhat out of focus.

Turning back to table 2 (B) and column 10, this becomes particularly obvious. Of course, some adjustments must be made because of the increase here in base pay which will necessarily reflect itself in added annual value of deferred retirement benefits. If the colonel in question purchased the equivalent protection, his over-all compensation from the Government would be reduced to $9,989 in contrast to $9,964 in the classification revision. In the case of the lieutenant colonel, his over-all compensation would be reduced to $8,611 in contrast to $7,956 in the classification revision and $7,428 in comparable industrial pay rates. In the case of the major, it would be $7,184 against $6,784 and $6,852 in the comparable positions. In the case of the captain, the value of his over-all compensation would be $5,928 against $5,724 and $6,180 in the comparable occupations. I have not carried this throughout the entire categories but I think this illustration is sufficient to indicate the very great importance of this interrelated problem. If action is not taken as promptly as possible toward a solution, then I certainly feel that there would not be justice in denying a request which could be made fairly on the part of other Federal employees that they, too, should be permitted to abandon the burden of contribution and rely solely on the Government assuming the full obligation. In that connection, according to the committee's report on both of these bills, the individuals involved total 1,593,516. The latest information which I have as to the number of employees, exclusive of those in the armed services is the additional report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, Congress of the United States. The total is 2,111,257.

To complete the record, may I quote from certain letters which the committee incorporated in the report on H. R. 4591?

First, the following is contained in the fourth paragraph of the letter from the President to the Secretary of Defense, dated March 5, 1949:

> I believe that it would be appropriate to put the proposed retirement system on a 6 percent contributory basis, similar to the system now in effect for classified employees. Such a step should be coupled, however, with a modification of the retirement system to provide survivor benefits for personnel of the uniformed forces. The amounts of the various benefits should be adjusted so as not to absorb completely the revenue to be received from contributions.

Next, may I quote from the letter of Hon. Frank Pace, Jr., Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to the Secretary of Defense, dated May 11, 1949, as follows:

> I agree that there are not now sufficient and adequate data upon which to base a thorough study of experience under existing military retirement systems and that such a study is necessary for the development of a fair and consistent contributory retirement system. In this connection, I am recommending to the President the appointment of a Presidential commission to conduct an across-the-board study of all Federal civilian and military retirement systems. I am sure you will agree to the validity of an across-the-board approach.
>
> With respect to gross pay, I feel that the National Military Establishment has overlooked the advantages of developing a gross pay alternative to replace the pay scales recommended by the Hook Commission. Regardless of whether the development of such a scale is now necessary to meet Budget requirements, I believe that we should confer again with the President respecting his further wishes in the matter. There is no major issue between us since you subscribe to the soundness of the gross pay principle. I believe we agree that until it is developed and written into law for the military services there can be no effective means of providing full understanding of what military pay scales really are and of dissipating valid criticism against a system which incorporates tax-free allowances and thereby creates a preferred class of Government employees.

I should like to ask two questions:

Is it not fair to say that this extraordinarily large spread between what will be paid in all kinds of value under this bill to personnel of the several Services and what would be paid under the Reclassification Act to other employees of the Federal Government, or what persons with similar ability, training, and responsibilities earn in civilian life, is due to the fact that primarily there is no provision in this bill for the change-over of the present noncontributory system to the contributory system?

Mr. KILDAY. I cannot agree that that is entirely the question, although it probably is involved.

Mr. HESELTON. Is it the major issue?

Mr. KILDAY. I think the basic difficulty is in attempting to assign one of the classifications of the civil service to what is comparable in the military classifications. I cannot agree with the Flanders statement.

Mr. HESELTON. I understand that, but may I ask this: If this system were now changed over in this bill to a contributory system, whatever form it might take, certainly that figure of $10,409 for a lieutenant colonel would be sharply reduced, because in receiving the gross benefits or pay, they have sufficient so that they can contribute to their retirement just as other Government employees have to do. Is not that right?

Mr. KILDAY. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. The rates contained in the original bill, which was recommitted, would have been sufficient to provide a contributory system. I can say definitely to the gentleman that legislation on that subject is pending before the committee, and that it is the purpose of the committee to go into the question at an early date. Of course as to the schedule and so on I would have to refer you to the chairman of the full committee who is here.

Mr. HESELTON. May I just comment on the difference between the original bill and the present bill with respect to the comparable over-all benefits involved. Under the terms of the original bill the figure for a lieutenant colonel was $10,778 for everything. Under this bill it is $10,409, which is a difference of $369. Obviously that is not such a substantial difference as to have the effect that they should not be asked to contribute as other employees contribute.

Mr. KILDAY. But if you had a contributory system as opposed to a noncontributory system, it would have to be at the rate of 6 percent. I do not say that we have cut out all of that contribution by this reduction, but it would have to be apportioned when the time came to apply the contribution. I can say to that in the services themselves most of the men would prefer to go on a contributory system because they feel that the criticism which comes to them from a noncontributory system does more harm than they would get from a contributory system.

Mr. HESELTON. And there are advantages to the men in the service under a contributory system over the existing system.

Mr. KILDAY. Oh, yes. Then we would be able to get to the survivors' benefits. That is the most grossly inequitable thing that we have in the armed services today—the manner in which we treat the widow and children of a soldier or retired man who dies.

Mr. HESELTON. May I say in conclusion I have made these inquiries because I want to have in the RECORD, and for my information, the assurance of the gentleman and I hope the chairman of the full committee agrees with this, as I know he does from his conversation with me, that we can look forward to early action.

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct.

Mr. HESELTON. If that is so, I may be able to change my vote, but I will reserve the right to vote to repeal the pay rate portion of this legislation if it is not done in time so that this inequity will not be worked permanently into the Federal system.

Mr. KILDAY. I think I can assure the gentleman that the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], who is the author of the legislation which is now pending before our committee, and who is most active in the matter, will get hearings.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. May the committee now have the same assurance from the chairman of the full committee that the committee will report as soon as it can at its convenience a proper bill providing for a contributory compensation system?

Mr. VINSON. I can assure the House that at the proper time the full committee will give due consideration to the subject. I cannot say what the final action will be, but personally, I have been an advocate of that measure for a long time.

Mr. HAND. You are personally for it?

Mr. VINSON. I am for it.

Mr. HESELTON. I hope that by that remark the gentleman has not placed me under the further difficulty of trying to interpret what he says. But when he says that in proper time due consideration will be given to this. I trust that it will be fairly soon.

Mr. VINSON. As soon as an intelligent approach and understanding can be reached on such an important question.

Mr. HESELTON. I thank the gentleman and want to express my appreciation to both the chairman of the full committee and of the subcommittee, as well as to the staff members of the committee, for their courtesies to me. None of us, not members of the committee, can be expected to have the detailed knowledge of this highly complicated and technical bill the committee members have. I think the very great majority of the Members of the House approve heartily of almost the entire bill. The committee is entitled to congratulations for its work. But each of us must assume an individual responsibility in discharging our duty. We want to do justice to the personnel of the armed services. But we also want to do justice to other equally valuable employees in this Government. And we must further do everything possible to be just to the great majority, all the rest of the American citizens, who, directly or indirectly, have to carry, in large part, the gigantic cost of operating this Federal Government. If this bill is passed, it will not be merely recognition of and adjustment of certain inequities which undoubtedly exist. It will be a challenge to those who receive these benefits from the American people to meet the responsibilities recognized here. I am confident that the American people will expect and demand greater efficiency, a determined effort to administer efficiently and economically the billions appropriated for the armed services and an immediate end to petty jealousies and squabbling within their ranks which, to date, has quite effectively stifled much of the congressional mandate for realistic unification.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I favored this bill before and I favor it now. To go into the arithmetic of this bill and the reconstruction of its various provisions would be repetitious since they have been fully and ably discussed. In order for our Nation to maintain its place in the world we must be strong. In order for us to stay strong, it is vital that we have a strong Army, Navy, and Air Force of the highest spirit and morale. I received a letter the other day from a lady who lost her husband in the recent war. She will not be affected by the provisions of this bill and her thinking is in no way colored by the desire for personal gain. She has had an opportunity through the years to observe the inner life of our great services. I shall read that part pertaining to this bill, which will take but a moment:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN SASSCER: I am writing you as a Navy widow to urge that your committee, Armed Services, consider the men and their families while they are alive. I have known that there is much sentiment expressed after they are gone, but little else. My husband gave his life saving 30 men from a gas-filled compartment of a cruiser, and his automatic control drillings helped save the ship. Congress passed a bill which brought back the bodies. How much finer to have given that money to the education and welfare of the children of the family. Now there is much ado about special privilege. I wonder when we will realize and recognize that the servicemen are our first line of defense, who must go along in peacetime unheralded and ignored. They and their families live in ways that ordinary people would deplore. Just the year before the war I doubt if I saw my husband more than 3 months, yet we keep high morale, striving for God and country.

Let us, in the tone and spirit of this letter, make our contribution to the morale of these great services, recognize their needs and their wants in life, as contrasted with flowers in death.

Our Maryland delegation on the previous bill voted in the majority to recommit. Today I think we are unanimously for the bill. I hope that prevails throughout this House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER] has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that section 201 of the bill be regarded as read, printed in the RECORD, and be open for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY]?

There was no objection.

(Section 201 follows:)

TITLE II—PROVISIONS RELATING TO BASIC PAY AND SPECIAL PAYS

BASIC PAY

SEC. 201. (a) For the purpose of computing the basic pay of members of the uniformed services, pay grades are prescribed and monthly base pay for such members is established wihin each pay grade according to cumulative years of service, as follows:

COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

Pay grade	Cumulative years of service												
	Under 2	Over 2	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
O-8	$877.50	$877.50	$877.50	$877.50	$877.50	$877.50	$877.50	$877.50	$877.50	$877.50	$877.50	$877.50	$904.50
O-7	729.00	729.00	729.00	729.00	729.00	729.00	729.00	729.00	729.00	729.00	729.00	756.00	783.00
O-6	570.00	570.00	570.00	570.00	570.00	570.00	570.00	570.00	584.25	612.75	641.25	669.75	698.25
O-5	456.00	456.00	456.00	456.00	456.00	456.00	470.25	484.50	498.75	527.25	555.75	584.25	584.25
O-4	384.75	384.75	384.75	384.75	399.00	413.25	427.50	441.75	456.00	484.50	498.75	513.00	513.00
O-3	313.50	313.50	327.75	342.00	356.25	370.50	384.75	399.00	413.25	427.50	441.75	441.75	441.75
O-2	249.38	263.63	277.88	292.13	306.38	320.63	334.88	349.13	349.13	349.13	349.13	349.13	349.13
O-1	213.75	228.00	242.25	256.50	270.75	285.00	299.25	313.50	313.50	313.50	313.50	313.50	313.50
WARRANT OFFICERS													
W-4	$320.10	$320.10	$320.10	$334.65	$349.20	$363.75	$378.30	$392.85	$407.40	$421.95	$436.50	$451.05	$465.60
W-3	291.00	291.00	291.00	298.28	305.55	312.83	320.10	327.38	334.65	349.20	363.75	378.30	392.85
W-2	254.63	254.63	254.63	254.63	261.90	269.18	276.45	283.73	291.00	305.55	320.10	334.65	349.20
W-1	210.98	210.98	210.98	218.25	225.53	232.80	240.08	247.35	254.63	269.18	283.73	298.28	298.28
ENLISTED PERSONS													
E-7	$198.45	$198.45	$205.80	$213.15	$220.50	$227.85	$235.20	$242.55	$249.90	$264.60	$279.30	$294.00	$294.00
E-6	169.05	169.05	176.40	183.75	191.10	198.45	205.80	213.15	220.50	235.20	249.90	249.90	249.90
E-5	139.65	147.00	154.35	161.70	169.05	176.40	183.75	191.10	198.45	213.15	227.85	227.85	227.85
E-4	117.60	124.95	132.30	139.65	147.00	154.35	161.70	169.05	176.40	191.10	191.10	191.10	191.10
E-3	95.55	102.90	110.25	117.60	124.95	132.30	139.65	147.00	147.00	147.00	147.00	147.00	147.00
E-2	82.50	90.00	97.50	105.00	112.50	120.00	120.00	120.00	120.00	120.00	120.00	120.00	120.00
E-1 (over 4 months)	80.00	87.50	95.00	95.00	95.00	95.00	95.00	95.00	95.00	95.00	95.00	95.00	95.00
E-1 (under 4 months)	75.00												

(b) For basic pay purposes, commissioned officers are hereby assigned by the rank or grade in which serving, whether under temporary or permanent appointment, to the various pay grades prescribed for commissioned officers by subsection (a) of this section, as follows:

Pay grade	Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps	Navy, Coast Guard, and Coast and Geodetic Survey	Public Health Service
O–8	General, lieutenant general, and major general	Admiral, vice admiral, and rear admiral (upper half)	Surgeon general, deputy surgeon general, and assistant surgeon general having rank of major general.
O–7	Brigadier general	Rear admiral (lower half) and commodore	Assistant surgeon general having rank of brigadier general.
O–6	Colonel	Captain	Director grade.
O–5	Lieutenant colonel	Commander	Senior grade.
O–4	Major	Lieutenant commander	Full grade.
O–3	Captain	Lieutenant	Senior assistant grade.
O–2	First lieutenant	Lieutenant (junior grade)	Assistant grade.
O–1	Second lieutenant	Ensign	Junior assistant grade.

(c) For basic pay purposes, warrant officers shall be distributed by the Secretary concerned in the various pay grades prescribed for warrant officers in subsection (a) of this section.

(d) For basic pay purposes, enlisted persons shall be distributed by the Secretary concerned in the various pay grades prescribed for enlisted persons in subsection (a) of this section.

(e) All members of the uniformed services when on the active list, when on active duty, or when participating in full-time training, training duty with pay or other full-time duty (provided for or authorized in the National Defense Act, as amended, or in the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, or in other provisions of law, including participation in exercises or performance of the duties provided for by sections 5, 81, 94, 97, and 99 of the National Defense Act, as amended), and in addition thereto, all members of the National Guard and the Air National Guard when they are entitled by law to receive from the Federal Government the same pay as that authorized for members of the Regular components of the uniformed services of corresponding grade or rank, shall be entitled to receive the basic pay of the pay grade to which assigned, or in which distributed, pursuant to subsection (b), (c), or (d) of this section, in accordance with cumulative years of service: *Provided*, That in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President, in the case of members of the uniformed services called or ordered to extended active duty in excess of 30 days, active duty shall include the time required to perform travel from home to first duty station and from last duty station to home by the mode of transportation authorized in orders for such members: *Provided further*, That any full-time training, training duty with pay, or other full-time duty performed by members of the National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States, pursuant to this section, while in their status as members of the National Guard or the Air National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia and which entitles them to receive basic pay, shall be deemed to be active duty in the service of the United States.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUTTON: Strike out table on page 9 and insert the following:

COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

Pay grade	Cumulative years of service												
	Under 2	Over 2	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
O–8	$750	$750	$750	$770	$770	$770	$790	$790	$790	$820	$830	$840	$850
O–7	600	600	620	620	640	640	660	660	680	680	700	700	725
O–6	500	515	530	545	560	575	590	605	620	635	640	640	640
O–5	450	470	490	510	530	550	560	570	580	585	585	585	585
O–4	395	415	435	455	475	495	515	530	540	550	550	550	550
O–3	335	355	375	395	415	435	450	465	480	480	480	480	480
O–2	275	290	305	320	335	345	355	365	375	385	400	400	400
O–1	230	245	260	275	290	300	310	320	330	340	340	340	340

WARRANT OFFICERS

W–4	$320.10	$320.10	$320.10	$334.65	$349.20	$363.75	$378.30	$392.85	$407.40	$421.95	$436.50	$451.05	$465.60
W–3	291.00	291.00	291.00	298.28	305.55	312.83	320.10	327.38	334.65	349.20	363.75	378.30	392.85
W–2	254.63	254.63	254.63	254.63	261.90	269.18	276.45	283.73	291.00	305.55	320.10	334.65	349.20
W–1	210.98	210.98	210.98	218.25	225.53	232.80	240.08	247.35	254.63	269.18	283.73	298.28	298.28

ENLISTED PERSONS

E–7	$202	$202	$210	$217	$225	$232	$240	$247	$255	$270	$285	$300	$300
E–6	172	172	180	187	195	202	210	217	225	240	255	255	255
E–5	142	150	157	165	172	180	187	195	202	217	232	232	232
E–4	120	127	135	142	150	157	165	172	180	195	195	195	195
E–3	97	105	112	120	127	135	142	150	150	150	150	150	150
E–2	82	90	98	105	112	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120
E–1 (over 4 months)	80	87	95	95	95	95	95	100	100	100	100	100	100
E–1 (under 4 months)	75	75											

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes in suppport of his amendment.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would bring about a pay increase to every member of our military forces. It is not as much as provided in the bill H. R. 4591, but in every instance except four, it is more than provided in H. R. 5007. It increases the lieutenant-colonel by $22.25 a month; it increases the major, or equivalent rank, $81.75; it increases the captain $58.75 a month; it increases the first lieutenant by $27.87 a month; it increases the second lieutenant $17.75 a month.

As compared with the bill H. R. 5007, it decreases the brigadier general by $56 a month and the major general $54.50.

The warrant officers remain the same.

Enlisted men receive monthly increases as follows: E–7, $4.15; E–6, $3.90; E–5, $3.30; E–4, $2.05; E–3, $2.10; and E–2 and E–1 are carried exactly as they are in H. R. 5007. The total cost of increases for the junior and senior officers amounts to approximately $104,853,000 per year for the fiscal year 1950; but since the committee is basing their report on a 9 months' period, it would, therefore, be three-quarters of $104,853,000.

The over-all increase for the enlisted men for the 12 months period would be $45,558,000 which would be a total increase for the year of $150,411,000 officers and enlisted men. These figures were not tabulated by me; they were tabulated by the gentleman who has been with the Hook Commission for the past 18 months as their mathematician, c. p. a., or whatever you may wish to call him. He was in my office this morning and he made these calculations for me. I do not doubt his figures whatsoever, for if I did then I should have to doubt the figures in the Hook Commission report, and there is no doubt about their accurateness.

The figure I have given of $150,411,000 is on a yearly basis; but for 1950 we are

figuring on a 9 months' basis, the amount for 1950 would be three-quarters of that.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO] will offer an amendment, when we get over to page 19, covering hazardous duty. If you will ask for a copy of his amendment and read it, you will find that his amendment will save $23,241,130. If you adopt these two amendments, without this new table in there covering hazardous duty, which is a discrimination against your infantry officers but helps the flying general, of course, it will cut down the cost of this bill, by $23,000,000 over what this amendment would cost. That is, over the cost of H. R. 5007.

In reference to cost I would like to make this statement. It has been stated on the floor of this House that H. R. 5007 will cost $283,000,000, I believe I am correct.

Mr. KILDAY. I believe it is $273,000,000.

Mr. SUTTON. That is for the cost of basic pay only. Actually the total cost of this bill H. R. 5007, according to the report figures given to me by Mr. Lattimer, the man who figured out the cost of the bill and who has been working with them 18 months, will be $467,802,641. So, actually, this bill is not costing $273,000,000 but is costing over $467,000,000.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. Has not the gentleman neglected to deduct the savings made in the other provisions of the bill?

Mr. SUTTON. The gentleman is referring to the ones the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], referred to?

Mr. KILDAY. Those two and the reduction of flying pay of $77,000,000, overseas duty pay, and so forth.

Mr. SUTTON. I hope the gentleman will let me proceed.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman wants to correct his figures by about $213,000,000. I realize it is a small item, but it might be material.

Mr. SUTTON. I agree with the gentleman 100 percent but I can also take those away from my figures and the cost of my amendment will be reduced accordingly. The over-all cost here will be $467,000,000. I will admit it is an increase over the cost if you want to interpret it as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], does, but, after all, as I said before, if you want an incentive, a career compensation pay bill, if you want something to keep those men in the armed services of our country, put it where it belongs, give it to the ones who deserve it and are suffering—the first and second lieutenants, the captains and majors.

Mr. KRUSE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. KRUSE. I notice the gentleman has cut all of the officers except the warrant officers. Would be kindly explain his justification for making no change whatsoever insofar as warrant officers are concerned?

Mr. SUTTON. I disagree with the gentleman. I have cut only two. That is, O–8 and O–7. After talking with numerous warrant officers, they are satisfied with this provided they can get spelled out in retirement exactly what status they are in instead of leaving it to the discretion of the Secretary. That is the reason why your warrant officers were left exactly as they are in H. R. 5007.

Mr. KRUSE. In view of the fact that all officers are going to be reduced, I cannot understand why warrant officers are left out.

Mr. SUTTON. They are not being reduced.

They have been increased. This amendment gives a pay increase to every member of the armed forces except O–7 and O–8, together with E–1 and E–2, which are untouched.

Mr. KRUSE. I am speaking in relation to the bill brought out in the committee.

Mr. SUTTON. H. R. 5007?

Mr. KRUSE. Yes.

Mr. SUTTON. In every instance except two, the O–7 and O–8.

Mr. KRUSE. The commissioned officers have all been reduced.

Mr. SUTTON. No, I disagree with the gentleman because in every instance, according to our figures, they are getting an increase, except the O–7, O–8, E–1, and E–2, which remain the same.

Which grade does the gentleman have reference to?

Mr. KRUSE. The O–6.

Mr. SUTTON. That is a little over $25 a month more than under H. R. 5007. I think the gentleman is a little disturbed about over and under 2 years. There is no major that goes in now in 2 years.

Mr. KRUSE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SUTTON. You will find that for an O–6 it actually takes 10 years to become a major. I might, for the information of the committee, say that for a second lieutenant, the way it is figured, it is on 4 years, first lieutenant 7, captain 10, major 9, lieutenant colonel 13, colonel 21, brigadier general 26, major general 30. That is the basis figured in the West Point Academy.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wish the gentleman would move that up to 30 minutes, because this is the most important part of the bill.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman has already spoken on the amendment.

Mr. SUTTON. I know, but there are several others that want to speak.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment. I have not had an opportunity to study or analyze it in detail, but I note that while it cuts down the committee bill in some of the places where increases are needed, it provides increases for junior officers over and above the increases provided in the committee bill. This bill as it comes from committee increases junior officers' base pay: second lieutenants 19 percent, first lieutenants 27 percent, and captains 26 percent. This Sutton amendment would give additional increases to those grades.

I voted against the last bill; I am supporting this bill today, because it provides a plan of career compensation that can be supported by our economy, but that contains inducements for a good man who wants to make armed services his career. We never can bid against private employment in boom times; on the other hand, private employment can never give the financial security in good times and bad, that the Government gives an officer or enlisted man. This bill strikes a fair balance, giving increases in compensation all through the critical ranks and grades, with opportunities for advancement to better paid top grades.

This amendment throws the entire plan out of line. I mention the extra pay provided for junior officers, because I want to discuss particularly one group, the recent academy graduates. I note in the committee report that resignations from the recent Naval Academy graduates have reached 643 since 1946 as contrasted with 63 such resignations in the prewar years 1937 and 1940.

The report then states:

> This is not as significant, however, as the increasing rate. This rate has nearly doubled during the past calendar year, and if continued at its present progression will bring the percentage of resignations from the last three graduating classes, namely, 1945, 1946, and 1947, to approximately 40 percent prior to the completion of 5 years of commissioned service.

I inquired at the committee table, and I was told that the percentage of walkouts, approximately 40 percent, is about the same for West Point.

This is what concerns me: These boys went into the Academies during the war years. These are the boys that were being educated at Government expense while their contemporaries, boys of the same age, were fighting and dying all over the world. Yet here I find, to my utter dismay, that these boys are walking out the first chance they get, not staying in. These fellows who sat out the war and played football, and studied up at West Point and Annapolis during the fighting, now want to get out as soon as they can. There may be some legitimate excuse for some of them; I know that some of them did some fighting before they were appointed; but all of them knew when they signed up what the pay of a second and of a first lieutenant was going to be, knew that they were safe while their friends were in the war, and this war group of Academy graduates had, and have, a special obligation to serve their country as officers, even at a financial sacrifice. They look bad getting out in a hurry in peacetime.

There are a lot of these fellows that are yellow, in my book. It may be a

good thing to get rid of them. They are not the kind I want to bait by increasing their pay. If they are not yellow, if they appreciate that they got a free education at Government expense while their buddies were out fighting and dying, they will stay in the service if they have a spark of patriotism in them, and they will stay in there, certainly, with the substantial increases given in the committee bill. They do not need the extra pay offered in this amendment.

It is an insult to a good man to say you have to bid for him, under such circumstances. If he belongs in that group, and if he is one of those who sat out the war, who took a free education and served the minimum time and got out, as far as I am concerned I do not want him. I do not want him to make the military a career, and I do not want to try to buy him back in.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is there nothing in the law today to keep these men in the service?

Mr. VORYS. As I understand, the requirements are 3 years for graduates of the Naval Academy and 4 years for graduates of West Point. I should like to be corrected if I am in error.

Mr. RIVERS. Four and four.

Mr. VORYS. Four for both?

Mr. RIVERS. Yes.

Mr. VORYS. I am corrected. It is four for both academies, but what they are doing is getting out at the first opportunity, on various excuses, sometimes before their minimum service is up, after they got a free education at Government expense, while boys the same age were fighting for their country.

Mr. GROSS. Let us increase that to 7 years.

Mr. VORYS. Those officers who were trained during the war ought not to need either minimum-service laws or maximum-pay laws to make them fulfill their moral duty to their country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO].

