

## IOWA

Harvey H. Douglass, Postville.

## KANSAS

William Campbell, Mullinville.  
Ruth B. Dunlap, Rose Hill.

## KENTUCKY

Homer Erwin Davis, Columbus.  
John T. Bradley, Kettle Island.

## MASSACHUSETTS

Lawrence L. Carpenter, Foxboro.  
Edward G. Perry, Teaticket.

## MISSOURI

George T. Carter, Moscow Mills.

## MONTANA

Jack Cruickshank, Bozeman.

## NEW JERSEY

Edward Fraiss, Camden.  
George M. Beaman, Keansburg.  
Louella Lockwood, Oceanport.

## NORTH DAKOTA

Fritz W. Liebig, Denhoff.

## ORFGON

Maude B. Thames, Oswego.

## TEXAS

James T. Butler, Crane.  
Roxie L. Dunn, Forestburg.  
Mary E. Gimon, Lovelady.  
Rufus O. Warner, Pearland.

## WEST VIRGINIA

Velva A. Pelter, Sharples.

## WISCONSIN

George Pudas, Iron River.

## IN THE NAVY

## APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

Ben Moreell to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of admiral, for temporary service.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 11, 1946

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Russell Wharton Lambert, minister, Centennial Methodist Church, Rockford, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, God of our lives and all life, we seek to know Thy will in this hour, that Thy way may be revealed unto us for our day and the days to come.

We thank Thee for the spirit that inspires men to set aside selfish interests and move into the realm of moral grandeur; for the love of humanity that turns men from bloodshed and tyranny into the methods of peace and justice; for the power that challenges men to rise from pettiness to heights of greatness in a day that yearns for the best.

Forgive our feeble courage, our neglected dreams, our discouraged hopes, and our acts of omission and commission. And now, in the beginning of a new day, stir us with a passion to regain the virtue of consistency in good things, that we may face a new age with alert minds, understanding hearts, and daring spirits.

May we dedicate ourselves to eternal principles that can come alive in our day to bless the world in the near and distant future. May we so lose ourselves

in the cause of God that we find ourselves in the greatness of character that becomes man. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2177. An act to provide for increased efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

JUNE 11, 1946.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,  
*House of Representatives.*

SIR: From the secretary of the Commonwealth of the State of Pennsylvania, I have received the certificate of election of Hon. CARL H. HOFFMAN as a Representative-elect to the Seventy-ninth Congress from the Twenty-third Congressional District to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Hon. J. Buell Snyder.

Very truly yours,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,

*Clerk of the House of Representatives.*

By H. NEWLIN MEGILL.

HON. CARL H. HOFFMAN, REPRESENTATIVE-ELECT FROM TWENTY-THIRD DISTRICT, PA.

The SPEAKER. The Member-elect will present himself at the bar of the House and take the oath of office.

Mr. HOFFMAN appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

## TERMINAL LEAVE TO ENLISTED PERSONNEL

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the bill granting terminal leave pay to enlisted personnel, H. R. 4051, should be overwhelmingly passed by the House. I am giving my unqualified support of this measure, and I hope there will not be a vote against it.

The enlisted personnel of our armed forces are entitled to this compensation, and it should be given to them as quickly as possible. Under our Selective Service System the men were forced to serve in the various branches of our armed forces whether they wished to or not, and those who served as enlisted personnel were just as good soldiers and just as good American citizens as those who served as commissioned officers. They fought side by side. In civilian life they are on an equal basis. It was more or less a fortune of circumstance that some were commissioned officers and some enlisted personnel.

The men and women, whether commissioned officers or not, have done their

best to win the war. Now that the war is over and they are returning to civilian life, they should certainly be treated alike in the matter of terminal leave pay benefits as well as in all other respects.

I was among the enlisted personnel of World War I. As a veteran and as a member of the American Legion for over 20 years, I am glad to vote for this measure and to assist in securing for the enlisted personnel and their families these and all other benefits which they so richly deserve.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include the record of votes on veterans' legislation and a letter from the Chief of Engineers of the War Department.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in the first to include a very excellent editorial that appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of June 6 in reference to the so-called Case bill, in the second to include an editorial that appeared in the Boston Post, and in the third to include a statement to be made by him before the Committee on Civil Service today.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Miss Stella Marks.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in one to include an editorial from the Chicago Sun, in the second to include an article from the Chicago Times, and in the third to include several articles.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a newspaper article and in the other to include a number of articles by Mark Foote on communism.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in reference to the wanton destruction of Army and Navy equipment.

Mr. HORAN (at the request of Mr. SCRIVNER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a commencement address.

## SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Fred Brenckman appearing in the June issue of the National Grange.

Mr. WOLCOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances: to include in one an address by Maj. Gen. Ray A. Porter given before the National Security Committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and in the other an address by Mr. C. B. Lister, secretary-treasurer of the National Rifle Association.

Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances: to include in one a statement by George Reilly before the Committee on Expenditures in the executive departments, and in the other a newspaper item and a statement.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a poem by Commander Isadore Chernin of the Binghamton Post of the American Legion.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include newspaper editorials in each.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### ACCUMULATED LEAVE FOR ENLISTED PERSONNEL

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the passage of the bill (H. R. 4051) to grant to enlisted personnel of the armed forces certain benefits in lieu of accumulated leave.

The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. Brooks) there were—yeas 116, noes 0.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 380, noes 0, answered "present" 1, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 152]

YEAS—380

Abernethy	Bailey	Bishop
Adams	Baldwin, Md.	Blackney
Allen, Ill.	Baldwin, N. Y.	Bland
Allen, La.	Barden	Bloom
Almond	Barrett, Wyo.	Bolton
Andersen,	Barry	Bonner
H. Carl	Bates, Ky.	Boren
Anderson, Calif.	Bates, Mass.	Boykin
Andresen,	Beall	Bradley, Mich.
August H.	Beckworth	Bradley, Pa.
Andrews, Ala.	Bell	Brehm
Angell	Bender	Brooks
Arends	Bennet, N. Y.	Brown, Ga.
Arnold	Bennett, Mo.	Brown, Ohio
Auchincloss	Biemiller	Bryson

Buck	Gregory	Mansfield,
Buckley	Griffiths	Mont.
Buffett	Gross	Mansfield, Tex.
Bulwinkle	Gwynn, N. Y.	Marcantonio
Bunker	Gwynne, Iowa	Martin, Iowa
Butler	Hale	Mathews
Byrne, N. Y.	Hall	May
Byrnes, Wis.	Edwin Arthur	Merrow
Camp	Hall,	Michener
Campbell	Leonard W.	Miller, Calif.
Canfield	Halleck	Miller, Nebr.
Cannon, Mo.	Hand	Mills
Carnahan	Hare	Monroney
Case, N. J.	Harless, Ariz.	Morgan
Case, S. Dak.	Harness, Ind.	Murdet
Celler	Hart	Murdock
Chapman	Hartley	Murphy
Chief	Havenner	Murray, Tenn.
Chenoweth	Healy	Murray, Wis.
Chiperfield	Hébert	Neely
Church	Hedrick	Norblad
Clark	Heffernan	Norrell
Clason	Hendricks	O'Brien, Ill.
Clements	Henry	O'Brien, Mich.
Clevenger	Herter	O'Neal
Clippinger	Heselton	O'Toole
Coffee	Hess	Outland
Cole, Kans.	Hill	Pace
Cole, Mo.	Hinshaw	Patman
Cole, N. Y.	Hobbs	Patrick
Combs	Hoch	Patterson
Cooley	Hoeven	Peterson, Ga.
Cooper	Hoffman, Mich.	Pfeifer
Corbett	Hoffman, Pa.	Phillips
Cox	Hollifield	Phillips
Cravens	Holmes, Mass.	Pickett
Crosser	Holmes, Wash.	Pittenger
Cunningham	Hook	Ploeser
Curtis	Hope	Plumley
D'Alesandro	Howell	Poage
Davis	Huber	Pratt
Dawson	Hull	Price Fla.
De Lacy	Izac	Price, Ill.
Delaney,	Jackson	Quinn, N. Y.
James J.	Jarman	Rabaut
Delaney,	Jenkins	Rabin
John J.	Jennings	Rains
D'Ewart	Jensen	Ramey
Dingell	Johnson, Calif.	Randolph
Dirksen	Johnson, Ill.	Rankin
Dolliver	Johnson,	Rayfield
Domengeaux	Lyndon B.	Reed, Ill.
Dondero	Johnson, Okla.	Reed, N. Y.
Doughton, N. C.	Jones	Rees, Kans.
Douglas, Calif.	Jonkman	Resa
Douglas, Ill.	Judd	Rich
Doyle	Kean	Riley
Drewry	Kearney	Rivers
Dworshak	Kee	Rizley
Earthman	Keefe	Robertson,
Eaton	Kefauver	N. Dak.
Eberharter	Kelley, Pa.	Robertson, Va.
Elliott	Kelly, Ill.	Robson, Ky.
Ellis	Keogh	Rockwell
Elsaesser	Kerr	Rodgers, Pa.
Elston	Kilburn	Roe, Md.
Engel, Mich.	Kilday	Rogers, Fla.
Engle, Calif.	King	Rogers, Mass.
Ervin	Kinzer	Rogers, N. Y.
Fallon	Kirwan	Rooney
Feighan	Klein	Rowan
Fellows	Knutson	Russell
Fernandez	Kopplemann	Ryter
Fisher	Kunkel	Sabath
Flannagan	LaFollette	Sadowski
Flood	Landis	Savage
Fogarty	Lane	Schwabe, Mo.
Forand	Lanham	Schwabe, Okla.
Fuller	Larcade	Scrivner
Fulton	Latham	Shafer
Gallagher	Lea	Sharp
Gamble	LeCompte	Sheridan
Gardner	LeFevre	Short
Gary	Lemke	Sikes
Gathings	Lesinski	Simpson, Ill.
Gavin	Lewis	Simpson, Pa.
Geelan	Link	Slaughter
Gerlach	Luce	Smith, Maine
Gibson	Lynch	Smith, Ohio
Gifford	McConnell	Smith, Va.
Gillespie	McCormack	Smith, Wis.
Gillette	McCowan	Somers, N. Y.
Gillie	McDonough	Sparkman
Goodwin	McGlinchey	Spence
Gordon	McKenzie	Springer
Gore	McMillan, S. C.	Starkey
Gorski	McMillen, Ill.	Stefan
Gossett	Madden	Stevenson
Graham	Mahon	Stockman
Granahan	Maloney	Sullivan
Grant, Ala.	Manasco	Sumner, Ill.
Green	Mankin	

Sumners, Tex.	Towe	Whittington
Sundstrom	Traynor	Wickersham
Taber	Trimble	Wigglesworth
Talbot	Vinson	Wilson
Talle	Voorhis, Calif.	Winter
Tarver	Vorys, Ohio	Wolcott
Taylor	Vursell	Wolverton, N. J.
Thom	Walter	Wood
Thomas, N. J.	Wasielewski	Woodhouse
Thomas, Tex.	Weaver	Woodruff
Thomason	Weichel	Worley
Tibbott	West	Zimmerman
Torrens	Whitten	

#### ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Wadsworth

#### NOT VOTING—50

Andrews, N. Y.	Grant, Ind.	O'Hara
Barrett, Pa.	Hagen	O'Konski
Brumbaugh	Hancock	Peterson, Fla.
Cannon, Fla.	Harris	Powell
Carlson	Hays	Reece, Tenn.
Cochran	Horan	Richards
Colmer	Johnson, Ind.	Robinson, Utah
Courtney	Johnson,	Roe, N. Y.
Crawford	Luther A.	Sasscer
Curley	Ludlow	Sheppard
Daughton, Va.	Lyle	Stewart
Durham	McGehee	Stigler
Ellsworth	McGregor	Tolan
Fenton	Martin, Mass.	Welch
Folger	Mason	White
Gearhart	Morrison	Winstead
Granger	Norton	Wolfenden, Pa.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Curley with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Crawford.

Mr. Durham with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. McGehee with Mr. Andrews of New York.

Mr. Harris with Mr. Jones.

Mr. Luther A. Johnson with Mr. Horan.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.

Mr. Tolan with Mr. Hagen.

Mr. Robinson of Utah with Mr. Grant of Indiana.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Carlson.

Mr. Stigler with Mr. Fenton.

Mr. Winstead with Mr. Hancock.

Mr. Roe of New York with Mr. Gearhart.

Mr. Courtney with Mr. Brumbaugh.

Mr. Folger with Mr. McGregor.

Mr. Hays with Mr. O'Hara.

Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Richards with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Sasscer with Mr. O'Konski.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on this last roll call I was present when my name was called and voted "yea." I looked at the Clerk and he indicated that he understood me. There was some confusion at the time and I assumed that I had been recorded, but I am now informed that I was not recorded. I ask unanimous consent that my vote of "yea" be recorded.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

JUSTICE TO ENLISTED SERVICE  
PERSONNEL

Mr. **RANDOLPH**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the **RECORD**.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. **RANDOLPH**. Mr. Speaker, it has just been my privilege to support the provisions of H. R. 4051. The practically unanimous vote by the House is indicative of the justice of the provisions of this legislation. I desire the **RECORD** to show that on March 5, 1945, I introduced the following bill, H. R. 2478:

A bill to grant to enlisted personnel in the land or naval forces certain benefits with respect to accumulated leave

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That for the purposes of this act, each enlisted member of the land or naval forces of the United States shall, for the period beginning with the date of commencement of his or her active service in such forces or corps, or December 7, 1941, whichever is the later, and ending 1 year after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, or the date of his or her discharge or release from active duty, whichever is the earlier, be considered as being entitled to annual leave at the rate of 2½ days for each month of such period. Such leave, less that actually received and used, may be accumulated and each person entitled thereto under this act shall be entitled, at the end of such period, to receive in a lump sum pay and allowances covering such accumulated leave. Such pay and allowances shall be computed at the rate of pay and allowances which such person was receiving at the end of such period.

SEC. 2. Any person entitled to the benefits of this act who is entitled to accumulated leave under any other provision of law may elect whether to come under the provisions of this act or such other provision of law for the period in which this act is in effect with respect to such person.

There were many other Members who likewise presented measures to correct the discrimination which was being practiced against enlisted personnel as against the law affecting commissioned officers of the armed services. The distinguished gentleman from Florida, Representative **ROGERS**, labored diligently for favorable consideration of his proposal. His bill and mine contained similar provisions.

It was my responsibility, also, to sign discharge petition No. 23, and it is gratifying to know that there were at least 218 Members who were desirous of speeding action. This statement is not meant as a criticism of the House Military Affairs Committee, because comprehensive hearings were held before a subcommittee of that group in an effort to bring forth a good measure for our approval. The important consideration, however, is that we have today acted affirmatively in alleviating the discrimination between officers and enlisted personnel in reference to terminal-leave compensation.

AN INJUSTICE IS RECTIFIED

We provide, under the bill just adopted, the same leave privileges to enlisted personnel as are accorded at present to commissioned personnel. We thus rectify an injustice within the defense establishments. Existing regulations call for commissioned officers to receive, on separation from the service, a payment in a lump sum covering unused annual leave. Our enlisted men, however, have received no such treatment. If the leave which they had accumulated, but had not used, was lost, they had no recourse.

Mr. Speaker, we know that officers and enlisted men served together during war, but we know the officers collected full pay for unused leave, while nothing in the way of recompense was given to the enlisted men. In other words the enlisted man had to forfeit the normal period of a furlough or leave.

I have been impressed by the report of the special committee, headed by General Doolittle, which has checked into the charges of discrimination and favoritism within our military establishments. One of the points at issue concerned the privileges accorded commissioned as against enlisted personnel. We must be courageous in correcting this injustice, and others within our service.

It is gratifying that all the veterans' organizations, according to my information, including the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, have wholeheartedly supported the over-all objectives which are sought by the passage of this legislation. The leadership of these groups, and all veterans, have every right to expect Congress to correct the inequities existing in leave pay.

It is well, my colleagues, for all of us to remember that a very large proportion of our service personnel had but little opportunity for leaves or furloughs. It is proper that they receive every dollar for that time. We have, as I have stated earlier, paid to officers on discharge necessary sums, and there must be no discrimination against the privates, corporals, and so forth, who have been denied what is rightly theirs. Commissioned officers have been granted 120 days of terminal leave, and it was inconceivable that rank would give any special money to those persons as against the enlisted men. It was this latter group that fought and suffered and paid the heaviest toll during World War II.

NO DEAD-END STREET FOR VETERANS

I have said repeatedly that we must not allow a dead-end street for returning heroes. Our veterans will want and deserve the security of employment and not pensions alone for war service. We must do everything within our power, as grateful people, to take care of those who have suffered injuries—and also to those dependents of boys who have given their lives. It is our obligation to adequately provide for the disabled and their families. We have the duty of adopting policies that will provide satisfactory work for millions of returning veterans in American business, industry, agriculture, and the professions. This is absolutely necessary if we are to deal justly with our service men and women.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. **HARE**, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 6739) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2242), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. **ENGEL** of Michigan reserved all points of order on the bill.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. **TARVER**. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5605) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. **TARVER**. Mr. Speaker, all the Members are familiar with the contents of this statement. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5605) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 8, 9, 10, 17, 24, 27, 28, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 57, and 64.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 6, 7, 11, 12, 14, 20, 23, 33, 35, 45, 46, 47, 49, 50, 53, 62, 63, and 65, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,309,500"; 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 "\$2,163,457"; and the Senate 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 stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "Provided further, That no part of the funds herein appropriated or made available

to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics under the heading 'Economic investigations' shall be used for State and county land-use planning, for conducting cultural surveys, or for the maintenance of regional offices"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$885,000"; 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 "\$497,032"; 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 "\$981,012"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,428,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,070,300"; 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 "\$1,355,000"; 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 "\$584,000"; 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 "\$2,676,500"; 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 "\$3,066,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$461,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$6,000,000"; 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 "\$2,754,111"; 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 "\$1,003,710"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$21,786,000"; 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 "\$2,380,000"; 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 matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "\$1,395,000, of which at least \$10,000 shall be expended for research in the utilization of waste woods"; 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 "\$39,300,000"; 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 "\$27,942,888"; 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 lines 6 and 7 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the following: "Seventy-ninth Congress, second session" and insert in lieu thereof, the following: "approved June 4, 1946 (Public Law 396)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "\$1,219,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "\$70,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "the making of loans to any individual farmer in excess of a total outstanding obligation of \$5,000 for all such loans or the making of loans to any individual farmer in excess of \$2,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment, insert the following: "and no loans, excepting those to eligible veterans, may be made for the acquisition or enlarge-

ment of farms which have a value, as acquired, enlarged, or improved, in excess of the average value of efficient family-size farm-management units, as determined by the Secretary, in the county, parish or locality where the farm is located"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 43, 52, 54, 55, 66, 67, and 68.

M. C. TARVER,  
CLARENCE CANNON,  
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,  
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,  
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,  
CARL HAYDEN,  
ELMER THOMAS,  
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,  
CHAN GURNEY,  
CLYDE M. REED,

*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. 5605) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying report, as to each of such amendments, namely:

#### TOTALS, ALLOCATIONS, ETC.

The following amendments relate to totals, allocations, etc., as they have been adjusted to the action of the conferees on other amendments: Nos. 3, 9, 10, 15, 24, 27, 30, 32, 39, 41, 42, 46, and 47.

#### OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Amendment No. 1, salaries and expenses: Senate deleted the following language inserted by the House:

"Provided further, That no part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used for the payment of the compensation of any officer or employee who authorizes or causes to be authorized the operation and administration of more than one warehouse inspection service under the jurisdiction of the Secretary, and appropriations and funds available for such services shall be transferred and consolidated and expended and accounted for as a single fund."

The House recedes, on assurances of the Secretary of Agriculture that the consolidation already effected by administrative order will be continued.

#### OFFICE OF INFORMATION

Amendment No. 2, printing and binding: House appropriated \$1,294,000; Senate, \$1,325,000; conferees agree upon \$1,309,500.

#### BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

Amendment No. 4, economic investigations: House appropriated \$1,923,457; Senate, \$2,173,457; conferees agree upon \$2,163,457. Action of conferees contemplates that no investigations will be made in Alaska.

Amendment No. 5, economic investigations: The House inserted the following language:

"Provided further, That no part of the funds herein appropriated or made available to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics shall be used for State and county land-use planning, or for the maintenance of regional offices, or for conducting social surveys."

The Senate struck out the House language and inserted the following, including the words enclosed in brackets:

"*Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated or made available to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics under the heading 'Economic investigations' shall be used for State and county land-use planning, for conducting cultural surveys, or for the maintenance of [more than one professional worker in the respective] regional offices[, and that all work done by the Bureau in the States out of funds appropriated or made available for 'Economic investigations' shall be done in cooperation with or on the approval of the respective land-grant colleges]."

The conferees agreed upon the Senate provision, omitting the words enclosed in brackets:

Amendment No. 6, crop and livestock estimates: House appropriated \$2,037,000; Senate, \$2,132,000; House recedes.

#### OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 7, special exploratory investigations of agricultural problems of Alaska: The Senate inserted language making the amount appropriated for this purpose immediately available. The House recedes.

#### OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Amendment No. 8, payments to Territory of Alaska under provisions of section 2 of the act approved June 20, 1936: House appropriated \$27,500; Senate, \$37,500; Senate recedes.

#### BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

Amendment No. 11, animal husbandry: Glendale, Ariz., Poultry Station: Senate appropriated \$30,000; House recedes. For study of possibilities of establishing a regional poultry research program in the southern Great Plains area: Senate appropriated \$2,500; House recedes. For study of possibilities of establishing a regional poultry research program in the Southeastern States: Senate appropriated \$5,000; House recedes.

Amendment No. 12, animal husbandry: Glendale, Ariz., poultry station: The Senate authorized \$20,000 of the appropriation for this item for construction of buildings. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 13 and 14, diseases of animals: Laboratory to investigate Newcastle disease of poultry: Senate appropriated \$30,000 for the construction of a building; House recedes. Investigation of roundworm parasites and intestinal and fringed tapeworms of sheep: Senate appropriated \$32,986; Senate recedes.

#### BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

Amendment No. 16, salaries and expenses: Increase for tabulating, analyzing, and making available data on dairy herd improvement association herds: Senate added \$37,488; conferees agree upon \$25,000. For further research on evaluation of mammary gland development in its relation to milk production: Senate appropriated \$8,700; Senate recedes. Analysis of experimental breeding data: Senate appropriated \$8,800; Senate recedes.

#### BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

Amendment No. 17, field crops: The Senate struck the following language: "Including not to exceed \$26,800 for investigation in the blackroot disease of sugar beets." The House recedes. However, see amendment No. 18, where an increased appropriation of \$26,800 is allowed for this purpose.

Amendment No. 18, field crops: Development of weed control methods in irrigated areas: Senate added \$12,000; House recedes. Experiments on nut grass: Senate appropriated \$10,000; House recedes. Control measures for blackroot disease of sugar

beets: Senate appropriated \$26,800; House recedes. Problems of burley tobacco production and disease: Senate appropriated \$15,000; House recedes. Production and breeding experiments on guayule rubber: Senate appropriated \$117,400; Senate recedes. To enlarge guayule research program, including processing tests and shrub conditioning studies: Senate appropriated \$45,100; Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 19, fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops: Investigations of virus and viruslike diseases of stone fruits of the Western States: Senate appropriated \$25,000; Senate recedes. Development of disease-resistant ornamental and flowering plants: Senate appropriated \$36,300; conferees agree upon \$5,200, to be earmarked for work on azaleas. Investigations on suitability of various types of cargo and transport services for shipping fresh and frozen fruits and vegetables: Senate appropriated \$52,000; House recedes. Investigation of diseases of vegetable plant beds in the South for work in connection with tomato plants: Senate appropriated \$10,100; House recedes. Cooperative vegetable seed work: Senate appropriated \$12,000; House recedes. Investigations of watery soft-rot disease: Senate appropriated \$10,000; Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 20, forest diseases: Development and improvement of methods for control of tree diseases: Senate appropriated \$30,300; house recedes. Little-leaf disease of pine: Senate appropriated \$25,000; House recedes. Investigation of the disease affecting mimosa trees: Senate appropriated \$25,000; House recedes.

Amendment No. 21, soils, fertilizers, and irrigation: Increase for soil classification and mapping: Senate added \$110,000; conferees agree upon \$55,000. Increase for preparation of soil maps and reports for publication: Senate added \$90,000; conferees agree upon \$45,000.

Amendment No. 22, agricultural engineering: Auburn Tillage Machinery Laboratory: Senate appropriated \$65,000; conferees agree upon \$30,000. Utilization of electric power on farms: Senate added \$43,140; conferees agree upon \$30,000.

Amendment No. 23, National Arboretum: House appropriated \$61,000; Senate, \$76,000; House recedes.

#### BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

Amendment No. 25, insect investigations: Investigations in Brazil of a fruitfly of potential danger to fruit culture, and the relation of insects to a disease of citrus trees in California: Senate appropriated \$35,000; Senate recedes. Reestablishment of investigations on insects affecting greenhouse and field-grown ornamental plants and mushrooms: Senate added \$28,100; House recedes. Not more than \$6,500 to be used for mushroom work. Development of measures to control the European corn borer by insecticides: Senate appropriated \$12,500; House recedes. Development of methods for deinsectizing airplanes and other carriers, and their cargoes: Senate appropriated \$50,000; Senate recedes. Investigations of the best leafhopper and the curly-top virus of beans: Senate appropriated \$15,000; House recedes.

Amendment No. 26, insect and plant disease control: Increase for elimination of sweet-potato weevil from commercial producing areas: Senate added \$50,000; House recedes. Intensification of gypsy moth control: Senate added \$45,600; House recedes. Expansion of pink bollworm control work: Senate added \$158,400; conferees agree upon \$80,000. Expansion of barberry eradication work: Senate added \$200,000; conferees agree upon \$100,000.

#### BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY

Amendment No. 28, work on guayule and other rubber-bearing plants: The Senate in-

serted the following language: "and for conducting investigations on the extraction and processing of rubber from guayule and other plants, vines, shrubs, or trees possessing natural rubber growing or capable of being grown within the continental limits of the United States, including not to exceed \$12,000 for the procurement of services, by contract or otherwise, for the production of guayule or other rubber-bearing plants; the transfer to the Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry, without compensation therefor, of real property (located in the vicinity of Salinas, California, including approximately two hundred and fifty acres of land now in guayule production) and personal property, valued at not exceeding a total of \$260,000, acquired for and heretofore used in connection with the emergency rubber project; and there shall be included in the next annual Budget a statement in detail of the amount and value of the property so transferred;."

The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 29, agricultural chemical investigations: Research on extraction of rubber from guayule and other rubber-bearing plants: Senate appropriated \$150,000; Senate recedes. To develop information and intensify studies on processed citrus fruits and on preservation and processing of soft fruits: Senate added \$7,500; House recedes. For expanding investigations on enzymes and phytochemistry: Senate added \$22,100; House recedes.

#### WHITE PINE BLISTER RUST CONTROL

Amendment No. 31, to expand cooperative work of Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine with State and private agencies for control on State and privately owned lands: Senate added \$1,000,000; conferees agree upon \$500,000.

#### FOREST SERVICE

Amendment No. 33, salaries and expenses: The Senate added the following language: "*Provided*, That not to exceed \$50,000 of the appropriation for 'National forest protection and management', and not to exceed \$50,000 of the appropriation for 'Forest fire cooperation' may be transferred to the appropriation 'Printing and binding, Department of Agriculture', for forest fire prevention posters and related printed material." The House recedes.

Amendment No. 34, national forest protection and management: To expand aerial photography and mapping of national-forest areas: Senate appropriated \$379,000; Senate recedes. To expand the work of reseeding national-forest lands: Senate appropriated \$400,000; House recedes. For restoration of existing recreational areas in the national forests: Senate added \$3,000,000; conferees agree upon \$1,000,000.

Amendment No. 35, construction and maintenance of improvements in experimental forest areas: The Senate added language making appropriations under "Forest research" available for the construction and maintenance of improvements. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 36, forest and range management investigations: Increase to establish, equip, and staff additional experimental forests and ranges, and to strengthen the work at existing units: Senate added \$250,000; Senate recedes. Research in connection with mechanization of naval-stores production: Senate appropriated \$50,000; House recedes.

Amendment No. 37, forest products: To establish two additional utilization research units and to strengthen existing units: Senate appropriated \$150,000; Senate recedes. To expand work on chemical utilization, waste utilization and improved wood uses: Senate appropriated \$100,000; conferees agree upon \$10,000 to be expended for research in the utilization of waste woods.

Amendment No. 38, acquisition of lands for national forests—acquisition of lands in the

Ozark and Ouachita National Forests, Arkansas: Senate appropriated \$250,000; Senate recedes.

#### FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

Amendment No. 40, forest development roads: House appropriated \$12,500,000; Senate, \$23,000,000; Senate recedes.

#### SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Amendment No. 44, soil conservation operations—purchase of equipment from Government surplus for loan and grant to conservation districts: House appropriated \$1,000,000; Senate, \$4,000,000; conferees agree upon \$2,500,000, to be expended only for such surplus equipment.

#### CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

Amendment No. 45, regular conservation program (direct appropriation): House appropriated \$257,500,000; Senate, \$259,246,000; House recedes. This action, together with reappropriation, provides a total of \$301,746,000 for the regular agricultural conservation program, plus \$12,500,000 for the special grass and legume seed program.

Amendment No. 48, administrative expense limitation: House provided \$26,942,888; Senate, \$28,699,598; conferees agree upon \$27,942,888.

Amendment No. 49, applications by veterans for payments, within one year from date of discharge: The Senate added language authorizing the filing of such application by the person entitled to payment in case of death, disappearance or incompetency of such veteran. The House recedes.

#### SUGAR ACT

Amendment No. 50, limitation on rates of payment: The Senate struck the following language:

"Provided, however, That none of the funds appropriated under this head shall be used for payments in amounts in excess of those determined by the Secretary to be necessary to provide returns to producers equivalent to those contemplated under the 1946 support payment programs approved by the Stabilization Administrator."

The House recedes.

#### EXPORTING AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Amendment No. 51, school lunch program: The House bill included the following:

"Provided, That not exceeding \$50,000,000 of the funds appropriated by and pursuant to such section 32 may also be used during the current fiscal year to provide food for consumption by children in nonprofit schools of high-school grade or under and for child-care centers through (a) the purchase, processing, and exchange, and the distribution of agricultural commodities and products thereof; or (b) the making of payments to such schools and centers or agencies having control thereof in connection with the purchase and distribution of agricultural commodities in fresh or processed form and, when desirable, for the processing and exchange of such commodities and their products; or (c) by such other means as the Secretary may determine: *Provided further*, That funds made available hereunder for a school lunch program shall be apportioned for expenditure in the States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia in accordance with school enrollment and need, as determined by the Secretary, except that if program participation in any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia does not require all funds so apportioned, the Secretary may reappropriate such excess funds to such other States, Territories, possessions, or the District of Columbia in consideration of need, as he may determine: *Provided further*, That benefits under (b) of this paragraph to schools or child-care centers or other sponsoring agencies shall in no case exceed the cost of

the agricultural commodities or products thereof purchased by the school or child-care center or other sponsoring agencies as established by certificates executed by the authorized representative of the sponsoring agency: *Provided further*, That such sponsoring agency shall maintain accounts and records establishing costs of agricultural commodities or products furnished in the program and that such accounts and records shall be available for audit by representatives of the Department: *Provided further*, That these funds may be used for, or to make payments in connection with, the purchase of such agricultural commodities and for exchanging, distributing, disposing, transporting, storing, processing, inspection, commission, and other incidental costs and expenses without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and without regard to the 25 per centum limitation contained in said section 32: *Provided further*, That not more than 2 per centum of the funds made available hereunder for a school lunch program shall be used to provide food for children in child-care centers. The amount of funds available hereunder for a school lunch program used in any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia during any fiscal year shall not exceed the total amount otherwise furnished for the same purpose by or on behalf of the school authorities and other sponsoring agencies in such State, Territory, possession, or District of Columbia, including the value of donated services and supplies, as certified by the respective schools, care centers, or agencies having control thereof."

