and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. Res. 681. Resolution authorizing that there be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives additional copies of a report prepared by Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. OUTLAND:

H. Res. 684. Resolution making H. R. 3914 a bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes, a special order of business; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 6905. A bill for the relief of Andre Lan; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mrs. LUCE:

H. R. 6906. A bill for the relief of Senzo Usui; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 6907. A bill for the relief of W. B. Hussey and J. O. Hussey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TALBOT:

H. R. 6908. A bill for the relief of Rev. William R. McCarthy; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

2037. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 103 operating and nonoperating railroad employees of New Castle, Pa., and vicinity, urging an amendment to House bill 1737, the railroad retirement bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2038. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of C. M. Bedell, Jr., and other residents of Onondaga County, N. Y., in opposition to any legislation or restrictions which may bring about partial or national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2039. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of the American Legion, Department of Texas, opposing H. R. 2346, granting members of the merchant marine similar rights and privileges as given veterans of the armed forces; to the Committee on Rules.

2040. By Mr. PLOESER: Resolution No. 382, adopted by the House of Representatives, State of Missouri, June 12, 1946: The Congress and the United States engineers establish a policy of adjustment, compensation, and replacement to persons in Missouri regarding property destroyed in connection with the construction of a dam on the White River near Bull Shoals in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Claims.

2041. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of Reserve Officers Association of the United States, at convention in Chicago May 31 to June 3, re disability compensation for members of the Reserve components of the armed forces; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

2042. By The SPEAKER: Petition of the Colorado State Federation of Labor, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for extension of price control, without crippling amendments; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

FRIDAY, JUNE 28, 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:

Most merciful God, the fountain of all wisdom and goodness, we thank Thee for the gift of sleep when the tangled web of weary thought emerges clarified and straightened by the touch of the new day. Like a bird that flashes from the darkness through the light back to darkness again, so our day of light is but a moment—a sudden call, and we are gone. Since we know not what a day may bring forth, but only that the hour for serving Thee is always present, may we wake to the instant claims of Thy holy will; not waiting for tomorrow, but yielding ourselves today. So may the service of our brief hour contribute to the beauty and glory of our America as in a darkened world she looks forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, in the splendor of Him who is the Light of the World. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, June 27, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate tomorrow in order to attend the funeral of a very dear friend.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 27, 1946, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1834) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Iowa or the Iowa State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Des Moines River at or near Farmington, Iowa.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 2341) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3517) to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to India, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes.

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

H. R. 3420. An act to provide for refunds to railroad employees in certain cases so as to place the various States on an equal basis under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act with respect to contributions of employees; and

H. R. 6477. An act to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended, and section 3 of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS BY SPECIAL SENATE COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, the committee has continuously examined instances of waste and excessive profits in war production. Since the end of hostilities, however, it has intensified its efforts in this particular phase of the committee's work. For months the committee staff has examined records in the Federal departments and in various companies, and executive hearings have been held. The committee is now ready to announce its first public hearings on a case of this character since the cessation of hostilities.

The public hearings will commence on Monday, July 1, 1946, in room 318 of the Senate Office Building and will concern a group of corporations located in the Chicago, Ill., area, of which the principal companies are Erie Basin Metal Products, Inc., an Illinois corporaton, of Elgin, Ill.; Batavia Metal Products, Inc., an Illinois corporation, of Batavia, Ill.; and the Interstate Machinery Co., an Illinois corporation, of Chicago, Ill. Affiliated with these companies, in connection with approximately $78,000,000 worth of war contracts, were some 11 other corporations and partnerships.

The committee's interest in investigating war contractors is to examine procurement procedures and financial aspects of the operations of war contractors for the purpose of ascertaining the manner in which Government officials have policed and supervised the expenditure of substantial sums of public funds in war procurement. This will include the safeguards set up to protect the Government where sizable advances have been made to enable the contractor to perform, the readjustment of prices in fixed price contracts, the renegotiation of profits on war work, the administration of regulations concerning the awarding of contracts, the granting of priorities for machinery and materials, cut-backs, pricing, manpower controls, "E" awards, termination, auditing, proper administrative overhead expenses and maintenance and repair costs, pyramiding, and practices and operating methods affecting the bill which the taxpayers have paid for goods produced for the war effort.

This is the first case of this character on which the committee has held public hearings since the termination of hostilities last September.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Over $315,000,000,000 had been spent in war procurement up to the end of hostilities. With procurement in World War II of such volume, with the need for haste which faced us during the early stages of the war, with need for relaxing ordinary safeguards in the expenditure of public funds because of the necessity of relative freedom of operation on the part of contracting officials of the Government and producing companies, it was perfectly obvious that there would be some wasteful and improper practices, and some instances of downright fraudulent and criminal practices.

During the war period, when the committee concentrated its activities especially on those phases of the war effort in which corrective action could be taken, of necessity, the committee could not examine closely any but the most flagrant cases which came to its attention in the course of the committee's other work. However, the committee has reported publicly in various interim and annual reports upon a number of such cases, among which are the following: Empire Ordnance Corp.; Engineers Group, Inc.; San Jacinto Shipbuilders, Inc.; Corrigan, Osborne & Wells; Clifford E. MacEvoy Co.; Basic Magnesium, Inc.; Colonial Mica, Inc.

In addition, the committee urged the adoption of measures to prevent inordinate profits on war business. As a result, the law for renegotiation of contracts was enacted. The committee has continued to follow the manner in which that law has been administered. Although production for World War II is completed, the renegotiation of profits on that war work is not completed. The committee's interest in war profits and in the administration of the renegotiation law continues.

Furthermore, the committee has continually examined the methods employed in the handling of procurement of war supplies and plans to make a report on the results of its studies throughout the war period, which will provide a basis for future war procurement policies.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

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

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

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

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is necessarily absent.

The Senators from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO and Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are detained on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business, having been appointed to the commission on the part of the Senate to participate in the Philippine independence ceremonies.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent by leave of the Senate, being a member of a committee designated by the Senate to attend the atomic bombing at Bikini.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of the Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are absent on official business, being members of the commission appointed to attend the Philippine independence ceremonies.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 214)

A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Post Office Department, amounting to $8,179, fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, NAVY DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 213)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations for the Navy Department, amounting to $23,750,000, fiscal year 1947, together with a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to the Naval Establishment (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH, UNITED STATES SENATE (S Doc. No. 215)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the legislative branch, United States Senate, amounting to $60,000, fiscal year 1946 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH, ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL (S. Doc. No. 210)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the legislative branch, Architect of the Capitol, amounting to $3,365, fiscal year 1947 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (S. Doc. No. 216)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior, amounting to $50,000, fiscal year 1946 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION (S. Doc. No. 212)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Veterans' Administration (readjustment benefits), amounting to $1,848,000,000, fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. Doc. No. 211)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the District of Columbia, amounting to $45,200, fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES SUBMITTED BY WAR DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 222)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriation submitted by the War Department to pay claims for damages to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death, amounting to $289,767.94, and which require an appropriation for their payment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES SUBMITTED BY NAVY DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 222)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay a claim for damages to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death in the sum of $1,365.07 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE (S. Doc. No. 223)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of appropriation amounting to $412,448.88 to cover claims allowed by the General Accounting Office and for the services of the several departments and independent offices (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIM ALLOWED BY THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE UNDER TREASURY DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 225)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriation amounting to $269.99 under the Treasury Department for payment of a certain claim allowed by the General Accounting Office (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS RENDERED AGAINST GOVERNMENT BY DISTRICT COURTS (S. Doc. No. 220)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriation for payment of judgments rendered against the Government by United States district courts, amounting to $4,530.82, together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS RENDERED AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT BY DISTRICT COURTS (S. Doc. No. 219)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting records of judgments rendered against the Government by United States district courts, as submitted by the Department of Justice through the Treasury Department, and which require an appropriation of $17,088.31, together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS RENDERED AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT BY COURTS OF CLAIMS (S. Doc. No. 218)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision relating to a judgment rendered against the Government by the Court of Claims (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY COURT OF CLAIMS (S. Doc. No. 217)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a schedule of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims which has been submitted by the Treasury Department and requires an appropriation for payment, amounting to $2,369,549.74 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CERTAIN CLAIMS ALLOWED BY GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE (S. Doc. No. 224)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation under the Treasury Department for the payment of certain claims allowed by the General Accounting Office, amounting to $23,145.33 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES TO OR LOSSES OF PRIVATELY OWNED PROPERTY (S. Doc. No 227)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriation submitted by the several executive departments and independent offices to pay claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property, in the sum of $10,452.85, which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of the act of December 28, 1922 (31 U. S. C. 215), and which require appropriations for their payment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES TO ROADS AND HIGHWAYS OF STATES (S. Doc. No. 226)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Public Roads Administration to pay claims for damage to roads and highways of States or their subdivisions, in the sum of $1,092,120.11, and which require an appropriation for payment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED PROVISIONS PERTAINING TO AN EXISTING APPROPRIATION, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (S. Doc. No. 228)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to an existing appropriation and to appropriations for the fiscal year 1947, for the Department of Commerce (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DRAFTS OF PROPOSED PROVISIONS PERTAINING TO APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1947 (S. Doc. No. 229)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to appropriations for the fiscal year 1947 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

LAWS PASSED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN AND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Joseph S. Mendoza, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the continuation of the Office of Price Administration; ordered to lie on the table.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Lester Washburn, international president, United Automobile Workers of America, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, Milwaukee (Wis.), praying for the continuation of the Office of Price Administration; ordered to lie on the table.

JUST PEACE SETTLEMENT WITH ITALY

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by Americans of Italian origin, representing the Grand Lodge of Rhode Island, Order of Sons of Italy in America, and many other fraternal welfare organizations, assembled in Providence, R. I., on June 23, 1946, requesting a just peace settlement with Italy.

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

Whereas a just peace settlement with the new democratic Italy and her restoration to freedom, self-respect, and contentment are indispensable to world stabilization and a lasting peace;

Whereas by finally overthrowing fascism in 1943, 2 years before the end of the war, the people of Italy struck a mortal blow to the Axis and thus tremendously helped the cause of the Allied Nations; and, thereafter, during the decisive phase of the war Italy was no longer an enemy but a cobelligerent with the Allies, rendering an invaluable moral and military contribution to the victory over the common enemy;

Whereas the late President Roosevelt and former Prime Minister Churchill affirmed coram popoli in the Atlantic Charter their most solemn engagement that in the post-war settlement the United Nations would seek no territorial aggrandizements; and the Allied Powers promised to the Italians their peace treaty would take in full consideration Italy's great contribution to the defeat of Germany;

Whereas a self-respected, laborious, and democratic Italy, as mother of western civilization for 2,000 years, will be a strong bulwark against the advancing ideologies of bolshevism;

Whereas Trieste and the Istrian Peninsula claimed by Yugoslavia; South Tyrol, which is on this side of the Alps, claimed by Austria; the Valleys of Tenda and Briga in the Maritime Alps, claimed by France, are geographically the natural borders of the Italian Peninsula since the time of creation, and politically an integral part of the Italian nation, because of more than one century of struggle for the unification of Italy which culminated with the redemption of Istria and Tyrol during World War I, when Italy was our ally and sacrificed 600,000 killed and 1,500,000 wounded;

Whereas the Italian colonies in north Africa, now under British military rule, were developed by Italy at great sacrifices years before this war and fascism; and the most appropriate solution would be to revert them temporarily to Italy under the aegis of the United Nations until the world problem of colonial empires, many times richer and larger than Italy's, would be solved by an international covenant, applying the same principle to all colonies and to all countries;

Whereas the economic resources of Italy are at the lowest ebb, and to become an element of peace and progress Italy needs loans and not the burden of reparation, of which she has already paid some in various forms to various allies;

Whereas the interest of the United States and Italy coincide, because both are interested in maintaining the European equilibrium for the good of the western civilization;

Whereas the people of Italy are bound by many ties of affection and admiration to the people of the United States;

Whereas the United States of America, more than any other country, won the war: Be it

Resolved, That we, Americans of Italian origin, representing the Grand Lodge of Rhode Island, Order Sons of Italy in America, and many other fraternal welfare organizations, assembled here in Providence, R. I., on the 23d day of June 1946, do hereby affirm our conviction that Italy does not deserve a punitive peace, and should not be humiliated nor mutilated to satisfy the revengeful and imperialistic appetites of any country;

And we voice our faith and confidence in the wisdom and good will of President Truman; and in the initiative and ability of Secretary of State Byrnes, so that the Paris Conference now being held there will be agreed a treaty of peace with Italy worthy of the traditions of the United States; which will be signed by the representatives of America without the remorse of having compromised with principles of justice in the face of unjust and arrogant pretensions; neither of having failed the vital interest of western civilization, in which is rooted our

American way of life; nor of having frustrated the longing of free peoples everywhere for an enduring peace.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 2304. A bill to provide for the training of officers for the naval service, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1627);

H. R. 1498. A bill to correct the naval record of former members of the crews of the revenue cutters *Algonquin* and *Onondaga*; without amendment (Rept. No. 1620); and

H. R. 5911. A bill to establish an Office of Naval Research in the Department of the Navy; to plan, foster, and encourage scientific research in recognition of its paramount importance as related to the maintenance of future naval power, and the preservation of national security; to provide within the Department of the Navy a single office, which, by contract and otherwise, shall be able to obtain, coordinate, and make available to all bureaus and activities of the Department of the Navy world-wide scientific information and the necessary services for conducting specialized and imaginative research; to establish a Naval Research Advisory Committee consisting of persons preeminent in the fields of science and research, to consult with and advise the Chief of such Office in matters pertaining to research; with amendments (Rept. No. 1628).

By Mr. OVERTON, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 1372. A bill to officially name the flood-control project authorized by Public Law 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved December 22, 1944, on Lytle and Cajon Creeks, near San Bernardino, Calif., the Sheppard Floodway; without amendment (Rept. No. 1621);

S. 2036. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Rhode Island to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Sakonnet River between the towns of Tiverton and Portsmouth, in Newport County, R. I.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1622);

H. R. 6222. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Calcasieu River at or near Lake Charles, La.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1623); and

H. R. 6597. A bill authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1624).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 669. A bill to name a dam on the Little Missouri River in Pike County, Ark., and the reservoir created by the same; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1629).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

H. R. 5186. A bill to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1625); and

H. R. 5820. A bill relating to mail service on Lake Winnepesaukee, N. H.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1626).

By Mr. DONNELL, from the Committee on Immigration:

H. R. 271. A bill for the relief of Eleanor McCloskey, also known as Evelyn Mary Mikalauskas; without amendment (Rept. No. 1630).

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

S. 920. A bill to fix the salaries of certain judges of the United States; without amendment (Rept No. 1631); and

H. R. 4180. A bill to amend the law relating to larceny in interstate or foreign commerce; without amendment (Rept. No. 1632).

By Mr. ANDREWS, from the 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; without amendment (Rept. No. 1633).

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, ETC., 1947

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably with amendments 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 I submit a report (No. 1619) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6739) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 44, after line 2, insert the following:

"Civilian war benefits: For all expenses necessary, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and travel, to enable the Federal Security Administrator, in order to continue during the fiscal year 1947 the civilian war benefits program heretofore financed from the emergency fund for the President, to provide medical and hospital care (including prosthetic appliances and medical examinations) by contract without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, and money payments, to (a) civilians within the United States who have been injured as a result of enemy attack or of action to meet such attack or the danger thereof, or who have been injured while in the performance of their official duties as civilian defense workers, (b) civilians disabled as a result of illness, injury, or disease which occurred during detention by the enemy, and (c) the dependents within the United States of individuals injured or killed under circumstances described in clause (a) or (b) or reported as missing as a result of enemy action, $158,000."

Mr. McCARRAN also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6739, the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and so forth, appropriation bill, 1947, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of the amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6739) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 44, after line 2, insert the following:

"Civilian war assistance: For all expenses necessary, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, to enable the Federal Security Administrator, in order to continue during the fiscal year 1947 the Civilian War Assistance program heretofore financed from the Emergency Fund for the President, to provide (a) temporary aid (including medical care by contract, transportation, and other goods and services without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, and money payments) to citizens of the United States or their children under 18 years of age who have been interned or stranded, and returned to the United States, or who have been evacuated from any area under the direction of the civil or military authorities of the United States, and (b) for the return of civilians evacuated from the Philippine Islands or Hawaii to the United States under the direction of the civil or military authorities of the United States during the period from December 7, 1941, to September 15, 1945, $5,495,000, which amount may be expended by advances or grants of funds or otherwise, to such Federal or other agencies as the Administrator may designate."

Mr. McCARRAN also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6739, the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and so forth, appropriation bill, 1947, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of the amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 2385. A bill exempting bonuses paid by States, Territories, possessions, and political subdivisions thereof, from the Federal income tax for those who served in the armed forces; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2386. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Glenna J. Howrey; and

S. 2387. A bill for the relief of Devir M. Wood; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2388. A bill for the relief of Ryohei Kubota; and

S. 2389. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fuku Kurokawa Thurn; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 2390. A bill granting an increase in pension to Mrs. Mary W. D. Perkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2391. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to advance Lt. Alfred R. Eubanks, United States Navy, retired, to the grade of lieutenant commander on the retired list of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 2392. A bill for the relief of John T. Hollandsworth, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH (for himself, Mr. MEAD, and Mr. DOWNEY):

S. 2393. A bill to provide benefits for certain employees of the United States who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for probational civil service appointments by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. J. Res. 169. Joint resolution to establish a commission to formulate plans for the erection, in Grant Park, Chicago, Ill., of a

Marine Corps Memorial; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. J. Res. 170. Joint resolution authorizing the presentation of the Distinguished Flying Cross to Rear Adm. Charles E. Rosendahl, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS—AMENDMENT

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

FOURTH DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MURDOCK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6885) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, to provide appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed as follows:

Bureau of Reclamation, Provost River project, Utah: For an additional amount for construction, $1,756,960, from the reclamation fund, special fund, to remain available until expended.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their title and referred as indicated:

H. R. 3420. An act to provide for refunds to railroad employees in certain cases, so as to place the various States on an equal basis, under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, with respect to contributions of employees; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

H. R. 6477. An act to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended, and section 3 of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. DOWNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 296), which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

Resolved, That the resolution, Senate Resolution 155, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to June 26, 1943 (relating to an investigation with respect to the supply and distribution of hydroelectric power), as amended and supplemented by Senate Resolution 304, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to June 5, 1944; Senate Resolution 313, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to September 5, 1944; and Senate Resolution 31, Seventy-ninth Congress, agreed to January 29, 1945, is hereby amended by inserting before the colon at the end of clause 4 of the first paragraph thereof a comma and the following: "and all matters relating to the utilization and disposition of the water resources of the Central Valley project in California, including the terms and conditions of contracts offered by the Department of the Interior for the disposition of such resources."

ADDRESS BY THE UNDER SECRETARY OF WAR BEFORE AFFILIATED YOUNG DEMOCRATS OF NEW YORK

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Kenneth C. Royall, Under Secretary of War, at the Seventh Biennial State Convention of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York, at New York City, on June 21, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS OF 1942—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed consideration of the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6042) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I had intended to discuss the pending measure at some length, but in the interest of expedition I have decided to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some editorial comments from selected newspapers on the subject of the OPA. I have before me an editorial entitled "Joy Ride to Inflation," from the Christian Science Monitor of June 15, 1946; an editorial entitled "Hoping for the Best Is All That Is Left," from the Louisville Courier-Journal; an editorial entitled "Dying Price Control," from the Detroit News of June 15, 1946; an editorial entitled "Congress Decides To Gamble on Inflation," from the Baltimore Sun of June 14, 1946; an editorial entitled "Wrecking OPA," from the Washington Post of June 15, 1946; an article entitled "OPA and the New Spiral," written by Ernest K. Lindley and published in the New Orleans Times-Picayune of June 15, 1946; an editorial entitled "The Seeds of Inflation Will Grow Votes of Wrath," from the Philadelphia Record; an editorial entitled "Both the OPA and Prices Still Need Controls," from the Philadelphia Inquirer; an editorial entitled "Lifting the Price Lid," from the Washington Star of June 15, 1946; and an editorial from the New York Times entitled "The Future of OPA," beginning with this statement:

The sweeping amendments to price control extension that the Senate finally adopted are full of inconsistencies.

I ask unanimous consent that these editorials and article be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the Christian Science Monitor of June 15, 1946]

JOY RIDE TO INFLATION

In the badly battered price control extension bill, Congress has readied the vehicle for what Stabilization Director Chester Bowles has called a joy ride to inflation. It is all primed to climb dizzying heights, and there is little likelihood of effective brakes being applied in the Senate-House conference committee.

First ascent will be on meat, milk, poultry, eggs, butter, other dairy products, and gasoline on which ceiling prices are slated to be removed June 30. Moreover, removal of these controls, by indirectly encouraging feeding of more grain to livestock, is likely to seriously decrease the grain available for flour, bread, and cereals in the United States and abroad.

Higher priced clothing appears inevitable. For instance, unrestricted cotton would add $60,000,000 to consumer apparel costs for every penny rise in cotton prices.

Even more inflationary are the amendments eliminating OPA's cost absorption program, and guaranteeing producers and handlers of every commodity their cost plus prewar mark-ups. With many items in limited production due to strikes and scarce basic materials, the consumer will have to stand the temporarily high production costs which might otherwise have been leveled off within many industries as volume increased. Moreover, administering such a provision would be practically impossible, since no product-by-product cost and profit figures are said to be available for 85 percent of American business firms.

If Congress wants to scrap price controls—and risk inflation, a cut in everybody's dollar and a new wave of strikes—it should kill OPA, not cripple it and then put it in chains.

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal of June 15, 1946]

HOPING FOR THE BEST IS ALL THAT IS LEFT

We suppose the only thing to be said about price control, after the Senate's action on the OPA bill, is that one may yet hope for the best. But the best that can happen now is bound to approach the worst that many optimists had thought, not so long ago, could possibly happen. Both Houses of Congress having passed bills that present merely a choice between evils, the brightest prospect is that something may be left of authority after the conference committees carve out a compromise.

This, or that the President may veto the final bill if it turns out to be simply too bad. In which case there is, of course, the danger that nothing will be substituted and that all controls, including even rents, will be ended on June 30.

Kentucky consumers, at any rate, may take what comfort they can find in the fact that their two most stalwart fighters for their dollar's security are still fighting. The bill, says Senator BARKLEY, "falls far short of what I had hoped for." Representative SPENCE says it will lead to "a spiral of inflation that will be disastrous." Both are on the conference committees. Senator BARKLEY voted for the bill on its final passage, although he disapproved of it, because he hoped to get another crack at it in the process of adjusting differences between the two versions. Mr. SPENCE, as chairman of the House Banking Committee, handled the bill in the lower chamber and fought to the last against weakening OPA.

However, what lies ahead is dogged, sweating argument in the cloister of the committee room. The time for oratory is past. This is too bad, for we should like to have heard somebody tell the truth, quite out loud, about the Senate bill and its guarantee of profits—"costs plus prewar mark-ups." The Senators may insist that this comes under the head of saving free enterprise from bureaucratic tyranny. What a travesty of freedom, when a law is written to protect profit and normalcy, come what may of destruction thereby.

[From the Detroit News of June 15, 1946]

DYING PRICE CONTROL

We have believed and still believe that a serious state of price inflation will afflict this

country if adequate Federal control of prices ceases. It is so argued by economic experience and the human side of business.

Group A gets higher prices for the goods it sells, group B demands and gets the like. So on and on, as to things we buy and as to wages.

The Senate price bill, passed Thursday, we believe, if enacted into law, would blow the lid off the prices of food and many other things just about completely. Although differing in numerous respects, the House bill is as bad.

As to what's coming, if either bill or a bad composite is enacted, also note the inflation existing because of many price increases already in effect.

But the time for sounding warnings, and dealing in dire predictions, has passed. Faint hope remains perhaps that, since the bills differ and the House-Senate conferees may, where differences exist, adopt new texts, a better measure may be the result. It's no more than a glimmer of hope, however, in view of the big majorities in both Houses for riddling OPA's powers over prices.

We are into the time of wait-and-see now. Each citizen while waiting will do well to remember the voting records of his Representative and Senators as these bills made their tortuous ways through Congress.

If, during this summer and fall, prices rocket up and the worth of everybody's dollar shrinks more and more, Members of Congress who are responsible for it may on a good ground be blamed by angry voters in November. That many Congressmen are highly nervous on this account about their political outlook is, in the light of these facts, easily understood.

[From the Baltimore Sun of June 14, 1946]

CONGRESS DECIDES TO GAMBLE ON INFLATION

The Senate yesterday passed its bill extending the life of the OPA for another year from June 30. The final shape of the OPA Extension Act will not be determined until the Senate bill and the House bill have been reconciled and resubmitted to both Houses. But the visibility for an extension of the OPA with its powers substantially intact is now zero. The House bill and the Senate bill differ a good deal in detail. But they have this in common: both of them greatly restrict the power of the OPA to control prices. It is hard to conceive of any combination of the features of the two bills which will not leave the OPA greatly weakened.

What this means is that Congress has decided to engage in a gigantic gamble, affecting all of us—a gamble in which we can't possibly win and are almost certain to lose. Advocates of price control, while conceding that price control by itself is not enough, argue that an OPA with adequate powers is necessary to hold back the forces of inflation until the time when production begins to approach demand. Congress, on the other hand, is gambling that the relaxation of price controls will prove so powerful a stimulus to production that supply will begin to equal demand much more rapidly than it would otherwise.

This is an appealing argument, considering how thoroughly fed up the country is with governmental controls. The same argument was produced following the First World War, and acted upon by Congress then—and proved utterly fallacious. The system of controls then prevailing was repealed and the boom-bust cycle of the early twenties was the result.

Now, Congress is gambling again. If it is right, the spurt of inflation will be relatively short-lived. If it is wrong, everyone suffers, particularly those with fixed incomes. Prices will skyrocket, commodity supplies will be subjected to speculative hoarding, and a new cycle of major industrial disputes will confront the country.

[From the Washington Post, June 15, 1946]

WRECKING OPA

Only by the most obtuse reasoning can what is left of the OPA be considered price control, and in no sense should Congressmen be permitted to palm it off as such. Price control after June 30 will be like the outer shell of a building left standing after the innards have been gutted by fire If the product of the combined Senate and House action actually becomes law, the door is open for another boom-and-bust cycle The best, and indeed only, prospect of averting this disaster lies in a Presidential veto.

What makes the Senate's 53-11 vote obviously a concession to special interest is the complete disregard of the wish of the majority as expressed in letters and in both national and regional public opinion polls. In October 1945, the Gallup poll showed that 72 percent of the people disapproved of removal of all price ceilings. The National Opinion Research Center in two separate national samplings in February and April 1946, revealed that 85 and 82 percent, respectively, thought price control necessary for the next year. The Des Moines Register Poll in March disclosed that 81 percent of Iowa residents felt that OPA controls should be continued for another year. In the same month the Philadelphia Bulletin poll showed 63 percent of Philadelphia residents as believing that price controls should be more rigid. And in the District of Columbia, the Post poll of last December indicated that 83 percent of the people favored continuing price control. These, it would seem, should have been enough evidence of national feeling to convince any politician.

The consequences of what Congress has done, if not revoked, will hang over Members' heads for years to come as a monument to political stupidity. It is ridiculous to say that controls on rents and other vital segments of the economy can be continued rigidly if essential cost-of-living items are allowed to rise sharply in price. Moreover, as costs go up, wages must also rise, or production—the very production relied on to prevent inflation—will again be choked by strikes. This is not mere calamity howling, for the handwriting already has been put on the wall by the labor unions. These considerations will no doubt be submitted to Congress by the President.

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune of June 15, 1946]

OPA AND THE NEW SPIRAL

(By Ernest K. Lindley)

It now looks as if there might be a period of relative peace on the industrial front, in which production can forge ahead. The delays caused by the major stoppages of the last 6 months have been very costly to the public, as well as to industry and labor. They have also impaired the influence of the United States in the world.

Several months of soaring production would go a long way toward repairing the damage done on the international front and checking the losses on the home front—provided, however, that soaring production is not accompanied by soaring prices.

If prices also soar, another round of major demands for wage increases is certain to begin. If the increases are granted, the result will be still higher prices. If they are granted only after strikes, the additional penalty will be further delays in production, which in themselves further prolong and increase inflationary pressures.

This is the problem which is now causing top officials in the administration the sharpest anxiety. It would be hard to overstate their anxiety, for Congress is ripping the muscle, bone, and heart out of OPA. If OPA collapses, whatever the ultimate consequences, the short-term effects almost certainly will be a further sharp rise in living costs, which will in turn touch off another series of demands for major wage increases, backed, when necessary, by strikes. How far this wage-price spiral might go no one can forecast.

The situation is further complicated, of course, by the fact that the large wage increases recently granted may not have been fully reflected yet in the cost of living. They will show up in still higher costs for some manufactured articles, higher freight rates, and higher taxes. State and local public employees, along with white-collar workers in many lines of private employment, will gradually win salary increases. A large part of the cost of settling the threatened maritime strike will be paid for out of increased Government subsidies for the American merchant marine.

Food costs will go higher still unless OPA is extended with approximately its present powers in this field, including enough subsidy money.

In one way, the argument against continuing food subsidies is sound. But one practical effect of dropping them, together with the dropping or serious weakening of other controls on the cost of living, will be to hasten and aggravate the demand for still more wage increases.

Labor is bound to lose part of the benefits of the wage increases already granted. It has lost a little already and it will lose more, even if OPA by a miracle should be extended in effective form, for the increases granted have been, on the whole, too large to be absorbed within the price structure of 6 months ago. The millions of professional, white-collar, and other workers, and pensioners, who have not received increases in dollar incomes as great as those won by organized workers, will suffer relatively even more.

If the rise in living costs can be held to approximately the minimum forced by the wage increases already granted, the threat of an ascending spiral probably can be removed. But at some point the demand for more wage increases is likely to become very determined again. If OPA is gutted, that point may be reached soon. No labor legislation that Congress will or can pass would prevent that determined demand from being made. The OPA weak extension bills which the House and Senate have dished up are indirect incitements to labor to start another round of strikes.

[From the Philadelphia Record of June 15, 1946]

THE SEEDS OF INFLATION WILL GROW VOTES OF WRATH

In one respect the United States Senate was helpful when it removed OPA's vital organs, sewed it up, and pretended the patient hadn't died on the operating table.

It got the dirty work over quickly.

That's exactly what the Record urged.

The bill the Senate passed is a phony, hypocritical measure which actually kills OPA while pretending to extend its life for a year.

Speed in getting this OPA-wrecker through Congress is paradoxically the only hope of preserving any semblance of price control beyond June 30, when present controls expire.

The faster it is cleared by a Senate-House conference committee, approved and sent to the President, the better.

As we said before, the President must jam that bill back into Congress with a stinging veto. He must make it clear to the public that the majority of Congress is trying literally to "get away with murder."

Let the President put the spotlight on Congress so that it will have to kill off price control honestly before the public gaze and suffer the public's wrath or—

Congressmen, to save their political skins, will feel compelled to continue, unimpaired, the present controls.

It's difficult to decide which is worse, the Senate bill or the House bill passed in April. The Senate measure was put together piece by piece, amendment by amendment, by "statesmen" who over and over made stirring profession of their good intentions.

The Record did not print the final roll call on the Senate OPA killer. It had no more meaning than the price of beets compared with the price of cabbage.

It did not show where Congressmen really stood on this issue.

Some pro-OPA Senators voted for it as the best measure they could get, hoped to improve it in conference. Others of the administration forces couldn't stomach it at all, rejected it.

At the same time the enemies of price control voted for or against it, depending on whether they thought it reduced price control sufficiently to a state of inertness.

All motives were possible—good, bad, or indifferent. Any Senator could profess any of them and change his story to make political capital, no matter how his constituents were disposed.

By all means get that No-OPA bill through fast and back again from the White House for a show-down test that will prove where each Member of Congress really stands.

If prices go kiting out of sight, and dollars buy less and less, the American public should know where to place the blame—right on Congress.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of June 15, 1946]

BOTH THE OPA AND PRICES STILL NEED CONTROLS

Now that both Houses of Congress have passed bills embodying radical changes in OPA controls, it would be well to consider a few economic facts which cannot be altered by any legislation.

It goes without saying that nobody wants to see prices rise any more. In most lines they are too high now even for widely inflated wages, while they constitute a heavy hardship on those with fixed incomes.

As for producers, distributors and retailers—outside the black market—they realize that prices which go up like a rocket are bound to come down like the stick.

OPA was established as a necessary wartime agency to hold prices in check. The initial mistake was the failure to apply equally rigid controls to wages, the chief element in costs and therefore in prices.

President Roosevelt constantly told labor that its abnormally high wartime wages would be maintained after the emergency was over. When the war did end, President Truman lost no time in throwing off wage controls and asserting employers generally could pay even higher scales without higher prices.

His open invitation to fresh wage demands was, of course, promptly accepted. Secretary Wallace gave inflation another powerful push by issuing a report, which he later admitted was based on faulty guesswork statistics, that wages could be boosted 24 percent while prices remained static.

OPA accepted these false statements as gospel truth and proceeded to damage its good record by refusing to make price concessions to fit the administration's new wage-raising policy. The undeniable effect was to keep moderate-priced goods in large quantities from the market.

In considering the question of extending the life of OPA after June 30, Congress was beset by two major pressure groups—both wrong.

One urged Congress to abolish all price controls and let competitive enterprise have full play in the hope that after only a brief period of higher prices adequate production would cause them to settle down.

The other major pressure group demanded that OPA be kept without any correction of its faults since the slightest attempt to regulate its activities would ruin the country.

Congress has endeavored to legislate between these extremes, imposing certain needed restraints on this agency's enormous powers. In the hope of stimulating production, it has decreed that prices must allow fair profits.

Today OPA is not curbing inflation, as every housewife knows. Many of its price ceilings have stimulated production of only the most expensive goods. Some of the new provisions are open to question. But if this new bill is finally enacted, it will make still more necessary a radical change in the administration's policy of encouraging wage increases all along the line.

[From the Washington Star of June 15, 1946]

LIFTING THE PRICE LID

The overwhelming vote by the Senate in favor of price decontrol on most market-basket items and to lift the price lid on many other commodities obviously paves the way for a decisive test of conflicting theories as to what will happen if OPA restrictions are relaxed in the critical reconversion period. The Senate's action on the heels of a similar though not so far-reaching revolt against OPA by the House makes inevitable a conference bill completely unacceptable to OPA, if the vehement warnings of OPA supporters are a reliable omen.

The less-drastic House bill evoked dire predictions of economic catastrophe from Economic Stabilizer Bowles and OPA Administrator Porter, and Senator BARKLEY, just before the Senate voted on its broader decontrol measure, declared that President Truman has said he would veto the legislation if it came to him in the form passed by the House. If such a veto were sustained, the only thing that could save OPA after June 30 would be adoption by Congress of a last-minute resolution to extend the present price-control law—a development that does not appear likely in view of the present mood at the Capitol.

It is obvious that the developing rebellion in Congress against continuance of price control in its present form was in no way quelled by the vigorous attacks which OPA supporters have made on those who disagreed with their own theories on the complex price-control question. Charges of selfishness and greed have been hurled indiscriminately against many in Congress and out who sincerely believe that controls in many instances have been ineptly applied or have been unnecessary and that they have defeated their objective by creating additional scarcities, encouraging black markets, and increasing the dangers of inflation.

It is just as unfair and absured to impugn the motives of the majority in the Senate and House who voted to curb control of prices as it is to charge the OPA with bureaucratic self-preservation instincts in seeking extension of stringent controls. The truth of the matter is that an honest difference of opinion exists as to whether there is need for strict application of price ceilings in certain fields and as to how long such restrictions are essential to prevent an inflationary blow-up.

The majority in Congress have registered their view that while a lifting of the lid may result in a temporary rise in prices, the effect will be to stimulate production to such an extent that the law of supply and demand soon will operate to bring prices down again to fair and reasonable levels. Congress now is evidencing its determination to give this theory a test in actual practice. If it carries out its determination, it will be taking a calculated risk, the results of which only time will reveal.

[From the New York Times of June 15, 1946]

THE FUTURE OF OPA

The sweeping amendments to price-control extension that the Senate finally adopted are full of inconsistencies. They would take price controls off such basic necessities of living as meat, poultry, eggs, butter and milk, and also off gasoline and cigarettes, but leave them on high-priced automobiles and on hundreds of other luxury and semiluxury products. This is the opposite in theory of what price control is supposed to do.

OPA once ventured the quick estimate that it was fixing 8,000,000 different prices. When it is considered that before the war, Government price-fixing of coal alone, which constitutes less than 2 percent of the national annual product, involved the fixing of 350,000 different prices, this 8,000,000 estimate does not seem excessive. It is obviously impossible for any single human mind or small group of minds arbitrarily to fix 8,000,000 different prices without unsettling and distorting the whole structure of production. For each price must be fixed in relation to all other prices. We cannot fix a legal ceiling on corn without a very exact relation to the legal ceiling on hogs. We cannot fix a legal ceiling on butter without similar exact relations to the legal ceilings on fluid milk, cheese and ice cream. We cannot fix a ceiling on automobiles without relation to the ceiling on steel. We cannot fix ceilings on prices in general while allowing wages to remain free or even boosting them by Government decision. The administration and OPA have made errors at all these points. They have unbalanced the proportions in which thousands of different products are produced and have forced some products out of production altogether.

If they had realized the immensity of the problem with which they were confronted they would have begged Congress to reduce its dimensions; to narrow the realm of their discretion and responsibility. But they did precisely the opposite. They insisted on retaining in peacetime all the controls they had maintained in war. They criticized every amendment passed by the House and all the amendments recommended by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, and refused to suggest any amendments that might better accomplish the same basic purposes. They implied in advance that every amendment would be a crippling amendment.

In these circumstances Congress was led to feel that OPA was bent on holding on to practically all price controls indefinitely. OPA had itself laid down only the vaguest criteria of when it would drop price control on specific articles. One of these was that it would stop controlling prices for particular commodities when supply had caught up with demand. This overlooked the fundamental economic fact that supply comes into balance with demand only at a price, and that by keeping the price too low it is possible indefinitely to prevent supply from catching up with demand. But even where OPA's own criterion had been fulfilled, as in the case of cigarettes and gasoline, OPA failed to take off ceilings. That is apparently why the Senate felt itself obliged to demand the removal of price controls on these specific articles. In other cases, as in meat, the Senate recognized that the product had already, in fact, got out of the control of OPA, and that the prices now actually being paid for the bulk of meat supplies are black-market prices.

We may hope that a wiser and better considered amendment than either those of the House or of the Senate will emerge from conference. Meanwhile, it is well to keep in mind that price control is at best only a secondary and transitional weapon against inflation. It deals with the symptoms and

consequences of inflation, not with its causes. The real battle against inflation must be fought on another front. It must be fought against budget deficits and all the other policies that tend to swell the money and credit supply.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). The Chair will ask the clerk to read at this time the unanimous consent order under which the Senate is acting, so that all Senators may be aware of it.

The CHIEF CLERK. The order is as follows:

Ordered, by unanimous consent, that during the further consideration of the conference report on H. R. 6042, no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 1 hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma obtained the floor.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I have only 1 hour. I regret very much that I cannot yield.

Mr. President, before a vote is taken on the conference report I feel impelled to submit some observations for the record. I am under no illusion that anything I may say will have any effect upon the vote on this report. The report cannot be amended. Senators will either have to vote for the report or vote against it. I desire to state for the record my interpretation of what the report means.

It means, first, that the life of OPA is to be extended for 1 year; and that is all-important. A single line in the bill extending the life of OPA gives that organization all the power it needs. Any additional verbiage or provisions are so much surplusage because, judging from the past history of this organization, it pays little or no attention to any provision which the Congress enacts into law.

Neither this bill nor any other bill or law even that I know of embraces any provision with respect to wages. I am not complaining about that. I am simply making the statement that the OPA has no control over wages, and exercises no control over wages except to permit wages to go higher and higher and higher. As wages go up, as a necessary corollary the prices of the things which wages produce must likewise go up. So no one can assert that this bill has any effect over wages. Wages are exactly what labor demands that wages should be.

The bill reduces the former drastic controls over nonagricultural products. It provides for a relaxation of such controls. To that extent industry is benefited. Industry has been taken care of. Thus we have this picture before the Senate today: Wages and wage earners are free and uncontrolled. Industry has been helped. But what about the other great group of our population? I refer to the farmers of our country.

Mr. President, I came from the farm. I have been associated with farming all my life. I think I know the problems of the farmer. Since I became a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry I have been continually embarrassed because the administration of whatever party is in power pays little or no attention to the wishes of the farm population of America.

Many years ago my former colleague from Oklahoma, the distinguished Senator Thomas P. Gore, was chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. That was back yonder during World War I. He tried to help the farmer. He proposed relief for the farmer, and he stood for the interests of the farmer while he was a member and chairman of that committee. Because he did so he fell into bad repute with the administration, and that bad repute lingered with him all the days of his service in the Senate of the United States.

At a later time, under another administration, our late distinguished colleague Senator McNary, of Oregon, was chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. He espoused what was known as the McNary-Haugen bill. His administration did not favor that legislation. He managed the legislation through the Senate, the House concurred, and the President vetoed the bill. Senator McNary did not stand well with the party in power, of which he was a part. During more recent years our late distinguished colleague Senator Smith of South Carolina was chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. He stood for the farmer. Because what he stood for was not agreeable to the administration, Senator Smith fell into bad repute with his administration, and such bad repute lingered with him during the remaining days of his life.

Now I have fallen heir to this committeeship. I find that as a rule the things the farmers want are not accepted by the administration. The farmers want a new parity formula. The administration says "No." The farmers have made a fight for years to have their labor costs included in the parity formula. The administration says "No."

Mr. President, the original OPA bill originated in the Committee on Banking and Currency, and that committee has had control of this legislation on behalf of the Senate from its inception up to the present time. That committee is considered to be not too friendly to the farmers. The farmers knew they would receive little, if any, consideration by going before that committee. So the various groups of the farm population of the United States made appeals to my committee to hear them. The committee secured a small appropriation to cover hearings and printing, and during the past year the committee invited the farm groups of the country to come to Washington to make their recommendations and voice their several protests. I have before me one volume of the hearings taken before my committee.

As a result of those hearings, the committee has made four interim committee reports, which I now have on my desk. One report is with respect to livestock and meat. The report was submitted on the 15th day of May 1945, now more than 1 year ago. Mr. President, without reading the findings and recommendations contained in the report, I ask unanimous consent that the recommendations to be found on pages 5 and 6 of the report be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

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

LIVESTOCK AND MEAT, MAY 15, 1945

FINDINGS

Causes which have contributed to the shortage of meat for civilian consumption include:

1. The substantial and increasing quantities purchased by the armed forces and lend-lease.

2. A decrease in pork production of over-one-third in 1945 compared with 1944 resulting from a decline in the 1944 hog production of approximately 30 percent.

3. The marketing of improperly finished cattle and calves and the failure to market the number of cattle warranted by the record numbers of cattle on farms and ranges.

4. The "squeeze" of processors of livestock between livestock prices and product ceilings resulting in losses and causing many reputable processors to curtail their operation.

5. The diversion of livestock from normal channels of slaughter and distribution into the black market, and the failure of the Office of Price Administration to take effective enforcement measures.

6. The diversion of livestock and meat into local distribution channels and away from interstate distribution.

7. An increased purchasing power resulting in a record civilian demand for meat.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee recommend for the purpose of improving the supply and distribution of meat the following:

1. A forthwith increase in the return to the feeders of AA and A grades of cattle through a fair and sufficient subsidy to feeders to encourage them to feed out range cattle to the maximum degree, thereby encouraging the feeding of more cattle and increasing not only the quality but the weight of AA and A grades of cattle.

2. An immediate incentive program to encourage, during the spring and early summer, the marketing of more grass and unproductive dairy cattle.

3. Raising the support price of hogs and extending support prices to cover all weights of hogs.

4. That assurance be given producers that support prices and ceilings for livestock will not be lowered unless adequate notice of such change be given.

5. That the Price Control Act be amended to require and direct the Office of Price Administration to give processors of livestock a reasonable margin of profit for processing each species of livestock.

6. The withdrawal of all slaughtering licenses and permits and a sharp reduction in the number reissued together with restrictions on slaughter by use of quotas so that meat will be directed into the normal interstate channels of distribution. The refusal to issue new slaughtering licenses and permits to known violators of governmental regulations and the concentration of enforcement efforts on fundamental major problems instead of marginal technicalities.

7. The extension of Federal inspection and set-aside orders to small slaughterers above local farm and retail level.

8. The limiting of lend-lease purchases of meat products consistent with domestic civilian supply.

9. That the Price Control Act be further amended to direct the Administrator to proceed without delay to remove all price

controls and regulations from any and all commodities just as fast as any such commodity becomes sufficiently plentiful so as to permit the law of supply and demand to operate to keep the price of any such commodity within the range of the cost of production plus a reasonable profit.

10. The committee recommend that a supreme Administrator for Food be created to have supervision and jurisdiction over both the Office of Price Administration and the War Food Administration.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the hearings continued, and we heard the livestock growers and ranchers of the country, the feeders, the processors and the distributors, of meat throughout the country. On May 2, 1946, the committee submitted a supplemental report upon livestock and meat, and in it the committee recommended that—

This committee recommends that all price controls and subsidies on livestock and edible products derived therefrom be removed at once.

Without reading the findings in full, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

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

LIVESTOCK AND MEAT, MAY 2, 1946

FINDINGS

From all the evidence, the committee finds:

1. Government controls and price regulations affecting livestock and meat have completely broken down; price ceilings on livestock and meat are a fiction; and, as a result of the black market and subsidies, meat is costing the American public at least $2,000,000,000 a year in excess of ceiling prices.

2. Most meat is being sold at black-market prices. Reliable surveys show that five out of six stores were selling meat at overceiling prices and the average price of all meat sold at retail was 20 percent above legal ceilings in February 1946. Facts from the surveys also show that the black market has become more serious since that time.

3. There is no shortage of livestock on farms and ranches; in fact, there is an excessive inventory of cattle; but there are severe shortages of meat in some places and in certain stores because of the black-market dislocation of distribution and because price controls and subsidies have impeded production by creating fear and uncertainty in the minds of producers and feeders of livestock.

4. The "price squeeze" placed on slaughterers by the OPA from 1942 to date has forced many legitimate slaughterers to close or curtail their operations, thereby fostering the black market.

5. Remaining legitimate slaughterers, both small and large, are willing and anxious to buy livestock at legal maximum prices but are unable to do so because black-market operators pay higher prices with the result that livestock is being diverted from the normal channels of slaughter and distribution into the black market.

6. The black market in meat is imperiling the national health through insanitary slaughtering and curtailed production of essential medicinal byproducts.

7. Black-market slaughtering is causing a complete economic loss of many millions of pounds of critically short byproducts such as fats, protein, feeds, and hides.

8. Widespread evasion of price controls on livestock and meat by those who are victims of the black market and must overcharge or go out of business, plus the failure of willful racketeering violators to be apprehended, has created a disrespect for all laws, and is rapidly undermining the moral fiber of the country.

9. Thousands of employees with long years of service and valued experience necessarily have been laid off by legitimate slaughterers because such slaughterers are unable to maintain their volume against black-market competition. Additional thousands of other employees in these packing plants have had their hours of work reduced for the same reason.

10. Four years of experience with Government controls, culminating in the present scandalous situation, shows conclusively the impossibility of controlling livestock and meat prices and meat distribution through Government laws, regulations, and directives; and any new or reinstated controls on the livestock and meat industry can only create greater confusion and further impede maximum production and legitimate slaughtering and distribution.

11. Removal of price controls and subsidies from livestock and meat will stimulate the marketing of livestock and the production of meat, drive the black-market operators out of business, save untold waste, safeguard the public health, and make a large supply of meat available to all at a competitive price which will be lower than consumers are now paying as a result of the black market and subsidies.

RECOMMENDATION

This committee recommends that all price controls and subsidies on livestock and edible products derived therefrom be removed at once.

ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Subcommittee.
HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD.
B. K. WHEELER.

My Small Business Subcommittee on Complaints studied the meat-control question and held hearings last winter. The Barkley-Bates amendment was considered. We recommended consideration be given to setting a program for gradual removal of price controls and subsidies by December 1946, at least, but conditions have rapidly changed and I feel sure immediate removal of controls should be given.

TOM STEWART.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, later, on May 25, after the committee heard the dairymen of the country, the committee submitted another interim report in which it made the following finding:

This committee recommends that all subsidies and price controls on milk and dairy products be removed at once.

I ask unanimous consent that the findings and recommendations contained in that interim report may be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

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

FINDINGS

1. Dairy production is declining nationally and the declines are greatest in the areas of greatest shortage.

2. Since dairy production is a long-time planning operation and cannot be expounded rapidly, the current trend must be reversed immediately if a prolonged disaster is to be avoided.

3. The responsibility for this condition resides in the price and subsidy policies of the stabilization agencies.

4. The refusal of such agencies to deal adequately with local problems is reflected in declines in deficit areas, the threat of permanent injury to production in such areas, and the uneconomic burdening of transportation facilities to import milk not meeting peacetime local health standards.

5. The maladministration of dairy pricing has had a bad effect in all segments of the industry, but due to dairy industry price structures the effect has been notably concentrated on butter. In substance, OPA has determined that the American consumer shall not have butter.

6. The subsidy program has not served to replace necessary price adjustments to stimulate production.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This committee recommends that all subsidies and price controls on milk and dairy products be removed at once.

ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman.
HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD.
TOM STEWART.
B. K. WHEELER.

I concur in the above findings of the committee. I also concur in the recommendations, provided that the Secretary of Agriculture finds that the net income of dairymen will not be reduced thereby nor a substantial segment of our population be deprived of the use of milk and other dairy products.

GEORGE D. AIKEN.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, as I stated a moment ago, industry has been recognized and helped by this proposed OPA extension bill. The wage earners and the laboring people are not retained under the controls provided by this bill. I am not complaining about that. But the farmers are retained under the controls of the proposed legislation. Mr. President, under this bill the farmers of America are the goats of our domestic economy. This bill, if it shall be enacted, will sentence 30,000,000 farmers to remain at least for another year the economic goats of our economic system. I do not consent that that shall happen, Mr. President.

After my committee had held these hearings and had submitted these reports, when this bill came before the Senate, I prepared and submitted an amendment which of necessity had to be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. The amendment proposed to remove from controls a number of the leading farm commodities. Mr. President, it proposed to remove timber from under the controls. Jurisdiction over timber has remained in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Timber is grown upon the land, so the Senate, in deciding about the jurisdictions of committees, placed timber under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. We had a hearing on timber. We found what the conditions were. The committee was of the opinion that timber should be removed from all controls under this legislation. So a provision to that effect was inserted in the amendment. Petroleum was likewise recommended to be decontrolled. Petroleum comes from under the land, mostly from farms. Very little petroleum is produced from under cities. When it comes from the land on the farms the farmers are interested in it, because they

receive royalties from it and they receive lease money for the use of their lands. The amendment proposed to take out from under controls milk, livestock, tobacco, poultry, fish and shellfish, grain, peanuts, fruits and vegetables, and the products processed in the main therefrom. Mr. President, my committee did not undertake to interfere with anything that did not appear to be a farm product.

What happened? The amendment was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. In that committee, Mr. President, we have some very able men. In the first place, they are specially selected—for various reasons, but, for one, because of their outstanding ability. I have been a member of legislatures for a long time. I have learned a good many things as a result of my service in various legislative bodies. Mr. President, there is one rule which is used in military strategy, in economic strategy, and in legislative strategy. That rule is to divide and destroy. The Banking and Currency Committee, being wise in the ways of legislation, proceeded, I would not say deliberately, but the effect of it was just the same, to divide these several groups and then to destroy them. The committee picked out livestock and placed in this bill a recommendation that livestock and meats be decontrolled. They took the next largest group, perhaps—the dairy industry, which covers the entire United States—and the committee placed in the bill a recommendation that milk and dairy products likewise be decontrolled. Third, in order still further to divide the farm groups the committee took the third largest group, perhaps, one which affects everyone—poultry—and the committee recommended that poultry likewise be decontrolled.

So the committee proposed to have livestock and the products of livestock, which means the little packers and the big packers and the ranchers and the feed-lot operators, come out from under this bill—relying upon the psychology that if they took out that large group, such group or groups would not be further interested in having any other group of agriculture decontrolled. When they proposed to decontrol livestock and when they proposed to decontrol poultry and when they proposed to decontrol dairy products, they found they had covered in that way more than one-half of the farm groups of these United States.

When the bill was reported providing for the decontrol of these various commodities, no doubt many farmers of America interested in those commodities thought, "Well, I am taken care of; why should I interest myself further in other groups of farmers who produce articles which I perhaps must buy and on the sale of which I cannot profit."

Mr. President, the bill came on the floor in that condition. There were a number of other products which we thought should be controlled, such as tobacco. The evidence before the committee was that there was a surplus of tobacco, and that it was not selling at ceiling prices. A motion was made to decontrol tobacco. By a voice vote the amendment was agreed to. There was no opposition so far as we could learn to decontrolling petroleum. Therefore my colleague the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] offered an amendment to decontrol oil and oil products. The amendment was agreed to.

As the bill passed the Senate it contained provision to decontrol livestock and livestock products, poultry and poultry products, and dairy and dairy products. Decontrol was also provided for tobacco and tobacco products. Some of the Senators being satisfied with such decontrols lost interest in the bill and some of them voted against my amendment. They had been protected and they thought they would be able to retain their assumed protection. My amendment secured only 21 votes here in the Senate. What happened thereafter, Mr. President? The rule of divide and conquer, the rule of divide and destroy was working.

Mr. President, I wish sincerely to pay a compliment to my old time friend and colleague the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. I did not become a Member of Congress as soon as he did. I reached the lower House in 1923. I found the now senior Senator from Kentucky at that time one of the most influential Members of the House of Representatives. I knew that he would sooner or later become a Member of the Senate of the United States. I likewise wanted to become a Member of the Senate and was successful. On March 4, 1927, the senior Senator from Kentucky and myself walked across to the Senate from the House of Representatives. Each of us took the oath of a Senator here in this Chamber. I am glad that the senior Senator from Kentucky has been a Member of the Senate during all the time which has intervened since that date. I am glad he is a Member of the Senate now, and I hope that he will remain such for many years to come.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Kentucky is the best informed man in public life today. That is a broad statement, but I believe it. He is the most efficient and successful legislator this Government has developed in 157 years of its existence. That is also a strong statement, but it is justified by the record which the senior Senator from Kentucky has made. What the Senator favors he secures. He gets what he wants. He defeats what he opposes. I regret that I do not find myself in agreement with him more often. If I did I would not suffer defeat so frequently. I realize that when I oppose the senior Senator from Kentucky I am doomed to lose. If I win in the committee I lose on the floor. If I win in the committee and also on the floor, I lose in the conference. [Laughter.] So. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky approaches more nearly the status of being a general specialist than any other man I have ever known.

What I am saying is not idle talk because the Senator is opposing me on the pending proposal. It is now too late for me to do anything about it. I realize what will be the fate of the farmers of this country during the next 12 months to come. I am fearful that a year from now we will have the same fight again. The longer these controls remain on the people of the United States, the harder it will be to remove them. It may be that we are today sealing the fate of the people of the United States.

Mr. President, I have explained what happened to my amendment. Some amendments were agreed to in the committee, later in the Senate, and went to conference. Then what happened? The conference report came before the Senate and we found that everyone had been taken care of but the farmer. Controls were eased on industry. Controls, instead of being released on farmers, were clamped down upon them like a crown of thorns. Mr. President, I cannot agree to such treatment of the farm population of this country. Oh, it may be said that the farmers are now in good condition. I cannot deny that. Wars always bring higher prices, but I make the positive assertion that during the war the farmers did not fare on an equality with the wage earners and industry. Any time the wage earners wanted an increase in salaries, in wages, or in liberalized rules, they asserted their desires, went fishing, and got what they wanted.

During the war the Congress found it necessary to pass legislation providing for the renegotiation of contracts in order to prevent industry from making unconscionable profits. What about the farmer? Only last November did farm prices increase approximately to parity.

My State, Oklahoma, is an oil-producing State, Texas is an oil-producing State, and Kentucky also produces oil. Mr. President, the oil industry has not been permitted to increase its prices above 61 percent of parity. In other words, oil and oil products today are selling at only 61 percent of what they were selling at back in 1926, the era of so-called Coolidge prosperity. Yet this Congress proposes to keep them on that level.

Mr. President, I do not wish to do anything which will cause me to lose the floor, because I may talk for only an hour. However, I should like my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky, to answer one or two questions so as to clarify the Record.

In the committee no objection was voiced to taking petroleum and petroleum products out from under control. No objection was voiced on the floor of the Senate to taking petroleum and petroleum products out from under controls. I ask the Senator from Kentucky what reason exists today for maintaining petroleum and petroleum products under OPA control?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I cannot tell the Senator the reason that petroleum and petroleum products are still under control. It was stated during the debate that one of the reasons why those products had not been decontrolled was the threat of a maritime strike, in which event the eastern seaboard of the United States and New England might be found short of oil, and therefore it was advisable to maintain controls over petroleum and petroleum products. However, that danger has now passed. I shall be frank with the Senator, as I tried to be yesterday with other Senators in regard to meats. I know of no

reason, so far as supply and demand are concerned, why petroleum should be any longer maintained under control with price ceilings.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. While the Senator is on his feet, I will ask him to explain why the decontrol of livestock and meat was not retained in the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the reasons have been explained. The House conferees would not agree to that provision of the bill. When the bill was originally before the House the Members of the House voted against the decontrol of livestock, beef cattle, and meat. Inasmuch as the Senate bill has provided for a decontrol board, the other House did not feel that it was logical to set up another board and at the same time take away from it jurisdiction with respect to important items of food such as poultry and poultry products, dairy products, livestock, and meat. Therefore, they would not agree to those provisions in the Senate bill.