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, the basic purpose of the entire pay-increase bill, as I have understood it from what the committee has said and from everyone who has spoken, is that for some reason or other you have to give some sort of inducement or incentive to people to go into the services. That is the purpose of this amendment. Also, as I pointed out before, the committee has said time and time again, and these are the committee's figures, that the people who are refusing to accept commissions are those who normally would be getting the junior-grade officer commissions. The men who are not going in the service and not staying in the service are the enlisted men, the high-grade enlisted men, and the junior-grade officers. If this is a bill to try to offer some incentive and inducement to get people in the service, if we have to do that for the good of our country, and I am willing to assume we have to, then it seems to me the logical and essential thing to be done is to analyze what is happening and see who is not going into the service, in what ranks, and then put the emphasis on them in connection with any pay raise.

The committee itself maintains, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], a member of the committee, told you yesterday, that where you are not getting the men in the service is in the junior-grade officers. The figures showed that and proved it, at least to my satisfaction. This amendment tries to put that inducement and that incentive into the ranks of those officers who are not staying in the service and not going into the service. It is offering them an incentive and an inducement. I think it is a sound amendment for that reason. I know, as I mentioned before, that if I were a young man going to start a career in the military service, I would be interested in whether or not my family and I could live for the first few years. I do not think, if I were not an Academy man that I would ever try to hope to go above colonel. I am inclined to think I would probably hope that I might get that high.

Another thing I would like to point out, if you will turn to page 9 of the bill, you will notice that the junior-grade officers are given pay increases every 2 years or so up until about the 12th or 14th year, and after 12 or 14 years there are no more pay increases for the low-grade junior officers. That is discriminatory against the enlisted man who rises from the ranks to the rank of officer. The reason is that the enlisted man who starts at the bottom is a career man, and does not get to be a second lieutenant or a first lieutenant until he has had about 12 or 14 years of service or perhaps 10 years of service. So, as a practical matter, what happens when he reaches that rank is that he then gets no more pay increases. On the other hand, the Academy men, the men from Annapolis or West Point are not first or second lieutenants for any 8, 10, or 12 years. They get pay raises all the time that they are in that grade. But they get out of that grade before they have completed 10 or 12 or 14 years of service. If they do not get out of that rank by that time, then they are not worth anything. So this pay bill, as it is now written, discriminates against junior officers who rise from the ranks and become second or first lieutenants. There is no question about that.

Briefly, what it does is that it goes back to the original bill which the committee brought in, with reference to enlisted men. It gives them the same pay that the original bill gave them. It gives junior officers a little more money than either that bill or this bill. It also gives the lowest grade enlisted man the same amount of money that the present bill does. In the old bill, everybody was given a raise except the lowest-grade enlisted man. The lowest-grade enlisted man was not given anything at that time. You will remember that the Case amendment was defeated here, because the amendment called for a percentagewise cut all the way down the line. That was defeated by the Members on the floor of the House which I interpret—I do not know how the committee interprets it, but I interpret it as an indication that the Members felt there should not be any percentagewise cut all the way down the line. Yet this bill has the Case amendment in it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] for the unerring devotion and time that he has spent in the preparation of this bill and the interest that he has manifested in the bill on the floor of the House. It is extremely interesting to note that those who voted against the bill which we brought on the floor of the House 2 weeks ago—a bill which we felt gave proper recognition to the junior officers and the enlisted personnel to the point where, out of $467,000,000 in the pay schedules, $420,000,000 went to the junior officers and enlisted men—are now speaking for this amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] which substantially increases the rates in the bill which he reported 2 weeks ago and the bill which he voted against. I just cannot understand the logic of his position. If he is interested in the junior officers, and in the enlisted men, surely he should have voted for the bill which we reported to the floor of the House 2 weeks ago. But he did not. He spoke against it, and voted against it although he may have experienced a change of heart in the meantime.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield, inasmuch as he mentioned my name?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I cannot yield to the gentleman, I only have 4 minutes, and this is the first time I have spoken this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] presents this tabulation of figures changing the pay schedules of the very complicated bill which the committee worked on for a period of 3½ months.

The amendment he offers now is going to cost $115,000,000 more than the bill we have before us this afternoon. The Hook Commission, which gave very careful study of all the factors entering into this pay schedule recommended a scientific approach to stabilizing the salaries and other compensations in the military forces of the Government. The bill we have before us this afternoon is a result of that study.

I trust you ladies and gentlemen will recognize the fact that the gentleman himself has had but a very limited time to put together this amendment, and it ought to be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be a very serious mistake to undertake to adopt this amendment. This amendment goes to the very heart of the bill. It rearranges the schedules so that inequities will be created in the future.

I think that much we say this afternoon as well as what we say on this amendment has disregarded the history of this legislation. I have served on three pay bills in the past. I recall when I first went to work on pay legislation in the House, we were paying the enlisted men of the grade of recruit $30 a month. We brought in a bill which increased it to $42 a month; and I recall we amended the bill on the floor to pay that man $50 a month. I recall that subsequently I brought in a bill with my name on it wherein we raised the recruit from $50 to $75 a month. So in the short tenure I have had in this House, I have seen the recruit raised from $30 to $75 a month. I have seen men in the enlisted grades immediately above recruit, that is, private first-class, corporal, and sergeant, raised proportionately. I think that in those days we put great emphasis on the lower brackets without proper emphasis upon the upper brackets.

I have been an enlisted man myself in a combat division. I know what it is to go out and fight in the front lines. I know above everything that an enlisted man wants a competent officer from whom his orders come. I know you cannot get good officers without paying for them.

If we upset this schedule by this amendment, we will create the same inequities again, and we will have to have another pay bill, which will be the fifth pay bill during my service here, to rearrange these schedules and get them back as they should be. I think you will be making a serious mistake, and I hope this committee does not do this.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. SIKES. This definitely is a better bill than the one which was before us when the pay raise measure was considered a few weeks ago and I am supporting it. I think it would be a mistake to adopt the amendment that has been suggested. Instead the bill should be passed in its present form.

Now, here is a point which I want to call to your attention. I know there are apprehensions on the part of enlisted men about what this bill might do to their retirement privileges. I know the answer, but I think the RECORD should show the answer, and I hope my distinguished friend who has done such good work on this bill will state definitely for the RECORD that this bill does not take away anything in retirement privileges which enlisted personnel now enjoy.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman knows I worked for many years for retirement benefits for both enlisted and officer personnel in the armed services. I believe that this takes care of the fundamental equities of enlisted and officers retirement.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that in committee we gave consideration to the plight of the enlisted men and the junior officers?

Mr. BROOKS. I think the committee is very sensitive to the condition of the enlisted man. During the First World War, I served as an enlisted man, certainly, I am going to stand up for the enlisted man and see that he gets a square deal in the committee every time.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. SIKES. Is it not also true that by this bill disability retirement privileges are extended for the first time to enlisted personnel?

Mr. BROOKS. That is right. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] for 4 minutes to close the debate.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, in the first place, this amendment would increase the cost of the bill by $150,410,000. I have not the slightest doubt in my mind but that if this bill is increased by any such amount of money it will again be recommitted; that a vote for this amendment is a vote definitely against the pay raises that we are attempting to give to members of the armed services.

This emphasizes something that is not understood by a great many people and understood least of all by the gentlemen who, in perfect good faith, have offered this pay schedule. There are many things which go into what should constitute these pay schedules; for instance, the Hook Commission in its report, which took long study, found that when you keep the entering wage too low in the higher brackets, when a time of emergency comes along you are not able to get your Reserve officers in the scientific and technical groups to come in; you cannot get doctors and people of that kind because they simply cannot afford to leave their civilian practice and accept the low pay in the entering brackets. That was taken into consideration together with many other things in connection with fixing the pay rates which are contained in the bill. I want to read you a wire from Mr. Wallace H. Whiting, a member of the Hook Commission, a wire dated today. It reads as follows:

> I feel today that pay scales we recommended to Secretary of Defense in 1948 were correct and are equally sound today. However, I wish to call your attention to the fact that the Hook Commission recommended these scales as a pattern of pay that could be adjusted to the economic condition of the country at any stated period. We feel it would be an error to distort the pay scale in any reduction that is made by increasing or decreasing certain grades at the expense of others.

In other words, this schedule is one that has been set up with proper differentials so that when the bill was recommitted we could take the schedule contained in the original bill, apply a percentagewise reduction to it, and still maintain the fundamental principle of the bill. If the pay scale which we have set up in this bill is enacted into law and should economic conditions reach the point where the cost of living has decreased, you can apply a percentagewise decrease and would have a proper bill and pay schedule; or should the cost of living increase you could apply a percentagewise increase to the schedule. For the first time since 1908 an effort has been made to work out a basic formula. That is why it took the Hook Commission a year to work this thing up; no wonder it took the committee 3 months to work it out, because for the first time we have formulated a pay scale that will exist for 50 years, a pay scale that can be increased or decreased by a simple resolution providing for a percentagewise reduction in this bracket, that bracket, and the other bracket, or provide a percentage increase if an increase is needed. I believe this is the fundamental part of the bill and I sincerely trust that the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SUTTON) there were—ayes 13, noes 108.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SERVICE CREDITABLE IN COMPUTATION OF BASIC PAY

SEC. 202. (a) Subject to the provisions of subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section, in computing the cumulative years of service to be counted by members of the uniformed services for determining the amount of basic pay they are entitled to receive upon completion of such years of service, such members shall be credited with—

(1) full time for all periods of active service as a commissioned officer, commissioned warrant officer, warrant officer, Army field clerk, flight officer, and enlisted person in any Regular or Reserve component of any of the uniformed services; and

(2) full time for all periods during which they were enlisted or held appointments as commissioned officers, commisisoned warrant officers, warrant officers, Army field clerks, or flight officers, in any of the Regular components of the uniformed services, or in the Regular Army Reserve, or in the Organized Militia prior to July 1, 1916, or in the National Guard, or in the National Guard Reserve, or in the National Guard of the United States, or in the Organized Reserve Corps, or in the Officers' Reserve Corps, or in the Enlisted Reserve Corps, or in the Medical Reserve Corps, or in the Medical Reserve Corps of the Navy, or in the Dental Reserve Corps of the Navy, or in the Naval Militia, or in the National Naval Volunteers, or in the Naval Reserve Force, or in the Naval Reserve, or in the Air National Guard, or in the Air National Guard of the United States, or in the Air Force Reserve, or in the officers' section of the Air Force Reserve, or in the enlisted section of the Air Force Reserve, or in the Air Corps Reserve, or in the Army of the United States without specification of any component thereof, or in the Air Force of the United States without specification of any component thereof, or in the Marine Corps Reserve Force, or in the Marine Corps Reserve, or in the Coast Guard Reserve, or in the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service, or in the Philippine Scouts, or in the Philippine Constabulary; and

(3) for commissioned officers in service on June 30, 1922, all service which was then counted in computing longevity pay, and service as a contract surgeon serving full time; and

(4) full time for all periods during which they held appointments as nurses, reserve nurses, or commissioned officers in the Army Nurse Corps, the Navy Nurse Corps, the

Nurse Corps of the Public Health Service, or the Reserve components thereof; and

(5) full time for all periods during which they were deck officers or junior engineers in the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and

(6) all service which, under any provision of law in effect on the effective date of this section is authorized to be credited for the purpose of computing longevity pay.

(b) Members of the uniformed services shall accrue additional service credit for basic pay purposes, for periods while on a temporary disability retired list, honorary retired list, or a retired list of any of the uniformed services, or while authorized to receive retired pay, retirement pay, or retainer pay as a member of the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, from any of the uniformed services or from the Veterans' Administration, or while a member of the Honorary Reserve of the Officers' Reserve Corps or Organized Reserve Corps: *Provided*, That, except for active service as prescribed in section 202 (a) (1), the service credit authorized in this section shall not be included to increase retired pay, disability retirement pay, retirement pay, or retainer pay while on a retired list, on a temporary disability retired list, in a retired status, or in the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, except as provided in title IV of this act.

(c) The periods of time hereinabove authorized to be counted in the computation of basic pay shall, under such regulations as the Secretary concerned may prescribe, include all service heretofore or hereafter performed by members of the uniformed services prior to their attainment of 18 years of age.

(d) The period of time to be counted in the computation of basic pay shall be the total of all periods authorized to be counted for such purpose in any of the uniformed services, but the same period of time shall not, for any reason, be counted more than once: *Provided*, That retired enlisted men heretofore or hereafter retired with credit for 30 years' service in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, and who served beyond the continental limits of the United States between 1898–1912, such service having been computed under previous laws as double time toward retirement, shall be entitled to receive the maximum retired pay now or hereafter provided for the grade in which retired.

SPECIAL PAY—PHYSICIANS AND DENTISTS

SEC. 203. (a) The term "commissioned officers," as used in this section, shall be interpreted to mean only (1) those commissioned officers in the Medical and Dental Corps of the Regular Army, Navy, and Air Force and commissioned medical and dental officers of the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service who were on active duty on September 1, 1947; (2) those officers who, heretofore but subsequent to September 1, 1947, have been or who, prior to September 1, 1952, may be commissioned in the Medical and Dental Corps of the Regular Army, Navy, and Air Force or as medical and dental officers of the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service; (3) such officers who on September 1, 1947, were or who thereafter have been or may be commissioned in the Medical and Dental Corps of the Officers' Reserve Corps, the United States Air Force Reserve, the Naval Reserve, the National Guard, the National Guard of the United States, the Air National Guard, the Air National Guard of the United States, the Army of the United States, the Air Force of the United States, or as medical and dental officers of the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service and who heretofore, but subsequent to September 1, 1947, have volunteered and been accepted for extended active duty of 1 year or longer, or who may, prior to September 1, 1952, volunteer and be accepted for extended active duty of 1 year or longer; (4) general officers appointed from the Medical and Dental Corps of the Regular Army, the Officers Reserve Corps, the National Guard, the National Guard of the United States, the Army of the United States, the Regular Air Force, the United States Air Force Reserve, the Air National Guard, the Air National Guard of the United States, and the Air Force of the United States who were on active duty on September 1, 1947; and (5) general officers who, subsequent to September 1, 1947, have been or who may be appointed from those officers of the Medical and Dental Corps of the Regular Army, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard, the National Guard of the United States, the Army of the United States, the Regular Air Force, the United States Air Force Reserve, the Air National Guard, the Air National Guard of the United States, and the Air Force of the United States who are included in parts (1), (2), or (3) of this subsection.

(b) In addition to any pay, allowances, special or incentive pays that they are otherwise entitled to receive, commissioned officers as defined in subsection (a) of this section shall be entitled to receive special pay at the rate of $100 per month for each month of active service: *Provided*, That such sum shall not be included in computing the amount of increase in pay authorized by any other provision of this act or in computing retired pay, disability retirement pay, or any severance pay: *Provided further*, That the commissioned officers described in subsection (a) (3) of this section shall be entitled to receive the pay provided by this subsection only during periods of volunteer service: *And provided further*, That no commissioned officer as described in subsection (a) of this section shall, while he is serving as a medical or dental intern, be entitled to receive the special pay of $100 per month as is provided in this subsection.

INCENTIVE PAY—HAZARDOUS DUTY

SEC. 204. (a) Subject to such regulations as may be prescribed by the President, members of the uniformed services entitled to receive basic pay shall, in addition thereto, be entitled to receive incentive pay for the performance of hazardous duty required by competent orders. The following duties shall constitute hazardous duties:

(1) duty as a crew member as determined by the Secretary concerned, involving frequent and regular participation in aerial flight;

(2) duty on board a submarine, including submarines under construction from the time builders' trials commence;

(3) duty involving frequent and regular participation in aerial flights not as a crew member pursuant to part (1) of this subsection;

(4) duty involving frequent and regular participation in glider flights;

(5) duty involving parachute jumping as an essential part of military duty;

(6) duty involving intimate contact with persons afflicted with leprosy;

(7) duty involving the demolition of explosives as a primary duty, including training for such duty;

(8) duty at a submarine escape training tank, when such duty involves participation in the training; and

(9) duty at the Navy Deep Sea Diving School or the Navy Experimental Diving Unit, when such duty involves participation in training.

(b) For the performance of hazardous duty as prescribed in part (1) or (2) of subsection (a) of this section, members of the uniformed services qualifying for the incentive pay authorized pursuant to said subsection shall be entitled to be paid at the following monthly rates according to the pay grade to which assigned or in which distributed for basic pay purposes:

Pay grade:	*Monthly rate*
O–8	$210.00
O–7	210.00
O–6	210.00
O–5	180.00
O–4	150.00
O–3	120.00
O–2	110.00
O–1	100.00
W–4	100.00
W–3	100.00
W–2	100.00
W–1	100.00
E–7	75.00
E–6	67.50
E–5	60.00
E–4	52.50
E–3	45.00
E–2	37.50
E–1	30.00

(c) For the performance of any hazardous duty as prescribed in parts (3) to (9), inclusive, of subsection (a) of this section by officers and enlisted persons qualifying for the incentive pay authorized pursuant to said subsection, officers shall be entitled to be paid at the rate of $100 per month, and enlisted persons shall be entitled to be paid at the rate of $50 per month.

(d) The President may, in time of war, suspend the payment of incentive pay for the performance of any or all hazardous duty or may prescribe that members of the uniformed services entitled to receive basic pay who are performing duties, other than those prescribed in subsection (a) of this section, in certain areas or under certain conditions which involve more than ordinary military risk or danger shall, in addition to basic pay, be entitled to receive incentive pay for hazardous duty either at rates not to exceed those prescribed in subsection (b) of this section or at rates not to exceed those prescribed in subsection (c) of this section, as may be determined by the President, in accordance with the pay grade to which assigned or in which distributed for basic pay purposes or their ranks, grades, or ratings, as the case may be.

(e) No aviation cadet shall be entitled to receive any incentive pay authorized pursuant to this section.

(f) No member of the uniformed services shall be entitled to receive more than one payment of any incentive pay authorized pursuant to this section for the same period of time during which he may qualify for more than one payment of such incentive pay.

SPECIAL PAY—DIVING DUTY

SEC. 205. (a) An enlisted person of the uniformed services entitled to receive basic pay and assigned to the duty of diving shall, in addition to basic pay, be entitled to receive special pay, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary concerned, at the rate of not less than $5 per month and not exceeding $30 per month.

(b) Members of the uniformed services entitled to receive basic pay and employed as divers in actual salvage or repair operations in depths of over 90 feet, or in depths of less than 90 feet, when the officer in charge of the salvage or repair operation shall find, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned, that extraordinary hazardous conditions exist, shall, in addition to basic pay, be entitled to receive the sum of $5 per hour for each hour or fraction thereof while so employed. The amounts authorized to be paid pursuant to this subsection shall, in the case of enlisted persons, be in addition to the amounts authorized pursuant to subsection (a) of this section.

(c) No member of the uniformed services shall be entitled to receive the special pay

authorized pursuant to this section in addition to incentive pay authorized pursuant to section 204 of this act.

(d) The President may, in time of war, suspend the payment of diving-duty pay.

SPECIAL PAY—SEA AND FOREIGN DUTY

SEC. 206. Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, enlisted persons of the uniformed services entitled to receive basic pay shall, in addition thereto, while on sea duty or while on duty in any place beyond the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska, be entitled to receive pay at the following monthly rates:

Pay grades:	*Monthly rates*
E–7	$22.50
E–6	20.00
E–5	16.00
E–4	13.00
E–3	9.00
E–2	8.00
E–1	8.00

SPECIAL PAY—REENLISTMENT BONUS

SEC. 207. (a) Members of the uniformed services who enlist under the conditions set forth in subsection (b) of this section within 3 months from the date of their discharge or separation, or within such lesser period of time as the Secretary concerned may determine from time to time, shall be paid a lump-sum reenlistment bonus of $40, $90, $160, $250, or $360 upon enlistment for a period of 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 years, respectively; and, upon enlistment for an unspecified period of time a lump-sum reenlistment bonus of $360 shall be paid, and, upon the completion of 6 years' enlisted service in such enlistment, for each year thereafter a lump-sum payment of $60 shall be made, subject to the limitation that the total amount paid shall not exceed $1,440. No reenlistment bonus shall be paid for more than four enlistments entered into after the effective date of this section: *Provided*, That the bonus to be paid in the case of a person reenlisting for a period which would extend the length of his active Federal service beyond 30 years shall be computed as if said reenlistment were for the minimum number of years necessary to permit such person to complete 30 years' active Federal service.

(b) For the purpose of payment of the reenlistment bonus authorized by subsection (a) of this section, enlistment in one of the Regular services following (1) compulsory or voluntary active duty in such service, or (2) extended active duty of 1 year or more in a Reserve component of such service, shall be considered a reenlistment.

(c) Enlisted persons of the uniformed services, who, prior to expiration of the period for which they have reenlisted, extend their reenlistment to any one of the longer enlistment periods mentioned in subsection (a) of this section, shall be paid the sum of $20 for each year of such extension subject to the limitations contained in subsection (a) of this section.

(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, a member of the uniformed services who reenlists within 3 months after being discharged from the enlistment entered into prior to the date of enactment of this act, or who reenlists within 3 months after being relieved from active service as a commissioned officer or warrant officer under appointment made prior to the date of enactment of this act if such commissioned or warrant service immediately followed enlisted service, shall be entitled to receive either (1) enlistment allowances in the amount and under the provisions of law in effect immediately prior to the date of enactment of this act, or (2) reenlistment bonus in the amount and under the provisions of this section, whichever is the greater amount: *Provided*, That the enlistment allowance payable under (1) hereunder shall in no event exceed $300.

(e) The Secretary concerned shall prescribe regulations for the administration of this section in his department.

TITLE III—PROVISIONS RELATING TO ALLOWANCES

BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE

SEC. 301. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this section or by any other provision of law, each member of the uniformed services entitled to receive basic pay shall be entitled to receive a basic allowance for subsistence in such amount and under such circumstances as are provided in this section. For enlisted persons such allowance shall be one of three types: (1) When rations in kind are not available; (2) when permission to mess separately is granted; or (3) when assigned to duty under emergency conditions where no Government messing facilities are available. Officers shall, at all times, be entitled to receive a basic allowance for subsistence on a monthly basis. Enlisted persons shall be entitled to the appropriate allowance on a daily basis.

(b) Enlisted persons shall be entitled to receive the appropriate basic allowance for subsistence while on an authorized leave of absence or while sick in hospital: *Provided*, That any such allowance shall not accrue when such persons are, in fact, being subsisted at Government expense.

(c) Payment of the basic allowance for subsistence, when authorized, may be made to enlisted persons in advance for a period of not exceeding 3 months.

(d) The President may prescribe regulations for the administration of this section.

(e) Members of the uniformed services entitled to receive a basic allowance for subsistence pursuant to this section shall be entitled to receive the following amounts:

Officers, $45 per month.

Enlisted persons when rations in kind are not available, $2.25 per day.

Enlisted persons when permission to mess separately is granted, $1.05 per day.

Enlisted persons when assigned to duty under emergency conditions where no Government messing facilities are available, not to exceed $3 per day.

BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR QUARTERS

SEC. 302. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this section or by any other provision of law, members of the uniformed services entitled to receive basic pay shall be entitled to receive a basic allowance for quarters in such amount and under such circumstances as are provided in this section: *Provided*, That an enlisted member in pay grade E–4 (less than seven years' service), E–3, E–2, and E–1, shall be considered at all times as a member without dependents for the purposes of this section.

(b) Except as otherwise provided by law, no basic allowance for quarters shall accrue to members of the uniformed services assigned to Government quarters or housing facilities under the jurisdiction of the uniformed services, appropriate to their rank, grade, or rating and adequate for themselves and dependents, if with dependents.

(c) No basic allowance for quarters shall accrue to any member of the uniformed services without dependents while on field duty, unless his commanding officer certifies that he was necessarily required to procure quarters at his own expense, or while on sea duty: *Provided*, That field duty or sea duty for temporary periods of less than three months shall not be considered as field duty or sea duty for purposes of this subsection.

(d) No member of the uniformed services assigned to Government quarters or housing facilities under the jurisdiction of the uniformed services shall be denied his basic allowance for quarters if, by reason of orders of competent authority, his dependents are prevented from occupying such quarters.

(e) The President may prescribe regulations for the administration of this section, and such regulations shall include, but not be limited to, definitions of the terms "field duty" and "sea duty."

(f) Members of the uniformed services entitled to receive a basic allowance for quarters pursuant to this section shall be entitled to receive a basic allowance for quarters at the following monthly rates according to the pay grade to which assigned or in which distributed for basic pay purposes:

Pay grade	With dependents	Without dependents
O–8	$150.00	$120.00
O–7	150.00	120.00
O–6	120.00	105.00
O–5	120.00	90.00
O–4	105.00	82.50
O–3	90.00	75.00
O–2	82.50	67.50
O–1	75.00	60.00
W–4	105.00	82.50
W–3	90.00	75.00
W–2	82.50	67.50
W–1	75.00	60.00
E–7	67.50	45.00
E–6	67.50	45.00
E–5	67.50	45.00
E–4 (7 or more years' service) [1]	67.50	45.00
E–4 (less than 7 years' service) [1]	----------	45.00
E–3	----------	45.00
E–2	----------	45.00
E–1	----------	45.00

[1] Service authorized to be credited in computation of basic pay pursuant to sec. 202 of this act.

TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES

SEC. 303. (a) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, members of the uniformed services shall be entitled to receive travel and transportation allowances for travel performed or to be performed under competent orders (1) upon a change of permanent station, or otherwise, or when away from their designated posts of duty regardless of the length of time away from such designated posts of duty, (2) upon appointment, call to active duty, enlistment, or induction, from home or from the place from which ordered to active duty to first station, and (3) upon separation from the service, placement upon the temporary disability retired list, release from active duty, or retirement, from last duty station to home or to the place from which ordered to active duty, regardless of the fact that such member may not be a member of the uniformed services at the time his travel is performed or is to be performed. Allowances above authorized may be paid without regard to the comparative costs of the various modes of transportation. The respective Secretaries concerned may prescribe (1) the conditions under which travel and transportation allowances shall be authorized, including advance payments thereof, and (2) the allowances for types of travel not to exceed amounts herein authorized. The travel and transportation allowances which shall be authorized for each type of travel shall be limited to one of the following: (1) Transportation in kind, reimbursement therefor, or a monetary allowance in lieu of cost of transportation at a rate not in excess of 7 cents per mile based on distances established or to be established over the shortest usually traveled routes, in accordance with mileage tables prepared by the Chief of Finance of the Department of the Army under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, (2) transportation in kind, reimbursement therefor, or a monetary allowance as provided in (1) of this sentence, plus a per diem in lieu of subsistence not to exceed $9 per day, or (3) for travel within the continental limits of the United States a mileage allowance of not exceeding 10 cents per mile based on distances established or to be established pursuant to existing law: *Provided*, That the travel and transportation allowances under conditions authorized herein for such members may be paid on separation from the service, or release from active duty, regard-

less of whether or not such member performs the travel involved.

(b) Without regard to the monetary limitations in this act, the Secretaries of the uniformed services may authorize the payment to members of the uniformed services on duty outside the continental United States or in Alaska, whether or not in a travel status, of a per diem considering all elements of cost of living to members and their dependents, including the cost of quarters, subsistence, and other necessary incidental expenses: *Provided*, That dependents shall not be considered in determining per diem allowances for members in a travel status.

(c) In addition to the allowances authorized above, under such conditions and limitations and for such ranks, grades, or ratings and to and from such locations as may be prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, members of the uniformed services when ordered to make a change of permanent station shall be entitled to transportation in kind for dependents or to reimbursement therefor, or to a monetary allowance in lieu of such transportation in kind at a rate to be prescribed not in excess of the rate authorized in subsection (a) of this section, and in connection with a change of station (whether temporary or permanent), to transportation (including packing, crating, drayage, temporary storage, and unpacking) of baggage and household effects, or reimbursement therefor, to and from such locations and within such weight allowances as may be prescribed by the Secretaries, without regard to the comparative costs of the various modes of transportation. When orders directing a change of permanent station for the member concerned have not been issued, or when such orders have been issued but are of such a nature that they cannot be used as authority for transportation of dependents and baggage and household effects, the Secretaries concerned may, nevertheless, authorize the movement of the dependents and baggage and household effects and prescribe transportation in kind, reimbursement therefor, or a monetary allowance in lieu thereof as authorized in this subsection, as the case may be, only under unusual or emergency circumstances, including but not limited to, (1) circumstances when duty is being performed by such member at places designated by the Secretary concerned as within zones from which dependents should be evacuated, (2) circumstances when orders which direct temporary duty travel of such member do not provide for return to the permanent station or do not specify or imply any limit to the period of absence from the permanent station, or (3) circumstances when such members are serving on permanent duty at stations outside the continental United States or in Alaska, or on sea duty. The Secretary concerned shall define the term "permanent station", which definition shall include, but not be limited to, a shore station or the home yard or home port of the vessel to which a member of the uniformed services entitled to receive basic pay may be ordered; and a duly authorized change in home yard or home port of such vessel shall be deemed a change of permanent station. Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned, transportation for dependents and baggage and household effects are authorized upon the death of a member of the uniformed services while entitled to receive basic pay pursuant to section 201 (e) of this act.

(d) A member of the uniformed services on duty with or under training for the Military Air Transport Service, Marine Corps Transport Squadrons, or Fleet Logistics Support Unit and away from his permanent station, may be paid a per diem in lieu of subsistence in an amount not to exceed the amount to which he would be entitled if performing temporary duty travel, without in either case the issuance of orders for specific travel.

(e) Cadets of the United States Military Academy, midshipmen of the United States Naval Academy, cadets of the United States Coast Guard Academy, applicants for enlistment, rejected applicants, general prisoners, discharged prisoners, insane patients transferred from military hospitals to other hospitals or their home, and persons discharged from Saint Elizabeths Hospital after transfer from one of the uniformed services, shall be entitled to receive such travel and transportation allowances as are provided in subsection (a) of this section, as may be prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, due consideration being given to the rights of the Government as well as those of the individual in the promulgation of regulations prescribing said allowances.

(f) The Secretaries concerned in establishing the rates and types of allowances authorized by this section shall consider in prescribing (1) monetary allowance in lieu of transportation—average cost of first-class transportation including sleeping accommodations, (2) per diem rates—the current economic data on cost of subsistence (including lodging and other necessary incidental expenses related thereto), and (3) mileage rates—average cost of first-class transportation including sleeping accommodations and current economic data on cost of subsistence (including lodging and other necessary incidental expenses related thereto).

(g) The Secretaries concerned shall determine what shall constitute a travel status.

(h) Regulations shall be promulgated by the Secretaries of the uniformed services, as provided herein, and such regulations shall be uniform for all services insofar as practicable: *Provided*, That no provisions of this section shall become effective until such regulations have been issued: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this act shall preclude the payment of travel and transportation allowances under provisions of law in effect on the day prior to the effective date of this act, until such regulations are issued pursuant to this subsection.

PERSONAL MONEY ALLOWANCE

SEC. 304. (a) Officers entitled to receive basic pay shall, while serving in the grade of lieutenant general, vice admiral, or in an equivalent grade or rank, in addition to any other pay or allowance authorized by this act, be entitled to receive a personal money allowance of $500 per annum.

(b) Officers entitled to receive basic pay shall, while serving in the grade of general, admiral, or in an equivalent grade or rank, in addition to any other pay or allowance authorized by this act, be entitled to receive a personal money allowance of $2,200 per annum.

(c) Officers entitled to receive basic pay shall, while serving as the Chief of Staff of the Army, as the Chief of Naval Operations, as the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, as the Commandant of the Marine Corps, or as the Commandant of the Coast Guard, in lieu of any other personal money allowance authorized by this section, but in addition to any other pay or allowance authorized by this act, be entitled to receive a personal money allowance of $4,000 per annum.

TITLE IV—PROVISIONS RELATING TO RETIREMENT, RETIREMENT PAY, SEPARATION, AND SEVERANCE PAY FOR PHYSICAL DISABILITY

ESTABLISHMENT OF A TEMPORARY DISABILITY RETIRED LIST

SEC. 401. (a) Any member of the uniformed services found to be unfit to perform the duties of his office, rank, grade, or rating by reason of physical disability and who otherwise qualifies as hereinafter provided may be retired or separated subject to the provisions of this title.

(b) The Secretary concerned shall establish for his uniformed service a temporary disability retired list, upon which shall be placed the names of all members of his service entitled to such placement pursuant to the provisions of this title. Such list shall be published annually in the official register or other official publication of the service concerned.

TEMPORARY DISABILITY RETIREMENT, PHYSICAL DISABILITY RETIREMENT, AND DISABILITY RETIREMENT PAY

SEC. 402. (a) Upon a determination by the Secretary concerned (1) that a member of a Regular component of the uniformed services entitled to receive basic pay, or a member of a Reserve component of the uniformed services entitled to receive basic pay who has been called or ordered to extended active duty for a period in excess of 30 days, is unfit to perform the duties of his office, rank, grade, or rating, by reason of physical disability incurred while entitled to receive basic pay; (2) that such disability is not due to the misconduct or willful neglect of such member and that such disability was not incurred during a period of unauthorized absence of such member; (3) that such disability is 30 percent or more in accordance with the standard schedule of rating disabilities in current use by the Veterans' Administration; (4) that such disability was the proximate result of the direct performance of active duty; and (5) that accepted medical principles indicate that such disability may be of a permanent nature, the name of such member shall be placed upon the temporary disability retired list of his service by the Secretary concerned and such member shall be entitled to receive disability retirement pay as prescribed in subsection (d) of this section: *Provided*, That if condition (5) above is met by a finding that such disability is of a permanent nature, such member may be retired by the Secretary concerned and, upon retirement, shall be entitled to receive disability retirement pay as prescribed in subsection (d) of this section: *Provided further*, That if condition (3) above is not met because the disability is determined to be less than 30 percent, the member concerned shall not be eligible for any disability retirement provided in this section, but may be separated for physical disability from the service concerned and upon separation shall be entitled to receive disability severance pay as prescribed in section 403 of this title.

(b) Upon a determination by the Secretary concerned (1) that a member of a Regular component of the uniformed services entitled to receive basic pay, or a member of a Reserve component of the uniformed services entitled to receive basic pay who has been called or ordered to extended active duty for a period in excess of 30 days, is unfit to perform the duties of his office, rank, grade, or rating, by reason of physical disability incurred while entitled to receive basic pay; (2) that such disability is not due to the misconduct or willful neglect of such member and that such disability was not incurred during a period of unauthorized absence of such member; (3) that such disability is 30 percent or more in accordance with the standard schedule of rating disabilities in current use by the Veterans' Administration; (4) that such member has completed at least 8 years of active service as defined in section 412 of this title; and (5) that accepted medical principles indicate that such disability may be of a permanent nature, the name of such member shall be placed upon the temporary disability retired list of his service by the Secretary concerned and such members shall be entitled to receive disability retirement pay as prescribed in subsection (d) of this section: *Provided*, That if condition (5) above is met by a finding that such disability is of a permanent nature, such member may be retired by the Secretary concerned and, upon retirement, shall be entitled to receive

disability retirement pay as prescribed in subsection (d) of this section: *Provided further,* That if condition (3) above is not met because the disability is determined to be less than 30 percent, the member concerned shall not be eligible for any disability retirement provided in this section, but may be separated for physical disability from the service concerned and upon separation shall be entitled to receive disability severance pay as prescribed in section 403 of this title: *And provided further,* That regardless of the percentage of disability determined to have been incurred, if condition (4) above is not met because the member concerned has completed less than 8 years of active service as defined in section 412 of this title at the time he would otherwise have been retired pursuant to this subsection, the member concerned shall not be eligible for any disability retirement provided in this section, but may be separated for physical disability from the service concerned and upon separation shall be entitled to receive disability severance pay as prescribed in section 403 of this title.

(c) Upon a determination by the Secretary concerned (1) that a member of the uniformed services, other than those members covered in subsections (a) and (b) of this section, is unfit to perform the duties of his office, rank, grade, or rating by reason of physical disability resulting from an injury; (2) that such injury was not the result of the misconduct or willful neglect of such member; (3) that such disability is 30 percent or more in accordance with the standard schedule of rating disabilities in current use by the Veterans' Administration; (4) that such injury was the proximate result of the direct performance of active duty, full-time training duty, other full-time duty, or inactive duty training, as the case may be; and (5) that accepted medical principles indicate that such disability may be of a permanent nature, the name of such member shall be placed upon the temporary disability retired list of his service by the Secretary concerned and such member shall be entitled to receive disability retirement pay as prescribed in subsection (d) of this section: *Provided,* That if condition (5) above is met by a finding that such disability is of a permanent nature, such member may be retired by the Secretary concerned and, upon retirement, shall be entitled to receive disability retirement pay as prescribed in subsection (d) of this section: *Provided further,* That if condition (3) above is not met because the disability is determined to be less than 30 percent, the member concerned shall not be eligible for any disability retirement provided in this section, but may be separated for physical disability from the service concerned and upon separation shall be entitled to receive disability severance pay as prescribed in section 403 of this title.

(d) A member of the uniformed services whose name is placed upon the temporary disability retired list of his service pursuant to subsections (a), (b), or (c) of this section, for the period during which his name is carried on such temporary disability retired list, but in no event to exceed a period of five years, or a member of the uniformed services, who is retired pursuant to the provisions of this title, shall be entitled to receive disability retirement pay computed, at his election, by multiplying an amount equal to the monthly basic pay of the rank, grade, or rating held by him at the time of the placement of his name on the temporary disability retired list or at the time of his retirement, whichever is earlier, by (1) a number equal to the number of years of active service to which such member is entitled under the provisions of section 412 of this title, multiplied by 2½ percentum, or (2) the percentage of his physical disability as of the time his name was placed on the temporary disability retired list or at the time or retirement, whichever is earlier: *Provided,* That for the purpose of the computation of (1) above, fractions of one-half year or more of active service shall be counted as a whole year: *Provided further,* That the disability retirement pay of any such member who shall have held a temporary rank, grade, or rating higher than the rank, grade, or rating held by him at the time of placement of his name upon the temporary disability retired list or at the time of his retirement, whichever is earlier, and who shall have served satisfactorily in such higher rank, grade, or rating as determined by the Secretary concerned, shall be computed on the basis of the monthly basic pay of such higher rank, grade, or rating to which he would have been entitled had he been serving on active duty in such higher rank, grade, or rating at the time of placement of his name on the temporary disability retired list or at the time of retirement, whichever is earlier: *Provided further,* That in no case shall such disability retirement pay exceed 75 percentum of the basic pay upon which the computation is based: *Provided further,* That if the physical disability entitling such member to disability retirement pay is found to exist as a result of a physical examination given in connection with effecting a permanent promotion or a temporary promotion where eligibility for such temporary promotion was required to have been based upon cumulative years of service or years of service in rank, grade, or rating, the disability retirement pay of such member shall be based upon the basic pay of the rank, grade, or rating to which such member would have been promoted but for such disability, if such rank, grade, or rating is higher than any other rank, grade, or rating upon which such pay is herein authorized to be computed and which such member would have been entitled to receive if serving on active duty in such rank, grade, or rating: *And provided further,* That for any member who, for any reason, has been or hereafter may be retired or whose name is carried on a temporary disability retired list and who, while in such status, serves on active duty, and while so serving, incurs a physical disability of 30 per centum or more in accordance with the standard schedule of rating disabilities in current use by the Veterans' Administration or incurs a physical disability in addition to or an aggravation of the physical disability for which he was retired or for which his name was placed on the temporary disability retired list, shall, if qualified therefor pursuant to this title, be entitled, on his return to a retired status or to the temporary disability retired list, to receive either (1) disability retirement pay as provided in this section, using as multipliers the highest percentages and basic pay which he attained while serving on such active duty, or (2) retirement pay or retired pay, as the case may be, as provided by any law in effect at the time of his retirement; and, in addition thereto, if such member is, during such period of active duty, promoted to a rank, grade, or rating higher than that rank, grade, or rating on which his retired pay, retirement pay, or disability retirement pay was based, and has served satisfactorily in such higher rank, grade, or rating as determined by the Secretary concerned, be entitled, on his return to a retired status or to the temporary disability retired list, to receive such retirement pay, disability retirement pay, or retired pay computed on the basis of the higher rank, grade, or rating and which such member would be entitled to receive if serving on active duty in such higher rank, grade, or rating.

(e) A member of the uniformed services whose name has been placed upon the temporary disability retired list of his service shall be given periodic physical examinations, not less frequent than every 18 months to determine whether the disability for which such member was temporarily retired has changed. If as a result of any such examinations, or upon the termination of a period of 5 years from the date of temporary disability retirement, it is determined (1) that the physical disability of such member is of permanent character and such disability is 30 percent or more in accordance with the standard schedule of rating disabilities in current use by the Veterans' Administration, the name of such member shall be removed from the temporary disability retired list of his service and such member shall be permanently retired for physical disability and he shall be entitled to receive disability retirement pay as prescribed in subsection (d) of this section: *Provided,* That for the purpose of computing such pay the percentage of his physical disability shall be determined as of the time of his permanent retirement; (2) that the physical disability of such member is less than 30 percent in accordance with the standard schedule of rating disabilities in current use by the Veterans' Administration, the name of such member shall be removed from the temporary disability retired list of the service concerned, and such member may be separated from the service concerned for physical disability and upon separation shall be entitled to receive disability severance pay as prescribed in section 403 of this title: *Provided further,* That at the end of a 5-year period during which the name of a member is carried on a temporary disability retired list, the Secretary concerned shall make a final determination of such member's case and shall cause such member to be retired, separated, or treated as provided in section 405 of this title.

(f) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, any member of the uniformed services who shall have completed at least 20 years of active service as defined in section 412 of this title, and who is otherwise qualified to be retired for physical disability except that his disability is less than 30 percent in accordance with the standard schedule of rating disabilities in current use by the Veterans' Administration, shall be retired and shall be entitled to receive disability retirement pay as prescribed in subsection (d) of this section: *Provided,* That the provisions of this section shall not be interpreted to limit the application of any provisions of law relating to voluntary or involuntary retirement.

(g) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, any member of the Army of the United States, Navy, Air Force of the United States, Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard, and all Regular and Reserve components thereof, who shall have completed at least 20 years of satisfactory Federal service in the uniformed services as defined in sections 302 and 306 of the act of July 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1087, 1089; 10 U. S. C. 1036a, 1036e), and who is otherwise qualified to be retired for physical disability except that his disability is less than 30 percent in accordance with the standard schedule of rating disabilities in current use by the Veterans' Administration may elect, in lieu of being separated and receiving disability severance pay pursuant to title IV of this act, to be transferred to the inactive status list of the uniformed service concerned pursuant to section 308 of the act of June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1090; 10 U. S. C. 1036g), and be granted retired pay upon attaining the age of 60 years if eligible in all other respects to be granted retired pay as provided in title III of that act.

(h) Disability retirement pay computed on the basis of years of active service shall not be deemed to be a pension, annuity, or similar allowance for personal injuries or sickness resulting from active service in the armed forces of any country within the meaning of section 22 (b) (5) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended.

SEPARATION AND SEVERANCE PAY FOR PHYSICAL DISABILITY

SEC. 403. A member of the uniformed services separated for physical disability pursuant to the provisions of section 402 of this title shall be entitled to receive disability severance pay computed as follows: An amount equal to two months' basic pay of the rank, grade, or rating held by such member at the time of the placement of his name on the temporary disability retired list or at the time of his separation, whichever is earlier, and which such member would be entitled to receive at the time of separation if serving on active duty in such rank, grade, or rating, multiplied by a number equal to the number of years of active service to which such member is entitled under the provisions of section 412 of this title but not to exceed a total of two years' basic pay: *Provided,* That for the purpose of this computation, fractions of one-half year or more of active service shall be counted as a whole year: *Provided further,* That the disability severance pay of any such member who shall have held a temporary rank, grade, or rating higher than the rank, grade, or rating held by him at the time of the placement of his name on the temporary disability retired list or at the time of his separation, whichever is earlier, and who shall have served satisfactorily in such higher rank, grade, or rating as determined by the Secretary concerned, shall be computed on the basis of the monthly basic pay of such higher rank, grade, or rating to which he would have been entitled had he been serving on active duty in such higher rank, grade, or rating at the time of placement of his name on the temporary disability retired list or at the time of separation, whichever is earlier: *Provided further,* That if the physical disability entitling such member to disability severance pay is found to exist as a result of a physical examination given in connection with effecting a permanent promotion or a temporary promotion where eligibility for such temporary promotion was required to have been based upon cumulative years of service or years of service in rank, grade, or rating, the disability severance pay of such member shall be based upon the rank, grade, or rating to which such member would have been promoted but for such disability, if such rank, grade, or rating is higher than any other rank, grade, or rating upon which such severance pay is herein authorized to be computed and which such member would be entitled to receive at the time of placement of his name on the temporary disability retired list or at the time of separation, whichever is earlier, if serving on active duty in the higher grade: *And provided further,* That in the case of a former member of the uniformed services who has received disability severance pay as provided in this section, the amount of such disability severance pay shall be deducted from any compensation for himself or his dependents to which he or they become entitled thereafter under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration for the same disability, but no such deductions shall be made from any death compensation to which his dependents may become entitled subsequent to his death.

PERIODIC PHYSICAL EXAMINATIONS

SEC. 404. (a) A member of the uniformed services whose name is hereafter placed upon the temporary disability retired list may be required to submit to periodic physical examinations during the period in which his name is carried on such list.

(b) A member of the uniformed services whose name is placed upon the temporary disability retired list and who is required to submit to a periodic physical examination shall, for travel performed, be entitled to receive the travel and transportation allowance authorized for the rank, grade, or rating in which retired for temporary duty travel performed while on active duty. Failure of any such member to report for any periodic physical examination after receipt of proper notification may be considered cause for terminating his disability retirement pay, except that such payments shall be reinstated at a later date if just cause existed for such failure to report, in which case payments may be retroactive for a period of not to exceed 1 year.

RECOVERY FROM PHYSICAL DISABILITY

SEC. 405. (a) If, as a result of a periodic physical examination, a member of a Regular component of the uniformed services whose name has been placed on the temporary disability retired list is found to be physically fit to perform the duties of his office, rank, grade, or rating, he shall, subject to his consent, if an officer, be called to active duty and, as soon thereafter as practicable, be reappointed, subject to the provisions of section 407 of this title, to the active list of his Regular component, or, if an enlisted person, be reenlisted in his Regular component.

(b) If, as a result of a periodic physical examination, a member of a Reserve component of the uniformed services whose name has been placed on the temporary disability retired list is found to be physically fit to perform the duties of his office, rank, grade, or rating, he shall, subject to his consent, be reappointed or reenlisted, as the case may be, in his Reserve component: *Provided,* That if the name of such member was placed on the temporary disability retired list for physical disability incurred while serving in the National Guard of the United States, or in the Air National Guard of the United States, he shall, subject to his consent, if not reappointed or reenlisted, as the case may be, in the component from which removed, be appointed, reappointed, enlisted, or reenlisted, as the case may be, in the Organized Reserve Corps or the Air Force Reserve.

(c) Any appointment, reappointment, enlistment, or reenlistment authorized pursuant to subsection (a) or subsection (b) of this section shall be in a rank, grade, or rating not lower than the rank, grade, or rating permanently held at the time of placement of the name of the member concerned upon the temporary disability retired list, and may be in the rank, grade, or rating immediately above the rank, grade, or rating permanently held at the time of placement of the name of the member concerned upon the temporary disability retired list. When seniority in rank, grade, or rating or years of service is an applicable factor in qualifying a member of the uniformed services for future promotion, such member who is being reappointed or reenlisted pursuant to this section shall, for the purpose of placement on a lineal list, promotion list, or other similar list, be given such seniority in rank, grade, or rating or be credited with such years of service as may be authorized by the Secretary concerned. Action under this subsection shall be taken on a fair and equitable basis, and regard shall be given to the probable opportunities for advancement and promotion to which such member might reasonably have become entitled but for placement of his name upon the temporary disability retired list.

TERMINATION OF DISABILITY RETIREMENT PAY

SEC. 406. (a) If, as a result of a periodic physical examination, a member of the uniformed services whose name appears on the temporary disability retired list is found to be physically fit to perform the duties of his office, rank, grade, or rating, he shall—

(1) if an officer of a Regular component have his disability retirement pay terminated upon the date of his recall to active duty and his status on the temporary disability retired list terminated on the date of his reappointment to the active list;

(2) if an enlisted person of a Regular component have both his status on such temporary disability retired list and his disability retirement pay terminated on the date of his reenlistment in the Regular component from which placed on the temporary disability retired list; or

(3) if a member of a Reserve component, have such status and his disability retirement pay terminated on the date of his reappointment or reenlistment in a Reserve component, as the case may be.

(b) If any such member does not consent to any action taken pursuant to either subsection (a) or subsection (b) of section 405 of this title, his status on the temporary disability retired list and his disability retirement pay shall be terminated as soon thereafter as practicable.

REAPPOINTMENT TO THE ACTIVE LIST OF OFFICERS PLACED ON THE TEMPORARY DISABILITY RETIRED LIST

SEC. 407. (a) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to reappoint to the active list of the appropriate Regular component of the uniformed services those commissioned officers of the Regular components of the uniformed services whose names have been placed on the temporary disability retired list and who are subsequently found to be physically fit to perform the duties of their office, rank, or grade on active duty. The President, or the Secretary concerned, as the case may be, is authorized to reappoint to the active list of the appropriate Regular component of the uniformed services those warrant officers of the Regular component of the uniformed services whose names have been placed on the temporary disability retired list and who are subsequently found to be physically fit to perform the duties of their office, rank, or grade.

(b) Irrespective of any vacancy in a grade, the authorized number of officers in such grade shall be temporarily increased, if necessary, to authorize appointments made pursuant to section 405 of this title.

PHYSICAL DISABILITY RESULTING FROM MISCONDUCT OR WILLFUL NEGLECT

SEC. 408. When a member of the uniformed services incurs a physical disability which is determined to render him unfit to perform the duties of his office, rank, grade, or rating and which is determined to have resulted from his misconduct or willful neglect, or was incurred during a period of unauthorized absence, such member shall be separated from his service without entitlement to any of the benefits of this title.

RANK OR GRADE IN WHICH RETIRED

SEC. 409. A member of the uniformed services who is retired pursuant to this title shall be retired in the rank, grade, or rating upon which his disability-retirement pay is based or in such higher rank, grade, or rating as may be authorized by law at time of retirement.

CESSATION OF BENEFITS UPON SEPARATION

SEC. 410. Any former member who has been separated for physical disability from any of the uniformed services and paid disability severance pay pursuant to this title shall not thereafter, unless such former member again becomes a member of the uniformed services, be entitled to receive from the service from which such former member was separated any payment for any monetary obligation provided under any provision of law administered by any uniformed service or for such uniformed service by any other uniformed service on account of or arising out of such former member's service on or prior to such separation: *Provided,* That such separation shall not operate to bar the former member concerned from receiving or

the service concerned from paying any moneys due and payable on the date of separation, or any moneys that become due as a result of a valid claim processed against the Government pursuant to any provisions of law.