The Senate struck out the House language and inserted in lieu thereof the following:

"Provided, That not exceeding \$75,000,000 of the funds appropriated by and pursuant to such section 32 may also be used during the fiscal year 1947, without regard to the 25 per centum limitation contained in said section 32, to carry out the purposes and provisions of the National School Lunch Act, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, such amount to be exclusive of funds expended in accordance with the last sentence of section 9 of the National School Lunch Act."

The conferees agree upon the Senate language with an amendment correcting the citation to the National School Lunch Act.

#### MARKETING SERVICES

Amendment No. 53, market news service: Federal contribution to Alabama marketing services for services received from State leased wire and Alabama marketing office: Senate appropriated \$3,000; House recedes. Dairy and poultry market news service in Atlanta, Ga., area: Senate appropriated \$7,500; House recedes. Market news service on eggs, butter, and poultry, Cincinnati, Ohio: Senate appropriated \$7,500; House recedes. Installation of a market news service to serve the stockyards area in Spokane, Wash.; Senate appropriated \$11,122; House recedes. Leased-wire service for cooperative market news office, Asheville, N. C.: Senate appropriated \$850; House recedes.

Amendment No. 56, Tobacco Acts—to permit the opening of new markets and provide graders for these markets: Senate appropriated \$200,000; conferees agree upon \$100,000.

#### LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

Amendment No. 57, administrative expenses: House appropriated \$24,000,000; Senate, \$24,600,000; Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 58, authorization to borrow loan funds from RFC: House appropriated \$67,500,000; Senate, \$82,500,000; conferees agree upon \$70,000,000.

Amendment No. 59, limitation on loans to individual farmers: The Senate deleted the following House language: "the making of loans to any individual farmer in excess of a total outstanding obligation of \$2,500 for all such loans" and inserted in lieu thereof

the following: "the making of loans to any individual farmer in excess of \$2,500."

The conferees agreed upon the retention of the House language, amended to increase the limit of total outstanding obligation to \$5,000, and the retention of the Senate language.

#### FARM TENANCY

Amendment No. 60, limitation on size of loans: The Senate struck the following language: "and no loan, excepting those to eligible veterans, shall be made in an amount greater than 25 per centum above the census value of the average farm unit of thirty acres and more in the county or parish where the purchase is made, as determined by the 1940 farm census."

The conferees agree on the following language: "and no loans, excepting those to eligible veterans, may be made for the acquisition or enlargement of farms which have a value, as acquired, enlarged, or improved, in excess of the average value of efficient family-size farm-management units, as determined by the Secretary, in the county, parish or locality where the farm is located."

#### WATER FACILITIES, ARID AND SEMIARID AREAS

Amendment No. 61, loan funds and administrative expenses for the water facilities program: House appropriated \$1,500,000; Senate, \$2,000,000; conferees agree upon \$1,750,000.

#### RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 62, salaries and expenses: House appropriated \$4,500,000; Senate, \$5,000,000; House recedes.

Amendment No. 63, proviso in connection with awarding of contracts: The Senate struck the following language:

"Provided, That no part of the funds herein provided for the Rural Electrification Administration shall be used for the processing or approval of any loan, the application for which does not stipulate (1) that the borrower shall, in awarding contracts under such loan, award such contracts to the lowest financially responsible and qualified bidder in each case, as determined by the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, (2) that the borrower shall open and consider all bids submitted, and (3) that such stipulation shall be made a part of the loan agreement covering such loan."

The House recedes.

#### FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 64, salaries and expenses (direct appropriation): increase for research relative to the effects of postwar adjustment and reconversion on farmers' cooperatives: Senate appropriated \$40,000; Senate recedes.

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 65, additional passenger-carrying vehicles for work in connection with experimental forests and ranges: The Senate inserted the following language: "plus twelve additional such vehicles for work in connection with experimental forests and ranges." The House recedes.

#### AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The managers on the part of the House report the following amendments in disagreement:

Amendment No. 43, forest roads and trails: Exempts certain easements or rights-of-way from the provisions of Revised Statute 355, as amended. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendments Nos. 52, 54, and 55, agricultural wage stabilization program: These amendments provide funds and authority for continuing this program, and a limitation on the conditions under which agricultural wages may be stabilized. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 66, Provision relating to subversive activities and strikes against the

Government. The House enacted the following:

"Sec. 5. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That such administrative or supervisory employees of the Department as may be designated for the purpose by the Secretary are hereby authorized to administer the oaths to persons making affidavits required by this section, and they shall charge no fee for so doing: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person employed for less than sixty days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or destruction of property, and payment of salary or wages may be made to such persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by this section."

The Senate struck out the House language, and inserted in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 5. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That such administrative or supervisory employees of the Department as may be designated for the purpose by the Secretary are hereby authorized to administer the oaths to persons making affidavits required by this section, and they shall charge no fee for so doing: *Provided further*, That any person who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That nothing in this

section shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person employed for less than 60 days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or destruction of property, and payment of salary or wages may be made to such persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by this section."

The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment, with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Sec. 5. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That such administrative or supervisory employees of the Department as may be designated for the purpose by the Secretary are hereby authorized to administer the oaths to persons making affidavits required by this section, and they shall charge no fee for so doing: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person employed for less than 60 days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or destruction of property, and payment of salary or wages may be made to such persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by this section."

Amendment No. 67, corresponding reduction of personnel in other agencies to offset increases provided in the Act:

The Senate inserted the following language:

"Sec. 6. Section 14 (a) of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1946 shall not apply to employment of personnel required to do the work authorized by those appropriations for which increased funds are provided by this Act."

The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur, with an amendment as a substitute for the Senate provision, as follows:

"Sec. 6. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to alter, or modify in any man-

ner whatsoever, the aggregate maximum personnel ceilings established by section 14 (a) of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1946 (Public Law No. 390) nor to authorize the compensation of a greater aggregate number than the number provided for in the aforesaid Act. In the case of any activity whose personnel may be increased in consequence of appropriations contained in this Act, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall recommend and effectuate such reduction in personnel in such Governmental agencies as he may deem advisable as will offset any increase in personnel for which provision is made in this Act."

Amendment No. 68, correcting a section number.

M. C. TARVER,  
CLARENCE CANNON,  
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,  
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,  
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report represents a unanimous agreement on the part of the Senate and the House conferees upon every item contained in the bill. There are six amendments which are legislative in character, action with regard to which could not be had in the conference report on that account. However, the conferees on the part of the House, as indicated in the report of the managers, will move to recede and concur, either with or without amendment, in the several amendments in question.

The bill which is before you now is approximately \$30,000,000 below the amount carried in the bill for appropriations, reappropriations, and loan authorizations as it passed the Senate. However, it is approximately \$35,000,000 with respect to those items above the bill as it passed the House of Representatives. The major portion of that increase, \$25,000,000, is represented by an increase in the amount of funds provided for the school-lunch program from section 32 monies.

You will recall that when the bill passed the House of Representatives this body had just passed the National School-Lunch Act, and the limitation provided in that act as it passed the House for the expenditure of funds for the school-lunch program was \$50,000,000, so your subcommittee on agricultural appropriations was obliged to observe what were then the expressed wishes of the House, and brought in a provision for the expenditure of \$50,000,000 for that purpose. Subsequently the Senate amended the school-lunch legislation so as to remove the over-all limitation of \$50,000,000 and to leave in the legislation no limitation whatever upon the amounts which might be appropriated by Congress under its authority. That amendment of the Senate was unanimously agreed to in the House. The \$75,000,000 which are now provided for in the bill for the school-lunch program are justified by a Budget estimate in that amount. It is expected that it will be sufficient to take care of the enrollment in this program of something in excess of 10,000,000 children for the next fiscal year

as against some 6,000,000-plus who have been taken care of in the program for the present fiscal year.

I insert here by permission of the House a statement regarding funds carried in the bill which is self-explanatory:

*Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, 1947*

	House bill	Senate bill	As finally passed	Conference report compared with House bill (+) or (-)	Conference report compared with Senate bill (+) or (-)
Direct appropriations.....	\$573,601,949	<sup>1</sup> \$598,737,735	\$581,240,121	+\$7,638,17	-\$17,497,614
Reappropriations.....	111,454,068	111,454,068	111,454,068		
Total appropriations and re-appropriations.....	685,056,017	<sup>1</sup> 710,191,803	692,694,189	+7,638,172	-17,497,614
Transfer from permanent appropriations.....	50,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	+25,000,000	
Authorizations to borrow from Reconstruction Finance Corporation (for loans).....	367,500,000	382,500,000	370,000,000	+2,500,000	-12,500,000
Grand total of items carried in bill, including Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds.....	1,102,556,017	1,167,691,803	<sup>2</sup> 1,137,694,189	+35,138,172	-29,907,614

<sup>1</sup>Includes \$1,045,100 for Budget amendments totaling \$1,095,100 contained in S. Docs. Nos. 143, 171, and 172, submitted after passage of bill by the House.

<sup>2</sup>This figure compares with total 1946 appropriations for comparable items of \$1,147,532,907 and total Budget estimates for this bill of \$1,144,359,740.

There are many items in the bill which are of very great interest to the membership of the House. The committee has felt that sufficient time has elapsed since last Friday for the membership of the House to study the conference report which was submitted on that day and in view of the fact that the actions recommended by them are unanimous in character, it is not felt that extended discussion of the conference report is necessary unless Members of the House desire to ask questions in regard to it, in which event I will endeavor as best I can to furnish them such information as they may desire.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. With reference to amendment No. 37 concerning forest products on page 10, the Senate provided for two additional utilization research units for the purpose of fortifying the present very excellent work that is being carried on in the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis. The Senate provided a \$150,000 increase which the conferees cut down to \$10,000. It seems to me that \$10,000 is a pretty small increase considering the vast forest areas in many States of the Union and the great waste that is entailed now in the logging of such areas.

Mr. TARVER. The Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations has manifested throughout the years intense interest in experimentation in forest products and in the solution of the problems of forestry. In the preceding item—forestry range management investigations—our committee made provision in connection with the bill as it passed the House for appropriation of \$480,000 in excess of the Budget estimate in order to provide for the establishment of 12 additional experimental forest stations throughout the United States.

In connection with the appropriations for the Madison laboratory to which the gentleman's inquiry relates, the committee has always endeavored to deal very liberally with the Madison laboratory,

recognizing the importance of its work, and has made provision in the bill as it passed the House for, as I recall, the amount that the Budget estimated was necessary to meet the reasonable needs of that laboratory. We realize the enthusiasm of many of our friends in the House with regard to these types of experimentations, but we feel that under the present financial conditions of the Government, when we have exceeded the Budget estimates by approximately \$490,000 in an effort to deal effectively with these problems which are not local to the area in which the gentleman is primarily interested, but which are general throughout the United States, we have been very liberal in connection with that subject matter. I now yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I would like to ask the gentleman a question concerning amendment No. 62. I notice the Senate increased the appropriation for the expenses of the Rural Electrification Administration, and also struck out those limitations that the House bill contained about which some of us complained when the measure was up before. As I understand it, your motion will be to concur in the Senate amendment?

Mr. TARVER. No. The conference report includes the proposed action with reference to amendments 62 and 63, and in connection with both of them the conferees on the part of the House have agreed to recommend that the House shall recede.

Mr. RANKIN. That is what I mean. I should have said amendments 62 and 63. These Senate amendments are very beneficial to rural electrification. Especially is that true as to amendment 63.

Mr. TARVER. No separate motion will be offered with reference to those amendments. The action with regard to them is recommended in the conference report.

Mr. RANKIN. But it means to recede and concur in these two Senate amendments?

Mr. TARVER. Exactly.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. The question of the school lunch is a little confusing. Do I understand the conferees have adopted the principle of the school lunch, but fixed no definite amount?

Mr. TARVER. No. The House and Senate, in the passage of the National School-Lunch Act, authorized appropriations without limit for the national school-lunch program. The pending conference report provides for \$75,000,000 for the next fiscal year for the purpose of carrying on that program.

Mr. DONDERO. Then, after that, what is the amount provided?

Mr. TARVER. Amounts which may be decided upon by the Congress from year to year as the needs of the program are reviewed.

Mr. DONDERO. That is just for 1 year?

Mr. TARVER. This is just for the fiscal year 1947.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Recurring to amendment No. 37 dealing with forest products, just how much are you giving the laboratory at Madison, Wis.? That is amendment No. 37.

Mr. TARVER. The Senate has receded from its amendment increasing from \$1,385,000 to \$1,635,000, except as to \$10,000, the sum involved in this paragraph of the amount involved in the Senate amendment, which it is provided shall be expended for research in the utilization of waste woods.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the conference report submitted today carries one of the best balanced agricultural programs ever brought before the House. Much of the credit, if not most of the credit, for its presentation in its present form is due to the work and wisdom of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, chairman of the subcommittee.

Judge TARVER is perhaps better informed on agricultural matters, and agricultural legislation in particular, than any other Member of the body. His practical knowledge of farm matters and his long experience in agricultural appropriations particularly fit him for this work. As a result his suggestions have been so largely followed in the drafting of the bill and his recommendations have been so generally accepted on the conference report that so far as I know there is no disposition to oppose or criticize either the report or the amendments returned for action by the House.

During Judge TARVER's long and eminent service in the House he has made invaluable contributions to the welfare of the country in many respects and in many widely diversified fields. But throughout his membership here—a period covering something like two decades—he has rendered increasingly valuable service to agriculture, particularly in his chairmanship of the committee in charge of agricultural appropriations.



As chairman of the body in control of the purse strings he has been in a position to help the farmer more directly and more effectively than any number of Members of Congress lacking this exceptional advantage, however earnest their interest and intentions. In providing for parity prices, in formulating commodity-credit policies, in supporting REA, in providing funds for farm security and soil conservation and in numberless other ways he has aided in maintaining farm prices and farm prosperity and to that extent assisted American agriculture in its indispensable contribution toward the winning of the war.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I wish to join the gentleman from Missouri in what he says about the service of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], on this particular bill. As far as the farmers are concerned, it provides funds for rural electrification for the coming year. By his agreeing to the Senate amendments to take out those limiting provisions that would have hampered the building of rural lines, he has added a great deal to the rural electrification program for the coming year, for which he deserves the commendation of every farmer in America.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No one is better qualified to testify to on that subject than the gentleman from Mississippi who has consistently led the fight for many years on behalf of rural electrification.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I appreciate very much the compliment the gentleman paid to my colleague, Mr. TARVER. For many years I have watched the career of the gentleman from Georgia. He has always undertaken to obtain equality for the farmers in common with every other group. I know of no man who has done more for the farmers of this country than the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. He has not only rendered this great service to American agriculture but he has done it at a minimum cost to the country. While he has provided for every legitimate need, he has exercised commendable economy in every bill he has reported.

If I were permitted to criticize the gentleman from Georgia, my only criticism would be that while he has served agriculture generally he has perhaps been a little too solicitous of the cotton industry. He has been always deeply interested in maintaining the price of cotton and in providing for research and other services to the cotton farmers which I sometimes thought went just a little bit beyond what was done for other branches of our agricultural economy, but notwithstanding that I must concede that his general service to agriculture as a whole has more than mitigated his

perhaps pardonable partiality in that one respect.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has stated that he thought possibly the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] had been a little too zealous in behalf of the cotton industry. Coming from a cotton district, the only part of Missouri which grows cotton, we do appreciate the splendid service the gentleman from Georgia has rendered the cotton growers of our State. I wish to say, however, that I believe a fair evaluation of the services of the gentleman from Georgia on this committee will show that he has been a strong supporter of all branches of agriculture, as well as cotton, and I think it hardly fair to say that he has been partial toward cotton because I think he has really been zealous for all branches of agriculture.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Coming as he does from the congressional district producing more cotton per acre than any other unirrigated district in the United States, the gentleman from Missouri is qualified to speak on the subject and I accept his opinion.

I count it a privilege to have served on the committee and subcommittee with the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER. Few men have attained the stature and achieved the position he holds in the House and in the hearts of his associates. It has been given to few men to serve so notably and so efficiently his constituents and his country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I note with regret that the conference committee has failed to include in this bill the amount recommended by the Senate for further investigations and research on the extraction and processing of guayule rubber. In spite of repeated warnings from Members of Congress and the Interagency Policy Committee on Rubber the Senate conferees receded from their position and the guayule liquidation program will proceed.

To me this is a tragically short-sighted attitude for the Congress to adopt. It may seriously affect our national security in the future and it will definitely restrict our ability to develop a method of producing raw natural rubber in the United States.

In order to emphasize the position of the administrative agencies on this important subject I wish to include the following letter from W. L. Batt, chair-

man, Interagency Policy Committee on Rubber:

OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION  
AND RECONVERSION,  
Washington, D. C., June 3, 1946.  
The Honorable JACK Z. ANDERSON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: As chairman of the Interagency Policy Committee on Rubber, I have been instructed to take whatever action that seems wise and necessary to implement a recommendation of that committee dealing with continuing research and development of natural rubber within this country.

In order to carry out the recommendations of the Interagency Committee, John Snyder, Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, requested the Department of Agriculture to prepare certain amendments to the agriculture appropriations bill for the fiscal year 1947. These amendments have the approval of the Bureau of the Budget and were transmitted by the President to the Congress. Recently, I appeared before the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. The Senate Committee on Appropriations included them in reporting the agriculture appropriations bill and the Senate has acted favorably.

So that you may have a résumé of the situation, I am enclosing a copy of the formal statement submitted to the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. This statement includes several exhibits. Exhibit A is an excerpt from the first report of the Interagency Policy Committee on Rubber. Exhibits B, C, and D are copies of the Interagency Committee's letter to Mr. Snyder, Mr. Snyder's letter of agreement and the action taken. Also as exhibit E, I am including a copy of a letter dated March 18, 1946, in which the views of the Interagency Committee were set forth to the members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

The Interagency Policy Committee on Rubber hopes sincerely that the House of Representatives will concur with the sections of the agriculture appropriations bill dealing with natural rubber research and extracting processes as passed by the Senate. I am at the call of the House conferees, should they be appointed and desire additional information.

Sincerely yours,

W. L. BATT,  
Chairman, Interagency Policy Committee  
on Rubber.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my word of commendation for the gentleman from Georgia, we all like him, but I would like to ask the gentleman and the Congress that when you stop paying the farmers subsidies in a short time because of the Treasury being broke, what is the farmer going to do? Why do you not go out and increase the price of the farmers' commodities and let the consumer pay the farmer the price he ought to have for his work and his commodities. That will get the country on its feet and stop raiding the Treasury. That is the thing I would like to ask Members on that side of the House at this particular time. Put some business into the operation of the Government and do it quick before it is too late.

Mr. TARVER. No subsidies for farmers are carried in this bill. The gentle-

man knows my position with regard to the subject matter of subsidies. I may say to the gentleman frankly that it is somewhat in accord with his own views, but when he takes the position that payments to preserve the soil of this country, our greatest national resource, from erosion and to restore fertility are subsidies to the American farmers, the gentleman is incorrect in his viewpoint.

Mr. RICH. I am not talking about that. I am talking about the wheat farmer, the cotton farmer, the dairy farmer, and other farmers being paid subsidies, the thing that will eventually break the farmer and wreck the Treasury.

Mr. TARVER. There are no subsidies for farmers contained in this bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, reference has been made to the long and distinguished record in Congress of my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER.

Certainly no Member of the Congress is more entitled to receive, or more greatly deserves, public recognition and commendation for faithful service, devotion to duty, and untiring efforts in behalf of his country, his State, and the people of his home district.

Georgia is a great agricultural State and I feel greatly indebted to the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, for the interest he has always shown in the welfare of the farmers and in the protection of their interests. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, which handles all appropriations for agriculture, he has never failed to fight the cause of those who produce the food and fiber to feed and clothe the Nation. He has actively supported the rural-electrification program, the tenant-purchase program, the soil-conservation and soil-building program, an expanded research program, and has fought day in and day out to secure fair prices and equality of treatment for the farmers.

The entire State of Georgia takes pride in the work of the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER and understands what a great asset it is to our State to have him in this important and responsible position as chairman of this subcommittee. It is a great honor and service to our State.

Mr. TARVER. 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. 43: On page 45, line 5, insert "*Provided further*, That in obligating or expending funds herein contained for 'Forest roads and trails' the provisions of Revised Statute, 355, as amended, shall not be applicable to easements or rights-of-way for forest roads and trails constructed under the provision of this section, where the cost of any such easement or right-of-way acquired under a single instrument of conveyance and the estimated cost of the improvements to be constructed thereon does not exceed \$40,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments Nos. 52, 54, and 55, all relating to the agricultural wage-stabilization program, be considered en bloc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 52: Strike out "\$2,394,764" and insert "\$2,434,764."

Senate amendment No. 54: Page 59, line 13, strike out "\$1,901,500" and insert "\$2,251,500, of which not to exceed \$350,000 may be expended for the wage stabilization program conducted during the fiscal year 1946 under the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses, War Food Administration', and, in the absence of other governing statute, the provisions of law applicable to such program during the fiscal year 1946 are continued during the fiscal year 1947."

Senate amendment No. 55: Page 60, line 5, after the word "orders" insert "*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for agricultural wage stabilization with respect to any commodity unless a majority of the producers of such commodity within the area affected participating in a referendum or meeting held for that purpose request the intervention of the Secretary."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments numbered 52, 54, and 55.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 66: Page 76, line 14, strike out all of section 5 and insert the following:

"Sec. 5. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an

organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That such administrative or supervisory employees of the Department as may be designated for the purpose by the Secretary are hereby authorized to administer the oaths to persons making affidavits required by this section, and they shall charge no fee for so doing: *Provided further*, That any person who is a member of an organization that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person employed for less than 60 days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or destruction of property, and payment of salary or wages may be made to such persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by this section."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate amendment No. 66 and concur in the same with an amendment as follows:

"Sec. 5. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That such administrative or supervisory employees of the Department as may be designated for the purpose by the Secretary are hereby authorized to administer the oaths to persons making affidavits required by this section, and they shall charge no fee for so doing: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction shall

be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person employed for less than 60 days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or destruction of property, and payment of salary or wages may be made to such persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by this section."

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 79, line 9, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 6. Section 14 (a) of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1946 shall not apply to employment of personnel required to do the work authorized by those appropriations for which increased funds are provided by this act."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67 and concur in the same with an amendment, as follows:

"SEC. 6. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to alter, or modify in any manner whatsoever, the aggregate maximum personnel ceilings established by section 14 (a) of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1946 (Public Law No. 390) nor to authorize the compensation of a greater aggregate number than the number provided for in the aforesaid act. In the case of any activity whose personnel may be increased in consequence of appropriations contained in this act, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall recommend and effectuate such reduction in personnel in such governmental agencies as he may deem advisable as will offset any increase in personnel for which provision is made in this act."

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 79, line 13, strike out "6" and insert "7."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House 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.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with the remarks I made today upon the conference report I may be permitted to insert a table showing appropriations, reappropriations and loan authorizations carried in the bill as it passed the House, as it passed the Senate, and as it has been finally agreed to in the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one

of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On May 21, 1946:

H. R. 5059. An act to provide additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the postal service; and

H. R. 1457. An act for the relief of Josephine Benham.

On May 22, 1946:

H. R. 4761. An act to expedite the availability of housing for veterans of World War II by expediting the production and allocation of materials for housing purposes and by curbing excessive pricing of new housing, and for other purposes.

On May 27, 1946:

H. R. 5604. An act reducing or further reducing certain appropriations and contractual authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes.

On May 28, 1946:

H. R. 4763. An act for the relief of R. L. Benton.

On May 29, 1946:

H. J. Res. 273. Joint resolution to provide for the proper observance of the one hundred and fifty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights; and

H. J. Res. 353. Joint resolution extending the time for the release of powers of appointment for the purposes of certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

On June 3, 1946:

H. R. 5504. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

On June 4, 1946:

H. R. 3370. An act to provide assistance to the States in the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of school-lunch programs, and for other purposes.

On June 8, 1946:

H. R. 1072. An act for the relief of Henry R. Butler;

H. R. 3228. An act for the relief of Sam Dishong;

H. R. 4141. An act for the relief of Piombo Bros. & Co.;

H. R. 4174. An act for the relief of Mayer G. Hansen;

H. R. 4270. An act for the relief of Southern California Edison Co., Ltd.;

H. R. 4298. An act for the relief of Severo Apoluna Dinson and Candilaria Dinson, and the legal guardian of Laura Dinson, and the legal guardian of Teresita Dinson;

H. R. 4418. An act for the relief of the city of San Diego, Tex.;

H. R. 4757. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gussie Feldman;

H. R. 4885. An act for the relief of Ernst V. Brender;

H. R. 5307. An act for the relief of Ben V. King;

H. R. 6010. An act for the relief of the Yakutat Cooperative Market; and

H. R. 6011. An act for the relief of Dr. Harry Burstein, Madeline Borvick, and Mrs. Clara Kaufman Truly (formerly Miss Clara M. Kaufman).

On June 10, 1946:

H. R. 216. An act for the relief of John Seferian and Laura Seferian;

H. R. 781. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Douglas Charles McRae, a minor;

H. R. 1238. An act for the relief of Father Peter B. Duffee;

H. R. 2188. An act for the relief of George W. Bailey;

H. R. 2223. An act for the relief of Catherine Bode;

H. R. 2242. An act for the relief of Mrs. Leslie L. Bryant and Miss Jimmie Alexander;

H. R. 2246. An act for the relief of the estate of Michael O. Mello, and Christian O. Mello;

H. R. 2248. An act for the relief of Joseph E. Alarie;

H. R. 2926. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alice Breen;

H. R. 2973. An act for the relief of Ben Thomas Haynes, a minor;

H. R. 3270. An act for the relief of James B. McCarty;

H. R. 3340. An act for the relief of Mrs. Merla Koperski;

H. R. 3599. An act for the relief of Ama L. Normand and the estate of Curtis Joseph Gaspard, deceased;

H. R. 3618. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vannas H. Hicks;

H. R. 4172. An act for the relief of Carlton G. Jerry;

H. R. 4300. An act for the relief of the county of Hawaii, T. H.;

H. R. 4301. An act for the relief of Philip Naope Kailli and Susie Kailli;

H. R. 4750. An act for the relief of C. C. Vest;

H. R. 4800. An act for the relief of Harry Fleishman;

H. R. 4833. An act for the relief of the estate of Robert Lee Blackmon;

H. R. 4836. An act for the relief of Louis M. Drolet;

H. R. 4905. An act for the relief of Nina E. Schmidt;

H. R. 5049. An act for the relief of the estate of Obaldino Francis Dias;

H. R. 5525. An act for the relief of Sylvia Wagner; and

H. R. 6245. An act for the relief of Mary G. Paul.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

#### [Roll No. 153]

Andrews, N. Y.	Granger	Ploeser
Baldwin, Md.	Grant, Ind.	Reece, Tenn.
Barrett, Pa.	Hagen	Richards
Brumbaugh	Harris	Robinson, Utah
Cannon, Fla.	Horan	Roe, N. Y.
Carlson	Jensen	Sheppard
Cochran	Johnson, Ind.	Stewart
Colmer	Johnson,	Stigler
Courtney	Luther A.	Tolan
Crawford	Ludlow	Vursell
Curley	McGehee	Welch
Durham	McGregor	White
Ellsworth	Morrison	Winstead
Fenton	Norton	Wolfenden, Pa.
Folger	O'Hara	Woodruff
Gearhart	O'Konski	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 385 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### APPOINTMENT OF FACT-FINDING BOARDS TO INVESTIGATE LABOR DISPUTES—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, H. R. 4908, entitled "An act to provide additional facilities for the me-

diation of labor disputes, and for other purposes."

The outstanding domestic problem confronting this country today is the maintenance and increase of production. We must have production, or the effects of ruinous inflation will be felt by every one of our citizens. Strikes and lock-outs are the greatest handicaps to attaining vital production.

Inasmuch as the solution of our present-day labor problems constitutes the key to production, this present bill must be judged in the light of whether it will assist in reducing labor strife in the Nation.

I have given careful study to the bill. I have not considered it from the standpoint of whether it favors or harms labor, or whether it favors or harms management. I have considered it from the standpoint of whether or not it benefits the public, which includes both management and labor.

In the determination of the question of whether or not the great majority of our citizens will be benefited by this bill, the question presented is whether it will help to stop strikes and work stoppages and prevent other practices which adversely affect our economy.

I have reached the conclusion that it will not.

I have tried, as representative of all the people of our Nation, to approach this problem objectively, free from the emotional strains of the times, and free from every consideration except the welfare of our Nation and of the world which is so dependent upon our recovery to a full peacetime economy.

This bill was undoubtedly passed by the members of the Congress in the sincere belief that it would remedy certain existing conditions which cause labor strife and produce domestic turmoil. I cannot agree with the Congress with reference to the results that would be achieved by it.

I trust that there will be no confusion in the minds of the members of the Congress or in the minds of the public between this bill and my request on May 25 for emergency legislation.

At that time I requested temporary legislation to be effective only for a period of 6 months after the termination of hostilities, and applicable only to those few industries which had been taken over by the Government and in which the President by proclamation declared that an emergency had arisen which affected the entire economy of the country.

It was limited to strikes against the Government. It did not apply to strikes against private employers.

Such emergency legislation is now before the Congress, and I again make the request that it be passed.

H. R. 4908 is utterly different from my proposal of May 25, in kind and in degree. Its range is broad, dealing with a wide variety of subjects some of which are wholly unrelated to the subject of settling or preventing strikes. It covers strikes against private employers. It is permanent legislation, operative even after the reconversion period is entirely over. And it applies not to a few selected and vital industries, but to every dispute,

no matter how insignificant, if the dispute affects interstate commerce.

At the same time, May 25, I also requested permanent legislation leading to the formulation of a long-range labor policy designed to prevent the recurrence of such crises, and generally to reduce work stoppages in all industries. I further recommended the immediate creation by the Congress of a joint committee to study the entire question and, within 6 months, to bring in its recommendations for appropriate legislation. I again renew the recommendation that a joint committee be appointed to make a study of the whole subject of labor relations, and to suggest permanent long-range legislation.

The fact that we are faced with an emergency which does justify the passage of temporary emergency legislation does not, in my opinion, justify us in the adoption of permanent legislation without the study that such permanent legislation needs. The bill is actually a collection of separate unrelated measures and is not an over-all solution of this most important problem. We must not make a false start. We must not approach the problem on a piecemeal basis as this bill does.