In order to get an agreement it was necessary of course for somebody to yield. The conferees retained practically everything the Senate put into the bill except those specific decontrols. The House conferees would not accede to them and would not yield. So under the circumstances, the Senate conferees felt that they were justified in yielding; and evidently the judgment of the House conferees was sustained by the later action of the House, for when the conference report was before it and a motion was made to recommit the bill to the conferees with instructions to agree to these very items which were in the Senate bill, namely, poultry, dairy products, livestock and meat, that motion was defeated by a vote of 221 to 150, a majority of 71 votes. That is the reason, frankly, why the provision for the decontrol of these specific items was removed from the Senate bill. The same thing applies to tobacco and petroleum. The House conferees took the same position as to all the specific items mentioned, and the Senate conferees could not very well assume the position that one or two of these items should be kept in and decontrolled if the House would not agree to all of them. So the entire list was eliminated from the conference report.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his explanation, and I hope it will satisfy the 30,000,000 farmers in the United States, but I am afraid that it will not be entirely agreeable to them.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will permit me—I do not want to take his time because he is limited to an hour—let me first thank the Senator for the very generous compliment he paid me a moment ago. I do not deserve such praise, but I know of no man in the Senate, or out of it, from whom I would rather hear it than from the Senator from Oklahoma, who, as he has said, has been associated with me and I with him for many years in the House and in the Senate. But I do not think it is quite accurate or fair to say that the bill does something for industry and nothing for the farmers, because in the conference committee, whereas the bill of the Senate mentioned only manufacturers and processors in the formula that would include costs since 1941, in conference we inserted the word "producers" so as to include all producers. A farmer is neither a manufacturer nor a processor, but he is a producer. So, in order that the formula might apply to all people on equal terms we inserted the word "producer," which of course includes farmers.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, at no time in the consideration of this bill, so far as I know, was there a proposition to decontrol a single specific item of industry; but it was proposed to decontrol a number of specific commodities produced by the farmers. So that the bill, insofar as industry is concerned, it is in general terms; it was developed in general terms; it was passed in general terms, and it comes back to the Senate in general terms. But, so far as the farmers are concerned, the Senate put in specific items that should be decontrolled and the conference committee took those items out.

Mr. President, the Congress is presumed to be the policy-making branch of the Government. The makers of the Constitution intended it to be. The makers of the Constitution put the legislative branch first in the Constitution. Of the 3,000 words or so in the Constitution 65 percent, approximately, are devoted to the powers of Congress. The Congress controls all other branches of the Government. The Congress can impeach any member of the executive branch; the Congress can impeach any member of the judicial branch; the Congress can make laws under which they are supposed to act. But, Mr. President, that is not the case. If we pass this law simply extending the life of the OPA that is all the OPA wants. The Congress has failed to establish any direct policy over anything in this bill. Its terms are all in generalities, so that when the Administrator gets this bill he will look it over and will see that the life of the organization has been extended, and he can then say that the Congress itself did not know what it wanted; that the conferees did not know what they wanted, hence all is left to the discretion of the Administrator.

Here is the way things go in the administrative branch. Mr. President, who has charge of the foreign relations of our Government? The answer—the State Department under the President. Who calls the signals on the team that represents the State Department? The Secretary of State, of course, calls the signals, and his staff, his personnel, and his employees play on his team according to the signals he calls, and if anyone does not play according to his signals, out he goes. Who calls the signals in the War Department? Of course the Secretary of War is the manager of the team, but I doubt if he presumes to act as the signal caller. At the present time the man who calls the signals there is the General of the Armies, General Eisenhower. I do not complain of that; I do not know that a better choice could be made. Who calls the signals in the Department of Justice? There is only one answer. The Attorney General calls the signals.

Now, Mr. President, following the analogy, who calls the signals on the price-control program? There is only one answer, and that answer is Generalissimo Bowles. So long as his organization has life he does not need any law; the law is in his way and he pays little or no attention to the law enacted by the Congress.

In 1942 Congress passed a law containing a provision that in fixing maximum prices of farm commodities the element of farm wages should be considered and included. He has never read that law, or, if he has, he has paid no attention to it.

The Congress passed the Bates-Barkley amendment, but, so far as I can learn, he paid no attention to that law. The distinguished author of that amendment said that it was not being carried out as he thought it ought to be carried out. So he conferred with the Generalissimo himself, and after his conference, with his keen sense of perception, his fine eyesight, and acute hearing, he made the statement that he thought he could discern a slight improvement. That is not very assuring, Mr. President, to the farmers of the United States.

Getting back to meat, I exhibit to the Senate a copy of the Evening Star, printed in Washington, D. C., dated June 26, and I read the headline as follows:

> Meat famine spreads in district area with distributors depleted. Retail grocers report scant stock and no relief in sight.

After 4 years of manipulation of the price-control system, at a time when there is more meat in the country than ever, at least more live meat on the hoof—eighty-one or eighty-two million head of livestock—we come to the point under the control of the OPA that we have no meat in the city of Washington. The shelves are bare, and there is no prospect of any meat. Yet today the Senate will vote to approve that record.

Mr. President, it has been stated on both sides of the aisle that the management of OPA is a national scandal. Yet today the Senate, if I do not mistake my guess, will vote to approve and to continue what Senators admit is a national scandal.

Mr. President, the OPA has made every citizen of this Republic a law violator. All producers are law violators. That might be a little too broad, because many do not know they are violating the law. The Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] had on his desk last night a stack of orders and laws 2 feet high. Those laws are orders and regulations and amendments which the OPA has promulgated for the government of the people of the United States. While I have not read those amendments and those orders, I think I would not be far wrong in stating every citizen of the United States has unknowingly violated some of those innumerable orders, rules, and regulations.

So, Mr. President, under this national scandal the producers today stand as law violators in the United States, and the processors likewise are law violators, in the main. Perhaps they do not know

it, perhaps some have escaped, but the statement stands.

Mr. President, the distributors are law violators under the rules and regulations and amendments of OPA. Finally, the consumers of the country, great and small, old and young, if they are eating, are violating the provisions of some rule or regulation of OPA. Every time a citizen puts a piece of steak in his mouth, the chances are it is a black-market steak. The citizen has no idea where the steak came from. There is practically no meat going through the regulary examined and inspected slaughter houses, so the chances are about 9 out of 10 that the meat the people of the country are eating today is black-market meat, ungraded and uninspected.

What does anyone know to be the condition of that meat? Nothing. Yet the Senate today in all probability will vote in favor of continuing a system whereby the people of the United States are forced to continue for another year at least eating uninspected and ungraded meat, and from an unknown source. I cannot support that kind of a proposal.

Mr. President, as I view the question, those who vote for the conference report vote to pass the buck and ball to Bowles. Thereafter, as to what he does with it, they will have no say.

Mr. President, a vote for the conference report means a vote to approve of the national scandal about which we have heard so much on the floor of the Senate during the discussion of the bill. It is admitted that there is plenty of meat in our country. It is admitted that there are plenty of milk products, though they may be scarce in some sections. It is admitted there are plenty of poultry products. Yet, Mr. President, in this land of plenty there is a scarcity, and a vote in favor of the conference report in my opinion is a vote of approval of a near famine, practically, in a land of plenty.

Therefore, Mr. President, assuming to speak for the farm population of this country—and I do that by the authority of many thousands of letters and telegrams which I have in my office—I cannot vote for the conference committee report. So, when my name is called, I shall vote "no."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a statement of a former distinguished Member of this body, now Governor of my State, Hon. Mon C. Wallgren, regarding the question now pending before the Senate, together with Governor Wallgren's letter to Mr. George Pepper enclosing the statement.

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

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Olympia, May 29, 1946.

Mr. GEORGE PEPPER,
Executive Director, Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, Seattle, Wash.

DEAR MR. PEPPER: Response to your letter of May 14 has been delayed because of my absence from my office. I have been in the East in the interest of the livestock and other industries of the State. I am glad to comply with your suggestion that I make public a statement in support of the OPA extension bill without crippling amendments and I shall cooperate with our State delegation in Congress in accomplishing this result.

I am enclosing herewith a copy of my public statement relative to the OPA controls.

With kind regards, I am,

Cordially yours,

MON C. WALLGREN,
Governor.

STATEMENT BY HON. MON C. WALLGREN IN SUPPORT OF OPA EXTENSION BILL WITHOUT CRIPPLING AMENDMENTS

The threat of unbridled inflation will continue to endanger us unless and until Congress gives approval to the OPA extension bill, without crippling amendments. There is no question but what the OPA can screen out certain nuisance items but controls must be maintained over all necessities. It is evident that selfish groups in this country are attempting to bring about the defeat of this measure or to so amend it as to make it ineffective. Once OPA controls are removed, prices on all commodities will immediately rise and inflation will be upon us. Inflation and speculation go hand-in-hand. The price of raw materials to the manufacturers will jump and the race to secure such materials will bring a constantly increasing manufacturers' cost. Merchants will then face increasing prices. The buying public will find that its dollar, saved during the past productive years, will shrink in value.

In 1920 inflationary prices, as many will remember, reached the point where sugar cost 25 cents per pound, bacon 58 cents per pound, eggs 90 cents per dozen, and many other items proportionately high. Clothing prices rose 30 to 50 percent. After the last World War, when pressures were far weaker than at present, rents climbed more than 50 percent.

The effect of all of this inflationary and speculative pressure would mean demands for increased wages which would again boost prices. The standard of living for the average family would be reduced to a distressing level, and for those on low fixed incomes it would result in wretchedness.

Some people misguidedly believe that taking off controls will mean spurt in production and that competition will then serve to hold prices down. But the present depletion of all consumer goods it so great that production could not be expected to increase to a point where competition would operate to bring prices down again for a considerable period of time. The more likely effect of this inflationary-speculative era would be that consumers would be unable to purchase enough goods and services to sustain the prices brought about by inflation and we would have another collapse similar to that which took place in 1929. Let us urge Congress to approve firm controls on prices and thus avoid repeating this frightful blunder.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate a notorious and habitual violation and disregard by the Office of Price Administration of section 201, title 18, of the United States Criminal Code, commonly known as the Antilobbying Act.

Mr. President, I read a section of the code, as follows:

No part of the money appropriated by any act shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers and employees of the United States from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

Any officer or employee of the United States who, after notice and hearing by the superior officer vested with the power of removing him, is found to have violated or attempted to violate this section shall be removed by such superior officer from office or employment. Any officer or employee of the United States who violates or attempts to violate this section shall also be guilty of a misdemeanor and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $500 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

Mr. President, this section prohibits the direct or indirect use of any part of money appropriated by any act, except where expressly authorized by Congress, to pay for any—(a) personal service, (b) advertisement, (c) telegram, (d) telephone, (e) letter, (f) printed or written matter, (g) or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation.

Any officer or employee, after notice and hearing by the superior officer who has the power of removing him, found guilty of violating or attempting to violate section 6, must be removed from office or employment.

Furthermore, any officer or employee of the United States who violates or attempts to violate section 6, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction must be punished by a fine not to exceed $500, or by imprisonment for not to exceed 1 year, or both by fine and imprisonment.

The self-evident language of the section was explained to the House on May 29, 1919, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sixty-sixth Congress, first session, page 403 by Representative Good, of Iowa, a member of the Committee on Appropriations and, from the noted applause, met with laudable approval by the House. Representative Good stated, page 403:

The bill also contains a provision which I am frank to say is subject to a point of order. It is new legislation, but it will prohibit a practice that has been indulged in so often, without regard to what administration is in power—the practice of a bureau chief or the head of a department writing letters throughout the country, sending telegrams throughout the country, for this organization, for this man, for that company, to write his Congressman, to wire his Congressman, in behalf of this or that legislation [Applause.] The gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. Sherley, former chairman of this committee, during the closing days of the last Congress was greatly worried because he had on his desk thousands upon thousands of telegrams that had been started right here in Washington by some official wiring out for people to wire Congressman Sherley for this appropriation and for that. Now, they use the contingent fund for that purpose, and I have no doubt that the telegrams sent for that purpose cost the Government more than $7,500. Now, it was never the intention of Congress to appropriate money for this purpose, and sec-

tion 5 (later changed to sec. 6, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD p. 911) of the bill will absolutely put a stop to that sort of thing. [Applause.]

Mr. President, Congress has not expressly authorized that any moneys appropriated for the Office of Price Administration could be expended contrary to the payments prohibited in section 6 of the act of 1919. In the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1945 (ch. 271, Public Law 132, approved July 5, 1945) which provided, among other things, appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, the appropriation for salaries and expenses of the Office of Price Administration was limited to "all necessary expenses of the Office of Price Administration in carrying out the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by the act of October 2, 1942, and the provisions of the act of May 31, 1941 (55 Stat. 236) as amended by the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and acts amending or supplementing such acts, and all other powers, duties, and functions which may be lawfully delegated to the Office of Price Administration, including expenses of in-service training of employees, including salaries and traveling expenses of instructors."

It should be noted that Congress has recently revived and specifically referred to section 6 of the 1919 act in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act of 1946 (ch. 109, Public Law 52, approved May 5, 1945, H. R. 2689), as follows:

Provided further, That no part of any funds available to the Department of Agriculture, the War Food Administration, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department or Administration shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the act of July 11, 1919 (18 U. S. C. 201) to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels.

Thus, the direct or indirect use of appropriated moneys by an officer or employee of the United States to pay for personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device intended or designed to influence a Member of Congress to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, either before or after the introduction of the bill, is a misdemeanor subject to a penalty by fine or imprisonment or both and removal of the officer or employee from office or employment.

Mr. President, every Member of the Senate has knowledge of both Mr. Bowles' and Mr. Porter's flagrant violation of this statute.

We have all been bombarded with telegrams, telephone calls, petitions, letters, post cards, and delegations, importuning us to "extend OPA without amendment"; to "vote against crippling amendments"; not to "kill price control," and similar inspired pressure.

We all know that this pressure on Congress was the direct result of literally hundreds of thousands of pamphlets, articles, charts, booklets, news releases, radio talks, and magazine articles prepared at the expense of the Government and out of funds appropriated by Congress and sent out at Government expense to women's clubs, labor unions, veterans and their families, schools, churches, newspapers, radio stations, and farm and similar organizations.

Recently many of us witnessed the spectacle of an airplane writing in the sky over the Capitol Building "Save OPA."

Mr. President, I am not so naive as to believe that Mr. Bowles or Mr. Porter or any other bureaucrat will ever be removed from office, or fined, or imprisoned for this flagrant, open, and notorious violation of this Federal statute.

However, this attitude of many bureaucrats that they are above the law and bigger than the Congress of the United States should cause the Congress to pause before it again surrenders the power of life or death over our business enterprises.

Mr. President, the people and the Congress of the United States have become indifferent, cynical, and calloused toward this kind of thing. Who would have believed a few years ago that a couple of obscure citizens, after becoming minor bureaucrats, could or would use millions of dollars of the public funds to publicize and glamorize themselves and build a powerful propaganda machine that can be turned on or off as one switches a light on or off?

Mr. President, who would have believed a few years ago that appointed public servants, responsible to the Congress, would have the effrontery publicly to brand a major committee bill "a monstrosity," "an economic booby trap," or, in effect, charge Members of Congress with being senile, doddering old men.

Who could anticipate that appointed public servants could or would organize and use a propaganda machine that overnight would be unleashed against Congress and its considered legislation. We all remember the next day after the House of Representatives passed the Price Control Act, how certain radio commentators, newspaper columnists, labor organizations, front organizations, all followed the lead of Messrs. Porter and Bowles in charging that "OPA was dead," the "Price Control Act was emasculated," "the pressure lobby had gutted OPA," "runaway inflation is on the way," and similar oft repeated untruths.

Mr. President, we all know about the protest meetings organized from coast to coast, the mass protests to Congress, the delegations from all over the country chanting the same chant "Kill the crippling amendments passed by the House."

This was not a strange coincidence, but was a cleverly organized propaganda campaign, financed with Treasury funds in violation of a United States criminal statute.

Mr. President, it is time for the Congress of the United States to take in hand and curb this vocal Frankenstein it has created.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have been asked by some who are opposed to the adoption of the conference report rather to summarize the position which some of us have taken in the Senate relative to this legislation, and to make plain our feelings respecting it, and the reasons for the way we shall vote upon this most important measure.

First, I want to say that I think the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] rendered the Senate and the people of the country a distinct service last night when, during his speech he read telegrams from people all over the United States which he called "the voice of the people."

I should like to say for the RECORD that the distinguished Senator from Texas is not the only Senator who has received telegrams on this issue. I, too, could have brought into the Senate hundreds of telegrams and letters which I have received, most of them within the past 24 hours, but many of them received over the period of the past 2 weeks, telling of the deplorable conditions throughout the United States. I wish to add to the "voice of the people" which was so eloquently and forcefully presented by the distinguished Senator from Texas a few of the telegrams which I have received. I do not wish to offer them all. Time would not permit me to do what the distinguished Senator from Texas did, because of the limitation of debate. However, I have selected from hundreds of telegrams and letters which I have received approximately 115, from many States in the Union, including my own State.

These telegrams are not what we call pressure telegrams. They are not sent by organizations, or by persons who have been asked by pressure groups to write or telegraph Senators in the interest of some minority group. They are examples of telegrams which are being received from individuals all over the country. They come from housewives, merchants, farmers, businessmen, wholesalers, manufacturers, processors, jobbers, distributors, retailers, and laboring people. They come from all classes of our economy. I wish to read only one of these telegrams, but I shall ask unanimous consent that the others be printed in the RECORD.

Some may believe that these telegrams are part of a propaganda drive, and that we are exhibiting them to make a show of pressure. Let me say in all seriousness that anyone who reads the RECORD will notice the names of the small towns from which many of the telegrams come. They are telegrams voluntarily sent, imploring the Senate to take these controls off the backs of the people.

The following telegram is from Kearney, Nebr.:

KEARNEY, NEBR., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We have had no beef for college cafeteria feeding 600 students since May 1 this year.

Little of anything but chicken since September 1, 1944. We are in no position to compete with agencies using black market. Believe prices might rise for a time if OPA eliminated, but that eventually prices would level off. Continuation of present meat situation intolerable.

HERBERT L. CUSHING,
President, State Teachers College.

This is a typical message from an educational institution. I have received messages from doctors and from directors of hospitals, telling about meat famines in various districts, and pleading that something be done to obtain meat for the famine areas. I wish I had the opportunity which the distinguished Senator from Texas had to read these telegrams. They are not telegrams commending me, but graphically bringing to the attention of Members of the Senate the pleas which are made for relief from totalitarian controls in order that the people may get food and clothing.

I ask unanimous consent that the telegrams to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

LINCOLN, NEBR., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
You are putting up a grand fight and so right; keep it up.

T. B. STRAIN.

OMAHA, NEBR., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:
Hold your ground OPA bill. Filibuster out if necessary.

C. S. HAINES.

HASTINGS, NEBR., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good fight. Remove ceilings on stocks, poultry, dairy products; filibuster if need be.

S. A. COATS.

FALLS CITY, NEBR., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY of Nebraska,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work, Senator.

FRED HSCHOCK.

NATIONAL STOCKYARDS, ILL.,
June 26, 1946.
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building:
As erstwhile Nebraskan I congratulate you on your fight against OPA. Keep up the good work.

JOHN CLAY & CO.,
W. J. MCGINNIS,
Manager.

COZAD, NEBR., *June 25, 1946.*
Hon. Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:
Contacts and personal conversation satisfy me that central Nebraska merchants and farmers are about to revolt against OPA livestock and meat regulations. Meat markets in small towns closing. My patients unable to buy meat. Please vote out OPA at once.

Dr. C. H. SHEES.

COZAD, NEBR., *June 25, 1946.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Present OPA regulations on meats and all other food products are making people lose all respect for Government. People are naming prices through black market regardless of OPA. As a producer of live stock, I urge you to use all your power to defeat OPA.

C. T. YOUNG.

SUMNER, NEBR., *June 25, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
Senate Building:
For God's sake do something to save the livestock and meat industry of these United States.

GUY SCUFDER.

COZAD, NEBR., *June 25, 1946.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
With OPA regulations live ceilings and so forth the livestock and meat industry is in terrible mess. Practically impossible buy meat anywhere except through black-market operators and even then only very limited supply of inferior quality. Present bill before Senate if passed will make it worse and will force livestock feeders and growers and legitimate meat industry out of business. Request you do everything possible oppose this legislation and insist upon livestock and meats being removed from OPA controls.

NOEL COVER.

BI-LO MARKET,
Hastings, Nebr., June 23, 1946.
DEAR SENATOR WHERRY: Please fight to kill the OPA on everything except rents and sugar.
Beets should be $2 per ton higher at least.
Answer is not needed, just fight to save this country.

L. J. COATES.

NORTH PLATTE, NEBR., *June 26, 1946.*
Hon. KENNETH WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
It is inconceivable that Senate will reverse itself and approve present OPA bill. In our judgment retention of meat price and slaughtering regulations will completely stop supplies and create situation far worse than anything we have ever experienced. I urge you to use every means at your command to defeat present bill and immediately abolish livestock controls in the interest of common sense and sensible meat distribution and prices.

RAY FARQUHAR,
Executive Director, Frozen Food Locker Manufacturers and Suppliers Association.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
My honest butcher has no meat. The black market got above my reach. I was forced to close my restaurant. My Jewish black-market butcher wants the OPA for at least one more year. My honest butcher and myself want to end the OPA now.

THOMAS ODRIEN,
Restaurant Owner.

ELMHURST, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
I would like to wake up Monday, July 1, without OPA. Please help Senator O'DANIEL.

ERNST HAMMERSCHMIDT.

TOPEKA, KANS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Suggest OPA bill be amended to give Comrade Bowles right to immediately liquidate all American kulocks rather than slowly starving them to death. Farm tractors went up $127 apiece yesterday. Present bill first attempt of American Congress to enslave an entire class of people. Filibuster your job.

CLAYTON E. KLINE.

GLENDALE, CALIF., *June 27, 1496.*
Senator WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Female steers are as ridiculous as OPA. Help Senator O'DANIEL return America to America.

CHARLES W. BOYLE.

HANFORD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
According to Fulton Lewis, Jr., you are our last defense against the dominating bureaucrats in OPA. Don't give up.

HERBERT BUTTON.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: As a citizen of United States I have a right to pass my opinion that the OPA is ruination of small businessmen. Will you kindly analyze this situation. Thank you for same.

LOUIS REST.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:
We cannot operate anything without violating the law. Please kill OPA.

WALTER GARVIN CO., INC.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
I trust you and Senator O'DANIEL will filibuster on the OPA bill and return our country to the American way of life.

Dr. DONALD J. MACDANIEL.

TAFT, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senator, Capitol,
Washington, D. C.:
You true friend of California housewives. They have empty bowls and too much Bowles, but no meat, bread, butter, or anything else. Knock out OPA.

Mrs. J. W. TRAVERS.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY of Nebraska,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: Please do everything you can to remove price controls off our foodstuffs. Thanking you very much to do whatever you can. Do hope that you gain enough of support to roll it back as everything is at a standstill.

E. H. MITCHELL,
Silver Dollar Motor Court.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 26, 1946.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Radio report tells of O'DANIEL's contemplated filibuster to kill OPA. This is good news to Americans opposed to European bureaucratic methods. Urge you fight with the same spirit you showed on town meeting OPA discussion. House has failed us. May the Senate save us from this step to statism.

CARL AND HELENE JOHNSON.

TROY, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:
All my family and everyone I know are heartily sick of OPA and senseless restraints.

Also disapprove of subsidies. Only Communists want continued regulations.

BLANCHE VAN EVERY GEER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I earnestly urge you to filibuster to kill the OPA completely. This is our last chance to get rid of it.

A. W. CORSE.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
Senate House, Washington, D. C.:

We are in back of you 100 percent in your fight to end price control. We look with pride on one truly patriotic American who knows that present bill will only end in black markets. American businesses are based on free enterprise. Do your utmost.

GUS JUENGLING & SON MEAT PACKERS.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We sincerely urge you to fight most vigorously to remove meat control and thereby break the black market which has made it impossible for us to purchase meat legally during the past 5 months.

BONNEE FROZEN PRODUCTS CO.,
L. JOHN LEWIS.

MARION, IOWA, *June 26, 1946.*
Hon. Senator WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:

Kill the OPA now. We are sick to death of it. Vote against the inclusion of railway mail service pensions with social security. We want no part of it. It is our pension bought and paid for and we want no tampering of administration by New Deal politicians. Sincerely,

JACK W. COMSTOCK.

DES MOINES, IOWA, *June 26, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Nebraska should praise God for a Senator who sees the danger ahead if OPA were continued.

A. G. PETERSON.

RADFORD, VA., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations. Away with OPA.

MAX C. RUPE.

WEEPING WATER, NEBR., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:

Sure help Senator O'DANIEL filibuster OPA 'till Sunday.

CARL E. DAY.

WATERTOWN, N. Y., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:

Don't give up fight against OPA. Filibuster.

HELEN I. MCMULLIN.

HARRISBURG, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
United States Senate:

Stick to your guns and compel controls lifted from meat and butter. Better still no OPA hampering Americans.

S. S. POMEROY.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *June 26, 1946.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Minnesota congratulates you. Trusts you will succeed in removing price control on meats. Butcher shops are out of meats, many closed. Nearly everybody driven into the arms of black marketeers. Through their weakness the House betrayed the public interest.

H. L. PRESTHOLT.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We are in back of you 100 percent in your fight to end price control, especially OPA control of meat and meat products. We urge your continued efforts to take OPA control off of meats.

JACOB BAUER SONS.

NEW GALILEE, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:

Please lend all your support and influence against the continuance of the OPA in any form. Restore the Constitution or checks and balances that they will function in favor of no man or group.

Dr. C. B. MOORE.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We are in back of you 100 percent in your fight to end price control. We look with pride on one truly patriotic American who knows that present bill will only end in black markets. American businesses are based on free enterprise. Do your utmost.

CINCINNATI WHOLESALE MEAT
DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
GUS JUENGLING, *President.*

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Under OPA dictatorship not allowed to increase tenancy from 9 to 21 capacity. Housing shortage largely responsible to stupidity formed to liquidate small prewar rents. Cannot cover costly repairs, only hopes of small business and farmers is understanding Senators like yourselves.

L. ROGERS.

NASHVILLE, TENN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations. One more year of control will give us either Russia's Government or India's condition.

W. H. ELAM.

ELDORADO ARK., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations to you on your stand against the OPA.

C. L. PEACOCK GROCERY.
THE CORNER GROCERY.
E. P. TRULL GROCERY.
DUMAS PACKING CO.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations. Keep up your fight to eliminate price controls.

ILLINOIS FUEL MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senator from Nebraska, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Make Housing Administration responsible for rent control. Abolish OPA.

G. GUY OWENS.

EUGENE, OREG., *June 27, 1946.*
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Continue the good fight. Filibuster till Monday for free enterprise and true prices based upon supply and demand.

TAYLOR LUMBER CO.
REVES TAYLOR.

SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:

Admire your OPA stand. God gave us freedom, let us keep it.

GRANGE GROCERY.

ST. JOSEPH, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your red-blooded heman determination to fight to the end OPA chaos, confusion, and un-Americanism. I strongly endorse your stand for a free America.

WALTER S. PARKER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Present proposed OPA bill discriminates against lumber wholesalers and will put us out of business on west-coast woods if passed. Suggest changing date of figuring costs from January 1, 1946 to December 1941. We appreciate your efforts.

ALLSOP LUMBER CO.

WHEATLAND, IND., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:

Encourage O'Daniel continue filibuster until present OPA bill is defeated.

WHEATLAND MERCHANTS COMMITTEE,
LEM KIMMON, *Secretary.*

LIMA, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senators TAFT and WHERRY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

May the memory of our gallant sons who gave their all be an inspiration to you to take up where they left off for the sake of freedom.

TOM MOORE.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your courageous stand against vicious OPA.

THOMAS J. POTTS.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

OPA smells to high heaven. America needs fresh air. Save free enterprise. End OPA. This is the show-down.

WOMEN'S LEAGUE FOR POLITICAL
EDUCATION.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Appreciate your efforts to eliminate or revise OPA.

E. LEE MERRILL.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Sincerely hope your efforts will eliminate OPA entirely.

A. W. BECKER.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Black markets and confusion will prevail so long as OPA exists. Best wishes for your success in fighting.
F. R. WINGERTER.

BUTLER, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:
Another year of OPA and other unwarranted Government interference will ruin our Nation. We fought this war for freedom and democracy. We would like to have it back again. Keep fighting OPA. We are for you.
ARNOLD ELEVATOR MILLS.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We are back of you 100 percent in your fight to end price control. We look with pride on one truly patriotic American who knows that present bill will only end in a black market. American businesses are based on free enterprise. Do your utmost.
HENRY SCHLACTER & SONS MEAT PACKERS.

ELMIRA, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We're glad to recognize in the Senate a statesman and one who has some idea of economics.
H. D. WOOLF, HARRIS MCHENY & BAKER CO.

ANDREWS, S. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Am sure the majority O. K. The American people will stand behind you in your fight to overthrow the OPA. More power to you.
D. D. OVERTON, Jr.

CULLMAN, ALA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:
Thanks for stand on decontrolled meat. Farmers are suffering OPA-itis.
C. E. HERRIN.

INDEPENDENCE, KANS., *June 27, 1946.*
Honorable Mr. WHERRY,
United States Senator from Nebraska,
Washington, D. C.:
Hope you carry on and defeat the very un-American bill which is a great danger and disgrace to humanity.
SCOTT BROTHERS, Since '99.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We urge you to back O'DANIEL in his important fight.
BONNEE FROZEN PRODUCTS CO.,
L. JOHN LEWIS.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill OPA. Honest men and women sick of Bowles.
M. MONTGOMERY.

ST. JOSEPH, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY, of Nebraska,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
This exchange compliments you on your stand and encourages you to persist in your efforts to remedy the chaotic situation existing in the livestock and meat industry as result of OPA regulations.
ST. JOSEPH LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE,
JOHN W. BENNETT, Jr., *President.*

EAST ST. LOUIS, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator K. S. WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations. More power to you and your fight on OPA. Evidently you remember when we had democratic government.
E. T. COUCH, Jr.,
COUCH SUPER MARKET.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Urgently recommend strong filibuster or any other tactics necessary to relieve the oil industry of the burden of the OPA.
ALFRED C. GLASSELL, Jr.,
Director of the Texas Independent Royalty Owner and Producers Association.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your stand against OPA. Let me urge you and all red-blooded American Senators to assist O'DANIEL all possible to kill the OPA now.
J. E. FRICE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Please help Senator O'DANIEL in his fight to abolish the un-American, unconstitutional, and communistic Office of Price Administration.
O. W. RICHARDSON.

TARENTUM, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
We urgently request you to support Senator O'DANIEL now in his courageous fight to restore the American form of government. Here's hoping that we can start out Monday morning free and unhampered by asinine OPA curbs and restrictions, free to let the law of supply and demand and common sense work out our economy.
E. C. West, J. E. Scheid, F. F. Huber, R. L. Shaffer, Cecilia Miscosky, Esther Miscosky, Alice Stitt, F. R. Lardin, T. H. Bender, and F. E. West.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 27, 1946.*
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Against filibustering as principle, but help Senator O'DANIEL against OPA.
ELBERT EASTMAN.

SEATTLE, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Important you win your fight re OPA program.
W. RINGER, *Secretary.*
Washington State Retail Grocers and Meat Dealers Association.

UTICA, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY:
Stick to your guns on OPA and help us get rid of the gestapo. Congratulations.
GEORGE E. CRESSY.

SILVER LAKE, IND., *June 27, 1946.*
The Honorable Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:
We livestock farmers apparently have been sold down the river again. Appreciate your efforts to protect the basic industry of our American agricultural program.
W. R. WEDRICK (Democrat).

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Nebraska Senator WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:
I deeply appreciate your efforts. Frankly, as both a dairy farmer and a creamery operator, I am convinced that our Nation's dairy industry will suffer great disaster if OPA controls are kept on dairy products.
KNOWLTON'S CREAMERY,
S. E. KNOWLTON, *Owner.*

SEATTLE, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Very few of the worst evils in the present OPA Act will be cured by passing the proposed bill recommended by conference committee and passed by House. We prefer no OPA at all rather than that. We urge you to fight for bill more in line with one passed by Senate or do away with OPA entirely.
M. A. WYMAN LUMBER CO.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We commend you for the stand you are taking for the decontrol of dairy, poultry, and meat products in any OPA extension bill to be passed by the Senate.
AMERICAN BULK CONDENSED MILK ASSOCIATION,
H. C. DARGER, *Executive Secretary.*

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.
SIR: We respectively urge you to use your influence against OPA. We raise a lot of cattle down here but we have no meat. We have a large lumber industry in east Texas, but no lumber for veterans' houses.
T. A. BLAKELEY,
President, The Mortgage Corp. of Texas.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. KEN WHERRY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
My family, my many, many business associates and friends give you our wholehearted support in your wonderful fight against the OPA.
JOHN H. BLAFFER.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
I appreciate and favor your fight against continuation of the OPA and believe that your fight is for the best interest of all the people of the United States. I am in favor of your filibuster and hope for its success.
GLENN H. MCCARTHY.

HANFORD, CALIF., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:
Gratifying to see your efforts in behalf of meat industry against OPA. Billion dollar subsidy appropriation would do more good to help balance budget. Supply and demand is only answer to meat industry problems.
DAVID BERNARD,
HANFORD MEAT & PROVISION CO.

NATIONAL STOCK YARDS, ILL., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Your fight against OPA commendable. Balance of legitimate livestock will go black market if price ceilings remain.
M. H. WATKINS.
BELLEVILLE, ILL.

FAYETTEVILLE, N. C., *June 25, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:
If you have to, filibuster OPA controls to death.
I. T. WARREN.

EAST ST. LOUIS, ILL., *June 25, 1946.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
We are informed OPA bill out of conference committee leaves control on meat. This means that many legitimate packing houses will be forced out of business and the black market will be in control. You have the facts brought out before Banking and Currency and Agricultural Committees. We have done everything possible to present the gravity of the situation. We urge that you do everything possible to block passage of bill in present form.
HUNTER PACKING CO.,
FRANK A. HUNTER, Jr., *President.*

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate:
We urgently request you do everything in your power to reinstate in the OPA extension bill the Wherry amendment which would give to wholesalers and distributors their peacetime mark-ups. The committee bill ignores completely the legitimate wholesaler and distributor; and if passed its present form, will do nothing more than compel a vital part of our distribution system to go out of business. You are doing a fine job. More power to you.
GEORGE A. DASCOMB, Jr.,
President, The Vaughan Lumber Co., Inc.

NATIONAL STOCK YARDS, ILLINOIS,
June 26, 1946.
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:
I am farming about 1,000 acres; am half interested in 2,500 head of beef cattle. If controls were taken off, livestock production would greatly increase. To keep controls on, production will go lower and black markets will get much worse. Why not let supply and demand govern and legitimate packers operate?
W. H. YOUNG.
EDWARDSVILLE, ILL.

MISSOULA, MONT., *June 26, 1946.*
Hon. KENNETH WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Montana packers have been losing $5 to $10 per head on cattle purchased at compliance prices and sold at OPA wholesale dressed prices since January 1, 1944, when the Vinson cattle stabilization plan became effective. Black-market operators have established cattle prices in Montana, as well as the country at large, $10 to $30 per head above compliance prices. All real friends of producers and small packers should vote for the elimination of livestock subsidies and the decontrol of livestock and meat—the only way to eliminate the black market.
E. S. HOLMES,
President, Montana Meat Packers Association.

NATIONAL STOCK YARDS, ILLINOIS,
June 26, 1946.
Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
To say we are heartsick at the action of the conference committee toward the OPA is mild. For years from our farms we have been among the largest producers of meat animals in the State of Illinois. In recent years at very short profits, and this year is showing up the worst of all. But we were living in hopes that this body would not resort to supposedly public opinion that is founded on vote-getting propaganda without facts. We at the present time are producing enough meat to feed 6,000 people per day. We have never sold one head in black market, but now we are sure there is no other way out or quit business, and this business is all we know. We think the American people are capable of running their affairs. Give them a chance.
ARTHUR KNAPP & SON.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We are wholesale carload distributors of lumber—have been for over 25 years. Under OPA regulations we have been directly discriminated against and put out of business. Senate-House conference committee report on OPA of no benefit to ourselves or other direct mill shipping lumber wholesalers. Would appreciate your rejecting the report and instruct committee to renew efforts for revision of bill more in line with that passed by the Senate. Will appreciate this consideration, as otherwise black market will continue grow bigger and bigger.
ARLING FUNCH LUMBER CO.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Joint conference committee report on OPA leaves wholesale lumber distributors in less favorable position than present discriminatory regulations. We solicit and urge your support in rejecting this report for revision by committee. We feel that wholesale distributors should at least be allowed the percentage of trade commissions they received prior to OPA as mark-up on ceiling prices. The joint committee report, if enacted, will surely put thousands of legitimate dealers out of business and will further encourage black-market operations.
THOMAS B. THAMES LUMBER CO.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Since 1908 we have operated retail lumber business in North College Hill, Ohio. Under OPA regulations we have been directly discriminated against and put out of business. Senate-House conference committee report on OPA of no benefit to retail lumber dealers. The report should be rejected and the committee instructed to renew efforts for revision of bill more in line with that originally passed by the Senate. If this is not done, black market will continue to flourish and legitimate concerns with enviable records for years will be out of business.
KNOLLMAN LUMBER CO.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY:
Since press reports indicate price-control conferees failed to definitely include your amendment intended to provide same protection for wholesalers and distributors, as does Taft amendments for manufacturers and processors, and since failure to recognize the plight of this essential segment of industry and commerce spells disaster for them, may we respectfully urge that you stand by your guns and insist that they be provided for as your amendment intended they should be. We lumbermen appreciate your good fight. More power to you.
LEGISLATION COMMITTEE THE CINCINNATI LUMBERMEN'S CLUB.

ERIE, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:
The 500 home-owned food stores of Erie and Erie County, Pa., who distribute more than 80 percent of the food products in a trading area of more than 200,000 people, protest and demand that OPA controls and ceilings on livestock, meats, dairy, and poultry products be removed as of July 1, 1946.
We believe that free enterprise on these foods will provide an uninterrupted flow of livestock, meats, dairy and poultry products in our community and the entire United States. We feel that with free enterprise that prices on those products will soon be lower than is now being paid.
HOME-OWNED STORES, INC., OF ERIE AND ERIE COUNTY, PA.
FRED D. MCCAULEY, *Executive Secretary.*

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 26, 1946.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
If you wish to prevent a national revolt on the part of all business against Government control you will vote to abolish OPA completely. Listen to the voices that are predicting the tomorrows present polls, refuse OPA three to one. Do not refuse to recognize the sounds of the times. Give industry and labor the opportunity of proving itself by eliminating controls for 9 months. If industry and labor fails to meet the challenge by then you can have a completely free hand. Present regulations are impossible, impractical, communistic, and unenforcible under a peacetime economy. When a widow with three children who desires to start a combination day nursery and home for three children who are now in an institution for two-thirds of the space devoted to the nursery and one-third of the space devoted for the home, is refused permission to build without priority assistance it is almost too late to say we still have the freedom guaranteed under our Constitution.
JOHN B. MCCRADY.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senate Whip KENNETH WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.
OUR DEAR MR. WHERRY: The conditions just passed by the House on the OPA bill are very unsatisfactory to the Panhandle, Texas. As far as meat, poultry, and meat and dairy products are concerned there is nothing but black market here. As supervisor of Ideal Food Stores markets I say, "Shall we operate legally and in fair competition, or shall we continue to operate with black market?" If the OPA continues the public will be buying at black-market prices, whereas if it is discontinued it would be much cheaper to buy legally and at competitive prices. My belief is that fair competition would discard all necessities of the OPA.
Sincerely yours,
DESMOND DEAN.

SALEM, OREG., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Something over 100,000,000 people are beginning to stoop, sneak, badger, and bluff to get sugar, soap, syrup, clothing, feed, lumber, radios, nails, autos, flour, bread, butter, cheese, meat, and or anything else they want and should have. Should black or free markets prevail? These are the people of what was and we believe is the finest nation on earth, the most enlightened, aggressive, upstanding, and compassionate. Consider coffee up, butter up, cheese up, bread up, beer up. Where is the held line? Consider no lumber, no autos, no sugar, no radios, no meat,

No soap. Where is production? Gobs of these people know the death of OPA on Sunday is just another of the Bowles crowd's propaganda scares to mislead the Nation's thinking people. They know Congress can reenact or relegislate whenever they see fit to do so or feel it necessary for the national welfare. Does someone or anyone think America must be kept in or returned to swaddling clothes? And if to what group of bureaucrats consider themselves competent to be pappy to us all. If we must die let us die fighting. Gentlemen don't give up the ship.

E. L. DICKSON.

SPOKANE, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*

Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,

Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

Stand by your guns. You are absolutely right about price control. But rent control is the worst culprit of all. Owners of rental housing are afraid to complain about OPA because OPA has instituted a "reign of terror" like the Commune of Paris, 1792–94. They collect fines out of court, without trial, like the five kings of Ireland in the Middle Ages. OPA sends out letters telling landlords to dig up $500 or $1,000 (without trial) for some infraction of their Communist rules, and two policemen to collect or go to jail. And like the "dark ages" no appeal is allowed. And no one can know their laws, not even lawyers, because their word is law. And the owners of rental property have no rights in their own homes. Why should anyone have to rent at a loss or charge the same rent in 1946 as they were charging during the depression 10 years ago just because that was what they were charging on March 1, 1942? No profit for the landlord is a cunning device of OPA to Russianize the United States of America. An excerpt from article VIII of the Constitution of the United States of America reads: "Nor excessive fines imposed nor cruel or unusual punishment inflicted." But Spokane OPA pompously fined a 73-year-old landlord $9,000 (AP) news item (excerpt) from Syracuse, N. Y. "71-year-old widow who charged 50 cents a week above the OPA maximum rental for an apartment, had to pay $1,500 to a tenant," and so on, ad infinitum. Could you beat that in Russia? And the OPA has something on everybody. Is that the new Russian plan and specification for the land of the free and the home of the brave? Remember? Socialists and Communists say "Get the landlord first and the rest will be easy." Save the United States of America. Repeal or modify rent control and blow up the OPA. Remove the ball and chain.

SCOTT C. SHARP,
A Bricklayer.

Mr. WHERRY. As the second part of the evidence, I should like to introduce a number of letters and telegrams received from pharmaceutical and chemical laboratories throughout the country. Time does not permit me to read them, but anyone who thinks for a moment that the situation is not serious need only go to the chemical laboratories of the country to discover the shortage of glands and chemical materials necessary to produce insulin, adrenalin, and dozens of other important drugs. I ask Senators to read these telegrams. There is no pressure about them in any way, shape, or form. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks letters and telegrams which have been received from pharmaceutical organizations.

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

LETTERS AND TELEGRAMS FROM SOME OF THE LARGEST PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANIES

A letter from Parke, Davis & Co., of Detroit, Mich., dated April 12, 1946, reads as follows:

"You are certainly aware of the fact that the available supplies of animal glands for medicinal use during the past several years have been constantly decreasing. This has variously been attributed to a shortage of labor, a shortage of feed, or a dislocation of animal production on the farms.

"At present the situation is perhaps more critical than at any time since the beginning of the war, and we believe that one important cause is diversion of cattle away from the regularly inspected packing houses into black-market channels. This, of course, not only presents a danger from supplying the public with uninspected meats but results in a total waste of all the animal glands, fats, hides and other byproducts. This is particularly serious to the manufacturer of medicinal and pharmaceutical products which are necessary for the maintenance of public health.

"At no time during the war were we able to fill our orders for products made from the pituitary gland of cattle, many of which were strictly military orders. This pituitary gland produces two important products, one of which is used in childbirth and the other in most surgical cases and for shock. We are unable, at present, to obtain more than about one-third of our normal requirements of these glands.

"Another extremely important gland is the beef suprarenal gland, which also yields two separate medicinal extracts: First, Adrenalin—so necessary in the treatment of asthmatic conditions as well as a heart stimulant. Second, the extract of the suprarenal cortex, which is the only known treatment for the many people suffering from Addison's disease. This is not curative but has to be taken daily to keep these people alive. We are not obtaining more than 50 percent of our estimated requirements of the beef suprarenal gland.

"Records indicate that patients suffering from diabetes are becoming more numerous each month and the only known preparation which will keep these people alive is insulin, which is made from the pancreas gland and which has to be taken daily in most cases. These glands are also used in connection with production of protein hydrolysates, representing amino acids, most recently finding wide application in the nutritional field.

"There is also a very large demand for ox bile which forms the raw material for several important products used and recognized by the medical profession for various disorders of the human gall bladder.

"Anything which will serve to direct the flow of normal supplies of cattle into the usual reliable packing house channels is not only desirable from the standpoint of procuring these various byproducts but would seem to be positively imperative if we are to maintain the public health standards of our people.

"We trust that this very important problem will receive the most serious consideration of any Senate committee dealing with it."

A telegram from Eli Lilly & Co., Indianapolis, Ind., April 10, 1946 says:

"It is our sincere hope you will be able to fully impress the proper authorities with the very serious shortage of supplies of raw materials necessary for important drug manufacture which are obtained from the meat packing industry. During the past several months have personally called on approximately 100 slaughterers in Indiana, Ohio, Kentucky, Missouri, and Illinois, and have just today returned from trip including Spokane, Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Phoenix, San Antonio, and Houston for the specific purpose of procurement of additional supplies pancreas glands, beef bile, thyroid glands. Almost universally have heard the same story on all of these contacts, namely that current regulations and conditions do not permit profitable operations especially in beef and that losses coupled with the virtual impossibility of staying in compliance make the situation nothing short of desperate.

"Cannot personally verify these facts; but after hearing the same story so many times from meat packers, both large and small, feel definitely that considerable change is necessary if the legitimate meat packer is to stay in operation at profitable volume and be honest. If situation continues much longer, someone must be prepared to accept responsibility for shortage of essential drugs, such as insulin, and other important drugs such as bile, pituitaries, thyroid, and perhaps antianemia preparations. Our current procurement is very much short of minimum needs and appears to be getting worse right along."

A letter from Wilson Laboratories, Chicago, Ill., dated April 6, 1946, reads as follows:

"The marked falling off in receipts of cattle has resulted in our supplies of certain glandular raw material being reduced to the point where we will have to discontinue operations.

"For example, beef pancreas are largely used in preparing insulin and other medicinal products. There is a shortage of pancreas of all sorts for insulin production. The failure to get insulin is very serious for the diabetic person who must rely on a daily injection of insulin.

"Pituitary glands are used to make extracts that are very largely employed in childbirth, in surgery, and in cases of shock. We are unable to produce these essential extracts because of a lack of raw material. We are practically shut down in that department.

"The failure to get cattle means our being unable to get ox bile, for which there is an enormous medical demand. You are familiar with this, since ox gall is used in the production of dehydrochloric acid. Bile products are used in the treatment of certain liver and gall-bladder and intestinal disturbances.

"There is a very serious disease known as Addison's disease, which involves the adrenal gland. We have been preparing an extract from beef adrenals that is capable of restoring those afflicted with Addison's disease to economic independence. The extract must be administered daily very much like the use of insulin in diabetes. Addison's disease patients are very susceptible to infection. Unless they have available an adequate supply of adrenal cortex extract they are in grave danger of dying.

"I do not know what becomes of these glands from cattle that are killed through black-market operations. To the best of my knowledge there is no indication that these materials are being saved. The failure to save them constitutes a definite menace to national health."

A second telegram from Eli Lilly & Co., dated April 12, 1946, says:

"If our telegram of April 10 does not in your opinion fully express the position which we as pharmaceutical manufacturers are now in due to severely reduced slaughter of many legitimate meat packers we shall be glad to have you wire or phone us, and we will endeavor to work with you to the fullest extent. Our situation with respect to essential drugs such as insulin is such that we must not overlook any opportunity to place our position to the attention of authority responsible for changes which will make the saving of pancreas gland and other important animal products possible in a quantity which is necessary. We consider this extremely serious

situation which demands attention as soon as possible."

A telegram from the Cudahy Packing Co., Chicago, Ill., dated April 12, 1946, says:

"One most unfortunate result of the present impossible situation in the livestock and packing industry is the wanton waste of valuable animal glands used by manufacturing chemists and makers of pharmaceuticals in the preparation of medicines essential in medical and surgical practice. Black-market slaughterers possess neither the facilities nor the technical skill required to recover these glands, and as a result the lives of many thousands of people under physicians' care are seriously endangered. For that reason, among many others, we urge action now to restore normal operations in the livestock and packing industry."

A telegram from G. D. Searle & Co., Chicago, Ill., dated April 12, 1946, says:

"As a result of current price policy in meat industry causing great diversion of animals from usual packing plant, we are unable to purchase but very small quantities of animal glands which we use in pharmaceutical manufacture. Consequently, supply only minor portion of physicians and hospital demand for necessary drug prepared from these materials."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in my speech on Wednesday I called attention to the fact that labor should be interested in seeing that price controls are lifted. They are causing wholesale unemployment. At that time I stated that I had received a message from the president and secretary-treasurer of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butchers Workmen of North America, an organization which covers the entire industry. I wish to read the first paragraph of this telegram, and then I shall ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the telegram, which is five pages in length, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. The first paragraph reads as follows:

We are firmly convinced that present Government regulations in the meat-packing industry are unenforceable. These inoperable prohibitions have already resulted in thousands of men and women in packing plants being unemployed. They have resulted in scores of meat-packing plants closing their doors. Unless something is done quickly, hundreds more will do likewise. It is impossible to prohibit the flow of necessary edibles to the consumers where there is always available a ready source of supply. There is no acute shortage of livestock. The public wants it. Legitimate packers are willing to slaughter it, but governmental restrictions apparently make this extremely difficult. The Nation had its experience with prohibitive measures in alcohol during the prohibition era. Even the life-for-a-pint law in Michigan did not prevent bootlegging.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks the entire telegram, of which I have read the first paragraph.

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

TEXT OF TELEGRAM SENT TO PRESIDENT TRUMAN, SECRETARY ANDERSON, AND MESSRS. PORTER AND BOWLES, BY THE PRESIDENT AND SECRETARY-TREASURER OF THE AMALGAMATED MEAT CUTTERS AND BUTCHERS WORKMEN OF NORTH AMERICA, A. F. L., ON APRIL 5, 1946

We are firmly convinced that present Government regulations in the meat packing industry are unenforceable. These inoperable prohibitions have already resulted in thousands of men and women in packing plants being unemployed. They have resulted in scores of meat packing plants closing their doors. Unless something is done quickly, hundreds more will do likewise. It is impossible to prohibit the flow of necessary edibles to the consumers where there is always available a ready source of supply. There is no acute shortage of livestock. The public wants it. Legitimate packers are willing to slaughter it, but governmental restrictions apparently make this extremely difficult. The Nation had its experience with prohibitive measures in alcohol during the prohibition era. Even the "Life for a pint" law in Michigan did not prevent bootlegging.

Bootlegging and black marketing are twin brothers. The consumers of our Nation no longer feel that they are under a patriotic obligation to observe unnecessary wartime restrictions. Black marketing in meats even when the war was at its height was widespread. It was impossible to enforce the prohibition of the sale and manufacture of alcohol, it is all the more impossible to enforce inoperable restrictive regulations in the flow of a commodity that the consumers need and which certainly, under even half-normal conditions, ought not to be interfered with.

It seems to us rather inconsistent to adhere to a hold-the-line principle when every consumer knows that the line is not being held. In many commodities, prices have been increased as much as 300 percent without any attempt being made on the part of the OPA to regulate them. It is also very inconsistent for our Government agencies to determine to hold the line on some commodities produced by some industries and completely ignore rising price levels of commodities in other industries. We offer strenuous objection to the plan of the OPA to place more rigid restrictions upon non-federally inspected slaughterhouses which would even make the situation worse. It is contrary to every concept of fairness to impose general restrictions upon small slaughterers that to some extent at least puts the Government in a position of finding legitimate small businessmen guilty of black marketing before they have been accused of such an offense.

The present national situation is such that offers opportunity to Federal inspected meat plants to engage in black market operations as well as non-Federal establishments. If meat can be purchased, the public is going to buy it. They consider that the war is over and that personal sacrifices need no longer be made in their principal table commodity. It is not surprising, therefore, that black market operators are springing up in all sections of the country. The owners of these establishments see an opportunity to make money. They do not consider it unpatriotic to do so; and very definitely the impossible restrictions now being imposed by OPA upon the meat industry will cause an increase in black market operations rather than a decrease. These regulations only result in a terrific increase in the cost of meat to the consumer, and the Government and the OPA is responsible for the situation. It is responsible for the loss of the thousands of jobs of our membership and responsible for the present inability of hundreds of legitimate slaughterers to continue their business.

We feel sincerely that if these restrictions were eliminated the prices of meat to the consumer would within a very short time level off which would result in cheaper purchases of the product. It would result in the packing industry generally booming as it has never boomed before because of the responsibility of our Nation to do all in its power to feed a famished world as well as to slaughter for the needs of ready purchasers within our own Nation.

The whole plan of meat price control as presently constructed is a crazy quilt of impossibilities. The purchaser of livestock is criminally libel, but the seller is not. The slaughtering industry, while to some extent at least, is influenced greatly by the larger packers; nevertheless it has always been highly competitive. We feel it will continue to remain a highly competitive industry. There is an abundant supply and there is an overabundant demand. Why not give these men who have been in the meat business all of their lives an opportunity to prove what they can do and release the controls. If they do not succeed in eliminating the present existing evils, there is no reason why the Government then cannot restore restrictions that would be workable even to the extent of actually operating the entire industry including the sale of livestock. At least the men who know the industry ought to have a chance to operate it so the consumer may have lower prices and so that the thousands of men and women, who earn their livelihood in the industry might have the opportunity to do so.

Mr. WHERRY. In my speech of last Wednesday I called attention to the fact that there was black marketing not only in meats, but in all industry. It is Nation-wide. I challenge any Member of the Senate to rise and say that there is not black marketing in lumber. Those of us who conducted hearings in connection with lumber know that today black marketing in lumber is almost as extensive as in connection with meats and foodstuffs. There is also to a great extent—and it is becoming more prevalent each day—black marketing in grain. The black market in grain today is tremendous. Times does not permit me to go into all the black-marketing operations in connection with grain, but at this point in the RECORD I should like to have printed a memorandum which was handed me, from the National Association of Commodity Exchanges and Allied Trades. I place it in the RECORD at this point because it graphically shows the break-down in enforcement, the law violations and the chaotic conditions in the production, sale, and distribution of grain.

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

SUMMATION FROM NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COMMODITY EXCHANGES AND ALLIED TRADES SENT TO SENATE AND HOUSE OPA CONFEREES

I

Complete chaos rules in the grain situation in this country due to unworkable price controls. Our humanitarian efforts for famine relief have been impeded by reason of this chaos to the point where administrative departments of the Government have been forced to resort to one expediency after another in their attempts to secure necessary grain to meet famine commitments. Only to the extent that such governmental action has been toward eliminating fictitious price distortions in grains has it been successful. But, the elimination of one inequity has created another and worse one in its place. Farmer resentment has mounted. Our mills producing breadstuffs for home consumption have shut down. Animal feeders have become desperate. Black markets have spread and flourished. According to competent testimony before congressional committees, three-quarters of the country's greatest grain crop, corn, is moving in black markets. The flow of grains have virtually disappeared from many important commercial channels. Conditions are getting worse.

II

Threats of real disaster loom if livestock, poultry and meats are to be freed from price controls while grains remain under price controls. Livestock and poultry are but the end product of grain. It is inequitable and untenable to expect grain to be shipped off the farm to feed our people at one level of price when it can be walked off the farm at another and entirely different level of price. Breadlines in America will become a commonplace.

Postulate: The freeing of grain prices will facilitate assembly of supplies for humanitarian export shipments.

There is today, with uncertainty over OPA's future, a marked tendency on the part of farmers to hold back grain crops. Even if grain price control is continued until early in 1947, the possibility of increased prices then will convince many producers that the cost of storage for those months ahead will be less than the price increase to be expected in 1947. And if there is release of controls over animal foods, without decontrol of grains, the tendency to put price-controlled grains into commercial channels will fall off sharply as farm feeding ratios get better. In the meantime, grain sought for the relief program from commercial channels will be under influence of Government set-aside orders which farmers resist, and the competing influence of black markets which apparently cannot be controlled by the OPA. It will be a struggle between USDA controls and black-market prices, to get food for famine relief.

The only deterrent on some hoarding of grains would be the black market, itself both a corrupting influence in our Nation as well as a higher price level in fact. Grain crops of 1946 can be stored until the estimated end of OPA in 1947 with logical hope of a gain in price greater than the storage costs.

Industrial costs are advancing rapidly, mainly through increasing costs of labor, both in hourly rates and changing productivity per worker. Agricultural producers will not be content to have progressive increase of urban labor costs while their own labor wage figured in price obtained for their output, is strictly limited by OPA.

At a somewhat higher level, grains would flow more freely and famine relief needs could be more surely met, upon a free price basis.

If we are to set aside 250,000,000 bushels of wheat for secondary relief program needs in 1946–47, the surest way to get the grain is by price. While people abroad cry for food, it will seem difficult for governments here or abroad to explain that they cannot get enough grain at a low price; and decline to get sufficient grain at a somewhat higher price.