MEMBERS OR FORMER MEMBERS HERETOFORE RETIRED FOR PHYSICAL DISABILITY

SEC. 411. Pursuant to such regulations as the President may prescribe, (1) any member or former member of the uniformed services heretofore retired by reason of physical disability and now receiving or entitled to receive retired or retirement pay; (2) any former member of the uniformed services heretofore granted or entitled to receive retirement pay for physical disability; (3) any member of the Army Nurse Corps or any person entitled to the rights, privileges, and benefits of members of the Army Nurse Corps, retired for disability under the act of June 20, 1930 (46 Stat. 790), as amended; and (4) any member of the Navy Nurse Corps, or any person entitled to the rights, privileges, and benefits of members of the Navy Nurse Corps, retired for disability prior to December 23, 1942, under the act of June 20, 1930 (46 Stat. 790), as amended, may elect within the 5-year period following the effective date of this title, (A) to qualify for disability retirement pay under the provisions of this act and, dependent on his qualification, shall be entitled to receive either the disability retirement pay or the disability severance pay prescribed in this title: *Provided*, That the determination of the percentage of disability as prescribed in sections 402 (a) (3), 402 (b) (3), or 402 (c) (3), as applicable, shall be based upon the disability of such member, former member, or person, as of the time he was last retired or as of the time he was granted retirement pay, as the case may be, and the percentage of such disability will be determined in accordance with the standard schedule of rating disabilities in current use by the Veterans' Administration; or (B) to receive retired pay or retirement pay computed by one of the two methods contained in section 511 of this act: *Provided further*, That the retired or retirement pay of each person referred to in (3) and (4) above shall, unless a higher rank or grade is authorized by any provision of law, be based upon the commissioned officer rank or grade authorized for such persons by the act of May 7, 1948 (Public Law 517, 80th Cong.).

DEFINITION OF ACTIVE SERVICE

SEC. 412. For the purposes of this title, the term "active service" shall be interpreted to mean (1) for members of the Regular components of the uniformed services and for those members, former members, and persons referred to in section 411 (1), (3), and (4), all service as a member of the uniformed services, or as a nurse, or as a contract nurse prior to February 2, 1901, or as a reserve nurse subsequent to February 2, 1901, or as a contract surgeon, or as a contract dental surgeon, or as an acting dental surgeon, or as a veterinarian in the Quartermaster Department, Cavalry, or Field Artillery, or as an Army field clerk or as a field clerk, Army Quartermaster Corps, while on the active list or on active duty or while participating in full-time training or other full-time duty provided for or authorized in the National Defense Act, as amended, the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, or in other provisions of law, including participation in exercises or performances of the duties provided for by sections 5, 81, 92, 94, 97, and 99 of the National Defense Act, as amended, or all service which such member, former member, or person has or is deemed to have pursuant to law for the purpose of separation or mandatory elimination from the active list of his uniformed service; (2) for members of the Reserve components of the uniformed services, other than commissioned officers of the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service, and for former members referred to in section 411 (2) that service which is equal to the number of years which would be used by such members or former members as a multiplier in the computation of their retired pay pursuant to section 303 of the act of June 29, 1948 (ch. 708, 62 Stat. 1088); and (3) for commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, heretofore retired for physical disability or hereafter retired or separated for physical disability pursuant to this act, in addition to the service creditable as active service under (1) above, their service, other than commissioned service, with the Public Health Service.

REGULATIONS

SEC. 413. The Secretary concerned shall prescribe regulations for the administration of this title within his department or agency, including regulations which shall provide that no member of the uniformed services shall be separated or retired for physical disability without a full and fair hearing if such member shall demand it.

POWERS, DUTIES, AND FUNCTIONS

SEC. 414. (a) All duties, powers, and functions incident to the determination of fitness for active service, percentage of disability at the time of separation from active service, and suitability for reentry into active service and entitlement to and payment of disability severance pay shall be vested in the Secretary concerned.

(b) All duties, powers, and functions incident to payments of disability retirement pay, hospitalization, and reexaminations shall be vested in the Secretary concerned or in the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under regulations promulgated by the President.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

TRAINING DUTY WITH OR WITHOUT PAY OF RESERVE AND NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL

SEC. 501. (a) Under such regulations as the Secretary concerned may prescribe, and to the extent provided for by law and by appropriations, members of the National Guard, Air National Guard, National Guard of the United States, the Air National Guard of the United States, Organized Reserve Corps, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, Coast Guard Reserve, and the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service, shall be entitled to receive compensation at the rate of one-thirtieth of the basic pay authorized for such members of the uniformed services when entitled to receive basic pay, for each regular period of instruction, or period of appropriate duty, at which they shall have been engaged for not less than 2 hours, including those performed on Sundays and holidays, or for the performance of such other equivalent training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties as may be prescribed by the Secretary concerned: *Provided*, That for each of the several classes of organizations prescribed for the National Guard, Air National Guard, National Guard of the United States, the Air National Guard of the United States, the Organized Reserve Corps, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, Coast Guard Reserve, and the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service, the rules applicable to each of which services and classes within service may differ, the Secretary concerned—

(1) shall prescribe minimum standards which must be met before an assembly for drill or other equivalent period of training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties may be credited for pay purposes, which minimum standards may require the presence for duty of officers and enlisted personnel equal to or in excess of a minimum number or percentage of unit strength for a specified period of time with participation in a prescribed character of training;

(2) shall prescribe the maximum number of assemblies, or periods of other equivalent training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties, which may be counted for pay purposes in each fiscal year.

(3) shall prescribe the maximum number of assemblies, or periods of other equivalent training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties which can be counted for pay purposes in lesser periods of time; and

(4) shall prescribe the minimum number of assemblies or periods of other equivalent training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties, which must be completed in stated periods of time before the personnel of organizations or units can qualify for pay.

(b) Members of the National Guard, Air National Guard, National Guard of the United States, the Air National Guard of the United States, Organized Reserve Corps, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, Coast Guard Reserve, and the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service, may be given additional training or other duty as provided for by law, without pay, as may be authorized by the Secretary concerned, with their consent, and when such authorized training or other duty without pay is performed they may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be furnished with transportation to and from such duty, with subsistence en route, and during the performing of such duty, be furnished with subsistence and quarters in kind or commutation thereof at a rate to be fixed from time to time by the Secretary concerned.

(c) In addition to pay provided in subsection (a) of this section, officers of the National Guard, Air National Guard, National Guard of the United States, the Air National Guard of the United States, Organized Reserve Corps, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, Coast Guard Reserve, and the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service, commanding organizations having administrative functions connected therewith shall, whether or not such officers belong to such organizations, be entitled to receive not more than $240 a year for the faithful performance of such administrative functions under such regulations as the Secretary concerned may prescribe; and for the purpose of determining how much shall be paid to such officers so performing such functions, the Secretary concerned may, from time to time, divide them into classes and fix the amount payable to the officers in each class.

(d) Under such regulations as the President may prescribe and to the extent provided for by appropriations, members of the National Guard, Air National Guard, National Guard of the United States, the Air National Guard of the United States, Organized Reserve Corps, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, Coast Guard Reserve, and the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service entitled to receive compensation pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall, when required by competent orders to perform any hazardous duty prescribed by or pursuant to section 204 of this act for members of the uniformed services entitled to receive basic pay and when in consequence of such orders they do perform any hazardous duty so prescribed, be entitled to receive an increase in compensation equal to one-thirtieth of the monthly incentive pay authorized by section 204 of this act for the performance of such hazardous duty by members of the uniformed services of corresponding grades entitled to receive basic pay, such increase to be paid to such members, as long as they are qualified to receive such increase, for each regular period of instruction, or period of appropriate duty, at which they shall have been engaged for not less than 2 hours, including those performed on Sundays and holidays, or for the performance of such other equivalent training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties as may be prescribed by the Secretary concerned pursuant to subsection (a) of this section.

(e) The provision of subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of this section shall not apply

when such members are entitled to receive basic pay as provided for in title II of this act.

(f) (1) Section 55a of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 422), is hereby amended by striking out the words "subsection (c), section 14, Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended", appearing in the third proviso thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the words "subsection (a) of section 501 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949."

(2) Sections 55a, 109, and 110 of the National Defense Act, as amended, are hereby amended by striking out the words "section 14 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended", wherever appearing therein, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "section 501 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949."

(3) Section 501 of this act and sections 55a, 109, and 110 of the National Defense Act, as amended, shall be applicable to the Department of the Air Force: *Provided,* That all references in section 501 of this act and sections 55a, 109, and 110 of the National Defense Act, as amended, to the Secretary of the Army, the Department of the Army, the Regular Army, the National Guard, the National Guard of the United States, the Organized Reserve Corps, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and the Organized Reserves, shall be construed for the purpose of interpreting section 501 of this act and sections 55a, 109, and 110 of the National Defense Act, as amended, as likewise referring to the Secretary of the Air Force, the Department of the Air Force, the Regular Air Force, the Air National Guard, the Air National Guard of the United States, the Air Force Reserve, the officers' section of the Air Force Reserve, the enlisted section of the Air Force Reserve, and personnel of the Organized Reserves transferred to the Department of the Air Force, respectively.

ACTIVE SERVICE CREDIT IN COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

SEC. 502. Active service in the Coast and Geodetic Survey as deck officer or junior engineer and active service counted on June 30, 1922, for longevity pay, shall be credited to commissioned officers as active commissioned service for purposes of pay, allowances, retirement, and retirement pay.

PAYMENTS BASED ON PURPORTED MARRIAGES

SEC. 503. Payments of allowances based on a purported marriage and made prior to judicial annulment or termination of such marriage which have been or which hereafter may be made under the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, or under this act are valid: *Provided,* That it is adjudged or decreed by a court of competent jurisdiction that the marriage was entered into in good faith on the part of the spouse in the uniformed services or that, in the absence of such a judgment or decree, such finding of good faith is made by the Secretary concerned or by such person as he may designate for the purpose.

CONTRACT SURGEONS

SEC. 504. Contract surgeons who are serving full time with any of the uniformed services shall be entitled to be paid the minimum basic pay, the basic allowances, and such other allowances as are authorized by this act to be paid to commissioned officers in pay grade 0–2. Contract surgeons who are serving part time with any of the uniformed services shall be entitled to receive the allowances for travel and transportation prescribed pursuant to this act under the same conditions and in the same amount as are applicable to commissioned officers.

ENLISTED PERSONS—CLOTHING ALLOWANCE

SEC. 505. The President may prescribe the quantity and kind of clothing which shall be furnished annually to enlisted men of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, the National Guard, the Air National Guard, the National Guard of the United States, the Air National Guard of the United States, the Organized Reserve Corps, the Air Force Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve, and he may prescribe the amount of a cash allowance to be paid to such enlisted men in any case in which clothing is not so furnished to them.

ALLOWANCE—SHORE PATROL DUTY

SEC. 506. Officers, midshipmen, and cadets of the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard when absent from a vessel or designated post of duty while assigned to shore patrol duty may be paid their actual expenses.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES—ENLISTED MEN—PHILIPPINE SCOUTS—INSULAR FORCE OF THE NAVY

SEC. 507. (a) The pay and allowances of whatever nature and kind to be authorized for the enlisted men of the Philippine Scouts shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Army and shall not exceed or be of other classes than those now or which may hereafter be authorized by law for enlisted men of the Regular Army.

(b) The pay and allowances of whatever nature and kind to be authorized for the enlisted men of the insular force of the Navy shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Navy, and shall not exceed or be of other classes than those now, or which may hereafter be, authorized by law for enlisted men of the Regular Navy.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES—CADETS AND MIDSHIPMEN

SEC. 508. Cadets at the United States Military Academy, midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, and cadets at the Coast Guard Academy shall be entitled to receive pay at the rate of $936 per annum, and to receive allowances as now or hereafter provided by law for midshipmen in the Navy and to transportation, including reimbursement of traveling expenses, while traveling under orders as a cadet or midshipman.

ASSIMILATION TO PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

SEC. 509. The provisions of titles II and III of this act shall apply equally to those persons serving, not as commissioned officers in any of the uniformed services, but whose pay or allowances, or both, under existing law are assimilated to the pay and allowances of a commissioned officer of any grade or rank of any of the uniformed services.

DAILY RATE OF PAY AND ALLOWANCES

SEC. 510. Members of the uniformed services who shall become entitled to receive any pay and allowances authorized by this act for a continuous period of less than 1 month shall be entitled to receive such pay and allowances for each day of such period at the rate of one-thirtieth of the monthly amount of such pay and allowances, and the 31st day of a calendar month shall not be excluded from the computation.

RETIRED AND RETAINER PAY OF MEMBERS ON RETIRED LISTS OR RECEIVING RETAINER PAY

SEC. 511. On and after the effective date of this section (1) members of the uniformed services heretofore retired for reasons other than for physical disability, (2) members heretofore transferred to the Fleet Reserve or the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, and (3) members of the Army Nurse Corps or the Navy Nurse Corps heretofore retired under the act of May 13, 1926 (44 Stat. 513), shall be entitled to receive retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay, in the amount whichever is the greater, computed by one of the following methods: (a) The monthly retired pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay in the amount authorized for such members and former members by provisions of law in effect on the day immediately preceding the date of enactment of this act, or (b) monthly retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay equal to 2½ percent of the monthly basic pay of the highest federally recognized rank, grade, or rating, whether under a permanent or temporary appointment, satisfactorily held, by such member or former member, as determined by the Secretary concerned, and which such member, former member, or person would be entitled to receive if serving on active duty in such rank, grade, or rating, multiplied by the number of years of active service creditable to him: *Provided,* That for the purpose of the computation of (b) above, fractions of one-half year or more of active service shall be counted as a whole year: *Provided further,* That in no case shall such retired pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay exceed 75 percent of the monthly basic pay upon which the computation is based: *Provided further,* That for the purposes of this section, the term "active service" as used herein shall mean all service as a member or as a former member of the uniformed services, or as a nurse, or as a contract nurse prior to February 2, 1901, or as a reserve nurse subsequent to February 2, 1901, or as a contract surgeon, or as a contract dental surgeon, or as an acting dental surgeon, or as a veterinarian in the Quartermaster Department, Cavalry, or Field Artillery, or as an Army field clerk or as a field clerk, Army Quartermaster Corps, while on the active list or on active duty or while participating in full-time training or other full-time duty provided for or authorized in the National Defense Act, as amended, the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, or in other provisions of law, including participation in exercises or performance of the duties provided for by sections 5, 81, 92, 94, 97, and 99 of the National Defense Act, as amended, and in the case of commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, that service which is creditable pursuant to part (3) of section 412 of this act: *Provided further,* That the retired or retirement pay of each member referred to in (3) above shall, unless a higher rank or grade is authorized by any provision of law, be based upon the commissioned-officer grade authorized for such member by the act of May 7, 1948 (Public Law 517, 80th Cong.): *Provided further,* That (a) enlisted persons or former enlisted persons of the Regular Army or Regular Air Force who have been transferred prior to the effective date of this section to the Enlisted Reserve Corps or to the enlisted section of the Air Force Reserve and placed on the retired list of the Regular Army or the Regular Air Force, respectively, under the provisions of section 4 of the act of October 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 539; 10 U. S. C. 948), as amended, and (b) enlisted persons or former enlisted persons of the Regular Navy or Regular Marine Corps who have been transferred prior to the effective date of this section to the Fleet Reserve or the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve under the provisions of title II of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, shall not be entitled to have their retired pay or retainer pay computed on the basis of the highest officer or warrant-officer grade held by them as authorized by this section until they have completed 30 years of service, to include the sum of their active service and their service on the retired list or in the Fleet Reserve or in the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, as required by existing law: *And provided further,* That enlisted persons and warrant officers of the uniformed services, heretofore or hereafter advanced on the retired list to a higher officer rank or grade pursuant to any provision of law shall, if application therefor is made to the Secretary concerned within 1 year from the effective date of this section or within 1 year after the date of advancement on the retired list, whichever is the later, and subject to the approval of the Secretary concerned, be restored to their former retired enlisted or warrant-officer

status, as the case may be, and shall thereafter be deemed to be enlisted or warrant-officer personnel, as appropriate, for all purposes, including the computation of their retired pay based on such enlisted or warrant-officer rank, grade, or rating, as the case may be.

RETIRED PAY OF MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS OF RESERVE COMPONENTS

SEC. 512. On and after the effective date of this section, any person who heretofore has been granted retired pay or who hereafter is granted retired pay pursuant to title III of the act of June 29, 1948 (ch. 708, 62 Stat. 1087), shall have his retired pay computed as authorized by the aforesaid title III on the basis of the pay provided for in this act: *Provided,* That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 305 of the act of June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1089), any member or former member of the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve heretofore placed on the honorary retired list of the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve with pay as provided in sections 309 and 310 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1183; 34 U. S. C. 855h, i), as amended, shall be entitled to have such pay computed as provided in this section.

RETIRED PAY GRADE OF CERTAIN WARRANT OFFICERS AND ENLISTED PERSONS

SEC. 513. Any enlisted person or warrant officer of the uniformed services who served in World War I, heretofore or hereafter retired for any reason, shall (1) be advanced on the retired list of the service concerned to the highest federally recognized officer rank or grade satisfactorily held by such enlisted person or warrant officer under a permanent or temporary appointment for any period of service between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, and (2) if not entitled to receive retired pay or disability retirement pay based on a higher officer rank or grade by some other provision of law, be entitled to receive retired pay or disability retirement pay computed on the basis of the officer rank or grade to which previously advanced on a retired list or computed on the basis of the officer grade or rank authorized by this section: *Provided,* That enlisted persons and warrant officers of the uniformed services, heretofore or hereafter advanced on the retired list to a higher officer rank or grade pursuant to any provision of law shall, if application therefor is made to the Secretary concerned within 1 year from the effective date of this section or within 1 year after the date of advancement on the retired list, whichever is the later, and subject to the approval of the Secretary concerned, be restored to their former retired enlisted or warrant-officer status, as the case may be, and shall thereafter be deemed to be enlisted or warrant-officer personnel, as appropriate, for all purposes, including the computation of their retired pay based on such enlisted or warrant-officer rank, grade, or rating, as the case may be.

RETIRED MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS SERVING ON ACTIVE DUTY

SEC. 514. Retired members and former members of the uniformed services, including members of the Fleet Reserve and the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, shall, when serving on active duty, be entitled to receive the pay and allowances to which entitled by the provisions of this act for the grade or rank in which they are serving on such active duty, and shall, when on such active-duty status, have the same pay and allowance rights while on leave of absence or while sick as members of the uniformed services entitled to receive basic pay of similar grade or rank, and, if death occurs when on active-duty status, while on leave of absence, or while sick, their dependents shall not thereby be deprived of any of the benefits provided in the act of December 17, 1919 (41 Stat. 367; 10 U. S. C. 903), as amended, and in the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 824; 34 U. S. C. 943), as amended.

PROVISION TO RETAIN PRESENT COMPENSATION AND TO LIMIT THE APPLICATION OF THE SERVICEMEN'S DEPENDENTS ALLOWANCE ACT OF 1942, AS AMENDED

SEC. 515. (a) No member serving on active duty on the effective date of this act shall, prior to July 1, 1952, and while serving on continuous active duty, including for the purpose of such continuous active-duty service in a reenlistment entered into within 3 months from the date of last discharge, suffer any reduction by reason of this act in the total compensation which he is entitled to receive under any provision of law in effect on the day immediately preceding such effective date: *Provided,* That (1) the provisions of this subsection shall cease to apply to such member whenever he shall become entitled to receive total compensation in excess of the amount to which he was entitled on the day preceding such effective date; and (2) the provisions of this subsection shall cease to apply to any part of such total compensation upon the failure of such member to qualify therefor: *Provided further,* That for the purposes of this subsection the computation of such total compensation shall not include contributions by the Government under the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, travel and transportation allowances, per diem and station allowances, pay of court stenographers of the Army and Air Force, enlistment allowance, or reenlistment bonuses.

(b) Any member who, on the effective date of this act, is serving in an enlistment contracted prior to the date of enactment of this act, or any member whose enlistment terminated in the period between the date of enactment and the effective date of this act, both dates inclusive, and who has entered into a new enlistment within 1 month of such termination shall not, prior to the expiration of the enlistment or reenlistment described above, or July 1, 1952, whichever is earlier, suffer any reduction by reason of this act in the total compensation which he is entitled to receive under any provision of law in effect on the day immediately preceding the effective date of this act: *Provided,* That for the purposes of this subsection, unless otherwise provided, the computation of such total compensation shall not include travel and transportation allowances, per diem and station allowances, pay of court stenographers of the Army and Air Force, enlistment allowance, or reenlistment bonuses, and following that date which is the last day of the sixth calendar month following the month in which this act is enacted, shall not include the contribution by the Government under the provisions of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, to monthly family allowance (1) for a father or mother dependent for substantial support or (2) for a father or mother dependent for chief support when a monthly family allowance is authorized for a wife or child of such member or (3) for a brother or sister dependent for chief or substantial support, but shall include other contributions by the Government under the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended: *Provided further,* That, notwithstanding the provisions of the preceding proviso, in the case of any member who, on the effective date of this act, is serving in an enlistment or reenlistment which was contracted prior to July 1, 1946, such member shall not, prior to the expiration of such enlistment or reenlistment or July 1, 1952, whichever is earlier, suffer any reduction by reason of this act in the total compensation which he is entitled to receive under any provision of law in effect on the day immediately preceding the effective date of this act, the computation of such total compensation, for the purpose of this proviso only, not to include travel and transportation allowances, per diem and station allowances, pay of court stenographers of the Army and Air Force, enlistment allowance, or reenlistment bonuses, but shall include all contributions by the Government under the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended: *Provided further,* That (1) the provisions of this subsection shall cease to apply to such member whenever he shall become entitled to receive total compensation under the provisions of this act in excess of the amount of such total compensation to which he was entitled on the day preceding the effective date of this act; and (2) the provisions of this subsection shall cease to apply to any part of such total compensation upon the failure of such member or his dependent or dependents to qualify therefor or to be entitled thereto: *Provided further,* That when a member is furnished Government quarters adequate for himself, if without dependents, or adequate for himself and dependents, if with dependents, the total sum saved for him by this subsection shall be reduced by the cash value of the basic allowance for quarters established under section 302 of this act: *And provided further,* That in the case of any enlisted person on active duty on the effective date of this act whose total compensation, not including travel and transportation allowances, per diem and station allowances, pay of court stenographers of the Army and Air Force, enlistment allowance, or reenlistment bonuses, but including the amount of the Government's contribution to such member's dependents under the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, on the day immediately preceding the effective date of this act, exceeds the amount of the total compensation to which he would become entitled under the provisions of this act, not including any Government contributions to his dependents under the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, he shall, if application is made within 1 year from the effective date of this act, be discharged by the Secretary concerned.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the provisions of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, shall, on the date of enactment of this act, become inoperative for the dependent or dependents of all members other than those prescribed in subsection (b) of this section.

PROVISIONS RELATING TO INCREASE OF RETIRED PAY BY ACTIVE DUTY

SEC. 516. Members and former members of the uniformed services, including members of the Fleet Reserve and the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, who have been, or may hereafter be, retired or transferred to the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve and entitled to receive retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay computed under the provisions of this or any other act, shall be entitled, subject to the provisions hereinafter listed, to receive increases in such retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay for all active duty performed after retirement or transfer to the Fleet Reserve or the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve: *Provided,* That the retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay to which such member or former member shall be entitled upon his release from active duty shall be computed by multiplying the years of service creditable to him for purposes of computing retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay at the time of his retirement or transfer plus the number of years of subsequent active duty performed by him by 2½ percent, and by multiplying the product thus obtained by the base and longevity pay or the basic pay, as the case may be, of the rank or grade in which he would be eligible, at the time of his release from active duty, to be retired or transferred except for the fact that he is

already a retired person or a member of the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve: *Provided*, That for the purpose of computing increases in retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay of any member or former member, fractions of one-half year or more of active duty performed subsequent to retirement or transfer by such member or former member shall be counted as a whole year: *Provided further*, That in the case of an officer heretofore retired with pay computed at a rate of either 3 or 4 percent as the multiplier for each year of service allowed in the computation of the retired pay, active duty performed subsequent to the effective date of this section shall not increase the retired or retirement pay for such officer upon his return to retired status unless such officer elects to have his retired or retirement pay computed by one of the two methods provided in section 511 of this act, subject to the limitations imposed therein: *And provided further*, That in no event shall retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay exceed 75 percent of the active-duty pay or basic pay which such person would be entitled to receive if he were serving on active duty in the rank or grade which is the basis for the computation of his retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay.

SAVING PROVISION AND AMENDMENTS RELATING TO MEMBERS OF THE MARINE BAND

SEC. 517. (a) Section 11 of the act of March 4, 1925, as amended by section 1 (c) of the act of June 29, 1946 (60 Stat. 343; 34 U. S. C. 701), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 11. The band of the United States Marine Corps shall consist of one leader, who shall be paid the basic pay, the basic allowances, and such other allowances as are authorized by the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to be paid to commissioned officers in pay grade O-3 and with the same number of cumulative years of service; one second leader, who shall be paid the basic pay, the basic allowances, and such other allowances as are authorized by the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to be paid to warrant officers in pay grade W-3 and with the same number of cumulative years of service, and such other personnel in such numbers and distributed in such grades and ranks as the Secretary of the Navy may determine necessary and appropriate: *Provided*, That hereafter during concert tours approved by the President, personnel of the Marine Band shall suffer no loss of allowances."