It is suggested that the bill merely constitutes a beginning, that it should be placed upon our statute books, and that we can then proceed with the study of additional legislation. I cannot agree with this thesis. This bill is not a permanent solution of our difficulties; and if it should become law, I fear that it may possibly result in being the only permanent legislation we would obtain.

We are not faced with a decision of choosing between this legislation and no legislation at all. It is more properly a choice between this particular bill and a more adequate and more inclusive solution of the problem.

The proposed measure, although described as a mediation law, is divided into two unrelated parts. The first six sections contain provisions relative to the mediation of labor disputes, postponement of strikes, and fact-finding. The remaining sections consist of provisions relative to robbery, extortion, unauthorized welfare funds, prohibitions against the organization of supervisory employees, union liability in the courts, and provisions establishing criminal sanctions, injunctive remedies and suits for treble damages against unions engaging in secondary boycotts, jurisdictional disputes, and certain other activities. These are a few of the many complex problems which must be studied with infinite care before the proper solutions are found and incorporated into permanent legislation.

One of the factors to be considered in judging this bill is whether or not it would have prevented, or shortened, the strikes which have so seriously damaged our economy these last few months. Judged solely from this standpoint, I am sure a fair-minded man would have to admit that it would have failed completely.

In 1943, in the heat of a controversy over a stoppage of war production in the coal mines, the Congress passed the War

Labor Disputes Act, more commonly known as the Smith-Connally Act. In his veto message of June 25, 1943, President Roosevelt warned the Congress that the strike-vote provisions of section 8 of the Smith-Connally Act would not lessen but would promote industrial strife. That prediction was fully borne out by subsequent events. It is my belief that a similar result would follow the approval of this bill.

If a joint committee to investigate this entire subject were appointed immediately and if the subject were given the priority to which it is entitled, a report covering the entire field could be submitted to the Congress within this calendar year.

I have analyzed the bill carefully and herewith submit my comments on the various sections:

Section 1: Declares that the objectives of the act are to encourage settlement of disputes between labor and management by collective bargaining and by conciliation, mediation, and voluntary arbitration, thereby minimizing industrial strife, strikes, and lock-outs.

Upon careful consideration, I have come to the conclusion that the bill will not achieve this high and unquestionably desirable objective. On the contrary, much of the bill is not only wholly foreign to the achievement of that objective, but, in my judgment, would actually defeat it.

Section 2: Defines certain key terms used in the bill.

Section 3: Provides that employers and employees in industries affecting commerce shall: exert reasonable efforts to make and maintain, collective bargaining agreements; give adequate notice of proposed changes; provide for the final adjustment of grievances or questions regarding the interpretation of agreements; arrange promptly for conferences with respect to labor disputes and cooperate with the new Federal Mediation Board in attempting to settle disputes amicably. The Mediation Board may proffer its services for the purpose of aiding in the settlement of a labor dispute affecting commerce.

If Federal mediation is proffered, lock-outs and strikes affecting commerce are unlawful until mediation is concluded or until 60 days after a written request has been made by one of the parties for a conference, whichever is earlier. An employer who changes the status quo by lock-out or other action is deemed to have engaged in an unfair labor practice within the meaning of the National Labor Relations Act. An employee who disturbs the status quo during this period, by striking or by engaging in a concerted slow-down of production, loses his status as an employee for the purposes of the National Labor Relations Act, unless he is reemployed.

Although section 3 is ostensibly designed to insure that the parties will attempt to reach a peaceful settlement, making a strike unnecessary, I feel that it would, in practice, tend to increase the number of strikes. I think it would lead to the development of methods to avoid the operation of this section. The bill provides that the right to strike is postponed only if the Federal Mediation

Board proffers its mediation services before the strike starts. I foresee that some unions might choose to strike before the Mediation Board has had an opportunity to determine whether it should enter into a certain case—an action not prohibited in the proposed statute. Although the purpose of the provision is to eliminate the so-called "quickie" strike, its effect might be to encourage unions to resort to such strikes.

If an employer violates the prohibitions of this section, he is merely guilty of an unfair labor practice. He may only be ordered by the National Labor Relations Board to cease and desist and to pay any back pay due. An employee, on the other hand, may suffer a far greater penalty. By section 3 (d), he loses his very status as an employee. That means that the employer, without offering any further reason, may refuse to reinstate him. The penalties are inequitable. An employer guilty of a violation can only be ordered (long after the event) to stop his violation and to restore the status quo. The employee, however, loses his basic industrial rights and perhaps even his means of livelihood. I fear that the provisions of section 3 (d) might well result in some employers provoking strikes in order to give them the opportunity to discharge the employee leaders.

To avoid the consequences of section 3, and to legalize a strike under the bill, a union need only give early notice of a request for a conference to start the running of the 60-day period during which strikes are forbidden. The result probably would be a great rush of premature notices for conferences. Sixty days thereafter, employees would feel free to strike—with the sanction of the Congress. So, too, there would be premature demands for mediation, long before the possibilities of direct negotiations between the parties had been exhausted.

No standard whatever—except only that the dispute should affect commerce—is provided for determining whether the Federal Mediation Board should proffer its services, although a strike can become illegal only if it occurs after such offer. It is apparently left to the Board's discretion. This places a heavy burden and extraordinary responsibility upon Federal mediation. Because of the serious consequences arising from the proffering of mediation services—namely, the outlawing of a strike—mediation is likely to be discouraged and withheld in many cases where it might prove most useful. It is highly undesirable for the mere fact of mediation to operate so repressively upon one of the parties. Mediation should be welcomed by both parties to be effective. This provision would have just the contrary effect.

And, under section 3, even if mediation is proffered, and the 60-day period expires without results, nothing happens. No facts are publicly found; no recommendations are made; no report is issued. No matter how important the dispute—whether in the steel, the automotive, or the shipping industry, so long as it is not a public utility—at the end of the 60 days, there is the anticlimax of nothing.

Not one of the major disputes which have caused such great public concern during the past months would have been affected in any way by this bill had it been law at the time.

The railroad strike would not have been covered by the bill at all. And the coal, steel, and automotive strikes were certainly not caused by an insufficient lapse of time between the unions' request for conferences and the calling of a strike. Each of these strikes would have had the full sanction of the bill.

Thus the very difficulties which this bill was presumably drafted to meet have been left untouched by it. These sections fail to provide a satisfactory method of coping with the labor-management disputes which confront the Nation.

Section 4: This creates a new five-man Federal Mediation Board. All mediation and conciliation functions of the Secretary of Labor and the United States Conciliation Service are transferred to the Board. The Board, although technically within the Department of Labor, would not be under the control of the Secretary of Labor.

I consider the establishment of this new agency to be inconsistent with the principles of good administration. As I have previously stated, it is my opinion that Government today demands reorganization along the lines which the Congress has set forth in the Reorganization Act of 1945, that is, the organization of Government activity into the fewest number of Government agencies consistent with efficiency. Control of purely administrative matters should be grouped as much as possible under members of the Cabinet, who are in turn responsible to the President.

The proposed Federal Mediation Board would have no quasi judicial or quasi legislative functions. It would be purely an administrative agency. Surely, functions of this kind should be concentrated in the Department of Labor.

Since 1913 there has been within the Department of Labor and responsible to the Secretary of Labor a United States Conciliation Service formed with the very purpose of encouraging the settlement of labor disputes through mediation, conciliation, and other good offices. The record of that service has been outstanding. During the period of 1 year from May 1945, through April 1946, it settled under existing law 19,930 labor disputes. Included in this total were 3,152 strikes, almost 10 each day. The Conciliation Service has formed one of the principal divisions of the Department of Labor.

The bill proposes to transfer that service and its functions to the newly formed Federal Mediation Board. To me this is the equivalent of creating a separate and duplicate Department of Labor, depriving the Secretary of Labor of many of his principal responsibilities and placing the conciliation and mediation functions in an independent body.

In the eyes of Congress and of the public the President and the Secretary of Labor would remain responsible for the exercise of mediation and conciliation functions in labor disputes, while, in fact, those functions would be conducted

by another body not fully responsible to either.

As far back as September 6, 1945, I said in a message to Congress:

Meanwhile plans for strengthening the Department of Labor and bringing under it functions belonging to it are going forward.

The establishment of the proposed Federal Mediation Board is a backward step.

Section 5: Provides that it is the duty of the Mediation Board to prevent or minimize interruption of commerce growing out of labor disputes. The Board may proffer its services upon its own motion or upon the request of one or more of the parties to the dispute. Where mediation does not succeed, the Board is required to recommend voluntary arbitration.

Section 6: Provides that where a labor dispute threatens a substantial interruption of an essential public-utility service, the Board, in the public interest, may request the President to create an Emergency Commission, and the President is authorized to appoint such Commission. The Commission investigates and reports within 30 days, after which the President must make the report public. The cooling-off period is extended for a maximum period of 95 days, with an additional 30 days upon the approval of the parties.

Much of the discussion with reference to section 3 is applicable here. It is difficult to understand why the Congress has applied the fact-finding principle to public utilities but has omitted it entirely in other industries of equal importance.

The remaining sections of the bill have nothing whatever to do with the expressed objectives of the bill.

Section 7: Reenacts in amended form the so-called Antiracketeering Act. On its face, this section does no more than prohibit all persons, whether union representatives or employees or others, from interfering with interstate commerce by robbery and extortion.

I am in full accord with the objectives which the Congress here had in mind.

However, it has already been suggested that some question may arise from the fact that section 7 omits from the original act the provision that it was not to be construed so as to "impair, diminish, or in any manner affect the rights of bona fide labor organizations in lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof."

It should be made clear in express terms that section 7 does not make it a felony to strike and picket peacefully, and to take other legitimate and peaceful concerted action.

Section 8: Provides that it is a crime for an employer to contribute to a welfare fund to be administered solely by an employee representative. It is also a crime for the employee representative to receive the contribution. Welfare funds established by employee representatives are to be restricted to certain specific uses. The prohibitions of the section are made enforceable by injunc-

tions. Certain routine exemptions to the operation of the section are made.

Welfare funds supported by employers and administered by unions are no novelty. I believe it is inadvisable to remove such a question as this from the scope of collective bargaining between employer and employee. This section does more than require that there be joint control of such funds. It specifically limits the uses to which the moneys deposited in such funds may be put.

This whole subject needs long and careful study. To write into the permanent law the program for workers' welfare funds without a study by any committee of the Congress is, in my opinion, at least improvident. This particular provision was prepared and presented because of one of the items of controversy in the recent coal strike. I feel that this is altogether too important and too complicated a question to be disposed of hastily.

Section 9: This provision deprives supervisory employees of their status as employees for the purposes of the National Labor Relations Act.

This section would strip from supervisory employees the rights of self-organization and collective bargaining now guaranteed them under the National Labor Relations Act. I fear that this section would increase labor strife, since I have no doubt that supervisory employees would resort to self-help to gain the rights now given to them by law.

This complex question has long been under consideration by the National Labor Relations Board. The Board and the courts have pointed out that supervisory employees have a dual capacity. In dealing with the employees under them, they act for management. However, with respect to their own wages, hours of work, and other terms and conditions of employment, they act for themselves. The full right of supervisory employees to the benefits of collective bargaining is one that cannot be lightly thrown aside.

On the other hand, management is entitled to proper protection. Somewhere in the area of disagreement between the parties the line can be drawn with reasonable accuracy. There has been no attempt to draw that line in this section.

Section 10 provides that suits for violation of collective bargaining contracts affecting commerce may be brought in the Federal courts; labor organizations are deemed to be bound by the acts of duly authorized agents acting within the scope of their authority and may sue or be sued as a separate entity; money judgments against a labor organization are made enforceable but only against assets of the union; any employee who strikes or otherwise interferes with the performance of a collective bargaining contract in violation of the contract without approval of the labor organization party to the contract loses his status as an employee for the purposes of the National Labor Relations Act unless he is reemployed.

I am in accord with the principle that it is fair and right to hold a labor union responsible for a violation of its contract. However, this legislation goes much far-

ther than that. This section, taken in conjunction with the next section, largely repeals the Norris-LaGuardia Act and changes a long-established congressional policy.

I am sure that, without repealing the Norris-LaGuardia Act, changing this long-established congressional policy, or imperiling the principles of the National Labor Relations Act, a sound and effective means of enforcing labor's responsibility can be found.

Section 11: This provision subjects various union activities to the antitrust laws with all their criminal sanctions, injunctive remedies, and provisions for treble damages. Although the section is entitled "Secondary boycotts," the scope of the section in fact extends far beyond such matters. While its enactment would provide remedies that might result in the elimination of certain evils, such as improper application of the secondary boycott, it would also make those remedies available against recognized legitimate activities of organized labor.

That there are some abuses in this field, no one can gainsay. I deplore the strike or boycott arising out of a jurisdictional dispute as one of the most serious of such abuses. A way must be found to prevent the jurisdictional strike. It cannot be justified under any circumstances. I am convinced, however, that the antitrust laws, the objectives of which are the elimination of unfair business practices and the protection of free competition, are not designed to solve the abuses pointed out in this section.

In this regard, however, I do not need to emphasize the necessity of applying the antitrust laws to combinations between employers and labor designed to restrain competition.

Section 11 (c) rescinds the Norris-LaGuardia Act with respect to antitrust actions against labor organizations. The labor injunction is a weapon to which no private employer should be entitled except within the careful restrictions laid down by that act. We should not invite the return to the practice of issuing injunctions without notice or hearing and a revival of the other abuses that tended to discredit our courts and give rise to the widespread popular denunciation of "government by injunction."

Injunctions requested by the Government itself, and designed to restrain strikes against the Government in cases where refusal to work for the Government has produced a condition of national emergency, are, to my mind, an essential element of government authority. This authority, however, should not be available to private employers under the vast variety of conditions contemplated by section 11 of this present bill.

Sections 12 to 14: These sections include provisions with respect to making copies of collective-bargaining agreements available to the public and with respect to furnishing available data which may aid in the settlement of labor disputes. They are unobjectionable.

The passage of H. R. 4908 confirms the need for a careful study of labor-management problems with a view toward long-range remedies. It demonstrates

the dangers of attempting to draft permanent labor legislation without painstaking and exhaustive consideration.

H. R. 4908 strikes at symptoms and ignores underlying causes. As I have noted, not a single one of the recent major strikes would have been affected by this bill had it been law.

As I said to the Congress on May 25, we should immediately have temporary legislation, dealing with the urgencies of the present, so that strikes against the Government which vitally affect the public welfare can be halted. This is necessary in the midst of the extraordinary pressures of reconversion and inflation. I have asked the Congress for such legislation. The precise form which such emergency legislation is to take is, of course, for the Congress to decide. But if the form adopted is inadequate, the responsibility must also rest with the Congress.

It must be remembered that industrial strife is a symptom of basic economic maladjustments. We cannot attribute work stoppages to any one factor. As we move from war to peace, severe strains are placed upon our economic system. Labor and management alike are seeking security. The combination of rising prices, scarcity of commodities, lowered standards of living, and altered tax programs today creates fears which are present at the conference table to disturb the orderly process of collective bargaining.

A solution of labor-management difficulties therefore is to be found not alone in well-considered legislation dealing directly with industrial relations, but also in a comprehensive legislative program designed to remove some of the causes of the insecurity felt by many workers and employers.

During the past 10 months I have urged the Congress to enact such a program. Among the proposals which I have recommended are adequate insurance against unemployment, health, and medical services for families of low and moderate income at costs they can afford; a fair minimum wage, and the continuance of the price control and stabilization laws in effective form. These measures would remove some of the major causes of insecurity and would greatly aid in achieving industrial peace.

Our problem in shaping permanent legislation in this field is to probe for the causes of lock-outs, strikes, and industrial disturbances. Then, to the extent possible, we must eliminate these causes. Strikes against private employers cannot be ended by legislative decree. Men cannot be forced in a peacetime democracy to work for a private employer under compulsion. Therefore, strikes must be considered in the whole context of our modern industrial society. They must be considered in the light of inflationary pressures, of problems of full employment, of economic security.

Legislation governing industrial relations is workable only when carefully considered against this broad background. I am confident that with painstaking and dispassionate study which will probe fairly and deeply, Congress can evolve equitable legislation which

promises an era of peaceful industrial relations.

We accomplish nothing by striking at labor here and at management there. Affirmative policy is called for, and a congressional committee such as I have suggested is the best means of formulating it.

There should be no emphasis placed upon considerations of whether a bill is antilabor or prolabor. Where excesses have developed on the part of labor leaders or management, such excesses should be corrected—not in order to injure either party—but to bring about as great an equality as possible between the bargaining positions of labor and management. Neither should be permitted to become too powerful as against the public interest as a whole.

Equality for both and vigilance for the public welfare—these should be the watchwords of future legislation.

The bill which I am returning to you does not meet these standards.

Many procedures have been suggested from time to time by students of the problem. They should all be considered. A comprehensive study of this problem should be based on a realization that labor is now rapidly "coming of age" and that it should take its place before the bar of public opinion on an equality with management.

It is always with reluctance that I return a bill to the Congress without my approval. I feel, however, that I would not be properly discharging the duties of my office if I were to approve H. R. 4908.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 11, 1946.

\*The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the membership has a duty to discharge. Further debate would not aid that decision. I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 255, nays 135, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 154]		
YEAS—255		
Abernethy	Boren	Cole, Kans.
Adams	Boykin	Cole, Mo.
Allen, Ill.	Bradley, Mich.	Cole, N. Y.
Allen, La.	Brehm	Cooper
Almond	Brooks	Corbett
Andersen,	Brown, Ga.	Cox
H. Carl	Brown, Ohio	Cravens
Anderson, Calif.	Bryson	Cunningham
Andresen,	Buck	Curtis
August H.	Buffett	Daughton, Va.
Andrews, Ala.	Bulwinkle	D'Ewart
Arends	Byrnes, Wis.	Dirksen
Arnold	Camp	Dolliver
Auchincloss	Campbell	Domengaoux
Baldwin, Md.	Cannon, Fla.	Dondero
Barden	Case, N. J.	Doughton, N. C.
Barrett, Wyo.	Case, S. Dak.	Drewry
Bates, Mass.	Chapman	Dworshak
Beckworth	Chelf	Earthman
Bender	Chenoweth	Eaton
Bennet, N. Y.	Chiperfield	Elliott
Bennett, Mo.	Church	Ellis
Blackney	Clark	Elsaesser
Bland	Clason	Elston
Bolton	Clevenger	Ervin
Bonner	Clippinger	Fallon

Fellows	Judd
Fernandez	Kean
Fisher	Kearney
Fuller	Keefe
Gamble	Kerr
Gary	Kilburn
Gathings	Kilday
Gavin	Kinzer
Gerlach	Knutson
Gibson	Kunkel
Gifford	Landis
Gillespie	Lanham
Gillette	Larcade
Gillie	Latham
Goodwin	Lea
Gore	LeCompte
Gossett	LeFevre
Graham	McConnell
Grant, Ala.	McCowan
Gregory	McKenzie
Griffiths	McMillan, S. C.
Gross	McMillen, Ill.
Gwinn, N. Y.	Mahon
Gwynne, Iowa	Maloney
Hale	Manasco
Hall,	Mansfield, Tex.
Leonard W.	Martin, Iowa
Halleck	Martin, Mass.
Hancock	Mason
Hand	Mathews
Hare	May
Harness, Ind.	Merrow
Hartley	Michener
Hays	Miller, Nebr.
Hébert	Mills
Hendricks	Monroney
Henry	Mundt
Heret	Murray, Tenn.
Heselton	Murray, Wis.
Hess	Norblad
Hill	Norrell
Hinshaw	Pace
Hobbs	Patman
Hoeven	Peterson, Ga.
Hoffman, Mich.	Phillips
Hoffman, Pa.	Pickett
Holmes, Mass.	Pittenger
Holmes, Wash.	Ploeser
Hope	Plumley
Howell	Page
Jarman	Pratt
Jenkins	Price, Fla.
Jennings	Priest
Jensen	Ramey
Johnson, Calif.	Rankin
Johnson, Ill.	Reed, Ill.
Johnson,	Reed, N. Y.
Lyndon B.	Rees, Kans.
Johnson, Okla.	Rich
Jones	Riley
Jonkman	Rivers

NAYS—135

Angell	Flood
Bailey	Fogarty
Baldwin, N. Y.	Forand
Barrett, Pa.	Fulton
Barry	Gallagher
Bates, Ky.	Gardner
Beall	Geelan
Bell	Gordon
Beimiller	Gorski
Bishop	Granahan
Bloom	Green
Bradley, Pa.	Hall,
Buckley	Edwin Arthur
Bunker	Harless, Ariz.
Butler	Hart
Byrne, N. Y.	Havener
Canfield	Healy
Cannon, Mo.	Hedrick
Carnahan	Heffernan
Celler	Hoch
Clements	Hollifield
Coffee	Hook
Combs	Huber
Cooley	Hull
Crosser	Izac
D'Alesandro	Jackson
Davis	Kee
Dawson	Kefauver
De Lacy	Kelley, Pa.
Delaney,	Kelly, Ill.
James W.	Keogh
Delaney,	King
John J.	Kirwan
Dingell	Klein
Douglas, Calif.	Kopplemann
Douglas, Ill.	LaFollette
Doyle	Lane
Eberharter	Lemke
Engel, Mich.	Lesinski
Engle, Calif.	Link
Feighan	Luce
Flannagan	Lyle

Rizley	Robertson,
Robertson,	N. Dak.
Robertson, Va.	Robson, Ky.
Rockwell	Rodgers, Pa.
Rogers, Fla.	Roe, Md.
Rogers, Mass.	Russell
Sasscer	Schwabe, Mo.
Schwabe, Okla.	Scrivner
Shafer	Sharp
Short	Sikes
Simpson, Ill.	Simpson, Pa.
Slaughter	Smith, Ohio
Smith, Va.	Smith, Wis.
Springer	Stefan
Stevenson	Stockman
Sumner, Ill.	Summers, Tex.
Sundstrom	Taber
Talbot	Talle
Tarver	Taylor
Thomas, N. J.	Thomason
Tibbott	Torrey
Trimble	Trumble
Trin	Trin
Vorsy, Ohio	Vorsy, Ohio
Vursell	Wadsworth
Weaver	Weaver
Weichel	West
Whitton	Whitton
Whittington	Whittington
Wickersham	Wickersham
Wigglesworth	Wilson
Winter	Winter
Wolcott	Wood
Woodruff	Worley
Zimmerman	Zimmerman

Sparkman	Thomas, Tex.
Spence	Torrens
Starkey	Traynor
Sullivan	Voorhis, Calif.
Thom	Walter

Grant, Ind.	O'Konski
Hagen	Peterson, Fla.
Harris	Reece, Tenn.
Horan	Richards
Johnson, Ind.	Robinson, Utah
Johnson,	Roe, N. Y.
Luther A.	Sheppard
Lewis	Stewart
Ludlow	Stigler
McGehee	Tolan
McGregor	Welch
Morrison	White
Norton	Winstead
O'Hara	Wolfenden, Pa.

NOT VOTING—41

So, two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof, the veto of the President was sustained and the bill was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

- Mr. McGregor and Mr. Grant of Indiana override, Mr. Welch sustain.
- Mr. Ellsworth and Mr. Carlson override, Mr. Roe of New York sustain.
- Mr. Colmer and Mr. McGehee override, Mrs. Norton sustain.
- Mr. Stigler and Mr. O'Hara override, Mr. Curley sustain.

Additional general pairs:

- Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Crawford.
- Mr. Courtney with Mr. Andrews of New York.
- Mr. Winstead with Mr. Horan.
- Mr. Folger with Mr. Fenton.
- Mr. Robertson of Utah with Mr. Gearhart.
- Mr. Tolan with Mr. Hagen.
- Mr. Morrison with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.
- Mr. Harris with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
- Mr. Richards with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.
- Mr. Luther A. Johnson with Mr. Lewis.
- Mr. Cochran with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. BREHM changed his vote from "nay" to "aye." The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The message and the bill, together with the accompanying papers, are referred to the Committee on Labor and ordered printed as a public document.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE CEREMONIES, JULY 4, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 360, to provide for United States participation in the Philippine independence ceremonies on July 4, 1946, with Senate amendments and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

- Page 1, line 4, strike out "nine" and insert "not more than fifteen."
- Page 1, line 4, strike out "Three" and insert "Not more than three."
- Page 1, line 6, strike out "three" and insert "not more than six."
- Page 1, line 8, strike out "three" and insert "not more than six."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I caught the reading of the amendments, they merely increase the size of the representation that we will have at the Filipino birthday?

Mr. MCCORMACK. That is correct. As the gentleman will remember, we passed the resolution providing for three and the Senate increased that number to six.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is the only change?

Mr. MCCORMACK. That is the only change.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1947

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6739) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue not to exceed the balance of the afternoon, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] and myself, that debate be confined to the bill, and that at the conclusion of debate the Clerk begin to read the bill for amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6739, with Mr. THOMASON in the chair.

The clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, before proceeding with the discussion of the many provisions in this bill I want to express to my colleagues on the committee who heard and considered the justification for these appropriations my sincere and deep appreciation for their highly valued aid and cooperative assistance in every way. We were fortunate in having the same minority members we had last year; namely Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, Mr. KEEFE of Wisconsin, and Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN of Minnesota. These gentlemen have served on the committee for several years, particularly Mr. ENGEL, and by reason of their interest, experi-

ence and familiarity with the subjects involved it is a pleasure to say they have been of great service to the chairman of the committee in an effort to properly evaluate the services of the different agencies and the justifications supporting them. Of course, I am greatly indebted to Judge TARVER of Georgia, for his highly valued service and assistance. He has been a member of this committee for a number of years. In fact, he has served on this particular committee several years longer than your chairman and the interest manifested and shown by him is deeply appreciated and it is impossible to estimate the increasing value to the committee and to the Congress due to his number of years of service and studious application to the many activities involved and provided for in this bill. He is not only deeply interested in the many activities provided for by the Subcommittee on Agriculture, of which he is chairman, but he has always manifested a deep concern as a member of this subcommittee in the various activities and services being rendered the country by the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency. On the majority side we have two new members of the committee this year, Mr. ROONEY of New York, and Mr. NEELY of West Virginia, and I wish to express to them personally my sincere appreciation of their hearty and sympathetic cooperation and express the hope they may find the work sufficiently interesting as to command their continued cooperation for many years to come.

The bill carries upward of 100 appropriation items and the committee gave 8 weeks to hearing and considering the justifications. There are a number of items that do not have the full and complete endorsement of each member of the committee, but the amounts here recommended reflect the cooperative and combined judgment of the entire membership with possibly two or three exceptions.

An examination of the hearings amounting to approximately 1,400 pages of printed matter will indicate the extent to which the committee endeavored to obtain all the facts supporting the justifications and the exercise of its best judgment in reaching a proper determination of all matters before it for consideration. A reduction in the appropriation for some of the items may seem rather drastic. On the other hand, it may appear that some items could have been reduced to a greater extent, but I think it is fair to say at this time that this is one bill where the committee has been making some rather drastic reductions for a number of years, but I hope they have not been sufficient to reduce the efficiency of any of the activities provided for. I think it is fair to say further that in several instances we have found where pronounced reductions in appropriations have been offset by increased efficiency on the part of those directing the activities. If I recall correctly, the Chairman, Dr. Altmeyer, of the Social Security Board, testified that the personnel of this agency has been reduced from upward of over 2,000 in 1942 to approximately 1,500 for the fiscal

year 1946, despite the fact there has been a decided increase in the work load of the agency. It may be of interest to note further that the appropriation for the beginning of the fiscal year 1943 as it passed both Houses carried, in round numbers, \$1,261,000,000, or a decrease of \$141,000,000 as compared with the appropriation of the previous year.

In 1944 the appropriation was \$1,200,000,000, or \$61,000,000 less than the appropriation for 1943. The appropriation for the fiscal year beginning in 1945 was \$1,135,000,000, or a decrease of \$65,000,000 as compared with the previous year. The amount provided for in the fiscal year 1946 and carried in the bill as it passed the House was \$1,086,000,000 in round numbers, or \$49,000,000 less than the appropriation for 1945. You can understand, therefore, why this committee has not been able to make as drastic reduction as some might think should follow the cessation of hostilities. The reason is clear, we have been making such reductions for the past 5 years. It should be observed further that this bill carries with it appropriations for activities not heretofore carried. I refer to the National Wage Stabilization Board, the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, and other activities that heretofore appropriations were obtained through other committees.

The estimates submitted this past year were made and presented upon the theory that both the war in Europe and the Pacific would continue through the fiscal year 1946, but it will be recalled that the committee in marking up the bill proceeded upon the theory that the war in Europe would be over by July 1, 1945. Consequently, the bill this past fiscal year did not carry appropriations that could now be eliminated because of the cessation of hostilities. However, there are a few wartime activities that have been eliminated in the meantime, but it must be remembered there are some activities that were reduced during the war that are now reassuming normal proportions.

The amount carried in this bill for the present fiscal year 1946 plus the amount transferred to the Department, including any deficiency appropriations obtained amounted to \$1,202,631,586. The amount carried in the bill for fiscal year 1947 totals \$1,131,403,126, or \$71,228,460 less than the appropriation for the fiscal year 1946, and \$41,019,774 less than the budget estimate for 1947.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The amount available in the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1946 was \$162,736,932. The amount provided for the fiscal year 1947 is \$129,181,702, or a decrease of \$33,555,230. We will not be able to go into great detail as to the various items, but we shall be glad to break this down into the principal activities in the Department.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

The Office of the Secretary administers the activities of all the bureaus in the Department by approving labor policies and coordinating their operations. This office also provides central machinery for the performance of over-all management,



functions, which include central budgeting and financial controls, personnel administration, procurement, general service facilities, and so forth. The amount requested for 1947 was \$982,000 and the amount carried in the bill is \$862,000, or a decrease of \$120,000. The request for 28 new positions involving a total of \$115,406 has not been recommended. The committee felt that operating expenses of administering the enlarged functions of the Department sufficient economies may be made to offset any additional work due to the transfer of the National Wage Stabilization Board and the Reemployment and Retraining Service to this department.

#### OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

The Solicitor serves as a legal adviser to the Secretary of Labor and other officials of the Department; he is also charged with the responsibility of analyzing legislation which pertains or relates to the interest of the Department. The Budget Bureau estimate was \$1,034,000 for salaries and expenses in this agency, but the committee recommends only \$925,000, or a decrease of \$109,000. The committee has not approved the request for an increase of 23 new positions, but has approved the 234 positions allowed in the 1946 appropriation, together with 28 positions from other agencies recently transferred to the Department.

#### DIVISION OF LABOR STANDARDS

The functions of this division are to develop desirable labor standards for industrial practices, to promote uniformity in labor law administration, to make specific recommendations of methods and measures to improve industrial relationships of the working conditions of wage earners, and to make available to interested persons existing resources of the Department of Labor and pertinent material obtained from public or private sources. The Budget estimate for this division was \$283,800, the amount recommended for 1947 was \$215,000, or a decrease of \$68,800. The committee was apparently impressed with an item of \$34,696 to provide for a labor education standards program. However, there seems to be some difference of opinion between the promoters of this proposal. Some witnesses testified that it was for the purpose of preparing and distributing bulletins of information to be used by schools, colleges, labor groups and other agencies; whereas, others felt it would consist of a kind of extension service corresponding to that carried on by the Department of Agriculture. The committee felt inclined to approve the item, but it is thought if this item is to be enlarged and is to become an extension service comparable in any way to that carried on by the Department of Agriculture additional legislation will be required.