Shortages, both for domestic and foreign needs, result from maldistribution caused by price distortion. Grains have been wasted in unbelieveable quantities over the past few years due to this phenomena. For instance, wheat, the human consumption grain, has been fed to animals lavishly. Under the wartime stimulus of just a moderately favorable feed price ration around 350,000,000 bushels of wheat were fed to animals in one recent year.

The necesssarily clumsy efforts of artificial adjustment of price distortion by fiat has always been too little and too late. Without the automatic adjustment of delicate price ratios the disappearance of 400,000,000 bushels of wheat or more as feed this crop year is entirely possible. As the result of past policy, we have the unthinkable condition where mills are shut down in this country when our people need food, and breadlines actually exist today.

Postulate: Price ceilings must be lifted from livestock, meats, and poultry to correct well-defined evil conditions in these markets. Livestock meats and poultry are but the end products of grains. One cannot be decontrolled without the other. If ceilings are removed from prices of livestock, meats, and poultry, without simultaneous removal of ceiling prices on grains, the following results must be expected: (1) Further expansion of an already over-expanded animal population on farms; (2) a tremendous stimulation of the black markets in feed grains and ingredients; (3) producer resentment against congressional discrimination, in prices, as between farms producing grains principally, and producers of animal foods.

1. Numbers of animals on farms in the United States reached unusually high, and record numbers during World War II. This increase was made possible by Government administered ceiling and support prices, which insured exceptionally favorable feeding ratios; and because these record high numbers of animals could be fed from very high carry-overs of grain at the start of war years, heavy imports of grains, and by the four greatest years in succession, of volume of grain production in our Nation. During these 4 years this record animal population consumed over a billion bushels of grain more than we produced. Animal numbers today are too high for normal years of grain production, but numbers will not be reduced while feeding ratios are favorable.

2. Recent grain price increases by OPA-OES made the feeding ratio slightly less favorable (although OPA hastened to increase prices of milk and dairy products to prevent a reduction in the milk flow). But if price controls are removed from animal foods while price controls remain on grains, Congress itself will have re-established the favorable feeding ratio which the USDA-OPA have been trying to correct: Congress will have encouraged further expansion in our animal numbers. Heavy demand for famine relief abroad will be added to heavier demand for feed grains at home, and a chaotic black market will compete further with the Government relief program for available grain. Also, where crop and animal production occur on the same farm, diversion of grain from commercial channels (where it is needed for industrial as well as famine relief program) will be immediately made to farm feed lots.

3. Where the farm is in a principal grain producing area, such action as proposed by Congress would impose a strict limitation on price of its grain products, while freeing prices on other (animal) farms. These commercial and surplus grain area producers would resent bitterly such marked price discrimination as better classes of producers.

The further effect of such action would be to increase confusion in all price relationships between all farm products, compared to any reasonable demand-value. It would set up legal chaos in the American farm-price structure.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to another subject. Yesterday afternoon on the floor of the Senate the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] stated, in his explanation of certain phases of the bill, that the provisions which prohibit ceiling prices on agricultural products which were not so controlled before April 1 will not apply to such products as milk. This, he said, is because there were ceilings on some uses of milk prior to April 1. For example there was a ceiling on the farm price of milk sold as bottled milk. On the other hand there was no ceiling price on the farm price of cream made into butter, nor on milk made into cheese or evaporated milk.

The distinguished Senator from Ohio is not in the Chamber at this moment, but I should like to propound a question. Do other Senators agree with the Senator from Ohio that the bill would permit a ceiling price on such cream or milk for manufacturing into such dairy products as cheese and evaporated milk because of the fact that the farm price for some uses of milk were under a ceiling prior to April 1?

If it be true that all milk production is included, both that which was under a ceiling and that which was not under a ceiling, then I wish to refer the Senator from Ohio to the tables for the production of milk, as they present comparisons for the years 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1946. If those figures are correct, I wish to ask him whether he believes that milk should be decontrolled immediately upon the passage of this measure. That question is similar to the question asked yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] relative to the surplus of beef and the demand for beef and also the surplus of butter and the demand for butter and the surplus of pork and the demand for pork and the surplus of poultry and the demand for poultry and the surplus of dairy products and the demand for dairy products; and of course some time later I also asked those questions.

Mr. President, in summarizing the matter briefly, I desire to point out that the definite points at issue that have been brought out by the debate upon this measure justify the position which I took when this conference report automatically was brought up for vote last Wednesday. An impartial analysis of the interpretations placed upon its provisions by the proponents of the measure and by the opponents of the measure should convince the most skeptical that the conference report should have gone back then for further consideration in conference. Because of the parliamentary situation in which we now find ourselves, namely, the limitation of debate, and in view of the fact that the time will soon arrive when the life of the OPA under the present act will terminate, it is now practically impossible to send the bill back to conference for further consideration. The defense has been made and will be made that it would be of no use to do so, and yet I submit that it is not unusual to send back a conference report for a further conference. It is not unusual to proceed in that manner. Conferees have been sent back for a further conference on other measures time and time again, for further consideration of issues which have been closely contested in connection with a conference report.

The defense that further conference is useless is attempted to be made, especially by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], on the ground that the House has voted twice not to decontrol meat. Yet I wish to point out to the distinguished Senator from Ohio and to other proponents of the measure that a proposal to decontrol meat, submitted by Representative WADSWORTH, of New York, lost in the House by a very close vote.

I further submit to the Senate that the House did not even vote upon the question of the decontrol of meat, milk, livestock, poultry, and dairy products, as

covered by this measure, until after the Senate conferees receded from the Senate amendments on decontrol. That fact should be borne in mind. What would the House have done if the Senate conferees had refused to recede from the Senate amendments? In that event the present picture might be entirely different. But the Senate conferees receded from the Senate amendments, and then the House conferees returned to the House and told the House, "This is what the Senate conferees have done. Now we want to to take a vote on the meat situation." The very arguments which are used here at this time were used then in the House of Representatives. The House was told "Here is what the Senate conferees did. Now the only thing for the House to do is to vote not to decontrol meat, livestock and livestock products, milk, poultry, and dairy products." I think that is the primary reason for the pending conference report.

Again I ask, Why does it happen that the Senate of the United States, which by 2 to 1 voted into the measure five amendments for decontrol, now has before it a conference report which deletes them from the bill or else emasculates them beyond recognition by those who wished to have them adopted? Why should not another effort be made to see to it that the Senate amendments are not receded from?

But, no, Mr. President; we are told that it is useless to do so because the House voted not to decontrol meat. But we must remember that the House voted that way after the Senate conferees receded from the Senate amendments in the conference.

The defense of the conference report is also made on the theory that there has been set up within the provisions of this so-called price-control bill the machinery for decontrol. Oh, Mr. President, just think of what the proponents have said they were going to do. I hope they do even one-half of what they have said they will do in respect to decontrol if the conference report is adopted. The statement has been made by the proponents of the measure, time and time again, that we can expect an early decontrol of livestock, dairy products, and poultry. Once again I hope that the distinguished majority leader will help us get these decontrols, because that is his interpretation and that is the basis on which this conference report is presented. Its advocates say they hope to have the conference report adopted on that basis.

To those who believe in such a defense, let me say that this is an administrative procedure; and, as I said on the floor of the Senate last Wednesday, if we are to judge the future by the past, the act will be interpreted by Chester Bowles as he sees fit. Certainly if we are to take the statement of the President at face value, there will be little chance, if any, of getting decontrols during the extension of the OPA Act.

The interpretation placed upon the Barkley-Bates amendment, the interpretation placed upon the Bankhead amendment, the interpretation placed upon the entire Stabilization Act by Chester Bowles time and time again, in the face of the provision that there should be no change in business practices—the provision was written into the act, Mr. President, that there should be no change in business practices—the interpretations which have been made by Mr. Bowles, in the face of that provision which is written into the act, should convince us all, because of the violations and the overriding thereof, that we in the Congress cannot expect decontrol of anything under Chester Bowles, if the OPA Act is extended.

While I admit that the machinery for such procedure is set up—and, Mr. President, what window dressing there is in this measure—yet, stripped of all its window dressing, the cold fact remains that this measure does not provide for the accomplishment of anything more than could be accomplished under the present act, if it were properly administered. I hope every Member of the Senate understands that fact. There is nothing in the pending measure which, even if properly administered, will give us anything more than we could have had under the act already on the statute books, if it had been properly administered. If it had been properly administered, we would not find ourselves in the present chaotic condition. Today conditions would be different if the present Stabilization Act had been administered as the Congress of the United States interpreted it. That one fact alone justifies a vote against the conference report.

Mr. President, all of us have to tell the American people, and I must tell the people of Nebraska when I go back home, if I tell them the truth, that this act will avail us no more than the one now on the statute books. In fact, the provisions of the pending measure legalize the cost absorption and profit-control program which Chester Bowles initiated without authority of Congress. Do not ever forget, Mr. President, that the pending measure provides for the extension, in the future, of the cost-absorption program upon the basis upon which it has been put into effect by Chester Bowles. It was never legalized by Congress. It is an invention of Chester Bowles. Now the pending measure, which we are asked to approve, condones the practice in which he has engaged during the past 4 years. Every cost-absorption requirement which has been imposed on any segment of industry is now to be legalized, for the first time, by Congress. The pending measure gives Chester Bowles the green light; it gives him the "go" sign by approving those practices, even though, as I have said, the Members of Congress, or at least I, have held them to be illegal. By the adoption of the pending conference report we shall condone profit control, and we shall say that Chester Bowles can decide how much he will take from the pockets of the dealers. We shall thus authorize that to be done. Before now we have contended that he had no right to do it. But the pending measure approves it and permits it, and under the pending measure he will be able to continue to apply the cost-absorption policies which have been imposed prior to 1946, for by this measure we shall be giving him the legal authority to do so. That is a fair statement. That is the proper interpretation. Just as sure as anyone goes to Chester Bowles to obtain relief, the first thing he will tell them is that this is the correct interpretation of the act.

Mr. President, we now serve notice upon the American people that we approve the black-market operations of Chester Bowles. We sanction what he has done for the past 4 years, because we extend the act on practically the same basis, without the restrictions. We tell the American people that even though 80 percent of the meat is black marketed and sold through racketeers, we condone it. There is no dispute about it. The fact has not been disputed by anyone. We condone it. We say to the country that we believe in that kind of practice. We say that that is what the American people should tolerate.

Mr. President, I do not have time to read into the RECORD everything which I should like to have the RECORD show, and I shall therefore ask that certain matters be placed in the RECORD without reading them. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks a portion of a statement of Royal C. Stephens, from page 1159 of the hearings, which gives a picture of what I have been talking about.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am informed that since Congress had indicated they are going to relieve the American people from a lot of unfair rulings by the National Price Administration, just last week Mr. Louis H. Budd, Jr., OPA administrator of Sussex County Price Control Board since 1942, resigned his position, effective within a week, at the conference of OPA officials held at Newark, N. J., when Mr. Budd was told by the State OPA officials that under a new ruling he would be expected to produce a minimum of 15 docket cases every month. "Docket cases" is the OPA term used for violations. Mr. Budd informed that the national office "has selected a minimum of 15 docket cases per month as an arbitrary figure below which a board should not fall and still be able to justify its existence."

I now request your committee to subpena Mr. Louis H. Budd, Jr., of 24 Church Street, Sussex County, N. J., who last week resigned as OPA administrator of the Sussex County Price Control Board which is located at Newton, N. J., and request him to tell your committee of some of the unfair and un-American and unconstitutional rulings of the National Price Administration, and at the same time request Mr. Paul Porter, OPA Administrator, and Mr. Chester Bowles, the former OPA Administrator, to be present and listen to Mr. Louis H. Budd reveal some practical information that will make them more efficient in handling OPA affairs.

In conclusion, I wish to submit for the record a letter from Mr. Harold B. Simmons, a Democratic justice of the peace, and a veteran of World War No. 1, from Bryan Township, Sussex County, N. J., to the Newark Evening News under the date of Saturday, April 27, 1946, that expresses the feelings of the American citizens of Sussex County over Mr. Louis H. Budd resigning as administrator of the price control board of Sussex County, N. J.

Very truly yours,

ROYAL C. STEPHENS.

NETCONG, N. J.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks a memorandum in the form of a synopsis of black-market operations in meat from 1942 to the present date.

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

MEMORANDUM ON LIVESTOCK AND MEAT SITUATION

THE BLACK MARKET

Prior to 1942 approximately 1,500 meat packers produced all the meat entering domestic commercial channels. In 1945 Federal slaughter licenses were issued to more than 26,000 slaughterers. In February 1946 subsidy payments were made to approximately 12,000 of them.

The 14,000 who do not apply for subsidies, and many other slaughterers are operating in the black market. They have moved in and taken over a large percentage of the production and distribution of meat.

A large percentage of the livestock marketed is sold at prices in excess of legal ceiling prices. When the black market finishes buying there are relatively few head left to be purchased at legal prices. The result is that all law-abiding slaughterers have been forced to close or curtail drastically their operations.

The margin between legal livestock prices and wholesale meat ceilings is such that an efficient packer cannot recover all of his costs if he sells the carcass as dressed meat. It is obvious that the meat of all animals purchased in excess of legal prices is sold to the retailer or consumer at illegal prices.

Most retail dealers, if they wish to stay in business, must pay illegal wholesale prices for a large percentage of their meat. The result is that more than 83 percent of the retail stores from coast to coast, and from border to border are selling meat above ceiling prices and making overcharges at the rate of $1,250,000,000 annually.

Many black-market slaughterers are killing and dressing livestock in uninspected plants, in barns, sheds, and fields lacking adequate refrigeration or other sanitary requirements. They are grading their own meat, and are selling upgraded, contaminated, and in some instances diseased meat. A large percentage of black-market meat, under Federal inspection standards, is wholly unfit for human consumption.

The black market wastes meat, hides, bones, offal, and grease worth many millions of dollars annually. Either the farmer or consumer must absorb this loss.

Huge quantities of valuable glands and other materials, the sole source of raw materials for many pharmaceutical products, are destroyed by black-market slaughterers. The principal pharmaceutical companies who produce these medicines inform us that stocks are being depleted. On April 10, 1946, Eli Lilly & Co., in a telegram filed with the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, said:

"If situation continues much longer, someone must be prepared to accept responsibility for shortage of essential drugs such as insulin and other important drugs such as bile, pituitaries, thyroid, and perhaps antianemic preparations. Our current procurement is very much short of minimum needs and appears to be getting worse right along."

The black market has caused widespread unemployment and drastic reduction of working hours in plants of law-abiding slaughterers. On April 5, 1946, the president and secretary-treasurer of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butchers Workmen of North America, A. F. of L., the long-time established union of packing house workers and meat cutters, sent a telegram to President Truman, Secretary Anderson, Messrs. Porter and Bowles complaining about this condition and urging that all controls be immediately removed from livestock and meat.

Prior to 1942 the livestock and meat business was a respectable business, conducted by honorable and law-abiding people. During the last 3 years the black market has grown steadily. In 1946, in a large percentage of the transactions, everyone, from the farmer who raised the animal to the consumer who purchased the meat, was a party to a violation of a Federal statute or regulation.

When you add to the $1,250,000,000 consumers are now paying in excess of ceiling prices the $750,000,000 paid in meat subsidies and the cost of administration of OPA, it is clear that the cost of maintaining the fiction "that the line is being held on meat" exceeds $2,000,000,000 annually, more than one-half of total Federal expenditures in 1929, and more than one-half of the proposed loan to Britain now being debated in Congress.

THE CAUSE OF THE BLACK MARKET

The nature of the livestock and meat business is such that it does not lend itself readily to price control. It was a very difficult problem, notwithstanding the established industry's full and complete cooperation with the Office of Price Administration.

There are serious doubts whether the Meat Division of the agency, if staffed with meat experts, could have held a rigid price line and avoided the black market.

Unfortunately, the OPA concentrated on "profit control" instead of "price control." Its first order rolled back meat prices and "froze" them at levels below other competitive food prices and below levels justified by livestock prices, the supply and demand, and the consumers' ability to pay. The consumer roll-back and the interjection of subsidies in 1943 imposed further pressure on "the meat price line."

From the inception of price control one or more species of livestock has been in a "price squeeze." Companies whose sole income was derived from the class of livestock in the "squeeze" were faced with the alternative of going "broke" or "black." This, and the unprecedented consumer purchasing power and his desire for meat, opened wide the gates for the black-market operator and invited him to enter the field. The extent of the response is demonstrated by the fact that in a 2-year period 26,000 new commercial slaughterers and more than a million farmers and retailers applied for and received licenses to slaughter livestock and sell meat.

Testimony before congressional committees, official reports, letters to Congress, speeches, and press releases by officials of the Office of Price Administration clearly establish the agency's full knowledge of the continuous existence of a growing black market in meat since shortly after the inception of price control.

In the early stages it is possible that the black market might have been restrained within reasonable bounds had the OPA eliminated the "squeeze" and established prices at reasonable levels which would have permitted all packers with average costs and efficiency to recover all of their costs and a reasonable margin of profit. Notwithstanding a direct mandate of Congress in 1945 (the Barkley-Bates amendment), the Office of Price Adminisration neglected or refused to change its faulty pricing policies, and, 1 year later, we now find a large percentage of the meat business firmly in the hands of the black market.

The OPA has used two different methods to eliminate or control the black market—(1) more controls and (2) well-publicized threats of prosecution—neither of which has been effective.

Controls have been added to controls until we now have a multitude of complicated, involved, and unworkable regulations, and an almost complete break-down of price control at all levels in the meat industry. Since May 11, 1942, in the Beef and Veal Division alone, 112 regulations and directives and more than 1,100 amendments have been issued. No single individual does or could understand all of these regulations, and many of them could not be complied with if understood.

Enforcement against the deliberate black-market operator has been wholly ineffective. The scattered prosecutions and nominal fines have been considered a minor annoyance and part of the cost of doing business. In spite of everything the OPA has been able to do, the black market has grown steadily.

It seems that the OPA has concentrated its enforcement activities against the legitimate operators. A review of the reported cases indicates that many of the prosecutions were for technical, unintentional, or unavoidable violations. The record shows that the meat packer who has observed the law and regulations has been forced to curtail his operations or discontinue his business.

Enforcement at the retail level has been left, in the main, to volunteer price panels. The futility of this amateur policing is demonstrated by the fact that five out of six retail stores are selling meat above ceiling prices.

It appears that the OPA has approximately 350 employees in its Meat Enforcement Division country-wide, one out of every five being a lawyer. This number is more than 100 less than the number of employees in the OPA's Information Section.

The Government figures, which show that a large percentage of livestock sold on public markets is sold at prices in excess of legal ceilings, necessarily mean that the meat is sold at illegal wholesale prices. This demonstrates how ineffective the OPA has been at curbing the black market at the slaughter and wholesale level.

THE REMEDY

It is the firm conviction of all segments of the industry—the rancher, the feeder, the packer, distributor, and retailer—that the only remedy is the immediate removal of subsidies and all price controls from livestock and edible meat products.

Full legitimate production is the only answer to both the inflation and the black-market problems. At this late date, an increase in livestock and meat ceilings will not get full legitimate production or eradicate the black market. At this late date, improvised regulations are not a remedy, nor can additional investigations bring about compliance with OPA regulations. Price control appears to have completely broken down, and effective enforcement is no longer possible.

Black-market operators cannot compete with legitimate commercial meat packers under a free economy. They are not interested in the meat business at the industry's normal profit margin. They are inefficient and wasteful operators. They will disappear from the market and go out of business if the legitimate meat packer is permitted to compete with them on even terms.

WHY CONGRESS SHOULD DECONTROL MEAT

After more than 3 years of an expanding black market it is obvious that if subsidies and price controls on livestock and meat are to be removed and the business returned to law-abiding and taxpaying citizens the Congress will have to do it.

Under the formula of the often-announced price decontrol policy the removal of controls on livestock and meat is long past due. Livestock on ranches and farms is in abundant supply. In fact, there is a larger potential domestic per capita supply of meat available than has ever been consumed in

this country at any price. Also feed demands and a sound farm economy require an orderly liquidation of several million head of livestock, beginning now while the consumer is ready, able, and willing to buy the meat at fair prices.

Present inventory value of this surplus livestock represents cash, high wartime production costs, and future subsidy payments. Consumers, as indicated by black-market prices, want, and are able, to buy this extra meat. All that is needed is the removal of controls and the legitimate meat packers will buy, slaughter, and distribute it at fair competitive prices that will be a gain to the farmer and a saving to the consumer.

On the other hand, if the removal of subsidies and price controls is delayed until meat prices decline, the financial stability of many ranches and farms may be impaired.

WILL THE REMOVAL OF SUBSIDIES AND CONTROLS ON LIVESTOCK AND MEAT CAUSE RUN-AWAY INFLATION?

The public is now paying on the average, 20 percent more than legal retail ceilings for all the meat consumed, or $1,250,000,000 annually. Almost $750,000,000 is paid out of the United States Treasury annually as meat subsidies. Undoubtedly it costs several additional millions of dollars to administer the Livestock and Meat Division of the OPA.

Whether costs in excess of $2,000,000,000 annually above ceiling prices for meat is inflation is a moot question. We now have it.

Notwithstanding near record livestock numbers on ranches and farms we now have an acute shortage of meat in most large consuming centers caused by the black-market waste and maldistribution. Well informed, conservative people testified before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that unless controls are removed promptly the country will be faced with a meat famine during the next year.

Because of scarcity of meat in many consuming centers, and the black market's illegal overcharges, the consumer is overpaying an average of 20 percent above ceiling prices for inferior meat.

If the controls are removed and legitimate trade channels reopened there will be an abundance of meat in every retail store. Surely, the consumer will not pay legitimate operators as much per pound for meat in abundance as they now pay the black market for a short supply. In any event, the United States Treasury will save the $750,000,000 it is now paying out in subsidies and the costs of maintaining the meat section of the Office of Price Administration. Black-market waste will be recovered and the serious threat to the public health removed.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture, in its publication the Livestock and Wool Situation, March–April 1946, is of the opinion that "if price ceilings on meat were removed, the average retail meat price in the second half of the year probably would be 15 to 20 percent above present reported levels, and somewhat higher than this for the better grades and more desirable cuts." (We understand that "present reported levels" are OPA retail ceiling prices.)

Discontinuance of subsidies and removal of controls from livestock and meat will not cause runaway inflation. In fact it will increase the return to the farmer for his livestock, increase the quality, and reduce the cost to the consumer.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished minority leader asked some questions about hides. He asked why hides could not be obtained. During the afternoon, over the telegraphic news service, there came a new order issued after the inquiry of the Senator had been made on the floor of the Senate. Here is the story which came to us from the Chicago Journal of Commerce:

The Government tonight revoked all import controls on hides, skins, and leather and relaxed price ceilings to permit free competition for world supplies.

Both actions resulted from a decision of the combined hides, skins, and leather committee on which this country and 13 other nations are represented to dissolve. The decision was made tonight simultaneously with the scrapping of all previous rulings of the committee.

OPA announced that American importers now may figure their ceilings by adding a mark-up margin of 5 percent to the cost of skins as landed.

The action, while it will undoubtedly result in higher import prices for the hides and skins, OPA said, will have no immediate effect on prices for leather or leather goods because ceilings on the latter are not changed.

Today's ending of international distribution controls will mean that importers throughout the world will probably begin to compete for supplies, OPA said.

If American importers were bound by the dollar and cent ceilings that have formerly applied to some of the imported skins being priced today, they would not be able to match offering prices of buyers from other countries.

Apparently the OPA have consented to American tanners buying hides on world markets at higher prices and without ceilings, while the American cattle producer has the doubtful pleasure of selling his hides to American tanners on the basis of ceiling prices. It seems strange to us that the American tanner may pay whatever is required to buy South American hides, but is forced by OPA to pay a very low ceiling for American hides.

Mr. President, by the modification of the Lucas amendment, we afford little relief from the gestapo methods practiced by the OPA enforcement officials. I have already asked and received consent to have printed in the RECORD a certain portion of the testimony of Mr. Royal C. Stephens, which will be, I am sure, very illuminating on this subject.

Mr. President, I wish to read a telegram which has come from Kansas City, Mo. The telegram reads as follows:

We are today rejecting the following advertisement from Kansas Feeder:

I ask that Senators listen to this telegram. I repeat:

We are today rejecting the following advertisement from Kansas Feeder:

Mr. President, the feeder is the man who feeds cattle and gets them ready for sale. Some processor buys the cattle, kills them, and later the consuming public receives the meat. That is, it receives the meat if it can obtain it.

I continue reading from the telegram. It refers to an advertisement which has been rejected by the Kansas City Daily Drovers Telegram, one of the finest periodicals of its kind printed anywhere in the Middle West. I read:

We are today rejecting the following advertisement from Kansas feeder "For sale, 7 loads of choice fat cattle, weight 1,100 pounds. Having had to compete with Government black market in corn wish to get into contact with a black market meat operator."

Mr. President, do Senators know what that means? It means that the feeder, in order to feed his cattle, was required to pay a black market price for grain.

I continue reading from the telegram:

We are passing this information on to you with the idea of the thoughts of the man in the country fearful that it may be the development of a trend. You are at liberty to use.

That telegram is signed by Kansas City Daily Drovers Telegram. They would not accept the advertisement.

Mr. President, I wish to say with such force as I can, that today the cattle feeder is being forced into the black market in order to obtain grain to feed his cattle. Without it, he cannot do business. The price of grain runs all the way from $1.50 to $2.50 a bushel. It is necessary for a cattle feeder to find a black market operator in grain, or he cannot carry on his business.

Mr. President, in the extension of this act we tell the American businessman and the American public generally, that they are to be governed by executive orders issued by bureaucrats who never stood for an election. I wish that some of them had to stand for election in Nebraska.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, may I add also the State of Kansas?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; the same is true with reference to the State of Kansas. Whatever is true, in that connection, in the State of Nebraska is true also throughout the Nation.

Literally, thousands upon thousands of orders are issued by the OPA, and they are misinterpreted, contradicted, and rescinded. It means something more than merely so many figures on paper when I tell you, Mr. President, that from March 14, 1936, to November 4, 1945, there were issued 107,138 directives, orders, grants, permissions, and prohibitions. To print them would require more than 62,000 pages and 93,000,000 words.

Since May 11, 1942, 112 regulations and directives, and more than 1,100 amendments have been issued. All of them affected the beef and veal division of the meat industry. No single operator can possibly understand all of the regulations, much less comply with them. How in the world is business of this country expected to proceed in an orderly fashion when it is required to interpret directives which even the bureaucrats themselves cannot interpret when they come before our committees? Time and time again bureaucrats have been asked to interpret this directive or that directive, and disagreements have been developed between the bureaucrats themselves with reference to the proper interpretation which should be applied. Time and time again there have been disagreements between the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration when ceilings should have been raised. Long ago I stated that the agency which is responsible for production should be responsible for prices. An agency which is responsible for production should know what is required in order to obtain production. But we do not have that kind of a situation in our administration. If the Department of Agriculture says that so much production of a certain commodity is required, the Office of Price Administration will often overrule it.

Mr. President, I believe that the Senate has the power to end price controls. The rejection of the conference report will have the effect of ending them.

At the beginning of my remarks I said that the time has grown too late to send the conference report back to the conference committee for further consideration. Once again, referring to the statement which was made by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] that we are now making a choice between two evils, and he certainly spoke the truth as he saw it—either the present bill or no price control at all. I think the time has come when this country would be better off without any price control than to continue to operate under the present chaotic conditions.

I wanted to send the report back to the conferees, but I could not have that done.

I am never going to vote to condone cost absorption; I am never going to vote to continue black-market prices and regulations in this country. I base my position upon the following reasons:

First, because there is wholesale disrespect for law in this country. It is unnecessary to make a further statement on that point. Every housewife knows, every Member of the Senate knows that the only way food, clothing, and other necessities of life can be obtained is on the black market.

Secondly, because under the Bowles system we cannot get maximum production. It makes me laugh—if it were not so serious I would indulge in a good laugh—to hear this man Bowles continue to talk about production. The fact is we do not have production. There is not in the market places even the food we need, let alone the things we need to wear or the articles we need in our homes; indeed, under the Bowles system which is now in operation, there are not even homes enough where the people may live. The result has been absolute failure. I do not want it to continue for another year.

Third, because production can only be obtained by the elimination of price impediments. If we would remove price impediments then we would restore our legitimate markets and be able to carry on in the American way.

Now let me contrast production under the American way with production of other nations of the world under the totalitarian way.

What has our American system accomplished in peace? Under our liberal American system we have in 160 years achieved the greatest degree of personal, religious, and political liberty, the highest living levels, the highest wages, the best working conditions, the finest educational systems, the finest railroads, the most magnificent highways, the greatest airways, and the greatest array of luxuries ever achieved by any people in any period of time anywhere. But the subversionists now say, "Close your eyes to all that, the American system is a failure; we must have totalitarian control."

What has our American system accomplished in war? Not only have we achieved all these wonderful advantages and comforts of life in peace, but certainly we have proved the efficiency of the American system in war.

For 40 years the Japanese war lords drove their people to get ready for the struggle against the Occident. For 20 years Mussolini drove Italy, boot and spur, to get ready for the war he knew was coming. For 20 years Stalin forced the Russian people to intense sacrifices and efforts to get ready for the war he knew was to come. For 12 years Hitler and the Nazi ruffians drove the enslaved and terrorized German people day and night to prepare for the war he and his cohorts planned against civilization.

Now what about the American way? In just three short years, under our free Government, with our free industry, our free labor, our free agriculture, our free people of every religious faith, every political creed, every race and color united, cooperated and overcame that 40-year Japanese, that 20-year Italian, that 20-year Russian, and that 12-year German lead. Our production put us on an offensive basis in the greatest war of all time. Not only that, Mr. President, but we fought two wars at once—one in the Pacific, without any help from the Allies, and one in the Atlantic into which we poured billions of lend-lease—gift machines and munitions of war, and supplies.

We gave Russia more than $9,000,000,000 worth of war supplies, civilian foodstuffs, and clothing. We gave Britain more than $25,000,000,000 worth of the same kind of lend-lease supplies. In addition we poured billions of dollars worth of other machines and munitions and foodstuffs into other countries including China. And yet, these Communists would tell you our American system cannot defend itself in a modern world.

Lastly, we have got to decontrol some time if we are to keep the American way; otherwise, we have gone completely totalitarian. I think we should make a start now. The fear which some are trying to put into our hearts has no basis, because conditions are so chaotic now that they cannot become worse; under the free competitive system they can only become better.

The whole decontrol system boils down to one thing, namely, administration. I think there are those in the United States of America who, if they had the job, could do it in the American way, but apparently the administratior wants to continue with the program of Chester Bowles. That is the way it would deal with the economy of 140,000,000 American people.

I am now going to say something about political strategy. Let me say that I believe in the Republican Party and in its principles, and I think I can safely say that no one has been more loyal or worked harder for the Republican Party than have I; but some of our Republican strategists say this is a hot potato and that the thing to do is to let the administration settle its own bungling on OPA. They say that we must pass the bill as it is and let the President veto it; let him assume the responsibility. It is my judgment that the Congress has the responsibility, and that this responsibility is above partisan politics. I want the Senate to know that when it comes to an issue of this kind I place my Americanism above party loyalty and party politics. It is our job as Members of the United States Senate to do the best we can to provide legislation which will aid the American people to get back to an American economy. That is our responsibility. It transcends party responsibility. It cannot be shirked. It can not be shifted. When we of the Congress have done the best we can, we send it on to the President of the United States. Then and only then is it his job to handle the legislation as he sees fit.

But it seems to me that any legislative leadership on either side of the aisle that wants to transfer a hot potato to the President's lap, without taking action on it, is weak-kneed and spineless. It is not the kind of leadership the American people expect from the Senate of the United States, and especially from the minority party.

The Republican Party is already charged with a failure to decontrol livestock, dairy and dairy products, poultry and poultry products. Let me prove it. There have only been two votes in the House on the decontrol of meat; one was on the Wadsworth bill, which I have already mentioned. The other was taken after the Senate conferees had receded from their decontrol amendment. The Senator who cast the deciding vote which permitted the conference to recede from the Senate amendment was a Republican, and we are already being charged over the radio and in the press as the party responsible for the failure to decontrol meat.

Here is what Fulton Lewis, Jr., said last night about the recession from the Senate amendment:

> As one of the Republican members of the House-Senate Joint Conference Committee which was working out the final details of the OPA extension legislation, it was Senator TOBEY, a Republican, who swung with the Senate Democrats even when one of the Senate Democrats persisted in holding out against the President and decided the fateful issue of whether there should be a specific change or continued controls of meat and other commodities on the side that President Truman wanted. Senator TOBEY voted to strike out those provisions as Mr. Truman had requested.
>
> On top of that record on the part of Senator TOBEY, Mr. Truman's letter of yesterday did not sit well either with Republicans or Democrats.

I wish to say to my distinguished friend from New Hampshire that I think he has a perfect right to vote as he pleases on OPA extension. I know he feels conscientiously about its continuance, and he has the right to vote as he pleases; but I also wish to say in all fairness that I feel that as a Senate conferee he should not have receded from the amendment on the decontrol of meat, nor should any other Senator on the conference committee have receded, at least until after the House had taken a vote on that provision. I shall be of that opinion as long as I live, and I say that in all frankness and in all fairness as I make this statement on the floor of the Senate.

So, whether we like it or not, whether it is the wise political thing to do or not,

the Republican Party is charged with that responsibility.

Mr. President, in conclusion I wish to say that now is the time to show leadership. The way to demonstrate leadership is not in talking the conference report to death. The way to show leadership is in voting. If we as a Republican Party are to perform the responsibilities imposed upon us, it is our job to defeat totalitarianism. That is what we were sent here for. Each and every one of us was elected on a platform obligating us to speak and to vote against totalitarian controls. We cannot remain faithful to our party, and certainly we cannot be faithful to our Government, if we vote to continue the totalitarian controls which are written into the provisions of the bill we are considering.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator think any Senator can vote for the conference report——

Mr. WHERRY. I made that perfectly clear, and the question requires no answer. I said that if a Senator believed he could vote for the conference report, that was his prerogative, and he should do so.

Mr. AIKEN. I think any Senator could be perfectly true to his party and vote for the conference report.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not think one could be true to the platform of the National Republican Party, or the State platforms I know of, and now vote to continue totalitarian controls.

Mr. AIKEN. If being true to the party consists in taking orders from those who consider themselves party leaders——

Mr. WHERRY. I would rather take orders from those men than from Chester Bowles, as the Senator has been doing for the last 4 years.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is not telling the truth.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall not challenge those words. I could have the Senator taken off the floor for them. But I will say that anyone who supports Chester Bowles' program for 4 years supports totalitarian controls, and that is what the Senator has done. He voted for the extension of the act and he is going to vote for this conference report.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Wilbur J. Brons appearing in the Chicago Journal of Commerce under date of June 26, 1946, and entitled "OPA Extended Bill Gives Black Market New Lease on Life."

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

THE ROUND TABLE

(By Wilbur J. Brons)

OPA EXTENDER BILL GIVES BLACK MARKET NEW LEASE ON LIFE

The final conference version of the OPA extension bi'l was bad news.

This hodgepodge of political conflict, confusion, and appeasement will postpone urgently needed economic adjustments for the better part of another 12 months. Delay in price relief will continue to plague producers in many lines. This will mean a further distortion of the production picture.

And if the conferees failed to bring distinction upon themselves for the measure as a whole, they flopped even more miserably when they decided at the last moment to keep meat and dairy products under OPA control. This was a pure gift to the black-market boys, who now buy most of the cattle and peddle most of the butter.

Monday, while the conferees were busily gumming up the works, 10,000 head of cattle and 2,000 hogs arrived at the Union Stockyards here. Of the 10,000 cattle, Swift & Co. was able to purchase five. Wilson & Co., Inc., got three. Armour & Co. got none. Most of the remainder of the 10,000 cattle went to eastern markets—to bidders who pay no attention to OPA regulations and have no need of Federal subsidies.

The details of the story have been told so many times they are hardly worth repeating. But the 14,000 slaughterers who did not apply for subsidy payments this year are only a fraction of the total slaughterers who sell black-market meat. How many are killing cattle without having gone through the formality of obtaining a license is anybody's guess, but it would have to be several times the number of licensed slaughterers to account for the steady decline in stockyard receipts.

As this is written, more than half of Chicago's retail butcher shops are closed. The majority of those still open are paying illegal prices for the meat they sell over their counters. That is the only way they can stay in business. The housewife who raises her eyebrows when she gets her bill for meat is soon dropped from the butcher's list of preferred customers.

The butter situation is almost identical. Reputable retailers are now handling about 16 percent of the volume they handled in 1941. If these retailers were able to get their proportionate share of available butter, they would be handling about 50 percent of their 1941 volume. About 50 percent of the butter produced today is moving to consumers through illegal channels, at an average price of about 80 cents a pound. In some communities, it is being peddled from door to door at prices ranging from $1 to $1.50 a pound.

As of January 1, this year, there were 889,000 fewer milk cows on farms than on January 1, 1945. Dairy herds are being liquidated at an alarming rate in the States which normally produce most of the farm-separated cream for butter manufacture. Exclusive of Government requirements, there will be only about 6 pounds of butter available this year for each man, woman, and child in the country.

Other aspects of the OPA compromise will be discussed from time to time. Despite Messrs. Bowles, Porter, Wallace, et al., there will be no "boom or bust" this year. Progressive price rises are, nevertheless, inevitable under the administration's present wage policy. Economists outside the administration are quite generally agreed that if there are any sharp price disturbances this summer, they will be in nondurable goods.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this morning about 30 minutes after midnight, as we left the Senate Chamber and proceeded out into the street, the lightning was flashing, it was very humid, and as I got outside I heard a woman say, "What's the matter with our country?" It will be remembered that all last evening the galleries were filled, as they now are, with folks who are interested in their Government. But that one sentence, "What's the matter with our country?" struck me very forcibly. I remember that William Allen White once wrote an editorial on the subject, What's the Matter with Kansas? It was that editorial which precipitated him into the national arena where he gained recognition as a sane political thinker.

This morning I heard my distinguished friend the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] praise the ability and integrity of the majority leader, and with every word of it I agree. I would characterize the majority leader as a great general, who usually, as the Senator from Oklahoma said, succeeds in getting his way.

But what is the matter with our country? As I saw my distinguished friend the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] proceed yesterday through 8 hours of debate with a smile on his lips, constantly the master of himself, I thought it was a good demonstration that we in the Senate, in the heat of debate, at least are keeping our heads. I marveled not only at the way the Senator from Texas handled himself, but at his physical ability and endurance, and his humor, interrupted, as he was, time and time again.

In that connection I compliment the other Members of the Senate, because feelings run deep on the subject we are considering, tremendously deep, and what is more, we are the target, as it were, of thousands of people throughout the country who also have felt the impact of this issue and have, as indicated by the thousands of telegrams the Senator from Texas received yesterday, expressed themselves about it.

Of course, frequently telegrams are the result of emotion, of fear, and for months previously many of the telegrams on this subject were nothing but channeled telegrams, as letters were channeled. Messages came in on printed postcards, indicating that Tom, Dick, and Harry were simply obeying the direction or the request of someone else. But the telegrams which have come recently are the result of individual thinking on this subject.

Of course, something else has caused the people to be more or less mentally upset. It has been the conflict on the radio. Fulton Lewis on one side, and several prominent commentators on the other, have precipitated into the minds of people who listen to the radio their individual concepts on the pending issue.

What is the matter with America? Nothing is the matter with America. Would we change a great public forum of 140,000,000 people, even though many of the expressions which have come to us indicate that they are not the result of thinking the problem through, but the result of impetuosity caused by the impact of somebody else's strong words? No; we would not change it. We would not have our thinking channeled, as took place in Germany, or as it is in Russia. Stalin told our negotiators that he could not understand why we permitted our newspapers and commentators to criticize public servants. In other words, there we have a frame of mind on the international scene in Russia which cannot comprehend one of the great rights of America—that is, the right of each individual to think a problem through—and, what is more, to express his convictions to his public servants. So, in that respect, I say there is nothing wrong with America.

As I proceeded home about 15 minutes later, at almost 1 o'clock this morning, I was accompanied by my good friend the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], but the words of the woman's question rang constantly in my mind: "What is wrong with America?" So, prefatory to my remarks on the issue we are debating today, I noted down a few things I wanted to say on that most important subject.

Mr. President, there is nothing inherently wrong with America. In my opinion, there are a few people who have gone wrong in their thinking and who, as a consequence, because of their exalted position, have placed this country in the particular situation in which we now find it. What I mean to say is that a great deal of thinking has to be straightened out. We must get down to "brass tacks" and think every issue through if we truly want to put this, our beloved country, in a position where it will function as it should function. I say to the occupants of the galleries that it is not solely their public servants whose duty it is to make sure that the country will function properly. Each and every American citizen in this critical atomic age has the duty to see to it that the country functions properly.

Now, Mr. President, what must we do? We must get rid of the racketeers. What is a racketeer? A racketeer is one who wants to run the Nation or other people's business, not according to the law of the land, but according to what he says the law is. In other words, he puts himself above the law. He makes himself the legislative branch, the executive branch, and the judicial branch of the Government.

Mr. President, the racketeer mind is too much in evidence in this country. It is in evidence particularly, as has been shown on the Senate floor in the few days we have been discussing this measure, in pretty nearly every market of America in which citizens have to buy necessities of life. It is also in evidence in government administrative branches, as was clearly demonstrated earlier today by my good friend, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], who said that the OPA, instead of recognizing that it is a creature and a servant of the legislative branch, openly, in a racketeering frame of mind determined what the law was, different from what the legislative branch of the Government said the law was. The result is what always happens when racketeers enter the picture—they mess things up. That is one reason why we are debating OPA today.

It has been said on innumerable occasions in this debate that if OPA had been administered according to the intent and the direction of Congress, there would not be the critical situation which prevails today. I think we can accept that statement as fact. Anyone who attempts to add or multiply contrary to the rules of mathematics, comes out wrong. If he says 2 times 2 equals 6, the result is wrong.

Anyone who violates the law of the land creates a condition which is not sound. Any administrator of the law of the land who violates the law, creates a balled-up condition, and that is what we are facing now.

What I wish to stress, Mr. President, and I repeat what I previously stated, is that a great deal of thinking has to be straightened out. What do we have to do first? First we must get rid of the racketeers; not simply the racketeers who are operating in the OPA black market but the racketeers of our fundamental American thinking. That word fundamental means something, and I hope that every school teacher who is helping to shape the young minds of tomorrow will understand and appreciate what fundamental American thinking is, because the youngsters of tomorrow are either going to accept the concepts of fundamental American thinking or they are going to accept the racketeer's concept of American thinking, and there are plenty of those who are racketeering the fundamentals of America.

Second. There is not any question that we have to have greater efficiency in government. We must get rid of excess bureaucrats and stop riotous spending.

Third. There is not any question that we have to balance our budget. In saying that I am replying to the lady's question: "What is the matter with our country?" The budget can be balanced. It must be done. But we will have to stop appropriating millions and billions of dollars for public improvements, most of which have no business being in the picture at this time. What do I mean by that? Senators know that every dollar we spend in public improvements competes with private enterprise and the needs of our people, which now run into the billions of dollars—yes, Mr. President, into the billions of dollars' worth of goods required for everyday living.

Fourth. We must go to work and produce. That means that the workers of America, and management and particularly the labor leaders, must acquire a different slant on their obligation to the Nation.

England is exporting more today than she has ever exported in her history. In Britain, workmen know there is only one answer to their problem, and that is work and more work. With millions of their homes destroyed by war and their industry damage, the people of England went to work after VE-day, and worked as one team.

Recently we were privileged to have in this body a delegation from Britain. They were legislators, leaders of the labor government in Britain. They stood on the Senate floor in front of the desk of the President of the Senate, and we passed in front of them and shook their hands. It was my privilege to become pretty well acquainted with them. They were more like us than are many others from Britain whom I have heretofore met. I got close to them. I talked with them.

What did they say? They said that there was only one answer, and that was work. Further, they said that they had no particular faith in a number of our great labor leaders. Mind you, with millions of their houses destroyed and many of their factories gone, they went to work, and today England is exporting more goods than ever before in her history.

Furthermore, they said, "We learned long ago that the way to get production is not to make it worth while for anyone to remain idle." That is another thing which we must learn.

What is the matter with America? Nothing is inherently wrong with America. We are a growing nation of 140,000,000. Our land is the garden spot of the earth. Not one home has been destroyed, not one factory blown to pieces. Our railroads, our highways, our farms, and our cities are all ready to go. But I was informed today that there is no meat to serve in the Senate restaurant. A few days ago I was informed by the chef that the restaurant had run out of oatmeal, and could not buy any more. Some of us have been trying to buy common white cotton shirts.

What is the matter with America? Britain can answer that. We must get rid of the communistic-minded folks who consciously or unconsciously are throwing monkey wrenches into our economy. We must get rid of those who want everyone with means, energy, and inventive genius liquidated so that they can apply their remedies. We must get rid of those who pretend to believe that money is a curse, but are always looking for it. The Master said that it was the love of money that was the root of all evil, meaning that when a man violates the first commandment and lusts after money or anything else, to the point where he forgets that man is something more than mere physique, that is the root of all evil.

What is the matter with America? I repeat that there is nothing wrong with America, but there is something wrong with some of us. The OPA picture is an illustration. Everyone agrees that there is something wrong in the set-up. I remember a story about two darkies. One of them was buying a mule from the other. The first one said, "Mose, am dat mule sound?" The other replied, "Sure dat mule am sound." The first one asked him, "Do you guarantee dat mule is sound?" The other replied, "Sure; I guarantees dat mule is sound." The first one said, "I will buy him." The next day the man who had bought the mule noticed the mule in the pasture. He was running around and butting his head into every tree and fence post. So he decided that the mule was not sound, but that he was blind. He went to the darky from whom he had bought the mule and said, "Did you guarantee dat mule as being sound?" The other replied, "I sure did." The first one said, "Well, look at him butting his head into that tree." The other man said, "Boss, dat mule am sound, only he just don't give a damn." [Laughter.]

That story illustrates a condition of mind which we find in this country. The Senator from Oklahoma illustrated it today by pointing out two laws with respect to which the OPA "didn't give a damn." It failed utterly to follow the legislative mandate. That is what makes things rotten. It is the racketeer mind. It is not merely the man who slaughters a cow and disposes of the meat in violation of OPA prices. It is the OPA itself, which violates the mandate of the legis-

lative branch. The OPA officials set themselves up as overlords.

I am talking about fundamentals. I have met many fine men in the OPA organization. I could give the names of 6 or 10 of them who have been very cooperative, who were distressed because of the complicated machinery in that organization, and who literally cried because of their inability to get things done. When I showed them that month after month went by without any heed being given to a critical business situation, they admitted it. I asked, "What can be done?" The answer was "We do not know. We have tried to pry things loose."

I have a great deal of respect, and in some cases affection, for some of the men upon whom I have called in OPA. They have helped me to find the solution to many problems. As I say, I have met many cooperative men in that organization who were disgusted with the mechanics of it, who realized the inequity of the set-up, who have seen injustice done, and who have admitted the injustice. Those men have seen loafers on the job constantly coming in late in the morning, men who, when we are working 80 hours a week, cannot be found on Saturday. The is partially the responsibility of the President, who after VJ-day said to the workers downtown that they should have a 5-day week. In this challenging period when we are working for production, when we are trying to harness the tremendous evil forces resulting from the war, we find these synthetic people in the Government saying by their acts and deeds, "Let things go." The result is the situation in which we find ourselves today. The men of whom I speak have worked diligently, but they have been unable to get results because of the ineptitude of the administrative organization.

What is wrong with America? Nothing; but we must get rid of some of the fake medicine men, many of whom have harassed the economy of this Nation for more than a decade, and are interfering with our really getting under way.

I could amplify that statement by citing a thousand examples in my own State, which is 50 percent industrial and 50 percent agricultural. Business after business has been damaged and injured and workmen have been put out of jobs because of OPA. In wartime we could overlook OPA's mistakes, but now there is no further need for such action on the part of Americans. Time and time again I have seen how prewar industry failed to get a necessary and just increase. But some new, favored son who opened up an industry 10 or 15 miles away got an increase of 10 percent or in some cases 50 percent for a product and thus the old industry was put out of business, or seriously injured.

So, Mr. President, we must get rid of the racketeer mind, the fake-medicine mind. I remember the old fake-medicine guy. When I was a boy he used to come around, and the lumberjacks would gather around him. He would hold up a bottle of medicine and tell them that the medicine in that bottle would cure everything from gray hair and toothache and stomach ache to consumption and cancer. He would tell his story, and he would get all the crowd mesmerized. His chant was, "$1 a bottle, six bottles for $5!" I have seen those people, mesmerized by the very magic and dramatics of his voice, pay their hard-earned dollars which they had to work 10 days in the woods to earn.

What was that medicine? When I was older I had it analyzed once by a brother-in-law of mine who was a druggist. He said, "Counting the bottle, the whole thing costs about 5 cents. It is made up of a little sarsaparilla, some roots, a little brown sugar, and water." But it fooled those people, and enabled the medicine man to take in a lot of money. The worst thing about it was that the racketeer tactics of the medicine man planted in the minds of those who listened to him many ideas about diseases which they never had.

So today the medicine men in Government and out of Government who harass our economy must be taken care of. You and I in the Congress must take care of them.

Another thing we must do is to get rid of a lot of the synthetic-thinking, wild-eyed professors who are teaching our youth in some of our great educational institutions. I wish I had time to tell the Senate about the parents who come to my office and tell of the impact which such professors have on their children.

An impact of the same sort took place here in this city yesterday. Some Senators may have read in the newspaper that the PAC held an educational institute in Washington yesterday. I was privileged to be classified there as one of those whom the PAC does not like. If I were running for office this year, that would bring me 50,000 more votes in my State. The people know about the PAC.

Mr. President, let me refer to an incident which I related on the floor of the Senate not very long ago. A group of them—17 of them—headed by one of the CIO leaders from Milwaukee, came into my office, some 5 or 6 months ago. They laid before me a paper on which were listed some 11 or 12 bills. They said, "We came down here to demand that you vote for these bills."

I lined those men up around my office. I said to the leader, "Have you read these bills?"

He said, "No."

Then, to one after another of them, I said, "Have you read these bills?"

In each case the answer was, "No."

I said to them, Well, I shall let you in on a little secret: Neither have I. Only one of those bills is before my committee. Now, gentlemen, I will give you 30 minutes to talk, if you want to talk that long. First, I will talk 10 minutes to you. But after I have talked 10 minutes, you will probably not have anything to say.

I do not know who sent you down here or who is paying your expenses. But just think what you are doing. You come here and tell me to commit myself on legislation which is not yet born, legislation which you have not yet read. Don't you know that a bill may go into a committee looking like a dove, and may come out looking like a jackass?

They did not know that.

I said then, "Gentlemen, those measures may go into a committee in the way in which they are framed now, but the committee may amend them to such an extent that when the committee reports them they will not be recognized as bearing any semblance to the bills which were sent to the committee." I said to them, "I remember that last year one of the distinguished Members of the Senate, Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, stated on the floor of the Senate that he would have to vote against his own bill because of the fact that the committee had amended it to such a great extent." So I said to them, "Now don't you understand how ridiculous it is to tell a Senator what he should do when you do not know what you are talking about?"

The delegation's leader said, "Well, you listen to the chamber of commerce."

It so happened that my secretary was present at that time, so I said to him, "Have you seen any representative of the National Chamber of Commerce around here."

He replied, "No."

I said to them, "Well, gentlemen, I recall that twice since I have been here, representatives of the chamber of commerce have come to this office. But instead of demanding that I do certain things, they suggest what they think should be done. They know better than to demand." I said, "Wouldn't this be a terrible country if 17 men could tell a United States Senator what he should do? How long do you think the great laws on the statute books which protect the rights of labor would remain intact if that were the case?"

Then one of the men said, "Well, Senator, we think you are antilabor."

I said, "Wait a minute. Where did you get that notion?"

They did not answer.

I said, "I will tell you where you got it. Last fall I ran for office, as you know. I suppose that none of you voted for me; but that is all right, and you have the right of petition, and I am ready to listen, any time, and I am ready to receive letters."

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, on the average I receive 300 communications a day, the year round.

I said to those men, "Gentlemen, I am ready to receive your petition, but I will tell you something. A year ago last fall when I ran for office, I went to the northern part of Wisconsin, where workmen had worked with me in the sawmills for 15 cents an hour. Can any of you say you ever worked 11 hours a day for 15 cents an hour?"

They could not say that.

"All right," I said, "then do not say that I am antilabor. But I will tell you something. The Friday before the election, the stewards of the CIO throughout the State called their unions together, and said to the men, 'There is one guy we have got to get; that is Senator WILEY.'"

Mr. President, that is what this newspaper says the PAC again stated yesterday.

I said, "Some of the workmen in Eau Claire and La Crosse and in other places, after they had learned who that 'guy' was—and I was the guy—said, 'What is the matter with WILEY?' The answer was, 'He does not take orders.'"

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to get that, because it shows the racketeering mind in action again.

The answer was, "He does not take orders." That is the point, Mr. President.

If a man does not take orders from this outfit, they are out to get him. What a wonderful and safe Nation this would be if each and every one of the 96 Members of the Senate took orders. What kind of a country would we have? "He does not take orders." That is one of the demands of this racketeering outfit which we will get rid of if we take the proper action. If we take a little political action on our own part, if we start to live straight, act straight, and think straight, we will not permit any individual, group of individuals, or combination of individuals to tell us—by "tell us" I mean command us—what to do.

I recall the statement of a Britisher which was about as follows: "I would think there was something wrong with my son if he were not a Socialist before arriving at his twenty-fifth birthday. But, if he continued that way after he was 25, I would think he was crazy."

Mr. President, I would not go that far because the term "socialism" means one thing to one man and something else to another. However, I was speaking of the impact of some of the so-called educated leaders—as they believe they are—on the formative minds of the youth of America. Such so-called leaders are striving to give the impression that the political life and the economic life of Russia are superior to ours. That kind of propaganda is impressed on the young formative mind, delicately attuned to receive impressions and ideas, be they right or wrong. Those leaders plant their poisonous seed.

What is wrong with America? Nothing. However, there is something wrong with some persons in America. Yes, Mr. President, some of us, including the businessman, the farmer, and the sober, sane, thinking workingmen of America—and, thank God, they are becoming more and more numerous and are beginning to realize that some labor leaders have sold the rank and file down the river—must understand that it is necessary to get down to brass tacks and do some work in order to combat all subversive forces and all kinds of synthetic thinking.

Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that yesterday, at a PAC conference, my name was mentioned as one of those whom the PAC has sworn to defeat. I welcome the challenge. I do not like to indulge in personal references, but when I was a young man I was a scrapper. For three terms as a district attorney, I filled the jails and prisons with murderers and rapists of that time. The record still stands. Since then, I have mellowed somewhat, but when I observe the way some people in this country are raping the American concept, I am somehow or other renewed in my youth, like the eagle, and am ready for another fight. So I say the challenge is made to all Americans in open debate to meet the racketeers of American values.

I repeat, in talking with the English labor delegates who were here a few days ago, one of them said, "We do not have much time for some of your labor leaders. We know that the only answer for putting the Nation back on its feet is work." Another statement which the same gentleman made was this: "We found out long ago that it is unsound economics to pay folks to loaf."

What is wrong with America? There are too many loafers. Yes; there are those who would legislate out of existence the men who build and create, and put the loafers into running business and government. Who taught such nonsense as "Get all you can for nothing—to hell with the Government—the less you work the better—lend and spend?" Who made possible the chiseler, the grafter, and the racketeer? Who in this period set the example for a 40-hour week; who crippled production by suggesting a 25-cent-an-hour increase; who sold the synthetic idea that this wage could be paid by management without price relief? Who catered to the labor leaders and the PAC through the years until we are in the fix we are now in?

Mr. President, in 1932 Governor Roosevelt, of New York, campaigning for the Presidency, made this statement:

> Let me propose a text which, in my opinion, expresses a sentiment that is widely held this year. It is presented so clearly, so distinctly, and so admirably that I would not change a word of it, even though it was spoken 12 years ago. Coming from a great figure in our national life, it deserves serious consideration; and coming from a great Republican, it deserves particularly consideration from Republicans: "For one reason or another even a wisely led political party, given a long enough tenure of office, finally fails to express any longer the will of the people; and when it does so fail to express the will of the people, it ceases to be an effective instrument of government. It is far better for such a political party—and certainly better for the state—that it should be relegated to the role of the critic and that the opposing political party should assume the reins of government. This condition appears to have arrived in America."

In this statement he answered, What is the matter with our country?

Mr. President, I believe that in this quotation of ex-President Roosevelt we have the answer to the question, What is wrong with our country?

Every good business, after a number of years, changes its auditor, so as to have a double check on his business. This Government needs a check on what is going on.

In my own State, as I have said, we are 50-percent industrial and 50-percent agricultural. We have lived through the OPA regimentation of businessmen and farmers.

I believe the best indication how the milk producers of my State feel on the subject is expressed in a letter signed by Charles W. Holman, secretary of the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, and I ask that the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the chair). Is there objection?

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

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The most serious defect in the conference committee bill is the elimination of the McFarland amendments which appeared in the Senate bill. Those amendments were designed to remove controls over livestock, dairy and poultry products, because price controls on these commodities had broken down and were drastically curtailing production. To leave these commodities under price controls is to assure continued black markets, increasing shortages, and continued distress among farmers.