(b) Personnel of the band of the United States Marine Corps serving under appointments authorized by law in effect on the date of enactment of this Act who may be appointed to appropriate grades or ranks in consequence of the amendment of such law by subsection (a) of this section shall not suffer by reason of such appointment any reduction in the pay and allowances to which they would have been entitled either in their current enlistment or during any subsequent enlistment or after transfer to the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve or to the retired list. No former member of the band of the United States Marine Corps who has been heretofore retired or heretofore transferred to the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve shall suffer any reduction in retirement or retainer pay to which he would otherwise have been entitled but for reenactment of this act.

SAVING PROVISION RELATING TO FORMER LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE AND FORMER BUREAU OF MARINE INSPECTION PERSONNEL

SEC. 518. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to diminish any of the rights, benefits, and privileges authorized and conferred—

(1) by the act of August 5, 1939 (53 Stat. 1216), as amended by the act of June 24, 1948 (Public Law 761, 80th Cong.), upon personnel of the former Lighthouse Service; and

(2) by the act of July 23, 1947 (61 Stat. 411), for personnel of the categories described in sections 3 (6), 5 (7), and 6 (5) of said act,

who were commissioned, appointed, or enlisted in the regular Coast Guard pursuant to said acts of August 5, 1939, and July 23, 1947, respectively.

SAVING PROVISION RELATING TO MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS RECEIVING RETIREMENT PAY ON DATE OF ENACTMENT OF THIS ACT

SEC. 519. Any member or former member of the uniformed service or any person entitled to the rights, benefits, and privileges of a member or former member of the uniformed services, including any person entitled to the benefits provided in the act of May 7, 1948 (62 Stat. 211), who on the date of enactment of this act, is receiving or is entitled to receive retired or retirement pay pursuant to any provision of law, shall, notwithstanding the provisions of this act, be entitled to continue to receive or shall continue his entitlement to receive that retired or retirement pay which such member or former member is entitled to receive under any provision of law in effect on the day preceding date of enactment of this act.

SAVING PROVISION RELATING TO LAWS PROVIDING FOR PAY REPEALED BY THIS ACT

SEC. 520. Any provision of law which, on the date of enactment of this act, entitles any person to be retired, to receive pay, retired pay, retirement pay, or retainer pay, or other monetary benefit, and which is directly repealed, impliedly repealed, or amended by the provisions of this act, shall, if the entitlement of such person to such retirement, pay, retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or other monetary benefit is saved by the provisions of this act, be continued in full force and effect for such entitlement and for such a time as such entitlement may exist.

PROVISIONS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT AMENDED AND REPEALED

SEC. 521. The following sections, subsections, and other provisions of the act of July 1, 1944 (ch. 373, 58 Stat. 682), as amended, are amended or repealed as hereinafter in this section indicated:

(a) Wherever the words "pay and pay period" appear in subsection (d) of section 207, such words shall be deleted and the words "basic pay" shall be substituted in lieu thereof.

(b) Subsections (b) and (d) of section 208 are repealed. Subsections (c), (e), (f), (g), and (h) of said section are redesignated as subsections (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f), respectively. Subsection (a) and the subsection herein redesignated as subsection (e) of said section are amended as follows:

"(a) Commissioned officers of the Regular and Reserve Corps shall be entitled to receive such pay and allowances as are now or may hereafter be authorized by law."

"(e) Whenever any noncommissioned officer or other employee of the Service is assigned for duty which the Surgeon General finds requires intimate contact with persons afflicted with leprosy, he may be entitled to receive, as provided by regulations of the President, in addition to any pay or compensation to which he may otherwise be entitled, not more than one-half of such pay or compensation."

(c) Subsection (g) of section 210 is amended by deleting therefrom the words "incurred in line of duty" wherever they appear.

(d) Section 211 is amended by repealing subsection (a) thereof; by redesignating subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), and (h) thereof as subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g), respectively; and by changing "subsection (c)" to "subsection (b)" in the subsection hereby redesignated as subsection (a). The subsections hereby redesignated as subsections (b), (c), and (g) of said section are amended to read:

"(b) (1) Any commissioned officer of the Regular Corps who at the time of his original appointment was more han 45 years of age shall upon his retirement for age pursuant to subsection (a) of this section be entitled to retired pay at the rate of 4 percent of his active pay at the time of such retirement for each 12 months of active commissioned service, including any such service in the Army, Navy, or Coast Guard, but in no case more than 75 percent of such active pay.

"(2) The retired pay of an officer, who is retired pursuant to subsection (a) of this section or pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection and who has served 4 years or more as Surgeon General, Deputy Surgeon General, or Assistant Surgeon General, shall be based on the pay of the highest grade held by him as such Surgeon General, Deputy Surgeon General, or Assistant Surgeon General.

"(c) In time of war, a commissioned officer who has been retired under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section may, in accordance with regulations of the President, be recalled to active duty.

"(g) A commissioned officer shall be retired or separated from the Service for physical disability depending upon his eligibility for such retirement or separation under other provisions of law and be paid such retirement or such severance pay to which he may be entitled under such other provisions of law."

(e) Subsection (d) of section 214 is amended by deleting therefrom the words "longevity pay" and substituting in lieu thereof the words "the computation of basic pay."

(f) Subsection (b) of section 215 is amended by deleting therefrom the words "travel, transportation of household goods and effects, and."

(g) Section 706 is amended by deleting the words "subsection (c) (1)" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "subsection (b) (1)" and by deleting the words "subsection (b)" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "subsection (a)."

PROVISIONS RELATING TO RETIREMENT OF OFFICERS SPECIALLY COMMENDED FOR PERFORMANCE OF DUTY IN COMBAT

SEC. 522. (a) Section 412 (a) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 is hereby amended by deleting the words "and with three-fourths of the active-duty pay of the grade in which serving at the time of retirement" as they appear in lines 8 and 9 of the said section on page 874, volume 61, Statutes at Large.

(b) The act of June 6, 1942 (ch. 383, 56 Stat. 328; 14 U. S. C. 174a; 33 U. S. C. 864e), is hereby amended by striking out the words "and with three-fourths of the active-duty pay of the grade in which serving at the time of retirement." and by inserting in lieu thereof the words ": *Provided*, That the provisions of this act shall not apply in the case of any officer who has been so commended if the act or service justifying the commendation was performed after December 31, 1946."

(c) Nothing contained in subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall be held to reduce the retired pay of any officer placed on a retired list prior to the effective date of this section, nor shall the provisions of section 412 (a) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended by subsection (a) of this section, or the act of June 6, 1942 (ch. 383, 56 Stat. 328), as amended by subsection (b) of this section, be construed as granting any increased retired pay to any person by virtue of the higher grade or rank to which such person is or may become entitled to pursuant to such provisions of law.

AMENDMENTS OF THE ACT OF JUNE 3, 1916 (39 STAT. 190; 41 STAT. 776)

SEC. 523. (a) Section 30 of the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 187; 10 U. S. C. 658), as

amended, is amended by deleting therefrom the third, the seventh, and the ninth sentences of the first paragraph.

(b) Section 37a of the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, is amended by inserting a period after the words "and length of active service" and deleting the rest of said section.

(c) Section 38 of the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, is amended by deleting the following words therefrom: "and mileage from his home to his first station and from his last station to his home."

AMENDMENT OF THE ACT OF FEBRUARY 18, 1946 (60 STAT. 20)

SEC. 524. That part of title III of the act of February 18, 1946 (60 Stat. 20; 37 U. S. C. 112c), which authorizes transportation of dependents and household effects of civilian and naval personnel of the Naval Establishment stationed outside continental United States is amended by deleting therefrom all reference to naval personnel.

AMENDMENTS OF THE ACT OF JUNE 5, 1942 (56 STAT. 315)

SEC. 525. (a) Subsection (e) of section 4 of the act of June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 314), as added by section 4 of the act of February 12, 1946 (60 Stat. 5; 50 App. U. S. C. 764 (e)), as amended, is amended by deleting therefrom the reference to section 4 (a), 4 (b), and 4 (c).

(b) Section 5 of the act of June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 316; 50 App. U. S. C. 765), is amended by deleting therefrom all references to military personnel.

AMENDMENT OF THE ACT OF MAY 27, 1908 (35 STAT. 418)

SEC. 526. Paragraph 23, heading "Office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General," of the act of May 27, 1908 (35 Stat. 418; 39 U. S. C. 134), as amended, is amended by deleting the last sentence thereof.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 4 OF THE NAVAL AVIATION CADET ACT OF 1942 (56 STAT. 737)

SEC. 527. Section 4 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 737; 34 U. S. C. 850c), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. Aviation cadets, while on active duty, shall be entitled to be paid at the rate of $105 per month, which pay shall include extra pay for flying. They shall be entitled to receive, in addition, the same allowance for subsistence as is now or may hereafter be authorized for officers of the Navy, and shall, while on active duty, be furnished quarters, medical care, and hospitalization, and shall be issued uniforms, clothing, and equipment at Government expense. When traveling under orders, aviation cadets shall be entitled to receive transportation and other necessary expenses incident to such travel, or cash in lieu thereof, on the same basis and at the same rates as are now or may hereafter be prescribed for enlisted personnel of the Navy."

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 4 OF THE ARMY AVIATION CADET ACT (55 STAT. 240)

SEC. 528. The first five sentences of section 4 of the Army Aviation Cadet Act (55 Stat. 240; 10 U. S. C. 303, 304 304b), as amended, are hereby further amended to read as follows:

"Aviation cadets, while on active duty, shall be entitled to be paid at the rate of $105 per month, which pay shall include extra pay for flying. They shall be entitled to receive, in addition, the same allowance for subsistence as is now or may hereafter be authorized for officers of the Army, and shall, while on active duty, be furnished quarters, medical care, and hospitalization, and shall be issued uniforms, clothing, and equipment at Government expense. When traveling under orders, aviation cadets shall be entitled to receive transportation and other necessary expenses incident to such travel, or cash in lieu thereof, on the same basis and at the same rates as are now or may hereafter be prescribed for enlisted personnel of the Army."

AMENDMENT OF THE ACT OF JUNE 30, 1941 (55 STAT. 394)

SEC. 529. The act of June 30, 1941 (55 Stat. 394; 10 U. S. C. 656, 939, 982a), as amended, is hereby amended by deleting therefrom sections 1, 2, and 3.

AMENDMENT TO THE NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT

SEC. 530. (a) Section 71 of the National Defense Act, as amended (32 U. S. C. 4b), is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of the section, inserting a comma in lieu thereof, and adding the following: "and, in addition thereto, shall include any officer of the National Guard of any State, Territory, or of the District of Columbia who has been temporarily extended Federal recognition by the Secretary of the Army under such regulations as he may prescribe, and who shall have successfully passed the examination prescribed in section 75 of the National Defense Act, as amended, pending final determination of his eligibility for, and his appointment as, an officer of the National Guard of the United States in the grade concerned, and if and when so appointed the appointment shall be dated and shall be deemed to have been effective from the date of such recognition, however, such temporary extension of Federal recognition shall be granted only when such officer takes oath that during such recognition he will perform all Federal duties and obligations required of him the same as though he were appointed as an officer of the National Guard of the United States in such grade, and such temporary recognition may be withdrawn at any time and if not sooner withdrawn or replaced by permanent recognition as an officer of the National Guard of the United States in such grade it shall automatically terminate 6 months after its effective date."

(b) The foregoing amendment in subsection (a) of this section and section 1 of the National Defense Act, as amended, shall apply to the Department of the Air Force and to the Regular and Reserve components of the Air Force in the same manner that it would so apply had it been enacted prior to the enactment of the National Security Act of 1947 (Pub. Law 253, 80th Cong., approved July 26, 1947).

ACTS AND PARTS OF ACTS REPEALED

SEC. 531. (a) All acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed on the date such provisions of this act become effective, and the provisions of this act shall be in effect in lieu thereof, and such repeal shall include, but shall not be limited to, the acts and parts of acts repealed in subsection (b), (c), and (d) of this section.

(b) The following acts and parts of acts are hereby repealed:

(1) Section 1245 of the Revised Statutes (10 U. S. C. 931).

(2) Section 1251 of the Revised Statutes (10 U. S. C. 933).

(3) Section 1252 of the Revised Statutes (10 U. S. C. 934).

(4) Section 1253 of the Revised Statutes (10 U. S. C. 966).

(5) That part of section 1261 of the Revised Statutes (10 U. S. C. 692) which provides additional pay for aids to brigadier generals and major generals.

(6) Section 1454 of the Revised Statutes (34 U. S. C. 418), as amended.

(7) Section 1588 of the Revised Statutes (34 U. S. C. 991), as amended.

(8) Section 1612 of the Revised Statutes (34 U. S. C. 971).

(9) Section 1613 of the Revised Statutes (34 U. S. C. 972).

(10) The third proviso of section 3 of the act of October 1, 1890 (26 Stat. 562; 10 U. S. C. 932).

(11) Section 6 of the act of April 12, 1902 (32 Stat. 101; 14 U. S. C. 169), as amended.

(12) That part of paragraph 3, heading "Marine Corps," of the act of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1200; 34 U. S. C. 973) which provides additional pay for privates of the Marine Corps regularly detailed and serving as cooks.

(13) That part of paragraph 3, heading "Pay of enlisted men," of the act of May 11, 1908 (35 Stat. 108; 10 U. S. C. 803), as amended, which authorizes additional pay to an officer of the Army below the grade of major required to be mounted who provides himself with suitable mounts at his own expense.

(14) That part of paragraph 2, heading "Pay of the Navy," of the act of May 13, 1908 (35 Stat. 128; 34 U. S. C. 867), which provides additional pay for aids to rear admirals of the Navy.

(15) That part of paragraph 14, heading "Miscellaneous," of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 575; 10 U. S. C. 644), which authorizes additional pay for enlisted men of the Army detailed to serve as stenographic reporters.

(16) That part of section 1 of the act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1063; 10 U. S. C. 750a), as amended, which relates to expenses of officers abroad as observers of foreign armies at war.

(17) That part of section 127a of the act of June 3, 1916, as added by section 51 of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 785; 10 U. S. C. 301), which relates to additional pay for military aviators and junior military aviators.

(18) That part of section 127a of the act of June 3, 1916, as added by section 51 of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 785; 37 U. S. C. 4b), which provides for longevity pay for service in the Regular, provisional, or temporary forces.

(19) That part of section 1 of the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 629; 10 U. S. C. 935), as amended, which reads as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Army shall make a list of all officers of the Army who have been placed on the retired list for disability and shall cause such officers to be examined at intervals as may be advisable, and such officers as shall be found to have recovered from such disabilities or to be able to perform service of value to the Government sufficient to warrant such action shall be assigned to such duty as the Secretary of the Army may approve."

(20) Paragraph 4, heading "Medals of Honor, Distinguished Service Crosses, and Distinguished Service Medals," of the act of July 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 871; 10 U. S. C. 696).

(21) That part of subchapter IX of the act of July 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 882; 10 U. S. C. 276), which relates to pay and allowances of warrant officers of the Army Mine Planter Service.

(22) Section 4 of the act of February 4, 1919 (40 Stat. 1056) as renumbered section 6 and amended by section 1 of the act of August 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 744; 34 U. S. C. 357).

(23) Section 13 of the act of July 2, 1926 (44 Stat. 789; 10 U. S. C. 1430; 34 U. S. C. 364b).

(24) The act of April 9, 1928 (ch. 327, 45 Stat. 412; 34 U. S. C. 886), as amended.

(25) Section 10 of the act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 307; 37 U. S. C. 29a).

(26) The act of August 25, 1937 (ch. 769, 50 Stat. 805; 10 U. S. C. 699).

(27) That part of the act of October 15, 1940 (ch. 885, 54 Stat. 1177; 10 U. S. C. 276, 277), which relates to pay and allowances of warrant officers of the Army Mine Planter Service.

(28) That part of section 6 of the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 604; 34 U. S. C. 350e), as amended, which relates to pay and allowances, and section 8 of such act (55 Stat. 604; 34 U. S. C. 350g), as amended.

(29) Section 2 of the act of August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 629; 37 U. S. C. 16a), as amended.

(30) That part of section 1 of the act of August 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 651; 10 U. S. C. 593a) relating to base pay and allowances for warrant officers in the Army of the United States which precedes the proviso, and also all of said section 1 following the colon preceding the proviso.

(31) Section 7 of the act of January 19, 1942 (56 Stat. 8; 33 U. S. C. 864d), as amended.

(32) So much of the second proviso of section 2 (b) of the act of January 19, 1942 (56 Stat. 7; 33 U. S. C. 854a), as relates to pay, longevity pay, allowances, and retirement.

(33) Section 1 of the act of May 4, 1942 (56 Stat. 266; 37 U. S. C. 18a).

(34) The act of June 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 359), as amended, except section 12 of such act, as amended, except that part of paragraph 1 of section 10 of such act, as amended, which relates to enlisted personnel in a travel status, and except paragraph 4 of section 15 of such act, as amended.

(35) The act of April 10, 1943 (ch. 47, 57 Stat. 62; 37 U. S. C. 118b) as amended.

(36) The act of June 30, 1944 (ch. 335, 58 Stat. 648; 10 U. S. C. 1430a), as amended.

(37) The act of July 6, 1945 (ch. 279, 59 Stat. 462; 10 U. S. C. 1430b), as amended.

(38) Section 5 of the act of June 29, 1946 (60 Stat. 345; 37 U. S. C. 101a).

(39) The act of March 6, 1946 (ch. 49, 60 Stat. 32; 37 U. S. C. 103b), as amended.

(40) Section 14 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 854; 34 U. S. C. 889).

(41) Sections 14, 15, and 16 (b) of the act of June 3, 1948 (ch. 390, 62 Stat. 299, 300).

(c) The following acts and parts of acts are hereby repealed:

(1) That part of section 1 of the act of August 5, 1882 (22 Stat. 286; 34 U. S. C. 892), which relates to officers of the Navy traveling abroad under orders.

(2) That part of section 1 of the act of March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 456; 10 U. S. C. 747), which relates to computation of mileage and necessity for travel by officers of the Army.

(3) Paragraph 21, heading "Miscellaneous," of the act of June 12, 1906 (34 Stat. 246; 10 U. S. C. 743, 748, 870), as amended.

(4) That part of paragraph 6 heading "Marine Corps," of the act of March 3, 1909 (35 Stat. 774; 34 U. S. C. 977), which provides for settlement of traveling-expense claims.

(5) That part of the act of March 23, 1910 (36 Stat. 255; 10 U. S. C. 821), under the heading "Quartermaster's Department," subheading "Transportation of the Army and its supplies," which relates to reimbursement of the Government for excess baggage carried.

(6) Section 126 of the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 217; 10 U. S. C. 752; 14 U. S. C. 138; 34 U. S. C. 895), as amended.

(7) That part of section 1 of the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 633; 10 U. S. C. 823), as amended, which relates to transportation of baggage of enlisted men discharged for disability in line of duty.

(8) That part of the act of July 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 860; 10 U. S. C. 754), as amended, which relates to travel expenses of enlisted men incident to entry on or relief from active duty.

(9) The act of September 29, 1919 (ch. 65, 41 Stat. 288; 10 U. S. C. 753).

(10) The first paragraph of section 5 of the act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1190; 10 U. S. C. 306; 34 U. S. C. 893), as amended.

(11) Subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of section 4 of the act of June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 315; 50 App. U. S. C. 764 (a), (b), (c), and (d)), as amended.

(12) That part of paragraph 1 of section 10 of the act of June 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 363; 37 U. S. C. 110), as amended, which relates to enlisted personnel in a travel status, and section 12 of such act (56 Stat. 364; 37 U. S. C. 112), as amended.

(13) The act of October 14, 1942 (56 Stat. 786; 50 App. U. S. C. 831, 832, and 833), as amended.

(14) The act of October 29, 1942 (ch. 631, 56 Stat. 1011; 34 U. S. C. 899).

(15) So much of section 1 of the acts of June 26, 1943 (ch. 147, 57 Stat. 204), June 22, 1944 (ch. 269, 58 Stat. 309), May 29, 1945 (ch. 130, 59 Stat. 209), and section 101 of the act of July 8, 1946 (ch. 543, 60 Stat. 488; 37 U. S. C. 112b), as relates to per diem allowances for naval officers traveling between places in the same vicinity, naval personnel on special duty in foreign countries and naval personnel of the Naval Air Transport Service.

(16) The act of November 28, 1943 (ch. 330, 57 Stat. 593; 50 App. U. S. C. 833 a, b, c, d, e, and f), as amended.

(17) Section 1 of the act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 392; 37 U. S. C. 117b).

(18) Section 6 of the act of October 6, 1945 (ch. 393, 59 Stat. 539; 10 U. S. C. 751a; 34 U. S. C. 895a), as amended.

(19) The act of April 27, 1946 (60 Stat. 126, 127; 37 U. S. C. 112d–112i), as amended.

(20) The act of March 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 23; 10 U. S. C. 760).

(d) The Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 532. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 533. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c) of this section, this act shall become effective on October 1, 1949, and no pay, allowances, or benefits provided herein shall accrue to any person for any period prior thereto.

(b) Section 515 of this act shall become effective on the date of enactment of this act.

(c) Subsection (c) of section 531 of this act shall become effective on January 1, 1950.

Mr. KILDAY (interrupting reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD, and be open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 25, after line 15, strike out "$45" and insert "$42."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FURCOLO:

Page 19, after line 12, strike out the chart between lines 12 and 13 and insert the following chart:

"Pay grade:	*Monthly rate*
O–8	$50
O–7	50
O–6	50
O–5	50
O–4	100
O–3	100
O–2	100
O–1	100
W–4	75
W–3	75
W–2	75
W–1	75
E–7	50
E–6	$50
E–5	50
E–4	50
E–3	50
E–2	50
E–1	50"

Page 10, line 3 (c), strike out through line 6 and insert as follows:

"For basic-pay purposes, warrant officers are hereby assigned by grade and rank to the four pay grades prescribed for warrant officers in subsection (a) of this section, as follows:

"W–4. Commissioned or chief warrant officers with over 26 cumulative years of Federal service; warrant officers with over 30 cumulative years of Federal service.

"W–3. Commissioned or chief warrant officers with over 20 cumulative years of Federal service; warrant officers with over 20 cumulative years of Federal service.

"W–2. Commissioned or chief warrant officers with less than 20 years cumulative Federal service; warrant officers with over 20 cumulative years of Federal service.

"W–1. Warrant officers with less than 20 cumulative years of Federal service."

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I think probably all Members have the mimeographed amendment that I have offered. It is on page 19 and has to do with the hazardous-duty pay.

This is similar to an amendment I offered at the time the bill was considered previously, although some change is made. I may say that while this amendment if adopted will save $23,000,000 the purpose of the amendment is not economy. It has the effect of saving $23,000,000 approximately, but it is not offered as an economy amendment. It is offered, rather, in the hope that it will be a more fair and equitable provision and that it will be helpful as far as the morale of the services are concerned.

What we have to understand about this bill is this: First off they set up a pay schedule in which they pay certain men in the service according to their qualifications, according to their ability, according to the knowledge and judgment which they have, with which I have no quarrel at this time. After they have provided for those payments so that there is a different ratio of payment to all men in the service whereby captains, for example, get more money than the privates because they have more responsibility and are supposed to have greater judgment and knowledge, they then have certain types of duty that are called hazardous or perilous duty and for men who are in these hazardous or perilous duties there is provided a certain extra pay. According to the pay schedule on page 19 it is set up so that this extra pay varies from $30 for the lowest grade man to $210 a month for the highest grade man.

The amendment that I have offered tries to change that, and what it does in effect is to give the amount of $50 to all the enlisted men who are on hazardous duty, regardless of rate; to give the amount of $75 to all the warrant officers on hazardous duty, regardless of rate; and the amount of $100 to all the junior-grade officers and the amount of $50 a month to all the senior-grade and field officers. I am not particularly concerned whether the amount is $50 or $100 or whatever it may be. I made that point the last time during the debate,

But, what I am concerned about is that this Congress not go on record as placing a different price tag on the value of a man's life, depending on his rank. I know the committee is going to say that this is really not hazardous duty; this is really incentive pay for duty that does not attract. When that was discussed before the committee some time ago, I said, "Well, if that is what it is, call it that; call it incentive pay or something else." But, the fact of the matter is, it is still here under the heading of hazardous pay, because that is what it is.

I hope that the Congress will go on record as doing something that I think will do more to improve the morale of the armed forces than anything else, and this is it. It is all right to pay men differently according to their ability, but when you get to the point where you are giving men something for risking their lives in hazardous duty, then put them all on the same plane. It is interesting to note that of the very few of the enlisted men who testified in the hearings held by the committee, one pointed out in answer to this very question and said, "Sir, when I am on a plane with eight other men, I hold my life as dear as any other man in that plane."

Hazardous duty in effect is where two men go on a certain mission. For instance, one is a private and the other is a major. Now, you say to them, "You are both going to risk your lives on this mission. You are being paid differently for your ability, but now you are going on this mission, and to the major we are going to give you $200, and to the private $30." I do not think that is fair, I do not think it is just, and I do not think it improves the morale of the armed forces in any way whatsoever, and I do not think that this Congress, regardless of what the military may want to do, should put its stamp of approval on a system that does that. If this amendment is adopted it will put the lowest grade enlisted man on a par with the highest grade man in the Army as far as getting that $50 a month for hazardous duty pay. It will also distinguish somewhat between the grades, not that I want to make that distinction, but I am making it only because of the fact that 3 weeks ago when I offered a similar amendment, it was turned down by this Committee, and I do not see much sense in offering the same amendment again and having it turned down. I would like to see all get the same extra bonus for harardous duty, regardless of rank, but that amendment was defeated 3 weeks ago, so I have changed my amendment to the present one.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this matter was thoroughly debated yesterday, and it was thoroughly debated when the other bill was before the House. I think it is clear that $12.50 is no incentive to a man making $150 a week, and that you lose all of the benefit of flight pay when you go to a system of this kind. The matter has been studied thoroughly by the commission and the committee, and I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 3 minutes.