#### CONCILIATION SERVICE

The objective of the Conciliation Service is to promote and establish harmonious labor-management relationships in industry through the settlement of labor disputes. It is alleged that its responsibilities are particularly heavy at this time for the reason that with the exception of the National Mediation Board, which has

jurisdiction over all labor disputes involving railroad employees, the Conciliation Service is the sole agency of the Government in this field of work at the present time. The committee has always been very kindly disposed to this particular activity, but we feel that without being specifically critical this agency has failed to meet the objective contemplated by the Congress. Instead of reducing the number of labor disputes or increasing the harmonious labor-management relationships in industry we find there has been increased discord and an increased number of labor disputes despite the efforts of the Conciliation Service. I think it is fair to say this cannot be attributed to any lack of ability or inefficiency on the part of those charged with the responsibility of the Service. I think it is due largely to the failure of the Congress to properly evaluate many human equations that would have to be met and considered by this agency, and while I have always been a devoted and loyal friend to this Service and I still have confidence in the objective, I am convinced that the formula heretofore used in its operations will have to be changed in some way before we can expect to reach the objective contemplated by the Congress. The Budget estimate for 1947 was \$2,363,500 and the amount recommended by the committee is \$2,300,000, or a decrease of \$63,500. It should be noted however, that the amount recommended is \$271,339 above the base for 1947 and it will provide for 32 additional positions or inspectors in the Conciliation Service.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

#### [Roll No. 155]

Adams	Fulton	Outland
Andresen,	Gearhart	Pace
August H.	Gillespie	Patman
Andrews, N. Y.	Granger	Patrick
Arends	Grant, Ala.	Peterson, Fla.
Baldwin, Md.	Grant, Ind.	Powell
Barry	Griffiths	Randolph
Bates, Ky.	Harris	Reece, Tenn.
Bland	Hart	Reed, N. Y.
Bolton	Hartley	Richards
Boykin	Heseltun	Robinson, Utah
Brumbaugh	Horan	Roe, N. Y.
Buffett	Jarman	Sabath
Bunker	Johnson, Ind.	Schwabe, Okla.
Cannon, Fla.	Johnson,	Shafer
Carlson	Luther A.	Sheppard
Celler	Kee	Simpson, Pa.
Clark	Lea	Slaughter
Cochran	LeCompte	Stewart
Colmer	Lemke	Stigler
Courtney	Lesinski	Summers, Tex.
Crawford	Ludlow	Thomas, Tex.
Curley	Lyle	Tolan
Dawson	McDonough	Torrens
Domengeaux	McGehee	Vursell
Durham	McGregor	Wastelewski
Eberharther	McKenzie	Welch
Ellsworth	Morrison	White
Fenton	Norton	Winstead
Fisher	O'Hara	Wolcott
Flannagan	O'Konski	Wolfenden, Pa.
Folger	O'Neal	Woodhouse

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMASON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Com-

mittee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 6739, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 335 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6739, with Mr. THOMASON in the chair.

Mr. HARE. The next item is:

#### APPRENTICE TRAINING SERVICE

This Service brings together employers and labor for the formation of programs for apprenticeship. It formulates and promotes standards necessary to safeguard the welfare of apprentices and cooperates with State agencies engaged in the formation and promotion of standards of apprenticeship and the further development of such State activities. The amount estimated for this Service for 1947 by the Budget Bureau was \$1,832,000 and the amount recommended by the committee is \$1,800,000, or a decrease of \$32,000.

#### BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

This Bureau performs statistical and research work in the field of general labor economics, employment statistics, productivity and technological development, occupational outlook, prices and cost of living, the gathering of wage data, compiling of information on industrial relations and statistical information on industrial hazards. Its vast resource of information is used by labor, management, State officials, Members of Congress, private citizens and individual firms. The work of this Bureau has undoubtedly increased to a considerable extent in recent years, but the appropriation has grown by leaps and bounds in the last few years. This is accounted for in a large measure through the demand of numerous war agencies and war activities for statistical data for use in planning various and sundry types of programs. The Bureau submitted a special item of \$620,400 to be used in obtaining certain statistical data said to be necessary in connection with the proposed housing program. The total Budget estimate for the next fiscal year was \$5,427,000; the amount approved by the committee was \$4,787,000, or a decrease of \$640,000.

#### THE CHILDREN'S BUREAU

The chief responsibility of the Children's Bureau is to investigate and report upon all matters pertaining to the welfare of children and child life. It is also charged with administering the child-labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act and to administer the maternal and child-welfare provisions of parts 1, 2, and 3 of title V of the Social Security Act. Its work breaks into four major functions: First, the maintenance of fact-finding, advisory, and reporting services pursuant to the act establishing the Bureau; second, child-labor administration under the Fair Labor Standards Act; third, the administration of grants to States for maternal and child welfare under title V of the Social Security Act;

and fourth, the administration of grants to States for maternity and infant care for the wives and infants of servicemen in the lowest four pay grades. The amount recommended by the Budget for salaries and expenses is \$447,500, which represents an increase of \$53,705 over the 1947 base and is to be used in making studies of juvenile delinquency and studies of employment opportunities and controls for inexperienced young people.

The Budget estimate for salaries and expenses under the Fair Labor Standards Act was \$298,600 and the amount recommended by the committee was \$256,309, or a decrease of \$42,291.

The amount recommended by the Budget for maternal and child welfare was \$516,800 and the amount recommended by the committee is \$438,535, or a decrease of \$78,265.

The Budget estimate of grants to States for emergency maternity and infant care was \$17,593,000 and the amount recommended by the committee is \$16,664,000, or a decrease of \$929,000.

We might say that the Budget submitted a supplemental item which provided for the Children's Bureau to conduct a study of the experience gained in the administration of the Emergency Maternity and Infant Care Program, which the committee has not allowed and which accounts for the total deduction in this item. The number of infant care cases handled through January of the fiscal year 1946 was 1,125,814.

#### RETRAINING AND REEMPLOYMENT ADMINISTRATION

The objective of the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, authorized in title III of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, is to effect coordination during the reconversion period among the activities of those agencies of the Government charged with the functions of retraining, reemployment, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation. The legislation for this activity expires June 30, 1947. The Budget estimate for this was \$338,000 and the committee recommended the full amount.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman care to yield at this point?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I wanted to ask the gentleman about the apprenticeship training program. Am I correctly informed that the committee bill carries the amount for that purpose which was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. HARE. The amount requested was \$1,832,000. The amount allowed was \$1,800,000, which was \$295,000 more than it had for 1946 and \$32,000 less than the amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget for 1947.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Is it not true, in the gentleman's opinion, that the work of that agency is a very important one at the present time?

Mr. HARE. I agree with you thoroughly.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. What is the relationship between that appren-

ticeship training service and the retraining and reemployment service?

Mr. HARE. The apprenticeship training service is an old service provided for by act of Congress. It was originally placed in the Department of Labor and was there for a number of years until the war came on. Then it was placed in the War Manpower Commission and was carried on by that agency until the latter part of last year, when it was transferred by Executive order back to the Labor Department. It is now an agency of the Department of Labor. Its purpose is to prepare standards of apprenticeship for the several States, because the apprenticeship program is a State program; it operates under State law; and this agency provides for uniformity in establishing a standard for what would be known as a standard for a particular position or type of work.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am glad the committee has allowed practically the Budget estimate for this item, for it seems to me that both from the point of view of training workers for the construction program we have on and also from the more important point of view of trying to open opportunities for veterans that this work is one of the most important that is being done by any governmental agency.

#### UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Mr. HARE. The United States Employment Service assists in the development and coordination of a Nation-wide system of public employment offices for men, women, and juniors, establishes operating standards and procedures, and promotes uniformity in the operation of the employment service; maintains a program for clearance of labor between the States; and provides an adequate and effective job placement and counseling service for veterans.

The Budget estimate was \$5,132,000 and the committee recommended \$6,394,600. In recommending the total of \$6,394,600 for general administration expenses, the committee has added a proviso that \$2,650,600 shall be for use in carrying into effect the provisions of title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, which amplifies the responsibilities of the Veterans' Employment Service in aiding veterans to obtain satisfactory employment. The increase is recommended after hearing the testimony of the Director of Veterans' Employment Service and the officials of the United States Employment Service. The increase will be used for increasing the number of employees of the Veterans' Employment Service, which has to do solely with the efforts of assisting veterans to obtain satisfactory employment. The amount appropriated for general administration for the fiscal year 1946 was \$11,732,000 and the amount the committee is recommending for 1947 is \$5,337,400 less than the 1946 total.

The committee, in recommending the appropriation of \$68,517,000, has divided such amount into two parts. The first, \$17,129,250, is to provide necessary funds for the operation of the service as a Federal agency through October 6, 1946. The second part, \$51,387,750, is proposed

for making payments to the several States beginning October 7, 1946, in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 6, 1933, as amended, to January 1, 1942—Twenty-ninth United States Code 49-491—and for carrying into effect section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. This service has much to contribute toward a return to normal employment conditions and production, and the testimony before the committee revealed that the demands for service upon the local employment offices by both employee and employer is the greatest in its history.

#### WOMEN'S BUREAU

The committee was impressed with certain features of the work carried on by this Bureau and, therefore, approved the Budget estimate of \$234,000 for the fiscal year 1947, which represents an increase of \$32,100, which will provide for 10 new positions, together with \$1,579 for automatic promotions under the Mead-Ramspeck Act. The committee has increased the appropriation for this Bureau for printing and binding by \$1,000 to enable it to print and distribute a list of bulletins which might be of assistance to women workers and available at the Government Printing Office.

#### WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

This Division is responsible for the administration of the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act. Both acts deal with the establishment of wage-and-hour standards for employees. The Fair Labor Standards Act covers employees engaged in interstate commerce or in producing goods for interstate commerce and requires that a minimum wage, and time-and-a-half for hours worked in excess of 40, be paid. The Walsh-Healey Act requires Federal Government supply contracts to contain certain maximum and minimum wage, child labor, safety, and health stipulations.

The Budget estimate is \$4,623,000 and the committee recommended \$4,203,700, which is a decrease of \$419,300. The amount recommended will enable the Division to make 45,000 inspections, which it is believed should prove adequate at this time to insure enforcement of the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Walsh-Healey Act. This is the same number of inspections that was made during the fiscal year 1945. The estimates presented to the committee contemplated a sufficient staff to make 56,000 inspections during the fiscal year 1947. It is not felt that an increase in the number of inspections is necessary, but rather that the Division should continue to operate at the 1945 level, and, inasmuch as the employees worked a 48-hour week during the 1945 fiscal year, there should be an adjustment of the estimates for 1947 so as to permit the making of 45,000 inspections on the basis of a 40-hour week. Such course requires an addition of 87 inspectors and 40 clerical-facilitating employees, at a cost of \$361,840.

#### NATIONAL WAGE STABILIZATION BOARD

Salaries and expenses: Budget estimates, \$5,191,900; recommended, \$4,191,900; decrease, \$1,000,000.

This agency was established on December 31, 1945, by an Executive order which also abolished the National War Labor Board. Its principal objective is to control the amount of any wage or salary increase which can be recognized as a basis for increasing prices or as a base for increasing the cost of goods or services under contract to the Federal Government. The National Wage Stabilization Board has the responsibility for applying these controls. In carrying out such principal function, the Board receives and acts on applications for the approval of wage or salary increases and decides whether and to what extent such increases can be approved under the standards prescribed by the Executive order and applicable regulations. To the extent that any wage or salary increase is not so approved by the Board, the increase cannot be used as a basis for increasing prices or cost to the Government. In addition to the rules limiting the extent to which wage and salary increases may be used for price purposes, there are rules which maintain, in effect, direct wage controls in certain limited areas, chiefly the building and construction industry. This means that no wage increase legally may be made in such industry without prior approval. In addition, no wage decreases in any industry legally may be made without prior approval of the Board.

The committee was favorably impressed by the statement of the Chairman of the Board, but felt that some reduction could be made in the estimate submitted, and, accordingly, is proposing a reduction of \$1,000,000. In addition, the committee is proposing reductions in the allotments from the traveling-expense appropriation for this activity of \$38,500, and \$5,000 from the appropriation for contingent expenses.

#### RETRAINING AND REEMPLOYMENT ADMINISTRATION

Salaries: Budget estimate, \$338,000; recommended, \$338,000.

The objective of the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, authorized in title III of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, is to effect coordination during the reconversion period among the activities of those agencies of the Government charged with the functions of retraining, reemployment, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation. The legislation for this activity expires June 30, 1947. It is felt that the full amount requested would be needed if this agency is to accomplish its objective by June 30, 1947.

#### EMPLOYMENT OFFICE FACILITIES AND SERVICES

Budget estimate, \$68,517,000; amount recommended, \$68,517,000.

The committee, in recommending the appropriation of \$68,517,000, has divided such amount into two parts. The first, \$17,129,250, is to provide necessary funds for the operation of the service as a Federal agency through October 6, 1946. The second part, \$51,387,750, is proposed for making payments to the several States beginning October 7, 1946, in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 6, 1933, as amended, to January 1, 1942 (29 U. S. C. 49-491), and for carrying into effect section 602 of the Serv-

icemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. This service has much to contribute toward a return to normal employment conditions and production, and the testimony before the committee revealed that the demands for service upon the local employment offices by both employee and employer is the greatest in its history.

#### OFFICE OF EDUCATION

The Budget estimate for salaries and expenses submitted by the Budget Bureau is \$1,520,200, or an increase of \$56,562, the amount approved over the corresponding item for 1946, but an increase of \$577,662 above the base for 1947, which included certain items for national defense purposes. The increase provided for 126 new positions with proportionate increase in miscellaneous expenses. The committee recommended an increase of \$49,052, providing for 52 new positions at a total cost of \$46,552. The statutory grants approved by the Budget are recommended by the committee and are as follows: For the development of vocational education, \$14,200,000; promotion of vocational education in Hawaii, \$30,000; promotion of vocational education in Puerto Rico, \$105,000; and further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts, \$2,480,000. The committee approved a specific request in the amount of \$1,337,000 to be allocated to States for carrying on food conservation activities.

#### OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Vocational rehabilitation service is provided for under Public Law 113 and undertakes to render aid and assistance to physically handicapped persons who may be restored to an employable status. It is a program operated by State boards of vocational education in accordance with State plans approved by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. The testimony before our committee disclosed that a year ago there were 89,416 disabled persons in the process of rehabilitation. The estimate for the fiscal year 1946 will be approximately 105,000. The estimate for the fiscal year 1947 being 120,000. The economic value of the program as shown from the hearings before our committee discloses there were 41,925 persons rehabilitated into employment during the last fiscal year. That is, these persons were actually placed on the pay rolls of employers in a way and under conditions which apparently proved to be satisfactory to both employer and employee. It is stated that prior to the beginning of the rehabilitation program that the average income of such persons from what they could earn in part-time employment and what they received in the way of charitable contributions, relief payments, and so forth, amounted to \$24 per month; whereas, according to the testimony furnished your committee, the same individuals following the completion of rehabilitation services had an average earning of \$147 per month. It was stated that 18 percent of the number referred to had never been employable before and that 79 percent were not working at the time they were referred to the State agencies for rehabilitation. The estimates submitted by the Budget Bureau for the next fiscal year for grants or aid to the States is \$11,747,700, or an

increase of \$42,400, which is recommended by the committee. The general expense item approved by the Budget for 1947 is \$644,300, or an increase of \$170,912 over the appropriation for the fiscal year 1946. The amount recommended by the committee is \$564,300, which is an increase of \$90,912 over the appropriation for 1946, but a decrease of \$80,000 in the Budget estimate.

#### FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

For the enforcement and operation of the Food and Drug Administration the committee has recommended a total of \$3,482,383, or an increase of \$40,083 over the amount of the appropriation for the fiscal year 1946. This agency is performing an outstanding service in a most important work. It has the responsibility of enforcing five laws, to wit, the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act; the Tea Importation Act; the Import Milk Act; the Federal Caustic Poison Act; and the Filled Milk Act. It is in constant contact with American manufacturers in its operations and enjoys the greatest respect and cooperation from this large group of American businessmen. Food and drug manufacturers and processors have been called upon to do an ever-increasing production job during the past years, and it is much to their credit that they have processed more foods and drugs than ever before. They have suffered the loss of experienced employees, have found it increasingly difficult to replace obsolete or worn-out equipment, and have been faced with numerous handicaps due to emergency conditions, but throughout the emergency and much to the credit of the Food and Drug Administration, the manufacturers have maintained an attitude that the American public and the armed forces are entitled to pure, clean, and uncontaminated foods and to potent, pure, and uncontaminated drugs.

#### UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The present budget was prepared and the estimates have been considered under the Reorganization Act of 1944. The \$10,897,000 item carried in the last appropriation bill for the control of malaria was primarily a national defense item and as such has been eliminated from this bill. However, an increase in the control of communicable disease item of \$1,040,000 in 1946 to \$7,372,000 in 1947 is an increase of \$6,332,000, the greater portion of which will be used to continue the program for malaria control. It was pointed out to the committee that a large number of veterans who saw service in the Tropics, many of whom were subjected to malaria, will upon return enlarge the necessity for increased activities in the malaria-control program, and it was contended that this problem will be found in many sections of the country now practically free from malaria, but the malaria-control program is combined with the control of other communicable diseases, such as typhus fever, and so forth. Recent experience has disclosed that the use of the relatively new insecticide, DDT, has been very effective in combating the spread of insect-borne diseases and the committee feels it will be an expensive economy to deny a proper appropriation

to proceed as rapidly as possible with preventive measures. The typhus program parallels in many ways the program to combat malaria and other tropical diseases and it is felt that the program to control such diseases should all be under one supervision.

Another national defense item carried in the 1946 appropriation, \$59,957,000 to be used for training of nurses, has been eliminated as a defense item, but \$16,300,000 has been included to continue the training-for-nurses program to its completion. The total amount carried in the appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1946 for the Public Health Service was \$142,305,380, the amount carried for the fiscal year 1947 is \$95,173,879, or a decrease of \$47,131,501, which represents a decrease below the Budget estimate of \$10,141,321.

#### ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

The committee has approved \$3,729,358 for St. Elizabeths Hospital, which is \$1,062,358 above the Budget estimate. The increase is approved for the purpose of eliminating, if possible, numerous deficiencies which have been the experience of the institution during the last few years, and to provide \$75,000 for a general over-all survey of the entire institution by the Public Buildings Administration. It should be noted, however, that the increase is over the Budget estimate, but represents a decrease of \$2,377,007 below the appropriation for 1946.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD

The committee has recommended \$484,000,000 for grants to states for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind, which when broken down will be as follows: Old-age assistance, \$398,700,000, or an increase of \$27,700,000 over the appropriation for the fiscal year; aid to dependent children, \$73,950,000, or an increase of \$14,656,000; and aid to the blind, \$11,350,000, or an increase of \$644,000, making an overall increase in these three items of \$43,000,000.

Grants to States for unemployment compensation administration will show a decrease from \$57,042,000 for the fiscal year to \$49,045,000 for the fiscal year 1947, the decrease being \$7,997,000.

#### EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

The United States Employees' Compensation Commission is charged with the duty of administering several laws which provide workmen's compensation benefits to employees in certain employment in Federal jurisdiction. It is responsible also for administering statutory benefits authorized in the case of certain civilian workmen employed outside the United States. It is difficult to estimate in advance the necessary funds required to make payment to individuals for death and disability benefits for the reason that one cannot know in advance the number and extent of those entitled to such benefits. However, the committee has approved an appropriation of \$11,100,000 for benefit payments, which is \$630,000 less than the estimate submitted by the Commission and approved by the Budget. The committee felt that possibly there would be some decrease in the number of liabilities during the next fiscal year as

compared with the fiscal year 1946. It is further thought that the present reorganization proposal now pending before the Congress, if made effective, may result in some economies during the next year. The total amount carried in the bill for the fiscal year 1947 is \$12,600,000, which represents a decrease in the appropriation for 1946 to the extent of \$10,420,390.

#### NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The total estimates for the National Labor Relations Board call for an appropriation of \$4,746,900 for the next fiscal year, or a decrease of \$238,030 below the amount available for the present fiscal year and a decrease of \$677,400 below the Budget estimate.

#### RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

The amount approved by the committee for the fiscal year is \$300,995,000, which is an increase of \$6,300,000 over the appropriation for 1946 and a decrease of \$3,800 below the Budget estimate for 1947.

#### CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, we have not discussed the provisions of this bill in great detail, but we invite your attention to our report, as well as the hearings before our committee. Your committee has given careful consideration to the evidence submitted in support of the estimates. We may have made mistakes in properly evaluating them, but our recommendations are now before you. If the majority of you think the reductions made are too drastic, or that we have erred in our judgment in any way, there is nothing to prevent you from offering amendments adjusting the appropriations to meet the will of the majority of the Members of the House. On the other hand, if you think we have failed to make the necessary reductions and still maintain that degree of efficiency desired in all the agencies involved you will have the same opportunity to make further reductions.

Mr. KEEFFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, a reading of the bill will indicate the widely varying character of the numerous departments and agencies and institutions that are provided for in this appropriation bill. It is called the Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill and makes available for the next fiscal year funds to carry on the activities of those two great Departments of Government.

For a long time it was very noticeable, especially during the war period, that functions of the Labor Department had been transferred to other departments of Government, so that up until a year ago the Labor Department had been stripped of many of its fundamental functions and we found those functions scattered through other agencies of Government.

I have been one who for several years has urged upon the Secretary of Labor, and in speeches in the well of this House upon the Congress, that it seemed to me that the functions of the Department of Labor that properly belong to that Department ought to be restored to

that agency, and that those functions of the Department of Labor that are not proper functions of that Department ought to be transferred to the agency where they most properly belong. You will recall that when the War Manpower Commission was set up under the direction of Mr. McNutt by Executive order the Apprenticeship Training Division was transferred from the Labor Department over to the War Manpower Commission. The employment services were transferred from the Labor Department to the War Manpower Commission. Although we had in the Labor Department a Conciliation Service that this subcommittee and the Congress dealt generously with every year in the matter of funds, we found that the War Production Board, the Army and the Navy, and the Maritime Commission all had set up within their agencies so-called labor conciliation services. Some 2 years ago I appeared on the floor of this House in support of a motion to strike out the appropriation for the Labor Conciliation Service in a naval appropriation bill, and I pointed out at that time the tremendous confusion and duplication that existed in the field of labor conciliation and mediation due to the fact that the Government had seen fit to set up these competing and duplicating conciliation services in various and sundry departments of Government other than the Labor Department.

I recall so well when standing in the well of this House and making that sort of a statement that the chairman of the Committee on Labor, the distinguished gentlewoman from New Jersey, arose and stated that she had just contacted the then Secretary of Labor, Madam Perkins, and gave assurance to the House that there was no duplication, there was no confusion, and that everything was working out perfectly lovely and fine, and as a result of that speech the effort which was then being made to bring back to the Labor Department its proper functions was defeated.

A year later when this bill came up before the committee for consideration, attention was again called to that situation, and lo and behold, the RECORD discloses, for any one who wants to read it, that the Undersecretary of Labor, then Mr. Tracey, and the Secretary of Labor, then Madam Perkins, came before the committee and said it was time to take their hair down and tell the committee the facts. There was duplication. There was confusion. There was such duplication and such confusion that I am certain it contributed in large measure to the resignation of John Steelman as Director of the Conciliation Service in the Department of Labor.

I am glad to know that at long last the Department of Labor has recognized the effort that the committee has tried to put forth in its behalf to bring back to the Department of Labor the functions that properly belong there and to let other agencies of Government handle the functions that properly belong there.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFFE. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman from Wisconsin is vigorously correct in his presentation of this subject. There have been those of us on the House Labor Committee who saw the danger to which the gentleman has directed attention. We have tried, with him, to rectify it. I believe much of the confusion, as the gentleman calls it today, is not always due to a controversy between management and labor, but is aggravated because the Government itself has added to the troubled situation by overlapping and duplicating practices.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not believe there is any question about it. One of the prime complaints that always came to me from labor was the fact that they had labor functions scattered through some 26 agencies of the Government, instead of having the matters handled where they should be handled, in the Department this Congress has set up, the Department of Labor, to handle labor disputes.

I call your attention to some general observations on this subject matter. I am speaking generally without getting into particularization yet as to this bill. I have told you about the transfer to the War Manpower Commission of the Apprenticeship Training Division and of the United States Employment Service. Those services by administrative action have now been sent back to the Labor Department, so we now have in the labor section of the bill the apprenticeship training and the United States Employment Service, again back in the Labor Department where they very properly belong.

You will note also for years this Congress, as a result of organic legislation, placed the Children's Bureau in the Department of Labor. The Children's Bureau has two fundamental functions to perform. One of those functions is the matter of inspecting and enforcing the child labor laws. The other function is to administer grants in aid to the States under three titles of the Social Security Act. Another function was added to the Children's Bureau when the Congress saw fit to carry out the emergency maternal infant-care program and has provided year after year the appropriations to finance that most splendid undertaking. So that for years now, since the adoption of the M. I. C. program, the Children's Bureau has had three fundamental functions.

I call the attention of the Members of Congress to a function that to me has always seemed utterly intolerable. You will recall that we have a Wage and Hour Division, an inspection service, that is set up fundamentally for the purpose of making inspections in plants of this country to see to it that compliance is had with the provisions of the wage-hour law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes.

The Wage and Hour Division was charged with the responsibility of making those inspections and to see to it that the wage-and-hour law was enforced throughout the country. You will also recall that at the same time we had what

was called the Public Contracts Division, dealing with the Walsh-Healey contracts, so that we had two inspection services, one the Wage and Hour Division with its inspectors handling violations under the Fair Labor Standards Act, and a set of inspectors working under another Administrator, the Public Contracts Division, enforcing the Walsh-Healey Act.

I am glad to say that I raised the question with Miss Perkins when she was Secretary of Labor and administratively she did combine those inspection services into one service, which is now being administered by Mr. Walling, head of the Wage and Hour Division. But here is the funny thing. I hope you will follow me rather closely, because you must have a careful understanding of the law in order to follow.

An employer performing service or work, or employing people under the wage-hour law, was subject to inspection by the Wage-Hour Division. If he was performing a public contract for services to the country in excess of \$10,000, he came under the Walsh-Healey Act. When we passed the Walsh-Healey law we provided that the inspectors under the Walsh-Healey Act, of the Public Contracts Division, would have complete charge of inspecting for child-labor violations and could also prosecute or recommend prosecution or do all things necessary to see that the child-labor laws were properly carried out so far as those employees working under the Walsh-Healey Act were concerned. But right across the street is an employer who is not under the Walsh-Healey Act, but comes under the wage-and-hour inspection of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Strange as it may seem, those people under the combined inspection services would also inspect on behalf of the Children's Bureau for child-labor violations. But instead of being authorized to go through and handle the violations and prosecute if necessary, they have to funnel their inspections through the Children's Bureau and let the Children's Bureau handle child-labor violations in those plants that were making consumer goods and were not under the terms of the Walsh-Healey Act. That has always seemed to me to be a ridiculous situation. I am very happy to note that the President in his recommended reorganization plan has left in the Department of Labor the labor functions of the Children's Bureau and has transferred to the Wage-Hour Division the entire control over the question of not only inspection for wage-hour violations but entire control for inspection of child-labor violations. That is a step in the right direction. That is a program I have advocated now for 3½ years and I believe the former Secretary of Labor would have carried it out administratively had she remained as Secretary of Labor. I am glad that the President has seen fit to recommend that in his reorganization plan. I am also glad to note that as part of that reorganization plan the President has recommended that the medical services and the child welfare services of the Children's Bureau shall be transferred to the Federal Security Agency. I have advocated that for 3½ years, since I have been

pretty well acquainted with the workings of that Agency. That matter is going to come before the Congress for a vote some day and it would be well for the Members of Congress to thoroughly orient themselves and understand that situation before condemning that portion of the President's reorganization plan. Here is what will happen: Here is the Children's Bureau that is charged with allocating funds to States under 3 titles of the Social Security Act. The Social Security Board is charged with allocating funds for the rest of the titles under Social Security. Is there any reason in the world why in the Department of Labor you should have a bureau set up with a great big staff to handle the matter of the allocation of funds for child and maternal welfare, and so on, which involves the health and welfare of individuals, and have the Social Security Board handling the other titles of grants to States that involve substantially the same thing? Under the President's reorganization plan, those functions of the Children's Bureau are transferred to the Social Security Board. I think there not only could be more efficient administration of the grants-in-aid program under Social Security, but I think an efficient administration will save a great deal of money. I personally want to compliment the President for that portion of his reorganization plan.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. HENRY. I quite agree with what the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin is saying. The only difficulty I find with the President's reorganization plan is that there are other reorganizations in his plan with which I do not agree, and I shall be compelled to vote against some of them.

Mr. KEEFE. I am speaking only of one plan. I think it is reorganization plan No. 2. There may be some question as to the wisdom of the dissolution of the Employee's Compensation Board. That is included in that plan. But the other part of the plan which transfers from the Census Bureau to the Federal Security Agency the Bureau of Vital Statistics, I am in complete accord with, because it centralizes in one bureau all of the agencies having to do with public health and welfare. As one Member of Congress I hope we will be able to accomplish that and build in this country one agency of government of sufficient size and dignity that it may achieve Cabinet status, to deal with the welfare and the rights of human beings in the matter of public health.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to compliment the gentleman on the last remark he made which I believe is a very statesmanlike remark. I wanted to ask him for my own information, and to sharpen the point a little, about the child welfare proposition that the gentleman was discussing a moment ago. It is true that the Social Security Board administers the aid of dependent chil-

dren which is a program of grants-in-aid to States?

Mr. KEEFE. That is right.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Am I correct that other functions for child and maternity welfare, as now being conducted by the Children's Bureau, are also grants-in-aid programs?

Mr. KEEFE. That is right.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In other words, they are not action programs but purely grants-in-aid programs?

Mr. KEEFE. That is right.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That could quite as well be administered by the Social Security Board on the same basis and with the same personnel as they administer the other grants-in-aid?

Mr. KEEFE. That is right. They administer the child welfare service program, the crippled children grants-in-aid program, the child welfare grants-in-aid program under the provisions of three titles of the Social Security Act. The Social Security Board, on the other hand, administers all of the other programs set up under the Social Security Act, and they all relate to the general over-all picture, and they are grants-in-aid programs, and they all require the States, under the terms of the Social Security Act, to conform to certain standards that are set up. Those standards are pretty well known. There is not any reason in the world why the administration of those grants-in-aid programs, in my humble opinion, could not be turned over to the Federal Security Agency, and the same people working in the Children's Bureau today handle those grants-in-aid in the Federal Security Agency.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. I think it is time we stopped this duplication of administrative set-ups to handle the same general program.

Now, I want to discuss just a little bit one or two items in this bill which may surprise some people, because the committee has seen fit to override the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget and grant appropriations in excess of the Budget estimates.