Section 11 of the committee bill would not only continue control policies which are destroying dairy production but would aggravate their effect. Under this language it would be possible to establish maximum prices on agricultural products which would return to the farmer less than his present returns. Furthermore, the section pemits stabilization agencies to continue in effect maladjusted prices between localities and various products within the dairy industry. Existing provisions of law requiring grade, location, and seasonal differential have not prevented these maladjustments in the past and there is no reason to expect them to do so now. This bill, if enacted as presently drawn, will prove a disservice not only to the dairymen of the Nation who have been struggling to maintain adequate production of milk and other dairy products, but will deprive the consumers of much needed dairy foods.

Section 11 of the bill establishes the calendar year of 1941 as a base period from which to measure cost increases in production of agricultural commodities. In 1941 dairy prices were in a violently unbalanced state. The lend-lease program was demanding enormous quantities of cheese and evaporated milk. Government prices for these products were high. Consequently, diversion of milk to cheese and evaporated milk resulted in all-time record production of these products at the expense of other dairy products, mainly butter. If maximum prices for dairy products were based on the price prevailing in 1941, the chaotic shifting of producers between plants and of plants from the production of other dairy products to production of evaporated milk and cheese which occurred in 1941 would be repeated.

No one knows what method OPA would use in calculating increases in production costs. A common method of estimating approximately the increases in United States average production costs is based on an index of costs in which feed prices are given a weight of 50 percent, farm wage rates 25 percent, and all other production costs 25 percent. This index has increased 83 percent from 1941 to May 1946. Applying this percentage increase to the 1941 average prices gives an estimate of the increase in costs of milk production to May 1946. Some prices calculated by this method are shown in the following table, in comparison with the approximate actual annual returns to farmers including subsidies:

Product	Approximate price required by sec. 11	Approximate actual annual return [1]
Whole milk, United States average dollars per hundredweight	3.98	4.48
Butterfat, United States average dollars per pound	.625	.815
Condensery milk, United States average dollars per hundredweight	3.31	3.78
Whole milk, New York State do	[2] 4.27	4.65

[1] 1945 annual average price plus current subsidies on an annual average basis, plus allowance for price increases effective in June 1946.

[2] Costs of dairy farming in New York increased 81 percent according to Cornell University calculations.

To a degree, calculated costs may be irrelevant in setting farm price ceilings. Milk prices may cover calculated costs but still be so low that other farm products pay the farmer more for his labor. Such conditions were important in the 8- to 10-percent decline in cow numbers in important butter-producing States last year. By allowing prices to reflect demand, production of farm products will be increased, and so balanced as to overcome the most acute shortages which now prevail.

The various decontrol provisions of the committee bill will be no help to the dairy farmer. Stabilization agencies have priced dairy products so low that production in the foreseeable future cannot possibly satisfy demand. Thus we may never get out from under price controls. In sum, policies will continue which on one hand will further reduce dairy production and on the other will so inflate demand that controls will not be lifted.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES W. HOLMAN,
Secretary, National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, may I be informed as to how much time I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has 12 minutes more.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, decontrol of dairy products and livestock was and is proposed as the solution for unsatisfactory conditions which price control has brought about in the dairy and livestock industries. The conditions I refer to are the break-down in distribution of meat and dairy products, the diminution of dairy production, and the great incubus of subsidies which current theories of price control have placed upon the Nation.

It has been 4 years since Congress first authorized the application of price controls. Four years ago we had entered a vast and grim war. The Government took requisitioning and allocation powers to marshal all our resources as quickly as possible for that war. Price controls were established to buffer the economic impact of arbitrary controls over the flow of resources. After 4 years we find that too rigid price controls have had secondary effects, like the first effects of allocation, which seem to demand the contiuation of price control. But too rigid price control itself proves inadequate to solve its own problems, and must be reinforced again by allocation and rationing, long after the original need for such controls has passed. Thus, a vicious circle has been started, which must be broken.

It seems reasonable to undertake the relaxation of price control on classes of products which show no ills other than those ascribable to price control itself. This the price control agencies themselves have refused to do. The facts of the situation have been fully developed in hearings before both Houses of Congress.

Two industries in particular, the dairy and livestock industries, are in chaos at the present moment. Price control has abrogated economic laws which always have caused these complex industries to maintain a fine balance in production and distribution. As a consequence of arbitrary pricing policies, conditions have arisen which the Office of Economic Stabilization asserts require quotas and limitations even more rigid than those which were needed for successful prosecution of the war. These added restrictions inevitably will further stifle production and thus intensify the one problem which we are assured requires the extension of price control.

I should like to recount in some detail the evidence which influences me to believe that less, rather than more, price control is needed on dairy products.

Mr. President, I had a friend who several months ago was engaged in the milk-producing business. He is a man somewhat over 80 years of age, and he spends his winters in Florida, but his home is in a little town of about 700 people in the neighborhood of 40 miles from where I live. I received a letter from him stating, "I notice that in Wisconsin you cannot get any butter, and that you cannot get any butter in the Senate". Parenthetically, I might say I do not know how long it has been since I last saw any butter in the Senate restaurant. This man said further, "In Florida we can get plenty of it if we are willing to pay $1.25 a pound." Think of that, $1.25 a pound for butter—black market. That illustrates how OPA does not and cannot regulate.

Price controls were applied to fluid milk and cream in May 1942, and to butter, cheese, and evaporated milk in October 1942. That year this country reached a peak production of 119,000,000,000 pounds of milk. Thereafter, dairy production subsided. Actual milk production was lower for the next 2 years than in 1942. In 1945 a substantial decline in milk cow numbers set in, offset for the time being by heavier production per cow which increased total milk production by 3,000,000,000 pounds over 1942. Thus, the effect of price control has been to contract the dairy industry. Contrast this with the 12.5-billion pound increase in milk production during the 3 years before price control.

After the close of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee hearings last month the Office of Price Administration issued a statement with reference to the dairy problem. Therein it cited the increase from 1941 to 1945 as occurring under price control. From 1941 to 1942, a period partly free from any price control and wholly before price control achieved its "hold the line" rigidity, the increase in 1 year exceeded the total increase in 3 years from 1942 to 1945.

The full extent to which dairying has been retarded under price control is shown by production trends in the extensive deficit areas. Down the Pacific coast, across the South, and up the Atlantic coast the war brought revolutionary shifts in demand. In the South, particularly, demand for fluid milk outstripped what had been a rapidly growing local supply of milk. In State after State prewar production trends were reversed downward due to a refusal of OPA to make adjustments based on local conditions.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry found that repeatedly local price relief which would have increased production was denied on the simple ground of "hold the line." OPA has taken the position that local cost increases have nothing to do with local price increases. The cumulative effect of such a policy pursued in market after market has been to aggravate the national shortage of milk for all purposes.

Nowhere is there an indication that OPA will change this policy if price control is continued on dairy products. All the evidence is to the contrary. In announcing an enlarged dairy subsidy program on April 15, Mr. Bowles said, "Since early this year special local price relief has been provided in a number of fluid milk market areas. To the extent that relief was given in anticipation of the increases announced today, corresponding reductions in milk prices will be made in those areas. Additional increases in particular markets to offset cost increases will not be needed." In the program embodied in the May 29 directive, the Office of Economic Stabilization canceled all of the local recognition previously granted in New Mexico and Arizona, and half of that granted in four other areas.

Another aspect of this selective discrimination, is the discrimination against butter which has forced thousands of dairymen out of production. In vast areas, particularly in the tier of States from Oklahoma through North Dakota, dairymen have no markets for anything but farm-separated cream. The ceiling on butter puts a ceiling on this cream. In these States milk cow numbers were reduced 8 to 10 percent.

Think of it, when the world was hungering for our products, when we needed them more and more, the OPA program caused an 8- to 10-percent reduction in the number of cows.

The current dairy programs do not fully correct the severe penalty which producers of farm-separated cream have carried ever since 1941. Regardless of diversion problems, which I shall discuss in a moment, such a penalty on at least 50 percent of the dairy farmers of the country should be removed.

Mr. President, I have spoken many times on the floor of the Senate in relation to the cheese situation in the State of Wisconsin. I demonstrated that because of OPA's inept approach to the problem this great State of mine, which produced up to 56 percent of the total production of Cheddar cheese of the Nation, felt the impact of maladministration.

Flagrant mistreatment was also accorded the evaporated milk industry and the casein industry. The butter and livestock ceilings must be removed together. I know no way to accomplish that result unless it be assurance from Secretary Anderson and from Mr. Bowles that that will be done. But we have no such assurance. If the past foreshadows the future, then we will see a continuation of these crippling activities and to me that means serious damage not only to my State but to the Nation.

WHY DAIRY PRODUCTS AND LIVESTOCK SHOULD BE DECONTROLLED

Decontrol of dairy products and livestock was and is proposed as the solution for unsatisfactory conditions which

price control has brought about in the dairy and livestock industries. The conditions I refer to are the break-downs in distribution of meat and dairy products, the diminution of dairy production, and the great incubus of subsidies which current theories of price control have placed upon the Nation.

It has been 4 years since Congress first authorized the application of price controls. Four years ago we had entered a vast and grim war. The Government took requisitioning and allocation powers to marshal all our resources as quickly as possible for that war. Price controls were established to buffer the economic impact of arbitrary controls over the flow of resources. After 4 years we find that too rigid price controls have had secondary effects, like the first effects of allocation, which seem to demand the continuation of price control. But too rigid price control itself proves inadequate to solve its own problems, and must be reinforced again by allocation and rationing, long after the original need for such controls has passed. Thus, a vicious circle has been generated, which must be broken.

It seems reasonable to undertake the relaxation of price control on classes of products which show no ills other than those ascribable to price control itself. This the price control agencies themselves have refused to do. The facts of the situation have been fully developed in hearings before both Houses of Congress.

Two industries in particular, the dairy and livestock industries, are in chaos at the present moment. Price control has abrogated economic laws which always have caused these complex industries to maintain a fine balance in production and distribution. As a consequence of aribitrary pricing policies, conditions have arisen which the Office of Economic Stabilization asserts require quotas and limitations even more rigid than those which were needed for successful prosecution of the war. These added restrictions inevitably will further stifle production and thus intensify the one problem which we are assured requires the extension of price control.

Raising dairy prices to offset and permit the removal of subsidies is no more than should be done in any event. It has been the consensus of dairy industry witnesses that the over-all rise in dairy prices upon complete removal of controls would only approximate the effect of removing subsidies. The prices of various dairy products would settle down in somewhat different relationships to each other than under present ceilings, but this would have a salutary effect on consumption and production. With dairymen free to bargain for fluid-milk prices suited to the needs of their local areas, and freed of the onus of the subsidy program, we would see a stop to liquidation of dairy herds and a turn toward the more abundant production of dairy products.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, last evening, in the debates upon OPA, the Senator from Illinois was engaged in a colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and during that debate the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] also had something to say which I am going to read into the RECORD at this time.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator indicate what page of the RECORD he is reading from?

Mr. LUCAS. I am reading from page 7661 of the RECORD. The distinguished Senator from Nebraska said this:

Mr. WHERRY. Why did the Senator from Illinois enter into Nebraska and get into Nebraska politics when I ran against the Honorable Senator George Norris? The Senator from Illinois made broadcast recordings which were sent to Nebraska and used in an attempt to defeat me. Dozens of records, containing speeches against me were sent out there by the Senator from Illinois. Drew Pearson wrote articles against me. The Senator from Illinois joined in attacking me. Why did the Senator get into that campaign? And in view of his having gotten into that campaign, why criticize the Senator from Texas for speaking against the Senator from Illinois in the Illinois campaign in 1944?

The Senator from Nebraska further said in that connection:

I have been looking for a chance to say this ever since I came to the Senate.

Later on in the colloquy I requested the distinguished Senator from Texas to yield in order that I might answer the able Senator from Nebraska, but due to the parliamentary situation the Senator from Texas could not yield.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. What is the page from which the Senator is reading?

Mr. LUCAS. From page 7661 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday.

Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity of denying categorically some of these unusual statements. First, I want to say that I never entered into Nebraska politics when Senator WHERRY ran against Senator Norris—an independent—and a Democrat, whose name I have forgotten.

I want to deny categorically that I ever made a broadcast recording which was sent to Nebraska and used in an attempt to defeat Senator WHERRY.

I want to deny categorically that "dozens of records, containing speeches against me"—meaning Senator WHERRY—"were sent out there by the Senator from Illinois."

I want to deny categorically the inference that I joined with Drew Pearson in attacking the Senator from Nebraska.

I want to say definitely and unequivocally that I did not get into the Nebraska campaign in 1942. We had enough to do in Illinois at that time.

Now, Mr. President, it may be that the Senator from Nebraska was laboring under a misapprehension because of something that I said about the late Senator George Norris on August 17, 1942. I rose in the Senate at that time and made a statement, which can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 88, part 5, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, on page 6856. These are the words I spoke on the floor of the Senate at that time:

Mr. President, the able, distinguished, and eminent senior Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Norris, will soon complete 30 years of service as a Member of the United States Senate. His achievements over this long period of time in the field of sound progressive legislation are known to every student of government in the Nation.

The question which concerns the people of Nebraska, as well as the people of the Nation, is whether or not this elder statesman will become a candidate to succeed himself at the general election in November next. As one who is serving his first term in the United States Senate, it would be presumptuous upon the part of the Senator from Illinois to suggest a decision which should be made by this grand old man. But, Mr. President, his friends in Congress, as well as millions of other people in this country, hope that Senator George Norris, regardless of his age, will soon announce that he is a candidate for reelection.

Everyone knows that our Nation is imperiled. We need the eyes of vision, the voice of experience, and a flow of reason to help guide our legislative activities during the next 6 years to come. Oliver Goldsmith once said:

"I love everything that's old: old friends, old times, old manners, old books, old wine."

Another great writer said that—

"Age is not all decay; it is the ripening, the swelling, of the fresh life within, that withers and bursts the husks."

I see that my distinguished friend, the Senator from Nebraska, just came into the Chamber, and I will say to him that I am reading from a statement which I made on the floor of the Senate in August 1942. For his benefit I am going to reread that statement. I am sure the able Senator from Nebraska has been laboring under a misapprehension as to the part I am supposed to have taken in his campaign in 1942. I am now attempting to explain to the Senate, and in doing so I had just finished reading part of my statement.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator what he was reading? I understood him to say he was reading some of the speeches.

Mr. LUCAS. No, I am reading an address which I made on the floor of the Senate in 1942, which probably the Senator has never seen. I hoped by reading it at this time it would give the background for perhaps the Senator's misunderstanding of what I was supposed to have done in his campaign of 1942. I am going to read it again for the benefit of the Senator. I rose on the floor of the Senate on August 17, 1942, and said the following:

Mr. President, the able, distinguished, and eminent senior Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Norris, will soon complete 30 years of service as a Member of the United States Senate. His achievements over this long period of time in the field of sound progressive legislation are known by every student of government in the Nation.

The question which concerns the people of Nebraska, as well as the people of the Nation, is whether or not this elder statesman will become a candidate to succeed himself at the general election in November next. As one who is serving his first term in the United States Senate, it would be presumptu-

ous upon the part of the Senator from Illinois to suggest a decision which should be made by this grand old man. But, Mr. President, his friends in Congress, as well as millions of other people in this country, hope that Senator George Norris, regardless of his age, will soon announce that he is a candidate for reelection.

Everyone knows that our Nation is imperiled. We need the eyes of vision, the voice of experience, and a flow of reason to help guide our legislative activities during the next 6 years to come. Oliver Goldsmith once said:

"I love everything that's old: old friends, old times, old manners, old books, old wine."

Another great writer said that—

"Age is not all decay; it is the ripening, the swelling, of the fresh life within, that withers and bursts the husks."

Mr. President, there will be many husks to burst during the next 6 years, which will decide what course this Nation is to carve out for future generations to come.

Mr. President, in the Chicago Sun on Saturday last appeared an editorial about our distinguished colleague. It is entitled "The Grand Old Man." I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

Then follows the editorial.

Mr. President, I do not believe that I am the only Member of the United States Senate who praised and eulogized the late George Norris. I have not carefully examined the RECORD, but I distinctly recall that a number of Members of this body praised the late George Norris for his great ability as a legislator and the progressive principles of government which he advocated throughout his career.

I do not know what happened after I made this speech on the floor of the Senate. It may be that some of George Norris' friends in Nebraska took this speech, or parts of it—which they had a right to do—and used it as a recording which was broadcast to the voters of the State of Nebraska. But I want my friend from Nebraska thoroughly to understand that I categorically deny the statements which he made last night. The Senator from Nebraska said:

The Senator from Illinois made broadcast recordings which were sent to Nebraska and used in an attempt to defeat me.

I will say to the Senator that I did not even know the distinguished Senator from Nebraska at that time. I never made a recording against him. I never caused any recordings to be sent to Nebraska at any time.

Furthermore, the Senator said:

Dozens of records, containing speeches against me, were sent out there by the Senator from Illinois.

A moment ago I made the explanation that we had a pretty busy campaign in Illinois in 1942, and I had all I could do to help defend the Democratic cause. We were unsuccessful in that campaign. I did not send dozens of speeches to Nebraska. I sent no speech at any time.

The Senator from Nebraska further stated:

Drew Pearson wrote articles against me.

The Senator from Nebraska further stated:

The Senator from Illinois joined in attacking me.

I do not think the Senator means that I joined with Drew Pearson in attacking him. If he does, of course, I categorically deny that charge.

The Senator from Nebraska continued:

Why did the Senator get into that campaign?

The thing that struck me was the statement which the Senator from Nebraska made later. He said:

I have been looking for a chance to say this ever since I came to the Senate.

In view of that statement, I thought that perhaps the Senator was laboring under a misapprehension as to my actual participation in his campaign. If the Senator from Nebraska can say that the speech which I made on the floor of the Senate in behalf of the late Senator George Norris was something which interfered with his campaign, then his conclusions are correct. But I want the Senate distinctly to understand that the Senator from Illinois never made a single recording, or a group of speeches to send into Nebraska. As to what might have been done with what I said on the floor of the Senate, which became a matter of public record, of course I do not know. I had absolutely nothing to do with it. I thought an explanation was due and I could not permit the record to stand as it is without saying these few words.

In conclusion, let me say that I take nothing back of what I said about the late Senator George Norris. When I came to the Senate from the House of Representatives I frequently counseled with George Norris. George Norris was my friend, and he was the friend of every Senator who sought counsel and advice from him. I always liked him. The people of my State always liked George Norris. When most of us who are now Members of the United States Senate shall have been forgotten, the name of George Norris will continue to shine on the pages of history. Many may disagree with his theory and philosophy of government, but his name will stand out as a beacon light to lead progressive citizens up the rugged paths of unselfish interest. This is the type of public service which has made America great.

Mr. President, that is all I care to say. In view of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska last evening, I felt that I should make this explanation in justice to myself, in the hope that I might remove what seems to me to be a misapprehension that has been in the mind of the Senator from Nebraska ever since he has been in the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I sincerely thank the Senator for his explanation of the part which he took in that campaign. I appreciate the explanation. Let me say to the Senator that there is no further misapprehension. However, I owe the Senator an everlasting debt of gratitude, because it was those speeches which circulated through Nebraska which helped to elect me to the United States Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I am very glad to have that reaction from my able friend. I am a little puzzled to know why he made the statement last night that he had been waiting for an opportunity to say certain things ever since he came to the Senate. I thought the Senator probably should have complimented me for helping to elect him, if he had taken the same position last night he assumed today.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will permit me to do so, I shall be glad to come over and shake hands with him and tell him that I deeply appreciate the service which he rendered me in that campaign. Would the Senator like to shake hands with me? I shall be glad to shake hands with the Senator.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Just a moment.

I am very happy to find the Senator from Nebraska in such a genial attitude, because I thought I detected just the opposite last night when he was charging me with sending speeches into Nebraska and making recordings in Illinois and sending them out to his State in 1942. It seemed to me that the Senator believes I had more or less conspired with someone to defeat a candidate for the Senate whom I did not even know at the time. Now that the Senator is convinced and everyone is happy, I am very glad to subside. I yield to my friend from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was wondering whether the Senator's speeches which were sent to Nebraska were the same sort of speeches that I made in Vermont a few years ago when I was sent up there to make a speech in behalf of the Democratic candidate for the United States Senate, who was running against the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN]. I spoke in the Senator's home town, and I had a great many complimentary things to say about him, which he deserved. After the speechmaking was over the chairman of the Democratic campaign committee asked me whether I came up there to speak for Senator AUSTIN or his opponent. Perhaps the Senator from Illinois was paying a compliment to the Senator from Nebraska and it may have been misinterpreted.

VOTING RECORD OF SENATORS

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, our constituents are entitled to know how we voted on every issue that has come before us during the Seventy-ninth Congress. I therefore urge that the Senate publish a document containing a tabulation of the votes cast by every Member, together with a brief description of all of the measures voted on. Such a booklet should be published in a quantity large enough so that it could be available to every voter in the country. The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress has all of these records readily available, and could compile their pamphlet within a few days.

The people of the United States are becoming more aware of the political responsibilities which inhere in citizenship in a democracy. They are taking greater interest in politics and they are becoming increasingly informed upon the measures which come before us. Politics is no longer the private game of

clubhouse hangers-on, ward heelers, office seekers, and big-business lobbyists. Ordinary citizens are beginning to realize that the measures we pass here affect them just as much as they affect big business. Consumers are learning of the impact of legislation upon their grocery baskets. They will learn even more when price controls are suddenly removed or drastically weakened. For the past decade women's clubs have given more and more attention to politics and their members are among our best informed citizens. All of these people are vitally interested in knowing the voting records of their Senators. They have a right to know them. I therefore urge that the Senate make the voting records of its Members available to the public as soon as possible, and to this end I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution and ask that it be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 295), submitted by Mr. TAYLOR, was received and referred to the Committee on Printing, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be directed to compile and to publish within 3 weeks after the close of the present session of Congress a tabulation of the voting record of its Members during the Seventy-ninth Congress on all roll-call votes, together with brief descriptions of the issues voted upon. For the purpose of easy readibility and quick reference, each Member's votes shall be gathered in one place. The Superintendent of Documents shall sell copies at cost, and shall print sufficient copies so that a supply is on hand at all times until the end of 1946.

EXTENSION OF PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS OF 1942—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed consideration of the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6042) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I shall vote for the conference report on the OPA. My reason for doing so, however, is not because I approve the conference report, but because I think we should get the whole thing before the President at the earliest possible time. When this measure reaches the President, I think he should determine whether, in effect, it does away with all price controls and will allow the cost of living to rise sky high and will open the floodgates of inflation. I think the pending measure will do that. In my opinion the President should veto it. The time has come to stop fooling the people. If certain Members of Congress are willing to take action as will bring about the high cost of living which prevailed after the last war, with the same ruinous effect on all, except perhaps the very rich, and followed by a depression similar to the one which occurred after the inflation following the last war, they have a right to do so. But the people also have a right to know who did it, and to pass judgment in November upon those who did it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to the Senator from Florida that I, too, think the President of the United States should veto the conference report. But I intend to support the President of the United States to that end by voting my convictions and in doing that I shall vote against the conference report. If the Senator favors a veto then I say logic, consistency, and support of the President dictate his vote against the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator from Oregon for saying that, and I shall comment upon his suggestion at the close of the brief statement which I wish to present first.

When certain Members of Congress set out to assure profits to all producers and processors and manufacturers, they forgot what they were doing to the masses of the people of America. According to a survey recently announced by the Federal Reserve Board today, two out of every five American families have savings of less than $40. I wish to repeat that statement, Mr. President: Two out of every five American families today, as revealed by the Federal Reserve Board, pursuant to a survey made by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, have less than $40 in liquid savings. That means that in cash, in bonds, or in other liquid assets they have $40 or less. That situation applies to two out of every five American families. Their savings are about 1 percent of the total liquid assets in the country. Those figures are not mine. They are given out with the approval of the Federal Reserve Board, in connection with a study to ascertain who has the savings in the United States.

Two-thirds of the families of the United States make less than $40 a week, which is just a little more than $2,000 a year. Mr. President, what is the size of the average family in the United States? It is about four. The average family has four members. Two-thirds of the families in the United States make less than $2,000 a year with which to care for the average family of four members. They are the so-called rich, who are said to be clamoring for a chance to pay high prices, according to the opinions of certain gentlemen who speak on this measure. What will happen to those families when inflation comes?

Mr. President, the overwhelming majority of the children of the United States live in the homes of the poor. When the cost of living rises, their standard of living and their health care go down. If the President vetoes this measure, as I hope he will, then he should ask the Congress for a joint resolution continuing the OPA as it is until February 1, 1947.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Assuming that the Congress did not follow that recommendation, then where would we be?

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator refer to the continuing resolution?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. If the President were to veto the measure now pending, and if he then requested the Congress to pass a continuing joint resolution—and it would be my expectation that he would ask the able majority leader of the Senate and the able majority leader of the House of Representatives to introduce such a resolution, or else he would ask the chairmen of the appropriate committees in the House and the Senate to do so—then it would be up to the Congress to determine whether it would pass the joint resolution continuing the OPA as it is until February 1, 1947, at the President's request and for the reasons given by the President.

If the Congress were to fail to do so—and I wish to answer my able friend the Senator from Illinois in two ways—first, a record would be made of those in Congress who were willing to stand behind the President and were willing to stand behind the people on such a clear-cut issue as that.

As the able Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] has pointed out, the American people are entitled to know our record in this body. Then the people of the United States would know who favor inflation, who favor bringing back the high cost of living which existed after the last war, and who are willing to stand by the President and the Government and the people in this crisis which threatens their very security and their very existence.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I ask the Senator to permit me to make one further statement in response to the question asked by the Senator from Illinois.

If, however, the Congress were to persist in that attitude, and still were not to pass any continuing joint resolution at all, then we would have no OPA, we would have unbridled inflation, and we would have an incalculable increase in the cost of living, just as we shall have under the pending measure, if it becomes law. But the advantage would be that the American people would know who gave them that bitter medicine and who tried to spare them from its iniquitous effects.

As the situation is today, we would accomplish the same economic result if we adopted the pending conference report and if it became law, yet the responsibility is so diffused and so confused that the people can hardly tell who has been responsible for bringing this evil in their lives perhaps for many years to come.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield, first, to the Senator from Oregon, to whom I have promised to yield. I ask the Senator from Illinois to wait for a few minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, does the Senator from Florida agree that if the Congress made the record which I think is alluded to in the question put to him by the Senator from Illinois, the knowledge on the part of the American people as to who was responsible for the inflation which will flow from this bill would in no way alleviate their conditions insofar as their suffering from such inflation? It would be a rather empty satisfaction, would it not, for them to have

merely the knowledge of who made the record that inflicted inflation cruelties upon them. Frankly, I am at a loss to understand the illogical position of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. It might be of little benefit to them insofar as changing the situation would be concerned. But I dare say that their discomfiture would not last longer than the early days of next year, because if, in the November elections, the people disapproved of the action of Congress in opening the floodgates of inflation, the new Congress that would be elected could not get to Washington fast enough to pass effective price-control legislation.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator answer this question, please: From a parliamentary standpoint, is it not the obligation of the Senate to make certain that it has exhausted every possibility of getting a better bill, before it takes final action?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; I think so. I say that I think we have exhausted all such possibilities, and I say that the bill now before us is the best bill we shall be able to get from this Congress, unless the President takes this issue to the American people and asks for a decision upon a clear-cut issue.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit several questions in relation to that conclusion?

Mr. PEPPER. I gladly yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am sure that the Senator from Florida recalls that the other day, the Chair ruled that, from a parliamentary standpoint, the only way by which the Senate could get the pending measure back to conference would be, first, by rejecting the conference report. Then we would be in a position to request a further conference. Did the Senator from Florida hear that ruling?

Mr. PEPPER. I did, and of course, that is the parliamentary procedure.

Mr. MORSE. Let us assume that we are able to defeat the conference report, and let us assume that the bill goes to a further conference. Does the Senator from Florida think that the result of such conference could be in any other direction, if we are to have any bill at all, than in the direction of a bill more nearly like the original Senate bill than the pending bill?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Oregon that, in my opinion, in view of the bill on which the conferees on the part of both Houses had to work, the result in the form of the pending conference report is better than we had a right to expect. The bill as passed by the Senate and the bill as passed by the House of Representatives were so bad that there was no leeway for a committee on conference to bring out a good bill and submit it to the Senate and to the House. That leads me to believe that even if the Senate rejects the pending conference report and orders the measure to be sent to a further conference, we shall never get out of conference, on the basis of the bill as passed by the Senate and the bill as passed by the House, a better conference report than the one which we now have before us.

Mr. MORSE. But if we reject the pending measure, is it not true that thereby we shall serve notice on the conferees that they must bring from the further conference a better bill, if they hope to have it enacted into law?

Mr. PEPPER. But if they do not bring back a better bill, we shall be back where we are today. After all, in the conference the conferees debated the measure for days. After that has happened, and after the measure has been fought out in the committees and in the Senate and in the House, and after it has become obvious what the philosophy and attitude of both bodies are, I do not see how it is possible to expect to receive from any further conference which might consider the matter any better measure than the one now before us.

Mr. MORSE. If they do not bring back a better bill, will they not have made exactly the same record which the Senator from Florida has pointed out he believes will be made if the President vetoes the bill and the Congress does not then take any action on the basis of the veto? The same record will be made in either case, except under the procedure which I have suggested we would put squarely up to the conferees, on reconsideration, the question of submitting to the two Houses a better bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; but the able Senator from Oregon is overlooking the time element which is involved. It is now 3 o'clock Friday afternoon. The Price Control Act will expire midnight next Sunday. So, at best, there is only the time which remains between now and midnight next Sunday for anything to be done to save price control for the people of the United States. If the conference report comes back to the Senate and is again debated, there will be further delay in making an appropriate adjustment before price control lapses entirely. But if, this afternoon, we agree to the conference report and let the bill go to the White House this evening, the President, who will be anticipating its arrival and will have in the meantime made a study of the questions involved and advised with his counselors, will have all night tonight and tomorrow to determine what he wishes to do, and the Congress will have an opportunity later, including Sunday, if necessary, to consider a continuing resolution. In an emergency there is no reason why the Congress should not sit on Sunday. In that case the issue would be clearly presented of whether we want price control to continue until next February. At that time a new Congress will be in session.

I agree with the Senator from Oregon that, if I believed it was possible to get from the conference not a better bill but one comparable to what we now have, I would be in favor of returning the bill to conference. But I ask Senators to take into consideration the time element, and the fact that the other House has already acted, and that the conference committee could not meet unless the House agreed to another conference. I ask Senators also to consider the uncertainty with reference to whether the House would agree to another conference, and the time which would be involved in getting the conferees together. It seems to me that if we were to follow such procedure there would be no prospect of extending the present act. I am sure that the Senator from Oregon and I, as we usually do, have the same end in view. We only differ with reference to the best way to reach the end. The question is one of allowing this Congress to decide whether it will do away with price control. I am not quarreling with the Senators who take the point of view that it would be better not to have price control. However, I believe that it would be terrible to do away with price control at any time during the next few months. But we should let the Congress decide squarely whether we will kill the Price Control Act or extend it. I believe that the method which I have suggested, namely, that of adopting the conference report this afternoon, allowing it to go to the White House, giving the President the opportunity to send a message of recommendation back to us tomorrow, and allowing us the rest of the day and Sunday, if necessary, to consider the matter, would be the best method to follow.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator for permitting me to interrupt him. I have not at all overlooked the time element which is involved, but I have a point of view in regard to the time element which is exactly opposite to that of the Senator from Florida. I believe that it is necessary to consider the time element from the standpoint of how long it will take to put this bill into any form of effective administration. I assert that it will never be effectively administered. I believe that a hiatus period of a few days would help and not hinder the situation.

With all due respect to the Senator from Florida, I believe that a vote for the conference report would be a vote against a Presidential veto. I believe that the Senator from Florida is "passing the buck" to the President, and I think we should now support the President's position by voting against the bill, and thereby demonstrating to him that the margin between those who favor it and those who oppose it is very small.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I know how earnestly the able Senator from Oregon feels. I admit that there is an honest difference of opinion with reference to what is the better method to follow in achieving the result which both of us wish to attain. I believe that the method which I have suggested is a better method than the one which has been suggested by the Senator from Oregon, although I do not quarrel at all with the sentiment expressed by the able Senator from Oregon. If we send the bill back to conference at this time and the House of Representatives does not agree to a new conference, the act will expire at midnight next Sunday and we will not have any legislation at all on the subject. The President would still have to make some recommendation to the Congress, or we would have to pass a continuing resolution, and that much more time would be consumed in arriving at the same place.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida wants the President to veto the bill and request Congress to pass

a resolution for the continuance until February of next year of the OPA Act as it now appears on the statute books?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. From a parliamentary angle, I may say that there is nothing, I believe, which would prevent any Senator from offering amendments to such a resolution when it came before the Senate. So, what I fear is that we would find ourselves in the same position in which we now are. If the Senate should agree, as the Senator has suggested, to take a straight-out vote upon the question of whether we shall continue or not continue the OPA Act, of course, that could be done. But I fear that when the resolution gets here and amendments which have been offered heretofore to the OPA bill are again offered to the resolution, we will find ourselves in the same position we are in now. The country ought to know definitely whether we are in favor of continuing the OPA, or whether we are opposed to it. There is no doubt that the amendments now contained in the bill are crippling in character. As the Senator from Oregon said a moment ago, if I understood him correctly, this act cannot be effectively administered within the life of the act.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I agree with what the Senator said in the last part of his remarks, and I agree with reference to the possibility of what could happen if a resolution such as the one I have described were presented. However, we know very well, Mr. President, that what we say on the floor of the Senate is not nearly so clear in connection with a matter of this kind as what the President of the United States would say. He has the vantage point of his great office. I repeat that what we might say would not be so effective and clear as what the President might say. We can debate this matter. Some have said that the pending bill practically destroys price control. Others say that it does not. However, I believe that if the President of the United States, backed up by his advisers, were to tell the American people that we might just as well not have price control as to have this bill, and that the time had come for the Congress to make a decision as to whether or not we shall have price control, and he vetoed the bill in furtherance of that policy and asked the Congress either to pass a continuing resolution preserving price control or to kill it and let the people know what we have done, we would face a different issue than the one we face this afternoon.

Mr. President, not all our people are as familiar with the parliamentary situation in Congress as are we. We know that we do not have the power to amend the conference report on the Senate floor. There may be persons in the galleries and throughout the country who wonder why, if the bill is not a proper bill, we do not amend it here in the Senate. We cannot do that. Under the rules of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, we must adopt the conference report in toto or reject it in toto. We must accept it or have nothing. We do not have any power to amend it.

A little while ago there was a bill before the Senate with reference to which at least 17 Senators expressed themselves. I offered a substitute amendment proposing to continue the present price-control law until February 1 of next year.

There was a record vote, and 17 of us voted at that time, even for a simple continuing provision. But a majority of the Senate chose to adopt the bill which the Senate did pass at that time. That bill went to conference with the House of Representatives, and there the conferees considered the Senate bill and a bill which the House had passed some time ago.

Senators will remember and the country will remember, that when the House bill was passed, it was emblazoned on the headlines of nearly every paper in the country that the crippling amendments of the House of Representatives had, for all practical purposes, destroyed price control in the United States. It was stated that the same effect attached to the bill passed by the United States Senate. So when the conferees met they had to deal with two bills, each of which had been properly castigated, in my opinion, as to all practical purposes destroying price control.

I think the conference is to be complimented for having brought back as good a conference report as it has, taking into consideration the bills with which the conference had to work in the consideration of the measures.

Mr. President, I believe that we might just as well have no price control at all as to have the bill which would become the law if this conference report should be agreed to by the Senate as it has been adopted by the House of Representatives.

What does it do? It guarantees, in the Taft amendment, that every producer, which means anyone who grows or makes anything anywhere in the country and every processor and every manufacturer, and that includes practically all the creative people in this country, practically all those who put goods and commodities into the channels of trade, shall be guaranteed the price he got between October 1 and October 15, 1941, plus all industry-wide increases which have occurred between October 15, 1941, and the present time.

Mr. President, what will that mean? It will mean that in the automobile business, for example, the man who sells raw materials will be able to get a great mark-up on his raw materials. It means that the man who processes will get a mark-up on his processing service, and, finally, when many things come together in a given part of an automobile, the price of the whole part will have been increased, and when that part becomes a part of a larger part, then the larger part will get an increase in price. Eventually all these parts which have had increases will become the whole automobile, and goodness knows—in fact, no one has been able to estimate—what the total increase in the price of the finished product will be when all these lesser increases all down the line have been granted by the OPA.

Mr. President, not only is that allowed, but there is no real, practical standard which is defined; it is practically left to the OPA to ask a man what he thinks he is entitled to, and they have little discretion except to give him what he demands as his price increases. As I have said, no one has been able to tell how much that is going to add to the cost of food, to the cost of wearing apparel, to the cost of practically every kind of goods the American people use.

Mr. President, if we are to have that kind of a law, it means for all practical purposes no price control, because I do not believe prices would be substantially higher without such a law than they would be with such a law upon the statute books of the country.

We will destroy the law of supply and demand if we enact legislation of that sort, we will guarantee to the people that they will not have low prices, and we will guarantee to every producer, processor, and manufacturer that he will get the largest profits, in my opinion, he could expect to get.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. What would be the opposite of the plan the Senator just described, under which each manufacturer, producer, or processor would make a profit? What would be the opposite to that?

Mr. PEPPER. The opposite would be the plan we are now superseding, and I will say to the Senator from Indiana that I admit readily that there are many defects and there are many hardships under the plan we presently have. There are some producers, there are some processors, there are some manufacturers, who are undoubtedly bearing very heavy onerous burdens, but when we deal with public matters in most cases we have to balance interests between the harm we do and the good we do, and I say to the Senator that the burden that is being suffered by the producers, the processors, and the manufacturers today, under the present law, in my opinion is far less dangerous and less onerous and less obnoxious than the burden the consuming public—taking into consideration the fact that most of them are poor people—would have to bear if we assured the profits this bill guarantees to the producers, the processors, and the manufacturers.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I gladly yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. If I understand the present OPA law correctly—and I believe I do—it provides that every manufacturer and processor is entitled to a reasonable profit, and that no maximum price shall be fixed that does not show a reasonable profit. What is the difference between the present law and the one the Senator has just described? I am certain that the Senator is not advocating that anyone in America handling merchandise shall manufacture or process or produce at a loss.

Mr. PEPPER. Neither does the OPA, as I understand the administration of it, expect people to sell things at a loss, generally speaking. There may be cases where, under past regulations, they may not let a man make a profit on a particular article if he manufactures more than one; they will not make him take a

loss on any part of his production, but if he is making cost of production on a given article, we will say article A, and if his over-all profit position is reasonably satisfactory, they will not give him a profit on article A. I realize that there are some disadvantages about that, but if it is a question of keeping a manufacturer from making a profit on article A when his over-all profit position is fairly satisfactory, or raising the cost of living to the masses of the people, with all that brings about, I prefer the former policy, and that is the policy that is now in effect.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, if I remember correctly, the so-called Taft amendment merely provides that the manufacturer shall be given the same mark-up or profit he was receiving on October 1, 1941, and if he was receiving no profit or had no mark-up at that time, he likewise would get no mark-up at this time.

I have listened to a good deal of talk about businessmen handling certain items without any profit, and I rather suspect they have done so in the past, not intentionally, but unintentionally. I should like to ask the able Senator what percentage of the business in America, either today or 5 years ago or 10 years ago, has been handled at a loss. I do not suppose the Senator can answer the question; I am certain I cannot.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not know.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let us say it was 10 percent, which I am certain is 10 times too high, but I am willing to use 10 percent as the figure. Let us say it is 10 percent, or 10 times too high. What particular disadvantage is that going to be, or what material effect is that going to have upon prices, 10 percent, or 5 percent, or 1 percent, or 2 percent, or whatever it may be? In other words, we are talking about the small end of our economy. On the floor of the Senate we are prone to use the exception to try to prove the rule. We are trying to take a very small percentage of our business, of our national economy, and say, "If you permit that 5 percent to make a little profit, prices are going sky high," when there is not any basis for the statement. It is a small percentage of our economy, and means nothing, in the net result, on whether we have inflation or whether we have stable prices.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senator has a right to his opinion about that matter. I do not care about the opinion that has been expressed on this floor by Mr. Chester Bowles or Mr. Paul Porter. I know there are no more devoted public servants in this country than those two men. I think they are able, are competent, are devoted to the public service. I attach great consideration and great respect to the figures they give to the Congress and to the country about what the effect of these various proposals would be upon the cost of living. I know what they have said. I have seen their public statements, I have talked with them personally. I know they feel that for all practical purposes we might just as well have no price control at all as to have perhaps the legislation that is contemplated by the conference report. But I do know, Mr. President, that if the Senator from Ohio and others who placed this amendment in the bill had not thought that the amendment was going to add to the profit of the producers and the processors and the manufacturers over what they are now getting they would not have put it in the measure.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I know the Senator from Florida wants to be fair in giving the reasons why the amendment under discussion was placed in the bill. As the authors of it have told me—and I believe they are accurate because my whole experience in business bears out their statement—their reasons were to create production on the theory that production cannot be created unless there is some profit. They wanted to give a reasonable profit to stimulate production.

I want to tell the Senator from Florida, if he will permit me——

Mr. PEPPER. I want to say one thing before the Senator goes further. I did not suggest that there was any sinister motive behind the proposal.

Mr. HAWKES. I realize that the Senator does not think there is.

Mr. PEPPER. But the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] raised the question as to whether this amendment would add any more profit to the producers and processors and the manufacturers. I was merely saying that if the authors of the amendment had not thought it would, obviously they would not have put it in the measure.

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

Mr. HAWKES. Will the Senator pardon me a moment. I am not criticizing what the Senator from Florida is saying. I am merely trying to enlarge upon it and to show that we are all seeking to obtain production. I think the Senator from Florida will agree that I am just as much interested in seeing that the ordinary men and women of this country—I have been one of them all my life—get the things they need on a fair basis as is any other Member of the Senate. It is only a question of difference of opinion as to the way to get those things.

If the Senator from Florida will permit me to make one other remark, I will say to him, and all my other colleagues in the Senate, that we are not going to cure the difficulties of the present situation without passing through a period in which we are going to be tried. We are going to have some injustices, hardships, and unfairness. There is no question about that. We are not going to get from where we are to where we want to go without some trouble no matter what course we choose to follow.

I want to tell the Senator a very interesting little story of a real happening, which, from my point of view, is justification for voting for the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. A few weeks ago seven little boys about 10 years old were sitting in my living room and I wanted one of them to do an errand which was a little difficult to perform. I said to the boys, "Which one of you boys will go to the store and get a big package and bring it up to the house?" Not one of them moved. They looked at each other, and each one was hoping that someone else would say he would do the job. Finally I thought I would try a little experiment. I said, "Which one of you boys will go to the store and get this package if I give you a quarter for doing so?" Everyone of them sprang to his feet. That was an illustration of what is the mainspring behind production. That is what we are trying to do to get production. That is what I am hoping we will accomplish.

Mr. PEPPER. I will say to the able Senator from New Jersey, for whom he knows I have the greatest admiration and the warmest affection, that if he were a hungry man and had but a quarter with which to buy what he needed to eat, he could not have given the boy a quarter to go to the store for him, no matter how much of an incentive that quarter might have been to that boy.

Mr. HAWKES. I may say to the Senator that he is talking about one thing and I am talking about another. I am talking about the mainspring that impels people to produce, and production is the only answer to this situation; that is all.

Mr. PEPPER. I thoroughly respect the point of view of the Senator, but what I am saying is, Mr. President, that we proceed on the assumption that the people can afford to pay the prices that will result in this production through the incentive motive. If the Senator will allow me just a moment more. I asked a while ago, "Who are the American people?" We hear some carelessly say from time to time, "Why, everyone has money." It is considered that money is just growing on trees, practically.

Mr. HAWKES. May I say to the Senator that I do not agree with that idea. That is not my thought.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is too able and sound a businessman to believe any such thing.

Here, Mr. President, are the figures on savings carried out in a little more detail than I gave them a while ago, as reported by the Federal Reserve Board after making a study of the savings of the people of the Nation. As I said, two out of every five families in the United States have total savings, per family, in liquid assets, of less than $40. Those two families out of five families represent 40 percent of the families of the whole of the United States, and they have 1 percent of the savings of the whole people of the United States. Just think of that. The Federal Reserve Board wanted to see what was the distribution of our savings. It wanted to know: Where are all these savings that we are talking about, of the riches accumulated as the result of the war? Who has the riches that came out of the war? It was found that 40 percent of all the American people had 1 percent of the savings of the American people.

It was found that the top 10 percent had 60 percent of the savings. Think of that. The top 10 percent of the American people had 60 percent of the savings, or an average per family of $10,500.

Senators remember when Mr. Henry Ford, Jr., and some other businessmen

said, "Let us take off all controls. In the long run we will be much better off without them." I do not blame Mr. Ford for taking that position. I do not blame the man who has $10,500 saved up for taking such a position. Perhaps he can weather the storm for 6 months or maybe for a year. Of course we know the storm will die down sometime. But I am talking about the period during which the storm is upon us. Mr. Ford has his millions, and the top 10 percent of our families have an average of $10,500. But 40 percent of the American people have but $40 for each family. How can a family weather much of an economic storm on $40—a family which averages four persons? Suppose the head of the family loses his job. Suppose his wages are cut. If prices go up and his wages are cut how long will that $40 last? If he has sickness in his family how long will the $40 last. That is what I am talking about, Mr. President. I am not talking about those who feel they do not need to have any controls, who would just turn everything loose and let the devil take the hindmost for about a year, and go on a buyers' strike; those who do not have to buy luxuries. But I am talking about the men and women and children of this country who have to buy food and have to buy clothes and have to buy houses in which to live, or rent houses, those who have to buy the essentials of life. I say that they do not have the money with which to weather the storm of inflation. When inflation comes to them, not only are their savings taken, but it has a direful effect on the health of their children. That is the reason, Mr. President, why I do not favor doing away with price control.

I stated that the top 10 percent of American families have 60 percent of the savings. The top 30 percent of American families have 87.5 percent of the total liquid assets or savings of the country. Ninety-two percent of the families of the United States have incomes of less than $3,000 a year. And, as I stated, two-thirds of the families of this country have incomes of less than $2,000 a year.

Mr. President, this amendment guarantees the profits of 1941 plus industry-wide cost increases to the producers and the processors and the manufacturers. I have before me some figures that come, I believe, from the Department of Commerce, and I am going to quote the figures. They give the profits of all corporations in 1936 to 1939, before taxes. They were $5,300,000,000. But in 1944 the same corporations, before taxes, made profits of $24,100,000,000, and in 1945 made profits estimated before taxes of $20,900,000,000. After taxes the profits of all corporations in the United States, from 1936 to 1939, were $3,900,000,000. In 1944 they were $9,800,000,000, nearly three times as much. In 1945 they were estimated at $9,100,000,000, approximately three times as much.

Nineteen hundred and thirty-six to 1939 was not such a bad period for the corporations of this country. They were not the best years in our history, but they were not the worst. Yet in 1945 the corporations were making nearly three times as much, after taxes, as they made between 1936 and 1939.

I am now going to give the figures of the profits of 2,152 leading industrial corporations. Before taxes, 1936 to 1939, they made $3,100,000,000. In 1944 they made $10,100,000,000. There was no report in 1945.

After taxes, in 1936–39, they made $2,600,000,000. In 1944, after taxes, they made $3,900,000,000. There was no report for 1945.

Now I give the return on net worth of 2,152 manufacturing corporations. That is the dividends, as it were. In 1936–39—I leave out the figures before taxes and simply speak of the figures after taxes—they made 8.2 percent. In 1944 they made 10 percent. There is no report for 1945.

Now, Mr. President, let me mention something else that these corporations have gotten. Under the carry-forward-carry-back tax law that Congress passed, if a big corporation does not make as much money in the first 2 years after the war as it made during the war, when it paid excess-profit taxes, it can draw back from the Federal Treasury some of the excess-profits taxes it paid in during the war. Mr. President, that means that billions of dollars are going to be drawn out of the Federal Treasury by the corporations of this country which they paid in in taxes during the war. At this point I should like to insert in the RECORD some profit data of nondurable manufacturing concerns and distributive trades in the first quarter of 1946 as compared with 1945.

Profits before and after taxes of 125 large corporations, first quarter of 1946

	Profits		Percentage change first quarter 1945	
	Before taxes	After taxes	Before	After
100 nondurable manufacturing	$306,000,000	$192,000,000	−18	+23
25 miscellaneous services	70,000,000	40,000,000	+11	+80

Of the 25 miscellaneous service groups, 13 trade corporations earned $39,000,000 before taxes and $24,000,000 after taxes, or 61 and 166 percent respectively above the 1945 level. The increase in the profits after taxes for the nondurable manufacturing group and for the miscellaneous distributive services is due in part to the lowering of their taxes.

I wonder how much is going to be drawn out by the little taxpayers.

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, how much time have I?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has until 3:36.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does not the Senator think the RECORD should show that corporations will not draw back any taxes unless they lose money, so as not to leave the impression that they are going to draw back this money, and in addition make billions of dollars? They will draw back money only if they lose money.

Mr. PEPPER. Is it not a fact that the carry-forward carry-back provision also permits them to draw back certain money in case their standard of earning falls below that of the base period?

Mr. CAPEHART. I understand that.

Mr. PEPPER. That does not mean that they must have a loss.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think we should correct the RECORD so as to show that they draw money only in case they lose money. In other words, they do not make profits in their normal operations and in addition draw money from previously paid excess-profits taxes. They draw back money only in case they lose money.

Does not the Senator also believe that the RECORD should show that while he is speaking of 2,500 of the large corporations of America, those which have monopolies to a greater or less extent, we should likewise protect the 3,000,000 small businessmen of America—the little corner grocery store, the little drug store, the little man in the pressing business, and the shoe-shine man? There are about 3,000,000 in that class.

Mr. PEPPER. Of course.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator is speaking about 2,500 corporations. We must protect the 3,000,000.

Mr. PEPPER. Of course, we want to protect the masses of the people; but primarily those who will profit from this amendment are the major production groups of the country, the big manufacturers, the big processors, and the big producers.

During the debate on the minimum-wage bill I pointed out that about 10 percent of the farmers of the country produced 54 percent of the agricultural output of all farmers. So, when there is an increase in the prices of farm products, primarily the benefit goes to about 10 percent of the farmers of the country, and not so much to the little fellow who is farming on the side of a hill.

Mr. President, I rose to say that I feel that for all practical purposes this bill destroys price control. I wish there were some way by which I could vote against the conference report, as I voted against the bill when it was before the Senate and open to amendment. At that time I offered a resolution continuing price control as it now exists until February 1, when the new Congress, from the people, will have a chance to act on the matter.

There is no way that I can get a better bill, the conference report which is now before the Senate not being open to amendment. If we kill it in the Senate, we kill price control altogether, without the executive branch of the Government having an opportunity to suggest any alternative to complete repeal of price control. Moreover, the House of Representatives has already acted upon the conference report. We have no assurance, on Friday afternoon, that the House could be persuaded to set aside its action in agreeing to the conference report so that the bill could be sent to a new conference.

For that reason, much as I disapprove of this measure, much as I think that in

general it is giving to those who have and taking from those who have not, much as I think it will penalize the poor of America and add to the already swollen profits of the processors, the producers, and manufacturers, nevertheless, I shall vote for the conference report in the hope that it will get to the President at the earliest possible time, so that the President may have an early decision by his advisers as to what the effect of the measure will be.

If it does in substance kill price control, tomorrow he can send a message to Congress courageously vetoing it, as he courageously vetoed the Case bill because it was inimical to the public interest. Then he will call upon those who are going to stand by the public interest in this matter, as well as by him, to support in the Senate and in the House of Representatives a simple continuing resolution preserving price control, with all its defects and shortcomings, as it now is, until February 1. Then if the Congress, with that clear-cut issue presented to it by the Chief Magistrate, supported by factual argument, turns down the request of the President, the American people will know, as they have a right to know, who it is that has broken the dike, who it is that has stricken down the dam, who it is that has opened the floodgates and deluged them with the destructive effects of the high cost of living and inflation and set the stage for the inevitable depression to follow. (Manifestations of applause from the galleries.)

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, like the Senator from Florida, I feel that I owe it to myself to explain my vote on the conference report. I feel that the bill as it is presented to the Senate, with no opportunity for amendment, is so emasculated as to be utterly ineffective as price control. It has left only a few vestiges of price control.

I also feel that, having operated for 4 years on an all-out total war basis, we need more than a few months to make adjustments and permit prices to seek their normal level. Prices cannot reach their normal level until we are assured that production meets demand. Until that time arrives, the type of price control which is needed is a flexible price control which will operate until prices of various commodities become adjusted.

This is the only bill on which we can vote that has any reference to price control. I believe that as it is now organized the Office of Price Administration is not an office of price administration at all. It is merely a screen, a subterfuge behind which to hide in blaming an executive agency for what will inevitably happen in the future with rising prices.

However, in spite of that fact, because there still remains the possibility of holding an organization together that can be used in case of grave emergency—and I fear that such an emergency will come sooner than we think—in spite of my revulsion for the bill as drafted, and my feeling that it is a subterfuge, a legal fence or hedge behind which to hide during the coming inflation and the resulting deflation, I shall vote for that little subterfuge because it still maintains an organization that can be used when the situation becomes critical in the future. I shall support it with a clothespin on my nose, so to speak. Nevertheless, because it is a small step in the right direction—and it is such an infinitesimally small step I dislike to think of it—I shall support it, protesting to my conscience as I do so, but nevertheless endeavoring to hold together an organization which can be used for emergency purposes in the future when the situation becomes too stringent, as it may become when all controls are released.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, although I am anxious to reach a vote on the conference report, I wish to speak for a few minutes on this subject.

In the debate on the conference report there has been so much discussion on profits that I fear we have lost sight of the real reason why price control, and possibly rationing, are now necessary in the United States.

One year ago today we were engaged in the greatest war in history. Between 13,000,000 and 14,000,000 young Americans fought in that war. Nearly 300,000 of them died. Seven hundred thousand more came home wounded, sick, or injured in some way. The terrific impact of the war has been felt all over the world. We do not know how many millions of men died; probably we shall never know, but we know that the number was staggering.

We know that today perhaps 50,000,000 people are in ill health or crippled as the result of the war. We know that millions of homes throughout the world were destroyed. In White Russia the people destroyed their own homes in order to hold back the enemy. All over the rest of the world homes have been destroyed and broken, and families have been separated. The commerce of the world has been disrupted in almost every nation, our Nation being the most favored of all. Factories have been razed. Great electric plants have been destroyed. Finances have been exhausted, governments have toppled, and 400,000,000 people are faced with starvation.

We are living in a chaotic world, which is the inevitable aftermath of the great World War through which we have gone. The United States is trying to do what it can to restore the economy of the nations which were engaged in the war. We are trying to bring to the world everlasting peace.

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

Mr. AIKFN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPPER. I am very much impressed with what the able Senator has said about the many fine men and women who lost their lives, their health, or their limbs in the public interest. So even if a few processors, producers, and manufacturers lose a little money by reason of our efforts to protect the public interest, their burden will not be comparable, will it, to the burden which our soldiers had to bear during the war in the public interest?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, what the Senator has said is true. But today America is the only nation which can restore stable government to the other nations of the earth and can free their populations from the fear of starvation and hunger. When we find ourselves with a short supply of food because of the contributions we have made to the rest of the world, it is necessary that we use artificial means to keep prices here in the United States from getting completely out of hand.

But, Mr. President, shall the United States say to the rest of the world, "We will keep all our food and all our machines and all our technicians and equipment at home"? Shall we say to the rest of the world, "We will seize all the commerce of the world, because we now have the power to do it, and other nations do not have the power, either financially or in any other way?" Shall we say to them, "You must let your women and children go hungry. You must let millions of them starve or die of disease for want of care and medicines, and you can let the dictators rule in your countries"? because a starving country will invariably grasp at dictatorship if it is forced to do so. Shall we say to them, "You must do this while we in America will have the food and will be the best fed people in the world, and we will maintain the biggest and best military force the world ever saw, so that if you ever attempt to get any of our food, we will defeat you"?

No, Mr. President; I do not think that is the American way and I do not think that is what our people want us to do.

I think they want us to do all that it is possible to do to keep the hundreds of millions of people on this earth from starving. They want us to do all we possibly can do to restore sound and stable governments to the other nations of the world. They want us to do all that it is possible to do to restore commerce and industry to the world, and, above all else, they want us to do everything it is possible to do to build and maintain an organization for permanent peace. They want us to do this, even if it means that they will not have everything they want for themselves, even if it is necessary to have legal controls for a short time.

Mr. President, that is why this measure is before the Senate today. It is not here for us to discuss whether someone in business should make a profit of 16 percent or a profit of 18 percent. This measure is before the Senate because it is a means by which we hope to restore peace and prosperity to the world. We could have surpluses in the United States today if we wanted to have them. If we simply said, "We will not send our food and our materials to any other country in the world," we would not be talking about price control today. More likely we would be talking about support prices.

So this bill is before us. I do not think it is a good bill, but I think it is the best bill we are going to get, and I think it is infinitely better than no bill at all.

If the pending conference report is adopted, as I hope it will be, I realize that it will not prevent certain high prices from going higher. Undoubtedly, if the pending conference report is adopted, there will be more inflation than we have

now; but if we adopt the conference report, although it is not all it should be, I think it will be sufficient to prevent complete collapse in this country because of high prices.

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

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

Mr. AIKEN. I shall conclude my remarks in just a moment.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to ask the Senator a question in regard to an agricultural matter.