Mr. SUTTON. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, according to the rules of the House, no time limit can be set in the Committee of the Whole. It has to be in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. According to the rules of the House, a time limit can be set after there has been debate on the subject.

Mr. VINSON. There has been 10 minutes of debate on it.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TACKETT. I am not fighting this bill, but I think we ought to have an opportunity to be heard here.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is correct. I will make it 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. I want to give everybody an opportunity to express their views.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT].

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, the committee tells us that by this bill they have reduced the former proposal for officers' pay from 8 to 10 percent, but it is now easy to see that they are restoring some $23,000,000 to the officers in the form of hazardous-duty pay. It is hard for me to conceive any person believing that a buck private's life in an airplane is not just as valuable as a general's life in an airplane. I know there are many Members of the House who have practiced personal-injury law before coming here. I wonder whether you were ever able to find any jury or court of law that would tell you a general's life is more valuable than a buck private's life. The former proposal by this committee provided $100 per month to be paid to the generals for hazardous-duty pay, and the committee then contended, and today contends, that the former proposal was better than the bill now being considered. When the House at that time by record vote made it necessary for the committee to reduce expenditures to the high brass, the committee comes back here restoring $23,000,000 for the generals in the form of hazardous-duty pay. That is all it amounts to. Where is the incentive? A general is not going to be any more anxious to get in an airplane on a dangerous mission for $10,000 than he is for 10 cents. He is doing it out of patriotism, as all the rest of us do during wartime. You know it is fair and you know it is just and you know it is honest that this amendment be adopted. Of course, I know the committee sees they have the House going today, and they are going to try to slam this bill through if they possibly can do it. But you may find yourself surprised, just as you did before.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts and I would appreciate it if the committee would bear with me while I explain my reasons for my opposition.

It is not easy to change a thing like a complicated pay schedule, pare off some here and add some there, and still have the balanced structure you started with. There are many factors involved in a thing like this. Change one thing and you find that something else must be changed too. Otherwise you have a grotesque situation; you violate some essential principles on which the whole thing must be based. In this pay bill, for example, it was decided to reduce the size of the increases granted all but the lowest enlisted grades. This was done on a progressive basis, very slightly in the enlisted ranks, but becoming more substantial through the officer grades until the raises for general and flag officers were cut most of all. Immediately a grave difficulty developed where general and flag officers entitled to flying pay were concerned.

The system of incentive pay for flying was overhauled in the original bill. One-half of base pay is the present rate, and that works out well enough in the enlisted and lower officer grades. It becomes too much, however, in the higher grades if the basic pay itself is to be raised. For that reason a flat rate scale was worked out for all grades which provided less flying pay for all higher ranking officers and $100 a month for generals and admirals. It was an equitable system for the originally proposed pay scale, and I don't recall that anyone objected to it.

On this new scale, however, it was seen that that would not work. With their flying pay so reduced, and with so small an increase in base pay, many general officers and admirals would actually receive not a pay raise, but a cut. For a rear admiral or brigadier general it would be a slight cut, but for all others it would be nearly a hundred dollars a month—ninety-two, to be exact. Now, a basic principle that this whole pay revision is based on is that while pay increases may vary, certainly no one's pay should be decreased. I am sure that all the gentlemen here agree with that. I am also sure that no one here wants to reduce the pay of many of the leaders of our armed forces.

In order to avoid that, this new bill provides the same flying pay for general and flag officers as it does for the rank of colonel or Navy captain. This change, however, also avoids an even worse situation. Were it not made, all colonels with over 18 years' service would actually receive more pay than the brigadier generals. This would be equally true in the Air Force, Marine

Corps, or Navy. That means that if you have a Navy captain with 30 years of service who flies—and he can be a young man still in his forties—and you want to promote him, you must say, in effect, "You've done such a good job that we're going to cut your pay $50 a month. You're a better officer than your fellow captains, so we're going to pay you less. We want you to accept greater responsibility and do more work. You'll have greater financial obligations, of course, but you'll have $50 less a month to meet them with." Were I a captain under such a system, and if I suspected myself of great merit, I fear that I would be strongly tempted to hide my light under a bushel.

The strongest criticism the Hook Commission made of the current pay structure is that it enables a man to do nearly as well by coasting along as he can by being ambitious. He is not sufficiently encouraged to seek advancement. For a man to have his pay reduced upon promotion, then, is patently ridiculous.

This provision, which merely levels off flying pay at the grade of colonel or its equivalent, is an absolutely necessary device to avoid violating the most important pay principle of all—that of pay commensurate with responsibility accepted and duties performed. It also guards against anyone receiving even less pay then he now does. I have talked to some length on this because I want to be sure that it is understood. The consensus was that the increase for generals should be reduced and it has been. But this change might appear strange to some Members unless they realize why it had to be made. I do not want misunderstanding and confusion to kill this vital legislation. Too much in the future may depend upon it. The economic and judicious expenditure of our vast defense appropriations definitely does depend upon it.

The time allotted does not permit me to go into the bill at length, but, I know that this is now a good bill.

I have some little misgivings about just how badly we have emasculated the compensation rates which we originally deemed right and proper for general officers and our commissioned men, but apparently the heads of the armed services are satisfied with the cuts made by the committee in order that the services may enjoy the benefits that will be afforded by enlisted personnel with long tenure of service.

There is no doubt but what all officer personnel has taken a drastic cut below the pay schedules as provided in this bill as contrasted with the bill over which we worked 2 weeks ago.

Mr. Chairman, the one end-product of the United States Air Force is military flights. Effectiveness and economy are of essence.

The wondrous technical and other precision instruments with which ground installations as well as flying ships are equipped make it mandatory that we highly train all personnel regardless of their duties in order to keep the ships flying in the air.

Trucks, jeeps, cranes, battleships, cruisers, submarines, tankers, fighters, pursuits, light and heavy bombers are all mere weapons of war.

Their provident military and strategic uses require highly trained men of experience. Their effective operation requires that henceforth our armed services must compete in every labor field with private industry. That competition will require that the armed services pay rates of wages comparable with those received in civil life.

The voluminous studied findings of those concerned with the study of this problem and the writing of this bill, the report of the hearings, are all supported not alone by the Chiefs of Staff but by the Commander in Chief himself who recommends the adoption of H. R. 5007 by this House.

In my reading of corroboratory evidence there are several things that stand out markedly in the three branches of service. The first is the great number of men who rose from the rank of enlisted privates to become general officers. The second was the number of general officers as well other line and flag officers that were killed during the last war.

There are no less than 60 generals in the air force alone who started their military careers as privates in the ranks.

The following is a roster of the Air Force generals who rose from the rank of private:

General: Muir S. Fairchild.

Lieutenant generals: Howard A. Craig, Edwin W. Rawlings, Nathan F. Twining, Ennis C. Whitehead.

Major generals: John D. Barker, Lucas V. Beau, James M. Bevans, Clayton L. Bissell, Fred S. Borum, Carl A. Brandt, Franklin O. Carroll, Charles C. Chauncey, Orval R. Cook, Richard C. Coupland, Robert W. Douglas, Jr., Eugene L. Eubank, Caleb V. Haynes, Albert F. Hegenberger, Earl S. Hoag, James P. Hodges, Frederick M. Hopkins, Jr., William E. Kepner, George C. McDonald, Clements McMullen, Bob E. Nowland, Earle E. Partridge, St. Claire Streett, John E. Upston, Robert M. Webster, John M. Weikert, Lyman P. Whitten, Paul L. Williams, Kenneth B. Wolfe.

Brigadier generals: Charles Y. Banfill, Rosenham Beam, George H. Beverley, Charles H. Caldwell, Warren R. Carter, Paul T. Cullen, Joseph V. de P. Dillon, John P. Doyle, Jr., William D. Eckert, James M. Fitzmaurice, Dale V. Gaffney, Byron E. Gates, Thomas O. Hardin, resigned, Donald R. Hutchinson, Glen C. Jamison, Harry A. Johnson, Clarence P. Kane, Emil C. Kiel, Clifford C. Nutt, James F. Phillips, Max F. Schneider, Ned Schramm, Wallace G. Smith, Arthur Thomas, Charles E. Thomas, Jr., Yantis H. Taylor.

As it is with the Army and Air Force, so it is with the Navy of these United States. Of the 36,737 Regular Navy Officers now on active duty 16,915 have previously served as enlisted men.

In addition thereto, and now serving in a commissioned or warrant status are the 276 candidates recently selected from enlisted personnel for entry into the Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps.

Prominent among those in the Navy who started on their career as privates and rose through the ranks are such men as Rear Adms. John Enos Wood, Paul Luker Mather, Samuel Ellsworth McCarty, Frederick William McMahon, Irving Mathew McQuiston, Richard Francis Whitehead, Herbert Lamont Pugh, Alfred Melville Pride, Joseph Bruce Logue, Wesley McLaren Hague, James Hicks Foskett and a veritable catalog of officers of lower rank.

There has been a great deal of talk with respect to pay provisions in this bill and particularly so with respect to the drastic reductions in flying and hazard pay that were made but a few days ago in the Armed Services Committee.

I wonder how many of us realize that over two-thirds of all the Army officers killed in combat during World War II were flying officers of the United States Air Force.

I wonder how many of us realize that out of the 36,645 Army officers who died in combat that 24,119 of the dead were Air Force officers.

Additionally thereto, the fatalities included 16,313 of Air Corps flying personnel.

Is it any wonder, therefore, that in his early years an Air Force flyer must pay approximately twice as much for ordinary life insurance as does a ground officer?

Is it any wonder why at the age of 22 air pilots life expectancy is 12 years less than that of a non-flying officer?

I cite these facts merely to indicate a single phase of the complicated pay bill this House is handling today. In order to demonstrate the hazards assumed by Air Force general officers while in flight let me remind you of the dispatches as poured into this country of the deaths in action of these illustrious men.

Killed in action: Maj. Gen. Clarence L. Tinker, Brig. Gen. Frederick W. Castle, Brig. Gen. Nathan B. Forrest, Brig. Gen. Davis D. Graves, Brig. Gen. Howard K. Ramey, Brig. Gen. Kenneth N. Walker, Brig. Gen. Russell A. Wilson.

Missing in combat: Lt. Gen. Millard F. Harmon, Brig. Gen. James R. Anderson, Brig. Gen. Asa N. Duncan.

Killed in airplane crashes: Lt. Gen. Frank M. Andrews, Brig. Gen. Harold H. George, Brig. Gen. William H. Eaton, Maj. Gen. Herbert A. Dargue, Brig Gen. Carlyle H. Wash, Maj. Gen. Robert Olds, Brig. Gen. Donald R. Goodrich, Brig. Gen. Alfred J. Lyon, Brig. Gen. Arthur B. McDaniel, Brig. Gen. Clinton W. Russell.

It is because of the fairness, the equity, righteousness and decency with which the Armed Services Committee studied and perfected every provision of H. R. 5007 that not alone am I going to vote in support of this bill but urge it upon every Member of the House to do likewise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I am going to make this appeal to the Committee that it support the committee in its recommendations in this respect. I recognize that when there is an extra hazard, like flying or submarine service, or other service of that sort, it is something that, in a sense, cannot be adequately paid for. When we had hearings some time back regarding this matter of extra-hazard duty, especially flying, and other such duty, I was amazed to learn how the life of the average man on such extra hazardous duty is shortened. I think the least we can do is to

give him a reasonable compensation as an incentive pay to take care of the situation in reference to extra-hazard pay.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired; all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TACKETT) there were—ayes 84, noes 85.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. KILDAY and Mr. FURCOLO to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 94, noes 94.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARROLL: Page 73, line 10, after the word "amended", strike out all of section 315 and insert the following: *"Provided,* That notwithstanding the foregoing, the provisions of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, shall remain in effect for the dependent or dependents of an enlisted man until the expiration of the enlistment or reenlistment period for which he has contracted prior to the date of the enactment of this act, or of an enlisted person inducted into any of the uniformed services prior to the date of the enactment of this act until the expiration of his compulsory period of active service."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, this was the amendment offered to the bill which this body considered some weeks ago; this was the amendment which was passed by this body.

I must say in all fairness as I attempt to amend this present bill that I cannot do so. I offer this amendment for the purpose of the RECORD. In my opinion I think this bill will pass. As I indicated to you before, I intend to vote for it, but I offer the present amendment so that the record may be clear when it goes to the other body.

Frankly, I am disappointed that the bill under consideration did not include the amendment recently accepted by the House, but here is what we are now up against in attempting to amend section 515: If we now pass this amendment would be attempting to write legislation on the floor of the House concerning an extremely complicated subject. If we should accept the amendment which I have offered after striking out all of the other provisions of section 515, it might cost not $100,000,000, but possibly $300,000,000; in other words, the paragraphs of section 515 are so interwoven and interrelated that is is impossible to amend this section of the bill under present circumstances.

As I have stated before, I am disappointed. I am confident that if the membership here had a chance to vote on this particular amendment it would pass; and I shall tell you why; I want to repeat myself just a bit: Every member of the military service under the terms of this bill will receive a wage increase except two categories of enlisted men. Any enlisted man who enlisted prior to July 1, 1946, who has dependents will not receive a wage increase under this bill; and an enlisted man who enlisted after July 1, 1946, will not receive a wage increase. What you have done under the terms of this bill is to penalize those people who are unfortunate enough to have dependents; that is the effect of this bill. Notwithstanding the defects of the bill, notwithstanding the fact that I do not believe it fully equitable, I believe we ought to pass the bill and let it go over to the other body for study and correction. It is my personal intention to follow the bill as it proceeds to the Senate, in the hope that this matter will be more favorably considered while in committee.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to urge anyone to vote for my amendment; nevertheless, I should like to have it in the RECORD.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, the same reasoning applies to this amendment as applied to the previous amendment I offered in reference to hazardous pay. What this would do in effect is change the wording of the bill. Where it now gives $100 a month to officers for hazardous duty and $50 for enlisted men, that would be changed to pay them all at the same rate of $50 a month. The same reasoning applies to this as to the other amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FURCOLO) there were—ayes 44, noes 105.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic conference at Des Moines has two very obvious purposes, according to an editorial in the Washington News of yesterday.

First. To sell Agriculture Secretary Brannan's farm plan to farmers and farm organizations in 16 Midwestern States.

Second. To line up votes in those States for the election of Democrats to Congress, pledged to adopt the CIO endorsed Brannan plan in the Eighty-second Congress.

No bones are made as to this purpose which is, of course, very laudable from the viewpoint of retaining control of the Congress by the present administration.

My farmers of the Midwest can well ask, "Why should we discard the theory of parity just because someone comes up with a plan? Just what experience has Brannan had that we should consider his judgment infallible, and throw away a proven program?"

Also, they could well ask, "Why do not the Democrats, now in absolute control of Congress, set aside the new Aiken Act which is scheduled to come into operation January 1, next, and reenact as permanent legislation the 90-percent of parity price-support law, with certain minor changes to take care of perishables and perhaps some acreage control, needed sparingly as conditions develop?"

When the word came from Des Moines the other day that the Brannan plan will not be advanced this session, but will be put off until next year, election year, the Democrats stand accused of playing politics at the expense of agriculture in the Nation. Why should the Congress not have the right to consider this now?

I challenge the administration to repeal now the Aiken bill, which I have always opposed, and to reenact our present price-support structure. The Democrats say that the 60–90 percent features on basis of the Aiken bill are no good. I agree with them. Why should we let it go into effect? Why invite a possible depression which could easily be averted?

Why do not the Democrats change that law now? If this Democrat controlled Congress adjourns without correcting this mistake of the Republican Eightieth Congress, the Democrats will stand convicted of being perfectly willing to play politics at the farmer's expense. Are they big enough to rise above party politics and meet the Republicans half way in reenacting the program we now have, which has given prosperity to agriculture and to the Nation?

Let us repeal the Aiken bill and extend the 90-percent parity floor indefinitely.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, we have been hearing a great deal about the "brass" during the past 2 days. We heard a great deal about the "brass" during the previous debate on this bill. We have read about the "brass" in the newspapers and have heard about the "brass" over the air.

In fact, there is the sound of "brass" all about us.

Would it not be appropriate therefore, in the closing minutes of this debate, as we near a final vote, to recall the lines of a very appropriate poem from the pen of Berton Braley. He has called it Five-Star Finals.

After hearing his words of wisdom there remains nothing to be said, so why attempt to say more? Let us give ear to his words of wisdom.

FIVE-STAR FINALS

(By Berton Braley)

The postwar strategical board is in action
Refighting the war to its own satisfaction,
And showing—with hindsight on all that occurred—
How admirals blundered, and generals erred;
Where Nimitz was timid; MacArthur was blind,
Where Ike Eisenhower showed a second-rate mind,
Where Marshall was lacking in judgment and vision
And Arnold was shy on decisive decision,
And how 'twould have bettered the job, by and large,
Had the postwar strategical board been in charge.

So let's jump en masse on the Brass
With postwar hindsighters before us.
Let's yammer and whoop at the gold-braided group
And pan 'em in rancorous chorus:
The admirals: Phooie!
The generals? Nerts!
Above second looie
They're all padded shirts.
They bossed fighting forces
That none could surpass,
But now the war's over
Let's jump on the Brass.

Yet, somebody planned, builded, fed, and supplied
The Army by land and the ships on the tide.
And somebody had to direct and command
The planning and fighting as figured and planned.
For wars are not won by unorganized mobs
Of even our valorous GI's and gobs.
So could be the Brass, when debunking's all done,
Had something to do with the war that was won.
(It was won, remember? A fact that's ignored
Or missed by the postwar strategical board.)

But, shucks! Use brass knucks on the Brass.
The "experts" are setting the style,
For braid on the shoulders informs all beholders
"This guy has to take it—and smile."
The admirals? Phooie!
The generals? Punk!
Their planning was screwy
Their orders were bunk.
True, under their leadership, triumph was scored,
But "Nuts," say the postwar strategical board,
"They won, but in winning
They hadn't no class,
And now the war's over
Let's jump on the Brass!"

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUTTON: Page 19, after line 12, strike out the chart between lines 12 and 13 and insert the following chart:

"Pay grade:	*Monthly rate*
O–8	$100
O–7	100
O–6	100
O–5	100
O–4	100
O–3	100
O–2	100
O–1	100
W–4	75
W–3	75
W–2	75
W–1	75
E–7	50
E–6	50
E–5	50
E–4	50
E–3	50
E–2	50
E–1	50"

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just wish to take this time to inform the Republican Members of the House that the conference scheduled for this afternoon has been postponed until tomorrow. We had hoped that we could conclude the program earlier today, but in view of the fact it is so late we decided to hold the conference tomorrow. It will follow the adjournment of the House.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, reserving the last 5 minutes to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. TACKETT. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the Sutton amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENNETT of Florida as a substitute for the Sutton amendment: On page 19, after line 12, strike out the chart between lines 12 and 13 and insert the following: "$50 per month for all pay grades."

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to make a long speech. We have discussed the general merits of this matter pretty fully. The discussion has been on the question of whether, after arrangement has been made for the basic pay of the various men in the armed services, there should be differentials on the question of the hazard pay. I personally do not think there should be. I voted for the Furcolo amendment a while ago but I did not completely like it, for I see no reason why a second lieutenant should get more money than an enlisted man in the field of hazard pay. I am not indulging in demagoguery here at all. I started out as a private, as many of you did that were in the service. I ultimately became a captain. I know I would not like to lead a platoon of men in any sort of activity as a lieutenant and have it known that my hazard pay was to be different from that of the enlisted men who were serving with me. I would not want that situation to obtain.

I think it would be a healthy thing if we made all the hazard pay the same. The issues have been pretty well discussed. I think this amendment is a better amendment than any that makes any differential whatever. I do hope you will approve it, because it is sound as to military defense and it is sound economy; and it would, I believe, make for better morale in the services if you adopt this substitute amendment which gives everybody $50, whether they are generals or privates, on this hazard proposition.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FURCOLO. I agree completely with what the gentleman has said. The amendment I offered on hazard pay 3 weeks ago was exactly in line with this. I certainly hope the amendment will be adopted. I think it is the best one so far.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would entirely destroy the whole structure of flying pay. Yesterday I took considerable time to explain to you that there are great hazards in military flying in time of peace. This is far more important in time of peace than it is in time of war, as in peacetime we must train our pilots who will fight for us in war. For instance, the probability of life of a pilot 22 years of age compared to a ground officer 22 years of age is 12 years shorter on the average than that of a nonflying officer. In order to offer the incentive that is necessary to keep these boys flying, experience has shown you must give them incentive pay. That is what this is, incentive pay. We are not paying for a man's life. You cannot pay for a man's life, but you can pay for the financial loss suffered by a man's family in the loss of his life, and all the courts pay less for those with small income, because all that is paid for is the pecuniary loss caused by the death. That argument is ridiculous, as all courts admit you cannot pay for a life.

Look who you are hurting here. You are reducing the first lieutenants, the captains, the majors, and the lieutenant colonels, some warrant officers, and much of our enlisted airmen who have air duty, and there you have the heart of the whole American Air Force. We have had flying pay for over 35 years. It has worked very well and the committee bill will make it work better. It furnishes the incentive to get the young officers who are to make the leaders later on. You are going right down the line and punishing these men, and the result will be that they will not take these hazards, they will stay on the ground, so you will paralyze and kill the American Air Force. Do not do anything like that. America will need this Air Force in time of war, and it is essential that it be strong in time of peace if we are to avoid the war no one wants. The Air Force is the one symbol of power and authority that the world, as it looks at us, respects. If you adopt this amendment you will kill the whole incentive principle we have had in flying pay for over three generations and thus start the disintegration of our Air Force, military and naval.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The basic pay of a second lieutenant is $180. What does he get as a flyer?

Mr. JOHNSON. He gets one-half of that; $90.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. He gets one-half of his base pay.

Mr. JOHNSON. This scarcely hurts the generals at all, as those who fly comprise less than one-half of 1 percent of our pilot strength. It is going to hurt over 90 percent of the men who comprise the Air Force and who are going to do the flying in combat if war ever comes.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. Is this not one of the best methods of destroying the Air Corps?

Mr. JOHNSON. This is a dagger pointed right square at the heart of the American Air Forces and our Naval Air Force.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will this not bring about an acutal reduction in pay for the men flying the planes and operating the submarines?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes, it will bring about a pay reduction both as it effacts them and in the pay scale as a whole, when applied to about 95 percent of our flying personnel.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Because of the difference of 12 years in the life expectancy of the average flier as against the average ground man, actually the incentive pay will not bring the total earnings of a flier over that of the ground men.

Mr. JOHNSON. Actuarial studies show that a flier during his flying career and his whole military career will earn about $269,000 and a ground officer, for his whole career, about $273,000.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. MORRIS. I want to compliment the gentlemen for the fine statement which he has made, which has changed my view of the matter entirely. It is the only statement which has brought out the facts which we are groping for. I think the statement that the gentleman has made is a very fine one.

Mr. JOHNSON. I hope that what the gentleman is saying as to his change of mind on this is typical of many more Members who want to help the Air Force.

Do not pass this amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] unless you want to kill the Air Force.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT].

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, the previous speeches insinuating that this amendment will split up the Air Corps will no doubt change a lot of votes, but I will guarantee you that to adopt this amendment will not lose one single solitary flyer. The reduction here that is being asked for by this amendment amounts to $50 per month to a second lieutenant. Under the provisions of this bill, the lieutenant will receive $100 per month for hazardous duty. Can you imagine any man going out on hazardous duty for $50 a month? Not a soul. These fellows like to fly their airplanes and you know it. The Air Corps is full and always will be full. Many civilians are daily learning to fly an airplane. Then you talk about having to pay $50 a month more to a lieutenant to fly an airplane than to the private who flies an airplane. There are more people killed on the highways of America every day than in the air in a year or even 2 years. We all know that. Talk about the officers' incentive; if you wanted somebody to perform a hazardous duty for you, whom would you try to employ—a man drawing a thousand dollars a month or the man drawing $75 a month? The fellow who needs the money is the one who is going to perform that hazardous duty for the extra pay. These little buck privates need the money; but at the same time you say it is going to split up the whole Air Corps. I will tell you what I will do. I will quit this Congress if you lose one flyer over this thing if you reduce the hazardous-duty pay to $50 a month.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Is it an incentive for the second lieutenant today, who gets $180 base pay and 50-percent increase, or $270, when under this bill they get $263 with the $50 amendment?

Mr. TACKETT. I do not know what you said and I do not believe you do either.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Well, it ought to be very clear to the gentleman that the man who flies today and the man who goes in a submarine and a man who does parachute jumping gets 50 percent over and above his base pay; you know that, do you not?

Mr. TACKETT. Yes; I know that.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. All right. That gives them $180 plus $90 or a total of $270 a month.

Mr. TACKETT. Yes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Under this bill the base pay is $213 a month and the increase you want to give is $50.

Mr. TACKETT. That is right.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is $263, or $7 less than what he is receiving now.

Mr. TACKETT. Yes; you have it right.

Mr. Chairman, the enlisted man's family is entitled to the same rights and privileges when it comes to hazardous duty as the biggest general in the Army.