We have out here St. Elizabeths Hospital. That is one of the institutions that is covered by this bill. It is administered by one of the finest administrators, in my judgment, that is to be found in the United States. It should be a model institution, and it is. But it is very rapidly declining, because the Congress of the United States has not seen fit to give the necessary personnel to that institution to enable it to properly function and give the care that it ought to give to the inmates of that great institution.

Soldiers, sailors, and members of the armed forces out there are entitled to the best care this Government can give them. A hospital is a 7-days-a-week institution. They cannot stop on Saturday afternoon, they cannot quit on Sunday, they cannot work that way running a hospital; it is a 7-days-a-week institution. They used to work 48 hours. We went back to a 40-hour week. Does it take any great persuasive argument to convince

anyone that with the reduction in the workweek from 48 to 40 hours on a 7-day-week operation they will have to have more men and women working out there if they are going to give the aid to those people and the help and care to which they are entitled? And yet Dr. Overholser told us that the Budget estimate before him showed clearly that the Budget Bureau not only did not give him an increase to provide for the necessary additional personnel but in effect actually cut his budget.

I said: "Dr. Overholser, are you going to be able to operate this hospital on the money that is carried in this Budget estimate?"

He said: "I cannot."

"Can you give any degree of decent care to these inmates out there under this Budget estimate?"

And he said: "I cannot."

My colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and the speaker now addressing you went out there to look that hospital over. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word of tribute to those wonderful men and women who are out there working on those wards, taking care of the thousands of insane patients who are out there. How in the name of God they can get people to work at all in many parts of that institution is a thing that intrigues me.

This committee put into this bill sufficient funds to enable Dr. Overholser and his very able administrative assistants to get sufficient personnel to give just a minimum of decent care to the people who are compelled to be in that hospital, and the committee has carried in this bill therefore an appropriation in excess of the amount requested.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. I wish to commend the committee for its very fine action in the matter of St. Elizabeths Hospital. The nursing care, the medical care, and just the basic physical care of the hospital itself is one of the most difficult things in the world. Too much cannot be said of the consecrated service being rendered by the staff and the workers of this great hospital in spite of low salaries, insufficient numbers, and difficult working conditions. I wish to ask the gentleman whether he has examined the President's reorganization plan and whether he is satisfied to have St. Elizabeths Hospital cease to take Army and Navy personnel who need treatment in such an institution. The gentleman will remember that St. Elizabeths originated as an Army hospital. Has he had time to examine into the implications of the reorganization plan, especially as it relates to St. Elizabeths Hospital, and would he care to go into the whole new problem it creates.

Mr. KEEFE. That, of course, is a very highly controversial question and I am very frank to say that I have examined the President's proposal but I do

not care to express or hazard an opinion with respect to it at this particular time.

Mrs. BOLTON. Does the gentleman feel that some action will be taken by this body on that plan?

Mr. KEEFE. The matter is now pending before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. They are holding hearings.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Before I put to the gentleman the question I wish to ask him to elaborate upon, I want to say that if there is one man in the Congress of the United States who understands what is contained in this particular appropriation bill, that man is the gentleman from Wisconsin, FRANK KEEFE. Glance at the printed hearings and see for yourself the knowledge displayed by Congressman KEEFE of the subject now before us.

I wonder if the gentleman from Wisconsin will elaborate upon the point that was brought out by the committee at the time we visited St. Elizabeths Hospital in which the Superintendent there told us of the difficulty under which they operate because of this 25-percent differential given to the Veterans' Administration, thus enabling them to take the best personnel away from such institutions as St. Elizabeths. I wish the gentleman would elaborate upon that point.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not think time will permit of doing that except to say that in order to run a hospital of the character of St. Elizabeths any one knows that you must have the highest type of trained psychiatrists, including psychiatric nurses and medical attendants in that hospital. They are experiencing tremendous difficulty out there, and I may say that that is true of other institutions throughout the country because of the extremely attractive salaries being offered by the Veterans' Administration for the character of service that they have to utilize in St. Elizabeths. I want to pay a little word of tribute to those magnificent psychiatrists, nurses, and doctors who are self-sacrificing in an institution of that kind and are willing to stay on the job and give these people the care they are entitled to in the face of the tremendously increased offers of job opportunities in the Veterans' Administration. It is a situation that somebody connected with a committee ought to look into if we are not going to have a very disturbing situation in all of the other hospitals of the country not under the control of the Veterans' Administration.

Let me point out one other item, and this relates to public health. We were advised after the hearings closed that the Bureau of the Budget had cut the National Institute of Health nearly \$2,000,000. I found out about it, and I called those people up and asked them some questions. What will be involved if this cut takes place? They told me. They did not tell us when they were before the committee because they were acting under a rule which says that a representative of a department shall not

justify any item that is not included in the budget. I was simply amazed to find that the Bureau of the Budget had cut the Public Health Service in three of its most vital research programs and evidently were doing it on the basis or the hope that the Congress would pass this national-science bill, that then they could turn these funds over to some "super-duper" investigation or scientific organization.

I took the position, and I maintain it now, that there is not a possibility of that bill passing this Congress before adjournment. What would happen in the next 6 or 8 months, then, if we took away the funds that are now being devoted by the National Institute of Health to the financing of clinics throughout the country? What would happen to that scientific research and investigation in the next 6 or 8 months? I will tell you what will happen. It would stop. The research that is being carried on now in connection with malaria would stop; the research that is now being carried on in connection with penicillin would stop; and the research that is carried on now in connection with communicable diseases would have to stop on July 1. You must realize that that is not research being conducted by the National Institute of Health only. We have organizations all over this country, I believe some 51 research organizations, devoting themselves to an effort to get at the cause and the cure for malaria. There are organizations breaking down the potentials of this mysterious and magnificent drug, penicillin, where they have not even scratched the surface, having only broken it down into four essential characteristics. I, for one, want to say that the members of this subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations are not going to permit the termination of the magnificent research work that involves the lives and future of human beings. So we gave to the United States Public Health Service the money and the funds in excess of the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget to carry on this work. I believe that the Members of Congress will applaud the committee for taking that very desirable action.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. As far as I am concerned, I do most earnestly applaud the committee for its splendid service. May I ask the gentleman this, whether the functions of the Bureau of the Budget are of a character that it can cut all the bills to pieces before the Congress has opportunity to see them, and whether the committees of the Congress do not have the right, yes, the obligation to consider the original plans of the departments rather than having to consider a second-hand version when they come back after they have been hashed up by the Budget? It is only in recent years that the Budget has assumed prior rights of consideration of all legislation presented to the Congress.

Mr. KEEFE. I have my individual views on that matter and I have often

wondered why they called it a Bureau of the Budget. That is all I have to say on the subject, and so far as I am concerned, when I have the ability to understand and I know the public need and necessity I, as one Member of Congress, am going to exercise my prerogative and my responsibility, and my duty to the people of this country to see to it that an agency of Government such as the United States Public Health Service that is dealing with the lives and the fortunes and the health of individuals is not going to be curtailed in carrying out its proper functions. That is the attitude of this subcommittee and that attitude has been confirmed by the full committee.

I just want to say one word further, and that relates to this subject of cancer research. Can you think of anything more important than the research that is being conducted to try to find the cause and, if possible, the cure for that dread scourge? I cannot think of any, and so far as I am concerned one of the reasons why I have such great confidence in the United States Public Health Service and its personnel is because when that subject was before the subcommittee, my distinguished friend, the gentleman from West Virginia, Governor NEELY, who is tremendously interested in this matter of cancer research, felt that they were not asking for enough money. He suggested that the committee would be willing to give them a very greatly increased appropriation for cancer research, and unlike some agencies of government, it was refreshing to find the answer come back, "Governor, we would like to have a lot more money, but we have asked you only for the amount that we can expeditiously expect."

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. I want to say that this House and the country is indebted to the very able Representative, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], for the informative and convincing explanation that he is making of projects that are carried in this measure.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I merely want to ask the gentleman whether he has the slightest idea why in the world the Budget should have cut off the funds for these research projects.

Mr. KEEFE. There was no reason given, but I understand through the grape vine that somebody was hopeful that this national science bill would pass, which proposed to set up a "super-duper" department of investigation and scientific research, and they wanted the funds to ultimately filter into that organization. But it would have been disastrous to the research that is now going on, and we must continue to maintain and support that research. God Almighty knows this Nation, if it needs anything under the sun, needs the expenditure of money in the interest of the preservation of public health. That is why I am such a

protagonist of the judicious expenditure of funds in that direction.

Let me say this further. This is not a bill in which you can make drastic cuts, as you can in some other bills. We have done pretty well, as the chairman told you a while ago, cutting in the spots where you could reduce expenditures in connection with this appropriation during the last 5 years.

I call your attention to the fact that the grants-in-aid program and the grants to the States that are contained in this bill under Social Security, with all of its old-age assistance and crippled children assistance, and so on, the grants-in-aid program of the Children's Bureau, the grants-in-aid for vocational education, the grants-in-aid for the employment services, the grants-in-aid for the endowment of colleges of agriculture and mechanical arts, vocational rehabilitation, the grants-in-aid for venereal disease control, control of tuberculosis, assistance to the States in general public health services, control of communicable diseases, the grants-in-aid to the blind and to crippled children, the unemployment compensation payments, the Federal unemployment compensation grants, the employees' compensation payments, railroad retirement grants, and all that sort of thing, amount to a total of \$986,000,000 out of this bill, and they are all sums of money that this committee cannot touch. The Congress has passed the legislation and said, "We want these bills paid." You have to pay the old-age assistance on a matching basis, as provided by law. You have to provide these grants to the States, and many more than I have indicated. But when you come to talk about economy, you cannot economize where you are going to cut off the life and the future of a human being or a child; but we have done a fairly good job in this bill, if you will analyze it, in cutting some of the spots where you can cut.

The gentleman from California asked a question about apprenticeship training.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. I want to give a little further answer to it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would appreciate it very much if the gentleman would do that.

Mr. KEEFE. I think many people have a mistaken idea as to what the Federal part in apprenticeship training really is. Apprenticeship training systems are State systems. Apprenticeship training results from the enactment of laws by the legislatures of the States whereby they set up the facilities and the program for apprenticeship training. It usually means simply this, that the State system through the State Board of Apprenticeship Training enters into agreement with employers in the State that can comply with the necessities for instruction, and they will indenture apprentices to those employers under a contract by which at the time of graduation that individual may become a journeyman. They work closely with the vocational system. The vocational schools furnish a portion and part of the instruction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

The Federal Government goes out into the States and into the field to try to stimulate the States through their legislatures to adopt apprenticeship training systems, and they send their representatives into the States where they already have these systems to aid the States in carrying out the apprenticeship training program that is provided under the GI bill of rights. The gentleman will recall that when the GI bill was on this floor I was privileged to offer the amendment which the committee accepted which made the apprenticeship training available to the veteran as part of the educational program under that bill. Hundreds of thousands of veterans are availing themselves throughout this country of the right to secure training and education under the apprenticeship system. I want to call your attention to this situation. There are many States in the Union that do not even have a system of apprenticeship training. Then what happens? That is where the Federal organization comes into play. What they have done is this: The Federal Apprenticeship Training Division goes into a State, such as the State of Texas, for example, which has no State system of apprenticeship, and they enter into a contract with the State agency by which the State agency designates the Federal Apprenticeship Training Organization to act for them in the placement of apprentices under the GI bill of rights. I personally think it is one of the great organizations of the country and that the apprenticeship training is a very far reaching and very necessary program to aid in securing trained mechanics and journeymen. Especially is that true because of the tremendous demand for artisans necessary in connection with the building program that is now going on.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I say to the gentleman I think he has rendered a great service to the veterans by the amendment that he offered to the GI bill. I understand that more than 80 percent of the people at present taking advantage of the apprentice training program are veterans.

Mr. KEEFE. That is true.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I ask the gentleman whether in his judgment the funds carried in the bill, which I understand are approximately the Budget estimate, are in his opinion sufficient to enable this work to be adequately carried on in the next fiscal year?

Mr. KEEFE. As one who has for many years been a strong advocate of apprenticeship training, I may assure the gentleman that in my opinion the funds that are carried in this bill are wholly adequate to carry out the functions of the Federal Apprenticeship Training Division.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. KEEFE. There are many, many other things in connection with this bill that I could discuss but I do not want to take up any more time. I would like to call your attention to a few things that were unearthed which were interesting. Just let me tell you of one interesting situation to show how government operates. You remember back in the days of Paul McNutt when he was running the employment services and he issued an order to his Federal employment offices that they were not to make any referrals to agriculture and that they were only to make referrals to industry? Congress got a little upset about that, and they said they were going to do something to have an employment service for domestic agriculture. So they voted, I believe, some \$30,000,000 to the Department of Agriculture to be administered by the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture who were to go out and recruit the help and make placements on the farm. Strange as it may seem, this year when I started to puddle around in the water, not knowing just where we were going, we discovered before we got through that the United States Employment Service in 11 States, and 11 of the most important agricultural States in the Union, had made contracts with the Agriculture Department Extension Service by which the USES performed the placement service for agriculture in those States and was paid for it out of the \$30,000,000 which we appropriated to the Extension Service.

If that is not a ridiculous conglomeration of confusion, then I do not know what is. I am calling attention to it because some committee of this Congress ought to be able someday to put their finger upon this amazing confusion that exists that allows such an unusual expenditure of public funds. Why did not we make the appropriation directly to the USES in the first place instead of funneling it over to Agriculture and then over to the USES with all of the administrative expenses hooked on as a result of that sort of operation? Members of Congress, if you give studious attention to one of these bills and one of these departments, you will find not only in that instance but in hundreds of instances cases of confusion and duplication until the whole thing is confounding to an individual sitting there on this little subcommittee trying to understand the complexities of a bill that covers so many agencies as are found in this one.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER].

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this bill contains conspicuous appropriations for the officials who concern themselves with women and children's problems, but nobody should get the impression that dependent women and children of this country can bear to have their standards of living reduced.

I mention this now because the principal argument for the British loan bill is that the British stood alone and the Americans can stand a loan.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time. I ask that the Clerk read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

Salaries and expenses: For support, clothing, and treatment in St. Elizabeths Hospital of persons who have become insane since their entry into the armed forces of the United States, insane beneficiaries of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, insane beneficiaries of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, and all other insane persons whose admission to the hospital is authorized by law, including reimbursement to employees for the cost of repair or replacement (where the damage exceeds \$2 and does not exceed \$100) of personal belongings damaged or destroyed by patients while employees were in line of duty; travel expenses; printing and binding; and not exceeding \$3,000 for maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; and not to exceed \$185,000 for repairs and improvements to buildings and grounds; and not to exceed \$15,000 for furnishing and laundering of such wearing apparel as may be prescribed for employees in the performance of their official duties; \$3,729,358, including cooperation with organizations or individuals in scientific research into the nature, causes, prevention, and treatment of mental illness, and including maintenance and operation of necessary facilities for feeding employees and others (at not less than cost), and the proceeds therefrom shall reimburse the appropriation for the institution; and not exceeding \$1,500 of this sum may be expended in the removal of patients to their friends; for expenses of attendance at meetings of a technical nature, pertaining to hospital administration and medical advancement, when authorized by the Federal Security Administrator; not exceeding \$2,500 for the purchase of such books, periodicals, and newspapers as may be required for the purposes of the hospital and for the medical library, not exceeding \$75,000 for transfer to the Federal Works Agency for expenses incident to a survey of the buildings and grounds of the hospital; and not exceeding \$1,500 for the actual and necessary expenses incurred in the apprehension and return to the hospital of escaped patients: *Provided*, That so much of this sum as may be required shall be available for all necessary expenses in ascertaining the residence of inmates who are not or who cease to be properly chargeable to Federal maintenance in the institution and in returning them to such places of residence: *Provided further*, That not exceeding \$200 additional may be paid to two employees to provide mail facilities for patients in the hospital: *Provided further*, That during the fiscal year 1947 the District of Columbia, or any branch of the Government requiring St. Elizabeths Hospital to care for patients for which they are responsible, shall pay by check to the superintendent upon his written request, either in advance or at the end of each month, such amounts as shall be calculated by the superintendent to be due for such care on the basis of a per diem rate approved by the President and bills rendered by the superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital in accordance herewith shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of payment; proper adjustments of such bills paid for in advance on the basis of such calculations shall be made monthly or quarterly, as may be agreed upon by the superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital and the District of Columbia Government, department, or establishments concerned. All sums paid to the superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital for the care of patients that he is authorized by law to receive shall be deposited to the credit on the books of the Treasury Department of the appropriation made for the care



and maintenance of the patients at St. Elizabeths Hospital for the year in which the support, clothing, and treatment is provided, and be subject to requisition upon the approval of the superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, where is the Clerk reading?

The CHAIRMAN. At page 32, line 19.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 26.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina desire recognition?

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee desires recognition for the purpose of calling attention to what appears to be a typographical error in the appropriation line 16 on page 26. Instead of \$11,530,888 the amount should be \$16,628,000.

I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. HARE: Page 26, line 16, strike out "\$11,530,888" and insert "\$16,628,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

This title may be cited as the "Employees' Compensation Commission Appropriation Act, 1947."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty-six Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

	[Roll No. 156]	
Andrews, N. Y.	Gearhart	O'Hara
Auchincloss	Gifford	O'Konski
Baldwin, Md.	Granger	O'Neal
Bell	Grant, Ind.	O'Toole
Bland	Hall,	Patrick
Bloom	Edwin Arthur	Peterson, Fla.
Boren	Harris	Quinn, N. Y.
Boykin	Hart	Rains
Bradley, Mich.	Hébert	Reece, Tenn.
Brumbaugh	Herter	Richards
Buckley	Hinshaw	Robinson, Utah
Bunker	Holmes, Wash.	Roe, N. Y.
Cannon, Fla.	Hook	Rogers, N. Y.
Carlson	Horan	Sabath
Celler	Johnson, Ind.	Sheppard
Clements	Johnson,	Short
Cochran	Luther A.	Simpson, Pa.
Cole, N. Y.	Jones	Starkey
Colmer	LaFollette	Stewart
Cooley	Lanham	Stigler
Courtney	Ludlow	Sumner, Ill.
Crawford	Lynch	Sumners, Tex.
Curley	McCormack	Tolan
Dawson	McGehee	Torrens
Domengeaux	McGregor	Traynor
Durham	McMillen, Ill.	Wasielowski
Eaton	Mankin	Welch
Ellsworth	Mason	White
Fellows	May	Winstead
Fenton	Monronev	Woodhouse
Flannagan	Morrison	Worley
Fogarty	Norblad	
Folger	Norton	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMASON, 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. 6739, and finding itself

without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 329 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

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. 6739, with Mr. THOMASON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Salaries: For three Board members of the National Labor Relations Board and other personal services of the Board in the District of Columbia and elsewhere necessary in performing the duties authorized by law, \$2,991,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 44, line 20, strike out lines 20 to 23, inclusive.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to strike out the appropriation for the National Labor Relations Board. Those who are forward looking have become more and more disturbed by the performances of the National Labor Relations Board. The Government, in my opinion, has no business in labor disputes except to act as a mediator and to be fair between the employer and the employee. They have not only failed to be fair as between employer and employee, but they have failed to be fair between different groups of employees and they have, by pressure and various other operations, many of them outside of the law, like their incursions into the agricultural labor field, destroyed the confidence that the public should have in that Board. Perhaps the law might function if a board had been appointed which had in mind the responsibility that the Government owes, but that has not been the case. The only way out of this situation from the standpoint of promoting industrial peace, giving the workman a chance, giving collective bargaining a chance to continue and to succeed, is to get rid of the operations of this Board. Perhaps we will need a mediation board. Perhaps we will need another board after this one is disposed of, but the way things are going it is absolutely impossible to have any kind of approach to industrial peace unless we proceed to wipe out this sore upon the body politic.

For my own part, I like to see the workman have a chance. He does not have that chance when we are subjected to such enormous monstrosities as we have been lately. It has been a terrible thing when they have kept plants closed for period after period by rows between different labor unions. It has been a terrible thing when local unions have been obliged to pass a resolution designating the management of operation with reference to labor disputes to labor leaders some thousands of miles away, and then have those people go off and pay no attention to the local problems.

So in so many instances collective bargaining has been dead. It has been a terrible situation.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does the gentleman believe the National Labor Relations Board has been a force for mitigating labor disputes or for aggravating them?

Mr. TABER. It has been a force for aggravating them and making them worse. Continually the number of strikes that have happened has risen as a result of the operations of the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be adopted and that we can begin to proceed toward industrial peace.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, to strike out this appropriation or to adopt the amendment offered by my good friend from New York, for whom I always have a great admiration, would go to the very root of the collective-bargaining policy established by the Congress. The collective-bargaining program is lodged in the National Labor Relations Board. It is a function of the National Labor Relations Board to determine the bargaining agency in difficulties or misunderstandings arising between management and labor, by holding elections. If we approve this amendment, that entire program will be eliminated and that policy will be absolutely destroyed. The Board also has the function of looking into unfair labor practices. If we adopt this amendment, we can expect additional unrest between labor and management.

I am not prepared to say that the Board has been successful in every detail, because hardly any agency of the Government has been successful in every detail. We have made some mistakes here in this wonderful body. We have here great minds and great hearts endeavoring to solve the great problems of the Nation, yet I think we have made mistakes at times.

If we will take a look at the history of the National Labor Relations Board for the last few years we will be convinced that it is rendering a valuable service to the Nation and a valuable service to the people it endeavors to represent. I am particularly interested in activities of this Board and its work since our genial and good friend, Jack Houston, who served in this House for a number of years, has been a member of the Board. We find from the testimony that was submitted to our committee only a few weeks ago that in 1943 the number of cases disposed of was 9,783. The number of cases disposed of in 1944 was 10,229. The number of cases disposed of in 1945 was 10,298. In the fiscal year 1946 up to date, they have disposed of 12,751. It is interesting to note that while we have increased the appropriation for this agency over the years as much as 18 percent, the number of cases disposed of has increased 23 percent. In other words, over the last few years or

over the last 4 years, we might say, the number of cases disposed of by this Board, and disposed of satisfactorily to the parties interested, has increased 23 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for an additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. In effect, would not the adoption of this amendment, at least for 1 year, mean striking out the very heart, so far as governmental action is concerned, with reference to collective bargaining and looking into unfair labor practices? And would it not be injurious to the best interests of good management and labor relationships?

Mr. HARE. I said at the outset it would absolutely destroy our collective bargaining policy. It would absolutely destroy the functioning of this agency with reference to determining who the bargaining agent is or who the bargaining agent will be in case of a labor dispute. It will also eliminate that function of determining what is an unfair labor practice. If we destroy those three, the responsibility will be on this body.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 53, noes 77.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

No part of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used in any way in connection with a complaint case arising over an agreement, or a renewal thereof, between management and labor which has been in existence for 3 months or longer without complaint being filed by an employee or employees of such plant: *Provided*, That, hereafter, notice of such agreement or a renewal thereof shall have been posted in the plant affected for said period of 3 months, said notice containing information as to the location at an accessible place of such agreement where said agreement shall be open for inspection by any interested person: *Provided further*, That these limitations shall not apply to agreements with labor organizations formed in violation of section 158, paragraph 2, title 29, United States Code.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELLIOTT: On page 46, line 3, after the word "code", strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used in connection with the investigation, hearings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining units composed in whole or in part of agricultural laborers as that term is defined in the Social Security Act in section 409, title 42, United States Code."

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is the same amendment that

was adopted in 1945 and practically the same amendment that was adopted on the Case bill on February 6, 1946. This defines agricultural labor:

The term "agricultural labor" includes all service performed—

(1) On a farm, in the employ of any person, in connection with cultivating the soil, or in connection with raising or harvesting any agricultural or horticultural commodity, including the raising, shearing, feeding, caring for, training, and management of livestock, bees, poultry, and fur-bearing animals and wildlife.

(2) In the employ of the owner or tenant or other operator of a farm, in connection with the operation, management, conservation, improvement, or maintenance of such farm and its tools and equipment, or in salvaging timber or clearing land of brush and other debris left by a hurricane, if the major part of such service is performed on a farm.

(3) In connection with the production or harvesting of maple sirup or maple sugar or any commodity defined as an agricultural commodity in section 1141j (g), title 12, as amended, or in connection with the raising or harvesting of mushrooms, or in connection with the hatching of poultry, or in connection with the ginning of cotton, or in connection with the operation or maintenance of ditches, canals, reservoirs, or waterways used exclusively for supplying and storing water for farming purposes.

(4) In handling, planting, drying, packing, packaging, processing, freezing, grading, storing, or delivering to storage or to market or to a carrier for transportation to market any agricultural or horticultural commodity; but only if such service is performed as an incident to ordinary farming operations or, in the case of fruits and vegetables, as an incident to the preparation of such fruits or vegetables for market. The provisions of this paragraph shall not be deemed to be applicable with respect to service performed in connection with commercial canning or commercial freezing or in connection with any agricultural or horticultural commodity after its delivery to a terminal market for distribution for consumption.

As used in this subsection, the term "farm" includes stock, dairy, poultry, fruit, fur-bearing animal, and truck farms, plantations, ranches, nurseries, ranges, greenhouses, or other similar structures used primarily for the raising of agricultural or horticultural commodities, and orchards."

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. LEA. Is it not true that the definition of "agricultural labor" that you would apply to this amendment is the definition that was adopted in the House by the Ways and Means Committee several years ago?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. LEA. And has since been approved two or three times by the House?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I could not hear what the distinguished gentleman was asking you.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] said that this amendment was the same amendment that was adopted a few years ago and again in 1945 and again in 1946.

Mr. Chairman, as I started to say, this amendment is much needed at the present time in the interest of protecting the

processing, handling, and production of foodstuffs of all kinds on the farms. We all know that we need some clarification in defining agricultural labor connected with agriculture and harvesting and processing in order to properly protect agriculture at this particular time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the heart of the matter as far as this amendment is concerned seems to me to be this—that we have had various definitions or interpretations of agriculture on the part of many agencies of the Government. In order to establish a definition for "agriculture" this House has previously, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce pointed out a few moments ago, several times adopted this same amendment which is now being offered, and attached it to previous bills, so that confusion can be done away with.

I am sure the House today will again support the same amendment. The last time, as I recall, it was offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

There is no other question involved. Some of these days the Committee on Agriculture will bring up the entire problem of the definition of "agriculture." Until then, it is necessary to attach it to individual bills, because it expires with the provisions of the bill and must therefore be renewed.

I ask for an aye vote.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. OUTLAND. Can the gentleman point out to the House during the 3 years in which these groups have been covered by the National Labor Relations Board where we have had any industrial strife as a result?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes; I think I could, but I should have to take more time than I have.

Mr. OUTLAND. If the gentleman will yield further, I may say that about 25,000 people who would be involved if this amendment were reenacted are employed in my district. Since the National Labor Relations Board has acted as the jurisdictional agent there has not been one strike. Pass this amendment and you will see more strikes and strife than we have ever had before because you are doing away with the only machinery we have for dealing with labor disputes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman's point is not very well taken because the amendment has been in force now for several years on other bills. I am glad to know there have been no strikes.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

This amendment is similar to last year's so-called Lea amendment, and I must again oppose it for the reason that we are discussing and considering legislation on an appropriation bill which is vicious in its nature, insofar as the rights of the workman in industrial food-processing plants are concerned.

This proposed legislation is not for the benefit of the farmer; this rider is for the benefit of huge private industrial corporations and canning plants and would deprive, were we to enact this amendment to the pending bill, a million and a half workers who were protected purposely by this Congress when clothed with the provisions of the Wagner Act.

Section 2 (3) of the National Labor Relations Act defines the employees who are entitled to the protection of the act. Those employees who may truly be regarded as farm labor are by the terms of this section presently excluded from the operation of the act. The farmer's hired hand and other employees engaged in ordinary cultivating and harvesting operations have never been included under the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Act.

The proposed rider offered by the gentleman from California would deprive a million industrial food-processing workers of the protection of the Wagner Act by amending that act to make the social-security definition of agricultural labor applicable. Over 500,000 industrial employees are affected directly by the Social Security Act definition.

By the trick phrase "bargaining units composed in whole or in part of agricultural laborers" an estimated additional half million industrial workers would be excluded. An entire bargaining unit would be excluded as long as a single worker in the unit could be regarded as coming within this false and expanded concept of agricultural labor.

Apart from these evils in its substance, the proposed rider typifies the viciousness of seeking to evade the obligations of law by the device of riders attached to appropriations. There have been efforts in the past to amend the act to exclude these broad groups of workingmen from the benefits of the act. Up to this date Congress has refused to enact such an amendment. Now the device of appropriations riders is being brought into play by my distinguished friend in an effort to evade the proper procedures of amendment. The law is left on the books, but the use of funds for its enforcement is so circumscribed as to make the law a non-entity.

Furthermore, by legislating through appropriations, Congress places the Board in the position of seeking interpretations from the Comptroller General. Thus, the Comptroller General, not the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals—as required by statute—is forced to make decisions as to when and where the act may be enforced. The rider device converts the Comptroller General into a super-judge.

As I said previously, the employer groups seeking enactment of this rider are private industrial corporations, not farmers. The industries which would obtain special exemption and unfair competitive advantages include such operations as the Trulyn Shippers, in Edinburg, Tex., employing over 1,000 men and women in the packing of tomatoes, and the American Fruit Growers, a multi-million-dollar corporation which purchases agricultural products from farmers, packs them and distributes through

its own commercial outlets under its own brand name.

Some of the employers who are seeking this exemption have been the subject of investigation and exposure by the La Follette committee in connection with their antilabor activities. Included among them are the antilabor Associated Farmers of California. By enacting this rider, the Congress would permit itself to be used as an antilabor instrument of these employers instead of confining its deliberations on an appropriation bill to financial matters appropriate to the subject matter of the bill.

We would be opening the door and inviting other groups to ask for similar exemptions. If this group is excluded this afternoon by the backhanded device of a rider, placing limitation on the use of the National Labor Relations Board's funds, will we not be bombarded with demands from other special-interest groups to exclude other types of employees?

I am in thorough accord with the position taken by the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND], and am seriously apprehensive of the results of the passage of this rider for the reasons given by him awhile ago.

This amendment is just as viciously antilabor as the Case bill which we buried earlier today following its veto by President Truman. As a member of this Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Labor Department, Federal Security Agency, I shall ask for a roll-call vote in the event the rider is attached here in the Committee of the Whole. I urge you to defeat it.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I would like to answer the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND]. Before he was a Member of Congress I was the Congressman from the district which he now serves. There were strikes in that district and there were foodstuffs that rotted and spoiled because we needed such an amendment as I have offered here today.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. OUTLAND. I may say for the benefit of the House that the gentleman who represented the portion of the district I am talking about is the gentleman now occupying the floor, the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ELLIOTT. I am talking about Ventura and that territory.