Mr. AIKEN. Very well; I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say that the views of the Senator from Vermont on agricultural problems have a great deal of influence with the Senator from Oregon.

The following problem has been presented to me at a conference which I attended this afternoon, and I should like to have the views of the Senator from Vermont regarding it. It was pointed out to me that the recent interim report of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry makes plain that one of the greatest defects of the OPA's pricing policies in regard to dairy products is the insistence of the OPA upon adjusting the producers' prices on a national average basis.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. The OPA does not consider, so I was told, cost increases in a particular area, but measures its adjustment solely by the national average increase in cash costs. Of course, as to the individual producer, that varies a great deal throughout the United States. His cost varies greatly, depending upon the particular section of the country in which he is located; and frequently as to an individual producer it is much higher than the national average.

This has worked a great hardship on dairymen in the Northwest, the South, the Northeast, and other areas where costs have risen higher than the national average. The OPA, by means of the national average cost device, is destroying the dairy industry in those areas by keeping prices to local producers below their costs.

In my section of the country, for example, the record is perfectly clear that a great many dairy herds have simply disappeared. The dairymen have gone out of business. At the same time, the OPA allows dealers to pay for milk coming from distant areas as much as $1.75 per hundredweight more than can be paid for local milk. For instance, I know of cases in Portland, Oreg., of milk being imported from Idaho and the purchasers of the milk being allowed to pay as much as $1.75 a hundredweight more for it than they could pay for the milk of local producers.

My question is this: In light of these facts, does subsection (f) of section 6, as contained in section 11 of the report, require the addition to the 1941 local price to producers of the amount of the average total cost increases in the particular locality since that time?

Mr. AIKEN. I have mislaid my copy of the report for the moment, but I say at once to the Senator from Oregon that I do not try to defend some of the actions of the OPA, and I think what he has said about that action and the orders in regard to the dairy industry is entirely true. In fact, sometimes the OPA has been so grievously wrong that there has been a very strong temptation to join those who say we should simply eliminate it.

But when I reach that point in my thinking, I also begin to think of the 30,000,000 people in this country who still do not really know how they are going to live through the next week, and I also think of conditions in the world and of the over-all situation, and then I come back to thinking that I must support the OPA.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. That particular subsection, as the Senator has said, provides that the maximum prices in the case of producers "shall be computed by adding such increase"—that is, the increase of cost—"to the average 1941 price for such agricultural commodity (with appropriate adjustments for grade, location, and seasonal differentials)."

It seems to me that with that clause in the bill and with the provision "as determined and announced by the Secretary of Agriculture," the Secretary of Agriculture would have authority to correct the situation which the Senator has described.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio, because, as I am sure he knows, my purpose in raising this question is to lay a legislative basis for a judicial interpretation, if necessary; and in a moment I am going to put the question to the majority leader.

But in order to make certain that I correctly understand the response the Senator from Ohio has made, let me say that I understand it is his interpretation of this bill—and certainly he has had much to do with its drafting—that in the case suggested by me the wording of the act would permit the making of the adjustments which would alleviate the dairy problem I have mentioned.

Mr. TAFT. That is my opinion.

Mr. MORSE. Does the majority leader share that view?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have only a few minutes more.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I must say that I was out of the Chamber at the time when the Senator made his remarks, and I do not clearly understand what he wishes to have an answer to.

Mr. MORSE. I shall wait until the Senator from Vermont concludes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Oregon that I myself am satisfied with the interpretation which has been made by the Senator from Ohio. Had he not made it as he did, I would have requested him to do so, because I knew he could make such an interpretation for the RECORD in much better language than I could.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to say that if we are willing to tighten up our belts and dispense with some of the quantities of food which otherwise we would like to have, and if we are willing to do that for one more year, I think after 1 year we can dispense with price controls for good. Western Europe and north Africa and other parts of the world are producing more and are getting back into production. So I think if we continue these controls for one more year, thereafter we shall be able to get away from them. None of us likes these controls, and sometimes they become almost unbearable. I shall not say anything about the mistakes the OPA has made in the States, and how troublesome they have been to all of us, because everyone knows about that.

This bill is not perfect. It will not be perfect if it becomes law. But I think it is the best we can get, and I think we should do the best we can with the best we can get.

At a time such as this, I do not think there should be any talk by anyone about quitting his job merely because he cannot get the tools with which he would like to work. All during the recent war the farm people of America were not able to get the tools they wanted to have, but they worked their hardest with the tools they were able to get, and they produced crops in almost unbelievable amounts.

I have heard it said that the President may veto this bill if it goes to him in its present form. I think it would be most unwise for him to do so. If he vetoed the bill, I do not believe that he would be doing any good to himself, to his administration, or to his country. The bill is infinitely better than no bill at all, and I am satisfied that that is the only alternative before us.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Inasmuch as the bill contains a provision with reference to a decontrol board, and assuming that the board functions with any force whatsoever, under the intent of the law does the Senator not believe that the decontrols will increase from time to time within the year?

Mr. AIKEN. I believe so. I believe that the decontrols could start almost immediately, and I also believe that the success or failure of this law or any other law depends largely on how it is administered. I believe that if the bill is properly administered, control can be exercised over the goods and articles which need control, and that decontrol will take place as rapidly as possible with relation to those goods and products which should be decontrolled. In the meantime, if we have no controls at all there will be at least 30,000,000 people in this country, with no savings and with little income, who will be in almost immediate distress because of high prices. The separation pay of $200 or $300 which we gave to the veterans would mean almost nothing to them. Increases in prices would wipe out their money almost immediately. The men who would otherwise be building homes would have to postpone such building because they would not be able to afford to buy or build homes if there were no control over the prices to be charged for the homes, or the materials with which new homes

are constructed. If there were no price-control law at all, Mr. President, there would be financial killings by speculators. I am not in favor of that. Another result might be political chaos. I know that there are those who favor, for one reason or another, political chaos and financial killings by speculators. I am not in favor of either, and I shall fight against them to the best of my ability. I am sure that most of the people of this country take the same position that I take with regard to that matter.

So, Mr. President, let us agree to the conference report. It is not what we want. I do not believe it is entirely satisfactory to any Member of the Senate. But it is the best we have, and we cannot take the risk of bringing about confusion which would inevitably follow the abrupt decontrol of goods and commodities.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am sure that the Senator from Vermont and the junior Senator from Oregon are striving for the same objective.

Mr. AIKIN. I am sure that we want the same kind of a bill.

Mr. MORSE. I regret that I find myself in complete disagreement with the Senator in the approach which he is taking in meeting the parliamentary problem before the Senate.

Mr. President, I should like to ask the able majority leader a question in order to lay a legislative foundation for a subsequent judicial interpretation if necessary. Before the majority leader came into the Chamber I pointed out that one of the practices of the OPA, in establishing producers' costs in the dairy industry, had been to measure its adjustments on the basis of the national average cost, thereby resulting in a great deal of disparity and many injustices in certain sections of the country. Particularly in the Northeast, and in the Pacific Northwest dairy costs have been much higher than the national average, with the result that our dairymen have suffered greatly, and a great many dairy herds have been disposed of.

What I wish to know from the able majority leader is whether or not subsection (f) of section 11 will permit adding to the 1941 local price to producers the amount of the average total cost increases in the particular locality since that time.

To put the question in another form, I wish to know whether, under the subsection to which I have referred, it will be possible for OPA, if it succeeds in setting up any administration of this act, to take into account the disparities in cost of production as they exist in various sections of the country.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in order to answer the Senator's question consecutively, I wish to take time to read the section to which he has referred:

(f) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, in the case of any agricultural commodity, the base period shall be the calendar year 1941, and in lieu of computing the maximum prices required or permitted by this section by adding the increase in the weighted average of per unit costs to the base period prices of particular producers, such maximum prices shall be computed by adding such increase to the average 1941 price for such agricultural commodity.

Then, in parentheses, are the following words:

With appropriate adjustments for grade, location, and seasonal differentials.

The language then follows:

As determined and announced by the Secretary of Agriculture.

I have no doubt, and I believe it was the view of the members of the conference committee, that that language meant that differentials should be taken into consideration in respect to location. Otherwise there would have been no purpose in incorporating the word "location" in the language.

Therefore, Mr. President, my answer to the Senator's question is that the Secretary of Agriculture not only may but is practically directed to take those differentials into consideration in determining the items of cost.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, I do not know to what extent any view of mine might influence any judicial tribunal. But as one of the conferees who discussed the matter, and as a member of the committee which discussed it when the language was being drafted, I have no doubt that what I have stated was the intention of the conferees, and will, of course, be the intention of Congress if the law is enacted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his statement, because I want to say that his views, as one who had charge of the bill on the floor, will have great influence in determining the congressional intent when the matter comes before the court.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, as one of the conferees I should like to endorse fully the interpretation just given by the senior Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it seems to me that the chief objective of this country in preventing inflation, is to get production and more production. We need it now. One of the great problems with which we have been faced under the OPA regulations has been that of getting a price ceiling level which would encourage production. In the lumber industry, in the building industry generally, and in many other fields of activity we were not able to obtain production because there was a lack of a realistic price ceiling.

At the same time, Mr. President, I believe that all of us recognize a sense of responsibility, because this is one of the most important measures which have come before the Senate during the post-war period.

The bill, as has been pointed out already, is certainly not a perfect piece of legislation. Yet, I doubt very much whether legislation which comes out of this or any other legislative body is perfect, or at least would seem to be so to partisans on one side or the other.

Mr. President, I believe that it is urgently necessary that next Sunday should not come with no price control whatever. Not very long ago my able colleague from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] whom I see sitting across the aisle, and I were members of a subcommittee which made a 30,000-mile trip around the world, investigating the disposal of Army and Navy surplus property. In Asia and in Europe we had the opportunity to see some of the devastating effects of inflation and what it does to a Nation's economy and to its people.

I happen to have before me a little diary which I kept on that trip. During the time the Senator from Delaware and I were in Athens, Greece, we were furnished with certain figures. I believe that I should read them into the RECORD now because they show something which every person dealing with this subject must keep in mind.

First of all, the drachma rate of exchange amounted to 150 to the dollar in the prewar period.

The official rate at the time we were in Athens amounted to 500 to the dollar.

The semiofficial rate for payments to British troops and to UNRRA amounted to 3,000 to the dollar, and the black market rate was about 6,000 to the dollar.

What is even more important and more illuminating is the fact that during the war period Greece had, as we had in this country, a system of controls. Even under those controls food had risen 10 times over the prewar period, and wages had risen only six times over the prewar period.

A combination of businessmen in Greece—and, strange to say, the left-wing organizations in Greece—had gotten together and had forced the taking off of controls in that unhappy country. What resulted? Food hit figures 92 times the prewar figures, while wages went up only from 30 to 50 times the prewar figures. So the wage earner and the pensioner, was caught in the squeeze, prices rising far more rapidly than did income.

Mr. President, this country has much, and it has much to lose. It seems to me that at this time in our country's history we need, more than ever before, certainly equally as much as in the period during the war, the spirit of cooperation in order to meet this problem. The loss of production from strikes in the automotive, steel, and coal and kindred industries, has done more to place us in a critical situation, so far as inflation is concerned, than have the modifications which have been made in the pending bill.

It is an old American pastime to try to find a whipping boy or goat for some of our problems. I do not believe Mr. Chester Bowles or Mr. Paul Porter should be blamed for what has happened in the field of OPA regulations and their administration. In the dealings I have had with these two gentlemen I have found them to be conscientious public servants. With many of their policies I have disagreed, but that certainly does not mean that they are interested any less in the preservation of the American system. I feel certain that, according to their lights, they are just as much interested in maintaining the American system as is any man sitting on the floor of the Senate today.

However, it seems to me, Mr. President, that the hope of holding the line, in the sense that phrase has been sometimes

used, was scuttled at the time the administration abandoned the wage control policies and abandoned rationing. I think at that time we lost all possibility of holding the line in the real sense of the word.

Recently the New York Times contained a very able editorial dealing with this situation. One problem with which we have been faced has been the squirrel-cage economics that some people seem to deal with these days. They entertain the belief that it is possible to increase costs and increase wages, and that it will not be necessary to increase prices. Of course, that is absurd.

This is what the New York Times had to say on Thursday, June 27. The editorial is a brief one, and I think it is quite apropos that it should be read into the RECORD at this time:

WAGE-PRICE RECORD

The myth that large wage increases could be granted without the need for price increases has been completely exploded by the events in the first half of 1946. The most recent evidence of the inadequacy of this theory is found in the 91-cents-a-ton increase in the ceiling price of anthracite coal, authorized to compensate producers for the wage increases recently granted. The record is replete with similar experiences in other industries:

Steel: A wage increase of 18½ cents an hour was accompanied by a price rise of $5 per ton, an amount equivalent to the entire wage increase.

Bituminous coal: An increase of 18½ cents an hour plus extras made necessary a rise of 40½ cents a ton in the price.

Meat: An increase of 16 cents an hour was accompanied by price increases equivalent to more than two-thirds of that amount.

Railroads: An increase of 16 cents an hour, later made 18½ cents an hour, led to the recently approved 3- to 6-percent rise in freight rates.

Automobiles: An 18½-cents-an-hour increase made necessary an increase of $16 to $60 a car for General Motors. In addition, a further rise of 5 percent has been permitted in order to compensate for the higher costs of steel and other parts which in turn had been caused by higher wages.

These instances are typical. Building materials, work clothing, textiles, and many other products could be added to the list. The full impact of these wage increases has not yet been felt. This is particularly true concerning the price increases permitted for coal, steel, and freight rates. Clearly, workers cannot benefit from wage increases which necessitate price increases and hence limit the rise in real earnings. The only fundamental basis for an expansion in real income is found in increased productivity. When wage increases are sharply in excess of those that can be paid out of production, the inevitable result will be higher prices.

Mr. President, I merely wish to say, in conclusion, that it seems to me that under the parliamentary situation with which we are faced, we have a choice of either passing the bill we are considering or ending up with no bill at all on Sunday evening. We have a clear duty and obligation to adopt the conference report.

It is true, as I pointed out before, that the legislation will not please all elements of our economic community. I believe it is the best legislation that can be achieved at this time. If, perchance, the Senate should not adopt the report, if new legislation could not be passed by Sunday night, and the country were left without any benefit of controls whatever, I believe a great multitude of our people would be very seriously hurt in the months ahead.

Many veterans have returned and are trying to get started in jobs or in business. There are many millions of people who are dependent upon fixed incomes, upon pensions, upon insurance policies. All of these have a vital stake in what we do here today.

Finally, Mr. President, I believe that there is an even greater reason for preserving the economic stability of America. I believe it is only by preserving a sound national economy and a solvent Federal Government that we can perform our full duty in helping to maintain the peace of the world.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I had not intended to say anything on the conference report, but I think perhaps I should speak for a few minutes, and I promise not to take much of the time of the Senate.

I am very much disappointed in the conference report, as I suppose every other Senator is. I do not suppose it suits the conferees, so far as that goes. But in my particular State, and I dare say it is probably true in others, there is very great disappointment because of the poultry, meat, and dairy-products provision.

In Delaware we have been very hard hit by the OPA rulings as to poultry. I have tried my best, as have others, to secure relief. I remember the Senator from Georgia and I were together before representatives of the OPA with reference to a ruling on poultry. However, we received very little satisfaction as to what might be expected with reference to that particular item. I believe we were told that perhaps in August there would be an abundance of poultry anyway, and that then the ceiling would be raised, which does not help us at all. The poultry industry amounts to well up toward $100,000,000 a year in the area from which I come, and that of course strikes at the very root of the economy of so many of our people that they are disappointed.

What makes the situation very difficult for us is the way in which the problem now appears. We cannot vote for what we would like to vote for, and we cannot vote against what we would like to oppose. I suppose every Senator is receiving telegrams—I know I am—from people asking that we work for particular items, that we have this put in or that taken out, and we cannot do it. So we are faced with the problem, as I see it, of either taking the conference report or leaving it.

The Senator from California has told the Senate of some instances of inflation which we observed on our trip. I do not know what the Chinese dollar was worth in American money before the war. I do know that I picked out the cheapest breakfast in Shanghai that I could get, and it cast $240 in Chinese money. In France we were told that we could get a perfectly good 50-cent meal for $17.50. Wherever we went we found that prices had gone out of sight.

Mr. President, I am afraid of such a situation coming about in America, and I am apprehensive that it may result if we let go of all controls. There are those who say we should do away with all price controls. I do not know whether they take that position because they have a hatred of the agencies that have handled price control. I do not know whether they are wrong, or whether I am wrong. I think those in control of prices have had a hard task to perform, and that they have done a great work. I say that notwithstanding the fact that my particular section of the country has been hit about as hard as any other section of the United States by the rulings of OPA. I do not think the OPA made the rulings for the purpose of doing anyone an injury. I think, as a whole, that organization has done a great work for the American people. I do not have any feeling of antagonism toward either Mr. Bowles or Mr. Porter. I have great respect for both of them. If OPA is continued, I hope they will see the situation as it exists in the country today and will realize that there must be a relaxation of controls when supply overtakes demand.

In the last few months 365,000,000 pounds of poultry were in cold storage. That was a time when there should have been a relaxation of control. So far as I am able to judge, there is absolutely no excuse for an attempt to continue price controls when supply reaches, as it did in the case of poultry, a point where it is much higher than the demand. Whenever there can be a relaxation of controls I think it should be made gradually. I think the conferees have tried to bring about a possibility of gradual relaxation. Whether it will work out in practice I do not know. I can only say that so far as poultry is concerned in my section of the country considerable damage has been done. Many millions of pounds of poultry have been driven from the market, and I do not think there can be a return to a normal condition in any reasonable time. I hope those in control will see to it that this situation is not benefiting anyone. I believe the members of the conference committees had the right idea when they provided for a gradual relaxation of controls. If those in control of OPA will do what the conferees had in mind they should do, I believe benefits will result to the people.

Mr. President, I, for one, want no part of the responsibility for bringing about such conditions with respect to rising prices as I have attempted to describe. I will say, in addition to what was stated by the Senator from California, that while we were in Greece 3,500 drachma would buy one American dollar. The price was stabilized after that at 5,500 drachma to the dollar. We saw the state of inflation in that country where there was a scarcity of food. There was a scarcity, of course, of everything else, as Greece had been an invaded country, but food was what everyone had to buy. So the price of food has gone out of sight. Inflation was so great that it was impossible for men to support their families with the work of

their hands. Therefore UNRRA had to support about 75 percent of the people of Greece at the time we were there. If I am wrong, and if the Senator from California has the exact figures, I wish he would correct me. As I remember, however, approximately 75 percent of the people of Greece were supported by UNRRA at that time. Shortage of crops, shortage of production, of manufactures, of everything, had led to the bidding up the price of everything the people needed, until the prices had risen so high that it was impossible for anyone by his hands to make sufficient money to support his family.

Mr. President, that is a condition which I fear in America. If such a condition should come upon us it would not only wipe out the savings of millions of people but it would put millions of others on some kind of an UNRRA, some kind of a charitable or philanthropic organization.

We are told that what we want and need is production. That is true; we do want and need production. I do not know whether adoption of this measure will increase production. I am of the opinion that in our impatience at conditions resulting from the war, we are inclined to abuse or criticize our public officials, and not take into consideration the fact that we have been in a long hard war, and that we are now paying a part of the penalty of such a war.

Mr. President, in spite of the fact that many of our people would like to have OPA wiped out, and take a chance on inflation, or bet on there being no inflation, so far as I am concerned—and I am speaking only my own opinion—I do not think I can afford to take any part of the responsibility for bringing on such conditions in America as the Senator from California and I found to exist in different parts of the world. Therefore, Mr. President, whether it be right or wrong, I have decided to vote for the report on the theory that it is the best plan we now have before us. We cannot vote for what we want. We cannot vote against what we do not want. We can only vote for or against what is before us. Therefore I shall vote for the report.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to speak at length on this bill, but I do wish to make it perfectly clear that I do not consider the bill providing for the extension of the Emergency Price Control Act and the Stabilization Act as it comes to the Senate from conference, and upon which we are about to vote, the kind of a bill that the Senate should pass. While I fear that many features of the conference report are unworkable and cannot be successfully administered, still, considering the fact that the Price Control Act would completely expire at midnight on June 30, I am going to vote for the conference report. It is my considered conclusion that this course is far better than to take a chance on all controls collapsing suddenly at midnight on Sunday night.

Mr. President, the question of continuing price controls and the gradual lessening of them, as I see it, is indeed important to the economy of our country. Those who would remove controls entirely say that they are willing to take a chance and that they feel that prices, through the law of supply and demand, will soon seek their level and that we will not have dangerous inflation.

On the other hand, those who oppose such removal of price controls and favor the gradual lessening of them, a tapering off of them, and who want some price control retained, say that they will not take a chance on removing them or swiftly relaxing them as it might place us in a position of having run-away inflation.

So it is between these two forces that we have contention and disagreement, not only here in the Senate, but throughout the country. Adoption of the report provides the only hope possible for continued control at this time, unless the President should veto the measure, and it should be returned in time for Congress to reconsider it or take action otherwise on it before the expiration date. That might take place. However, I am not willing to take a chance on the country being left without some controls. For that reason I will vote to support the conference report.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I have not changed by mind about how I shall vote on the conference report. I know that I shall not disappoint Senators when I say that I am not going to make a further speech. However, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks numerous telegrams which I have received concerning the OPA situation. As my friend from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] says, they constitute The Voice of the People.

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

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. E. H. MOORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We are wholesale carload distributors of lumber—have been for over 25 years. Under OPA regulations, we have been directly discriminated against and put out of business. Senate-House conference committee report on OPA of no benefit to ourselves or other direct mill shipping lumber. Wholesalers would appreciate your rejecting the report and instruct committee to renew efforts for revision of bill more in line with that passed by the Senate. Will appreciate this consideration as otherwise black market will continue grow bigger and bigger.

ARLING FUNCH LUMBER CO.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator E. H. MOORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Do your utmost against this un-American OPA.

ROGER J. BAINBRIDGE.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator MOORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the following citizens, agree with you 100 percent that OPA is unconstitutional, Communist, un-American, and unnecessary, and the people at the top are positively dishonest.

JAMES J. CORRELL.
ETHEL W. CORRELL.
JOSEPHINE TURNER.
JOHN KUHN.

MADISON, WIS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator E. H. MOORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Tremendously admire your guts for exposing OPA racket. Please accept my thanks as veteran one of millions of citizens backing your fight to kill OPA.

ROBERT BENSON.

OSHKOSH, WIS., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. EDWARD H. MOORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Your speech on OPA today was splendid. Thanks and congratulations.

RICHARD LLOYD JONES.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator E. H. MOORE,
Senator of Oklahoma,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep on fighting this un-American, unconstitutional, and communistic Gestapo, the OPA. Give America back to the American people.

LEE JENKINS.

MCALESTER, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator MOORE, of Oklahoma,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Continue that good fight for freedom of our people as against communistic OPA. You are gaining admiration of all the best and leading people by your good work.

Dr. J. C. BENTLEY.

TULSA, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. ED MOORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your 3-hour speech; it shows your great statesmanship. We admire your efforts to overcome the tyrannies of OPA and the communistic bureaucrats.

OKLAHOMA STATE BOARD CHAPTER PRO AMERICA.

TULSA, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator E. H. MOORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We appreciate what you have done and ask that you extend your moral support to Senator O'DANIEL in his filibuster.

TULSA USED CAR DEALEPS ASSOCIATION,
R. N. MILLER, *Vice President.*

Senator ED MOORE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your great speech upholding American principles. We are back of you 100 percent.

TULSA COUNTY CHAPTER PRO-AMERICA.
By Mrs. C. W. GRIMES.

TULSA, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator ED MOORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We appreciate your fight to abolish OPA entirely; don't weaken.

MILDRED TUTTY,
MURLE TUTTY,
Rev. TURLEY,
CLARA NOE,
MARIE BENT,
ROBERT TURLEY.

ANDARKO, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. ED. H. MOORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up fight to rid country of OPA.

R R. CLARK.
CLARK BOYLES.

TULSA, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator ED MOORE,
Washington, D. C.:
We are with you to the finish on that OPA fight. Our women want food for our families at normal prices. We also want production. Keep up your fight.
MRS. HOMER D. WILSON,
President, Tulsa County Republican Women's Precinct Club.

HANFORD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Honorable MOORE,
Washington, D. C.:
Gratifying to see your efforts in behalf of meat industry against OPA. Billion dollar subsidy appropriation would do more good to help balance budget. Supply and demand is only answer to meat industry problems.
DAVID BERNARD,
Hanford Meat and Provision Co.

PASADENA, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator E. H. MOORE,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on speech against OPA.
J. B. WRIGLEY.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator MOORE of Oklahoma,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Keep up your good work to discontinue OPA and put an end to all the confusion, uncertainty, and black markets that OPA has caused. Let competition, supply, and demand again go into effect for a better, happier, and more prosperous United States.
SORENSEN'S RESTAURANT,
Anoka, Minn.

LOCKLAND, OHIO, *June 28, 1946.*
Senator MOORE,
Senator from Oklahoma,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Heartiest congratulations to a real American. Keep up the good work to get rid of the octopus. God and all true Americans are with you.
The KING, GROLL, OSTERMANN, AND ALMER FAMILIES.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. ED. H. MOORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
In this day of political cowardice it is most heartening to find a man who is willing to stand up and speak out courageously. Your speech in the OPA will live long and if this Nation lives it will be recorded with the declaration of freedom which Franklin, Clay, and Jefferson gave us. I congratulate you upon your forthright statement in saving our country from those who seek to put it in shackles.
WALTER S. HALLANAN.

QUINCY, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator MOORE,
United States Senate Office,
Washington, D. C.:
Please join Senator O'DANIEL, filibuster OPA out of existence Sunday midnight.
FRANK H. WHEELOCK.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator MOORE,
Republican, Oklahoma,
Care United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Why don't you help Senator LEE O'DANIEL in his fight; it seems to be your duty?
MRS. LUCILLE ROBINSON.

DETROIT, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator MOORE,
Senate Chambers, Washington, D. C.:
Mere consumer urges your active support O'DANIEL to defeat this or any OPA extension.
JOHN M. DAVENPORT, Jr.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator ED MOORE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
An Oklahoman in Washington says "Keep up your good work; stretch 3 hours to 3 days."
WM. GILL, Jr.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator ED MOORE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Your help was grand in saving America from OPA which is part of plan for complete socialism. Thanks, great work.
BEN WILEMAN,
Oklahoma City, Okla.

ST. LOUIS MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. E. H. MOORE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
You are right; hold the floor and keep talking.
DAN O'BRIEN,
Member, Retail Grocers Ass'n.

AUSTIN, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator MOORE, *of Oklahoma,*
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Appreciate your efforts in the fight. Here's strength to you.
J. COCHRAN.

TARENTUM, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. E. H. MOORE,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We urgently request you to support Senator O'DANIEL on the floor in his courageous fight to restore the American form of government. Here's hoping we can start out Monday morning free and unhampered by asinine OPA curbs and restrictions, free to let the laws of supply and demand and common sense work out our economy.
E. C. West, J. E. Scheid, F. F. Huber, R. L. Shaffer, Cecelia Miscosky, Esther Miscosky, Alice Stitt, F. R. Lardin, T. H. Bender, F. E. West.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. E. H. MOORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Press dispatches indicate you are waging a mighty battle against price control extension. More power to you. However, if price control is extended, lumbermen will appreciate your influence to insure for wholesalers and distributors the same protection Taft amendments provide for manufacturers and processors. The Wherry, Capehart, and Wolcott amendments made this provision, but Senate-House conferees were indefinite. Unless corrected by allowing wholesalers and distributors their historic margins, this segment of industry faces disaster. Your interest in our cause will be much appreciated.
LEGISLATION COMMITTEE, THE CINCINNATI LUMBERMEN'S CLUB.

GUTHRIE, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
ED MOORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Support "PAPPY" O'DANIEL in killing OPA.
SAM J. BELL.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. E. H. MOORE,
Senator Washington, D. C.
SIR: OPA is ruining the country. The thinking people are greatly opposed to the continuation of the OPA.
T. A. BLAKELEY,
President, Mortgage Corp. of Texas.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. E. H. MOORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We need more men like you in Congress. Best regards.
O. G. BITLER.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. E. H. MOORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Since 1908 we have operated retail lumber business in North College Hill, Ohio, under OPA regulations we have been directly discriminated against and put out of business. Senate-House conference committee report on OPA of no benefit to retail lumber dealers. The report should be rejected and the committee instructed to renew efforts for revision of bill more in line with that originally passed by the Senate. If this is not done black market will continue to flourish and legitimate concerns with enviable records for years will be out of business.
KNOLLMAN LUMBER CO.

GLENDALE, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator MOORE,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Everybody here with you 100 percent. Keep talking.
ERWIN BURMAN.

DENVER, COLO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator MOORE of Oklahoma,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
You're making history. Stick to your guns. Our employees have been playing baseball account unable to buy cattle within compliance. Please save our industry.
CAPITAL PACKING CO.

LOCKPORT, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
United States Senator E. H. MOORE,
United States Senator From Oklahoma,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill OPA. Talk it to death.
RAYMOND RUHLMAN.

WILLIAMSVILLE, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator MOORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep the good word going. Beat the OPA.
H. P. SHEPHERD.

SPRINGFIELD, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator MOORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations and thanks for your speech to the Senate on OPA. You are just 100 percent correct and most citizens agree.
W. W. TROIT.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator MOORE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
More power to you. Millions of Americans back you. War is over, so should the OPA.
JOSEPH A. WADE.

SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator E. H. MOORE, of Oklahoma,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Good work. Hope you kill the OPA.
T. M. BAILEY.

BUFFALO, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator E. H. MOORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. Hope you kill the OPA.
GEORGE P. URBAN, Jr.

LOUISVILLE, KY., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator MOORE,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up your good work. A real-estate widow. God bless you.
Mrs. FORST.

SALISBURY, N. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator MOORE, of Oklahoma,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
The United States needs less of Chester Bowles, Paul Porter, and OPA. Meat, poultry, and dairy products must be freed from price control now.
GLENN E. KETNER.

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator E. H. MOORE,
Washington, D. C.:
You are doing a splendid job. Keep up the good work.
L. WEHERING LUMBER CO.

HOLLYWOOD, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator E. H. MOORE,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. America's behind you.
A PROPERTY OWNER.

BUFFALO, N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. Senator E. H. MOORE,
United States Senate, Washington D. C.:
I urge you to do your utmost in repealing the OPA amendment as I feel that by eliminating this destructful agency industry will increase production from the present 40 percent to 50 percent to capacity rate, thus bringing America back on a free competitive basis. The OPA has failed on all counts with prices soaring each day and the distribution system of commodities practically destroyed. OPA has stifled everything dead in its tracks.
F. J. WARNER.

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator E. H. MOORE,
Washington, D. C.:
You are doing a splendid job keep up the good work.
CORPUS CHRISTI BRICK & LUMBER CO.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator E. H. MOORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
For the safety of the Republic, Federal control of individual economics must cease forthwith. OPA must not be permitted to continue any longer its pernicious tampering with our American way of life. Your efforts to that end will be considered by 100,000,000 people as a master stroke for our country equal to the winning of the war.
E. O. EDWARDS.

BERKLEY, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator E. H. MOORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work we are all with you.
FRANK PUSEY.

BALTIMORE, MD., *June 28, 1946.*
Senators MOORE, of Oklahoma, and O'DANIEL, of Texas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We commend your stand on OPA, CIO, PAC. The war is over. OPA has fulfilled its objective, should be permanently abolished, eliminating black markets. It is time that business be permitted to pursue its normal course. Continuance of OPA policies are definitely detrimental to good business ethics. When business is permitted to function normally supply and demand will regulate prices through competition.
KIRSON CONSTRUCTION CO.

DENVER, COLO., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator MOORE,
Republican, Oklahoma, Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Long of opinion OPA should terminate and natural economic laws function. Believe many of our opinions has been reticent to speak up. Keep fighting.
GEORGE W. MASTEN, Jr.
GEORGE C. HAHN.

ANDREWS, S. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. E. H. MOORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Am sure the majority of the American people will stand behind you in your fight to overthrow the OPA. More power to you.
D. D. OVERTON, Jr.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator MOORE,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your courageous stand against vicious OPA.
THOMAS J. POTTS.

MUSKOGEE, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator E. H. MOORE,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
Please assist Senator O'DANIEL in his filibuster so that the American people can return to the form of government they have been so long without.
RALPH H. ROLSTON.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Oklahoma Senator E. H. MOORE,
Washington, D. C.:
Hope it is possible for you to join with W. LEE O'DANIEL in his proposal to talk the OPA out of existence and help save the country from the bureaucrats.
WRIGHT TITUS.

MUSKOGEE, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator E. H. MOORE,
Care Senate Chambers,
Washington, D. C.:
No doubt you agree with Senator O'DANIEL in his filibuster movement to kill OPA. For said action we are grateful.
WM. WILSON LUMBER CO.

BARTLESVILLE, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. EDWARD H. MOORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D C.
Today sent the following wire to Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL: Quote, Just read in newspaper that you contemplate fighting OPA extension to the best of your ability. If filibuster was ever justified it is more than justified against enemies of the American form of government. More power to you from me and the majority of American citizens who wish to retain the American way of life—unquote.
A. ARUTUNOFF.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Oklahoma Senator MOORE,
Washington, D. C.:
I deeply appreciate your efforts. Frankly, as both a dairy farmer and a creamery operator I am convinced that our Nation's dairy industry will suffer great disaster if OPA controls are kept on dairy products.
S. E. KNOWLTON,
Owner Knowlton's Creamery.

TULSA, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator E. H. MOORE, of Oklahoma,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on fight against OPA. Hope you join O'DANIEL's filibuster.
C. P. ALLEN.
W. O. MORSE.
D. W. FARNHAM.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I had intended to make a speech against the conference report. I intended to do so yesterday. I had some notes prepared, but I started to read telegrams expressing the voice of the people, and I read so many of them that we ran short of time. We recessed a little after midnight last night. The speech which I have prepared, and did not have an opportunity to make yesterday, is so long that time would not permit me to make it now under the limitation of debate. I have conferred with our majority leader. I have told him that in order to expedite consideration of the conference report I would dispense with making my speech at this time if he thought it would be possible for me to obtain unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the telegrams which I did not have an opportunity to read on the floor of the Senate yesterday. It seems that the reading of those telegrams has caused a change of sentiment in some quarters. A rumor is now circulating to the effect that the President may veto the bill, which leads me to believe that he has looked at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and has read what I said last night. If that happens, it will be simply another way of accomplishing what I wished to accomplish, because I wish to see the OPA eliminated, abolished, and done away with. I hope he will veto it, but I do not believe he will.

While reference has been made in some quarters to the effect that I have been engaged in a filibuster, the RECORD will disclose that there has been no filibuster. I have simply read into the RECORD telegrams from citizens of this Nation expressing their views about OPA and making some comments of my own on the conference report designed to extend the life of OPA. These telegrams can truly be considered as "the voice of the people."

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

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Three hundred citizens of East Flatbush, Brooklyn, signed petitions today to extend OPA without any crippling amendments. They are outraged at your proposed filibuster and demand that you carry out the will of the people which is to extend OPA as is. They will hold you responsible for any trifling with the lives of the American people. Signed petitions on file with Senator Barkley.

HALDANE AND EAST FLATBUSH CLUBS OF COMMUNIST PARTY.

NEW YORK., N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

We fought for the right to live. Death or OPA will make living impossible. Urge end of filibuster and complete support of OPA.

MR. AND MRS. MICHAEL SAPHIER.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

You have been raised in a nuts patch. OPA must survive.

W. D. KING.

GALVESTON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Forwarding to you 1,376 signatures on petitions collected today in which citizens pledge refusal to buy any commodities except the bare necessities of life until elected representatives legislate continuance OPA bill with full price control to allow citizens maintain families on equitable standard of living within present wages.

H. K. DEUCHARE,
Agent National Maritime Union.

DETROIT, MICH., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations. Glad to see we have one American with guts in the Senate.

Ex-Col. BRUCE R. DODDS.

ERIE, PA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Americans Veterans' Committee demand that for once you think of the national interest instead of your own. Stop obstructing OPA.

ERIE CHAPTER,
AMERICAN VETERANS' COMMITTEE.

ENNIS, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations. Keep up good fight against OPA.

W. G. WOOD.
F. L. WADSWORTH, Jr.
T. Q. MOSELEY.
BILL MCCALL.

MARTINSBURG, W. VA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Try your best to keep talking until the OPA expires Sunday night. Abraham Lincoln freed the Negro slaves. Help us to free ourselves from the d—— blood-sucking leeches in Washington who want to artificially control our lives.

HOMER N. PANKEY.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Sir, I think your actions on the OPA legislation are outrageous and a mockery to our system of government. Please do not go through with your intended filibuster.

HAROLD KLARMAN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As a Texas lawyer with a lawyer father and family in Texas, I oppose your OPA stand and urge you to support OPA.

GERALD WEATHERLY.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

If your filibuster kills OPA the public will not forget O'DANIEL when they see their savings vanish in the consequent inflation.

JOLIS.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 28, 1946.*
W. LEE SAPPY O'DANIEL,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

The eyes of Texas are upon you as well as 47 other foreign States. If you can secure an interpreter I would suggest you read Constitution and the American Bill of Rights during your filibuster as you indicate you need help. Please reply.

J. S. ANTONY ADAM YANKEE.

MIAMI, FLA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

To a grand Governor from Texas we of the State of Florida are rooting for you. Don't stop talking.

Mrs. DAVID GEORGE.

CRESSON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Wish you all the success in your efforts against OPA.

SLOCUM BROS.

ODESSA, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
PAPPY LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I've always been against you but now I'm for you. You did your best to kill OPA. Wish I had been there to of helped you out.

L. R. CARTER,
Carter Hardware Co.

RUSK TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL, OF TEXAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

You are performing the greatest public service of your career. Keep talking. You can expect bureaucrat parasite employees, their friends, and relatives to try to keep jobs, but unorganized and until yesterday unrepresented Americans will back you.

J. PERRIN WILLIS.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Thank God that not all of the Senate Members are selfish little men. That silly filibuster of yours in this humble man's opinion should make the free-enterprisers mighty happy.

E. J. STIDSTON.

ENID, OKLA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your effort to kick the two-bit Hitlers out.

O. L. STITH,
SARAH STITH.

FORT DODGE, IOWA, *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington D. C.:

Congratulations on your stand against OPA. We surely hope Iowa Senators will back you.

L. R. SCHRADER STEAK HOUSE.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington D. C.:

My address is 420 West Alabama; we hope you will kill the OPA and get the Government out of private enterprises so business of America can survive.

R. C. WORTHY.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 28, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As a veteran and resident of Illinois, I want to register a strong disapproval of your filibuster against necessary price controls.

WARD H. WHIPPLE.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your courageous stand in behalf of your constituents and your convictions against extension of the bungling, bureaucratic, undemocratic OPA. We appreciate your standing for right even though you had no support whatsoever.

P. C. NAYLOR,
Manager, Austin Hi-way Lumber Co.

DETROIT, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

We fought for your security. Demand that you relinquish floor for passage of OPA extension.

TWENTY-THREE VETERANS, WORLD WAR II REGISTRATION DIVISION, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION.

HIGHLAND, MICH., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL OF TEXAS,
Washington, D. C.:

Good for you. Keep on talking. Kill OPA. Detroit is rotten both with Republican and Democrat New Dealers.

CHAS. NEEDHAM.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We demand that you stop shameful attack on welfare of American people. Citizens of Texas and the country cannot buy the necessities of life if OPA dies.

A GROUP OF TEXANS IN WASHINGTON.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Was certain when we Texans sent you to Senate that you would represent us brilliantly. Your stand on OPA disproves our belief.

WILLIAM WALTER,
Dallas, Tex.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Appreciate your sincere efforts. Unfortunately, we do not have more men of your courage and understanding in Washington.
BRYAN SPARKS.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We heartily endorse your stand on OPA. More power to you.
Leo Owens, Mrs. Owens, F. F. Bell, J. F. Perkins, Mrs. J. F. Perkins, Howard Hollingsworth, J. W. Cole, H. H. Hollingsworth, J. F. Berrias, H. H. Kelton, Chas. Day, L. M. Peacock, J. R. Allison, John F. Perkins.

AUSTIN, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We are heartily in accord with you in your stand against OPA. It is time that the bureaucrats with their petty ways are ousted.
JAMES MILLER.
S. M. BYRNE.
OMER DREILING.
JAMES E. FERGUSON.
FREEMAN TAYLOR.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Throw OPA into trash can. Chester Bowles yesterday dismissed 18 pending suits against price violators in Houston alone, showing their cases have no merit. How much longer must taxpayers be burdened with such an outfit as Bowles is operating, unless, of course, they stay to have expensive jobs. Air-mailing paper today.
P. G. SACKENREUTHER.

MIDLAND, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We hope you stay in there and get us farmers some relief from OPA. We are behind you.
O. C. COLLINS.
R. O. BROOKS.
W. B. FRANKLIN.
R. C. VEST.
R. D. JONES.

AUSTIN, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Read this one, sir: Austin Chapter, Americans Veterans Committee, wonders who you're speaking for. Certainly not Texans, veterans, or common citizens. Suggest you do something constructive for a change, like being quiet and/or voting for OPA.
STUART LONG
(For 125 Texas veterans).

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
The "meadow dressing" you are spreading not only stinks but has no fertilizing qualities.
W. J. BRIGGLE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate:
For over 2 years my wife and I have been working practically day and night, working as much as 18 to 20 hours a day, in an effort to establish ourselves in an honest, reputable business. Our net returns have been but fair and our worries many, but we have kept doggedly to our work in the hope of someday having a well-established business. We have no desire to work as hard as we do and would like to limit ourselves to a 10-hour day, but this would mean hiring additional employees and would result in very little, if any, profit for our efforts, so to make some profit on the venture, we are forced to work these many hours each day. A little over 3 months ago the OPA director here ordered price ceilings for us that were asinine for this type of operation and evidently a complete lack of knowledge as to this type of business, and demonstrated a decided lack of even good business judgment. Were we to invoke the prices set forth, we would suffer a gross loss on sales. That is a loss on just the difference between income from sales and cost of sales and is before operating expenses, administered expenses, etc. Were we to adopt those prices, we would be in a position of "hot dog" vendor who bought his "hot dogs" for a dime and sold them for a nickel. He'd have a tremendous business and maybe have a lot of fun. But he wouldn't last very long. Similarly, we would last just about 2 weeks, at which time we would have been wiped out. When this was pointed out to the OPA, we were allowed some relief, in that the new prices would have wiped us out in about a month instead of in 2 weeks. The unfair price was again brought to the attention of the OPA and a new set of prices were given us. All of this, mind you, by pure guesswork and without business basis or justification. This final price ceiling is still silly for this type of operation, and we are now forced to operate in violation of the OPA and will continue to do so in an effort to scrape together by our combined 135 hours a week of hard labor, just the means of a fair living and the building of a small, honest business. Senator O'DANIEL, is this too much to ask? Isn't this the American way of life or has that way changed? Thanks a lot for starting your talk of enlightenment, for which you shall long be remembered and ever be highly regarded. We do hope and pray that you will continue your talk through Sunday midnight and a few hours beyond, just to play safe. You may be sure that every fair-minded American is with you in your fight to restore the American way of life to the American people. Please see the fight through to a finish. Thanks.
H. N. DIXON.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Texas is the largest State in the Union but Mr. O'DANIEL is not nearly as big as Texas or as large as the United States of America. The Senator pro tempore cannot and must not slaughter the Office of Price Administration, causing an unparalleled rise in food costs to the little people. Why cannot the Senator see that the small people need a control that his eminence is opposed to.
W. M. CROSBY.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:
Stop your foolish filibuster. I served on Guam. Please sit down.
JOHN S. TODD.

HOLLYWOOD, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:
Stop sillybustering at wives of overseas veterans; both did our patriotic duty. Unpatriotic action detours us. Forget patronage. Remember us and others. Keep OPA.
MRS. FRANCES M. TODD.
SILLYBUSTERING PPC.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:
Your activities are unpatriotic. Millions will suffer. Please sit down.
Dr. J. W. TODD.

MONAHANS, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
If you are talking for me you can shut up.
T. L. TODD.

BEAUMONT, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
I am a 2-by-4 groceryman. Have never voted for you before. Stay in there and pitch. Will vote for you next time.
HUBERT MONCRIEF.

ENNIS, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
The fight you are making for your people is appreciated.
M. W. GLASPY.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
More power to you. Greatest need for America that OPA be eliminated. All Oklahoma behind you; also Wheeler, Tex.
BEN WILEMAN.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Texas can do it. Keep it up.
WM. GILL, Jr.

YANKTON, S. DAK., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
As an old Texan who put my buck in the flour barrel years ago, luck to you.
E. P. BELLAMY.

FORT WORTH, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
The eyes of Texas are upon you and proud of you. Don't stop. Kill OPA.
Mr. and Mrs. LEON KANE.

EL PASO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
I am glad that the junior Senator from Texas put his country before politicis. Only a statesman would undertake your present task. Wish you success.
JOHN G. OECHSNER.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Capitol,
Washington, D. C.:
To bad people who voted for you have to regret it with a betraying knife between their shoulder blades.
JOHN HANSARD.

DALLAS, TEX., *July 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We are with you.
JOHN F. MYERS.

HEREFORD, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
We wish you success in your fight for the people to get rid of OPA and all the other elements of Government which would deprive the people of their freedom.
TOM SANDERS.

COLLEGE STATION, TEX.,
June 27, 1946.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.
Your filibuster stinks. We hope to have enough money left to vote against you when you run again, that is, if you have enough guts. We remain, four ex-servicemen who came back to this. If OPA goes, you can, too.
LOHN.
CRAIN.
JONES.
TEAGUE.

CORSICANA, TEX.,
June 27, 1946.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on your stand. We beg you to save us from the OPA. Stay on the people's side. Freedom from fear. There is more fear in this country now than ever in the history of the United States. Those in favor of OPA are in favor of higher prices. Do away with OPA, and competition will lower prices. The strikes caused by the unions and OPA control is causing a depression right now. Business is off. Do away with OPA and let merchandise come through. The war is over. OPA was a war measure. Surely they don't want to keep OPA until the next war. Do all you can to save us now. If OPA goes on, a depression will surely follow.
Sincerely,
GEO. DANIELS,
Care Simon Daniels Co.

AUSTIN, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
The people of Texas are disappointed in you. Do not filibuster, and let the OPA bill pass.
E E. ORNALD, Jr.
A. G. LONEY.

CHATHAM, N. J., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill the OPA and become Texas' greatest man since Sam Houston.
R. S. HUGHES.

REDWOOD CITY, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Hurrah for Texas. Here is some help for for your filibuster. I prefer to run my business the American way and minus the OPA.
L. CASARETTO.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
The American flag is as beautiful in coloring and as artistic in design as ever but its unseen beauty, liberty, and freedom are no longer there. May God guide you in your unselfish attempt to restore our constitutional rights to us.
MARY O'DONOHOE.

DETROIT, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We are in back of your filibuster. The OPA refuses to set my rent at that prevailing in the neighborhood. They use seven of the slum houses in Detroit to prove that my modern home should rent for no more and that this is their practice always. We property owners are being robbed of our homes.
MRS. ALOYSIUS VERHOVEN.

BRIDGEPORT, CONN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: The war is over; give us back the American form of government. By all means try and talk till Monday. Talk them to death.
M. TAGER,
A Haggard Businessman of Bridgeport, Conn.

BURLINGTON, N. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
I hope God will give you strength to talk until Monday morning so that we may wake up under the American form of government. I hope there will be others who will have the good old American spirit and fall in line with you. We are getting sick and tired of every individual being told what he can and can't do. Best wishes.
J. H. SMITH.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: I am all for your efforts to eliminate OPA and rid ourselves of that communistic influence.
J. F. HUBBARD.

MISSOULA, MONT., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
The purpose of this telegram is to assure you of our sincere appreciation and to let you know you have the high regard and support of every livestock producer and member of the packing industry in the State of Montana as well as the Nation. You have the courage of your convictions and have set an example that will prove to be an inspiration to every one of us.
MONTANA MEAT PACKERS ASSOCIATION,
E. S. HOLMES, *President.*

SAFFORD, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
We are gratified to know that you are taking every possible means to eliminate OPA and all it stands for. We, the people of Arizona, are behind you 100 percent and only hope that you can continue this good work until midnight Sunday. Best wishes for your continued success.
JENNINGS LUMBER CO.
LOUIS JENNINGS.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Backing you with prayer to defeat OPA.
MRS. MADSON.
GLADYS AMUNDSON.

ELDORADO, ARK., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank you for your efforts in defeating the vicious and communistic bureaucratic OPA.
Dr. J. G. MITCHELL.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Floor, Capitol,
Washington, D. C.:
The American people have already liquidated OPA, only Chester Bowles and Members of Congress have not yet discovered the fact. We are at the cross roads. Do you gentlemen have the courage to vote to return us to free markets, a free economy with enough meat, butter, fats, clothing, for our people, and enough fuel oil for heat this winter or will you continue to vote the communicrats the power to ruin and destroy our country? The farmers, the women, the shopkeepers, the small business people don't want OPA. Can't you men realize that? Keep up the fight, Mr. O'DANIEL. Texans never have the reputation of being quitters. Thousands of people are counting on you. I'm from Houston, unfortunately visiting in Washington.
SAMMY LANE.

BROCKTON, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Good work. Millions of Americans are with you. Rid America of un-American OPA.
E. A. HOLLANDER.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Your heroic stand on the floor of the Senate on behalf of commercial democracy demands the unqualified commendations of every farsighted and progressive American.
C. A. GOULD.

KIRKWOOD, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: You have my encouragement to keep up the fight to save America. America will only be America with the capitalistic form of government, the individual being able to buy or sell in a competitor market.
Sincerely yours,
GEO. J. CLARK.
CLAYTON, MO.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Senator, stay in and keep pitching. We need bread and meat for our working people.
G. DEVITA.

BAINBRIDGE, GA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I wish you 100-percent success. Keep up the good work.
J. E. WHITE.

HANFORD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. L. O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Gratifying to see your efforts in behalf of meat industry against OPA. Billion-dollar subsidy appropriation would do more good to help balance budget. Supply and demand is only answer to meat-industry problems.
DAVID BERNARD HANFORD MEAT & PROVISION CO.

DENVER COLO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations to you on your stand on OPA. John Hancock Lee Raley, of Dallas vacationing in Denver, Colo.
JOHN HANCOCK.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washigton, D. C.:
Kill the OPA.
NORTHWEST DUROC BREEDERS ASSOCIATION,
Beaverton, Oreg.

BENTONVILLE, ARK., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I am for you 100 percent. If only had more Senators like you and Senator MOORE, of Oklahoma. Senator WHERRY was right when he said the OPA didn't know one critter from another. Last year a cowman from Osage County, Okla., wrote the OPA to get feed to fatten his 400 steers and they wired fatten half of them and keep the other half for breeding purposes.
JAY FIERCE.

TROY, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Success for your filibuster. Is haymaking time. Pick-up balers, use baling wire, or special twine. None to be had on account of OPA ceiling. Manufacturers cannot make or will not release farm machinery, and parts are tied up same way.
BERT FAVORITE.
TROY, OHIO.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Please keep up the good work. We're pulling for you.
JACK DEMING.

PACOIMA, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Defend the American way. Repudiate the office of prolonged agony.
C. H. ROBINSON.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Laud your efforts. Defeat OPA.
Mrs. BUSCHE and Mrs. NEWELL.
LILLIAN SCHOENING.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
You are to be highly congratulated on your stand against the OPA. Hope you will continue.
E. A. FARRISS.

FORT PIERCE, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Please hold out to kill OPA so we can get some meat.
A. E. Sasser, Mrs. Ebner, Mrs. Thompson, Fred R. Carlile, A. J. Cummer, Buelah Mackson, Carl A. Johnson, Mrs. C. W. Nicholson, Jr., New Hoard Neu; Mrs. Earl Copenhaver, H. W. Kendall, N. L. Kendall, F. Smith, H. H. McFern, B. A. Robinson, H. W. Forbes, Mrs. G. R. Sammons, Roy Carlile, Dill Forsyth, Mrs. J. W. Knowles, Thelina Weaver, Mrs. Karl Gorcy, Mrs. Carl Lignoski, F. E. Cramer, H. E. Goforth, C. A. Cleveland, New Hoard Newu.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill OPA. Free Americans from present bondage.
RODINE, YOCUM, AND MILLER.

TAMPA, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
SIR: My company and other automobile dealers of Tampa are solidly behind your position against OPA. We are wishing you the best of luck in your filibuster proceedings.
HARGROVE USED CARS.

JOLIET, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
As Teddy Roosevelt said, "Bully, bully" for your intention to talk the OPA to death. We hope you do, as it is the most unjust, unfair, and obnoxious department ever created in our Government. We are with you and hope you win. Bully, boy.
HUGH H. BOLTON.

SPOKANE, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill OPA. Today's breakfast, two eggs, one slice bread (OPA regulations), no butter; 40 cents requested; bread charged extra, 15 cents for two slices toast.
S. L. UTSEY.

PANAMA CITY, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We approve of your filibuster and wish you luck in your fight to kill the OPA, as we believe Americans have sense enough to tend to their own business; also it will remove 70,000 parasites from the taxpayers' shoulders.
CITIZENS OF BAY COUNTY, FLA.

SPOKANE, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*
FILIBUSTER HURRAH, INC.,
Care Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Democracy threatened with OPA bureaucratic strangulation. History should record your filibuster greatest step toward morality in Government in 15 years. Kiss Chester Bowles for me.
C. J. NYALDNER HIWAY FEED STORE.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Every good wish for success in your filibuster against OPA. Hope you kick it back where it belongs. If you need filibustering material, will gladly send you Encyclopedia Britannica.
GEORGE O. BETTIS.

SAVANNAH, GA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Indiscriminate use of veto power will result either in abolishment of the power or destruction of representative government. Suggest you discuss abdication of Reichstag under Hitler, also American Revolution resulting from deadlock George III and Parliament, also corruption of courts under Hitler, also discuss Charles I and Cromwell.
KARL M. FLEEHURST.

STORMLAKE, IOWA, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, United States Capitol,
Washington, D. C.:
Filibuster the OPA law out of existence and the OPA Gestapo set up by men who tried to make many laws similar to Hitler's dictator ideas. Let us free business enterprise in the United States of America.
C. V. LARSON.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep the good work up. We are for you.
P. J. O'BRIEN.

BURLINGTON, VT., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We are fighting with you. Great job.
HAROLD R. LEACH.

WEST LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Care of Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Hoping you successfully wage your battle against the OPA.
R. E. DE CAPRIO.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Please filibuster the OPA out of existence.
CHARLES E. NIEHUSS, M. D.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your stand against OPA. Our heartfelt gratitude to you in your fight to give the country back to the people.
Mr. and Mrs. DANIEL HURLEY.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Three hundred rooms vacant due to OPA. Congratulations your fight.
FAE BOLLINGER,
GI's Wife.

SPOKANE, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Successful filibuster will restore businessmen's confidence in democratic government. My business contacts with feed dealers and farmers throughout Pacific Northwest proves disgust for OPA.
VYTOBOLATOR SALES CO.,
GEORGE E. SMITH.

BURLINGTON, VT., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Doing a fine job; keep it up.
W. E. PLAISTED, Jr.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
You did your part trying to save country from Office of Price Administration un-American domination. Hope you keep on fighting for Americanism. OPA in present form gives New Deal Communist pay rollers opportunity to continue stifling production, life of Nation, and wresting long-established enterprises from legitimate owners and turning them over to thieving Communists and fellow travelers and profiting through operation of foreign-born black marketeers, and that, I believe, is the main thing OPA'ers wanted. Keep on fighting, for America is awakening and will some day throw the rascals out.
WILEY S. SMITH.
Lexington Hotel.

HEREFORD, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
I wish to encourage you in your actions to rid the Government of those bureaucrats, including OPA, which stand in the way of a democratic government.
JAMES W. WITHERSPOON.

MIAMI BEACH, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
You will be most popular presidential candidate if you kill OPA.
E. T. BOURDEN.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work; we are behind you.
HAROLD CURRY.

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
As an income property owner, a southern woman, and a widow dependent upon her rentals, I congratulate a fellow countryman for the courage of his convictions in setting aright a hopelessly tragic situation of antiquated earnings and soaring expense on one hand and tempting black-market offers on the other, which we of honest purpose who own multiple building know and are forced to suffer. Tell 'em Mr. Texan and God bless you.
LOUISE S. TOWNELEY,
149–1513 South Elm Drive.

WILMINGTON, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Please accept my encouragement in your filibuster against OPA. You are showing the same courage that the Texans demonstrated at the battle of the Alamo. Assisted by brave men from every State of the Union I am sure that many courageous men of the Senate will rally around you today to save this Nation from OPA as our forefathers rallied to save Texas.
FRANK L. ALEXANDER.

FORT WORTH, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Hold the floor in the filibuster for 48 hours. There is 6,000,000 votes in Texas for you. We are very grateful for your efforts put forth in this piece of legislation.
AUBREY C. MITCHELL,
1312 Richmond Street, Fort Worth, Tex.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank you for your gallant fight against bureaucrats' oppression.
PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION.

EL DORADO, ARK., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
You have opportunity to save this Nation.
H. B. GEEVES.

SHELTER ISLAND, N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
The OPA and prohibition both noble experiments—never can work. Filibuster this OPA that is crippling this country and you might be the next President.
ARTHUR W. CORSE,
575 West End Avenue, New York City.