Now, please do not get this into your heads. Just because there may be three or four actually trying to slaughter this bill, that is not my purpose or intention and I do not believe you so interpret my efforts. I just think we should treat everybody kind of half way equal when it comes to human suffering. You cannot point out to me or any other person one reason in the world for giving a general an extra $210 per month for hazardous duty and at the same time giving the buck private in front of and in a more perilous position than the general only $30 per month for even more hazardous service. The reason is just not there. There is no incentive involved because people do not sell human suffering for $50 a month. You gentlemen know that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] for 3½ minutes, to close debate.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, of course we enjoyed the gentleman from Arkansas. Let me assure you that this is not a laughing matter. This is a very serious matter that you have before you at this time. If there are to be economies applied to the bill, well and good, but let us not put them where they will do the most harm. Let us not adjourn this House tonight with word going out to the pilots of the jet planes that "your pay has been reduced by the Congress of the United States." Let us not have a situation where you have appropriated billions of dollars to build up a modern air force, and then have word go out that "the pay you are now receiving has been reduced by a Congress which seems to feel there has been some discrimination as to enlisted men."

As I said yesterday, I do not contend for one moment that one man's life is any dearer to him and his family than another man's life to himself or his family. This is incentive pay. A man making five or six hundred dollars a month is not going to be induced to fly these dangerous instruments. Yes, there are millions of them flying puddle-jumpers, but you do not find many of them flying jet planes. One of our colleagues attempted to fly one of those jet planes a few weeks ago and you know the catastrophe that came from that. This is different from flying a puddle-jumper.

The system that was inaugurated 30 or 35 years ago was not right. We are attempting now to revise it. For God's sake, let us not overnight destroy the air force we have built up. You say a man is going to fly no matter how much money he is going to receive. He is not the only one to decide. In many instances he is a married man and there is someone else who is going to determine whether he will engage in that dangerous occupation. I assure you that a cry is going up from the families of these men that "You are not to take this hazard when there is no incentive in it for you. It means nothing to us after you are gone."

This is the most serious thing that has been suggested. Is this great House of Representatives going to adopt an amendment to supplant that which has been carefully worked out over a 15-month period, when the authors themselves have not been able to come to a conclusion as to which amendment should be offered? Are we going to affect the great billions of dollars we have invested in the air force and in the abilities of the men we have trained, on an amendment that is written on the floor at the last minute, after another amendment written probably as hastily has been defeated? I sincerely trust that this House is more responsible than that. If this has merit and the scale should be revised, let it be done in the other body, but for God's sake do not let word go out to these air fields, to every one of these pilots and crew members, "Your pay has been reduced in the bill to which you have looked forward for more than a year for a pay increase and an irre-

sponsible Congress, acting hastily, has cut your pay under what you were previously getting."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

The question was taken; and the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SUTTON) there were—ayes 43, noes 123.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RABAUT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5007) to provide pay, allowances, and physical-disability retirement for members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Public Health Service, the Reserve components thereof, the National Guard, and the Air National Guard, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 249, he reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Armed Services.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Evening Star.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include certain tabulations.

Mr. KUNKEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered by Senator MARTIN, of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Los Angeles Mirror.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement with reference to the city of Willard, Ohio.

REPRESENTATIVE J. J. HEFFERNAN

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] may insert his remarks at this point in the RECORD within the limitations of the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Brooklyn, Representative JAMES J. HEFFERNAN, has been unavoidably delayed in returning to Washington by reason of the death and burial of a distinguished Brooklynite, Hon. D. Kenneth McEvoy, who has served the people of Brooklyn for many years as a confidential employee in the office of the district attorney. In addition, he served as president of the Twelfth Assembly District Regular Democratic Organization for the past 25 years. Representative HEFFERNAN is the head of that organization. We all know of Mr. HEFFERNAN'S many years of service on the Armed Services Committee, and we know that he has supported all legislation coming from that committee. He regrets very much having to be absent today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOYKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the text of a bill he has introduced.

Mr. STEED asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. WALSH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. DELANEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in four instances and include certain excerpts.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Buffalo Evening News.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a short letter and in the other a statement he made before the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. BAILEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune and an article appearing in the New York Times by Bess Furman on Federal aid to education.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made earlier today and to include a petition.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time I have today under special order be relinquished, and that on tomorrow and Monday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the reorganization bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this matter will come up for consideration on tomorrow?

Mr. PRIEST. That is my understanding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances and include certain newspaper articles.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 242) and ask for its consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 234, Eighty-first Congress, incurred by the Committee on Armed Services, not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee and signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "$50,000" and insert "$25,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 255), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That effective June 1, 1949, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, additional compensation per annum, payable monthly, to certain employees of the House, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE DOORKEEPER

To the chief janitor the sum of $300 basic, so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; the assistant manager of telephones (majority) the sum of $300 basic, so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; the assistant manager of telephones (minority) the sum of $500 basic, so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

SPECIAL AND MINORITY EMPLOYEES

To the minority employee (John W. McCabe) the sum of $500 basic, so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; the minority employee (pair clerk) the sum of $500 basic, so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROPOSING AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I present a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 57), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, 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, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 5,000 additional copies of the hearings, held before said committee, on the resolutions entitled "Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President."

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF PRAYERS OF SENATE CHAPLAIN

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I present a privileged resolution (S. Con. Res. 19) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed as a Senate document the prayers offered by the Chaplain, the Reverend Peter Marshall, D. D., at the opening of the daily sessions of the Senate of the United States during the Eightieth Congress, 1947–48, and at the opening of the first 10 daily sessions of the Senate of the United States, Eighty-first Congress, 1949, together with excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD relative to Dr. Marshall's death; and that 6,000 additional copies be printed and bound, of which 5,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 1,000 shall be for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I present a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 45) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, 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, the Committee on Foreign Affairs be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 2,000 additional copies of part I and subsequent parts of the hearings held before said committee during the current session on the bill (H. R. 2362) to amend an act entitled "The Economic Cooperation Act of 1948," approved April 3, 1948.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL RESETTLEMENT CONFERENCE FOR DISPLACED PERSONS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 231) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed as a House document a report of the proceedings of the National Resettlement Conference for Displaced Persons as submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged joint resolution (S. J. Res. 55) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Joint Committee on the Economic Report be authorized to issue a monthly publication entitled "Economic Indicators," and that a sufficient quantity be printed to furnish 1 copy to each Member of Congress; the Secretary and the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate; the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives; 2 copies to the libraries of the Senate and House, and the Congressional Library; 700 copies to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report; and the required number of copies to the Superintendent of Documents for distribution to depository libraries; and that the Superintendent of Documents be authorized to have copies printed for sale to the public.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING, BINDING, AND BLANK-BOOK WORK

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4878) to authorize certain Government printing, binding, and blank-book work elsewhere than at the Government Printing Office if approved by the Joint Committee on Printing.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second proviso of section 11 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes", approved March 1, 1919 (40 Stat. 1213), is amended to read as follows: *"Provided further*, That all printing, binding, and blank-book work for Congress, the Executive Office, the Judiciary (other than the Supreme Court of the United States), and every executive department, independent office, and establishment of the Government, shall be done at the Government Printing Office, except (1) such classes of work as shall be deemed by the Joint Committee on Printing to be urgent or necessary to have done elsewhere; and (2) printing in field printing plants operated by any such executive department, independent office, or establishment, and the procurement of printing by any such executive department, independent office, or establishment from allotments for contract field printing, if approved by the Joint Committee on Printing."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentlewoman from New Jersey how much printing is going to be sent out, and the reason for it?

Mrs. NORTON. The purpose of the bill is to modify the law in order to permit essential Government printing to be produced in the best interests of the Government. A recent survey developed that obvious savings of time and expense can be effected by doing much printing within the area where the use of the printed matter is required. It must be approved by the Joint Committee on Printing, which has jurisdiction over establishment of Government field printing plants and the establishment of field offices in the Government Printing Office.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is mostly for field work?

Mrs. NORTON. The gentleman is correct. In the discussion on the bill, it was pointed out that there would be quite a saving to the Government in doing it this way.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Each contract must be approved by the committee?

Mrs. NORTON. That is right.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I wonder if the gentlewoman and her committee have made any check on the wastepaper and books that have been printed and baled up and placed in the basement of the House, and never been opened? Has the gentlewoman ever made any check on what is going on?

Mrs. NORTON. No; that would take more time than I have at my disposal.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Has the gentlewoman made any check on the tons of wastepaper that is in storage there and that has never been opened? Does the gentlewoman know anything about what is going on in the basement of the House Office Building itself?

Mrs. NORTON. I do not. I spend no time in the basement. There are people who do keep track of wastepaper, and I know it is resold.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. There are a great many tons of printed matter that has been authorized by her committee that has been printed and wrapped up and sold as wastepaper without ever being unwrapped. It runs into many thousands of dollars' worth. I hope the gentlewoman will check on the matter and give us a little economy right here in our own operations.

Mrs. NORTON. I will be very glad to do that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 20 minutes.

HOUSING LEGISLATION

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have known the distinguished—and, I might add, the imposingly handsome and brilliant gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL]—who argued with such eloquence on the floor of the House last Tuesday the case against the clearance of the plague spots of our cities—the slums—and the liberation of unfortunate men, women, and children from the gloom into the sunshine.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] and I served many years ago in the General Assembly of Illinois. From that time to this there has existed between us a bond of friendship of the warmest fiber. With much seniority in this august body and with a prestige in the councils of his party won on merit, nevertheless, on my arrival, despite the grayness of my hair, a newcomer here, and, I hope, with the respect proper and expected accepting with deference and abiding by the rule of seniority, none received me with a warmth more genuine nor extended to me a hand of friendship which more truly spoke to me the glad word "welcome."

I come, therefore, Mr. Speaker, into this well, with no spirit of angry combat, surely not that of personal animosity, to correct my colleague and my friend in the misstatements which he made from inadvertence, I am sure, and from inaccurate statements furnished him by those he in sincerity trusted but whose connection with the vicious real-estate lobby was too close. I wish to make it plain that I have no thought—nor do I intend such implication to be taken—that my distinguished and beloved colleague intentionally accepted his calculations with knowledge of the evil source from which they came. I know full well his high honor and his spotless integrity.

Assuredly, I do not intend to debate the philosophical arguments which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] presented in opposition to H. R. 4009. I think it is up to each individual Member of this body to decide whether a bill which has the support of all the principal veterans' organizations, the labor organizations, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish church groups, women's organizations—in fact, of practically all important groups except the real-estate lobby and closely allied interests—is socialistic or whether it will promote the American democratic system. I think it is up to each individual Member of this body to decide whether responding to the urgent needs of families who live in slums and other bad housing is, if I may use the term of one of the spokesmen of the real-estate lobby, "political racketeering."

I cannot fix upon other men the philosophies which will guide them in their relations with their fellow men. For myself I accept the rule of life that what is good for my neighbor is good for me and that which does harm to my neighbor's children will come back to do harm to my children. I can take no other view in approaching the question of slum clearance and the providing of decent housing to all, to the utmost of our ability. But my colleagues whose philosophy is different, who view this life of ours as a struggle of the strong over the weak, with each man looking out for the immediate advantage for himself and his own loved ones, I grant may be as sincere in their convictions as am I in mine. So much for the philosophical phase of the eloquent address of my respected colleague. I wish that my philosophy were his only because I think it would add to his happiness.

My purpose, however, is to correct some of the misconceptions of the gentleman from Illinois as to what H. R. 4009 would do and what it would cost the Federal Government. Since these misconceptions have been made abundantly available to all members of this body by representatives of the real-estate lobby, I am not surprised that the gentleman from Illinois and my good personal friend has been misled into erroneous conclusions. I am confident, therefore, that he will welcome additional facts, available from the hearings and report of the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I am a member, and other sources, which may throw a different light on these matters.

It is all a matter of simple arithmetic—so understandable as to be within the grasp of any child of grammar school age—the figures furnished with official certainty by the Bureau of the Budget—this item of the total cost, extended during the binding force of H. R. 4009, of wiping spotless from the face of America the scars of lodgings for the sons and daughters and little children of America unfit for habitation even by the lowest of the beasts of the forests.

It is all so simple and so understandable that, his attention directed to the inaccuracy of the figures emanating from the real-estate lobby, I have the abiding confidence in my colleague and my friend to know that he will not resent, but will thank me, for the corrections.

The statement of my distinguished colleague that this proposed legislation will add to the cost of the Government the colossal sum of over $20,000,000,000 is composed 50 percent of fact and 50 percent of real-estate lobby. That I shortly will show with a conclusiveness—convincing, I hope—to my distinguished colleague.

But first, Mr. Speaker, I would refer to the associations which my colleague and I have had in the decades past in our State of Illinois. Does he not remember when a Democratic administration in Illinois was pioneering to lift our State from the mud and to give to the farmers and urban residents alike a system of good and passable roads?

Does he not remember when the great Governor of Illinois, Edward F. Dunne, the brilliant Richard J. Finnegan, now associated with Marshall Field in the editorship of the Chicago Sun-Times, and I, in minor and humble capacity, drove over the roads in his county of Marion and other counties in southern Illinois, roads feet deep with sand or, when muddy, bogged up irregularly with farmer-contributions of straw and hay, drove over those all-but-impassable roads preaching the gospel of good roads? And does he not remember how the cry was hurled at us—"state socialism," "interfering with the people's right to have their own kind of roads," and "a ruinous cost that would plunge us into everlasting bankruptcy"?

Well, Mr. Speaker, the roads were built, as they were built in every other State in the Union. Instead of bankruptcy, as gloomily forecast by the timid souls of that period, they have brought prosperity to farm and city alike and have broadened the horizons of human contentment.

In the one year of 1930 there was spent on State highway systems a total of $1,139,677,000. In 1940 the total was $1,591,290,000. In 1946 it was $1,669,889,000. Add it all up, and include the contributions of Federal and local governments, and since the days when my distinguished colleague from Illinois and I were in the Illinois General Assembly the total cost of pulling America out of the mud has exceeded $60,000,000,000.

What the high-powered propagandists of the present real-estate lobby could not have done with that figure to keep the wheels of American road transportation deep down in the sand or trudging through the mud!

At the best, Mr. Speaker, there is much silliness in this use of the billion-dollar figure as a scarecrow to stop the onward march of the American people into the abundant contentment and the full security which under a government of, for, and by the people is their birthright. In 1949, based on the estimate from the first quarter, given in David Lawrence's news weekly, the yield from investments in America—money going to people who derive income from coupons and not toil—has increased in excess of $10,000,000,000 over the year 1940. The wage and salary earnings of the workers of America in the same period have increased in excess of $75,000,000,000 in 1 year.

Even if the 50–50—50-percent fact, 50-percent real-estate lobby—calculations of my good friend and colleague from Illinois were correct, who in common decency and in view of these figures would be stopped from doing the decent thing if not for the adults then for the little children in the slums?

Let me repeat, Mr. Speaker, so that the fine gentlemen of the real-estate lobby can have yet another headache, if their grossly inflated figure of $20,000,000,000 was derived from books of statistics, and not from works of imaginative fiction, the money that the clippers of coupons will receive in excess of what they received 8 years ago in 2 short years would pay the entire cost of 40 years of slum clearance and public housing. Let these fine gentlemen attempt to justify to the American people their position in giving priority to the clippers of coupons to little children in the slums of our cities.

But, Mr. Speaker, what with good hearts we give comes back to do us blessing. The wild prosperity of the twenties had its source in a construction boom when $11,000,000,000 of the workers of America, extracted for the profit of the bankers working on big commissions, were used to build most of the large apartment buildings and hotels now standing in our cities. The depression of 1929 came on when the $11,000,000,000 was gone and the construction industry went busted. That would never have happened if private industry had stabilized the construction industry and the hand of the banker had remained in his own pocket.

I do not always agree with the distinguished Senator from Ohio, the Honorable ROBERT A. TAFT, but among the conservatives of this country there are few, if any, more richly gifted with intelligence. Senator TAFT, just this week, and notwithstanding the eloquent speech of the gentleman from Illinois, a member of his own party, issued a public statement that the enactment of this proposed legislation would have a healthy effect on the whole national economy and would be a key feature in maintaining prosperity and preventing a depression.

That, Mr. Speaker, is no sentimental approach to this question of slum clearance and public housing. That challenge to the insipid economy reasoning of the fine gentlemen of the real-estate lobby comes, not from a liberal, but from the very fountainhead of intellectual ultraconservative leadership in the United States.

Let me quote the words of this champion of conservatism, Senator ROBERT A. TAFT:

> There is still a great need for low-cost housing. This need is not being met and it is up to Congress to do something about it without further delay. It takes time to get a great housing program under way, and the sooner we get at it the better it will be for the people who need such housing and the Nation's economy.
>
> The economic situation is an added urgent reason why a big housing program should be launched without delay. Private housing on construction is falling off because builders are reaching the end of the market in high-priced homes. Public housing is the answer to stabilization of the construction industry. That is a key factor in maintaining prosperity and preventing a depression. A big public-housing program would have a healthy psychological effect on the whole national economy.

I wonder if my distinguished and beloved friend from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] in the light of what Senator TAFT has said, after the gentleman from Illinois had spoken, will now wish to amend his remarks to include a reading out of Senator TAFT from the Republican Party.

But I have said that I would do my friend from Illinois a service of friendship by pointing out to him in convincing manner wherein, in his acceptance inadvertently of the calculations of the vicious real-estate lobby, he had fallen into error, which now before the debate on H. R. 4009 starts he might wish to correct.

The gentleman said that this proposed legislation, and I quote his words, "will add to the cost of the Government the colossal sum of $20,000,000,000." The colossal thing about this figure is the way in which it was computed. First, the gentleman from Illinois added together the total amounts authorized in subsidies and grants for the full 40-year period and assumed that they would be the actual outlays for these purposes. Then, for good measure, he threw in the total amount authorized for repayable loans. He arrived at a figure of $19,312,500,000. If he had stuck to the amounts actually authorized in H. R. 4009, instead of including the $800,000,000 in loans already authorized for low-rent public housing in the United States Housing Act of 1937, his figure would have been $18,512,500,000.

Now, on reconsideration, I wonder if the gentleman from Illinois would not agree with me that treating as a cost item loans that are repayable with interest is not really a strange kind of bookkeeping. Does any banker, or savings and loan official, enter on the liability side of his operating statement the face value of loans which he expects to be paid back? No, certainly not; he lists the amount on the asset side of his balance sheet. I respectfully suggest, therefore, that the first deduction that should be made from the gentleman's expense computation should be the face amount of well-secured, repayable loans authorized under H. R. 4009.

This leaves a maximum authorized 40-year cost of $16,562,500,000 of the programs contained in H. R. 4009. Of this amount, $16,000,000,000 represents the maximum annual contributions which could be paid for 40 years for low-rent public housing, at the rate of $400,000,000 per year.

That brings me to another interesting bit of arithmetic used by the gentleman from Illinois.

First he takes the maximum construction cost limit for public housing of $2,500 per room, allowed under the bill only for unusual high-cost areas; multiplies it by five, adds something for other items of cost like land; and comes to a total cost of over $15,000 per dwelling. Then, to prove this figure, he divides $16,000,000,000 by "a little over $15,000" to reach 1,050,000 units, the maximum number authorized under the bill, to show how the $16,000,000,000 would be used up.

The gentleman apparently overlooked the fact that the annual contributions of $400,000,000 per year would be pledged as security for the repayment, with interest, of bonds issued by local housing authorities to finance the construction of the houses. I am sure that he would not say that when a man goes out to borrow $15,000 on a house, all he will have to pay on that loan is $15,000. So I suggest that he compute the total cost in principal and interest of $15,000 loans on 1,050,000 houses, at 2 or 2½ percent interest for 40 years. I think he would find that this would run from $20,000,000,000 to $24,000,000,000. Therefore, he would have to conclude, on the basis of his figures, that $400,000,000 per year would be grossly inadequate for debt service on $16,000,000,000 worth of housing.

If the gentleman from Illinois had checked the full facts, he would have found that the maximum annual subsidy of $400,000,000 at a maximum allowable rate of 4½ percent of the total cost would permit a total capital expenditure for public housing of only $8,900,000,000, or only $8,465 per unit for 1,050,000 units. He would have found further that the actual total cost of the public housing program to the Federal Government will not be $16,000,000,000, as he assumes from his reading of the bill, but $9,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000 under very lib-

eral estimates. I suggest for ready reference that he turn to pages A3585–A3586 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where his able colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], has inserted realistic estimates of costs, as reported by the Bureau of the Budget.

If the gentleman will read carefully, I think he will find that the 40-year subsidy authorization of $400,000,000 per year necessarily had to cover the maximum requirements that could be anticipated under most unfavorable circumstances in order to provide adequate security for the bonds sold by local housing authorities in the private market. A further reading will disclose that under actual anticipated conditions in the financial market, local housing authorities will be able to amortize these bonds at 2 to 2½ percent interest in 29 to 33 years, instead of the maximum period of 40 years and that subsidies will have to be paid only for the shorter period.

Further reading from his colleague's speech in the Appendix of the RECORD will show that the actual estimate of average subsidies that will be paid for 29 to 33 years is $310,000,000 per year. We need to authorize $400,000,000 because in some years in some localities the full subsidy may be required to make up the difference between what low-income families can afford to pay and what it costs to operate the projects and pay off the loans. But in the average year in the average locality the rents paid by the low-income families will be able to cover, in addition to the operating costs, part of the debt service, so the subsidies can be less than the maximum authorized. I might add that the average subsidy need, from 75 percent to 80 percent of the authorization, is a most liberal estimate in view of the experience under the present low-rent program which, I should like to remind the gentleman from Illinois, is not new but actually is 12 years old.

So what we have is a public-housing program that is actually going to cost the Federal Government nine to ten billion dollars over not more than 33 years. Add a half billion dollars for slum clearance and rural housing and reasonable administrative expenditures and you will come to less than $11,000,000,000 over 33 years, instead of $20,000,000,000 as stated by the gentleman from Illinois. My own estimate from the figures available is that the cost will be about $10,000,000,000, which as I have pointed out, is equal to the amount of money received in 1949 by the clippers of coupons in excess of the amount they received 8 years ago.

The people in southern Illinois may not have a direct interest, as my friend and colleague intimates, in paying their pittance of a share of the $300,000,000 per year to provide decent homes for slum dwellers in other parts of the country. Even that is questionable since even southern Illinois can suffer from crime and disease spreading from the pest holes of the slums.

I do not think the people of southern Illinois—Mr. Speaker, I know and love those fine men and women down where my distinguished colleague comes from—will find it in their hearts to withhold this pittance from the unfortunates in the slums of Chicago. Certainly the people of my city of Chicago have never found it in their hearts to withhold, from the tremendous tax contributions they make, benefits in good roads, health, education, agricultural improvements, public works that directly affect southern Illinois and which are possible largely because of the dollars from Chicago.

It is from cities like Chicago that the money comes to make possible the $1,500,000,000 Congress has appropriated annually on behalf of the farmers in southern Illinois and elsewhere. I hope that we in Congress have learned to consider the needs of the people as a whole—the needs of rural families and the needs of city families, whether they are for housing, agricultural benefits, or other things. Also it is worth while to mention that in Illinois low-income families not only of Chicago, but also of Cairo, Danville, Decatur, East Moline, East St. Louis, Granite City, Kewanee, Madison, Moline, Peoria, Quincy, Rantoul, Rockford, Rock Island, Springfield, and Venice have benefited from the "not new" existing low-rent public-housing program.

There is one line more of misinformation contained in the speech of the gentleman from Illinois that I would comment on. That is the implication that a Member of Congress could call up the Public Housing Administration here and have some friend of his, personal or political, admitted to one of these low-rent projects or have somebody kicked out because he had not voted the right way. The housing agency simply could not do anything about it even if someone insisted, because, aside from setting up the requirements in accordance with the law, it has nothing to do about determining who is admitted or allowed to remain in the projects. These are locally owned projects operated by local housing authorities which are governed by boards made up of prominent local citizens serving without pay.

Half of the membership of these boards is made up of businessmen, bankers, retail merchants, insurance men, realtors, industrialists and the like. Another 20 percent of the members consist of professional people—lawyers, doctors, teachers, and so forth; another 15 percent of labor officials and wage earners and the rest of farmers, civic leaders, and a very few public officials. I have seen the roster of some of these boards, and I can tell you that they are made up of the best people in our cities and towns—the kind of people who would quickly tell off anyone who tried to get someone in the projects who was not entitled to be there. In all the investigations that have been made of the locally owned and controlled low-rent public-housing program, no one has come up with any real evidence of political control of the tenant families or of political corruption. All that the vicious real-estate lobby can do is to conjure up the evil thoughts that lie in evil minds.

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to my dearly esteemed colleague from Chicago.

Mr. CHESNEY. I was here when the gentleman from Illinois made his speech, and he said the problems of the city of Chicago were due to the corruption of the Democratic administration. I was wondering whether when the Republicans were in power if they also contributed to this corruption. I am of the belief that the program of finding homes and building homes was handled in a very good manner under the Democratic Party in the city of Chicago.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. In my time there has been no corruption in the city of Chicago, such as some other cities are reported to have experienced. At least there has been no public exposure followed by supportive developments. During the administration of Mayor Edward Kelly a subway was constructed—a great public work—without even a suspicion on the part of any person of any favoritism in bidding or of the slightest misuse of the public funds. I think everybody in Chicago, including those in opposing political camps, will agree that the building of the subway without the slightest touch of scandal was a real tribute to the honesty and efficiency of municipal government. Democratic mayors of Chicago—Carter Harrison, father and son, Dunne, Dever, Cermak, Kelly, and the present mayor, Kennelley—have all been very popular with the electorate. No man in the city's history has ever enjoyed more popularity than Mayor Kennelley with all groups and all individuals.