Mr. OUTLAND. I may say in that connection that the National Labor Relations Board has had jurisdiction since 1942 over these particular canneries and packing sheds and since that time there has not been one bit of industrial strife because the machinery to take care of it has been there.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, in connection with this jurisdictional dispute over who represents the district now represented by the gen-

tleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND], the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT] formerly had three counties of it and I had one.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND] stated that there has been no industrial strife in the canneries and packing plants in California. Those of you who were present when I took the floor not long ago to criticize the action of the NLRB will there has been no industrial strife in the canneries and packing plants in California. Because of the fact that the A. F. of L. has shown enough intestinal fortitude to override a decision rendered by the National Labor Relations Board foodstuffs in California today are being canned and processed and sent to market. If the A. F. of L. and the canners had followed the order that was issued by the National Labor Relations Board ordering the canneries and processing plants to bargain with both the CIO and the A. F. of L. there would not be a bit of our food being processed or canned. There would be nothing but trouble. I think the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND] must know that is true.

What we need in this country more than any other one thing is a definition by the Congress of the term "agriculture" and the term "agricultural labor." The amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT] seeks to do that in this instance. Again I point out to you that we have under the National Labor Relations Act one definition of "agriculture" and "agricultural labor;" under the Wages and Hours Act we have another definition; under the Social Security Act another definition; and under the Internal Revenue Act still another definition. This is another attempt by those of us who are primarily involved to clarify the situation so that we can do away with some of this agricultural and industrial strike that we have in this country.

May I pay my respects to the preceding speaker? He spoke, as do many Members who are not familiar with the subject, about the Associated Farmers of California. I am proud to say that when I was first elected to Congress in 1938 I was an active member of that organization. That was one group in California that had intestinal fortitude enough to fight Harry Bridges and his gang to their knees and keep them out of the agricultural fields.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. HARE. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, the rider now being debated would remove over 1,000,000 workers from the protection of the Wagner Act. I need not stress the seriousness of this exclusion. When workers can no longer defend themselves, their very bread and butter may be at stake and violent strife which

they do not seek may be thrust upon them.

All this is done by a singularly specious piece of word trickery. From the first drafting of the Labor Relations Act, it was felt that agriculture and farm workers fell in a special category. Farm labor was excluded from the act. Now, truly industrial workers are robbed of their rights by the mean device of calling them agricultural labor.

The men and women who work in packingsheds and similar industries do exactly the same kinds of jobs as their brothers and sisters who work in factories making broomsticks or lightbulbs. They punch a clock when they go to work, they stand at a work bench under the eye of a foreman, they use machines, and as far as the individual worker is concerned, it is more or less chance that the raw material of the work happens to be the produce of the land.

The simple evidence of the eye is clear enough. Equally clear is the industrial nature of food processing as seen in the eyes of the law. In the North Whittier Heights case, the ninth circuit court stated:

When the product \* \* \* leaves the farmer as such and enters a factory for processing and marketing, it has entered upon the status of industry. In the status of this industry, there would seem to be as much need for the remedial provisions of the Wagner Act as for any other industrial activity.<sup>1</sup>

This judgment by the ninth circuit court was backed up by the Supreme Court of the United States. The Supreme Court denied certiorari in this case.

Federal administrative judgments run in the same direction. By an ironical twist, the inflated definition of agricultural labor used in this rider is borrowed from what is called the social security definition. Yet the Chairman of the Social Security Board himself, Arthur J. Altmeyer, described one of the main kinds of packing sheds as follows:

Employees of the large expensively equipped packing plants are little more than attendants of the machines they operate. The inside of a typical citrus packing house is a maze of conveyer belts and machinery. There is little to distinguish the conditions under which workers perform services in these plants from those in ordinary urban factories.

It is perfectly true that the working farmer has many serious problems. He did yeoman service during the war and he still serves his country from dawn till dark. But the sources of this rider have nothing to do with the American family size farm. The attack against food processing workers was launched by large-scale grower-shippers who no more resemble farmers than the chairman of the board of the United States Steel Corp. It smacks of cowardice as well as falsehood for businessmen to hide behind the name of farmer in an attempt to steal the rights of industrial workers.

We have heard much in recent weeks about the need to find a solution for labor disputes. Now we are presented with this rider which virtually guarantees not

less but very much more strife in labor relations. We have seen the effects of special privilege before. Here is a most outrageous case wherein for the selfish interests of a few industrialists, masquerading as farmers, the Congress, if it passes this rider, will put itself in the position of forcing workers to the final recourse of the strike to preserve their basic rights as freemen.

I hope the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND], who has made a very pronounced and assiduous study of this whole subject matter, will be accorded courteous attention when he speaks following me, because he is conversant with every aspect of the problem and speaks from first-hand knowledge.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, perhaps my district contains as many packing plants as any other section of the State of California. These plants are on about an 11-month operation basis throughout the year. The people who work in them are urbanites; they live in cities. They follow their occupation just the same as people employed in any other line of industry. They are not even close to the farm. To accept this definition that is going to put them in the same classification as the people who reside in the country, people who actually get dirt under their fingernails on the farms is quite unfair. It is merely an attempt to break down the standards that have been set for city dwellers. They work as other industrial workers and their work is classified more as that of industrial workers than it is of agricultural workers. They do not nor can they supplement their living standards with country products as do those who live on the farm.

This thing sneaks in the back door. It has been brought in here by the Associated Farmers. I am proud to say that I come from a district where there are a lot of Associated Farmers, and they have never supported me. If the definition of agricultural workers must be revamped, let us do it in an orderly fashion through legislation introduced for the purpose and not slip it in behind the scenes as a sneak rider. Let us enter the house boldly through the front door and not by stealth by way of the back door when no one is on guard. This is an attempt to break down the standards of labor in the cities by forcing on urban workers the lower standards of the unorganized workers of the rural sections of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Chairman, the pending amendment constitutes a deplorable example of the unsound and unjustifiable custom of making or modifying laws by means of riders on appropriations bills. The purpose of the amendment is to transmute a million industrial workers in processing plants and packing sheds into agricultural laborers or farmers, and thus by legislative legerdemain deprive them of the benefits of the Wagner Act. This undertaking is

on the logical level of a contention that a wheelbarrow can be transformed into an automobile by pushing it into a garage.

The food-processing workers whom the amendment would classify as farmers or agricultural workers, have, for many years, peacefully organized and collectively and harmoniously bargained with their employers in pursuance of the provisions of the Wagner Act. But if the proposed amendment is enacted, this army of law-abiding, deserving men and women will be deprived of all means of protecting the industrial rights which they enjoy under existing law. For example, under the operation of the amendment, if the workers in a food-processing plant should form a union, as they have the inalienable right to do, there would be no lawful authority to certify them as a bargaining agency. Therefore, the strike with all its burdensome consequences would be the only means to which these union workers could resort to obtain recognition of their collective status from an unfriendly employer.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ELLIOTT. This amendment does not include commercial canneries and commercial packers.

Mr. NEELY. Of course, it does not. But it does include those who work in what are called the packing or processing sheds.

Mr. ELLIOTT. It possibly may, yes.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Chairman, to adopt the amendment will be to add another injury to the many which the Nation's toilers have suffered at the hands of those in high places during recent months; it will be to encourage industrial strife; it will be to substitute contention for content.

To defeat the amendment will be to preserve legislative propriety, do justice to a million of those who live by toil, and promote industrial peace.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is my understanding that these workers or persons who would be exempted do not work on the farms.

Mr. OUTLAND. Not a single one works on the farm. Not one hired man now comes under the jurisdiction of the NLRB.

Mr. McCORMACK. My understanding is that this applies not only to those who pack, can, and process, but also applies to everybody employed in connection with distribution. Is that correct?

Mr. OUTLAND. That is correct. And that is why it is unfair to term this amendment as one affecting agricultural laborers.

Mr. Chairman, may I quote from the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT]. The language in part is as follows: "Composed in whole or in part of agricultural

<sup>1</sup> 109 Fed. 2d 76, Jan. 17, 1940, C. C. A. Ninth Circuit.

labor as defined in the Social Security Act."

Mr. Chairman, that means if the bargaining unit had just one person as a member who qualified as agricultural labor as defined in the Social Security Act, then the National Labor Relations Board would have no jurisdiction whatsoever. I wonder if the Congress wants to take that step. Think of the intricacies that will be involved. Secondly, I would like to say to my colleagues the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] and the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] that I, too, want to see a definition of agricultural labor that means the same thing in one law as it does in the other. I will join with you on that. But, gentlemen, why not put it in a separate bill instead of tacking it on as a rider on an appropriation bill? Why drag in such a definition by tactics such as this? That is not the way to get a definition of agricultural labor. Let us put it in a bill by itself, and I will join with you then in working out a common definition. Mr. Chairman, we hear a great deal about the need for more and more food supplies not only in this country but in other nations of the world. If you enact a rider like this, you are going to create additional strife in the processing and packing plants of America that are helping to process and to transport this food that is so badly needed. I am certain that we do not want to take this step. We are anxious to do everything possible in this House to reduce labor strife. By passing a rider like this we are going to do everything we can to encourage labor strife. And we are doing it because the membership is not fully informed as to the true implications of this rider. It seems to me that this would be a backward step and not a forward step. If we want to define agricultural labor, let us do it, but let us not do it by enacting a rider like this. The NLRB does not touch one single hired man in this country. Agricultural labor is not the issue here today. This point I cannot emphasize too strongly. We are hitting the people working in mechanized plants and processing plants that are as much industrialized as my colleague the gentleman from West Virginia pointed out a few moments ago. I urge that this rider be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I wonder what the gentleman thinks of the operation of this board in connection with farms in New Jersey where they went in and tried to organize and force the men into unions on the farms of New Jersey?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss this question from the point of view as to whether it is good legislation to change fundamental law with a rider attached in this way to an appropriation bill. I am not going to discuss it from any other angle. We have here one-half of the California delegation in favor of the bill and the other half against it. It is apparently a Cali-

fornia fight from start to finish. I have tried to protect the legislative prerogatives of the various committees of this House. This is not the place to write a definition of agricultural labor. If there were any question about it, the argument this afternoon ought to convince any fair-minded person that this is not the place to write that definition.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it not a fact that the reasons for defining agriculture by the definition sought to be put in this bill for tax purposes under the Social Security Act is an entirely different reason than that contained in the National Labor Relations Act and Wage-Hour Act?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. That is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. They are not similar at all, are they?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. No they are not. Farmers and farm labor are specifically exempt from the National Labor Relations Act. That act does not apply to farmers and people working on the farms.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Does not the gentleman want to be corrected on that?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. It does not apply to the people working on the farms.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It applies to the farmer when he takes his products to the packing house and helps to package them.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. That statement has been made and denied on this floor several times this afternoon. The argument on this very question ought to be convincing that the definition for "agricultural labor" ought to be changed only after all parties have been heard by the proper legislative committee and should not be written into an appropriation bill on the floor of this House.

At the beginning of my remarks I stated that I wanted to discuss this question purely from a point of view as to whether it is good legislation to change fundamental law with a rider attached to an appropriation bill in this way. As is well known, the national labor relations law has been bitterly opposed by industry and just as enthusiastically supported by labor. Any definition of "agricultural labor" which may be written into this bill will only apply to the funds appropriated therein and the amendment must be written into each annual appropriation bill to make it effective. This is the third California versus California fight we have had on the floor of this House and you are going to have it every year so long as you continue to write that definition into an appropriation bill. If this policy is continued the Appropriations Committee will find itself in a position where half of the bill will be appropriations and the other half of the bill limitations on appropriations changing fundamental law. We will spend 1 day debating the advisability of making appropriations for a specific purpose and the next day debating whether or not fundamental law of the land should be changed without com-

mittee consideration by riders on an appropriation bill. Even the proponents of this amendment have told me personally that I was right in the position that I have taken in this matter. There may have been some excuse during the war for putting some of these riders on an appropriation bill. The war is over. It is up to the proponents of this amendment to go to the proper legislative committee with a bill, have that committee hold hearings where both labor and industry can be heard on the matter, and then after proper hearings submit to the House for consideration a definition of "agricultural labor" which will once and for all settle this question.

Let me remind both labor and industry that this practice works both ways. You will, without a doubt, find amendments offered in the future changing fundamental laws affecting both industry and labor. This amendment has been proposed for the past 3 years. It was attached, I believe, on two occasions to the War Labor Board appropriation. Ample time has been given for legislative action. If the proper legislative committee does not bring your bill out, all you have to do is to place a petition on the Speaker's desk and if a majority of this House, 218, want that bill passed they can bring it to the floor within 30 days.

I shall continue to oppose legislative riders of this type on appropriation bills. This practice, particularly in peacetime, is not only bad practice but will result in the enactment of laws without that proper consideration which is so essential to good legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ELLIOTT) there were—ayes 84, noes 64.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. HARE and Mr. ELLIOTT to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 113, noes 67.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 26, line 16, for the purpose of offering a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARE: Page 26, line 16, after the word "diseases", insert "including the operation and maintenance of centers for the diagnosis, treatment, support, and clothing of persons afflicted with venereal diseases; transportation and subsistence of such persons and their attendants to and from the place of treatment or allowance in lieu thereof; diagnosis and treatment (including emergency treatment for

other illnesses) of such persons through contracts with physicians and hospitals and other appropriate institutions without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; fees for case finding and referral to such centers of voluntary patients; reasonable expenses of preparing remains or burial of deceased patients; furnishing and laundering of uniforms and other distinctive wearing apparel necessary for employees in the performance of their official duties; recreational supplies and equipment; leasing of facilities and repair and alteration of leased facilities; and for grants of money, services, supplies, equipment, and use of facilities to States, as defined in the act, and with the approval of the respective State health authorities, to counties, health districts, and other political subdivisions of the States, for the foregoing purposes, in such amounts and upon such terms and conditions as the Surgeon General may determine."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to. Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to. Accordingly the Committee rose; and, the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMASON, 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. 6739) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Elliott amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELLIOTT: On page 46, line 3, after the word "code", strike out the period and insert a comma and the following: "Provided further, That no part of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used in connection with investigation, hearings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining units composed in whole or in part of agricultural laborers as that term is defined in the Social Security Act in section 409, title 42, United States Code."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY and

Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 104, noes 65.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 202, nays 134, not voting 95, as follows:

[Roll No. 157] YEAS—202

Abernethy, Allen, Ill.
Allen, La.
Almond
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Andresen, August H.
Andrews, Ala.
Arends
Arnold
Barden
Barrett, Wyo.
Beall
Beckworth
Bell
Bennet, N. Y.
Bennett, Mo.
Blackney
Bolton
Bonner
Boykin
Brehm
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Bryson
Buck
Buffett
Bulwinkle
Byrnes, Wis.
Camp
Campbell
Cannon, Mo.
Case, S. Dak.
Chapman
Chelf
Chenoweth
Church
Clark
Clevenger
Cole, Kans.
Cole, Mo.
Cooley
Cooper
Cox
Cravens
Cunningham
D'Ewart
Dolliver
Domengeaux
Dondero
Doughton, N. C.
Drewry
Dworshak
Earthman
Elliott
Ellis
Elsaesser
Elston
Engle, Calif.
Ervin
Fellows
Fernandez
Fisher
Fuller
Gamble
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Gerlach
Gibson
Gifford
Gillespie
Gillie
Gore
Gossett
Grant, Ala.
Gregory
Griffiths
Gross
Gwynne, Iowa.
Hagen
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Hancock
Hare
Harness, Ind.
Hays
Hebert
Henry
Hess
Hill
Hinshaw
Hobbs
Hoeven
Hoffman, Mich.
Hoffman, Pa.
Holmes, Mass.
Hope
Howell
Jarman
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Ill.
Johnson, Lyndon B.
Johnson, Okla.
Jonkman
Kearney
Kerr
Kilburn
Kilday
Kinzer
Knutson
Larcade
Latham
Lea
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lemke
Lewis
Lyle
McConnell
McCowan
McMillan, S. C.
Mahon
Maloney
Manasco
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Mathews
Morrow
Michener
Miller, Nebr.
Mills
Mundt
Murray, Tenn.
Norblad
Norrell
Pace
Peterson, Ga.
Phillips
Pickett
Poage
Pratt
Price, Fla.
Ramey
Rankin
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Riley
Rivers
Rizley
Robertson, N. Dak.
Robertson, Va.
Rockwell
Rodgers, Pa.
Roe, Md.
Rogers, Fla.
Russell
Schwabe, Mo.
Schwabe, Okla.
Scrivner
Shaffer
Sharp
Short
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Slaughter
Smith, Ohio
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Stefan
Summers, Tex.
Sundstrom
Taber
Talle
Tarver
Taylor
Thomas, N. J.
Thomason
Tibbott
Towe
Trimble
Vursell
Wadsworth
Weaver
Welchel
West
Whitten
Whittington
Wickersham
Wilson
Winter
Wolcott
Wood
Worley
Zimmerman

NAYS—134

Adams
Bradley, Pa.
Buckley
Bunker
Butler
Canfield
Carnahan
Case, N. J.
Celler
Biemiller
Bishop
Bloom
Clippinger
Coffee
Corbett
Crosser
D'Alesandro
Delaney, James J.
Delaney, John J.
Dingell

Dirksen
Douglas, Calif.
Douglas, Ill.
Doyle
Engel, Mich.
Fallon
Feighan
Flood
Forand
Fulton
Gardner
Geelan
Goodwin
Gordon
Gorski
Granahan
Green
Hand
Harless, Ariz.
Havener
Healy
Hedrick
Heffernan
Heselton
Hoch
Holifield
Hook
Huber
Hull
Izac
Jackson
Judd
Kean
Kee
Keefe
Kefauver
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, Ill.
Keogh
King
Kirwan
Klein
Kopplemann
Kunkel
Landis
Lane
Lesinski
Link
Luce
McCormack
McDonough
McGlinchey
Madden
Mankin
Mansfield, Mont.
Marcantonio
Miller, Calif.
Morgan
Murdock
Murphy
Murray, Wis.
Neely
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Neal
O'Toole
Outland
Patrick
Patterson
Philbin
Pittenger
Ploeser
Powell
Price, Ill.
Priest
Quinn, N. Y.
Rabaut
Rabin
Rains
Randolph
Reed, Ill.
Resa
Rogers, Mass.
Rooney
Rowan
Ryter
Sabath
Sadovskl
Sasser
Sheridan
Smith, Maine
Somers, N. Y.
Sparkman
Spence
Starkey
Stevenson
Sullivan
Thom
Thomas, Tex.
Voorhis, Calif.
Vorys, Ohio
Walter
Wasielewski
Wigglesworth
Wolverton, N. J.
Woodhouse

NOT VOTING—95

Andrews, N. Y.
Auchincloss
Baldwin, Md.
Baldwin, N. Y.
Bates, Ky.
Bland
Boren
Bradley, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Brumbaugh
Byrne, N. Y.
Cannon, Fla.
Carlson
Chiperfield
Cochran
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Combs
Courtney
Crawford
Curley
Curtis
Daughton, Va.
Davis
Dawson
De Lacy
Durham
Eaton
Eberharter
Ellsworth
Fenton
Flannagan
Fogarty
Foiger
Gallagher
Gearhart
Gillette
Graham
Granger
Grant, Ind.
Gwinn, N. Y.
Harris
Hart
Hartley
Hendricks
Herter
Holmes, Wash.
Horan
Johnson, Ind.
Johnston, Luther A.
Jones
LaFollette
Lanham
Ludlow
Lynch
McGehee
McGregor
McKenzie
McMillen, Ill.
Mansfield, Tex.
Mason
May
Monroney
Morrison
Norton
O'Hara
O'Konski
Patman
Peterson, Fla.
Pfeifer
Plumley
Rayfel
Reece, Tenn.
Rich
Richards
Robinson, Utah
Robson, Ky.
Roe, N. Y.
Rogers, N. Y.
Savage
Sheppard
Stewart
Stiger
Stockman
Sumner, Ill.
Talbot
Tolan
Torrens
Traynor
Vinson
Welch
White
Winstead
Wolfenden, Pa.
Woodruff

So the amendment was agreed to. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
Mr. Fenton for, with Mr. Eberharter against.
Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. Rayfel against.
Mr. Brumbaugh for, with Mr. Savage against.
Mr. Horan for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.
Mr. Graham for, with Mr. De Lacy against.
Mr. O'Hara for, with Mr. Roe of New York against.
Mr. McGregor for, with Mr. Byrne of New York against.
Mr. Grant of Indiana for, with Mr. Lynch against.

Additional general pairs:
Mr. Hart with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Jones.
Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mr. McGehee with Mr. Gwinn of New York.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. McKenzie with Mr. Andrews of New York.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.

Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Holmes of Washington.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Auchincloss.  
Mr. Combs with Mr. Curtis.  
Mr. May with Mr. McMillen of Illinois.  
Mr. Stigler with Mr. Crawford.  
Mr. Courtney with Mr. Plumley.  
Mr. Monroney with Mr. Cole of New York.  
Mr. Davis with Mr. Mason.  
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Carlson.  
Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.  
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Sharp.  
Mr. Torrens with Mr. Rich.  
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Stockman.  
Mr. Traynor with Mr. Robison of Kentucky.  
Mr. Folger with Miss Sumner of Illinois.  
Mr. Tolan with Mr. Talbot.  
Mr. Boren with Mr. Woodruff.  
Mr. Patman with Mr. Gillette.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and Messrs. PLOESER, HAND, FULTON, and KUNKEL changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. THOMASON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York (at the request of Mr. TABER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial and a quotation of law.

Mrs. LUCE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include several newspaper articles.

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances on the subject of railroad retirement.

Mr. PLOESER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include newspaper articles on the life of Nicholas Murray Butler.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. REED of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include newspaper articles.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Dr. Clyde M. Longstreth, of Atlantic, Iowa.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Washington Star by David Lawrence.

Mr. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Kansas City Star.

Mr. BARRY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. TARVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a poem.

Mr. GOSSETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. POWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an editorial appearing in yesterday's Washington Post and in the other an article from Everybody's Digest.

Mr. GARDNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered last Wednesday on Government's position in the realm of human relations.

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances; to include in one a magazine article, in one a brief essay, and in the other some resolutions.

Mr. BOREN (at the request of Mr. RIVERS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include letters, editorials, and other data.

Mr. ROWAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Harold Nommensen, president of the Progressive Steel Workers Union at the dedication of a plaque in memory of 63 employees of the Wisconsin Steel Co. plant in Chicago who lost their lives in World War II.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on the British loan from the Daily Kennebec Journal.

Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he recently delivered in Springfield, Mo.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JENNINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

#### UNITED STATES PRINCETON UNIVERSITY BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 367, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints as Commis-

sioners of the United States Princeton University Bicentennial Commission the following Members of the House of Representatives to serve with himself: Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. ANDREWS of New York, Mr. GAMBLE, and Mr. MATHEWS.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] is recognized for 1 hour.

#### THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE AND THE AMERICAN MARITIME INDUSTRY

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address my remarks today to some aspects of the American merchant marine and the American maritime industry generally. All of us have been forcibly reminded of the significance of this industry in our national economic life and in the economic well-being of the entire world by the present collective-bargaining negotiations now taking place under the auspices of the Department of Labor here in Washington. The fact that the maritime unions have already set a strike date, June 15, imposes a real responsibility upon all parties—labor, management, and Government—to see to it that a satisfactory solution is arrived at before then in respect to the wages, hours, and working conditions of the unions.

It is not my purpose at this time to discuss these negotiations, the concrete proposals, or the past history of collective bargaining in this industry. I would describe for the honorable Members some rather peculiar characteristics of this industry usually described as a private enterprise operated by private ship-owners earning a profit based on the risks taken with privately owned and invested capital.

It is an odd fact that not until the workers in the industry sat across the table from the operators, their employers with whom they were bargaining, was the anomalous and wholly false and deceptive role of these ship operators revealed to the naked eye for all to see.

The unions, duly certified through the National Labor Relations Board as the collective-bargaining representative of the workers are today bargaining with the spokesmen of three shipowner and ship-operator associations—the Waterfront Employers Association of the Pacific Coast, the American Merchant Marine Institute, and the Pacific American Shipping Association.

The unions represent the workers. Who do the association spokesmen represent?

Mr. Frank J. Taylor, chairman of the American Merchant Marine Institute and chief management spokesman in these negotiations, very carefully describes himself as follows: "Chairman of the Committee for General Agents for the War Shipping Administration."

General agents for the War Shipping Administration. We have, then, collective-bargaining negotiations being conducted between bona fide representatives of the workers and ship operators acting as general agents of the War Shipping Administration. To what does this add up?

These ship operators do not own the vessels. The vessels are the property of the people of the United States. Some 2,400 of the 3,100 ships in the merchant marine are today owned by the United States Government. But the United States does not operate these vessels; instead, the War Shipping Administration, utilizing the private operators as agents, turns the ships over to them, and guarantees profits upon their operation.

The ship operators who are arguing today about the impossibility of establishing a work-week at sea of less than 56 hours, who repeatedly raise the question of the feasibility of profitable operations if maritime workers have a workweek of less than 7 days, are today establishing wage rates, hours, and working conditions for United States Government property. This is the truth of it.

The United States Maritime Commission—after February 2, 1942, the War Shipping Administration assumed this responsibility—throughout the war chartered vessels at exorbitant hire to private operators. One might say fantastically exorbitant rates.

The story has already been told once in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It will be well to refresh ourselves at this time by turning to a recent statement by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman WIGGLESWORTH, on this entire charter-hire practice.

Between July 1941 and December 1942 the United States Maritime Commission paid out \$199,767,162 in charter hire on 758 vessels. The book value of these vessels amounted to \$37,900,000. The American taxpayers were saddled with an excess charge of almost \$162,000,000. It has been estimated that up to April 1945 \$76,153,323 was expended on charter hire on vessels with a total book value of \$2,400,161. Nearly \$74,000,000 in public funds was squandered by the charter-hire policy.

These are the agents, private operators who in 4 years earned 30 times over the book value of their vessels.

We are seeing in Washington today a shadow play or better a Punch-and-Judy show. American shipowners, hired agents of a United States Government agency are performing in the stage of labor relations, making claims and counter claims, rejecting union proposals, and issuing press releases, all of which have nothing to do with the case.

For the War Shipping Administration must, in the final analysis, play the tune that the ship operators by no understandable power dictate.

We have recently seen the United States Government involved in two labor disputes—coal and railroad. In both instances Government seizure and a Government dictated or negotiated agreement settled the dispute.

In the maritime industry there is no need for Government seizure before Government negotiations could be held. In the maritime industry the most that is required is to destroy the mirage of private operation, to pierce the legal fiction under which the private owners are now operating. The WSA could simply disperse with its private operators now acting as its agents, negotiate its own contracts, and operate the vessels which it

owns with the personnel manning them at present.

Everyone knows this. President Truman knew this when he threatened to break a possible strike by using Navy and Coast Guard personnel to man the ships. Why raise this false issue? Is there any real need for the personnel of the armed forces?

The present personnel on the ships and the docks are prepared to work and would, I believe, cheerfully and speedily negotiate a contract with the real owners of the vessels in the merchant marine, the United States Government, if that became necessary.

But I am not certain that the War Shipping Administration even need disperse with its agents in this instance; though perhaps a careful investigation of the operations of the United States Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration during the war years will reveal how much of a parasitic growth these private agents have been, how profitable their riskless operations.

In the present collective-bargaining negotiations the least we should expect from the War Shipping Administration is a forcible reminder to its agents that bargaining should be carried on in good faith, that issues should be settled on their merits, and that the strike should be prevented in the only manner all of us are anxious to see, the speedy arrival at a negotiated agreement.

It is this point that I wish to repeat today. This is the key to the entire situation.

Private enterprises, hired agents of the Government, are not meeting with the unions as operators of Government-owned vessels but as private capitalists protecting their own investments and aiming at maximizing their own gain. The situation would be ludicrous were it not so serious for the American people and for the workers in the American maritime industry.

We have in the maritime industry today the most thorough and complete separation of those two inseparables of capitalist enterprise—risk and profits. The Government of the United States, as the owner of the vessels, takes the risks on all these ventures; the ship operators take the profits.

Has the Government, through the War Shipping Administration, done all in its power to reach a peaceful settlement in this dispute? Not at all.

There has been no active intercession by the War Shipping Administration in this case except to publicize its planning, with other interested Government agencies, in the event of Government operation and direct Government negotiation.

But why wait until after Government operation before exercising the right and power the Government does possess at this time? Why all this talk about the need for special legislation, for special Government actions on the part of the Executive when the Government now has all the power and all the legal right as the owner of these vessels to force its agents to negotiate and to reach an agreement.

We in Washington have seen some strange methods used in solving recent

labor disputes. In one instance the railroads, the desire of the striking workers to return to work on the basis of the findings of a Presidential fact-finding board was denied as President Truman insisted that the brotherhoods accept his own proposal and his only. In the coal case the United Mine Workers Union negotiated directly with the Government after the seizure of the mines and a satisfactory settlement seems to have been achieved.

There was no negotiation between the Government and the unions after seizure of the railroad lines. There was in the coal case. What can we expect to happen in the maritime industry? Strike-breaking as in railroad or negotiation as in coal?

Collective bargaining and direct negotiations between owners and workers has been and is the most satisfactory method of solving labor disputes. It has not been tried sufficiently in this instance.

Why expect the private operators now here in Washington to get down to brass tacks in negotiations, to make concessions now, to bargain in good faith when they have nothing to lose by remaining adamant and forcing a strike and consequent Government action?

The War Shipping Administration now stands squarely behind its agents in these collective-bargaining negotiations, and the War Shipping Administration has the power to see to it that genuine collective bargaining takes place and is consummated in a contract.

The ship operators are dealing with the unions. Let us have the shipowners, the United States through the War Shipping Administration, participate directly in all of this. Unless such action takes place, and speedily, we will see the entire maritime industry of the United States stopping at dead center.

I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. PATTERSON].

Mr. PATTERSON. We have just gone through a railroad crisis where charges and countercharges of double dealing have filled the air. A body of evidence has been published in some newspaper indicating that the dealings with the railway unions by the White House have left room for considerable suspicion that there has been something less than a frank approach to the real issues in the threatened railway strike. The charge was made by the unions that the White House interfered with negotiations which were making some progress, hampered those negotiations with threats, and finally broke the unions to a settlement which many still regard as unjust.

Are we running into a similar double-dealing situation in the dispute in the maritime industry? Are we going to be presented with a situation in which the Army, the Navy, and the Coast Guard have to be called in to an extreme national emergency, without knowing the real reasons for the use of such power in a labor dispute?

Certain disturbing situations have occurred in the last 10 days. As we know, the maritime unions, which have scheduled a strike by a secret vote of their membership in the event collective bargaining failed, on June 15 were called



down to Washington by the Secretary of Labor. He told them to get together in day and night sessions and to spare no efforts to avert what he termed a national disaster, in the form of a maritime strike.

Hardly had these negotiations gotten under way when President Truman told a press conference, first, that the outlook in negotiations was "gloomy," and, second, that relief ships must move. The President inferred that a maritime strike would interfere with the movement of relief supplies to hungry peoples abroad. The President told the press that he will use armed forces to run the maritime industry in the event of a strike.

This statement, in the midst of negotiations, seriously hampered the efforts of the unions and the Labor Department conciliators to work out a settlement and to avert a strike. This statement of the President in effect gave the employers, the operators, and the shipping industry advance notice that the Government itself would support all efforts to break a strike. He told the employers in effect that they could continue to hold out and to refuse to deal and to make promises because the inference was plain that the Government would be behind them.

Before making such inflammatory statements, it would have been simpler to check the real facts in the situation. What are the facts?