ATLANTA, GA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Don't lose your grip on the viper. Kill it completely.
MRS. LAURA B. JONES.

CHESTERFIELD, MO., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Honorable Senator, keep talking, we are with you.
CHESTERFIELD FARMERS ELEVATOR & SUPPLY CO.

CHATTAHOOCHEE, FLA., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. L. O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
If OPA is allowed to continue, the Nation will be on starvation in 30 days. So keep talking.
G. B. ROSS.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill the OPA. Kill the black market.
NORCO METAL PRODUCTS CO.

MARFA, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
First time you have done anything we approve of.
PAISANO HOTEL,
E. S. POWERS, *Manager.*

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
SIR: I hope that this message reaches you before you give out; and I might add we in Texas, after many, many years, are glad for a humble flour salesman with intestinal fortitude to fight another bureau. You will probably lose, but that shall not change our affection for you, because the writer is raising a family of one 17-year-old son, twin daughters, 15, and another cotton-top 10-year-old boy, and also the writer does not want, after educating these people, for them to become a part of a bureau set-up by our dear Government nor a potato-weighing, tire-inflating cog in any chain store or other chain who buys from the War Assets Administration on a 30-day credit and sells the merchandise, reinvests the money again, buys, reinvests the money from our dear Government, while the poor veteran must pay cash in advance before he gets the merchandise. You will probably be called another Huey P. Long, but there is one consolation: you have even the late President turned to Texas and allowed his picture to appear on a 25-foot billboard shaking the hand of a big dear friend to break the flour salesman out with all due respect to our past commander, God rest his soul. Our bureaucratic friend lost the race and the poor little flour salesman wound up in Washington. You don't know me; I don't know you. God bless your heart if you can kill one bureau. Like Jack the Giant Killer, they may hate you, but Texas loves you and respects you and elects you. Fight as long as you can, and we may add that if you want talking time, try to name the bureaus that have been set up by our puppet Government, plus Phillip Murray, plus John L. Lewis, and you can talk for 3 years by just naming the bureaus that have been set up for little Murph. You might add in your talk, since our dear bureaucrat Government hasn't thought of it, why they can't think of a bureau to establish a one-room apartment for GI Joe and the other fellows that can't find a place to stay for wife and kiddies. We stop now not to embarrass you, not to pay you homage, but to raise our kids in our American public schools to where they will not have to weigh potatoes, wipe a windshield, scrub a bathroom, or join the other bureaus or chain organizations that are gradually taking charge of our God-loving country.
J. O. CLOYD,
A Small Businessman That Worked His Way Without Any Education From a Bootblack to a Businessman.

PITTSFIELD, MASS., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations for your courage to protect the American worker from unemployment and business from bankruptcy.
JOHN J. ROSE.

ALAMOGORDO, N. MEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. You have our support.
E. M. DALE, JR.,
ALEX WYKA,
W. H. ASHBY.

MIAMI, FLA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building:
Hurray. It's about time someone protected the Government and our beloved county apartment-house owner who does not intend to increase his rent.
HENRY R. PIQUETTE.

LAINGSBURG, MICH., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Stay with your program. Filibuster the OPA out the window.
MARY D. WILLIAMS.

DOVER, OHIO, *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Amend rent and save Tuscarawas County.
RICHARD CLEMENS.

BURLINGTON, VT., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work.
JACK LINDSAY.

NEW PHILADELPHIA, OHIO, *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
More power to you. Keep up the good work.
CARL E. RICHARD.

LANSING, MICH., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL:
Please put shevik on the end of Chester's name and send him back to his own country and if he can ruin that half as much as he has ours maybe they won't come over here and lick us.
ERASTUS BAKER.

WEEHAWKEN, N. J., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Save America. Kill the political football, OPA. The prayers of all who love the American way of life are with you in your glorious fight.
HENRY MULLER.
NELSON GOODWIN.

EAU CLAIRE, PA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
On your OPA program we are backing you.
J. M. BEATTY.

WILMINGTON, DEL., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas:
Go ahead Senator, make your speech, and make it long. Am all for you.
HARRY H. ROSEN.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL:
Keep up good work. OPA must be abolished if un-American.
Mrs. AGNES M. LEWIS.

DOYLESTOWN, PA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL:
Congratulations on your stand against un-American OPA. Keep up good work.
BERTRAM KENDLE, Jr.

FLINT, MICH., *June 28, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator, Texas:
Hitler's Gestapo, King Henry VI's, Mortons Fork, and the New Deal's OPA in same category. Keep the New Deal's mercenary votes in the bag with a renewal of OPA, congratulations Senator.
ROBERT A. GRIMES, Sr.

POCOMOKE CITY, MD., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Continue fight against OPA. No meat in my store. Truck operating 1 day instead of 4.
E. CARMEL WILSON.

BUFFALO, N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building:
We are with you 100 percent. Give us more O'Daniels for a better America.
ALBERT FOX.

SELMA, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL:
We are wishing you every success in your campaign against OPA.
SELMA DRESSED BEEF CO.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Your filibuster threatened the budget of all families who pay rent. Am sure your stand is opposed by majority of people of moderate means. Hope you will stop your efforts to block OPA.
HENRY TUMEN.

SEATTLE, WASH., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Please discontinue your disgraceful conduct while we American citizens anxiously await action by our Representatives on this issue which so vitally affects all of us.
Mr. and Mrs. S. H. KAHMANN.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Keep the filibuster going. May God bless you and help you get things back to the good old American way. Oust OPA and use the money for building more and better highways. Everyone will benefit then.
CLARK WELLBEARGER.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep that filibuster going whatever you do. I am proud of a man like you. I am an ex-vet in business for myself. I agree with you very much.
L. C. OXBORNE.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the filbuster. Hats off to men like you. Oust the OPA and let us live like real Americans. Send those OPA home wreckers back to Germany. God bless you and keep up the good work.
BERT RATHMANNER,
Home Owner and Taxpayer.

FORT WORTH, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. People at home admire you for your efforts to defeat the OPA.
Mrs. DON GIBBONS.

HEREFORD, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
Hope you're able to kill OPA, and by far the majority of citizens want this done. We appreciate all you are doing for good government and for the liberty and freedom of our people.
J. H. SEARS.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
America means freedom. We don't want communism. Fight on for freedom, Pappy.
CORA HUFF MACKIE,
Kentucky Democrat.

PLEASANTON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Give OPA both barrels. We are behind you.
PLEASANTON JAYCEES.

LIBERTY, MO., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Our belly is full of the OPA. How in the heck did they get that way?
FRANK BOYD,
ROBERT THOMASON,
Farmers.

APPLETON, WIS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Three cheers to you, Senator PAPPY O'DANIEL. Kill regimentation, kill OPA. Let the parasites who administer dig ditches. Talk on, O'DANIEL, talk on.
RONALD N. SCHOMISCH.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
Persevere. You are the only hope the people have to preserve our Constitution. May God bless you.
E. G. SIADOUS.

LUBBOCK, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the fight on OPA and save the landlords of Texas from financial ruin and injustice.
MAX M. COLEMAN.

DENVER, COLO., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Denver merchants are feeling pinch more every day. Meat industry, if some relief doesn't come soon, black market will take full control. We're on your side.
ROBERT L. NORTON.

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Go to it. We are for you 100 percent.
L. B. WEHERING LUMBER CO.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Those of us who still believe in the American form of government give you our heartfelt thanks, our gratitude, and sincere support in your courageous stand in attempting to return those revered principles so long missing from the American scene. Thank you. Good luck.
RAYMOND N. BOWMAN.

TULSA, OKLA., *June 28, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Bless your soul for having guts to take your stand against the political leeches and dictators. Tell those lightning bugs that any thinking American can see through their lies. The mess stinks and we citizens want our rights in and the apes out.
F. E. BRIDGES.

WICHITA, KANS., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Capital Building, Washington, D. C.:
More power to you. Thank the Lord we still have a few public men who believe in constitutional government.
HAROLD MAHAN.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up good work. I am for a filibuster, so are 1,500 members of the I. R. G. A. of St. Louis, Mo.
EDWARD ROOK.

EAST ORANGE, N. J., *June 28, 1946*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Go to it. Throw the OPA out. They have shackled our country for the last 5 years. We don't want any dictators here.
CORA E. STOELLER.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Keep the filibuster going. Maybe you can show those New Deal yes men that they are wrecking our country.
EMILY WHEELBEARER.

SALINAS, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: "Dare to be a Daniel, dare to stand alone, dare to have a purpose

firm, and dare to make it known." I want OPA abolished. I will then have $1,000 to pay income tax with. We want no left wing in America.

Gratefully,

Dr. K. W. BLAYLOCK.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the filibuster. American housewife oust the OPA and let us feed our families, the things we want and work for.

Mrs. LAURA RATHMANNER.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Praise the Lord for one American left in Washington that will stand up express himself against Moscow. May the Lord help you in defeating OPA.

C. M. VAN DUSEN.

SPOKANE, WASH., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Backing you in your attempt to restore constitutional government in this Republic. Down with mobocracy and bureaucrats. Remember what Daniel did to the lions. May God give you strength.

H. O. SCHUMACHER,
Monroe Street Lumber Co.

MIDDLESBORO, MASS., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your vigorous stand against OPA, one of the worst outrages against the American way of life.

Lt. Comdr. F. L. BARROWS.
Mrs. F. L. BARROWS.
Mrs. GRACE P. BARROWS.

ELBOW LAKE, MINN., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the fight. We are backing you up and hope you win. We feed livestock extensively, and if OPA is not killed livestock feeders will have to quit.

FLINT BROS.

WHITE OAK, GA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Thank God for men like you. Trust you will hold out and help restore freedom to our country once more.

E. A. P. MCCARTHY.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

We on the west coast are calling on you to smash OPA.

ROBERT L. KRIEGER.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep that filibuster going whatever you do. We need more men like you. We Americans are used to freedom so keep that good work up.

LEE S. WILCOS.
GEORGE JACOBSON.
BILL WOODS, Jr.

TAMPA, FLA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

More power to you in your excellent efforts against OPA extension bill. OPA was a wartime measure and should have ended with VJ-day. Since then OPA has impaired the Nation's economy, weakened the people's morale, destroyed respect for government, and created unnecessary shortages. Let's bury it for keeps, together with subsidies and other crackpot brainstorms emanating from bureaucratic Washington.

Dr. LOUIS LOMBARD.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Floor,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations. You are a brave American. Kill the OPA, which is the Soviet secret weapon in America and has successfully communized the whole country. We are rooting for you, the only fearless man in America.

S. C. LLOYD,
President, San Fernando Valley Poultry Producers Association.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Please start talking and keep talking till Monday.

Dr. CARL C. CHRISTENSEN.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I am the president of Braun, Ray Bros. & Finley, wholesale lumbermen in Omaha, Nebr., and I am leaving tonight by plane for home thoroughly disheartened and disgusted with the situation in the producing district. There is no competition. Why should there be? The OPA price is the same to everyone and with the multitude of Government regulations there is no incentive for anyone to operate. Unquestionably the most healthy and most stimulating thing that could happen to American industry would be the elimination of the OPA. Western papers today carried a smear campaign against the lumber industry by the OPA officials and I naturally wonder why if they know these things about lumber companies they did not prosecute them long ago. Why wait until deadline day to create excitement that might result in a public demand for OPA's continuance? Let us hope this will be the final smear campaign and that with competition restored through the elimination of this Government monstrosity we may all go ahead, manufacture, distribute, and use the lumber and get somewhere. I sincerely hope that you carry out your intentions of filibustering and wish you lots of luck. If you doubt whether I know my business ask Senator HUGH BUTLER.

AUSTIN BRAUN.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

In this day of political cowardice it is most heartening to find a man who is willing to stand up and speak out courageously. Your speech on the OPA will live long and if this Nation lives, it will be recorded with the declarations of freedom which Henry Clay and Jefferson gave us. I congratulate you upon your forthright statement in saving our country from those who seek to put it in shackles.

WALTER S. HALLANAN.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations. Keep it up. We are behind you.

E. R. WARD.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Thank God there is an American left of your caliber. Keep up the good work.

B. I. VIGNAUX
General Manager, Emoryville (Calif.)
Golden West Meat Co.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations. Keep up the good work.

SIMPSON PHILLIPS.

WEST LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

You are a true American. We hope you succeed.

Mr. and Mrs. W. J. REED.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Senator O'DANIEL, keep up the filibuster and give America back to the Americans.

O. W. COTTON.

CULVER CITY, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the fight. We support you as Republicans.

W. J. SHIELDS.

ASHLEY, N. DAK., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Good work. Wish you all the luck in the world that you will succeed and get rid of OPA. Wish we had more men in Congress like you.

REINIE FEIL.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Stay in there pitching biscuits and remember the Alamo.

A TEXAN.

DENVER, COLO., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

You are performing a great patriotic service. Continue the filibuster.

FRANK DELANEY.

GRAHAM, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL of Texas,
Washington, D. C.:

Fight OPA to a finish—middle westerners are for you.

WRIGHT'S LOCKER & GROCERY.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations your stand against OPA. Texas should be proud of a Senator with the intestinal fortitude to be an American. May I live to see the day that I can vote for you for President.

FRED A. STANDIFORD.

LAFAYETTE, LA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations for your courage. Hope you are successful in your fight.
STERRETT PROCTER.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D.C.:
May you succeed in defeating OPA and save American business.
WILLIAM BARSOTTI.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your patriotic stand regarding the extension of the Office of Price Administration. You have the solid backing of all clear-thinking democratic Americans. We appreciate your courage in these times of governmental bureaucracy and law by directive instead of congressional action. More power to you.
SOUTHTOWN MOTORS.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Keep talking. Give us back our country. Praying for you.
CARL SANDERS.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D.C.:
Filibuster the un-American, unconstitutional OPA out of business. Save the taxpayers' money and people from ruin.
M. C. REESE, *Democrat.*
JERRIE LEE, *Republican.*

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D.C.:
OPA cause of dissension and civil war here. Please protect us.
ELIZABETH IDEN.

FORT WORTH, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Luck be with you. We are for you. Down with the OPA.
HOOVER STOVE & FURNITURE CO.
JOHN F. HOOVER,
Formerly With United States Navy.

DETROIT, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office,
Washington, D. C.:
Agree with you about the OPA. Hope that price controls will be removed. Think it will put an end to black market. It would be grand to shop normally and be able to get meat and hosiery without standing in lines for hours.
MRS. H. G. CLARK.

EUGENE, OREG., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:
The meat industry must be released from OPA.
BLUE BIRD PACKING CO.

SEASIDE PARK, N. J., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep talking good work.
A. R. MATHIS.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your good work against the OPA. Glad someone in the Senate is there to protect our American ways.
O. E. OLSEN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Wish to encourage you in liberating our country from bureaucratic regimentation. Kill the OPA rent control now. A monument should be erected for you.
Sincerely,
BLICKSHIRE HOTELS AND
MOTOR COURT, INC.
BAKERSFIELD, CALIF.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Please go through with your plan to filibuster the OPA bill.
WILLIAM, MARY, MARGARET, JAMES,
JOHN LAHEY.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
As a native daughter of Texas and now a property owner in California, keep up the fight for our rights.
ANN SHUGRUE.

VICTORIA, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We join with other interests in this area in urging you to use your influence with OPA for permission to ship western sugars into this area. The situation here is alarming and will get progressively worse unless we can obtain some western beet to relieve situation.
GROCE WEARDEN CO., INC.

OLNEY, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D.C.:
Congratulations on your stand on OPA. American business is for you.
W. W. PRICE.

TYLER, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:
Being in the poultry, egg, feed, hatchery business, I come in contact with most farmers in this area. OPA has created ill will among farmers and food producers. I can definitely see as long as OPA is in force farmers will only produce what they have to. This means shortages. You cannot fight inflation with low production. Low production with OPA and God's law of supplying demand means black markets. Black markets are handled by racketeers. Racketeers with big incomes are dangerous. Choose higher price through black market or legitimate channels. Through black market it will get worse. Through legitimate channels it will encourage production, competition, and fair prices.
LOUIS H. KLAYMAN.
L. & L. POULTRY FARMS.
TYLER POULTRY & EGG CO.

SEATTLE, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*
Texas Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We extend the best of luck to a real American Senator and only wish we could do more than just give our moral support. Suggest if necessary start filibuster. Best regards.
RALPH FLEMING DUNGENESS CRAB, INC.

SPRINGFIELD, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations and thanks. We do hope the Lone Star State will return America to the people.
W. W. TROUT.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
There is no question that the OPA is fostering the black market and other underhanded practices. It is actually causing inflation by retarding normal production. Anything that you and your friends in the Senate can do by filibuster or otherwise to kill this totally un-American agency will be appreciated by us and by thinking people everywhere.
THE SUPERIOR OIL CO.,
W. B. JAYRED,
Vice President.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
I'd filibuster against OPA if it were the last thing I did on earth. OPA belongs in Russia where it came from. Not in America. More power to you. Regards.
M. H. MARR.

LUBBOCK, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Kick out the OPA by filibuster or other means at your command. The eyes of Texas are upon you.
HUGH W. THOMAS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Hall of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:
We want price control; California veterans must have homes. Sit down.
FLORENCE ZOE CHASE.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay in there and pitch. We're with you 100 percent.
LOUIS E. SEIN, Sr.,
ALBERT C. SEIN, Sr.,
ALBERT C. SEIN, Jr.

LAWTON, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator "PAPPY" LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Excellent representation. You and MOORE are real Americans. Good luck.
C. TOM BULLOCK.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator From Texas,
Floor of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We are supporting you.
J. L. BOONE,
Meat Merchant.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator From Texas,
Floor of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We are supporting you.
KARUNAS & FULLERTON.

BALTIMORE, MD., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Admire your stand against OPA. Most Americans do suggest that Wallace, Bowles, and the CIO leaders all take a trip to Russia.
R. W. JOHNSON.

ORLANDO, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your OPA stand. The merchants of Florida are 100 percent with you.
J. D. BLEDSOE.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
House of Senate, Washington, D. C.:
A meeting was held this afternoon in which it was unanimously voted to wire you our sincere appreciation in your efforts to allow the businessmen to go back to the American way of doing business, and to inform you that the association and other businessmen in Kern County, State of California, are behind you 100 percent.
KERN COUNTY BUSINESS OWNERS ASSOCIATION.

NICHOLS, IOWA, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Best regards from a tired merchant. Stay in and pitch.
SHAFERS SUPERMARKET.

MINEOLA, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your stand against OPA and black market. We need more men like you in Washington. What is wrong with the other Senators? We need fair competition, not highjacking gangsters, to make an American way of life.
I. LINCOLN NASH.

SALISBURY, N. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:
The United States needs less of Chester Bowles, Paul Porter, and OPA. Meat, poultry, and dairy products must be freed from price control now.
GLENN E. KETNER.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Please keep up the good fight. It is good to see a real American with the courage of his convictions and farsightedness stand up and fight for what he knows is fundamental. I respect you.
RAY A. ROC,
MALT MIXER CO.

RUSTON, LA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill OPA. Feed advanced 100 percent, labor 133⅓ percent, car repairs 400 percent, and milk 6⅓ percent.
S. E. TARBUTTON,
Pine Ridge Jersey Farm.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work against OPA. We want it out.
JOE W. MCCLANAHAN.

AIKEN, S. C., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
You deserve the thanks of all Americans for attempting to save your country. God bless you.
S. W. O'TOOLE.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank God there is one red-blooded American left in Washington, D. C.
Mr. and Mrs. GEORGE D. GRAY.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
Plenty of cattle and no meat. More power to Pappy. All Texas now is praying for you to hold out for a democratic form of government.
HOLLAND MEAT CO.

PONTIAC, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stick with it Senator, we are with you.
DANS MARKET.

WEST NEWTON, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Definitely with you in ousting OPA. Good luck.
TOWNE LINE MARKET.

MIAMI BEACH, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Care of Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Stay in there and pitch. All real Americans need you.
JACK FROST.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
In your battle against OPA you are fighting for the American way of life. Much strength to you; fight on, Senator. You are not alone.
CLYDE PIERCE.
E. H. BANKER.
FAY BRATCHER.
J. E. SUFFOLK.
DOUGLAS HENDERSON.
G. K. BROCK.
A. E. KLAGGE.

PAMPA, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Your friends here heartily approve your efforts to put an end to OPA by whatever means necessary.
W. H. DAVIS.

PAMPA, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Strongly favor your filibuster and believe you are right.
M. R. ROCHE.

AUSTIN, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Hundred rental units vacant here because OPA.
Mrs. H. W. SCHULLE.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We are all praying for your great effort to defeat communistic OPA. Give us production and plenty and not scarcity and black markets.
MARK R. HOLORAN.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your fight in our behalf. Property owners 100 percent behind you.
MARY C. LEWIS.

WILLIAMSVILLE, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep the good word going. Beat the OPA.
H. P. SHEPHARD.

PAMPA, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Trust you are successful in opposing arbitrary, autocratic, bureaucratic OPA.
E. J. DUNIGAN, Jr.

HADDON HEIGHTS, N. J., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
New Jersey takes off its small hat to Texas. We are proud of you, sir, for your battle on OPA. Let's hope we can be equally proud of our own New Jersey Senators. Just read of your anticipated filibuster. Keep pitching for us; we need your help. Congratulations.
WILLIAM I. MILLER.

RICHMOND, VA., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations in your effort to discontinue OPA
HARVEYS MARKET.

PONTIAC, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stick with it, Senator. We're with you 100 percent.
HOFFMANS MARKET.

MIAMI BEACH, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill OPA. You are doing the best job of this century.
L. SPENCER.

MATTOON, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We are back of you 100 percent. We pray you have strength to hold out.
J. HARLEY CATON.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work and break the OPA. Communist-dominated politics are starving

the American people while taxing them beyond all limits of human endurance. Patriotic Americans stand 100 percent behind you to break this economic atrocity.

E. KATERINE OBOLENSKY.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Success to you. You have our support out here.

GENE ROBBINS.

WASHINGTON, *D. C., June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We don't want OPA. More power to you.
MR. AND MRS. WILLIAM D. LEETCH,
Hollywood, Md.

DETROIT, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:
Wholeheartedly support your stand against OPA extension. Continuance means greater inflation, black marketing. Success in your battle for our America.

JOHN M. DAVENPORT, Jr.

BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: Throw out OPA and all subsidies. More power to you.

MRS. ARTHUR S. GRISWOLD.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator from Texas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. Let's return to the good old system of free enterprise which has made America great.

FLORENCE FRANKIN.

MIAMI, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
As a veteran of two wars, as a father of four children, as a direct descendant of John Hancock, and as an American, I thank God for a man that has the guts to attempt to relieve the strangulation of Government agencies and controls from our necks.

CURTIS E. HALEY.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your decision to filibuster against OPA. Bust it wide open.

HOME JACOBS.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep on talking. Knock OPA out.

MRS. MARY E. MORSON.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Stop the OPA and give us some freedom of action. Keep up your filibuster.

ILMA F. STOELK.

OGDEN, UTAH, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator "PAPPY" O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations and thanks to you for your brave attempt to free the American meat industry and people from the clutches of a handful of bureaucrats.
Sincerely,

OGDEN LIVESTOCK AUCTION CO.,
J. E. MANNING.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work—100 percent with you.

J. A. BAILBARY.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your action. It is time we had free speech and freedom from the OPA. Wish you luck.

VIVIENNE V. TAYLOR.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator Lee O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
More power to you. We are with you.

LEE MCKINDREE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We are behind you 100 percent. Wish we had more like you in the Senate. Stop the OPA and return to the American form of government.

LEE N. LAYPORT.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
If it's talking it takes, we know you can do it. Down with the OPA.

VERA K. LOCHNER.

LAS VEGAS, N. MEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work and really help the veteran.

JUANITY D. LAW.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay in there and pitch; we're with you 100 percent.

LOUIS E. SIEN, Sr.
ALBERT C. SIEN, Sr.
ALBERT C. SIEN, Jr.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work and get rid of the idiotic theorist back of OPA.

T. J. LAW.

LAREDO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Give them hell, Pappy, we're with you.

CHAS. A. ZEGUB.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:
I am backing you in your fight against OPA. God bless you.

MRS. F. C. HOLLAND.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
You are right, hold the floor and keep talking.

DAN O'BRIEN,
Member, Retail Grocers Association.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator E. H. MOORE,
United States Senate,,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up fight against attempt by administration to make OPA permanent. If you don't win now, there will be another manufactured emergency in another year to extend OPA. Compromise bill sells farmers down river; will greatly increase shortages of butter, beef, and other farm products. Prices higher now with OPA than after last war without OPA.

MINNESOTA PEOPLES POLITICAL FEDERATION,
A. J. OLSON, *Chairman.*
RICHARD S. WILSOX, *Secretary.*

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Veteran without apartment sends best wishes in OPA filibuster.

W. L. HOCK, Jr.,
7067 North Wolcott.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations; remember the Alamo; kill OPA.

CLETUS M. D. ESTE.

WICHITA, KANS., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
There is no freedom in America as long as we have the OPA. Accept my personal congratulations for your truly gallant fight.

STANLEY MACPHERSON.

EL PASO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay in thar and pitch. Dethrone the ocholacrats.

W. S. FRIAR.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations. We are pulling for you.

O. A. RITTENHOUSE,
Manager, Gable Lodges.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
More power to you, Senator. Termination of OPA would be greatest blessing since cessation of war. Continuance in any form will defer recovery from its evil effects just that much longer. "Our prolonged agony" is what continuance will mean.

N. W. TARR,
President, Tarr & McComb Oil Co.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator from Texas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. Let's return to the government of the people, for the people, by the people.

GEORGETTE GIBBONS,
High school student.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
You are doing the greatest service for your country that anyone could possibly do at this time. All power to you.
MARIE TOMLIN CORP.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C:
You are 100 percent right on this filibuster. Stay on with it.
WILLIAM G. COURY.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator From Texas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. Let's return America to the Americans.
CHARLES F. JARRETT.

HARTFORD, CONN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on the stand you are taking. Keep up the fight for the welfare of the people.
RALPH DELILLO, GI,
38 Months' Service Overseas.

DENVER, COLO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
You're making history. Stick to your guns. Our employees have been playing baseball account unable to buy cattle within compliance. Please save our industry.
CAPITAL PACKING CO.

LLANO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Filibuster to bitter end. Texans tired of being told prices they get and prices they have to pay.
PAT MARSCHALL.

OGDEN, UTAH, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator "PAPPY" O'DANIEL,
Senate Floor, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations to you for your thought for freedom for the American meat producers and packers. We wish our Senators from Utah had half as much intestinal fortitude as you are showing.
OGDEN DRESSED MEAT,
MYRON LOEWENSTEIN.

DAYTON, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Hope you talk that bill to death, as any other good American would do.
WALTER J. MCGARY.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Admire your spunk and courage for standing up for right. Ousting of the OPA is a step which must be taken to restore our freedom. Luck to you in your filibuster against the passing of any bill to perpetuate the OPA. Ex-Texans.
Mr. and Mrs. ROY LOWRY.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. Every Red and ALP member is on New York streets soliciting signatures to extend OPA.
MERLE S. DAVIS.

FRESNO, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
I am a retail meat merchant and must close tomorrow unless you win. My 65 employees are through tonight. In the heart of California meat-raising district, and nothing to sell.
WASHINGTON MARKET.
A. C. ZENGEL.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Hope you filibuster OPA and Chester Bolosky out of existence.
WHALEY GRAHAM.

MEMPHIS, TENN., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. "PAPPY" O'DANIEL,
Senator of United States,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay in there and talk till Monday morning. You are the greatest Senator alive.
G. H. KENSINGER,
Towers Building, Memphis, Tenn.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:
I am behind you in your fight against OPA. Keep up the good work.
R. J. KLEIMANN.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:
All the dairymen are behind you 100 percent. Keep fighting OPA.
SOUTH TEXAS PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,
B. E. STALLONES, *Manager.*

BUFFALO, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. Hope you kill the OPA.
GEORGE P. URBAN, Jr.

LUBBOCK, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Hogs cost $23 per hundred, cattle cost $3 per hundred above OPA price. Won't be any cattle fed, any hogs raised until conditions are changed. Please try to give us liberty.
N. C. MAPLES.

IRVING, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your stand on OPA. It should be abolished at once.
LOUIS BLAYLOCK.
B. P. BROWN, *Veteran.*
J. W. BRATTON.
MORGAN H. BROWN,
Overseas Veteran.
HARRY E. SPENCER, Jr.,
Overseas Veteran.

SALINA, KANS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. We are for you.
THE OFFICE ASSISTANT.

ODESSA, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We believe the best interest of all demand OPA be abolished.
F. L. BURROUGHS.

WINDER, GA., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We congratulate you Senator for your noble effort to abolish OPA. We Americans do not need this bureau. What America needs is to be restored as a free nation.
BARROW MANUFACTURING CO.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
As a royalty owner, please stay in there and do all you can.
BESS ROREX.

LAKE VILLAGE, ARK., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
It's time to return to the American form of government. We are all for you in your fight against the OPA.
J. H. Holloway; Sam Forte & Co.; J. H. Duncan; F. W. Nunn; Paul Duncan; James Duncan; W. T. Duncan; Ray Tillam; A. G. Black; Mrs. C. W. Tillam; C. W. Tillman & Co., by C. B. Tillman; Klakve Village Motors, by Ivan McInney; C. W. Tillman; T. B. Tillman; John S. McCalum; W. T. Loyd; Pinkus Bros.; Lakeview Grocery; Sam Wall & Co.; Lake Village Food Palace, by J. A. McDill, Sr.; J. A. McDill, Jr.; Grady D. Hicks; V. I. Whitaker; S. A. Masour; Idell Smith; Tommy Karam; Haynes Hardware Co.; M. Mancil.

FORT WORTH, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Hope you will fight the renewal of OPA to a finish. The cattlemen of Texas are behind you.
W. T. BONNER.
GAINESVILLE, TEX.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Pass the biscuits to the OPA, "Pappy." We are with you 100 percent.
G. M. CULTON.

SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I like your fight to put out OPA—Stay put.
E. J. WADE.

HANFORD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
As a returned vet was told what to do long enough. Now I would like to run my business my way. Do away with OPA.
C. O. RATLIFF.

BROWNSVILLE, TENN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep talking "Pappy"!
MARY DREW WITHERINGTON.

SAFFORD, ARIZ., *June 72, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Wish we had more real men like you in the White House. We admire your courage and hope you will get this OPA out of good old

U. S. A. We are with you and your supporters. Don't back up an inch, stay right there.

Marvin Pollack, Luke Accord, H. E. Johnson, N. Poltkin, Z C. Prino, Preston Larson, C. Lowell Richards, A. E. O'Bryan, Lamar Bellman, Curtis Long.

FOREST HILLS, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We heartily approve of your action because it sponsors the American way of life.
G. W. SCHARF.

PONTIAC, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stick with it, Senator. We are behind you.
ED GREGERSON.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
May God give you courage and strength to save America.
GEORGE MORRIS.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations for your courageous fight against a group that threatens our very existence as a free people.
SAM C. SUTTON.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Surely there are some who can and will help you in your stand against continuation of the OPA. Industry must be freed of the OPA's stranglehold and prices must be set by the law of supply and demand. The end of the OPA will bring simultaneously the end of the black market. Goods of all kinds will come out of hiding. Goods will cease to be moved from your back yard to ours and vice versa to create delusions of shortage. And most important, goods will cease to be hoarded by a Mr. or Mrs. America who now grossly overbuy and overpay because they live in constant fear that our Government will take something more away from them next week and because it is a thrill to have what the Jones are still trying to get. Thereby a large new 44.22 percent of our so-called short items will cease to be short almost immediately. Equipped as we are to produce, production will exceed demand very soon. The result will be low prices, abundant supply, and a drastic cut in the present great waste of material, especially food which is now spoiling due to holding over buying, etc. Can it be possible that we have only you in Washington who can see all this and have the courage to bring it to a fight? There are any number of American citizens like ourselves who could talk for days on just the OPA and its crippling effects on the whole world. Please make them all see the harm in OPA control, make their see the futility of OPA, make them understand you must succeed in your present endeavor. And you, Senator O'DANIEL, please accept our sincere thanks.

R. F. JOHNSON DAIRY PRODUCTS,
R. F. JOHNSON,
J. JOHNSON.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1496.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations. Keep up the fight for our rights.
ADELL M. GLEASON.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
More power to your efforts. Keep on talking for those who believe in a free America, and there are many more of us than you can even dream of. Congratulations and good luck.
WALTER F. BRITTAN.

HADDON HEIGHTS, N. J., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
DEAR SIR: Congratulations on your forthright stand against OPA, the black market's friend. I beg you to carry on your worthwhile fight. I humbly suggest you enlist efforts of New Jersey Senators SMITH and HAWKES. For this you have the gratitude of New Jersey residents. We are with you, Senator.

Respectfully,
LEIGH R. SMITH.

SUFFOLK, VA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Texas Democrat,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Success to you as an opposer to OPA. May God give you strength to talk until Monday.
A GROUP OF MERCHANTS.

PAMPA, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your opposition to high-handed OPA policies.
MEL DAVIS.

PAMPA, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Trust your efforts to eliminate OPA are successful.
J. W. GARMAN.

PAMPA, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Leaving it to you to filibuster the OPA out of existence.
W. A. DAVIS.

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Wish you all success in filibuster against OPA. God bless you.
CORPUS CHRISTI BRICK & LUMBER CO.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
My full endorsement price filibuster. Urge complete abolishment price control.
W. O. HUGGINS, JR.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL (Democrat, Texas),
Washington, D. C.:
Whoop it up Texas style. We've been corralled long enough.
H. M. FOSTER.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senatorial Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Good luck. Keep up fight, abolish OPA. With God's blessing and strength.
G. ERHARDT & SONS, INC.

PAMPA, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Don't like filibuster but if such is necessary to eliminate OPA, then go to.
J. P. BROWN.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Have just finished reading preamble to abominable OPA legislation as reported in conference report. It reminds me of an alleged scientific analysis of the Aurora Borealis which might be offered as clarifying amendment as follows: When the molofigiastical temperature of the horizon becomes such as to coloracize the impruient indentations of the hemispheric anology thus affected, a rapid change takes place in the thorambumpter of the borax kerbustus, and the aquaverusale which can only be seen when it is visible. Good luck and good voice to you.

EDWARD D. GRAY,
Bellport, N. Y.

SAND SPRINGS, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We note you are going to talk against OPA. Talk, talk for America as we know it and love it. Talk for every man, woman, and child that loves America. We are tired of being told what, when, and how to do everything. Let's kill OPA and bureaucracy. Talk.
S. M. HOUSE,
Muleskin Brown Furniture Co.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We are completely in accord with your action against the OPA.
R. W. DAVIS, Jr.

CHARLESTON, S. C., *June 27, 1946.*
O'DANIEL (Filibuster),
Washington, D. C.
Mr. O'DANIEL: I have small grocery business in Charleston, S. C. Have had 5 pounds butter for year 1946. Would like to help you prove to the public of the United States of America what is going on within the United States.
NORMAN BAXLEY.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator from Texas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work, let's get rid of the OPA and bureaucracy in general.
GEO. E. FRANKLIN.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep on talking, "Pappy." I'm for you.
E. BENNETT.

FORT WORTH, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Am pulling for you.
SAM LARD.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay in there and pitch. We're with you 100 percent.
LOUIS E. SIEN, Sr.
ALBERT C. SIEN, Sr.
ALBERT C. SIEN, Jr.

EL CAJON, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Take your time.
GORDON H. SPENCER.

WETHERSFIELD, CONN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We are with you, Senator O'DANIEL, in your fight to abolish the economic monstrosity that is OPA.
Mr. and Mrs. S. E. FITTING.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chambers,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep talking "Pappy"; we're behind you.
F. M. and W. R. DOLAN.

HOT SPRINGS, S. DAK., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Hold the floor; abolish OPA if possible.
A. MAIKA.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Admire your courage; do not let up now.
JAMES A. PATTON.

FORT WORTH, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank you, Papa; stay there and pitch.
Mrs. HARRIS.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Care the Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
You are fully justified in filibuster on OPA. No holds barred; hundreds of Texans are backing you in your position to kill OPA bill. Best wishes.
ERNEST COCKRELL AND MANY FRIENDS.

WINDER, GA., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
I hope you are successful in abolishing the whole OPA program so America can once more be free. My congratulations to you, Senator, for even trying. Regards.
W. H. JENNINGS.

TRENTON, N. J., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Assure you you have my full support on your OPA policy.
MURIEL L. THROPP.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on courage. Continue price fight.
TROY VAUGHN.
REO ELLSWORTH.
B. H. NELSON.
O. J. LAYMON.

SANTA ANA, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on stand against extension of OPA.
O. W. HUMPHREY.
W. L. COPELAND.

CULVER CITY, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Let's have a free America July 1. Congratulations.
A NATIVE SON.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C:
Keep up the wonderful work. We admire your courage and fortitude. You will have our solid backing and support in all your forthcoming actions.
THE BLUE DIAMOND AUTOMOBILE EXCHANGES OF TEXAS.

ORLANDO, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
United States Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up your good fight. The future welfare of this country depends upon your leading this country out of the insidious agency that is gnawing at the fundamentals of this country. Nine out of ten people are with you in your fight but they have been misled by propaganda until they don't know how to express their convictions.
H. F. MOORE, *Attorney.*

SAFFORD, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Wish we had more real men like you in the White House. We admire your courage and hope you will get this OPA out of good old U. S. A. We are with you and your supporters. Don't back up an inch, stay right there.
Marvin Pollack, Luke Accord, H. E. Johnson, N. Plotkin, Z. C. Prino, Preston Larson, C. Lowell Richards, A. E. O'Ryan, Lamar Bellman, Curtis Long.

SPOKANE, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator from Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay right with them. Let's get the country back into the hands of the people instead of in the hand of bureaus and when his fight is over please for the sake of America put through a bill doing away with all bureaus. Let the Congress run the country according to the way originally intended. At present we have men who the people never heard of or never elected outlining all the policies of the Government.
CHARLES E. POND.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We are behind you 100 percent.
EDWIN HUME.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank God we have one American who has the intestinal fortitude to fight so-called American freedom for his fellow Americans. I have been forced to endure OPA oppression and injustices for 4 years and can prove it. God be with you.
Mrs. HERBERT HUES.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations upon heroic measure started by you. Hope the Lord gives you strength to carry through. Bold step, freeing country of one tentacle of Bolshevic octopus hindering reconversion.
D. A. FRASER.

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
"PAPPY" O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We appreciate your efforts. Let's put America back in the hands of Americans.
KING MOTOR CO.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We support you in defeating OPA. Save our country.
Mrs. ESTHER RITTER.
SHIRLEY RITTER.

ANNISTON, ALA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
I want to congratulate you on your stand on the OPA.
E. C. LLOYD,
Lloyds Bakery.

SEATTLE, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, OF TEXAS,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Please do filibuster and kill OPA.
EDNA HOWARD.

HYNES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Member, Congress, Washington, D. C.:
Keep pitching. Texas should be proud of you, and I am. The Lord and 50,000,000 of red-blooded Americans are behind you.
M. R. PAYTON.

NEW CARLISLE, IND., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We the people of Indiana are with you and are praying for success.
W. C. TAYLOR.

ROCKMART, GA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
A group of businessmen from Rockmart, Ga., stand behind you and glory in your spunk. We believe by getting OPA out of the way it will knock black market in the head and give the businessman a better chance to do something.
S. H. Hutchings, G. W. Burnham, Dock Head, C. A. Smith, W. L. Waters, C. B. Westbrooks, Manco Irvin, Rufus Camp, Kirby Whitton.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 9146.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
We are for you hundred percent. Do not weaken. Good luck.
ARTHUR J. MEIER.
MILTON H. MEIER.
HARRY HARRISON.
FOSTER DAVIS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
More power to you, Senator. Termination of OPA would be greatest blessing since cessation of war. Continuance in any form will defer recovery from its evil effects just that much longer. "Our prolonged agony" is what continuance will mean.
TARR & MCCOMB OIL CO.,
N. W. TARR, *President.*

HOLLY OAK, DEL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
The food merchants of America are behind you. Go to it. Give us a chance to survive.
OVERLOOK MARKET,
Claymont, Del.

LOCKPORT, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill OPA. Talk it to death.
RAYMOND RUHLMAN.

WILMINGTON, DEL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
Honorable Senator, we are behind you and heartily in accord with filibuster, too. We small restaurant operators trying to operate legitimately. This is life or death—full speed ahead.
HENRY P. BURROWS, Jr.,
WM. D. CHALLENGER,
Veterans, World War II,
Operators Hob Tea Room, Inc.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
We wish to assure you that your efforts to terminate the OPA stamps you as a worthy leader of the people. More power to you. We sincerely believe a large majority of the people are with you and recognize you as a loyal American only interested in the welfare of our own country.
E. L. O'Malley, S. W. Wilcox, Harold B. Spotts, J. A. Skinner, Grace O'Connell, Earl Cox, Louise Stone, Hazel Baxter, Lee Beitel, Paul Denney, J. A. Beaman.

CASTINE, MAINE, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Democratic Senator From Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the fight because you are right. The real Americans are back of you.
THOMAS H. TAYLOR.

LEWISTOWN, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Speaking as a housewife with my family and my countries welfare at heart, I am thankful that at least one Senator can see through OPA destructive power and has the courage to really fight for the rights of the people. I sincerely hope that you succeed in your purpose.
Mrs. H. J. WHITEHEAD.

HUNTINGTON, W. VA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
DEAR SIR: We're behind you 100 percent, keep up the good work, and may God bless you. A humble family man who is trying to get meat on his table—Your friend.
J. E. BROWN.

HANFORD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
W. L. O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill the OPA and give the billion dollar subsidy and salaries of the OPA officials to veterans that fought for freedom and need it much more.
TED BENTLEY.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
The OPA has just about ruined my small toy business. Congratulations on your filibuster. All my business and Republican friends are for you here in St. Louis.
EMIL STRAND,
Hazel Novelty & Cabinet Co.

HOT SPRINGS, N. MEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We are all for your filibuster on OPA; more power to you.
LADDER RANCH.

DENVER, COLO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Hold on until OPA expires. I admire your courage and Americanism.
STANLEY MELNICK.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
It is encouraging to know that we have one Senator from Texas who feels free to speak for what he thinks is right. We are a small manufacturing concern employing about 100 people. We believe you are 100 percent correct in your effort to eliminate OPA. We sincerely believe that (1) OPA is the creator of black market; (2) OPA is driving all merchandise from regular channels of distribution; (3) our economy will adjust itself quicker and better under competitive conditions than it will by governmental regulation and interference. I would rather have the right to say I can't afford it than to have to say "Can you slip me a steak, Bud, for $4?" For the next time I should go back it would be six bucks, and so on. Wherein, then, is OPA with its huge appropriations for personnel and subsidies saving the taxpayer and consumer anything? We hope sincerely that you may be able to wage a victorious campaign against the adoption of the extension of this bill.
C. C. BINGHAM.

MIDLAND, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Dozens of people in Midland, Tex., are commending you for your stand on OPA and hoping you go through with filibuster.
DON THOMPSON,
PAUL MCHARGUE,
GEORGE T. ABELL.

WICHITA, KANS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay with this fight. As native-born Texan I hail you as the greatest Texan since Sam Houston.
J. N. POWELL.

TYLER, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Tolerance of OPA ended with the war. To continue it will add to the further degeneration of national morale.
W. C. WINDSOR.

HANFORD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations from ex-serviceman. Give us the freedom in business we fought for. Let the OPA die.
H. A. BUTTON.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations. Keep on trying to give us the American form of government.
R. A. BURT.
OILDALE, CALIF.

BILLINGS, MONT., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Get help if needed. Kill that OPA.
HARRIET NIELSEN.

PINE BLUFF, ARK., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay in there and pitch. Kill OPA.
AN O'DANIEL ADMIRER, VOTER,
Brookings Advertising Co., Pine Bluff, Ark.

MIAMI, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. We want America for Americans.
S. D. WIDNENER.

FALL RIVER, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations. Keep going.
WILLIAM B. PORTLOCK.

ROCKWOOD, TENN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Entirely out of meat and lard. Have had none for weeks. Keep talking.
MCNEAL FAMILY.

MIAMI, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. We hope you win.
G. D. HATFIELD.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Appreciate your fight. Would like to see you our next President.
BOB SCEARCE,
World War I Veteran.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
The OPA necessitated by war and unnecessary in peace in the interest of preservation of fourth-grade arithmetic should be entirely or almost so abolished. A Federal bureau that refers to bronze mines and prohibits the slaughter of female steers and operates on the theory that you are better off not to get a steak for a dollar than you are to get one for $1.50 has in my opinion overtried the patience of Johnny Q. Public. I hope you succeed in the fine fundamental endeavor you have undertaken.
WM. F. DOWDALL.

FRESNO, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We the people do not need OPA. We need a market to get rid of what we have raised.
CARL HOWELL.

BOSTON, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
You have many supporters, keep up the talk.
F. A. MCDONALD.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:
Myself, and hundreds of thousands, yes, millions, of Texans are behind you to eliminate the bureaucrats, drones, deadheads, and parasites. Keep up the good work, kill the OPA force of scarcity and inflation. Return the Government to the people for a better, more honest, healthful, prosperous, happy, and contented free people.
E. M. ZERR & Co.

DEL RIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Pleased with your action against OPA. Keep up the good work.
BOB GURLEY.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Independent oil producers solidly behind you in your stand against OPA. Continue all possible opposition. OPA's untenable position toward the oil producer cannot be understood. More power to you.
R. E. SMITH.

ODESSA, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We feel sure the best interest of all demand OPA be abolished.
BUNCH CONSTRUCTION CO.

DELRIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Wish to congratulate you on your OPA stand. Keep it up.
WALTER GILLIS.

HARDEEVILLE, S. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Fence in that monster called OPA and let him die a natural death at 12:01 o'clock Monday morning.
V. B. GLISSON.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Just returned from a trip covering parts of Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, and biggest part of east Texas; find 95 percent of all business for you on your stand against the buzzards of hell. Please hold the line.
S. O. WOMACK.
C. P. GUTHRIE.

LUBBOCK, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
The Lubbock Used Car Dealers Association has instructed me to wire you our endorsement of your stand on OPA.
C. E. DAVIS,
Secretary, Lubbock, Tex.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
The dairy farmers of America are back of you in your efforts to purge the Nation of OPA. They are mindful of the fact that the Senate attempted in its bill to remove price controls on dairy products. Because of the fact that the conferees struck from the bill these provisions for dairy decontrol, there now appears no other way than the course you have chosen to free our industry from the controls which are drying up dairy supplies and causing countless producers to drastically liquidate their herds.
CHARLES W. HOLMAN,
Secretary, National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation.

BATON ROUGE, LA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. We are pulling for you.
BATON ROUGE, LA.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations. Keep on trying to give us the American form of government.
BERNARD & SONS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. Talk OPA to death.
BEACHWOOD MARKET.

RICHMOND, VA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
We are very thankful that we have a Senator in this Senate with guts to stand up for the rights of the people, as the OPA is doing nothing but protecting the black market. My business is not closed because of black market but on the OPA ceiling.
J. H. SHELTON.

HANFORD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
After 2 years fighting on Tinian, Saipan, and Okinawa to eliminate the Gestapo of another country have returned home to find another gestapo, none other than Mr. Chester Bowles. It seems I gave up my rifle too soon. Please do away with OPA so I can make a living for my wife and three children.
GUY M. BURTON,
Meat Salesman,
Former United States Marine.

MIAMI, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.
SIR: My wife and I send our firm support in your courageous fight against extension OPA. We resent Government suppression of free enterprise, which many of us fought for in World War II.
JOHN A. B. BROWN.

PONTIAC, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stick to it; we are behind you 100 percent.
DISON FOOD MARKET.

PAMPA, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.
OPA unnecessary and hope you are successful in eliminating it.
JOE SCHRAEDEL.

HAMMOND, IND., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations, Senator O'DANIEL, for your tireless efforts in trying to send the OPA to its death. We're right behind you. Keep it up.
MIKE RAK & SONS,
Chicago Merchants.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your gaining the floor for your fight to the finish of communistic OPA. We are with you 100 percent.
D. L. WHITTLE.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:
Have always been 100 percent for you. Am now 1,000 percent since your gallant fight against OPA. Please talk until Monday noon. Millions of other Texans feel the same way.
NASH OSBORN.

LIMA, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
I hope you talk OPA to an early grave. Don't weaken.
CURTIS COAL CO.
F. A. CURTIS.

SEASIDE PARK, N. J., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Keep talking. God bless you.
HARRY L. SMITH.

WINDER, GA., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Wish you every success in fights against bureaucrats and communism. Hope your efforts will restore freedom of enterprise and democracy to America.
W. H. JENNINGS, Jr.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
In the present emergency when backbone and sound judgment seem so lacking in the Capitol of our Nation we take our hats off to you who have the guts to stand up and use whatever weapons are available in fighting for elimination of OPA. Your efforts to kill this monster called OPA is certainly appreciated by millions of straight-thinking freedom-loving Americans, and here's hoping that some of your colleagues may be inspired to jump in and do a little fighting.
FRED W. SIMPSON.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
SENATORS OF UNITED STATES, VOTING ON OPA EXTENSION,
Care of Senator W. Lee O'Daniel,
Washington, D. C.:
Price stabilization as war emergency is a patriotic sacrifice and not worse than the slaughtering of our boys by our common enemy. Peacetime price stabilization by dictatorship is too costly to be practical for enforcement. Too many diversified methods of production make it impossible for one school of thought to apply one particularly selected method of application.

Peacetime OPA can only clog up our wheels of production to such an extent that our people must go naked and starve to death. By all means let the OPA (a wartime black-market experiment) die a natural death on June 30, 1946, and let America once more build up its economy on individual ambition and constructive initiative. Kill the OPA.

PROPERTY OWNERS AND ASSOCIATES,
PROTECTIVE LEAGUE OF AMERICA,
By MRS. FRANK MORRIS, *Chairman.*

NORTHVILLE, MICH., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Resolution of Michigan Farmers Guild on OPA price ceilings:

"Whereas in our opinion the OPA has created distrust and a hardship on the American farmer as shown on the late market reports and the working people of this country;

"Whereas sooner or later we will have to depend upon supply and demand to furnish food and fiber for our Nation; and

"Whereas in order to obtain a smooth leveling-off period for our Nation we believe that cost of production should be substituted for farm commodities in place of OPA price ceiling: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That members of the Michigan Farmers Guild are asking the Congress of the United States to discontinue OPA in any and all forms."

H. S. ATCHINSON,
State President of Michigan Farmers Guild.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. (CLAGHORN) O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Suggest you listen to Fred Allen's program next Sunday and realize how you sound to the American people. Suggest you leave your hot air in Texas and stop this despicable filibustering.

D. C. DORWARD.
W. A. BAKER.
S. U. GREENBERG.
F. G. ALBRIGHT.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you help save OPA.

SYLVIA SCHUSTER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Shame on grown men who use filibuster tactics.

L. L. LANCASTER.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Entirely in sympathy with your efforts. Hope you win.

MARGIE and C. J. HULL.
MILDRED and C. L. (MIKE) HORACE FIELD.

CROWLEY, LA., *June 28, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We are with you in your fight against OPA. Anything you do to discontinue OPA is a favor not only to us but the people of the United States.

JAKE JOHNSON.
RHUL BENOIT.
TOM PRATHER.
NOBLE M. CHAMBERS.

CUMBERLAND, MD., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Keep up good work. Lead way to constitutional government.

W. D. WENZEL,
Moorefield, W. Va.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your stand on OPA. More power to you.

W. C. DENISON, Jr.

BROOKINGS, OREG., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator from Texas, Washington, D. C.:

Keep up your good work. We have as a result of OPA chaos in industry and black market. It's time to kill gestapo germs to safeguard what has made our country great.

A. H. GARDNER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

God be with you. OPA definitely unfair.

MATTS AUTO PARK.

CHILLICOTHE, OHIO, *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the good work. Bust the OPA by all means.

DRUMMOND MEAT CO.

CORSICANA, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator from Texas,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your filibuster. Headlines Texas papers say one-half butcher shops in America closed. The dishonesty practiced by the OPA heads has no place in the American Government. The OPA is being used for political purposes, and Bowles and his tribe cannot face the light of truth. Conserve your energy and talk these bums out of Washington. The forces of economy will work through competition to keep prices where they belong. Best wishes.

LLOYD WHEELOCK.

ATLANTIC CITY, N. J., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Good for you, Senator. Keep up the good work; do not give up.

J. SHANNON.

DALTON CITY, ILL., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Millions of American citizens are against the continuation of OPA but are not organized to present solid front. Thanks for your efforts in our behalf.

JOHN G. ALBRIGHT.

COATESVILLE, PA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your courageous stand. Keep up the good fight.

I. LANDIS HAINES.

UTICA, N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up good work.

SAMUEL DEMMA.

PORT ARTHUR, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

Appreciate your stand on OPA. Keep the good work up.

ED F. LOHMAN.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

We commend you on your stand regarding the OPA.

THE LUMBER MARKET.

MURRAY, KY., *June 28, 1946.*
United States Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

I admire your courage and intelligent reasoning regarding OPA. I regret that I cannot say the same of Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky.

W. O. CAUGHN.

CHARLESTON, MO., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL:

Stay with them. We are behind you 100 percent in southeast Missouri.

R. C. MCBRIDGE CO.
MCBRIDGE COOPERATIVE CO.

GLENS FALLS, N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL:

Eliminate OPA and get prices back to normal again. Competition will avert inflation.

MONTY B. INGALLS.

GLENS FALLS, N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL:

Bring back the American way of living by doing away with the OPA.

X. J. BROMLEY.

GLENS FALLS, N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL:

OPA should go. It throttles free enterprise. Keep up the fight.

MARJORIE BALDWIN.

GLENS FALLS, N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL:

Congratulations on your fight to quash OPA. Keep up the good work.

GORDON THOMPSON.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Praying success your filibuster; grateful your efforts to abolish OPA.

Mr. and Mrs. J. H. ALBERT.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up your courageous work; will send you a bushel of throat lozenges. I am a small businessman threatened to be put out of business by the Communist pincers, namely, between the OPA and the CIO. My industry is a bottleneck to housing and household furnishings. Makers of woodworking machinery, we employ 150 machinists. Thousands like us are threatened. Small business represents 90 percent of the Nation's economy. Wishing you every success.

ONSRUD MACHINE WORKS, INC.,
R. F. ONSBUD, *President.*

BAR HARBOR, MAINE, *June 28, 9146.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Texas Delegation:

May you have strength to last out. My reasons as housewife: Six weeks no red meat; price turkey, chickens, limits quantity; fish a staple; no beans; no butter; no lard. As a business, rooms rented. Cannot buy wholesale. Small stores as bare as my larder. What to feed them? How find black market? Elite trade and large places manage. Work for me.

VILLA STANLEY PUMPHREY.

TULARE, CALIF., *June 28, 1946*
Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

May the time soon come when those whom we trust in Congress strike OPA like the knights of old without fear or favor. Lay this greedy, unfair, unethical, and business-disrupting giant low. May the hosts of this great country give him a fitting funeral. May a spray of skunk cabbage adorn his bier, representative of his rotten methods. May

the plot surrounding his grave be strewn with cockleburrs, puncture vine, and Canada thistle, that the ghost of the OPA may direct its movements with carefulness and concern. May a hedge of thorns and poison ivy cover the cemetery gate, a significant warning to anyone who may be tempted to extol the virtues of this giant or worship at his tomb. May the happy, trustworthy evergreens and the lilies of the valley grow miles away, that their purity and sanctity may not be contaminated by the stench of the burial place of the OPA, the dead representative of disloyalty, greed, deception, business bribery, special privilege, and hunger.

HARRY CROWE.

WATERTOWN, WIS., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
We appreciate your good work; we definitely favor getting back to our good old American way of doing business. We want no future dictatorship.

DAIRY DISTRIBUTORS, INC., CO-OP,
J. C. SCHUMANN.

MIAMI, OKLA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Appreciate your effort.

W. A. HUMPHREY.

MIAMI, OKLA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Appreciate your effort.

CLAUDE KIDWELL.

MIAMI, OKLA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Appreciate your effort.

J. S. GAMMON.

BEAUMONT, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your stand for OPA. All power to you.

M. J. CARROLL.

RAYMONDVILLE, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up your work against OPA. Good luck.

E. J. KROGMAN.

BILLINGS, MONT., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senator, State of Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
Your courage and lasting fight for true American living is appreciated by Montana people. God bless you and success in your fight for our livelihood.

NORTHERN HOTEL,
M. W. CARTER,
General Manager.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senator from Texas,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:
The OPA is Mussolini's brain child. Why should we keep it alive?

MRS. A. C. DOYLE.

FLOYDADA, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:
You are urged to continue your efforts to protect the farmers. Unfair regimentation is not our idea of democracy. No OPA at all would be better than one not workable, with nothing to buy.

HERBERT SIMS.

FLOYDADA, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Member of Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Your effort to protect the farmer is appreciated and urge you to continue your filibuster.

T. G. HERRING.

CROSBYTOWN, TEX.

GAINESVILLE, GA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
As a veteran of two wars let me congratulate you on your stand for freedom. Kill the OPA.

WALTER J. SHAFFER.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
In behalf of the membership of this organization who are being forced out of work because of restrictions we urge you to oppose any legislation to extend any OPA restrictions on meat, butter, poultry, and eggs beyond July 1.