Mr. CHESNEY. Most of the bad reputation that has been attributed to Chicago has been through the newspapers that have made a big issue out of the gangland affairs. The city of Chicago is the most progressive city in the whole United States.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I agree thoroughly with my colleague. I am very happy to call Chicago my home, and more than a little proud.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York and my colleague on the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. MULTER. I will not argue the question whether New York City is greater or Chicago is greater, but the question I have in mind is this: Is it not true that the city of Chicago also has a public-housing project?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. It has.

Mr. MULTER. Is it not true that tenants who seek admission to those houses are admitted in accordance with need and their ability to meet the requirements of your local regulations, regardless of political affiliation?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. As is the case elsewhere, there has been good administration of public housing in Chicago and there has been complete divorcement from politics. That is the record. I may say to my colleague that in Chicago the people, city and State, have put over $55,000,000 into slum clearance and public housing.

Mr. MULTER. And there has not even been the suggestion of scandal in connection with it.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. No one has even suggested scandal. There has been none.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL BANK ACT AND BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENT

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 256) providing for consideration of the bill (H. R. 4332) to amend the National Bank Act, the Bretton Woods Agreement Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 842), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered 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 bill (H. R. 4332) to amend the National Bank Act and the Bretton Woods Agreement Act, and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill 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 bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

WHY THE SOUTH ATTRACTS INDUSTRY

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, among northern political reformers, radicals, so-called intellectuals, and others it has become quite fashionable to make derogatory remarks about southern industry. In many instances these remarks are harmless and are the result of ignorance of true conditions. In other cases they are dangerous in the false impressions which they seek to convey and are inspired from a sense of malice toward the South's expanding industry. In either case a false impression is created, and it is high time that these accusations and distortions of fact be examined.

Recently Chester Bowles, formerly OPA Administrator but now Governor of Connecticut, made a statement to the New England Council that industry in the South pays starvation wages. Presumably Governor Bowles was explaining why much of New England's industry, especially textiles, is migrating southward. Whether this statement is the result of ignorance or whether it is an attempt to convince businessmen that it is morally wrong to benefit from cheap labor, the impression which thousands—perhaps millions—of northerners received is wholly false. There is no disputing the fact that industry is moving southward. In 1948 89,000 jobs shifted from New England to Southern States. Of these 37,000 were in the textile industry.

In April of this year one South Carolina textile company ordered 14,000 new looms, the largest single order in the history of textile manufacturing. Since January 1945, 800 new plants costing $268,000,000 have located in our State of South Carolina alone. Recently the du Pont Co. selected Camden, S. C., as an ideal location for their new plant which is to manufacture orlon, a product similar to nylon. Likewise the Maverick Mills Corp., of East Boston, Mass., decided to invest $4,000,000 in a plant to be located in my home county of Greenville, S. C.

These facts clearly indicate that the South has much to offer to manufacturers and to industry in general. Industry understands that it must choose suitable locations if it is to prosper. Numerous factors must be taken into consideration in the choice of this location. It is evident that the South has these necessary attributes.

The single most important factor in determining a suitable locale for an industry is its nearness to good markets. Thus the trend of purchasing power is an important factor in creating good markets and thereby attracting industry. Good consumer and good industrial markets are both necessary.

The purchasing power of the South has greatly increased in recent years, and consumer demand has grown along with it. Business executives of companies locating in the South have not overlooked this point. In a survey of companies which had located or were planning to locate in Southern States, almost half gave proximity to markets as the reason for choosing that location. The southern markets are rapidly expanding and they are the most important factor in making the South one of the key industrial regions of this country.

Another reason for the industrial shift southward is the proximity to natural resources. Such agricultural products as cotton, peanuts, and timber offer an important advantage to manufacturers seeking new locations. Transportation expenditures are greatly reduced when the industries which make use of these products can establish their plants nearby. The South is fortunate also in having facilities in many areas to establish power plants. This has been an important factor in attracting food processing and chemical companies.

The question of labor supply is an important factor, but it is not primarily cheap labor but loyal, efficient labor which is drawing industry to the South. In the State of South Carolina, 99.7 percent of our labor force is native-born, and 58 percent is white. Labor realizes the advantages of making an area highly industrial, and the low record of turn-over and absenteeism has played an important part in demonstrating that labor in the South is highly efficient. If industry paid labor starvation wages and if sweatshop conditions prevailed, as Governor Bowles charges, it is not likely that the labor force would maintain their conscientious attitude. This accusation is belied by figures also. The minimum wage of the textile industry in South Carolina is 94 cents per hour. The average per hour is $1.17. Surely these are not starvation wages. Even these figures do not represent the true facts. Purchasing power gives a better picture of conditions than wage scales. Because of the South's temperate climate, expenditures for fuel, housing, and clothing are considerably lower than in the North, and it is probable that a comparison between the purchasing power of workers in the southern textile mills and workers in the northern mills would show that the advantages lie with our southern workers.

Royal Little, of Textron Manufacturing Co., which has textile plants all along the Atlantic seaboard, stated that workers in plants located in the Carolinas outproduce New England workers by almost 10 percent. The labor supply is a definite incentive for industry which is seeking a satisfactory location. This labor is not cheap in the sense that it works for sweatshop wages, but it is efficient, intelligent, and highly productive. Labor's attitude and willingness to cooperate with management is one of the prime reasons why the South is developing into a leading industrial region.

State legislative policies which avoid measures that would penalize industry have done much to attract new manufacturing industries. It is a strong temptation for State legislatures to attempt to balance their budgets by heavy taxes on corporations and manufacturing industries, but in the end they will defeat the ends which they hope to attain. High taxes have always frightened business, and new industries which are essential to prosperity are always prone to seek areas where tax rates are low. The majority of Southern States, realizing this, have offered industry a strong inducement by keeping taxes extremely low. Property taxes, severance imposts, and corporation licensing fees are so low as to be almost negligible. This policy of keeping tax rates low for industry has gone far toward attracting new manufacturing activities and new business to the Southern States. Fair treatment of economic enterprise has become a characteristic of southern legislative policy. As long as this liberal policy is continued, industry will continue to migrate to the South.

The presence of local capital to help expansion is another factor in the economic development of the South. This local capital has been extremely cooperative with new industries, and all concerned have been benefited. Local interest has been stimulated, and in numerous cases fine housing developments have developed along with the industries. These developments have raised the workers' morale, increased productivity, improved business, and in general aided the community.

While the attitude of State governments, communities, and labor all have important bearings upon the rapid industrial expansion of the South, one factor is more responsible than any of these. That factor is the presence in huge quantities of one of the world's most important crops—cotton. The use of cotton is so universal and so common that we seldom stop to think how

often everyone comes in contact with it in our daily lives. Its durability and launderability make it a household essential. Such items of clothing as formal, street, and house dresses, pajamas, aprons, dress, sport, and work shirts, summer trousers, and many others are made of cotton in the great majority of cases. Hundreds of household items such as curtains, bedspreads, and furniture coverings are made almost entirely of cotton; others such as studio couches, davenports, and chairs contain a large percentage of cotton felt in their make-up. In the military services when a man is assigned his equipment a large portion is made of cotton or at least contains some cotton. In a 5-year span preceding the war cotton supplied the needs of more than 60 percent of this Nation's need for textile fibers. Since the war the improved processes for developing such synthetic fibers as nylon, glass fiber, and various resin fibers have increased the consumption of these articles, with a resulting loss in the use of cotton, but cotton textiles are still far ahead. In 1948, cotton supplied 57.4 percent of the textile fiber used. This is still a long lead for the cotton industry, and it demonstrates that more cotton is used than all other textile fibers combined. The cotton industry is aware of the competition from the new synthetic products, and it has made better cotton products at a cheaper selling price by improved production methods. Machinery of the very latest types and greatest productivity has been installed. It is clearly evident that cotton will continue to be the No. 1 textile fiber for many years to come. This fact is a powerful inducement for industry to locate in the South. Textile concerns which plan to manufacture cotton products will be near the source and can greatly reduce transportation expenses.

Other types of industries are locating in the South because they realize that the destiny of millions of people is tied up with cotton and that the prospects for the whole cotton industry are good. This indicates that the purchasing power of the area will be high, and good markets will be assured. In 1948 an estimated 660,000 workers were employed in the southern textile mills. They were paid wages totaling more than $1,500,000,000. The value of the mills' product was estimated as $6,000,000,000. These figures prove the importance of cotton. It is still king in the South and is undisputed king of the textile fibers. As long as the outlook of the cotton industry remains bright, the over-all economic picture of our Southland will be healthy. A healthy economic state is essential if new industry is to be attracted, and King Cotton has been as effective as any single factor in the industrial expansion of the South.

From these facts it is easy to understand why the South, which for so many generations was an agricultural area, is at last attracting its share of industry. It was inevitable that the geographic factors such as climate and the availability of natural resources would play an important part in the development of the South. The mild climate permits low-cost construction, and low living costs, a benefit for both management and labor. In addition it makes possible the growth of cotton, the world's most important textile fiber. This in turn creates prosperity and builds purchasing power, an essential to good market conditions. These are physical conditions, and the South is fortunate in being blessed with them.

There are other conditions attractive to industry which are made by man. These include favorable treatment by the legislative bodies, community interest in new enterprises, and the attitude of labor. All of these have been favorable, and industry is beginning to take advantage of these overtures. A manufacturer who was planning a mill in a rural section of South Carolina advertised for 300 workers. He received over 3,000 applications. More than 90 percent of the applicants had high-school educations, and over 20 percent had attended college. This incident is typical of the labor situation in our South. There is an abundance of skilled labor which is willing to work at reasonable wages and to cooperate with management. Labor realizes that proper attitudes toward the manufacturing industries will benefit everyone by expanding business and thus creating more jobs. Industry realizes that by paying labor good wages and maintaining sound working conditions, better results will be obtained than by maintaining sweatshop conditions and paying starvation wages.

It is these factors which are making the South America's newest land of opportunity in the field of manufacturing. The climate, the expanding markets, and natural resources are elements which offer new industry important economic advantages. Opportunity is almost unlimited, and industry is fast taking advantage of this opportunity. Encouraged by friendly State governments and an intelligent labor supply, the South is making great strides toward bridging the gap between industry and agriculture. To those familiar with the situation in the South the charge that it is cheap labor which is attracting industry is absurd. Labor is a factor, but it is the quality of this labor and not its cheapness which industry finds advantageous.

The enthusiastic welcome which business and industry are receiving in the South is an indication that the people understand the advantages of an industrial region. With its ideal geographic features and this friendly attitude by its people, the South will continue to grow economically, and industry will find more and more reasons to locate in this region.

Threescore years ago one of the South's most eloquent sons, speaking in Boston, Mass., used the following prophetic words which are now becoming a reality:

> Far to the South lies the fairest and richest domain of this earth. It is the home of a brave and hospitable people. There is centered all that can please or prosper humankind. A perfect climate, above a fertile soil, yields to the husbandman every product of the temperate zone. There, by night the cotton whitens beneath the stars, and by day the wheat locks the sunshine in its bearded sheaf. In the same field the clover steals the fragrance of the wind, and the tobacco catches the quick aroma of the rains. There are mountains stored with exhaustless treasures; forest, vast and primeval, and rivers that, tumbling or loitering, run wanton to the sea. Of the three essential items of all industries—cotton, iron, and wood—that region has easy control. In cotton, a fixed monopoly—in iron, proven supremacy—in timber, the reserve supply of the Republic. From this assured and permanent advantage, against which artificial conditions cannot much longer prevail, has grown an amazing system of industries. Not maintained by human contrivance of tariff or capital, afar off from the fullest and cheapest source of supply, but resting in divine assurance, within touch of field and mine and forest—not set amid costly farms from which competition has driven the farmer in despair, but amid cheap and sunny lands, rich with agriculture, to which neither season nor soil has set a limit—this system of industries is mounting to a splendor that shall dazzle and illumine the world.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement of Mr. Thomas Kennedy appearing in the Journal of the United Mine Workers of America.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. TABER, indefinitely, on account of illness.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1127. An act to amend sections 130 and 1931 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to the notice to be given upon a petition for probate of a will, and to the probate of such will; and

S. 1134. An act to amend section 13–108 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia to provide for constructive service by publication in annulment actions.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1337. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Alaska Council of Boy Scouts of America for recreation and other public purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 16, 1949, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

692. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled

"A bill to amend an act entitled 'An act providing for the public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents,' approved January 12, 1895, as amended"; to the Committee on House Administration.

693. A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting parts III and IV of the report of the Tariff Commission on the operation of the trade-agreements program, June 1934 to April 1948; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 4208. A bill to add certain surplus lands to Petersburg National Military Park, Va., to define the boundaries thereof, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 825). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EBERHARTER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 5114. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit the use of additional means, including stamp machines, for payment of tax on fermented malt liquors, provide for the establishment of brewery bottling house on brewery premises, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 826). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 238. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to undertake a study of immigration problems; without amendment (Rept. No. 827). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SANBORN: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 4943. A bill to amend the act providing for the admission of the State of Idaho into the Union by increasing the period for which leases may be made of public lands granted to the State by such act for educational purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 828). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4585. A bill to authorize the purchase of additional farming land for Leavenworth Penitentiary; with an amendment (Rept. No. 829). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1168. An act to amend section 2680 of title 28, United States Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 830). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 3905. A bill to amend section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 832). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 5086. A bill to accord privileges of free importation to members of the armed forces of other nations; without amendment (Rept. No. 833). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 242. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 234; with an amendment (Rept. No. 834). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 255. Resolution providing for additional compensation per annum for certain employees of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 835). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 57. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives to have printed additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the bills entitled "Amend the Constitution with respect to election of President and Vice President"; without amendment (Rept. No. 836). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 19. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of prayers offered by the Chaplain, the Reverend Peter Marshall, D. D., at the opening of the daily sessions of the Senate of the United States during the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses; without amendment (Rept. No. 837). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 45. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to procure 2,000 additional copies of its hearings on the bill (H. R. 2362) to amend an act entitled "The Economic Cooperation Act of 1948," approved April 3, 1948; without amendment (Rept. No. 838). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 231. Resolution to provide for the printing as a House document a report of the proceedings of the National Resettlement Conference for Displaced Persons; without amendment (Rept. No. 839). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. Senate Joint Resolution 55. Joint resolution to print the monthly publication entitled "Economic Indicators"; without amendment (Rept. No. 840). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. H. R. 4878. A bill to authorize certain Government printing, binding, and blank-book work elsewhere than at the Government Printing Office, if approved by the Joint Committee on Printing; without amendment (Rept. No. 841). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 256. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 4332, a bill to amend the National Bank Act and the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 842). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1019. A bill for the relief of George M. Ford; with an amendment (Rept. No. 816). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1055. A bill for the relief of Agnese R. Mundy; with an amendment (Rept. No. 817). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1493. A bill for the relief of Cecil L. Howell; with an amendment (Rept. No. 818). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1792. A bill for the relief of Charles E. Ader; with an amendment (Rept. No. 819). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2095. A bill for the relief of the estate of Kenneth N. Peel; with an amendment (Rept. No. 820). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2925. A bill for the relief of Ida Hoheisel, executrix of the estate of John Hoheisel; with an amendment (Rept. No. 821). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3139. A bill for the relief of James B. DeHart; without amendment (Rept. No. 822). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3501. A bill for the relief of Nelson Bell; without amendment (Rept. No. 823). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 253. Resolution for the relief of John B. H. Waring; without amendment (Rept. No. 824). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1458. A bill for the relief of Joseph R. Gregory; with an amendment (Rept. No. 831). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 5162. A bill to provide for the deduction of subscription charges to certain prepayment health service plans for the purposes of the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 5163. A bill to terminate the war tax rates on certain miscellaneous excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 5164. A bill to afford duly ordained ministers of religion an additional income-tax exemption, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOLEY.

H. R. 5165. A bill to continue in effect until January 1, 1951, title III of the Second War Powers Act for the purpose of exercising import controls with respect to fats and oils and rice and rice products; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 5166. A bill to extend the laws of the United States relating to civil acts or offenses consummated or committed on the high seas on board a vessel belonging to the United States to the Midway Islands, Wake Island, Johnston Island, Sand Island, Kingman Reef, Kure Island, Baker Island, Howland Island, Jarvis Island, Canton Island, and Enderbury Island, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 5167. A bill to amend the provisions of law authorizing the granting of leave to Government employees so as to provide that such employees shall not be required to use annual leave for the purpose of preventing its accumulation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 5168. A bill to clarify the laws relating to the compensation of postmasters at fourth-class post offices which have been advanced because of unusual conditions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 5169. A bill making the Administrative Procedure Act applicable to certain hearings in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 5170. A bill to further the policy enunciated in the Historic Sites Act (49 Stat. 666) and to facilitate public participation in the preservation of sites, buildings, and objects of national significance or interest and providing a national trust for historic preservation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 5171. A bill to create the Veterans' Insurance Corporation and place the administration of the United States Government life insurance and national service life insurance programs under its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 5172. A bill to create a commission to make a study of the administration of overseas activities of the Government and to make recommendations to Congress with respect thereto; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 5173. A bill making certain changes in laws applicable to regulatory agencies of the Government so as to effectuate the recommendations regarding regulatory agencies made by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 5174. A bill making certain changes in laws applicable to the Department of the Treasury so as to permit the effectuation by the President and the Secretary of the Treasury of the recommendations regarding the Department of the Treasury made by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5175. A bill to establish a Department of Welfare; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 5176. A bill making certain changes in law applicable to the Department of the Interior so as to permit the effectuation by the President and the Secretary of the Interior of the recommendations regarding the Department made by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 5177. A bill making various changes in laws applicable to the Post Office Department in order to furnish a basis for a reorganization of the Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5178. A bill to authorize the President to determine the form of the national budget and of departmental estimates, to modernize and simplify Government accounting and auditing methods and procedures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 5179. A bill making changes in law applicable to the Department of Agriculture so as to permit the effectuation by the President and the Secretary of Agriculture of the recommendations regarding the Department made by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 5180. A bill to provide for an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce and to give the Secretary of Commerce authority to reorganize his Department so as to facilitate the effectuation by the President and the Secretary of Commerce of the recommendations regarding the Department of Commerce made by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 5181. A bill to revise the personnel policy governing the civil service of the United States, to revise the pay and pay administration policy in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5182. A bill to consolidate certain hospital, medical, and public health functions of the Government in a United Medical Administration; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. R. 5183. A bill to approve contracts negotiated with the Belle Fourche irrigation district, the Deaver irrigation district, the Westland irrigation district, the Stanfield irrigation district, the Vale Oregon irrigation district, and the Prosser irrigation district, to authorize their execution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 5184. A bill to approve contracts negotiated with the Belle Fourche irrigation district, the Deaver irrigation district, the Westland irrigation district, the Stanfield irrigation district, the Vale, Oreg., irrigation district, and the Prosser irrigation district, to authorize their execution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 5185. A bill to repeal the excise tax on transportation of property, transportation of persons, and long-distance telephone and telegraph; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 5186. A bill to authorize the contribution to Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, Inc., of an amount equal to the moneys received by the Selective Service System for work performed by persons assigned to tasks of national importance under civilian direction pursuant to section 5 (g) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota (by request):

H. R. 5187. A bill to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POTTER:

H. R. 5188. A bill to provide for the preparation of a plan for the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the building of the Soo locks; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H. R. 5189. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to construct, operate, and maintain certain works in the Columbia River Basin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 5190. A bill to repeal the act entitled "An act to suspend certain import taxes on copper," approved March 31, 1949 (Public Law 3, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COX:

H. R. 5191. A bill to provide for the furnishing of quarters at Thomasville, Ga., for the United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 5192. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code authorizing the establishment of special rectifying plants for the receipt, prior to tax, of distilled spirits, alcohol, and wines for rectification, bottling, and packaging, or for bottling and packaging without rectification; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 5193. A bill to approve contracts negotiated with the Belle Fourche irrigation district, the Deaver irrigation district, the Westland irrigation district, the Stanfield irrigation district, the Vale Oregon irrigation district, and the Prosser irrigation district, to authorize their execution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. McKINNON:

H. R. 5194. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer a portion of the Veterans' Administration center at Los Angeles, Calif., to the State of California for the use of the University of California," approved June 19, 1948; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 5195. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1948; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 5196. A bill to provide for direct Federal loans to meet the housing needs of moderate-income families, to provide liberalized credit to reduce the cost of housing for such families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 5197. A bill to amend section 1802 (b) and section 3481 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOOD:

H. Res. 254. Resolution to provide payment to the Congressional, Inc., for hotel service provided Miss Elizabeth T. Bentley; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 5198. A bill for the relief of Rudolf Thum, Mrs. Oliva Thum, Mrs. Mathilde Thum, and Mrs. Oliva Scherbaum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 5199. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thurman L. Bomar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 5200. A bill for the relief of Jan Wrobel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUINN:

H. R. 5201. A bill for the relief of the estate of Thomas O'Hare, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5202. A bill for the relief of the aliens Nicholas Partheniades, Catherine Partheniades, and their son, Constantine Partheniades; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST (by request):

H. R. 5203. A bill for the relief of Theo T. Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 5204. A bill for the relief of Mary Stathos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma:

H. R. 5205. A bill to quitclaim certain property in Enid, Okla., to H. B. Bass; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

1081. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of the delegates to the annual meeting of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom at Hartford, Conn., urging the enactment of legislation necessary for the protection of the civil and human rights of all Americans and residents of the United States in order to implement the standards set in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights passed by the United Nations on December 10, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1082. By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.: Petition of the Pennsylvania Society, Sons of the American Revolution, for an independent and impartial investigation of the interstate traffic in subversive textbooks and teaching materials; to the Committee on Rules.

1083. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Northwest District Dental Society, asking the Congress not to enact any legislation which will hamper freedom, such as the current proposals for compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1084. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, Calif., requesting the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 4 and House Joint Resolution 3, authorizing a suit in the United States Supreme Court to adjudicate the respective rights of the States of Arizona, Nevada, and California to the use of the water of the Colorado River; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1085. Also, petition of Edward F. Swenson and others, Whitestone, N. Y., stating the necessity for and requesting the passage of H. R. 2917, which would provide cars for blinded veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1086. Also, petition of Sisterhood of the Spanish and Portuguese Synagogue, New York, N. Y., requesting that the Congress reject any plan for calendar reform which includes a blank-day device; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1087. Also, petition of American ORT Federation, New York, N. Y., relative to the enunciation and implementation of the United States policy of support to Israel and expressing gratification by the American ORT Federation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1088. Also, petition of Mrs. Hilda Alto and others, Rapid City, S. Dak., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1089. Also, petition of Mrs. K. E. Fraley and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1090. Also, petition of Mrs. Agnes G. Shankle, General Welfare Federation of America, Washington, D. C., transmitting two petitions, containing 75 names, for L. Everett Gest, General Welfare of America Club for the State of New Jersey, requesting legislation to increase social-security and old-age benefits and the lowering of the retirement age to 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 16, 1949

(Legislative day of Thursday, June 2, 1949)

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

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

God of all mercies, at this ancient altar of dedication to the things unseen and eternal we bow with the confident assurance that the faith of the founding fathers is living still in this dear land for whose dream of freedom they were willing to dare and to die. Spirit of Life, in this new dawn give us the faith that follows on. Thou hast called us to play our part in one of the creative hours of human history. Help us so to speak and so to act in this day of destiny that tomorrow we may live unashamed with our memories. Across the debris of ancient wrongs may our glad eyes see the glory of the coming of the Lord as selfish exploitation makes way for brotherhood and for man. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 15, 1949, was dispensed with.

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 the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On June 15, 1949:

S. 147. An act for the relief of H. Lawrence Hull.

On June 16, 1949:

S. 714. An act to provide for comprehensive planning, for site acquisition in and outside of the District of Columbia, and for the design of Federal building projects outside of the District of Columbia; to authorize the transfer of jurisdiction over certain lands between certain departments and agencies of the United States; and to provide certain additional authority needed in connection with the construction, management, and operation of Federal public buildings; and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 55) to print the monthly publication entitled "Economic Indicators."

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1338) authorizing the transfer to the United States section, International Boundary and Water Commission, by the War Assets Administration of a portion of Fort Brown, at Brownsville, Tex., and adjacent borrow area, without exchange of funds or reimbursement.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2361) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, 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. 4878. An act to authorize certain Government printing, binding, and blank-book work elsewhere than at the Government Printing Office if approved by the Joint Committee on Printing; and

H. R. 5007. An act to provide pay, allowances, and physical disability retirement for members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Public Health Service, the Reserve components thereof, the National Guard, and the Air National Guard, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 19) authorizing the printing of additional copies of prayers offered by the Chaplain, the Reverend Peter Marshall, D. D., at the opening of the daily sessions of the Senate of the United States during the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses.

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

H. Con. Res. 45. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to procure 2,000 additional copies of its hearings on the bill (H. R. 2362) to amend an act entitled "The Economic Cooperation Act of 1948," approved April 3, 1948; and

H. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives to have printed additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the bills entitled "Amend the Constitution With Respect to Election of President and Vice President."

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Humphrey	Morse
Anderson	Hunt	Mundt
Bricker	Ives	Neely
Cain	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Connally	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Donnell	Kem	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kerr	Taft
Eastland	Kilgore	Taylor
Flanders	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Frear	Long	Thye
Gillette	Lucas	Tobey
Graham	McCarthy	Tydings
Green	McClellan	Watkins
Gurney	McFarland	Wherry
Hayden	McKellar	Wiley
Hendrickson	Malone	Withers
Hill	Martin	Young
Hoey	Maybank	
Holland	Miller	

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on official business in meetings of committees of the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent on official business, presiding at a meeting of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in connection with an investigation of the affairs of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] is absent on official business, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.