The shipment of relief supplies abroad and the movement of troops has never been an issue in the threatened maritime strike. It is not an issue now. Early in May all of the maritime unions involved in the dispute held a convention in San Francisco. At that time all of the unions pledged that all relief ships with food and troop ships would be loaded and sailed to their destinations in the event of a strike. There is not a maritime union in the United States that has threatened to impede the movement of this type of cargo. Yet the President of the United States gave that as a reason for threatening that the armed forces would break a strike in the maritime industry.

While persons in high places are spreading calumnies about the merchant seamen and confusing the real economic issues in the threatened strike, it is well to recall the record of the merchant seamen in the last war.

Even before the war, the maritime unions were among the first to recognize the menace of Fascist aggression. There were many instances where longshoremen refused to load scrap iron, oil and war materials destined for Japan. Seamen refused to sail such ships. It must be recalled that much of the material of war shipped to Japan prior to Pearl Harbor was used subsequently in snuffing out the lives of many American soldiers and sailors. During the war the maritime unions voluntarily submitted a no-strike pledge to the President of the United States. They kept that no-strike pledge 100 percent. Not a ship was delayed due to a strike by these maritime unions at any time during the war. This is a record to be proud of.

It is also a matter of record that the merchant seamen suffered more casual-

ties during the war than any branch of the armed services, in proportion to their numbers. In the darkest days of the war, when freight ships loaded with war materials were sailing without convoy, many to a watery grave, the merchant seamen came forward, manned their posts, and stuck to their posts regardless of risk. They kept 'em sailing on the Red Sea run, on the Murmansk run, on the Liverpool run. They delivered the goods. They were responsible for maintaining the lifeline between America's arsenal and the fighting fronts of our allies.

Great tribute has been paid to merchant seamen. Many in the highest places, including the chiefs of staff of the allied governments, have told of the great contribution of the merchant seamen in helping to win the war. However, these praises have been forthcoming on days of ceremony, such as Maritime Day, when medals are handed out posthumously to the wives of merchant seamen who gave their lives, and when the ship operators are able to set the stage with fancy banquets and dinners in celebration of the heroic exploits of the rank and file sailor and longshoreman.

Now is the time to recall the heroic record of the American merchant marine. Now is the time to recall that record because of the calumnies that are being foisted everywhere to becloud the fact that the seamen's unions are asking for a decent living wage for their members. Here is what Gen. Douglas MacArthur said of the merchant seamen when he had successfully ended his campaign in the Southwest Pacific area:

I wish to commend to you the valor of the merchant seamen participating with us in the liberation of the Philippines. With us they have shared the heaviest enemy fire. On this island I have ordered them off their ships and into foxholes when their ships became untenable targets of attack. At our side they have suffered in bloodshed and in death. The high caliber and efficiency and the courage they displayed in their part of the invasion marked their conduct throughout the entire campaign in the Southwest Pacific area. They have contributed tremendously to our success. I hold no branch in higher esteem than the merchant marine services.

General Eisenhower said:

When final victory is ours there is no organization that will share its credit more deservedly than the merchant marine. The real heroes of this war are the GI Joes in the Army, the Navy, and the merchant marine.

President Roosevelt also paid tribute to the merchant seamen on many occasions, pointing out we must use the merchant fleets of the Nation "wisely and vigilantly" after the war is won.

More than 6,000 members of one union alone, the National Maritime Union, made the supreme sacrifice in the war. Thousands were injured, became prisoners of war, suffered the harrowing experiences of trying to survive on rafts. Hundreds received medals for their valor and a great many received the President's Distinguished Service Medal for sacrifice under unusual circumstances. A number of Liberty ships were named for the heroes of the merchant marine.

They did a job.

Let us not stand idly by now while sinister forces attempt to do a job on them while they are in the legitimate pursuits of attempting to improve their living standards. Let us not stand idly by while threats are made to use the Army and Navy against them.

On the other hand, let us do all we can to help inject a note of reasonable negotiations into this dispute on the issues.

The sending of relief troops abroad is not an issue.

Sending troop ships abroad is not an issue.

Even the record of the merchant seamen during the war is not an issue.

There is one simple question involved in these strikes scheduled for June 15, and that is the economic question. It involves the maritime unions' legitimate request to reduce the number of hours worked from the present inhumanly long 56-hour and 63-hour week. The unions also seek to win wage increases that have already been won in many industries, such as automobile, steel, electrical, and so forth.

It should be possible to settle this question across the conference table and it should be possible for the Government and its representatives to guarantee a reasonable approach to these negotiations rather than inject threats of force.

I think this strike can be averted if the Government, the real owner of 80 percent of the merchant marine, takes a firm stand in forcing genuine collective bargaining by the ship operators.

If steps are taken in the direction of improving the living standards and working conditions of American merchant seamen, we can be assured that there will be no strike in the maritime industry on June 15.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER].

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot recently about an impending national strike in the maritime industry. Newspapers have carried reports of intensive preparation being carried on by agencies of the United States Government to operate and man the vessels of the American merchant marine in the event such a strike takes place. I think it is appropriate to look behind the headlines and try to see just what is involved in the dispute between maritime workers and their employers and attempt to learn whether the demands being made by the unions are reasonable or whether the employers' refusal to grant them is unreasonable.

The major point on which negotiations were deadlocked is the 40-hour week. Is a 40-hour week, 8-hour day an unreasonable request on the part of merchant seamen? The shipowners say it is. I can recall reading of similar statements by the owners of American factories when the 12-hour day was being debated. There were predictions of disaster when it was proposed that the working day be reduced to 10 hours and the same thing happened when the 8-hour law went into effect. American shipowners bitterly resisted previous efforts to shorten seamen's hours, making the identical arguments which they offer today. Yet the work-

ing hours aboard ship have been reduced from 12 hours a day to 8 hours a day for some classes of personnel and the American merchant marine still thrives.

Today the men are asking for an 8-hour day, 40-hour workweek as opposed to a 56- to 63-hour week. It does not seem to me that there can be any justification, economic, social, or moral for demanding that merchant seamen work 7 days a week, a minimum of 56 to 63 hours and often much longer than that. Congress has seen fit to guarantee by legislation that the vast majority of American workers shall work no more than 40 hours per week.

Let us look for a minute at the fight of the seamen for a 40-hour week in its historical perspective. In my judgment, the rectification of seamen's hours and working conditions is long overdue. The seamen have been most neglected of all American industry on limitation of weekly hours.

For oceangoing seamen, for centuries the traditional working time at sea was 7 days of 12 hours each, or 84 hours a week. This was true in the American service as well as the European merchant marine, while the sailing ship was queen of the ocean. Then came steam. The changes wrought in the seamen's labor by this technical advance were finally reflected in the delayed adoption of the 8-hour day on shipboard. Steam vessels had displaced sails in large measure more than a decade before the turn of the century but it took three additional decades for the beginning of an 8-hour day at sea. This change came largely through collective bargaining by the growing seamen's unions, following the reduction of working hours in shore industries. It was crystallized into law for unlicensed workers in the engine room by the La Follette Seamen's Act of 1915. It did not become legally binding for the deck crew until the passage of the amending act of 1936. It is still not law for members of the stewards' department.

But while the working day at sea was thus being reduced from 12 hours to 8, the number of working days in the week have remained unchanged. "One day's rest in seven" laws, enacted by several States for shore industries, have no counterpart for the seaman. The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 which sets the 40-hour week for manufacturing and commerce generally, excludes him. Fair weather or foul, in the Arctic or the Tropics, he still toils at the engines or on deck for 7 times 8, or 56 hours weekly. If he is a cook or messman his week may run to 63 hours. In cases of emergency, all hands, regardless of rating, may be called upon for hours unlimited, with no extra compensation for the time so worked.

With the modern advance in social and industrial standards, Yankee capacity for continuous improvement of operating processes, and the huge expansion of the American labor force, there is no longer any reason for condemning seamen, of all workers, to a 56-hour week. Their work is heavier, their calling is more hazardous, their living accommodations while at sea are more uncomfortable, than those of the vast

majority of shore workers who already benefit by the 40-hour provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. It is time for this discrimination against seamen to be wiped out.

I hope that when amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act are presented to us we will have the opportunity to vote for the establishment of a 40-hour week for merchant seamen. However, since the unions are trying to accomplish this worthy end through the process of collective bargaining it seems to me that they should have our warmest support for the success of their efforts. Merchant seamen like all American workers are entitled to the standard American work week.

A second point on which the workers and the shipowners are in disagreement is on the matter of wage. After working 240 hours a month a seaman gets about \$127 or \$31.25 a week. In other words the basic wage aboard an American vessel is 56 cents an hour for skilled labor. Let us compare just a few seamen's classifications with comparable work ashore. The nearest equivalent to an able seaman is a ship's rigger. While a seaman gets 56 cents an hour, his shoreside equivalent will receive from \$1.03 to \$1.20 an hour. Similarly engine department classifications such as firemen, and watertenders receive about the same pay as an able seaman. A stationary engineer who performs similar work ashore receives \$50 for a 40-hour week. In some industries where the work is not nearly as arduous nor as exacting, men get about \$1.20 an hour.

The steward's department reveals a similar condition. A second cook who also acts as the ship's baker for up to 60 men receives only \$162.50 monthly, or 68 cents an hour. Similar work ashore earned, in 1944, an average of 85.3 cents an hour, and this for work performed under controlled factory conditions and not handicapped by shipboard facilities.

These comparisons leave out of account the versatility and the adaptability which seamen are expected to display. On the issue of the specific skills required seamen have been held to wage levels far below those commensurate with their duties and responsibilities. Even if common laborer rates were used as a standard, this inequity would still exist. In the shipbuilding and repair industry laborers received in 1945 from 78 to 80½ cents an hour, with provisions for overtime. The least skilled worker on a ship must have greater qualifications, yet this rate is higher than is received by all except an insignificant fraction of the most highly paid unlicensed seamen, mainly chief stewards.

To have a real appreciation of the seamen's wage problems one must consider their total annual earnings. Because of a high percentage of illness and injury in the maritime industry, and because of the need for periods ashore with family and friends, average employment of seamen, even when jobs are plentiful, ranges from 8 to 9 months during a year. It is important to note that in 6 months of labor at sea the seaman has as many workdays as the shoreside worker has in 8 months on land. The seaman, how-

ever, is paid only while under ship's articles.

American seamen have the right to properly maintain a home and family the same as the rest of the American people. His ability to feed, clothe, and shelter his family and dependents during the course of any year depends entirely upon the amount of money the seaman receives during that year. It is obvious from some of the facts that I have stated here seamen's wages are substandard and that consequently their families are forced to live at substandard conditions.

The labor costs of shoreside industries directly affect the cost of water transportation. Yet for some reason, the workers ashore can be paid a living wage. Even the administrative staff employed by shipping operators, the office clerks and stenographers, are paid according to prevailing industrial standards. Only the seamen are expected to sacrifice. It is their wages which, according to the shipowners, make all the difference between ability and inability to meet foreign competition. But no one can explain why the shoreside wages paid to the majority of the operating personnel in the industry have no such effect.

It is only when he works aboard ship that an employee loses his right to a decent wage.

I think it is high time we abandoned such specious reasoning and lent every possible assistance to the achievement of decent American wages for American seamen.

Shipowners are not reluctant to accept operating subsidies for themselves but they resist every attempt to divert a fair amount of these subsidies into the pockets of maritime labor where they rightfully belong. The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 declared the intention of Congress to maintain maritime wage rates at a fair level and the seamen have a right to expect that this will be done. While protesting fear for the financial health of the industry, the employers remain discreetly silent about their huge wartime profits, as well as the enormous Government expenditures, which granted a high level of profits in peacetime. The records of the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries is replete with such data.

Congress has shown much concern for the profits of the shipping industry. The present dispute between the maritime workers and their employers has thrown very little light on the problems with which these workers are confronted. I think Congress will make an important contribution in the public interest if we now lend every possible assistance to the peaceful solution of the maritime problem with a fair settlement for the workers. I think they are entitled to have their hours reduced and their wages raised.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, one of the distinguished Members of this House, who has become nationally known for his knowledge of the problems of the maritime industry, is my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], who recently returned from the Pacific Northwest where he was the

chairman of the International Conference which convened in Seattle for the purpose of working out problems in common with the maritime industries among the nations of the world. I am very proud of the fact that Mr. JACKSON was chosen the chairman of that important Conference and gave the keynote speech.

I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] such time as he may desire.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from Washington for his very kind words.

Mr. Speaker, the pending labor dispute in the maritime industry should be thoroughly aired so the public will be familiar with all the issues. Much has appeared in the press of late regarding the inability of the operators to meet the costs of higher wages and shorter hours.

To my knowledge there has never been an accurate study or survey of the profits and earnings of the industry—particularly during the immediate prewar and war period. I know Congress has been advised from time to time on certain excessive profits such as the "Red Sea" charters—losses paid from insurance and large earnings from charter agreements with the Government.

It is most unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that a thorough and complete study of the earnings has not been made. Certainly the public is entitled to have this information in view of the statements and counterstatements that have appeared in the press on this question. If this information were made available maybe there would be an opportunity to have the dispute decided on its merits.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, it might be well and appropriate at this time to remind the House that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] has made a very intense study of the shipping industry, and as one of the senior members of the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries took a leading part in recent debate in connection with the so-called ship purchase bill.

Just in passing, the gentleman referred to the resolution introduced in the Senate by the gentleman from Vermont, Senator AIKEN, and in the House by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH]. It might be well for the Members of the House to take a profound interest in this whole subject of the maritime industry, because, if that resolution is acted upon favorably, I am convinced there will be brought forth startling facts revealing the enormous profits made by certain ship operators during the war to such an extent that the Comptroller General wrote a special report in which he questioned very much the War Shipping Administration's operations.

Recently the Navy Appropriations Subcommittee of the House, of which I happen to be a member, went very extensively into the operation of the War Shipping Administration and in the report and the hearings brought out directly very severe criticism against the War Shipping Administration for the shoddy and shabby way in which it had operated Government-owned ships.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Washington [Mr. DE LACY] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, there is no need for a maritime strike. The United States Government owns 80 percent of American merchant ships afloat. They were built with taxpayers' money. Operated by private shipping companies as agents, making millions in profits without investment in 80 percent of the fleet under their management, the ships belong to the people.

Instead of putting the pressure on the seamen, instead of threatening to use our Navy, whose magnificent performance in the war just past should not now be tarnished in the dirty work of strike-breaking, let our Government direct those whom it has chosen as its agents to operate the people's ships to reduce the inhumanly long workweek, to bring seamen's wages up within sight of shore-side wages, and make the settlement retroactive.

Those three simple steps, all clearly within the legal and the economic and the moral power of the United States Government, would end all talk of strike.

No body of men enjoys striking. No one is talking of tying up ships for fun or, as has been charged in the antilabor press, for political reasons or to gain some mysterious international effect.

The men who earn their bare livings in the American merchantmen, the men who faced the bombs and the torpedoes, the men from whose ranks more are listed as killed or missing during the war than were lost proportionately from any other branch of service, the men, Mr. Speaker, who took a terrific punishment from undersea wolf packs and from all the Luftwaffe could pour on and still went back to keep 'em sailing—these are the men who now say that 56 hours a week, 8 hours a day for 7 days a week without overtime rates is too long to work, and 9 hours a day for 7 days a week without overtime rates in the stewards' department is also much too long for any American to have to work.

These are the men who say that their miserably low wages, which range from 53 cents an hour to 73 cents an hour for the most highly skilled and best qualified, are not enough for them to support their families on.

And who but the profit-hungry ship operators will disagree that these hours are too long and this pay scale is too low?

American seamen want the 40-hour week enjoyed by other workers in American industry.

American seamen want at least the same minimal wage adjustment which has been found necessary and just in other parts of American industry.

American seamen want these necessary gains made retroactive to October 1, 1945, the date when their last contracts expired.

And American seamen want to win these modest concessions without having to tie up the waterfronts of three coasts.

Why should ship operators who got rich managing ships which the people paid for, which the Government built, which were manned by heroic men trained at Government and union expense, now arrogantly refuse to make any good-faith offer looking toward reduction in excessively long hours and excessively low pay in their maritime industry?

These wealthy agents took no financial risks during the war. They did not subject their precious persons to the dangers faced by the seaman and the men of the fighting fronts. They did not even run the risk of being hurt or killed, as so many thousands were in the lumber, shipbuilding, mining, and other industries during the war.

They own only 20 percent of the ships involved. They will get the cream of the Government-owned fleet for 5 cents on the dollar.

Let them in good faith now help build a stable American merchant marine, based, as all lasting industry must be based, upon a skilled, experienced, and stable working force.

It used to be said that seamen are bums. I have seen my share of seagoing bums, and I have lived under the conditions on board ships that make bums out of normal youngsters. I remember the conditions on the Alaska Steamship Company's lines and on the Dollar Lines, 20 years ago, before the seaman's unions cleaned them up. I remember lifting the crust of an apple pie to find a carpet of green mould underneath. I remember having to leave the forecabin when I wanted to clean up, travel half the length of the ship, go down through the engine room, out into the fireroom, and behind No. 3 boiler where one shower for all the black gang was located. In this hot place, between a B and W boiler and the bulkhead, where a roll of the ship could toss a man's bare flesh against the back of the boiler, men were privileged to wash themselves.

And on the old Dollar Line there was not even one shower. Nine firemen slept in one forecabin, with ports about 7 feet above the water line, so that clear across the Pacific the ports could not be opened for fresh air. Those who tried it got washed out of their bunks. With temperatures running as high as 154 degrees in the mountain-ringed port of Hongkong, men slept in stinking quarters, ate in a mess hall directly over the boilers, with sweat running down their arms and forming pools on each side of their bodies on the hard, wooden benches on which they sat.

I well remember coming out of the fire room, wringing wet, my shoes squishing with my own sweat, my dungarees so soaked that I could and did wring my own sweat out of them. I remember working on top of those boilers with a floor plate temperature of 150. I remember cleaning and blowing boiler tubes and crawling inside boilers to tear out firebrick, working in thick clouds of dust with no respirators, with floor plate temperatures running upwards of 140 degrees.

I remember that even the air that came down the forced draft was so hot

that it cracked our ears and burned our lips.

And I remember coming off those watches with not even a shower to go to. The Dollar Line permitted us to buy our own buckets and our own soap and towels, and graciously ran a cold water line into a little compartment about 8 foot square, with two toilets in it and the rest reserved for all the wipers, firemen, and water tenders aboard to clean up in.

Those ships were part of the owners' loot from the last war. The companies had mail subsidies so unreasonable that the great Senator Bone, of our State, and other distinguished Members demanded and got investigations which caused the whole system of subsidies to be changed.

Out of those conditions grew the present seamen's unions. Out of those conditions came legislative authority for the Maritime Commission to fix decent minimum wages for seamen and to inspect and correct living conditions aboard ship.

But the Commission, after one effort in 1937, quit the business of caring for America's orphans, the merchant seamen.

Now these men, whom we have just been praising for their valor in the war, are asking for economic justice. Yet they are being accused of being in some deep plot against the Government, of having mysterious international objectives. Mr. Speaker, the only politics being played with the marine worker is being played in Congress. Congress has not enacted a more adequate minimum wage-and-hour law. Congress has excluded seamen from unemployment and other benefits enjoyed by other workers in other industries. The Maritime Commission has not lived up to its responsibilities or exercised its powers in setting more adequate wages or corrected the inhumanly long hours.

Let any Member of Congress live on board one of our merchant ships, as I did when I was a youngster. Let any fair-minded and decent-hearted American. He will soon discover that the American seamen, like all other American workers, knows that he has some improvements in his working conditions coming, that with modern technical advances the 56- and 63-hour workweek is long obsolete, that ways can be found to pay him a wage upon which he, too, can support a family, can pay rent and food bills on shore, can clothe and educate children.

Or is it the object of the ship operators to drive every family man ashore? To take the running of our fleet away from its present skilled and honorable working force?

Two studies have been made of seamen and their families.

One of the studies was made by the United Seamen's Service, a war-born organization in which the Government, the shipowners, and the maritime unions cooperated to afford vitally needed services to our war seamen. A carefully chosen sample of 100 men, distributed according to the relative numbers of men in the various ratings on dry cargo vessels, was used.

The USS study showed only 28 out of 100 men who had no dependents. As

many as 41 were or had been married and were supporting wives or children or both. Altogether, the 100 men had 129 dependents.

TABLE 1.—Family responsibilities of unlicensed seamen—USS study<sup>1</sup>

Family responsibility:	
Without dependents.....	28
With dependents.....	72
Wife only.....	13
Wife and children.....	20
Children only.....	4
Other relatives only.....	27
Wife and others.....	7
Children and others.....	1
Total.....	100
Total number of dependent persons.....	129

<sup>1</sup> John W. Hastie, Unemployment, Annual Income and Family Status of Seamen, 1943.

The second study showing family responsibility of seamen was conducted by the National Maritime Union. Of 70 men interviewed, only 27 were found to be without dependents. The remaining 43 men had from 1 to 6 dependents each.

On the west coast, the United States Shipping Commissioner at San Francisco states that approximately 80 percent of seamen sign over an allotment of a portion of their pay to dependents. This is in marked contrast to the years 1936 and 1937 when only 15 to 20 percent of seamen signed allotment papers, and of these the majority were in the licensed group.

Upon investigation, American seamen are found to be as typical of American workmen as shipyard workers, textile workers, or steelworkers. The American seamen come from every State in the Union. Their backgrounds and heritages are as varied. Bombs, torpedoes, and mines have taken their toll without regard for color, religion, home, State, or any other distinguishing characteristic.

Instead of threatening to break a strike, why is not action taken to force the ship operators to bargain in good faith with the unions? The Government of the United States is in an extremely favorable situation in this industry. The Government owns 80 percent of the merchant marine. The Government has poured billions into building a merchant marine and has guaranteed huge profits to a small group of shipping operators who are merely acting as agents of the Government. The Government through the Labor Department, the War Shipping Administration, and the Maritime Commission, should stop talking tough to the unions and begin to talk tough to the operators who are their agents. There must be a real attempt to force the operators to make a reasonable offer to the unions. We face now the scandalous situation where the shipping operators have not made a single offer or a counter proposal to the demands of the maritime workers.

There is no need for a strike in the maritime industry. There is no question that the threat of the strike will disappear quickly if the shipping operators are forced to offer something reasonable and in good faith on the following and only issues in the present dispute:

First. Reduction of the present intolerably long workweek aboard ship.

Second. An increase in wages in line with national wage patterns recently established in many other industries.

Third. Retroactivity of wage increases to the date of expiration of old agreements.

Fourth. Agreement to negotiate other less important but real issues involving grievances and working conditions.

If the Government does not make some effort to put some reason instead of threats of force into the negotiations, there will be a strike on June 15. We know what this will mean to the Nation. We hear that unions in many foreign countries will refuse to load, unload, or sail ships while such a maritime strike is going on in our country. There is a possibility that railway workers will refuse to transport freight into docks for loading if it will mean crossing longshoremen's picket lines. We must not let this happen. It need not happen. Let the Government, which owns the ships, put pressure on their own agents, the operators, who have been bargaining fruitlessly with the unions for more than 7 months, make the operators stop stalling and sit down in good faith to work out for the first time a decent standard of living for our merchant seamen. They too sacrificed; they too contributed to victory. Let them share in the fruits of peace.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 30 minutes.

#### AMERICANS TAKE NOTICE—SCHOOL OF POLITICAL ACTION TECHNIQUES

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose to expose what I believe to be a Communist fraud which is being perpetuated upon the people of the city of Washington through the guise of a so-called School of Political Action Techniques to be conducted by the National Citizens Political Action Committee. I am sure that many Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle are not aware of the nature of this outfit, which has had the effrontery to print a picture of the National Capitol on the cover of its catalog. It is my purpose to show that the faculty of this school is largely composed of individuals who have rendered yeoman service to the Communist Party and its front organizations. A number of these individuals with subversive records are former Federal officeholders. This project, which is actually an attempt to establish in the city of Washington a branch of the chain of Communist schools to be found throughout the country, is a blot upon the fair name of this city and should be repudiated and denounced by loyal Americans of both major political parties.

SCHOOL OF POLITICAL ACTION TECHNIQUES, CONDUCTED BY THE NATIONAL CITIZENS POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE, WASHINGTON, D. C., JUNE 26-29, 1946—DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION FACULTY AND ADVISERS

John Abt: Husband of Jessica Smith, who is editor of Soviet Russia Today. Mrs. Abt worked in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics from 1922-27, for the Soviet Information Bureau in Washington from 1929-33, and was editor of the

Soviet Union Review until 1935. She was formerly the wife of Harold Ware, Soviet agricultural expert. Remember that Communist marriages must be based upon political affinity. Marriage with an anti-Communist is sufficient grounds for expulsion from the Communist Party. John Abt was known in well-informed circles as the commissar of top level Communist forces while he was in Washington. He was Sidney Hillman's chief assistant at the Communist-dominated World Federation of Trade Unions Conferences held in London and Paris. Thereafter he visited the Soviet Union, writing glowingly of his trip in the January 1946 issue of Soviet Russia Today. In Soviet Russia Today of May 1946 he wrote again regarding the "Soviet Lawyer's Role in the Trade Unions." In the New York Times of January 13, 1946, page 33, he charged that the labor crisis was precipitated by "the giant corporations which own the basic industries of our Nation." He is general counsel of Sidney Hillman's Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, of the CIO Political Action Committee and of the National Citizens Political Action Committee. He is reputed to be the connecting link between Sidney Hillman and the Communist Party. He was formerly with the La Follette committee.

Tilford E. Dudley, assistant to the chairman, CIO Political Action Committee, was a member of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, which defended Federal employees charged with subversive activities; the Washington Book Shop, the Washington outlet for Communist literature; the Washington Committee for Aid to China, another Communist-front organization condemned for its activities by Mrs. Roosevelt—appendix IX, page 1685, and executive hearings, pages 2361-2390. He was formerly with the National Labor Relations Board, as examiner.

Abraham Zeitz: Secretary of the Committee on Free Elections in 1940, which defended the ballot rights of the Communist Party; speaker at the pro-Communist National Action Conference for Civil Rights held in Washington, April 19-29, 1940.

Elmer Benson has 23 citations in appendix IX, a study of Communist-front organizations published by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, including: Member, national executive board, National Lawyers Guild in 1937; sponsor, tenth anniversary national conference of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, held October 20, 1943, an organization specializing in the defense of foreign-born Communists; sponsor, National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, which has defended the rights of the Communist Party and individuals charged with Communist activities; sponsor, Citizen Victory Committee for Harry Bridges; member, national advisory board, American Youth Conference, which booed President Roosevelt; publicly endorsed for Governor of Minnesota by Earl Browder—Dies, page 1363; photographed in parade of the American League for Peace and Democracy with leading Communists on August 7, 1937—Dies hearings, page

1369; indorsed by Communist publications—Dies hearings, page 1371; charges that Governor Benson and the Farmer-Labor administration of Minnesota are in league with the Communists—Dies hearings, page 1389; chairman, executive council, National Citizens Political Action Committee.

Dr. Dwight Bradley, speaker and sponsor, fifth national conference, American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, an organization which specializes in the defense of foreign born Communists, March 29-30, 1941; member, American Friends of Spanish Democracy, which was supported by the Communist Party—appendix IX, page 381; signer of appeal for Russian War Relief—New York Times, October 10, 1941; sponsor of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, which has been cited for contempt by the House of Representatives—appendix IX, page 941; sponsor of the Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, June 7-9, 1939, at which a featured speaker was Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, national committee member of the Communist Party, and Elmer Benson—appendix IX, page 1228; sponsor, dinner-forum for the pro-Communist magazine, Protestant Digest, February 25, 1941.

Martha Fletcher: Former chairman of United States arrangements committee for World Youth Conference, which was Communist inspired and dominated, held in London, August 29 to September 6, 1945. This was supported by the American Youth for a Free World, of which Mrs. Martha (Harold) Fletcher was chairman. She was a sponsor of the New York State Conference of Negro Youth, held April 15-16, 1944. The meeting was supported by the American Youth for Democracy, formerly the Young Communist League. Under the name of Martha Haven Fletcher she was a member of the editorial board of Spotlight—June 1944—official Communist youth organ. She signed a statement lauding George Dimitroff, former head of the Communist International—New York Times, December 22, 1943, page 40.

Leo Krzycki: President, American Slav Congress, and president, Polish Labor Council, both Communist dominated; vice president of Sidney Hillman's Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, recently granted a lengthy interview by Marshal Stalin. His speech on his return is quoted in the Daily Worker of May 9, 1946, page 15, as follows: "He had found in the Soviet Union, Poland, Yugoslavia, and other countries in eastern Europe" a warm spirit of working-class brotherhood and he "toured Europe as a representative of the American Slav Congress last year," and found "labor treated as an equal partner in government in Poland." He also "praised Marshal Tito." Krzycki was the leading speaker at a meeting on May 30, 1937, in Chicago, which started a riot at the Republic Steel Co. plant. He was a guest of honor at the dinner of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, held on April 17, 1943. On May 1, 1942, Leo Krzycki sent a message in behalf of the American Slav Congress to the Red army. Again on June 22, 1942, at a meeting in Detroit, he spoke at an

American Slav Congress meeting which greeted the Red army. He spoke on July 5, 1944, before the annual convention of the International Workers Order, a Communist fraternal organization. Sponsor, American-Russian Institute dinner, October 19, 1944; signer of a statement eulogizing George Dimitroff, former chairman of the Communist International—New York Times, December 22, 1943, page 40. Sponsor, Soviet Russia Today magazine dinner in honor of the Red army, February 22, 1943.

Tom Neill: Executive secretary of Servicemen's and Veterans' Committee, UERMWA—United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers Union, which is Communist controlled; delegate to the Communist-inspired and dominated World Youth Conference, in which he was associated with Martha Fletcher. Signer of statement to the President and Congress, defending the Communist Party—Daily Worker, March 5, 1941.

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL RESEARCH—FACULTY AND ADVISERS

Dr. Hadley Cantril: Signer of a petition issued by the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, a Communist-front organization, the petition seeking to abolish the Dies committee—appendix IX, page 332; sponsor of a meeting by the same organization held on April 13, 1940, in defense of public-school teachers charged with Communist activities; member, executive committee, Film Audiences for Democracy, a pro-Communist film organization—appendix IX, page 730; signer of a statement in defense of the Communist Party, December 14, 1939, during the Stalin-Hitler pact.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC RELATIONS—FACULTY AND ADVISERS

Abe Ajay: Cartoonist for PM; cartoonist for the New Masses, Communist weekly magazine.

Len De Caux: Editor of the CIO News; formerly with the Federated Press, a Communist news service; recently returned from a visit to the Soviet Union, after which he made a glowing report of his visit in his paper; supporter of the American League Against War and Fascism, cited as subversive by Attorney General Biddle. Cited as a Communist by Homer Martin, former president, Auto Workers—Dies hearings, page 2062.

Jay Deiss: Member, executive committee, Washington Committee for Democratic Action, which defended Federal employees charged with subversive activities—letterhead, May 23, 1941; former senior editor-writer of the Federal Security Agency.