MEAT CUTTERS LOCAL UNION No. 408,
G. W. WEIKEL, *Secretary.*

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on the stand you have taken this morning in the Senate. We need commodities on the market in order to restore free enterprise which is the inherent right of us citizens. Prices will return to normal once restrictions are completely lifted. Here's to the end of OPA.

C. OLWELL.

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Highly commend your effort to restore right of American citizens. You have the whole-hearted support of majority of citizens with best interests of the country at heart. Inflation is economic not political problem and can be controlled only by increased production through full enterprise. Best wishes for success.

D. L. GRANGER.

PALESTINE, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good Texas spirit. Your efforts are appreciated.

SCHMIDT FURNITURE CO.

FRANKFORT, IND., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations. It is gratifying that at least one Senator has guts enough to try to do away with this OPA which is the worst sort of regimentation ever to be tried on a supposedly free people. Best wishes and good luck.

HOWARD WILSON.

CRANDALL, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Stick it out, Pappy; we admire your efforts.

KEITH POSTON.

HANOVER, PA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the filibuster. Bury OPA deep. Thanks.

R. H. SHEPPARD CO., INC.
THOMAS P. STRAUSS.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:
Your courageous stand to discontinue OPA, and other New Deal regimentation, will be the greatest help to the American people in our history, for unless OPA is eliminated entirely and free enterprise restored that always made it possible for industrialists to build more and better war implements than our enemies and give us higher standard of living for if OPA is continued another year I believe Russia will be doing the commerce of the world and we will become a second-rate Nation within 5 years. They are working while we are loafing and quarreling. Please filibuster or do anything necessary to save and perpetuate our good United States as leaders of the world. You will become the greatest man living.

JOHN R. BATTLE.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
We have come to the conclusion that OPA is trying to perpetuate itself for the purpose of saddling on the country a planned economy and that, under its direction, we will be faced with continued scarcities and progressively higher prices. We are heartily in accord with your program to rid the country of that agency which has done more than any other Government agency to retard recovery.

E. CONSTANTIN, JR.
W. H. ROGERS, JR.
DORIS M. BROOKS.

TAMPA, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
May God bless you and give you strength.

W. M. HAMILTON.

TARENTUM, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your fearless and outspoken stand to eliminate OPA. The Congress needs men of vision like yourself who really wish to restore the American form of government. We have asked Senators WHERRY, CAPEHART, and TAFT to support you now. Don't give up the fight.

E. C. WEST, J. E. SCHEID, F. F. HUBER, R. L. SHAFFER, CECELIA MISCOSKY, ESTHER MISCOSKY, ALICE STITT, F. R. LARDIN, T. H. BENDER, AND F. E. WEST.

SAN ANGELO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
We want you to know that we are supporting your effort to abolish OPA 100 percent and heartily endorse your move to organize filibuster and kill OPA entirely. More power to you.

SAN ANGELO AUTO DEALERS ASSOCIATION, KENDALL WRIGHT MOTOR CO., C. M. KENLEY CO., OGLESBY MOTOR CO., PERRY MAXWELL CO., ANGELO FEED & GRAIN CO., SID BOLDING GARAGE, BOB FULLER MOTOR CO., BANKSTON MUNSELLE MOTOR CO., BAILEY AUTO CO., A. B. MOTOR CO., SCHUCH MOTOR CO., MUSTANG CHEVROLET CO., CECIL WALTON MOTOR CO., O AND S GARAGE, MACKS AUTO EXCHANGE, KEY & NIX OLDS CO., FOX BEAVER MOTOR CO., WESTBROOK MOTOR CO.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Press reports of your contemplated action against OPA conference bill gratifying. You have our full sympathy and earnest con-

gratulations. Apparently too few legislators sensitive to impact of any new bill of similar character on civilian economy. No honest informed person can deny there is chaos in industry due to impractical if not fanatical OPA administration. Hope you can talk it to death; failing that, that we may count on you to use your best offices for sensible, practical solution. Honestly believe nothing short of entire elimination will accomplish it. Good luck.

HOLBROOK LUMBER CO.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep your fight up against the OPA. We believe you are helping the common man. Congratulations.

Mrs. C. A. BRAZIL.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Home builders and realtors are for you and your fight against OPA 100 percent. Bowles has made black marketeers and bootleggers or failures out of building industries and subsidiaries. If you can kill OPA, you will have accomplished one of the greatest achievements in American history. Some examples of sabotage by Chester Bowles and his henchmen are as follows:

Veterans' housing is costing more than 50 percent above 1 year ago because materials cannot be produced profitably at OPA ceiling prices, therefore bootleggers are handling practically all materials for large operations. The veterans pay the bill. Of course this is a part of the Bowles-Wyatt program to pass the W-E-T bill and make public housing a permanent over-all dictatorship in the building industry. Plumbing supplies are selling for about double OPA ceiling price. Oak floorings the same. Asbestos materials are not available. Many industries are refusing to operate at a loss or to become outlaws. Their only alternative being to shut their plants down. More power to you.

FRED M. SEALE,
Director, National Association of Home Builders and President, Amarillo Real Estate Board.

DETROIT, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Three cheers "Pappy" for your courageous stand on the liberties of the people of these United States. If there were only more like you to aid you on your stand against bureaucratic government.

LOUIS HERSEY.

BEAUMONT, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Outside of Government employees, New Deal nuts, and fanatics, Texas people squarely with you in opposition to OPA. Talk bill to death. Turn Texas loose. Competition and buyers' strike will do away with inflation in reasonable time. I have served as member of Texas Legislature and passed 72 years of age and this is my first appeal to any Member of Congress on any subject.

J. HOMER GADDY.

WITTENBERG, WIS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office, Washington, D. C.:

I heartily agree, as do most Americans, that it would be swell to wake up Monday morning under the American form of government and tell the world that the America of our fathers stands as firm as Plymouth Rock. This would end once and for all the hedging and quibbling at Paris and New York and witness an exodus of bureaucrats from Washington. I urge you to lead the fight back to sanity and the American way of life. In this you have the support of all loyal citizens. More power to you.

J. WILL GATES.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator of Texas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the fight. We are for you.

CHARLES ETHERIDGE.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your courage. It takes a Texan to speak his mind. It certainly would be very refreshing for the American public to wake up Monday morning once again under the American form of government. Hundreds of thousands of famished home owners and realty taxpayers, the backbone of every municipality, are stunned by the word "freeze," while there is no freeze on any form of house repairs, painting, roofing, plumbing, etc. We want the real American way of life.

THOMAS PILUSO.

MILTON, DEL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Do all you can to rule out the OPA by June 30.

J. D. ROWINS, *Mayor.*

WATERTOWN, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas:

Congratulations for your stand on the OPA. This un-Americanism must go.

DEWITT L. MARSHALL.

CAMDEN, N. J., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE W. O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations. You are performing a great service for the entire country.

SAMUEL RAYMOND DOBBS.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Care of White House,
Washington, D. C.:

Please accept my sincere gratitude on your stand against OPA from a tired, discouraged, young businessman.

VICTOR C. KOEHLER.

ATHENS, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate House, Washington, D. C.:

Everyone in Athens is with you. Go ahead with your filibuster.

WESTFALLS RESTAURANT.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I heartily approve the action you are taking and I sincerely hope that you will be successful in your fight to completely eliminate and do away with the OPA.

N. R. ROYALL, Jr.

MASON CITY, IOWA, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Democrat, Texas,
Washington, D. C.:

We are getting darn sick of Bowles' Gestapo, so keep in there fighting. We are for you.

RUSSELL L. COOK.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Rush your filibuster and bring back the American way of life. We are backing you 100 percent.

W. E. MASSEY.

FORT WORTH, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I do hope you are able to fight the OPA with filibuster against the measure.

W. J. WEAVER.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Best wishes for success in fight against OPA. Support efforts.

S. C. ABERNATHY.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:

Believe your position on OPA is in the interest of our Nation's welfare. Hope you can stand and fight it out.

WILLIAM D. MCBEE.

SEATTLE, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Keep up the good work. My opinion is if you are successful in talking the OPA out of existence you will be doing the United States a fine service.

E. C. STONE,
Stimson Mill Co.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Ex-GI in business will be put out if OPA is retained. Keep up the fight.

ALEX WHITE,
Used Car Dealer.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator from Texas,
Washington, D. C.:

By killing OPA you will save America and keep it honest and block Stalin's racket. Keep up the good work.

E. A. KLUSMEYER.

MILTON, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

Keep on. Talk OPA to death.

FRANK M. REBER.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

We admire you as you give the political bureaucrats heck.

R. D. MOREAU.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator from Texas,
Washington, D. C.:

I heartily support your filibustering the OPA out of existence.

R. A. BURNETT.

BEAVER FALLS, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Glad to know we have a real American Senator. Backing you 100 percent.
Mr. and Mrs. E. L. KOCH.

WATERTOWN, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL:
Heartily approve your stand against OPA.
L. W. BALDING,
Hotel Brighton.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL:
Every American should appreciate your efforts to end OPA before Bowles completely stabilizes the black market.
J. P. FLIPPEN.

WHITTIER, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
Building industry confused and thwarted by inequitable and unsound economical directives of OPA. Vast numbers here convinced abolishment of OPA essential to progress of our country. May Divine guidance and strength be yours in the crucial hour.
CORIN SWAIN.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Liquidate the OPA. Do it now.
LES CROUCH.
GEORGE B. SANDERSON.

MOUNTAIN HOME, IDAHO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations for your fighting spirit. Cut red tape that is strangling livestock industry and business. Supply-demand competition will rebuild the Nation.
G. ANDREWS.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Care Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:
We knew you wouldn't let us down. With you 100 percent.
L. FOGLE.

DAYTON, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:
"Pappy" hold on. Hold on. The welfare of our Nation is at stake. Hold on. May God give you strength.
PAUL D. YODER.

ROCK HILL, S. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Care Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Representing 2,000 South Carolina farmers. We heartily endorse your stand against OPA and hope you hold out through Sunday.
FARMERS LEAGUE,
JOHN HINSON.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:
Heartily commend your patriotic action in filibuster against OPA Gestapo.
M. A. REINER,
ARTHUR WALKER.

WATERTOWN, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas:
Time to live under American form of government; talk OPA to death.
CLARK SHERMAN,
Depauville, N. Y.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 72, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
More power to you; please stage filibuster or anything else necessary to defeat this un-American OPA before we become bankrupt or land in an insane asylum.
Mrs. HAZEL K. DUNN.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator from Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
We heartily support your filibustering the OPA out of existence.
HERRMANN BROS.,
A. E. HERRMANN.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Urge you to continue fight on OPA and other restrictions. Regards.
H. H. COFFIELD,
Rockdale, Tex.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
Talk OPA bill to death and you have more friends than any man in the United States.
D. E. SMITH,
Locomotive Engineer.
TOM WRIGHT,
Car dealer.

LULING, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Care Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up your fight. Only wish you had more help.
M. C. WALKER, Sr.
B. R. MILES.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
May God give you strength in your noble fight for America.
R. HARRINGTON FIELD.

WICHITA, KANS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Your sentiments are right as rain. The world will remember and thank you for the defeat of OPA and all that it stands for. Get in there and fight.
ART KELLY.

JACKSONVILLE, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Please register our strong opposition against the OPA. We recommend it be destroyed. We are all for you. Lots of luck.
B. A. King, E. E. Starkey, B. O. King, Homer Ragsdale, P. J. Pavletich, A. E. Lowe, Geo. Trezise, L. B. Kern, H. H. Holcomb, Sampson Bros. Grocery, A. J. Brazil Star Grocery and Market.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Capitol, Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: Hope you will go on fighting the OPA, as I believe it definitely is trying to put people out of business. Am a veteran of World War II, having just purchased my own business and am completely out if OPA continues their stupid restrictions in the restaurant lines. Hope you will be successful in your great fight.
PAUL BORCHERT.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Earnestly, I am convinced that we have to depend upon you alone to reestablish government by the people and for the people. Please have courage and faith in your gallant fight.
W. R. MCBEE.

ALICE, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
We are for you 100 percent if you filibuster the OPA extension bill.
LESLIE COSTLEY, ROBERT M. FRANKS, J. H. DUNN, G. DUDLEY FITZSIMMONS, J. W. PORTER, J. A. GARCIA, N. G. NORTON.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Your intention to filibuster OPA deserves the support of every true-blooded American. The Bowle weevil has already done great damage to American industry. Bowles' high pressure advertising salesmanship has scared a lot of people, but a vast number of Americans want OPA liquidated. You can do a great national service to help kill it. It would be like releasing an avalanche of water on arid lands.
N. T. SHEPHERD CHAIR CO.
SALT LAKE CITY AND CHICAGO.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Hold the line. Kill that OPA.
BARNES ROOT BEER,
MR. BARNES.

MIDLAND, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on most patriotic and American gesture. Give them h——. We are behind you 100 percent.
WILLIS WHITE MOTOR CO.,
ROBERT K. WHITE.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
I am, as you seem to be, opposed to use of filibuster except in extreme cases. However, it is vitally important that this country return to free constitutional government. I urge that you use all honorable means to terminate OPA and all other Executive bureaus.
OTIS MEREDITY.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your stand; everybody here is for you. Major stronghold of OPA is on rent ceiling; think this should be sustained in modified form. Suggest, if possible, transfer of rent regulations to local boards of respective states would meet with hearty approval both landlords and tenants.
JOHN M. DAWSON.

SAN ANGELO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D .C.:
Stay in there and pitch against OPA. We are with you.
USED CAR DEALERS OF SAN ANGELO.
Guy F. Davis, B. F. Harris, D. H. Emerson, F. E. Luce, Shiel Barth Henry, G. Turner, R. M. Kennedy, D. L. Luce, J. T. Jackson, E. J. Darby, A. J. Rhyne, O. S. Shultz, L. J. Sparks, Dale Miller, Sewell Kenley, Brents Kenley, Jerome Luth, Hughes L. Mason.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:
DEAR SIR: Am backing you 100 percent in fight against OPA, as I believe it to be unfair and un-American.
MRS. ZELDA TRACY.

NASHVILLE, TENN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Do away with OPA and other un-American agencies.
W. J. HEWITT.

AUSTIN, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR FRIEND: I have seven houses under construction now. They are needed badly by the owners of which I can't finish at this time due to the OPA. Do what you can to let the OPA die a natural death. We are backing you sincerely.
H. J. WIMBERLY.

OLNEY, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulate your stand of you and associates. Can defeat OPA as it now operates you will be doing our country and all true Americans great service. The quota system especially vicious and detrimental to livestock industry and consumers. It should be eliminated immediately in livestock industry and many others.
ART L. WAGONER.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.:
I am unqualifiedly opposed to executive bureaus. Therefore, do all you can to abolish the OPA.
Miss W. A. PETTIT.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Your stand regard the OPA bill is greatly appreciated and is the best news we have heard in a long time. This is to show our appreciation and we are behind you 100 percent.
MIMMO MOTOR CO.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your able leadership and best wishes for complete success and victory in your current battle which will well serve friends throughout the Nation. Our Texas people are proud of you.
GEORGE F. ROZELLE.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
As an ex-GI trying to stay in business I will be forced out if OPA is continued in its present form. Let 'em have it, Senator. We're for you.
JOHN AYERS, *Used Cars.*

FORT WORTH, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We are all waiting and hoping that you really carry through. More power to you.
G. W. HOLDEN.
CLEVE THOMPSON.
FRANK DAVIS.
M. SNOW.
B. D. GARRISON.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
As a representative of Texas we are proud of you, as you are the only representative we have with the guts to speak his own sentiments.
FREEMAN MOTOR CO.,
223 West Sixth Street.

TYLER, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
I am in favor of abolishing the OPA entirely and hope you will work to that end.
R. L. PEVETO.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Your filibuster has my wholehearted approval. Keep up your fight against the OPA and all other Government restrictions on business.
BERT FIELDS.

BEAUMONT, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Speak until OPA is dead. I wish I could help you speak. I would read the Constitution over and over again to my audience. I vote for you.
NELLSON CARTER.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946*
Hon. Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Heartily favor your proposed filibuster opposing OPA. Full-time production without Government manipulation will soon cure our economic ills.
W. N. BARRICK,
Barrick Cattle Co.

BUFFALO, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Heartiest congratulations on being one of the real Americans in the Senate. Stick to your guns and block price controls on food. OPA propaganda against you but the people are back of you.
ADAM F. EBY.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D .C.:
OPA is unfair, unjust, inequitable, dishonest, and un-American. It is the cause of black market and unethical practices. Makes bread, meat, butter, sugar, and necessities of life scarce. Soup lines and hunger will prevail if OPA continues. OPA is unconstitutional—down with the OPA.
W. A. ASKEW.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Your Texas friends endorse your stand against OPA and bureaucracy.
FELIX DEVANS,
Texas Bank Building.

COLUMBIA, S. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator "PAPPY" O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill OPA with filibuster, if necessary. Congratulations on your stand. Let's get back to the American way of life.
J. R. HANSHAW.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Capitol, Washington, D. C.:
Stay in there and pitch. Let's get rid of this big chunk of bureaucracy right now.
R. C. KAY.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
You have my full support in your filibuster against the OPA and all other Government restrictions. You are doing your country a great service.
JOHN R. BLACK.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Good luck, we need more men like you in the Senate. Hope you succeed.
KARSTEN & SONS.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Sincerely hope other Senators support your fight for American rights.
C. L. GOPPERT.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
More power to you as you take the floor this afternoon on behalf of the taxpayers of Texas, as we are backing you to the last minute.
J. O. FREEMAN.

INDEPENDENCE, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations to you, also Senators WHERRY, BRIDGES, and MOORE, upon your statement to prevent passage of OPA extension bill. The American form of government is what we sent our boys to die for. Stand firm on your present convictions. Supply and demand will clarify the situation if given a chance and not throttled by the OPA.
MYLES A. and LILLIAN LARSON.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Urgently recommend strong filibuster or any other tactics necessary to relieve the oil industry of the burden of the OPA.
ALFRED C. GLASSELL, Jr.,
Director of the Texas Independent Royalty Owner and Producers Association.

LITTLEFIELD, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Deliver us from the oppression of OPA, if you by any means can.
HENRY BANKS.

ALPINE, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Your friends appreciate your efforts to restcre democracy; hope you filibuster.
Mrs. MAE M. AMENT.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I appreciate your opinion regard the OPA bill, and from conversation with my customers and other dealers here in Amarillo, Tex., we feel that the discontinuance of the OPA would be a benefit to the country and we are behind you 100 percent.
W. B. PARK.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations your stand against OPA bill. Farmers throughout Nation definitely behind you. Hope your voice holds out until you kill the thing deader than Hector's pup.
BRUCE B. DERRICK,
Secretary-Treasurer, Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association.

WEYMOUTH, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Roy V. Nelson, building contractor, father of three sons, one a returned veteran, why do I agree with your filibuster? I hate black market. Number one supply and demand will adjust prices.
P. S.: I need a new hat and suit, so does my father and three sons; we will not buy at present price level.
ROY V. NELSON.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL OF TEXAS,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill OPA; let's return honesty.
WILLIAM A. SARGENT.

PALESTINE, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
We, the undersigned businessmen of Palestine, wish to congratulate you on your efforts to defeat OPA and urge that you continue to fight all moves to continue OPA beyond June 30. Again thanking you, we are sincerely,
Raymond F. Rantzen, A. R. Johnson, Allen Grocery Co., Ben Kelly, Mrs. H. N. Davenport, R. M. Odom, Aubrey Meadors, J. C. Dickey, B. F. Callaway, D. L. Nobles, J. F. Callaway, E. D. Bobbitt, E. M. Dickey, J. R. Wilson.

TULSA, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on fight against OPA. Hope you kill it.
W. O. MORSE.
C. P. ALLEN.
D. W. FARNHAM.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Filibuster till Sunday midnight. I am for you.
A MISSISSIPPI-BORN TEXAN.

EUGENE, OREG., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C. :
True Americans tired of Stalin. OPA nightmare.
H. W. HALL.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
As a Texas oil producer I am sure you are right. Go ahead.
W. W. HOLMES.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
I am back of you 100 percent in your fight against OPA, as I consider it un-American and believe it to be pressure politics.
Mrs. M. J. POOLE.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C:
The businessmen in the Panhandle of Texas admire a man with the guts to speak his sentiments. Power to you.
W. M. TRUMAN.

WEST PALM BEACH, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Democrat From Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations. Keep filibuster going. Let's all be Americans once more.
MARY L. CROSBY.

LONGVIEW, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Shortening $30 a case because OPA won't turn it loose. Sugar, all you want at $27 a hundred. Kill OPA and we will get normal prices. If shortening is not loosened up soon I will have to close my doors. I fought in this war for freedom and Japan and Germany have it and we do without or pay black-market prices on account of OPA.
HOLLYWOOD CAFE,
J. D. MONTGOMERY.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Heartily endorse and appreciate your efforts against OPA.
T. B. TIMBES.

TACOMA, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Having lived 25 years in Texas I firmly believe you are the man to talk the OPA to death. It has convicted itself and does not deserve to live. Since VJ-day it has lived upon borrowed time.
GEORGE B. FRANKLIN.

DENVER, COLO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: Your OPA fight is worthy.
PAUL L. CLARK.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We are proud of you as a layman, also as a representative of Texas, in doing your best to protect the taxpayers against a bunch of political bureaucrats who are wanting nothing but a job.
Mrs. WM. FREEMAN.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Today's Dallas News intimates that you intend to conduct a filibuster against the OPA compromise bill. I thoroughly endorse such an idea and hope you succeed in such undertaking. Legitimate dealers in building materials are being put out of business by black-market practices and will have to close their doors unless the whole set-up now functioning is discarded.
LYON GRAY LUMBER CO.,
W. B. MARSH, *President.*

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
United States Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I want to commend you for your ardent efforts to abolish the OPA. No one realizes the fallacies of price regulation better than do we independent oil producers. It applies likewise to all other businesses and industries. I wish to personally urge that you continue in your valiant fight. Kindest personal regards.
P. N. WIGGINS, Jr.

EAST ST. LOUIS, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank God we still have men who remember American democracy. Congratulations on your proposed filibuster. Maybe you can save us.
COUCH SUPER MARKET,
E. T. COUCH, Jr.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Things the so rotten they stink. Central Council of America, War Dads, of St. Louis, went on record 100 percent to have FBI investigate the OPA.
UNCLE BILL FLORI CARONDELET,
CHAPTER 89.

ATLANTA, GA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill Office Price Administration. Restore freedom. Become America's greatest benefactor.
J. E. FAVER.

FRESNO, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
If you filibuster until the OPA dies a much-deserved death, come out to California and rest for a month. Our home is yours for as long as you wish.
Mr. and Mrs. GEORGE A. FRANCIS.

FALLS CITY, NEBR., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
Good work, Senator. Best of luck from Nebraska.
FRED H. SCHOCK.

SEATTLE, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Start filibuster. Keep it up. We're with you.
CLAUDE MCREYNOLDS.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
"PAPPY" O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Cancel OPA; carry filibuster through; good luck.
JIMMY LITTLE.

ARLINGTON, OREG., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your stand opposing the continuation of the OPA. It is gratifying that there are Members of Congress who vote intelligently.
H. F. KJAERBYE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Americans need no foreign controls. OPA dictatorial, extravagant, unconstitutional. Kill it if possible. God bless you.
HELEN COURTOIS, E. BUCHANAN, and IMOGENE KRAMER.

SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Admire your OPA stand. God gave us freedom; let us keep it.
GRANGE GROCERY.

ALHAMBRA, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Backing you in your fight against the OPA and for our freedom again.
BLANCHE MCFARLAND,
Teacher.

ATCHISON, KANS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
God bless you in your fight to eliminate the bureau that calls the American businessman a crook. We are behind you in your fight to eliminate this bottleneck to production.
CLANCY P. MILLER,
President, Miller Chevrolet Auto Co.

CHARLESTON, S. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senator from Texas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We are wiring Senators and Congressmen to support you in your patriotic battle to exterminate OPA. More power to you.
E. H. PRINGLE.

CARTHAGE, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations for your fight on OPA issue. Regardless of OPA propaganda to the contrary, the public is convinced OPA retards recovery; also disgusted with regimentation. May I salute for you for your courageous stand.
WALTER OTT.

GALLATIN, TENN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your filibuster proceedings. One hundred percent for you.
HOGINS MARKET.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
We foresee no meat available at all unless you are successful in your present efforts. Keep up the good work.
L. H. MOODY.
A. DELISLE.
G. A. FLADING.
W. TAYLOR SMITH.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your stand on OPA. Keep filibuster going until killed.
LES KELLEY,
Ford Dealer.

ST. JOSEPH, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your red-blooded heman determination to fight to the end OPA chaos, confusion, and un-Americanism. I strongly endorse your stand for a free America.
WALTER S. PARKER.

MIAMI, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. We're all for you.
BISCAYNE PARK CIVIL RIGHTS FOUNDATION.

ALHAMBRA, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We want no more OPA or rent control. Keep fighting.
G. G. MCFARLAND.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
I admire your sincere OPA opposition as a loyal American.
L. O. SCHNEEBERGER.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I heartily approve your filibuster against OPA. You can serve your country in no better manner than to continue your fight against OPA and all other Government restrictions on business.
V. D. BOSTICK.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Five Republicans say your OPA stand O. K.
A. V. STUCKER.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Talk for 1 week. Kill OPA.
GUY P. BAIRD.

ONEONTA, ALA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Your fight against price control welcomed by our farmers. Don't give up.
G. H. MCCULLOUGH,
Blount County Farmers Association.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations and best regards for your fight from two GI's.
Maj. RALPH L. SUMMERILL,
Capt. BOB GLEASON,
United States Marine Corps.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
The board of directors of the Republican Club of Pima County endorse your courageous move to abolish the OPA. The free American customer buying in a free competitive market coupled with immediate stoppage of deficit financing is the American way to stop further inflation and the effective way to promote production.
RICHARD CHAMBERS,
President, Republican Club of Pima County.

DAYTONA BEACH, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I want to congratulate you on your stand opposing the OPA bill. You will earn the undying gratitude of the American people if you will prevent its passage and kill the OPA for good.
E. W. COBB.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up filibuster. People of America are behind you for death of OPA.
BARRY SULLIVAN.

WINSTON-SALEM, N. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations your technique for terminating OPA. Every good wish for your success. Many North Carolina citizens are in complete accord.
MARTIN P. GUNBY.

COLUMBIANA, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Congressional Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations for your stand against OPA. More power to you.
C. F. COPPOCK,
Coppock's Market.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Your attitude against continuation of OPA is admired in Illinois as well as Texas. It is sincerely hoped OPA will not continue.
RALPH A. TRIERCHMANN.

EDINBURG, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay in there and fight. We are behind you 100 percent.
W. P. SMITH.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Tell the United States Senate that the war is over. All wartime agencies should be abolished immediately, especially the OPA, and the bureaucrats should all go home and start working for a living. More power to you.
KENNETH KRAHL.

MONTEREY, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill OPA any way possible.
B. A. BAILEY.

CHARLOTTE, N. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, from Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
Filibuster OPA out. Freedom of American people at stake. An old retired butcher.
WILLIAM C. MCINTIRE.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
The thinking people of Texas are strong with you in your fight against OPA and all Government restrictions.
W. P. LUSE.

GAY HILL, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay in there and fight; farmers are with you.
W. H. WERCHAN.

GALLATIN, TENN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your filibuster proceedings. One hundred percent for you.
SINDLE PRODUCE CO.

ST. JOSEPH, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
In the interest of public welfare we heartily approve proposed OPA filibuster.
CONSOLIDATED MOTORS, INC.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill the OPA and American business will support you. Good luck from 10 white-collar workers.
J. C. APPLETON.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. Kill OPA for the sake of America.
A. F. BLUNT.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill OPA and give us back the American form of Government.
ARMIN F. OBERBECK.

CULVER CITY, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We admire your stand on OPA; carry on. Pass this on to California Senators.
ANDERLS MEATS.
TWO GI's.

EUGENE, OREG., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Continue the good fight. Filibuster till Monday for free enterprise and true prices based upon supply and demand.
REEVES TAYLOR,
Taylor Lumber Co.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your stand on OPA. We are behind you 100 percent.
CENTRAL ARIZONA CATTLE
FEEDERS ASSOCIATION.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I thank God we do have a few real Americans left. Buck Fulford is my name. I own and operate two fried-chicken places in the city of New Orleans—fine dressed poultry places. At the present time it is almost impossible to keep my places going, due to the fact that the OPA has retarded production of spring chickens to such an extent that what is produced are consumed in the black-market channels.

Now, Senator O'DANIEL, last September I invested several thousand dollars to put in a poultry-buying place and dressing plant at Giddings, Tex., just 40 miles from Austin. You have been there many a time.

Senator O'DANIEL, I have talked with the farmers of that section and have tried to get them to raise fryers for me. They have all the equipment for raising fryers, brooders, and everything necessary for raising fryers. The only reason that they are not producing fryers today is that they cannot produce them for 28 cents per pound with the high cost of feed.

Senator O'DANIEL, you know those good old people in Texas. Good Baptist, good Methodist. You know many of them will not violate any law. Therefore, those few which are taking chances of producing are getting 34 cents per pound, whereas if it were possible for all of them to be producing we would have more poultry on the market than we could consume at reasonable prices. Senator TAFT knows me. He has been in one of my places of business in New Orleans. I'm sending a copy of this letter to Senator TAFT. If the OPA does not die June 30, then our real America cannot survive. Thank God we have two real Americans left in the Senate.

Sincerely yours,
BUCK FULFORD.
BUCK'S FAMOUS FRIED CHICKEN.

MUSKOGEE, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
Have wired Oklahoma Senators to join you in your laudable efforts to remove American people from domination of OPA.
WM. WILSON LUMBER CO.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations. Hope you talk out the OPA.
H. S. CORBETT.

COLORADO CITY, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Think practically all Texans appreciate your views and action on OPA. More power to you.
J. B. MILLS.

BEAUMONT, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Press reports your determined fight to last ditch for elimination of OPA and for freedom from bureaucratic controls. Congratulations. You have our hearty support.
J. E. BROUSSARD.

KNOXVILLE, TENN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
May Lord give you strength to lead this country out of the OPA, the most oppressive yoke ever worn by a nation.
Rev. and Mrs. GEO. M. KEEZEL.

SALEM, OREG., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Something over 100,000,000 people are beginning to stoop, sneak, badger, and bluff to get sugar, soap, sirup, clothing, feed, lumber, radios, nails, autos, flour, bread, butter, cheese, meat, or anything else they want and should have. Should black or free markets prevail? These are the people of what was and we believe is the finest Nation on earth. The most enlightened, aggressive, upstanding, and compassionate. Consider coffee up, butter up, cheese up, bread up, beer up. Where is the held line? Consider no lumber, no autos, no sugar, no radios, no meat, no soap. Where is production? Gobs of these people know the death of OPA on Sunday is just another of the Bowles' crowd's propaganda scares to mislead the Nation's thinking people. They know Congress can reenact or relegislate whenever they see fit to so do or feel it necessary for the national welfare. Does someone or anyone think America must be kept in or returned to swaddling clothes? And if so what group of bureaucrats consider themselves competent to be pappy to us all? If we must die let us die fighting. Gentlemen, don't give up the ship.
E. L. DICKSON.

CULPEPER, VA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
I wish to express my appreciation and gratitude for your wonderful stand on OPA yesterday.
Miss EDITH WEAKLEY.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
America is with you in your valiant fight to kill the OPA. Every place I go clerks, businessmen all bitterly complain about this Marxist despotism. Give me production and plenty and not scarcity and cheating.
FREDA MAUNE.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL:
Ex-GI in business will be put out if OPA is retained. Keep up the fight.
ALEX WHITE,
Used-Car Dealer.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL:
The morning papers give me the best news yet regarding your efforts toward keeping the future open for business. As an ex-GI am trying to stay in business, and you and your efforts only will keep others like me doing business. Keep up the fight, Senator.
PANHANDLE USED CAR DEALERS,
HOMOR RICE, *President.*

CULPEPER, VA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Office Building:
Congratulations on your stand yesterday regarding OPA. Keep the good work going.
W. EVERETT CIPPEGE.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL:
You are on the right track. Stay on that floor and knock that OPA out of the box. They think that the 100,000,000 Americans in the U. S. A. are of kindergarten age. We think that we are old enough to run our own business, and as one of the thousands of independent retail grocers I think you are doing a great service to our country.
E. A. ROGERS GROCERY.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate:
Many thanks for your strenuous efforts in our behalf.
DIXON PACKING CO.
HUBBELL & MCCORD PACKING CO.

NIXON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay with them, O'DANIEL. Kill the OPA in spite of high water so we can live again.
A. N. MARROU.

ANOKA, MINN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
God bless your efforts. Go to it and win.
Mrs. LEWIS A. SORENSEN.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Gen. Claude V. Birkhead and I have concluded that you are one of the few real Americans left in Washington, D. C.
E. A. HARRIS.

SHREVEPORT, LA., *June 27, 1946.*
LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
More power to you, Old Man. Keep on talking.
Mrs. ASHTON GLASSELL.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.:
The hearts of all the Southwest and all America are with you. If filibuster required to save our country then your name should be a symbol to a future free America.
AN AVERAGE CITIZEN.

SEATTLE, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. It is my belief that OPA has crippled production and distribution of critical materials for housing and is thereby jeopardizing the whole veterans' housing program.
TOM KUHN.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We want to get rid of OPA. Stay in there and fight.
ELTON WILLIAMS.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator from Texas,
Senate Floor, Washington, D. C.:
The OPA has forced black market and law violations on this country until there is now absolute disregard of all lawful authority with reference to all things including rents, food, oil, and lumber that OPA pretends to control. The propaganda put out by Bowles, Porter, et al., spending public moneys therefor, are the most nefarious, outrageous misrepresentations and lies the world has ever seen, including Goebbels. I urge you to talk this OPA to death in this hour of its last struggle, lest we have to shoot it to death later on.
J. E. PRICE.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas,
Care United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your fight against OPA and other bureaucratic restrictions.
LADD DINKINS.

CULLMAN, ALA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Please talk OPA to death. People down here are Americans, too.
TROY PULLEN.

FORT MYERS, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Every decent citizen fervently praying for your success. Keep fighting.
CORD S. J. WHITAKER.

CENTER LOVELL, MAINE, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
By all means filibuster. Conditions are critical in Maine. Ask TOBEY and BREWSTER to help.
Regards.
EDNA M. HEIM.

GLENDALE, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Capitol,
Washington, D. C.:
I commend you on opening the eyes of American form of government. Success on filibuster.
FRANK E. BARTKO.

COLEMAN, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
We are behind you 100 percent. Americans are capable of running their own affairs. OPA is responsible for black market, low production, and chaos. The whole bunch ought to be kicked out in order that business may be carried on in the American tradition.
E. H. Ray, Junk Pipe & Supply; W. J. Stevens; William W. Shoemaker; F. E. Stevens; Theo Griffis; F. W. Taylor, Jr.; George D. Rhone; E. A. Cezeaux; E. H. Henning; E. H. Henning, Jr..; J. V. Thames; Morrison D. Taylor.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
The unorganized masses of our people who are hesitant to communicate with you and other Senators are praying that your eloquence may convince enough of your brother Senators that OPA must be ended June 30 to preserve the American ways of life, and so that the smaller businessmen and producers of the necessities of life can continue their work and business and so that the larger producers of all needed necessities and other desired commodities will be produced in volume to provide the necessities and needs of our people. This OPA is destroying and corrupting all official and private life to a far greater degree than did national prohibition, and if OPA is continued, unemployment on a large scale is inevitable. Talk to them until they see the light. Please convey this message to Senator MOORE, of Oklahoma; and Senator WHERRY, of Nebraska; and other understanding Senators.
HENDERSON STOCK.
S. N. KARAM.
FERNE R. WIRT.
THELMA S. MILLS.
L. L. HENDERSON.
FRED J. ELLIOTT.

DEL RIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
A very high percentage of local producers are bitterly opposed to OPA price control. We endorse your stand, which is the only relief in sight. Sincerely.
C. T. LAKE,
Fort Worth, Tex.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
More power to you; do whatever necessary to kill OPA. We only regret we don't have a Senator with as much ability and nerve.
E. G. GRAZIER,
CHARLIE W. CLARK,
Lawyers.
Z. T. HELM,
Realty broker.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your fight in our behalf. God be with you.
VIOLET FRANKEL.

RACINE, WIS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
The best thing to do with a skunk is to kill it or deskunk it. I don't care which you do with the OPA.
WIER.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We commend you for your efforts.
We believe the Senate should reject the Senate-House Conference Committee report on OPA and renew their efforts for revision of a bill more in line with that originally passed by the Senate or else let OPA expire. We honestly feel that this country is in better shape today to get rid of OPA than it will be a year from today. In fact, we feel our future is dependent upon getting back to a free economy.
CARLOS RUGGLES LUMBER CO.

PECOS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. Fight OPA and bureaucrats. Your popularity increasing in leaps and bounds in west Texas.
BILL DAUGHERTY.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We are for you on your fight against OPA.
AMARILLO GARAGE AND STORAGE.

WEST PALM BEACH, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
After you toss out OPA, toss out the rest of the bureaucratic control to let industry go back into production and competition, so that living costs will return to normal sooner. Have heard many applaud you in this area since reading paper this a. m.
E. A. BLACK.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
I beseech you to protect property owners from this Gestapo form of government, by filibuster method if necessary. Our Congressman from California, ALFRED J. ELLIOTT, has protected the American way but it seems not enough. This terroristic drive on real property owners must cease. You have our wholehearted support.
EVA C. BECK.

WEST PALM BEACH, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Statesmen like O'DANIEL are only one. Your OPA work is outstanding. Sincerely hope your efforts will relieve us from OPA, the black-market agency. Florida needs an O'DANIEL.
RALPH HARDWICK.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Since 1908 we have operated retail lumber business in North College Hill, Ohio. Under OPA regulations we have been directly discriminated against and put out of business. Senate-House conference committee report on OPA of no benefit to retail lumber dealers. The report should be rejected and the committee instructed to renew efforts for revision of bill more in line with that originally passed by the Senate. If this is not done, black market will continue to flourish and legitimate concerns with enviable records for years will be out of business.
KNOLLMAN LUMBER CO.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Care of United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We here in Bakersfield are with you on your stand relative to OPA in bringing our country back to the American way of living.
KELLER METALS, INC.

WATERVILLE, MAINE., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senator from Texas, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
I commend you for your stand on OPA. More power to you.
EDMUND F. LONGLEY,
A Maine Republican.

KARNES CITY, TEX., *June 27, 1946*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations to you on your stand with OPA. Stay in there; we are with you.
S. J. KUHNEL.

RIVERSIDE, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
To prevent the ultimate eclipse of liberty in America the OPA must be killed and killed now. Congratulations on your fight. See it through.
DADA E. KEECH.

GREENVILLE, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We are behind you 100 percent in what you are trying to do for the people of the United States, for we would like to be a free people again. Give J. W. Abbott answer on this.
J. W. Abbott, Lester Collum, Carl S. Suddath, John Collum, Inie Holmes, J. W. Hamilton, Tom Mooney, Ike Isaacs, E. C. Hagan, Roy Collum, Tom McNatt Motor Co., J. B. Banks, J. A. Moore, F. M. McCoullough, C. F. Dowell, Jr.

FORT WORTH, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:
Talk this OPA bill to death and let's get lots of parasites out of Washington.
H. T. BIBB.

FORT PIERCE, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL of Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
Please kill OPA—we need meat.
David E. Harrison, Steve Johnston, M. D., G. Cay Coggins, Mrs. Billingsley, Belle D. Parks, Mr. and Mrs. G. B. Crose, Bart Milton, Earnestine Melton, J. T. Morgan, M. Church, Ralph Rubin, Charles D. Lells, W. R. Higgins, L. S. Hubbs, Mr. and Mrs. C. D. Mustain, J. D. Stafford, Jack Odom, E. Register, Ann Mack, Charles E. Getchell, N. E. Skaggs, H. B. Masters, M. L. Coker, R. B. Pickett, Piggly Wiggly, W. J. Rodway, Table Supply, D. T. Homan, Lovetts Corbertt Keen, W. P. McCormick, Clyde W. Cato, Mrs. Joe Othes, J. T. Kelly, J. T. Russel, H. J. Smith, Lollie Canaday, Mr. and Mrs. M. D. Hutchison, Mr. and Mrs. John D. Keffer, J. T. Tidwell, Mrs. Allen B. Garrett, Bus Campbell, Arnold J. Barrett, D. A. Church, M. Haskell, Mrs. A. C. Purdy, Otis Kelly, J. B. Brewer, C. Costas, W. E. Vassar, Mr. and Mrs. Buddy Hopkins, William White.

SANTA CRUZ, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Democrat of Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep fighting for our American form of government. Bust OPA bureaucracy.
Mrs. E. L. BLOTE.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
Lord give you strength to fight this OPA communistic group. All real Americans against it.
JOSEPH A. WADE.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Free the property owners from the tyranny of the OPA.
Mrs. ELLA MAY GRAHAM.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate House Building,
Washington, D. C.:
I agree with you wholeheartedly in the stand you have taken on the OPA bill now being considered, and I approve of any action you might take in defeating this bill as it now stands. Beef and petroleum particularly should have controls removed.
Regards,
MILLS BENNETT.

SEATTLE, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
More power to you. Hope you are successful and take OPA out of existence. Think you are doing a very fine service for your country.
V. O. STRINGFELLOW.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
No one who appreciates the public service you are performing in setting forth your views on price control can pronounce your effort as merely an attempt to frustrate the vicious purposes behind the bill you are opposing. Your objective is far higher than this. It is an honest attempt to set before the people, in the only form available, the truth behind this effort to fasten upon our people a planned economy that is a system of regimentation entirely at variance with the American principle of a free economy.
M. FRANK.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. Don't give up.
S. R. BROWN.

SEATTLE, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Hope you are successful talking OPA out of existence. If you can do that you will have done something.
NED STONE.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the fight against OPA; we are with you all the way. It takes a Texan to save democracy. Stay with it.
C. H. PETRICH.

SEMINOLE, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
OPA has destroyed the lumber, dairy, meat, poultry, automobile, sugar, and every other business that can be mentioned. Every businessman and every farmer in America is against it. The Jews are for it. Please stay in there and fight. We are all with you.
C. E. RAWLINGS.

RICHMOND, IND., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
House of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep going until the OPA is dead if it takes a month. You will get plenty of votes from Wayne County, Ind., for any national office you want from a transplanted Texas.
DRANCES M. SHORE.

DEL RIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Your attitude in regard to the OPA and meat controls is appreciated by us 100 percent. We, the livestock growers, strongly recommend your attitude.
JIMMY MILLS,
Livestock Order Buyers.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Census Bureau Special Housing Report, series H-46, No. 1, May 16, 1946, comparing November 1945 with April 1940, shows increase in number of occupied dwellings of about 8 percent, mainly in towns and cities, against National Conference Board figures showing population increase including armed forces overseas of no more than 6.3 percent.
Average size of occupied dwelling increased slightly from 4.78 to 4.85 rooms per dwelling.
Average number of occupants per dwelling declined from 3.29 to 3.06, resulting in increase in number of rooms per person from 1.45 to 1.58, or 9 percent.
The report also shows, page 10, an increase of 30 percent in number of occupied dwelling units inhabited by only six persons and 22-percent increase in number occupied by only two persons against a decrease of 13.4

percent in number of dwellings occupied by six persons—a decrease of 24.1 percent in those occupied by seven persons and 33.1 percent occupied by eight or more persons.

Official figures also show that new homes were built since 1940 faster than population increased, including armed forces overseas.

None of the above figures and comparisons includes trailers and garages as dwellings, although the people in them are counted in population figures. Therefore they are overconservative in showing increase of homes over population.

These figures show conclusively how rent control has caused the housing shortage by keeping rents down while individual and family incomes rose, permitting spreading out by more fortunate occupants.

This causes great hardship, especially for returning servicemen, newly married couples, and lower-income persons who cannot afford to buy homes yet may be forced to change residences to get jobs or promotions.

Evasions of rent controls are rampant with illegal rentals at exorbitant levels to cover added risks.

Reconversion is greatly impeded by resulting immobilizing of workers. Social, political, and economic discontent and family difficulties are increased.

Investment in housing is impeded, yet residential sales values are inflated by difficulty of obtaining rentals.

This situation will continue as long as rent controls are effective in keeping rents below supply-and-demand level in free markets.

Removal of rent controls would result in gradual rise of 15 to 25 percent in average rentals or 3 to 5 percent in cost of living.

But it would relieve inflation pressure on other consumers' goods, especially in durable lines. It would bring rents into accord with renters' ability and willingness to pay, secure more efficient use of housing facilities by removing artificial advantage which controls now give to single person and small-family renters.

It would be especially beneficial to returning veterans who cannot or should not buy homes especially at present prices.

If it caused only one in eight of households now having two persons or less to accept one person from six-person dwellings, a normal 5-percent vacancy condition would be created. This amount would be greater than could be built in 2 years of building at the highest rate ever recorded in this country, namely that of 1925, and a rate far above any that can be expected within at least the coming year.

V. ORVAL WATTS,
Economist, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

TEXARKANA, ARK., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Please continue filibuster against continuing OPA.

RICHARD BURGDORF.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C:
Best wishes in your great American fight to defeat continuation of the OPA. Kill the OPA and stop OPA-fostered black market and scarcity of goods.

SPALDING KENNEDY.

HAMMOND, IND., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United State Senator, Washington, D. C.:
Gratifying to know you have courage to filibuster against the un-American OPA bill. Wishing success.

W. M. A. FUZY, *Attorney.*

EUGENE, OREG., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building:
Following telegram sent today to Senators CORDON and MORSE: "Front page morning papers smeared with OPA diatribe directed to a small group of 40 out of more than 4,000 western lumber manufacturers and wholesalers, including Roseburg Lumber and Tony Lausmann, Medford. Charges filed by an OPA jackanapes named Golub and charges include practices permitted in OPA regulations at that time. How much longer are you going to be sucked in by OPA dictum and propaganda? When do you intend to throw out this OPA rabble and return our country to "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people." Earnestly hope you are successful in preventing passage of OPA extension bill.

H. J. COX,
President, Eugene Chamber of Commerce.

SAFFORD, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Wish we had more real men like you in the White House. We admire your courage and hope you will get this OPA out of good old U. S. A. We are with you and your supporters. Don't back up an inch. Stay right there.

Marvin Pollack, Luke Accord, H. E. Johnson, N. Plotkin, Z. C. Prino, Preston Larson, C. Lowell Richards, A. E. O'Bryan, Lamar Bellman, Curtis Long.

EVERETT, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Smash OPA. You should receive Congressional Medal. Congratulations for being a red-blooded American.

WILLIAM GUERRA.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Floor, Washington, D. C.:
The American people are looking forward to attending funeral services of OPA with you. Keep talking.

G. L. COOPER.

BETHEL, VT., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator "PAPPY" O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I hear you are trying to table the OPA to death. This sounds good to me. I think OPA only aggravates a difficult and inflationary situation and the sooner we get rid of it the better for the country.

M. S. MILLER.

LEWISTON, MAINE, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep talking until Sunday if necessary to kill OPA. You will receive the appreciation and blessings of all real Americans.

FRED GIVEN.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Continue the good work, holding up your hands in prayer.

MRS. ETHEL CAMPBELL.

GADSDEN, ALA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations, Senator. It's refreshing to know there's one non-Communist left in Washington.

MRS. W. M. COLE.
G. H. HALL.

OLNEY, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Your filibuster on OPA if made will be the greatest service rendered to free enterprise and the American people in the last 100 years. Business 100 percent for you.

J. F. CARTER.

CULPEPER, VA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Care Senate Office Building:
I am truly glad we have one Senator for the people that is not afraid to stand up for their rights. We hope we can have more just like you and we will certainly have a better Government for everyone to live under.

ROBERT M. STULTZ.

CULPEPER, VA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Office Building:
I am certainly glad we have one good sound minded man to look out for our interest in Washington, D. C., a man for the people.

MRS. JOHN PLEVAKIS.

CULPEPER, VA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Office Building:
I wish to thank you for your stand yesterday in behalf of the citizens of the United States and will say you have lots of good honest people's hearts and minds with you. So keep the good work going on.

G. T. CLARKE.

WEST PALM BEACH, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We salute you on your stand re OPA. Living costs are rising in spite of bureaucratic control. Your opinions and attitude are highly appreciated by many in this area. Wish we had a Representative like you.

J. C. LOCKETT.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
In accord with your action; kill OPA.

JOHN ZOTOS.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill OPA entirely or talk until you succeed. Your support appreciated.

MERRILL W. SMITH.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
One hundred percent behind you.

SAN ANTONIO LAUNDRY & DRY CLEANING ASSOCIATION.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We congratulate you on the stand you have taken in reference to OPA legislation.

MARICOPA PACKING CO.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Thoroughly concur with and assure of my wholehearted support of your action as regards the OPA. Sincerely hope all good Texans will back you to the utmost in your stand against this menace.

KEN MCNEALY.

CONROE, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
If you prevent the extension of OPA it will be the smartest move you ever made for the benefit of the country.
A. T. BALL.

SALISBURY, N. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Fulfill your filibuster threat against OPA. We, the people, back you up.
D. F. STRAUGHAN.

JEANERETTE, LA., *June 27, 1946.*
United States Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United State Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Don't give up, you have got OPA licked. Their policy and management is unfair to all producers. Here in southwest Louisiana and Texas sugar and rice are in the hands of black market. Its magnitude is out of OPA control. Black-market sugar selling twenty-five and thirty cents per pound; black-market rice equally as much. Chester Bowles' arrogance and dictatorial tactics are unbearable. This is the opinion of thousands of people in our district so don't give up.
D. MORESI AND THOUSANDS OF OTHERS.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Your stand on the OPA bill as reported today's paper is to be commended.
H. D. THOMPSON.

SAN ANGELO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:
We want you to know that we are supporting your effort to abolish OPA 100 percent, and heartily endorse your move to organize filibuster and kill OPA entirely. More power to you.
San Angelo Auto Dealers Association, Kendall Wright Motor Co., C. M. Kenley Co., Oglesby Motor Co., Perry Maxwelcbco, Angelo Feed & Grain Co., Sid Bolding Garage, Bob Fuller Motor Co., Bankston Munselle Motor Co., Bailey Auto Co., A. B. Motor Co., Schuch Motor Co., Mustang Chevrolet Co., Cecil Walton Motor Co., O & S Garage, Mack's Auto Exchange, Key & Nix, Olds Co., Fox Beaver Motor Co., Westbrook Motor Co.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Office of Senate, Washington, D. C.:
I joined your many friends in congratulating you on your courageous stand against price control agency.
HILLTON T. HOWELL.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Your efforts to kill OPA appreciated in San Antonio.
TOM HOPKINS.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We are wholesale carload distributors of lumber, have been for over 25 years. Under OPA regulations we have been directly discriminated against and put out of business. Senate-House conference committee report on OPA of no benefit to ourselves or other direct-mill shipping lumber wholesalers. Would appreciate your rejecting the report and instruct committee to renew efforts for revision of bill more in line with that passed by the Senate. Will appreciate this consideration as otherwise black market will continue to grow bigger and bigger.
ARLING FUNCH LUMBER CO.

WINSTON-SALEM, N. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your technique of terminating OPA. Every good wish for your success. This is the sentiment of 95 percent of our patrons.
J. T. GREEN,
Nissen Building Barber Shop.

COLLIERVILLE, TENN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
You will do the country a distinguished service if you can talk the OPA to death.
W. W. MCGINNIS, *Merchant.*

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate House, Washington, D. C.:
It would be swell to wake up Monday morning in America.
Dr. and Mrs. HUGH HEATON.

MIAMI, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Please keep it up until Saturday night. You represent more people than you suspect. So if your way is the only way, here's more power to you.
C. W. KISTLER,
President Miami Board of Realtors and Chairman Miami Chapter National Home & Property Owners Foundation.

AUSTIN, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Heartily in accord with your program regarding OPA.
W. R. KNIGHT,
MARVIN W. STAHL,
Gonzales, Tex.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I appreciate and favor your fight against continuation of the OPA, and believe that your fight is for the best interest of all the people of the United States. I am in favor of your filibuster and hope for its success.
GLENN H. MCCARTHY.

WEST PALM BEACH, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Glad we have at least one statesman in Washington. OPA should be discontinued on basis you have outlined. Keep up the good work to benefit we common people.
J. K. BLACK.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Joint conference committee report on OPA leaves wholesale lumber distributors in less favorable position than present discriminatory regulations. We solicit and urge your support in rejecting this report for revision by committee. We feel that wholesale distributors should at least be allowed the percentage of trade commissions they received prior to OPA as mark-up on ceiling prices. The joint committee report, if enacted, will surely put thousands of legitimate dealers out of business and will further encourage black-market operations.
THOMAS B. THAMES LUMBER CO.

FRANKLIN, TENN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
There has been a desperate need for eight long years for someone who would rise up and lead our people back to the American form of government. Your position is admirable, and I am 100 percent behind it.
T. F. LANCE.

WEST PALM BEACH, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
The morning papers report your stand against the black-market agency. I just returned from overseas and highly appreciate the fact that you see that OPA control is ineffective and may lead to greater industrial trouble here at home. Many people here are saluting you today.
FRANK GORNTO.

TULSA, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Your fight against OPA greatest service of modern times. If you succeed in killing OPA this Nation will call you great.
REPUBLICAN MINUTE MEN OF TULSA.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulation on your fight against OPA. Trust your filibuster will be successful. We are behind you.
CLARK & COWDEN.

SAN SABA, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Go ahead with filibuster. Kill OPA. Everybody with you.
J. D. ESTEP HARDWARE CO.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
This telegram is a token of moral support and an expression of appreciation for your present action against OPA. Keep it up.
C. A. POST.

NEWTON, KANS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations to you in your fight against the CIO-OPA.
MRS. FRANK RUPE.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:
SIR: Millions of Americans are supporting you in your fight against OPA. Thousands of Texans have already expressed their disgust with OPA bungling. We are with you all the way.
T. A. BLAKELEY,
President of the Mortgage Corp. of Texas.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Government bureaus do not run our Government. Continue the fight.
LEWIS E. PRICE.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Heartily endorse your stand regarding Senate action on OPA bill.
RIP C. UNDERWOOD.

LULING, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill the OPA. We are behind you 100 percent.
EARNES WILSON,
CLARENCE A. WILSON.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Hurray! Keep on a-talking. Stars and Stripes are with you.
HELEN BAKER.

NASHVILLE, TENN., *June 27, 1946.*
United States Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
If you need any help for your plan, count on us.
M. C. HARRISON.

TROY, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations. Telegrams, night letters, air-mail to follow.
BERT FAVORITE.

DETROIT, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
You are right; Give America back to Americans, and regimentation under OPA and other Government agencies. War is over; let us have liberty.
A. BOWLES.

LEAVENWORTH, KANS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Stay in and pitch, filibuster, kill OPA.
WILL T. ROBERTS.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
The OPA does not control the Government; we control the Government.
PAUL E. BUTTS.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL:
Sentiments in the Panhandle of Texas are at its highest for you because you have the courage to represent them in their belief.
SIXTY SIX MOTOR CO.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
In accord with your action. Kill OPA.
JAY D. PADGITT.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Good work, Pappy. Keep it up. More power to you.
Mr. and Mrs. G. A. RICHARDS.

LINCOLN, NEBR., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
If OPA staffs can be compelled to go to work and quit interfering with others that want to work the Nation's production will increase so fast inflation will be in reverse in 6 months' time and it's deflation, not inflation, which the administration is subtly seeking to prevent by the effect of continued OPA and subsidized unemployment scarcities. This un-American fascism must be ended sometime, why not now? Thanks for your efforts.
L. H. PAULEY.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We're backing you. Hope you win.
Mr. and Mrs. O. C. BRYAN.

WEST LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations for really working for the people. Other Representatives skating on thin ice politically. One person in Washington is consciencious objector to everything. Commodities and food only obtained through black market. Five rooms rent at $25 per month. Others $12 per night for one room. OPA—that's a joke, son.
ANNA LONGWORTH HILLYER.
SANTA MONICA, CALIF.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
We are behind you. Practically all our friends, rich or poor, believe you are right about OPA. Don't give up.
ALBERT MONK,
Manager, Associated Research, Los Angeles.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank God for at least one United States Senator with the courage to risk the ire of the CIO-PAC and of the petty bureaucrats who have flagrantly expended tax moneys to propagandize for the perpetuation of their jobs in which they find relief for their sadistic tendencies by ordering citizens to produce and sell and rent without profit. I wish there were more who had the courage. You are eternally right. OPA is not just part bad. It is the sole cause of our economic stagnation and the greatest injustice among its crimes is its insistence that property owners whos operational expenses have doubled must still charge only 1941 rents unless they can show approaching bankruptcy. Rent control is no less evil than other OPA schemes to take one man's property and give it to others under the guise of law.
C. S. GILBERT.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Texas Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Abolish OPA and free many property owners from an existing condition worse than war or slavery and win our eternal gratitude.
Ex-serviceman, Sgt. W. H. E.
Mrs. B. E. E.
Mr. and Mrs. LEROY.