Joseph Gaer: Born in Russia under the name of Fishman—former assistant to J. Raymond Walsh, CIO research director; former member of the advisory board, Direction, a pro-Communist magazine, produced by members of the Federal writers project. Interview by the Daily Worker, published June 9, 1945, page 8, refers to him as "a master of the pamphlet form, and certainly the varied examples issued by the CIO-PAC, of which he is publication director, bear this out." Former employee of the Treasury Department.

Thomas F. Burns: Former assistant to Sidney Hillman in the Office of Production Management. Member of the Communist Party. Former business agent of the Fisk United Rubber Workers Union. In early 1937 made a vice president of the CIO—Massachusetts House Committee on Un-American Activities, 1938, page 149.

Dr. Clark Foreman: President, Southern Conference for Human Welfare. William Weiner, treasurer of the Communist Party, testified that a subsidy of \$2,000 had been paid to the Communist Party of Alabama in 1938, when the Southern Conference for Human Welfare was founded, that this Southern Conference had been discussed with Robert F. Hall, when he was in New York, and that it had also been discussed by the central committee of the Communist Party at the time the \$2,000 was authorized. Front organizations and unions under the Communist aegis followed the lead of the Communist Party in building the Southern Conference for Human Welfare—appendix IX, pages 1581 and 1583; sponsor Win-the-Peace Conference, April 5-7, 1946.

Dr. Frank Kingdon: protested against imprisonment of William Z. Foster—Daily Worker, May 21, 1930; member, executive committee, American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom—letterhead, September 22, 1939—which defended public-school teachers charged with Communist activities; supporter of the American Student Union, a Communist youth front organization—appendix IX, page 514; supporter of the American Youth Congress, which booed President Roosevelt during the Stalin-Hitler Pact—appendix IX, page 525; supporter of the Greater New York Emergency Conference for Inalienable Rights, which defended the rights of the Communist Party—appendix IX, page 772; signer of statement against alleged anti-Communist propaganda—New York Times, May 19, 1930; statement issued by John Reed Clubs, formed in honor of John Reed, a founder of the Communist Party, United States of America; sponsor, National Emergency Conference, May 13-14, 1939, a Communist front organization which attacked registration and fingerprinting of aliens; member of United Student Peace Committee, supporting student peace strikes—Daily Worker, April 13, 1936, page 6.

Michael M. Nisselson: President, Sidney Hillman's Amalgamated Bank; member, Social Workers Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy—letterhead, February 8, 1939—which was supported by the Communist press; member, executive board, United American Spanish Aid Committee—letterhead; financial contributor to Social Work Today, January 1941, pages 16-18, pro-Communist magazine in the field of social work.

Irving Richter: Accused of being pro-Communist. They—Reuther's lieutenants—charged Richter was one of those who lobbied in support of the May-Bailey labor draft bill when the CIO was fighting it and the Communist Party was in favor of it—the Wage Earner, Catholic, May 17, 1946, page 12; supporter of the American League for Peace

and Democracy, when employed as research assistant by the Works Progress Administration—hearings, Dies Committee, page 6404. This organization has been cited as subversive by Attorney General Biddle. Richter was a member of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, which defended Federal employees charged with subversive activity; Washington (Communist) Book Shop; chairman of finance committee, ALPD above.

Katherine Schryver, also spelled Shryver: Executive secretary of the National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax, a Communist-front organization; formerly secretary of the League of American Writers, which has been cited as subversive by Attorney General Biddle; sister of Harold Buckels.

Rose Terlin: Identified as a member of the Communist Party, leader of the American Youth Congress and member of the staff of its publication, Champion—appendix IX, page 528; former executive secretary, White Collar Panel, Regional Labor Board.

Dr. J. Raymond Walsh: Identified as a frank apologist for the Communist line by Dr. John L. Childs—New York Times, July 20, 1945, page 11; signer of letter for closer cooperation with the Soviet Union—Soviet Russia Today, September 1939, page 28; member, League of American Writers—bulletin, 1938, page 4—which was cited as subversive by Attorney General Biddle; signer of attack on Dies committee—Daily Worker, May 13, 1940, page 1, 5; speaker, American Student Union, a Communist youth front, at its fourth annual convention; attacks Congresswoman Luce, for stirring up nightmare fears toward the Soviet Union—New York Times, May 28, 1945, page 17; lauded by Mike Gold—Daily Worker, January 15, 1938, page 7; speaker, forum, Science and Society, a Communist magazine—Daily Worker, November 23, 1942, page 3; member, executive committee, Council for Pan-American Democracy, which has attacked American imperialism; signer, Open Letter for Harry Bridges—Daily Worker, July 19, 1942, page 4; sponsor, American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, specializing in defense of foreign-born Communists; 17 citations in appendix IX; former professor at Harvard University, where he was identified with pro-Communist causes.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC RELATIONS—FACULTY AND ADVISERS

Tom Brandon: Former head of Brandon Films, 1600 Broadway, New York City, supplying pro-Communist films; secretary of the Workers Film and Photo League, affiliated with the International Union of Revolutionary Theaters in the Soviet Union—Dies, hearing, page 549. This league conducted the Harry Alan Potamkin Film School which studied "the movie industry of the Soviet Union as the producer of some of the greatest films of the day"—Tom Brandon, writing in New Theater, January 1934, pages 14, 15, a pro-Communist theater magazine. Brandon was a contributing editor of this magazine, which called itself the Organ of the League of Workers,

Theaters, Film and Photo League, and Workers Dance League, all pro-Communist organizations.

Alex Leith and Perry Miller are, respectively, executive director and founder of Stage for Action. Art Smith is vice chairman of this organization, which actively supports Communist causes—Daily Worker, February 6, 1946, page 6; June 3, 1945, page 14; January 11, 1946, page 3.

Lee Hays and Peter Seeger are, respectively, executive director and director of People's Songs, Inc. This organization is described in the Worker of March 31, 1946, page 7, and February 24, 1946, page 7. On May 9, 1946, this organization gave a concert at the New York Town Hall, for which tickets were on sale at the Communist Workers Bookshop. The affair was advertised in the Daily Worker. People's Songs has composed, according to the Worker, songs "that sounded like an army wanting to march nowhere but to home," including I Just Want To Go Home, and I Don't Want No More of Army Life, Gee, Ma, I Want To Go Home. These songs were sung to GI's. Lee Hays and Peter Seeger were members of the Almanac Singers, which composed anti-American songs for the American Peace Mobilization, which picketed the White House in 1941.

Allan Lomax: Formerly with the Music Division, Library of Congress; member of the Washington (Communist) Book Shop; member, Washington Committee for Democratic Action, which defended Federal employees charged with subversive activities; member, American League for Peace and Democracy, which has been cited as subversive by Attorney General Biddle. Composer of songs sung at Communist functions.

John T. McManus: Film editor of PM; president of the Communist-dominated New York local of the American Newspaper Guild; sponsor, meeting for Russian War Relief—Daily Worker, July 6, 1943, page 5; sponsor, Artists Front To Win the War, October 16, 1942. At this meeting Charles Chaplin praised Communists and called for a second front. McManus signed an open letter to Governor Dewey in behalf of Morris U. Schappes, Communist and convicted perjurer—New York Times, October 9, 1944, page 12. Signer of a statement approving granting Army commissions to Communists—Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 10, pages A1194-A1195; lecturer, Jefferson School of Social Science, a Communist school—Daily Worker, September 3, 1944, page 12; sends greetings to the Daily Worker, May 1, 1945, page 4.

Ben Shahn: Member of the Communist-dominated Artists Union—appendix IX, page 579; submitted radical designs to the Museum of Modern Art and Rikers' Island Penitentiary which were publicly condemned as communistic; contributor to Art Front, a pro-Communist art magazine—November 1935, page 8; signer of Call to the American Artists' Congress—Art Front, November 1935, page 6. Formerly with the Office of War Information.

Saul Mills: Endorsed Daily Worker—Worker, January 9, 1944, page 6; endorsed Army commissioning of Communists—Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD, volume 91, part 10, pages A1194-1195; Endorsed candidacy of Benjamin Davis, Communist candidate for councilman in New York City—Daily Worker, April 10, 1945, page 4; lecturer at the Jefferson School of Social Science, a Communist school—catalog, September 1944, page 75; cited in appendix IX 15 times; signer of the following statement endorsing the National Free Browder Congress of March 28-29, 1942:

You cannot divorce the Browder case from the political party which he heads. There is no question that Browder and those who are associated with him are a part of the united fighting front of freedom-loving peoples against the Axis. \* \* \* The National Free Browder Congress should be fully supported. The principles upon which our Government was founded \* \* \* are at stake. (Daily Worker, March 9, 1942, p. 3.)

Mills was a supporter of the American Peace Mobilization, which picketed the White House, and he condemned a bill to fine persons found guilty of sabotage on defense work \$10,000 plus 3 years' imprisonment.

Hannah Dorner and Edith Halpern: Executive secretary and field director of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, an organization avowedly built by the Communist Party as a political weapon—Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, page A1150.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] is recognized for 15 minutes.

#### BURLINGTON LINES VERSUS RAILROAD INVESTORS

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under date of May 29, Mr. Karl Fischer, assistant to the president of the Burlington Lines, distributed to many Members of Congress a memorandum relating to H. R. 5924 and S. 1253. The general objective of H. R. 5924, introduced by me, as well as that of S. 1253, introduced by Senator WHEELER, is to prevent the unnecessary forfeiture of \$2,500,000,000 of investments in American railroads which otherwise will occur under plans of reorganization approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission in proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act.

Mr. Fischer's memorandum, in which purportedly he speaks for the Burlington Lines, contains an argument in behalf of an amendment by which he proposes to exclude the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad from the provisions of the so-called Reed bill, H. R. 5924.

The argument advanced by Mr. Fischer is to the effect that the Burlington desires ultimately to acquire partial ownership in the Rio Grande, and in any event desires to have that railroad operated as a neutral independent carrier. According to Mr. Fischer the Burlington does not want the Rio Grande returned to its present owners, the Missouri Pacific and the Western Pacific, for even a temporary period—as the Reed bill would provide—during which its owners would have an opportunity to effectuate a speedy, sound, businesslike adjustment of its obligations—all with the required approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission—and emerge from bankruptcy. The Missouri Pacific interchanges traffic with the

Rio Grande through the Pueblo gateway. The Burlington—and the Rock Island also—interchanges traffic with the Rio Grande through the Denver gateway. The Western Pacific interchanges traffic with the Rio Grande at the latter's western gateway at Salt Lake City.

The Burlington, according to the memorandum, fears that if legislation typified by H. R. 5924 and S. 1253 is enacted, its relationship with the Rio Grande at Denver may deteriorate. The Burlington apparently fears also that continued ownership of the Rio Grande common stock by the Missouri Pacific and Western Pacific would result in the deliberate restriction of traffic through the Denver gateway in favor of the Pueblo gateway.

In the memorandum submitted by the Burlington Lines it is contended that the Rio Grande should be exempted from this pending legislation in order to keep it out of control of the two railroads which, with the approval of the Commission, purchased and now hold its common stock. In effect, Mr. Fischer requests Congress to declare by legislative fiat that this railroad shall be an independent carrier without control by any other carrier.

Obviously, questions involving the control of a railroad by one or more other railroads and questions involving interchange traffic arrangements are all matters for the Interstate Commerce Commission, established by Congress for just such purposes. For obviously, too, Congress could not possibly legislate intelligently upon such matters without first holding protracted hearings at which all phases of those complicated issues could be considered and all parties concerned could be heard. The voluminous records of such proceedings before the Commission show conclusively the utter impracticability of the request that Congress act directly in such matters. Appropriate procedure is provided in the Interstate Commerce Act for any application which the Burlington or any other carrier may care to make for authority to acquire partial ownership of the Rio Grande. The Burlington should not be permitted to avoid that statute through the special legislation it here seeks to secure.

The whole subject of railroad consolidations and intercarrier ownerships has received most exhaustive and lengthy consideration by the Commission during more than two decades. Elaborate plans for consolidating the railroads of the country into great systems have been evolved by the Commission only after most extensive hearings and deliberations. Conformably to such plans, the Commission long ago authorized the Missouri Pacific to acquire from the Western Pacific a half interest in the common stock of the Rio Grande.

Regardless of who owns and controls the Rio Grande, the operation of that railroad in a manner that would restrict the fullest and most profitable use of all its facilities, including the Denver as well as the Pueblo gateways on the east and the Salt Lake gateway on the west, would constitute a violation of existing law and would result in a fraud upon the creditors and other stockholders of the Rio

Grande and the public which it serves. It is not to be assumed that the Missouri Pacific and the Western Pacific would operate this carrier thus illegally and wrongfully. The Interstate Commerce Commission has completely effective powers to prevent such results as the Burlington fears. The Burlington could pursue its presently available and ample remedies in the event that the injustices it fears actually should be threatened in the future.

Moreover, the present plan for the reorganization of the Rio Grande, which the Burlington seeks to preserve, does not allot any part of the stock to the Burlington or any other carrier. The plan provides that the preferred and common stock shall be held in escrow for 10 years, within which time, presumably, the new owners will decide what affiliations with other systems will be most advantageous—submission document, page 172. The plan expressly provides that the sale of such stock, however, is to be made only with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It is clear, therefore, that the Burlington would have to secure the approval of the Commission to acquire any of such stock. Thus in any event it will have to comply with section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act.

There is no reason for the Burlington to suppose that its opportunity to become a purchaser of stock in the reorganized Rio Grande will be any different or any less advantageous under Commission-approved reorganization pursuant to the Reed bill or the Wheeler bill than under the present forfeiture plan pending in the courts.

The Burlington did not avail itself of the opportunity to make its proposals to the Judiciary Committee of the House which held extensive hearings upon the Reed bill, nor for that matter did it appear before the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate in hearings on the Wheeler bill. But it is now attempting to have Congress decide this involved issue between the Burlington and the Missouri Pacific upon the floor of the respective Houses and to secure action directly contrary to the recommendations of the House and Senate committees which favorably reported these bills, respectively, and completely supported them in the printed reports filed—House Report No. 1828 as to H. R. 5924; Senate Reports No. 925 and No. 1170 as to S. 1253.

This issue which the Burlington now seeks to inject into the consideration of this pending legislation is actually unrelated to either of these bills. The Burlington's proposals as set forth in Mr. Fischer's memorandum properly should be presented to the Interstate Commerce Commission which ultimately must pass upon them in any event.

#### THE DENVER & RIO GRANDE WESTERN REORGANIZATION

The Commission's plan for the reorganization of the Rio Grande wipes out completely the 300,000 shares of no-par common stock of a 1936 balance sheet value of \$62,457,540, also \$16,445,000 par value of 5 percent cumulative preferred stock, now aggregating a claim of over

\$26,000,000, and present claims of general mortgage bondholders amounting to over \$40,000,000. The common stock is all owned in equal proportion by the Missouri Pacific and the Western Pacific Railroads. The preferred stock as well as the general mortgage bonds are held by many thousands of small investors widely scattered throughout the land.

On July 11, 1939, the Commission issued its original plan of reorganization for the Rio Grande, in which it limited the capitalization to \$147,717,268. Subsequently, in 1940 and 1942, that figure was raised somewhat, but even the final plan of June 14, 1943, limited the capitalization to \$155,173,127. The record of proceedings on the plan before the Commission was formally closed May 20, 1941. All of the outstanding securities in excess of this restricted capitalization were declared to have no value and were wiped out by the Commission's plan. As in the cases of other railroads in section 77 proceedings, the Commission based its restricted capitalization upon its guess of what the Rio Grande would earn in the future and that guess was predicated largely upon the earnings record during the depression years of the 1930's. The Commission's forecasts were proved to be grossly wrong, and its forfeiture of these many millions of dollars of investments was shown to be wholly unnecessary and unjustified. In any event, such forfeitures are unjustified today.

Ever since the Commission's first plan was issued in 1939 the record of actual earnings of this railroad and of the vast improvement in its financial affairs has proved over and over again the needlessness and the tragic unfairness of the forfeitures which that plan and its later revisions decreed.

The gross revenue of the Rio Grande during the depression years 1932 to 1939 averaged approximately \$21,500,000 annually. Subsequent to the issuance of the Commission's original plan in 1939 the gross revenues of this railroad mounted approximately as follows: 1940, \$26,000,000; 1941, \$31,000,000; 1942, \$54,000,000; 1943, \$70,000,000; 1944, \$70,000,000; and 1945, \$75,000,000.

It was brought out in the Senate committee hearings on S. 1253, page 330, that after paying all interest on all other bonds of the Rio Grande for the 5½ years from January 1, 1940, to June 30, 1945, the earnings of this railroad were sufficient to pay the interest charges on the entire \$29,808,000 principal amount of general mortgage 5-percent bonds 5.61 times each year on the average. Ninety percent of the claims of these bondholders for principal and interest is wiped out by the Commission's final plan.

During the period from January 1, 1941, to June 30, 1945, the earnings on the wiped out stocks—after allowing full interest on all bonds—amounted to \$145.15 per share of preferred and \$68.01 per share of common, an aggregate of \$21,549,296.

On December 31, 1940, the Rio Grande had a deficit in net current assets of \$126,644. At the close of 1945 it had net current assets of \$26,339,939. Its cash on hand at the beginning of 1941 was \$4,328,184; at the end of 1945 it was

\$33,964,179; and on February 28, 1946, it exceeded \$40,000,000.

The earnings for January 1946 amounted to \$1.28 per share of preferred stock and \$0.43 per share of common. In February 1946 the earnings continued at the same high rate, the totals for those 2 months being \$2.56 for the preferred and \$0.85 for the common.

For the year 1944 alone the Rio Grande paid Federal excess-profits taxes amounting to \$7.90 per share of common stock.

In 1945 this railroad deducted \$12,700,658 for a special, accelerated amortization, and deducted for deferred maintenance \$2,763,694, a total of \$15,464,352 or an average of over \$50 per share of common stock. These extraordinarily large items were deductible in computing Federal-income and excess-profits taxes. Even so, these accrued taxes rose to \$10,488,390, or more than twice the amount for 1944. They totaled \$34.96 per share of common stock. Because of the bookkeeping methods employed, no stock earnings were reported for 1945, although gross revenues as well as accrued income and excess-profits taxes that year far exceeded those for 1944 when reported earnings were \$15.25 per share of preferred and \$5.06 per share of common.

During the period of bankruptcy the Rio Grande properties were greatly improved by huge expenditures from earnings. These desirable improvements not only vastly enhanced the value of the physical properties of the Rio Grande but very significantly increased its earning power by promoting more economical, more profitable operation.

As of the close of 1944 the trustees of the Rio Grande had charged to capital additions and betterments—less any new securities issued in payment—a total of \$37,401,655. In 1945 they charged \$4,762,414 to additions and betterments. These figures do not include an additional \$10,000,000 which the trustees expended for improvements and charged to operating expense. Since the Commission valued the railroad on July 13, 1942, at \$154,521,612 over \$30,000,000 has been expended on improvements, but the Commission increased its permissible capitalization by only \$615,515 in its final revision of June 14, 1943.

Under that plan the general mortgage bondholders receive common stock of the new company of a par value equal to only 10 percent of their total claim of \$43,548,155 as of January 1, 1943. This \$4,354,816 par value of stock represents but 10 percent of the proposed issue.

Although the general mortgage bondholders rejected the plan by vote, under section 77 the plan may be made effective without their approval. The plan was not submitted to a vote of the preferred and common stockholders because they had been completely eliminated.

In view of such a record of earnings over the past 6 years and of improvement in the financial status of the Rio Grande, the lamentable forfeitures of tens of millions of dollars invested by many thousands of widely scattered citizens—including, no doubt, many employees of that railroad—is irrefutably proved to

have been unjustified. At least such forfeitures are today unjustified in the light of present facts, regardless of whether the Commission's guesses in 1939-40 were then supportable or not.

Apparently Mr. Fischer and the Burlington Lines are not one whit concerned over the forfeiture of these vast investments in either the Rio Grande or other railroads. Indeed, they attempt to justify it, and seek to exclude these hundreds of thousands of investors in railroad securities from the benefits of an opportunity to save their investments, which opportunity the Reed bill and the Wheeler bill propose to grant them.

And for what purported purpose does the Burlington make this proposal? Primarily, to permit the Burlington to acquire a stock interest in the reorganized Rio Grande, and to benefit the present senior creditors of the Rio Grande who, under the plan, will hold all of the securities of the new company after the general mortgage bondholders—to the extent of over 90 percent—and the preferred and common stockholders—to the extent of 100 percent—have been eliminated.

The Burlington's fight is exclusively one to secure partial ownership of the reorganized Rio Grande or at least to keep the Rio Grande in a neutral position. It frankly says as much in its memorandum. Thus, the Burlington seeks to take advantage of an unfortunate position into which the Rio Grande, like many other great railroad systems of the country, was forced by the unparalleled Nation-wide economic collapse of the early 1930's and to deny the owners of that railroad the chance to salvage the tens of millions of dollars invested in it by the two railroads which own its common stock and by thousands of little people from probably every State who invested their savings in its bonds and preferred stock.

While it attacks the motives of the Alleghany Corp.—a common carrier subject to the Interstate Commerce Act—which holds about one-third of the voting stock of the Missouri Pacific, the Burlington's proposal would sacrifice not only the interests of the Alleghany but the thousands of other Missouri Pacific stockholders and creditors as well. If the conditions were reversed and the Missouri Pacific were attempting to deprive the Burlington of any interest in a 50 percent subsidiary, what then would be the Burlington's position as to such requests as it now makes?

I am not opposed to the Burlington acquiring a partial interest in the Rio Grande. I am opposed only to the course which the Burlington now is pursuing—unnecessarily, in my opinion—which would deprive those whose investments in the Rio Grande are unjustifiably sacrificed under the present plan of reorganization, of the opportunity to save their investments, or at least a substantial part of them, from destruction.

#### PRESENT RAILROAD REORGANIZATION IN GENERAL

The Rio Grande is, of course, but one example of the unnecessary and inequitable sacrifice of railroad investments under the Commission's depression-based plans of reorganization. Unless one of



the bills attacked by Mr. Fischer is enacted, approximately \$500,000,000 of creditors' claims and \$2,000,000,000 of stock are threatened with imminent extinction.

The truth of the matter is that practically all the present plans of reorganization under section 77 deprive bondholders of enormously valuable rights as well as extinguish vast investments in stock. The half billion dollars of creditor claims, above referred to as being wiped out, tell only a small part of the creditors' story. Very heavy sacrifices are being demanded of creditors in practically all of the Commission's proposals by reduction of their claims from superior to inferior bonds, or to stocks. This is also well illustrated in the case of the Rio Grande.

The Reed bill and the Wheeler bill each provides a simple direct method of saving so much of such investments as present conditions warrant. They do not attempt to legislate value into securities which have no value, but they will prevent the needless, unjust sacrifice of securities which it has been demonstrated have real value.

Although the Burlington levels an attack on all pending legislation designed to prevent such useless sacrifices of investments in our railroads—all of which securities were duly authorized by the Interstate Commerce Commission—it has no present interest in this general subject, as neither it nor any of its subsidiaries or affiliated companies are involved in reorganization proceedings. So far as the Rio Grande is concerned, the Burlington has an understandable interest. But in its general and vicious attack on all features of the Reed bill and the Wheeler bill, for whom does it speak? Whether wittingly or unwittingly, it speaks in fact for the senior creditor interests—largely institutional holders—who will be unjustly enriched at the expense of hundreds of thousands of junior creditors and stockholders.

Even Mr. Wilson McCarthy, one of the trustees of the Rio Grande, expressed his doubt of the justice of the Commission's plan at the present time when he recently said in his testimony before the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate on S. 1253:

My own personal opinion is that complete justice will be done as near as it can be done in this kind of a proceeding if, under some amendment to your present bill, this thing can be returned to the ICC. \* \* \* I have no desire, if this thing goes back, just to take a cursory look. I don't think that would accomplish anything. If an injustice has been done to these general bondholders, I am very sure that the ICC will be glad to correct it, and that seems to be about all that is left on the Rio Grande.

The Commission, however, has taken the position that it has no authority to recall plans of reorganization once it certifies them to the court—regardless of how unjust or outmoded those plans may have become—and the Supreme Court has repeatedly held that the Commission has exclusive and final jurisdiction to determine the limits of capitalization and the consequent result of what securities shall be extinguished. Only new legislation can open this vise in

which these investors are being squeezed into extinction. The Wheeler bill and the Reed bill each seeks to accomplish the salvaging of these investments and to give these railroads an opportunity to work out—with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission—a businesslike, sound, and fair adjustment of their debts and to emerge from bankruptcy. The request of the Burlington should not swerve Congress from enacting this sound remedial legislation either in the form of the Reed bill, favorably reported by the Judiciary Committee of the House, or in the form of the Wheeler bill, favorably reported by the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

Mr. MCGREGOR (at the request of Mr. JENKINS), for 5 days, on account of illness.

Mr. GROSS, for June 12, on account of death in the family.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5060. An act to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, approved May 7, 1924.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 12, 1946, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

##### SELECT COMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION OF WILDLIFE RESOURCES

Beginning at 10:30 a. m. each day, the Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources will hold hearings on Monday, June 10, Tuesday, June 11, and Wednesday, June 12, in the committee room, 448 House Office Building.

The purpose of the hearings will be to receive reports from the various Federal agencies engaged in wildlife conservation activities and from State game and fish departments, to hear testimony concerning migratory bird shooting regulation for the coming season, and for other purposes.

##### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On Wednesday, June 12, 1946, Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold a hearing on the bill (H. R. 6143) to incorporate the Amvets, American Veterans of World War II. The meeting will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building, and will begin at 10 a. m.

##### COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

There will be an executive session of the Committee on Invalid Pensions in room 247, House Office Building, on Tuesday, June 18, 1946, at 10:30 a. m.

The purpose of the executive session will be to review public bills pending before the committee and to determine which bills will be scheduled for hearings.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1381. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the Budget for the fiscal year 1947, in the amount of \$260,000 for the Office of Economic Stabilization (H. Doc. No. 652); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1382. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to create an Evacuation Claims Commission under the general supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, and to provide for the powers, duties, and functions thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1383. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

#### 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. HARE: Committee on Appropriations, H. R. 6739. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2242). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs, H. R. 6572. A bill to provide military assistance to the Republic of the Philippines in establishing and maintaining national security and to form a basis for participation by that Government in such defensive military operations as the future may require; with amendment (Rept. No. 2243). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CURTIS: Committee on Ways and Means. Senate Joint Resolution 162. Joint resolution extending for 7 months the period of time during which alcohol plants are permitted to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol; without amendment (Rept. No. 2244). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 6699. A bill to decrease the amount of obligations, issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, which may be outstanding at any one time; without amendment (Rept. No. 2245). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary, H. R. 6682. A bill to amend sections 81, 82, and 83, and to repeal section 84 of chapter IX of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; with amendment (Rept. No. 2246). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia: Committee on the Territories. H. R. 5112. A bill to authorize the city of Anchorage, Alaska, to issue bonds in a sum not to exceed \$7,500,000 for the purpose of constructing, reconstructing, improving, extending, bettering, repairing,

equipping, or acquiring public works of a permanent character, and to provide for the payment thereof, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2247). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia: Committee on the Territories. H. R. 5800. A bill to authorize school districts in Alaska to issue bonds for school construction, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2248). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 6646. A bill to establish the Office of Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs; with amendment (Rept. No. 2249). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 6738. A bill to prevent discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 6740. A bill relating to veterans' pension, compensation, or retirement pay during hospitalization, institutional or domiciliary care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 6741. A bill relating to the operation of section 8 of the Federal Airport Act with respect to the fiscal year 1947; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 6742. A bill to make certain imported merchandise subject to the same internal-revenue taxes as similar merchandise of domestic origin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 6743. A bill relating to the selection under the National Labor Relations Act of representatives of employees for collective bargaining; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 6744. A bill to provide that every Saturday shall be a holiday for banks and building and loan associations in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 6745. A bill to further amend the act approved August 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 864); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 6746. A bill to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers for veterans in a free competitive economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 6747. A bill to amend section 2 of Public Law 88, Seventh-ninth Congress, approved June 23, 1945; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 6748. A bill to prohibit the exportation of farm machinery (including tractors) until the domestic farm machinery and farm labor requirements are being currently met; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 6749. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and the Social Security Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 6750. A bill to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mrs. LUCE:

H. J. Res. 365. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating

to the election of the representative of the United States to the Security Council of the United Nations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. WEST:

H. R. 6751. A bill authorizing Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex., to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6752. A bill for the relief of Anthony Demetrios Paschalis, also known as Antonio Paschalis; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 6753. A bill for the relief of Robert W. Heavey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 6754. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Barile; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 6755. A bill for the relief of Mary E. Gaine; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 6756. A bill for the relief of Leonard Ralph McLaughlin; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6757. A bill for the relief of Colbert H. Cannon, of Oceanside, Calif.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6758. A bill for the relief of H. F. Elliott; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6759. A bill for the relief of National American Fire Insurance Co. of Omaha; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

H. R. 6760. A bill for the relief of Paul J. Weimar; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 6761. A bill for the relief of Fred E. Gross; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'NEAL:

H. R. 6762. A bill for the relief of Alice E. Shinnick; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6763. A bill for the relief of Haralambos G. Kaminaris, also known as Harry G. Toulitatos; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

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

1960. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of Donald A. Piper, of Monmouth, Maine, and 30 other citizens, urging aid in relieving the critical grain shortage existing in Maine and throughout the Northeast, requesting a congressional investigation and asking that grain now used in the manufacture of alcoholic beverages be allocated to feed manufacturers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1961. By Mr. VOORHIS of California: Petition of Mrs. Josephine Townley, 108 East Falls Street, Ithaca, N. Y., and 37 others, urging Congress to act favorably on House Joint Resolution 325, to prevent the use of grain for nonessential purposes during the period of shortage; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1962. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Fifth District Advisory Council of Townsend Clubs, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of House bill 2229; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1963. Also, petition of the commander in chief, Disabled Philippine Constabulary Veterans, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for legis-

lation for pensions for the Philippine Constabulary veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

1964. Also, petition of the Oberlin Townsend Club, Oberlin, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of House bills 2229 and 2230; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1965. Also, petition of the Bible Presbyterian Church, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for withdrawal of Russian military forces from Korea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1966. Also, petition of Antioch Grange, No. 452, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the strike situation; to the Committee on Labor.

1967. Also, petition of commission on action for peace and democracy, Congress of American Women, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for a rationing program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1968. Also, petition of the chairman, the Italian-American Labor Council, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a just and honorable peace for the Italian Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1969. Also, petition of Men of Special Services, Three Hundred and Seventeenth T. C. Group, APO 704, care of Postmaster, San Francisco, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to extension of the draft bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 12, 1946

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

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

Our Father God, with soiled face and hands unclean with the dust of earthy toil, we come to the crystal waters of Thy restoring grace. As those set aside to prescribe for the ills of an ailing social order, first cleanse our own souls from moral pollution and mental darkness. In a world where the worst wars constantly against the best, open our eyes to invisible allies which fight by the side of those who keep step with Thy will—invincible forces which at last will bend and break the spears of evil. When plagued with perplexity we have sought truth till our minds are wearied, when faint with the struggle our strength has departed, when the sadness of the world creeps into our own eyes, stand Thou in splendor before us like the light, like love all lovely, like the morning and the noontide which slays the shadows. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, June 11, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

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