MONROVIA, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill OPA and you kill another branch of the great bureaucracy. Kill OPA and you kill inflation. Kill OPA and tens of thousands of little black-market racketeers will die. Kill OPA and tens of thousands of legitimate business houses will again have something to sell. Kill OPA and you return America to the people. Kill OPA and the people will again have more to eat, more to wear, and live in better houses. Kill OPA and the people won't know how to live and act after living a life of slavery and fear under New Dealism for so long. Kill OPA and America will produce so much for so little that the people will live so luxuriously dictatorship will lose its strangle hold on America. Kill OPA and the people won't know what to do with their new-found freedom. Kill OPA and you give democracy another blood transfusion, but by all means kill OPA and deliver us from the greatest system of mass racketeering ever experienced by any people anywhere since the beginning of recorded time. Kill OPA and you will deserve a reward greater than anyone is able to give.
G. M. KNAPP, *Rancher.*

VENICE, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
Congress, Washington, D. C.:
Please use every effort to annihilate the OPA. The noose is around our necks now so tight we are strangling. God bless you.
ANN MARSHALL.

MIAMI, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay on the floor; kill OPA. I'll support you as President next term.
L. E. GAY.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Admire your courage, keep up the good work. Perhaps we can return to a normal economy with less money spent in cocktail bars and more in correct amounts for necessities.
HAROLD J. KURT,
President, Retail Reporting Co., Inc., and 25 Office Employees.

LAFAYETTE, IND., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
One hundred and thirty million Americans are depending on you with possible help from Senator MOORE of Oklahoma, to filibuster OPA to death beyond any possibility of resurrection. Please do not fail.
R. C. WALLACE.

WHITE PLAINS, N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
DEAR MR. SENATOR: We are thoroughly grateful for your work toward destroying the stupid OPA. The country should reward you with the Presidency if you want it.
Mr. and Mrs. B. H. KREIDER.
HARTSDALE, N. Y.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up your good work to discontinue OPA. Put an end to all the confusion and uncertainty and black markets that OPA has caused, and let competition, supply, and demand again go into effect for a better, happier, more prosperous United States.
SORRENSEN'S RESTAURANT.
ANOKA, MINN.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator "PAPPY" O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your filibuster. Don't give up; hold until Sunday at all cost. America's greatness was built on her ability

to produce in vast quantities—this was mainly what won the war for us. OPA now has a large portion of this production stymied. Let's remove the controls and get production going in full swing again. This is the American way.

T. H. SLEDGE.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We are backing you 100 percent. Kill the OPA. Get America back.

A. M. RUSSELL.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C:.
Congratulations. Tie a can to those New Dealers. Fine work.

WALTON PARKET.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chambers, Washington, D. C.:
We are behind you. Do away with OPA. Legitimate dealers can't exist under present system. Only black markets can survive.

CITY FOOD MARKET.

BATON ROUGE, LA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We landlords are desperate in Baton Rouge. Please help us. If possible, filibuster until Monday.

A TEXAN.

AKRON, OHIO, *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Suggest you continue filibuster on the un-American, unconstitutional, and unnecessary OPA legislation.

GEORGE E. BOSTON.
J. H. JOHNSEON.
J. F. STARK,
L. M. EWING.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
God bless you. Keep up the good work. From a Texas boy who is glad to know that there is still an American in Washington. Keep up the fight for America, we don't want communism like the OPA.

FRANCIS CHATHAM.

CHARLESTON, W. VA., *June 28, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We appreciate your fight on OPA. The war is over. We do not want our business and property controlled by bureaus in peacetime. Get us free again.

THE ELK LUMBER CO.
R. E. RINARD.
HOBART NEWCOMER.
T. C. OWENS.
PAUL C. DAVIS.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Don't give up the fight. Nevada is with you.

E. G. HAMILTON.

GAINESVILLE, FLA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
Death OPA in your battle for rights. We prayed all night. Don't give up.

Mrs. WILLIAM J. ALLEN.

HOT SPRINGS, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Talk long and loud against OPA. Win for us the right to own what we fought for.

JOHN G. and LIELA M. RANDEL.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
Good work on the OPA. Kill it. Fifty meat dealers here will have to close their doors under present system as black-market operators are doing the business. Let us operate on a businesslike manner.

S & B SELF-SERVICE GROCERY.

MIAMI, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Democrat Texas, Washington, D. C.:
Stay on the floor—kill OPA.

W. M. McDOUGLE.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Talk against OPA until you are as hoarse as a Nueces River bottom bull frog, but keep talking. Regards.

MIKE JARMAN.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work and kill the OPA. Ninety percent of meat business is in the black market. Don't let them drive all legitimate meat dealers to that. Approximately 50 markets here out of meat at present time.

RETAIL MEAT DEALERS ASSOCIATION.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Thanks for your American efforts—hoping you success.

J. F. KYLE.

LINDEN, N. J., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Please talk—preserve the American system, abolish OPA and communism.

GEORGE SWEET.
LINDEN, N. J.

CLEVES, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
The farmers of southwestern Ohio are behind you to kick OPA completely out of agriculture.

FRANK MINES,
President of Farmers Guild of Hamilton County.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Democratic Texas Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We the following citizens agree with you 100 percent that OPA is unconstitutional, Communist, un-American, and unnecessary and the people at the top are positively dishonest.

JAMES J. CORRELL.
ETHEL W. CORRELL.
JOSEPHINE TURNER.
JOHN KUHN.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: I wish to congratulate you on your stand against the continuation of the Office of Price Administration. I hope you have the courage and stamina to filibuster against the constitutionality of an un-American law which is gradually putting smaller business on the rocks.

E. DELUCA.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
I am not from Texas, but keep up good work. Bust OPA and get rid of black market.

Mrs. RINNE, *Pennsylvania.*

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
United States Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office, Washington, D. C.:
A government worthy enough to be fought for should be good enough to be returned to the people. More power to you.

B. F. KIRKLAND.

LEXINGTON, KY., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
More power to you, Senator. Keep up the fight. Real Americans will never forget you for your efforts in the OPA fight.

H. D. WRIGHT.

SEATTLE, WASH., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Congress,
Washington, D.C.:
The OPA is forcing honest man to do dishonest business, fostering wanton neglect and abuse of property by unscrupulous tenants and breeding countless other evils. I and thousands other citizens here thank you for your courageous attempts to destroy this scourge.

J. S. ARNASON.

LOCKLAND, OHIO, *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Heartiest congratulations to a real American. Keep up the good work to get rid of the octopus. God and all true Americans are with you.

The KING, GROLL, OSTERMANN,
and ALMER FAMILIES.

BATON ROUGE, LA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I'm betting on you. Make that two-faced Chester Bowles resign. We are Texans too.

BATON ROUGE, LA.

NEWARK, N. J., *June 28, 1946*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
It's about time that someone spoke up so people can make their living. Thanks, Senator.

WILLIAM ORR.

NASHVILLE, TENN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the fight against OPA. Christian Americans are praying for your success, and we will make ourselves felt against this communistic ideology in the coming and all future elections until the America we have fought for is free again.

WALTER A. WOOD MEADOR.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Give us back our freedom. Keep up the filibuster. God give you strength, citizen.

ADELE RAKLE.

ELKHART, IND., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I am a Republican. Your statement which appeared in this morning's issue of the Chicago Tribune is about the most American statement that has emanated from the Democratic Party. May I offer you my congratulations?

OTIS B. FIELD.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stick violently by your guns, Senator. Slay the Moscow reptile, OPA. Save our competitive system and our American freedoms. Away with New Deal despotism and regimentation. Filibuster them to an ignominious death. Foil the treacherous schemes of our enemies and be the Nation's liberator. God with you for victory.

MARIE I. BROWN
(An American consumer).

DALLAS, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
Seldom a day passes in our country towns or our cities that I do not hear someone say, "I used to be against O'DANIEL, but now I see he has taken the stand against the PAC, etc., and for the people. Therefore, I am for him for any office he may choose and only wish we had more men like him instead of the Fascist dictators we now have." More power to you.

PAUL MAUNDE,
Retired Druggist.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
House of Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Red-blooded American. Rather live in tent with bread and water than in luxury bought at price of freedom. Our last hope rests with you. "Give me liberty or * * *."

ALMA THOMPSON.

PASADENA, CALIF., *June 82, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
In the name of justice emphatically demand California Senators aid your OPA filibuster.

ARTHUR G. BAKER.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:
More power to you. Kill the OPA. If not, only recourse is black market. Good-by our American way of free enterprise. OPA has utterly and miserably failed. Relegate it to the scrap pile and place necessary controls in hands of permanent Government departments where it will be properly administered.

SUPR SAVE MARKET.

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We like your stand in regard OPA. Go to work.

CORPUS CHRISTI LUMBER CO.

CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA, *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the filibuster, Pappy. Shortages of meat, steel, etc., are hard on returned veterans. My wife is from Texas, and we are all for you.

Ex-Lt. S. R. MEEK.

RUSTON, LA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the fight. Kill the OPA. They are killing the producers, causing black market. May God bless you.

COOK'S DAIRY.

PORTSMOUTH, VA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building:
Thanks for your efforts to give us back a free America. Have requested BYRD to support you.

NORMAN W. PHILIPS.

MIAMI, FLA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Please accept my congratulations for statesmanship shown in your fight to rid the Nation of the strangling methods of OPA. Keep up your fight because we believe that if all of the wartime bureaus are abolished that our Nation can get into full production and within 6 months economic conditions will be improved instead of continuing chaotic, as they are today.

B. E. HEARN.

LITTLE VALLEY, N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We have been following your fight against OPA very closely. Keep up the good work. Wish I could be there to help you.

J. B. F. CHAMPLIN,
President, Cattaraugus Cutlery Co.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Have courage and keep talking. As the owner of a large meat market, I know that the OPA does not and cannot control meat prices. The OPA only aids black markets. I am forced to close 3 and 4 days a week regularly as a result of it.

PETER CASPER,
Casper Meat Market.

WINSLOW, ARIZ., *June 28, 1946.*
Texas Senator Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay in there and pitch; you are a real American.

Mr. and Mrs. FRED AMES.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Go to it, Lee; all real Americans glory in your courage.

G. E. PITSCHKE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations from two California Republicans. Too bad we have not more men of your caliber. More power to you, sir.

FLORENCE and ARTHUR NEILSEN.

GLENDALE, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chambers, Washington, D. C.:
Here is praying you hold out. More power to you.

MARION HILL.

LYNBROOK, N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the fight, Senator, and get out OPA dictators. Tired standing in line for an hour for a pound of chopped meat. Paying high price, it's half fat. We're sick of it. More power to your speech.

B. CAROLINE COLGAN.

DENVER, COLO., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Democrat, Texas,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Long of opinion OPA should terminate and natural economic laws function. Believe many of our opinions had been reticent to speak up. Keep fighting.

GEORGE W. MASTEN, Jr.
GEORGE C. HAHN.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 28, 1946*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL, of Texas,
Personal, Washington, D. C.:
I hope that you succeed in your wish to eliminate the OPA. America is tired of unnecessary restrictions. Stay with the job.

WALTER W. RIEHL.

PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE, *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
Every sane American citizen will be eternally grateful to you, and hope you will succeed in paralyzing the OPA octopus. May God give you strength.

DR. LINDLEY DOBSON.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
The people of Oregon are with you 100 percent. Keep talking; if short of material, wire Portland.

ARCHIE MANSFIELD.
ELMER BERGLAND.
BURTON COAM.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building:
More power to you in your stand against OPA and the continued regimentation of business when not necessary on behalf of the Montana Meat Packers Association. We back you 100 percent in your efforts to decontrol meat, dairy products, and poultry, and put these products through legitimate channels which is impossible under the OPA regulations as applied to the meat industry. I hope your strength holds out on this filibuster. God bless you.

THE MONTANA MEAT
PACKERS ASSOCIATION.
MATT BROWN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Glad to know there is one American left in our Government.

GEORGE P. KEARNEY.

OLEAN, N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL:
Keep up the fine work on the floor. We're all behind you.

BLUE AND WHITE STORES,
M. J. LOSKEY.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building:
Since a return to peacetime economy and the free enterprise system cannot be accomplished by continued Government controls and artificially regulated prices that are only holding essential commodities off the market

rather than preventing inflation, I register my opposition to the continuance of OPA. Keep America the land of the free.

ELBERT D. JONES.

PALO ALTO, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Floor, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your stand of talking on Senate floor until OPA expires. While the over-all purpose of the OPA to keep down prices was commendable, its administration has been disembodied, un-American, and absolutely impractical, and is the root of most of our present difficulties. Fighting is over; let's remove all wartime restrictions and start to live like we used to.

L. H. PRICE.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

It is an honor for every good American citizen to have a Senator like you in the White House. Wishing you success in your efforts to abolish the OPA, which is against justice and liberty.

HARRY SIEGEL.

LANSING, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: We sincerely hope you succeed in killing OPA. Many of your friends feel the same way. Property ownership has become a hardship. Landlords have nothing to say about their own property rights; the tenants are the only ones OPA will listen to. More power to you; best regards.

EDRIE FINDSEN,
Seventh Ward Democratic Chairman.

GAINESVILLE, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator "PAPPY" O'DANIEL, of Texas,
Washington, D. C.:

Power to you, Senator. Keep up the good work.

A. L. JUNEAU.

BOSTON, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your determination, as reported in the Boston newspapers, to defend America against the continuation of the OPA, which has Europeanized America to a point where we have a meat famine, a housing famine, a butter famine, a shirt famine, and one has to violate the law in order to buy a pound of butter or a loaf of bread. Friends and foes of OPA alike can find nothing to point to as causing these famines in everyday things, in our splendidly productive country, except the OPA itself.

Up here, the OPA benefits only the rich. People with money to give need only pay small amounts, under present ceiling prices, to purchase the products of working people who have only their labor to sell. And working people with only their labor to sell find they can only receive small amounts in prices for their products, under OPA ceilings, from purchasers who have the money to spend. Under price ceilings, people pay high in labor for the money they get for their products, and people pay low in money for the other fellow's labor and products. Meanwhile, the working people, managers and purchasers, are flypapered down and shortages result because nobody can do anything without the say-so of some nonproducer in Washington.

The Puritan magistrates in the Massachusetts Bay Colony at the time of King Charles II tried price ceilings on men's labor and products, but the plain people revolted and Massachusetts went ahead again.

Wouldn't it be wonderful to get back to a free, prosperous, and secure America and regain freedom to make our own prices and wages and to produce the ordinary things for our houses and tables in a plentiful, economical way and send the OPA back to the tomb of Hitler and Mussolini, who were the first to bring totalitarian wage and price control on us in this generation?

Everybody here is for the removal of OPA except those who have been poisoned by the prattle of paid radio propagandists peddling perfidious bureaucrats' paralyzing policies.

JOSEPH LEE,
National Committeeman from Massachusetts on American Democratic National Committee.

DAVENPORT, IOWA, *June 27, 1946.*

W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Care Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Wishing you success and keep fighting. Thousands in the Midwest are pulling for you. If petitions with signatures would help, will forward the same.

R. H. Elliott, J. W. Mohr, A. E. Larson, Ed Westphal, Ross Wyoke, W. E. Dohrn, *Rock Island, Ill.*

GAINESVILLE, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator "PAPPY" O'DANIEL, *of Texas,*
Washington, D. C.:

Power to you, Senator; keep up the good work.

A. L. JUNEAU.

YAKIMA, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Senate building, Washington, D. C.:

Since packers' meat prices were rolled back the end of 1942 by OPA, also due to three times former expense of labor and enormous losses from inefficient labor, also due to double the expense of hay, feed, pastures, and supplies, we have been forced to reduce our sheep and lamb operation by several thousand head. We also have a lot of sows just farrowing. Due to low OPA ceiling on pork and lard, and high cost of feed, labor, and pasture, we expect to kill and plow under 70 of these young pigs, unless relief offered from OPA. Understand most hog raisers throughout country contemplate doing the same. It is useless to start these pigs out with economic waste to finish them staring us in the face. We also have several hundred head high-quality Hereford cows, calves, and steers we expect to liquidate with our sheep and hogs unless unjust OPA ceilings are removed. If removed there is more than ample live meat supply in this country, especially beef, to regulate itself on a slightly higher basis. While so far we have always operated legitimately, if we are forced to go out of livestock business to save from as much loss as possible, we shall probably have to contact black-market operators and become criminals.

COFFIN BROS.
COFFIN SHEEP CO.
H. STANLEY COFFIN.

CULVER CITY, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*

Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

We are 100 percent supporting your program.

HAROLD LANDLEY.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1946.*

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep that filibuster going. America is behind you.

ATLAS AUTO SALES.

BEAR, DEL., *June 28, 1946.*

Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Senator O'DANIEL you are like myself. You are a true American. I hope you win. May I have the pleasure to meet you sometime? May your strength hold out for the good of America.

E. C. BROWN.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*

Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your fight for complete retirement of the OPA is what every right-thinking citizen wants. Rent control on residences and no limit on commercial rents is enough evidence that they are inconsistent with their rules. The people handle their own postwar problems in their own individual way. Wake the Senators up before it's too late.

WM. P. LANDFIELD.

PASADENA, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*

Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Building:

Congratulations on filibuster. May you succeed in your heroic effort to end OPA.

H. W. CLAWSON.

WEST PALM BEACH, FLA., *June 28, 1946.*

Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building:

Congratulations. Your action depicts democracy. Let's have more of it.

R. CECIL BENDER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*

Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

God bless you and give you strength to carry out your plans to kill the OPA and give us control of our property. You are a real American with red blood in your veins. Loads of the people we elect are a bunch of politicians who have no regard for the poor property owner.

ALTA SCHURTZ.

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA., *June 28, 1946.*

Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Millions of genuine Americans, those who have honestly and laboriously created and acquired and those who are now working, sweating, and humble look upon you as a leader possessing that today rare intestinal fortitude so necessary in these darkest hours to kill OPA forever and bring back to us our rightful heritage and freedom. The OPA personnel for the most part are autocratic, insolent, offensive, rude, parasitic, and communistic—a gang of storm troopers who invade your property, your home, and murder your rights as an American citizen, an increasing colony of termites or leeches devoid of honest energy and red blood.

JAMES C. HOWELL, *Taxpayer.*

HOLLYWOOD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate of United States,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the good work, don't stop. None but a Texan could do it, don't stop. This may make you President, don't stop.

WOLFE HOTEL,
QUAKER HOTEL,
PURITAN HOTEL,
Hollywood, Calif.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep it up, you are a real American. From a real American.

FRANK W. CLARK,
Los Angeles Country Club,
Los Angeles, Calif.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
United States Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas,
United States Capitol,
Washington, D. C.:

Am also sending telegram tonight to Senator PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada, who attended University of Nevada with my mother. Requesting him to hand to you an 11-page letter written to him, dated May 17, telling of our trouble with OPA as Los Angeles landlords. I thought you may be able to use my Saga of a Bereaved American Citizen's Persecution Under OPA, representative of the feeling of the majority of the American people. I can assure you let me shout my heartfelt praise to you for your good American conclusions and your courage. Keep up your good fight for God's sake; God is freedom.

MARY T. VOIGHT.

NEWARK, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Your stand against OPA extension is the act of a true American. The thinking people of the Nation are with you.

A. L. PALMER.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulate you on your stand against the extension of price control. Sooner or later this evil bureau must pass into oblivion. Why not now? To prolong it means breathing more life into black market.

J. S. BAILEY, Jr.

TULSA, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We are 100 percent back of you in your filibuster and are asking our Senators MOORE and THOMAS of Oklahoma to give you their support.

TULSA USED CAR DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
R. N. MILLER, *Vice president.*

TROY, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Meat packers, retailers, and producers in our section of Ohio are 100 percent in agreement with your attempt to block passage of proposed OPA extension bill, enabling that bureau to continue unfair controls over livestock slaughter and production. Your stand in this controversy is our last ray of hope that an impossible situation may finally be corrected.

THE BRAUN BROS. PACKING CO.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Many thanks for your valiant effort to restore the American way of life.

M. V. BOTHWELL.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Lo, a Daniel has arisen. A real statesman and patriot has emerged from the halls of mediocrity. You are doing a fine job. Keep it up, I am sick of the OPA tomfoolery and its commissars. Get them out together with the grafting black marketeers. Revise the American way of life. Let supply and demand operate as it will. Take our necks out of the OPA yoke.

FRANK STARR.

PEORIA, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations to you for trying to save this country for the people. You are my only Democrat.

M. A. LANGSTON.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:

We are for you 100 percent. Keep on talking. Texas is behind you.

MRS. W. B. MCBEE.

DALEY CITY, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Continue good work. Kill OPA.

RENSTERMAKER, MCKAY & PACKER.

COLUMBUS, IND., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Best regards in your fight against the industrial menace.

H. D. ADAMS.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations for your last-ditch fight to save our American system. Suggest you ask for bodyguards to protect you from the hundreds of thousands of gangsters and hoodlums who cannot afford to let you end their OPA rackets. Prohibition was like a Sunday-school picnic when compared with present-day bootlegging.

JOHN B. MCCRADY.

KLAMATH FALLS, OREG., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations. We need more men like you who have the guts to fight for the freedom we're all entitled to. Keep it up. Best wishes.

JOE FALES.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Keep the filibuster going. You can't imagine how happy we are to know there is one man in the United States Senate who is 100 percent red-blooded American. We wish you success in ousting OPA and all the other bureaus.

SUPER AUTO SALES.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

We of the Panhandle Livestock Association are behind your move to add meat and livestock to the OPA abolishment list.

Sincerely,

J. M. WEYMOUTH,
President, Panhandle Livestock Association.

AKRON, OHIO, *June 28, 1946.*
W. LEE (PAPPY) O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Stick to your guns, Pappy. Bust the OPA wide open. Let them know it's a real racket legalized by the Government in Washington. You'll have backing of all ex-GI's.

EDWARD G. MAXIM,
An Ex-Prisoner of Japan.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF, *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Keep up filibuster. God bless you in your work.

HOUSEWIFE.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chambers, Washington, D. C.:

Give them heck, Senator. We are ex-GI. We are small businessmen. We are still Americans. We agree with you, we don't like OPA. More power to you today. Give them heck again.

Private BOURASSA.

DENVER, COLO., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

America needs more men like you. Keep up the good works. Here's hoping you sink OPA.

FRANK, GLADYES, and ELIZABETH TAYLOR.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Press dispatches indicate you are waging a mighty battle against price-control extension. More power to you. However if price control is extended, lumbermen will appreciate your influence to insure for wholesalers and distributors the same protection Taft amendments provide for manufacturers and processors. The Wherry, Capehart, and Wolcott amendment made this provision but Senate-House conferees were indefinite. Unless corrected by allowing wholesalers and distributors their historic margins this segment of industry faces disaster. Your interest in our cause will be much appreciated.

LEGISLATION COMMITTEE, THE CINCINNATI LUMBERMEN'S CLUB.

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Stick to it and kill the OPA. Only increased production and corresponding taxation can stop inflation. People must go to work and produce goods to make business or go hungry. We cannot get farm equipment.

W. R. O'BRIEN.
ST. JOE, MICH.

COLUMBUS, GA., *June 28, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Apparently the black market is operated by the OPA. It seems that since OPA came into power certain people would buy stock in such things as shoes, sugar, or wheat, then have the OPA announce the product to be rationed at some definite date. Results are that millions of people have purchased unnecessary commodities. If anyone tells you that prices are in line with what they claim that person is either misinformed or lying. Honest merchants with quality merchandise are forced out of business. Cheap, chiseling wartime factories are permitted to flood the markets at enormous prices. The OPA has taken competition out of business and is encouraging our people to be dishonest. Humbly suggest you either discontinue OPA or replace them with men who will and can handle situation like it should be done. The OPA price on dime-store shirts originally sold $1.19, now $4.95; handkerchiefs were 5 cents, now 25 cents; beer, 10 cents, now 25 cents; automobiles, $100, now $600. Since everything is out of their control, why pay half million people our good money to promote dishonesty?

Regards.

CLARENCE WEEKS.

BERKELEY, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the good work. We are all with you.

FRANK PUSEY.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Capitol Building,
Washington, D. C.:
I am with you in your fight against OPA. I consider it un-American.
Mrs. LEE WALKER.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep your filibuster going. America needs more men like you. We want freedom. Keep going.
H. J. FLECK.

TULSA, OKLA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Please oppose OPA extension. Save our Government that big expense. Didn't have OPA after last World War. We sure don't need it now. Millions feel as I do—just neglect to write you. Hold the floor; keep on talking until midnight, June 30. I pray you Americans will stamp out dictation.
Mrs. JACOBS.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Care of United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Your courage at this hour of destiny is admired and condoned by all true Americans.
W. SEFTON.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Power to you. The eyes of Texas are upon you, and 90 percent are for you.
C. E. KING.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
More power and good wishes. Kill all Government regulations. Enforce antimonopoly laws against capital and labor. Let supply, demand, and service take care of economy.
FLOP HOUSE, ROOM 142.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Boy, I am for you; steam the New Dealers out.
CHAS. M. SUMMERS.

INGLEWOOD, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your filibuster against the OPA.
Mr. and Mrs. C. MUHLHAUSER.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Thousands here agree with you. OPA is unconstitutional, undemocratic, and communistic. Glamour boys, Bowles and Porter, have had the floor long enough. Keep talking, brother.
E. ROSALYNE HEARD.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep talking and kill the OPA once and for all. Property owners of Santa Monica, Calif., are all pulling for your success.
HARRY P. TALBOT.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator PAPPY O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank you for your fight against a hypocritical bureaucracy which, while claiming to fight for the American way and the Four Feedoms, forbids the sending of American newspapers and magazines to the American zones in Germany even as filler scrap in relief parcels, evidently considering every American newspaper or magazine as subversive. A few more years and we will all be subversive for daring to think.
FREDERICK G. HEHR.

MALIBU, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
More power to you. Support you 100 percent. Let's kill the OPA once and for all, so we can get back to normal supply and demand.
MACNICOL and MAJOR ULRICH.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
One hundred million fellow citizens unite in praying for the termination of OPA forthwith. Twenty million taxpaying property owners have been and are being mercilessly reduced to poverty. Your reward and gratitude from a grateful nation cannot be estimated.
C. G. EDWARDS.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Filibuster OPA out and their gestapo methods. Keep going, we are with you. America needs you.
FLECKS USED CARS.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
I hope you have success in ridding the country of OPA. Good luck.
PHILIP GILLESPIE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:
We are right behind you. Don't stop talking.
MURPHY MOTORS.
J. W. NEAL.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Splendid work. Every red-blooded American is with you.
DON WADDELL.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Good luck, "Pappy."
E. B. HALL.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
You are supporting millions of Americans. We depend on you and thank you.
L. W. MCGOWAN.

PALMDALE, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations. I hope you win.
EDGAR LEPAGE.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Capitol, Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. We are depending on you to put OPA in discard. My earnest request is that you do all in your power to knock out OPA.
ALPHA M. DRAPER.

LYNN, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Wake up America. The OPA rent control has lived its life. In my opinion, it has catered to the bad actors. Its acts unconstitutional, brazen, willful, and criminal.
HOWARD F. GILBRIDE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
You are making history. Let's get back to Americanism. Best regards.
J. H. HALES.

SEWICKLEY, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
If you could arrange for help in your "talkaphon" program to kick the OPA out of the window you would go down in history as a great man. I have influence in Texas and will see that you are backed up in the future to the limit.
JAMES H. CHILDS,
President of Four Corporations.

JAMAICA, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Chambers, Washington, D. C.:
Break the OPA deadlock. Return America to free enterprise and let's get going to the ideals we once knew.
IRENE and GEORGE DOUGLAS.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
The end of OPA means freedom once again.
GENE TOLOMER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United State Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Good work and more power to you. Do away with OPA and you will see prices fall in short order. We already have inflation, why kid ourselves? With OPA out of the picture, competition between merchants will be revived and prices drop—not rise. Just a corner druggist.
D. J. ORTMAN.

AKRON, OHIO, *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
The Senate Floor, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations. We have at least one man in our Senate with a backbone. Wish you success.
FERRIS SCOTT,
Member, Home Owners League.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay in there and fight. You are a great statesman.
T. B. LYNES.

EAST ST. LOUIS, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
The Honorable W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Livestock producers this area very angry. Feel have been let down, threatening discon-

tinue raising cattle, hogs, receipts livestock at this market estimated next week very slim and this company on verge of closing completely next week through lack of livestock to kill or raw material to manufacture. If the packing industry, one of the country's largest, is not to be destroyed and its business turned over to black marketeers, it is absolutely essential that price control be eliminated. You are familiar with the intolerable conditions, and we appreciate the support you have given us. We hope for your continued support to effect decontrol of livestock and meat.

HUNTER PACKING CO.,
FRANK A. HUNTER, Jr., *President*.

DAWSON, ILL., *June 27, 1946*.
Senator O'DANIEL,
Democrat of Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
For God's sake, save America.

ERNEST SAUERS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946*.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the great fight and give Americans a chance to recover.

ROBERT S. BURNS.

CLARKSBURG, W. VA., *June 27, 1946*.
Senator WILBERT LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill OPA, then we will again be American citizens. Thank you.

HARLEY W. HARMER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL OF TEXAS,
The Senate Chamber, Capitol Building,
Washington, D, C.:
Our friends and I of San Antonio certainly appreciate your efforts in our behalf against OPA.

A. J. SWEARINGEN.

BELMONT, MASS., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
Read Bill of Rights, Gettysburg Address, Boston Tea Party. The Revolution started in Boston. Cheers for you.

BARBARA FRITCHIE.

EL MONTE, CALIF., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the fight. Let's give the American way a chance again.

POPPY FOOD PRODUCTS CO.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations. Keep it up.

WILLIAM H. BREVORT, Jr.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Nation is indebted to you beyond expression for courageous filibuster to abolish OPA, breeder of rackets and black markets. Return America to the Americans.

CHAS. B. JUSTICE.

HOLLYWOOD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946*.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR O'DANIEL: Congratulations on your OPA fight. God bless you forever. I'll vote for you anytime.

IRENE M. FRANKS.

SPRINGFIELD, MO., *June 28, 1946*.
United States Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay in there; prevail on other Senators if help needed.

J. L. COLEY.

WICHITA, KANS., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I think and believe you do. OPA headquarters most business antitrust enforcement. If you can stay awake, you should lead America to freedom. Excuse me, but all of you should be running the Government, not business. You have taken us to capital or labor; better back off from both—remember Germany. OPA closed plenty business places. Last ruling closing 300,000 retail lumber yards account 60 percent manufacturing going retail. Thirty percent advance for manufacturing. American and business housing bridled by local retail lumber yards now out thinking they could still get job done. Doubtful about OPA doing if spending five billion, and might be good example most businesses.

NELSON DAY COMMERCIAL LUMBER CO.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Intelligent Texans as a whole are 100 percent with you in your stand against OPA. Fight hard. May God bless you.

JEWELL MCANELLY.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Nearly 4 years infantry overseas. OPA refused possession my own house, bought with combat pay, not GI loan. Where is the freedom I fought for and my buddies died for? With OPA, America no longer place for freeman stand.

Capt. JOHN MCDOWEN.

HOLLYWOOD, CALIF., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the filibuster and God be with you.

A BUSINESS WOMAN.

MONTEBELLO, CALIF., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your filibuster. Let's do try to return to the American way of living. Success to you.

Mr. and Mrs. LORY KING.
Mr. and Mrs. O. M. TROMPETER.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: Keep up the good work. Honest Americans are behind you. God bless you.

CELESTE and HARRY A. SALLO.

SANTA ANA, CALIF., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Best of luck to a Texan who is willing to fight. Kill the OPA. We are behind you.

JACK V. CLABORN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
You're of the stuff that made America great. I would almost move from California to Texas to vote for a man with your courage.

AN AMERICAN.

PEORIA, ILL., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
In spite of the fact we were already paying our janitress double the amount another janitor received for like services in same block, OPA rent control ordered us to increase her wages $3 a week, retroactive to last October. This is beyond their jurisdiction but they did it, showing if you give them an inch they will take a mile to cut our throats. At 103 Louisa Street, Peoria, less than a block from church, fine stores, transportation, etc., we recently finished a nice living apartment, all painted and stained, new linoleum cemented to floor, good furniture, furnished all utilities, including water for toilet and other uses, gas and electricity paid for by us and we charge a veteran and his family only $7 a week rent, but rent director ordered us down to $4. This is only two of the many abuses handed us. Life is almost unbearable. We appreciate your effort to end OPA. May God help you. Read this on the floor if you wish.

NIERSTHEIMER & HELLYER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
More glory to you. Down with the OPA and black market.

DETROIT GRIFFITH.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay in there and pitch.

D. B. MCDANIEL,
Houston, Tex.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Need more men like you to adjust America's future life. Open their eyes to what lies ahead. It is a wonderful thing you are doing. We back you to the limit.

UNION CAR MARKET.

CAMBRIDGE, MD., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
We retail grocers have ridden the toe of OPA since origin—kill it.

LUTHER A. PARKS,
President, Retail Grocers Association.

DAVENPORT, IOWA, *June 27, 1946*.
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
We and thousands more in the Midwest are for you, Senator. Keep on fighting. Wishing you success. If petition with signatures would be helpful, will forward same.

Fred A. Berger, Attorney; V. J. Ciesielski, Restaurant; Glen Griffin, Baker; Frank Palmer, Restaurant; Herman Farber, Wholesale Grocer; R. A. Lindberg, Auto Dealer; R. S. Little, Tax Consultant.

MIAMI, FLA., *June 27, 1946*.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.
Keep fighting, Texan. If you kill OPA you will do as much for our country as Washington did by defeating the British.

J. G. YANCEY.

ALPINE, TEX., *June 27, 1946*.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Stop OPA at all costs. I am for you. Filibuster or what have you.

R. W. CASTLEBERRY,
County Attorney, Fort Davis, Tex.

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We are for you 100 percent your stand OPA. Go to work.
D. D. FRAZIER.

EVANSTON, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL of Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
God speed you to success in the complete elimination of the OPA testified by the inviolability of the law of supply and demand. Get Bilbo to help. Keep up your 100-percent Americanism to the entire restoration of the Government to the people.
OLIVER L. BEAR.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
May you and your truly American Senators be given strength and courage to fight OPA until it has been wiped clean from our statutes and we can again live as free men.
W. S. RATTRAY.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your proposed filibuster or any method you may use to rid this country of the OPA and any other restricting agency.
A. M. BOSWORTH.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *June 27, 1946.*
United States Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Don't give up the fight—Nevada with you.
HERMAN HOFFMAN.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank you a million for your untiring efforts to bestow on this country its legal rights by stopping OPA. What our Congress needs is a whole lot more real Americans like you and Senator MOORE. Hope you are 100 percent successful in your efforts. More power to you and may God bless you.
Mr. and Mrs. ARTHUR H. FABER.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
The hopes and prayers of many property owners in our city and county are with you in your courageous fight to kill OPA and give America back to the American people.
EDWARD A. KELLY.

QUINCY, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations. Hope Senator WHERRY and others will join you in filibustering OPA out of Government agency by midnight Sunday.
FRANK H. WHEELER.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
A representative government demands representatives who abolish government control.
ALFRED MICHEL.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Hope you and WHERRY carry on talkathon until July 4. Sad situation when homeowner can't get possession of his own property or must keep undesirable tenants for 6 months because "Chessie" Bowles, OPA bureaucrat, says so.
FRANK I. HOGAN.
HUNTINGTON PARK, CALIF.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
I am 100 percent behind you. Do keep up the good work.
ALA BONNER.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your valiant fight against continuance of OPA. Your efforts merit strongest support from fellow congressional Members.
JOHN M. MCCOY.

MCALESTER, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Hold your friends together and free the American people and be the best loved and respected man in America by the leading people.
Dr. J. C. BENTLEY.

CUERO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stop OPA. Get them out of lumber, hardware, and other lines of business and the businessmen of the United States will get the job done in the proper manner and will only ask a legitimate profit. Businessmen of the United States are not liars and thieves. If the President would call in the main manufacturers, ask them to make only a fair profit, I know they would do it, and the small businessman would do the same. Stop OPA any way you can and you will be the "man of the hour."
J. T. NEWMAN & SONS.
NEWMAN-MARQUIS HARDWARE CO.
CUERO BUILDING CO.
J. T. NEWMAN, *Mayor, City of Cuero.*

AKRON, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: Keep it up if you can. Millions of good Americans will thank you for ridding the country of this darn communistic OPA. Thank you.
NED MARTIN.

GLENDALE, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Millions of Americans like ourselves are hoping that you have strength and courage to carry on to the final destruction of OPA.
R. P. CURTIS.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:
Stay with them, Pappy. Let's have more of American democracy.
H. A. REYNOLDS.
HELEN L. BROWN.

MARSHALL, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep on fighting as the OPA is sure destroying our country. We want the American way of living and not dictatorship.
Mrs. VINCENT ZULL.

LOS ANGELES, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
My prayers are with you to free us from this octopus-parasite affinity. You will go down in history as our liberator. Breaking bonds of limit, OPA has killed our business, robbed us of our home, reduced income from $600 per week to $60 per month. Insults, months of muddling waits.
MABEL MINOR.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Please keep up the good work you are fighting for. Down with the OPA. We are behind you 100 percent here in Cincinnati.
F. P. MCGEE.

MIAMI, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill the OPA. It has made crooks of honest people, also hampered full production. Keep up the filibuster.
Yours truly,
J. N. NORWOOD.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Our prayers and hopes are with you in your fight to eliminate OPA for all time. The dawn of a new day will arise upon the American people when the shackles of bureaucracy have been removed and free enterprise restored.
J. H. THORNBER.

TOPEKA, KANS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
Hoping you and your colleagues will be able to hold out until the OPA expires, so competition will regulate prices as of old.
RUSSEL L. PRUDIE.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
You have the profound respect, admiration, and sympathy of millions of Americans. They, too, are tragically aware that constitutional government is on trial. The sacred traditions of free men and the intellectual integrity of their public servants should transcend in importance any and all considerations of unenforceable price control. It is inconceivable that Congress will knowingly condone a continuation of the inexcusable and disgraceful abuse of administrative power which has characterized OPA since its inception. The letters "OPA" have of late taken on a new significance more accurately defined as "obnoxious political appeasement," calculated to exploit the political support of the less fortunate by appealing to their frugality. It is an edifying spectacle to find a man who alone is determined to stand by principle as against political expediency. No one can question your sincerity and integrity.
C. F. HUTCHES.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
You have our best wishes and prayers in your fight to rid our Nation from the OPA monstrosity.
LULA KAMP.

AURORA, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, OF TEXAS,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: More power to you. Break this crazy regimentation and the eyes of the Nation will be on you to be our next President. Read this telegram from the floor.
Your ardent supporter,
GEO. B. GELAKOSKI.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank God we have men from Texas representing Texas, with convictions as strong as yours. Keep up the filibuster until all Government bodies recognize we do have a Constitution in the United States.
GEO. E. ROSS.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Our prayers are with you as you follow your righteous and just convictions.
ROSS A. COLE.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I am for you. Hope you win. Praying for you.
BETTIE KAMP.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Floor, Washington, D. C.:
No one in Nation has shown democratic spirit as yours. Agree that OPA end will bring full freedom and free economy. Hope our trembling country has stamina to endure crisis before returned health.
FRANCIS MUSIC.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Care Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank God we have one real American in Washington.
WILLIAM L. PEDICORT AND PARTY.

CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
May God help you in your patriotic effort to end the vicious and destructive Office of Price Administration.
ALFRED K. HIGGINS.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:
We are for you 100 percent. Keep on talking, Texas is behind you.
MRS. W. CURTIS DE WARE.

GUNTERSVILLE, ALA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Talk a week; that will be one time you are talking for the common man.
M. F. ELROD,
Commander, Post No. 8, American Legion.

MIAMI, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Dear Senator, we the people of the United States should all appreciate the great service you are trying to render us, and I assure you many do. May the good Lord give you strength to carry it through to victory. O'DANIEL for President should be our motto.
J. FRANCIS WILLIAMS.

CANTON, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Every Senator, deep in his heart, knows you speak the truth about OPA. You are the only Senator with courage enough to stand on your hind feet and speak the truth. If you could defeat OPA bodily you would be the biggest man in America. More power to you.
C. S. BOLENDER.

BRENTWOOD, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Your lone fight for our constitutional rights has given me the first ray of hope that the American flag may again proudly wave over the land of the free and the home of the brave.
MRS. I. R. GAERTNER.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
I have been in the business of publishing lumber market information here for 25 years. If you wish to confirm this suggest you call Congressman ELLSWORTH who is well acquainted with me and my business. What I want to say is this: OPA has turned loose a propaganda program here in the Northwest today wherein they are trying to create the impression that the Northwest lumber industry, as a whole, has been violating major provisions of OPA ceilings and that their attitude in general has resulted in holding down the production of lumber which could otherwise be going to GI's for home building. Nothing could be further from the truth. I have made a careful study of the propaganda issued today and I am convinced that making liberal allowance there is not over 1 percent of the alleged charges which they make that have any foundation whatever, or could be prosecuted to a successful conclusion. They have purposely selected well known concerns and announced that they are suing them for triple damages on imaginary violations which they know do not exist. The facts are the OPA with its duplicity of complicated and impractical rulings has our lumber industry in such a position that the OPA itself is today the greatest encumbrance to a maximum output of timber products of all kinds. I note in Washington press report today you are considering taking steps necessary to allow this measure to die Sunday night. May I say to you as one American citizen to another that you could perform no greater service for your country as a whole.
C. C. CROW,
Editor and Publisher, Crows Pacific Coast Lumber Digest.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Have talked to lots of Dallas people today, and they are proud of your stand against the OPA. Do hope you can filibuster the darn nuisance out of existence.
The WHOLE DAVIS FAMILY (OF SIX)
HENRY R. DAVIS.

SALEM, OREG., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the fight for freedom. America needs it.
E. W. HARLAND.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your courageous fight against the most warped and unfair bureaucrat of them all. If you kill the OPA, you will be the most popular man in Arizona as well as in Texas.
BOB BARBER,
Native Texan and Practicing Attorney and Present Member of the State Legislature of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank God, there are a few Americans left with some guts. More power to your effort to let the oppressive OPA die.
E. G. BECK.

EAST ST. LOUIS, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your filibuster. A careful canvass of some 600 of our wholesale customers scattered throughout 30 States indicates that they and their thousands of customers feel very strongly that all controls on meat, poultry, and dairy products should be removed as soon as possible and hope that some bill can be put through removing those controls.
ULTRA LIFE LABORATORIES, INC.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Let Monday, July 1, 1946, be celebrated by the American people as another day of independence. God give us more patriots like O'Daniel.
D. G. RIDGEWAY.
E. C. SPENNY.
HOWARD NEWCOMB.

ODESSA, TEX., *June 27, 1496.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I glory in your spunk for what you are doing. Am 100 percent agreement in your opinion of OPA.
J. J. WILLIS.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep on talking and get rid of OPA.
VICTOR MILLMAN.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
On with filibuster. We are behind you 100 percent.
L. Z. BROWN.
GAYLE WALKER.
DEAN KNIGHT.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Your stand against OPA is the greatest act of your successful political career. Congratulations.
WALTER A. IRWIN.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We small meat dealers are in this fight with you all of the way. Stay in there and pitch. Do all in your power to kill OPA so that the people can get the things that they need.
EUGENIA MARKET.
ED GOLDMAN.

COLOMA, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Can get 100 signatures in 1 day to kill OPA. Houses being held from rent. Lumber cannot be manufactured at ceiling.
PERLEY D. PITCHER.

SILVERTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Your position concerning OPA meets my approval 100 percent and I'm a very small farmer.
WM. PEAUGH.

DENVER, COLO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
As a freedom-loving citizen I glory in your courage and pray that your strength shall be preserved to defeat the forces trying to destroy our great country.
GEORGE E. ROBERTSON.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We greatly appreciate the fight you are making against OPA and we will back you up.
WARD ORSINGER.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator from Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations and more power to you and all associated with you in your filibuster against the OPA, the most un-American monstrosity ever fostered upon the American people. A 68-year-old American citizen born and raised in America with no group nor union affiliation takes his hat off to you. Keep talking until the Bowles' gang hoists the white flag.
J. J. HORSELY.

DETROIT, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Hurrah. Kill OPA if for no other reason just to prove that all the dire things predicted by the administration will not happen. The American people have forgotten how to be free. Make them self-reliant in spite of themselves by ousting the whole OPA set-up.
EDWARD N. MARCUS.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Good work. What this country needs is more Senators like you.
WESLEY GILLILAND.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senator of Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay in there and fight this un-American fifth column Gestapo. Chester Bowles, give America back to the people.
LEE JENKINS.

BASTROP, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Americans want democracy and not a Gestapo. Fight hard to kill OPA. The people are backing you.
DURANT BELL.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Wish I could help you filibuster. End OPA.
LYDA H. WADE.

DANVILLE, VA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
What you are doing is the only justice to the citizens of the United States and the world. All producers, merchants, and that part of labor with sense are all on your side. Don't fail. Keep talking.
T. H. STULTZ.

SAYRE, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
We undersigned meat and poultry dealers in Sayre, Okla., and vicinity commend your stand on opposition to further OPA regulation of meat and poultry prices. Unless these regulations are repealed many meat and poultry dealers, even in this area of plenty meat and poultry, will have to go out of business.

Sayre Butchering Co.; United Grocery Co.; Furr Food; Phillips Food Market; J. T. Brown & Son; Hostetler Hatchery; Sayre Hatchery; Buck Wright Produce; Danner V. Fushs; Elder Market Grocery; Austin Cochran, manager; E. C. Mills; Pucketts Food Store; Phillip W. Andrews, owner; J. F. Brown, Jr.; C. R. Kimberlin; Jack Littlefield; Ivesters Grocery & Market.

SPOKANE, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Your fight against OPA commendable. Please don't fail. After you win, let's hope America will awaken and elect responsible men like yourself, thus eliminating racketeers.
Dr. and Mrs. HURD.

WICHITA, KANS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Hope you do filibuster the OPA out of existence. Let's have some sane government in the future.
J. C. LANE.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:
Your fight against OPA typifies the spirit of free America. Congratulations and success.
Dr. FRANCIS B. QUINN.

MCALESTER, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
I mean free the American people of OPA and gain admiration of all good people as leading man in America.
Dr. J. C. BENTLEY.

BOSTON, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your courage to eliminate the Bowles OPA. You are the only man with courage to stand against it. The politicians naturally want it, including Bowles.
FRANCIS HASTINGS.

HEREFORD, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We are for you in your fight against the OPA and all other organizations which deprive the people of their freedom. Any help we can be to you we will do so.
J. A. PITMAN.

DANVILLE, VA., *June 27, 1946.*
LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Your opinions of OPA are shared by producers, livestock raisers, as well as the informed public of this section of Virginia and North Carolina. Unless controls are removed from produce, livestock, poultry, and dairy products, production will continue to decrease. This is my opinion from contact with a large part of the producers of the Piedmont section of Virginia and North Carolina.
DANVILLE LIVESTOCK AUCTION MARKET, INC.,
C. C. FINCH, *Manager.*

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator from Texas, Washington, D. C.:
The OPA is no doubt wrecking this great country and I appreciate the fact that you are fighting bureaucracy, but I am afraid if you filibuster against the OPA bill now before the Senate, and succeed in letting the bill die at the end of the month, that Congress will, in retaliation, write a more unjust bill than the one now being acted upon. I sincerely hope you will consider this matter in every way before taking action.
H. R. CULLENOPA.

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations and success on your OPA filibuster.
Mr. and Mrs. E. F. LOONNIE.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
As one of the directors of the Texas Independent Producers & Royalty Owners Association I appreciate and favor your fight against the continuation of OPA and am in favor of filibuster you are now waging.
V. W. FROST.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your courageous move to abolish OPA by filibuster.
Mr. and Mrs. L. A. WILLIAMS.

MORRO BAY, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
OPA is wrecking the country. Keep up your good work.
EDITH S. NOYES.

BUFFALO, N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chambers, Washington, D. C.:
Hundreds of local Americans will not forget the man who fought to free this country of its most un-American controls, nor forgive those whose selfish political interests prompted them to work for its retention in the face of growing industrial paralysis and its inevitable byproduct inflation. On the verge of commercial ruin Americans are losing faith and patience as never before. They are watching and remembering.
FREDRICK C. LEWIS.

HONOLULU, VIA GLOBE, *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.
Millions of American citizens applauding your courageous fight to kill crime breeding and dishonest propaganda factory presently foistered on Nation in name of price control.
ROBERT BENSON.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Hope you hold out as planned, for your success means that there will be 5,000 houses and apartments for rent in Dallas when there is no more OPA. Thanking you very much for your efforts,
Yours very truly,
J. J. WOMACK.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We compliment you upon your stand against OPA and other autocratic bureaus. Stay in there and pitch.
C. A. MOHRLE.

LOUISVILLE, KY., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. Kill the whole OPA, especially rent control. Very few people are for it after they understand how it operates.
W. F. HAAS.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Vote-seekers, parasites, and its pay roll want OPA. I am only a common laborer, family of five, but willing to take chance with other freemen. Stay with us.
FRED and JEWELL BAILEY.

CULVER CITY, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.
MY DEAR COUNTRYMAN: If you can save America and the Constitution that stands for the right to competitive bargaining, the Bill of Rights, justice, and freedom for all, you will be the greatest emancipator since Abraham Lincoln. I am a persecuted property owner working 15 hours a day, so that OPA can keep one of their high salaried sympathizers in my low-priced 5-room apartment at $23 a month. All alone, I picketed the Broadway Emporium of the OPA protesting their putrid Nazi Bund but suffered their means of exploiting their ire against freedom of speech and the right to picket. If you can save America now you will save it for many years.
JUNE C. BUNCHE.

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank God for the heroic stand you have taken on the OPA matter. Let us get back to the real American plan of living.
HUBERT W. SWENDER.

MISSOULA, MONT., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your foresight and more power to you on your fight against OPA bill. Can we help you in any way?
MISSOULA MERCANTILE CO.,
W. J. HOWELL.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
More power to you, fellow. Keep up the good work. We are all for you.
LOS ANGELES COUNTRY CLUB,
L. C. WORMAN, *Toledo, Ohio.*

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
The eyes of Texas are upon you as well as the eyes of the world. You have been a man in every sense of the word during your term of office. Don't let down now to the Communist and the idiots. Stay in there and pitch.
G. D. WILLIAMS.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work of the filibuster. Standing by you to break the OPA. From a GI family. We are all property owners in Long Beach.
Mr. and Mrs. W. C. ASKEW,
WILMA G. BURGESS,
Mr. and Mrs. WILLARD H. RHODES.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator, State of Texas,
Washington, D. C.
A fair-minded gentleman from the confused Lone * * * State has something to offer the friendly United States. Till we meet again.
Friendly yours,
TAYLOR FURNITURE CO.
CLYDE M. TAYLOR.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work.
RAY HAYES.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL:
Keep talking. Our prayers are with you. We want a free America.
KATE R. FOSTER, *Teacher.*

WICHITA FALLS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill that OPA and receive the thanks and appreciation of the majority of the people of Wichita Falls, Tex.
G. W. RUSSELL.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
For gosh sakes, Pappy, keep talking.
GAYNELLE MILLER.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Heartily in favor of the stand against OPA. Hoping you are successful in carrying out your plans for forced expiration of OPA Act.
THE GEBHARDT CHILI POWDER CO.
A. KRONKOSKY, Jr.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL:
Congratulations on your decision to filibuster OPA bill. American people take new hope of there being one Senator in Washington believing in American principles.
W. F. BECKWITH.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your courage in trying to eliminate OPA returning America to normal way of life.
RODNEY DELANGE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations to you. Kill OPA. Two GI's.
ERNIE EBELING.
HAL HEBER.

BUNKER, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Hope you talk until OPA gives out.
O. J. SCHOLENDON.

LOGANSPORT, IND., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
If it takes a Texas Senator to restore the United States Government to its original status, we, the people of Indiana thank God for his courage. We count on Senators WILLIS and CAPEHART to give you their support.
OWEN L. LAIRD.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Wishing you great success in getting the OPA killed.
Yours sincerely,
ZANE J. SEMANDER.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I personally congratulate you on stand taken relative OPA. If possible filibuster out of existence.
J. R. SIKES.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
As one of the charter members of the rationing board of Potter County, Tex., which resigned in a body this week, I wish to heartily commend your plan of filibuster against the OPA extension bill. I am one of the many producers of livestock and grain in the Panhandle who are behind you 100 percent.
MILES G. BIVINS.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
You can do a great service to the American people by filibustering OPA out of existence. In 90 days all of Bowles' and Porter's propaganda will be debunked.
H. J. PORTER.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We congratulate you for your superb stand in the American way and, above all, for the American people.
AMERICAN POULTRY CO.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Care Senate, Washington, D. C.:
American people appreciate your efforts to eliminate OPA. Their employees can better serve the country on production line.
P. C. HOLNBACK.

GREENWICH, CONN., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. L. O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
OPA past, present, sabotages all America, promotes black market, and gets benefits from black-market returns. OPA regimentation wholly un-American. Decisive defeat most urgent sake free public, free industries, free labor, and all American system. OPA meddling, bungling, purposely responsible all labor strikes and shortages artificially produced.
JOHN BROSS LLOYD.

ENID, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Don't give up the ship. Give her all you've got.
A. P. MORGAN.

WATERTOWN, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your filibuster. Kill the OPA.
JOE CRYAN.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulate you on your OPA stand.
EARL DONNELL.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
God save America. Thankful for a leader like you.
ELLA PUGH.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
Do everything possible to kill OPA.
M. G. PERRY.

SOUTH BEND, IND., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
All thinking, productive Americans are behind you and WHERRY. Kill OPA.
CARL WINKLER.

NORTH CONWAY, N. H., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Talk on. We are praying for you.
KEARSARGE HALL.
E. L. RICKER.
E. F. ABBOTT.

AUGUSTA, MAINE, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
The milk dealers and farmers of Maine are with you in your effort to eliminate OPA, and especially the control of dairy and farm products.
FORDON W. DREW,
Secretary, Maine Milk Dealers Association.

FITCHBURG, MASS, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We admire the stand that you are taking to retain American way of life against the OPA. Congratulations and the best of luck.
WILLIAM POPP.

APPLETON, WIS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Good work. Hope you get other Senators to join in filibuster.
CHESTER SHEPARD.

SHREVEPORT, LA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Highly pleased at press report of your threat to filibuster OPA out of existence which we read on our way home to Crockett, Tex. Hope valiant efforts of you and others can stop Chester Bowles et al. for all time.
H. M. GODSEY.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Democrat of Texas, Washington, D. C.:
I am just one of the millions of freedom-loving citizens of the United States. I am weary of being hampered with OPA restrictions that blocks every effort I put forth trying to make an honest living for myself and children. Go to it and filibuster this giant monster out of existence and let America rise in a world of freedom once more. We fought the war to keep Hitler from coming into our country and let's fight the battle to drive him out.
E. H. HERTH.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, whether this bill becomes law or not, I feel that a large number of increases in prices will result from past policies of the administration. I therefore ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a list of some 500 price increases which have been granted since March 1, as some evidence of the fact that if this bill is followed by price increases, they cannot necessarily be attributed to any provisions of the bill. A list of 500 price increases was furnished to the House committee by the Price Administrator, and appears in the House committee hearings on the third deficiency appropriation bill, at page 811.

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

Price increases

Effective date	Commodity	Level of action	Amount of increase
Mar. 1, 1946	Automatic nonelectric temperature controls	All	5 percent over October 1941.
Do	Crude oil (Rodessa Field, Tex.)	Producer	10 cents per barrel.
Do	Crude oil (10 pools in Arkansas, Kansas, Michigan, Oklahoma, and Texas).	do	5 to 35 cents per barrel.
Do	Iron and steel mill products	All	Varied.[1]
Do	Live cattle and calves (at Leavenworth, Kans.)	Producer	15 cents per hundredweight for choice grade, and 20 cents, all others.
Do	Northern softwood lumber	do	$1.75 per M b. m.
Mar. 2, 1946	Packed tomatoes (certain counties of Idaho)	Packer	5 to 11 cents per dozen No. 2 cans; 20 to 44 cents per dozen No. 10 cans.
Mar. 4, 1946	Corn (sales in area B to feeders in lots of more than 5,000 pounds, or for l.c.l. sales, except to a trucker-merchant).	Country shipper	1½ cents per bushel.
Do	Innerspring mattresses (with wired tied units)	Producer	Producer: 16 percent over October 1941.
Do	Wheat and corn	do	3 cents per bushel.
Do	Oats	do	2 cents per bushel.
Do	Rye and barley	do	4 cents per bushel.
Do	Grain sorghums	do	9 cents per hundredweight.
Mar. 6, 1946	Douglas fir, western hemlock, and true fir lumber	do	Average 3 percent.
Do	Hard rubber products	do	15 percent.
Do	Hudson automobiles (7 models)	All	Producer: 10.8 to 18.3 percent over 1942. Retailer: 0.6 to 7.6 percent.
Do	Putty and calking compounds	Producer	15 percent.
Do	Vitrified clay sewer pipe and allied products (northern California).	do	6.5 percent.
Do	White trucks	do	1.3 to 48.6 percent.
Mar. 7, 1946	Concrete reinforcing bars, spirals, and welded stirrups	Fabricator	20 cents, 15 cents, and 30 cents per hundredweight, respectively.
Mar. 8, 1946	Cotton textiles	Producer	5 to 10 percent basic plus 5 percent incentive on specified low-end production.
Do	Maple sirup (bulk quantities)	do	4 cents per pound or 44 cents per gallon.
Do	Ohio clay tile (deliveries in Virginia, northwestern New York counties, and Cuyahoga County, Ohio).	Producer and reseller (in New York and Virginia).	$1.10 per ton.
Mar. 9, 1946	Burlap (sales of less than 25 bales)	Importer	10 percent.
Mar. 11, 1946	Beef liver	All except retail	$2 per hundredweight.
Do	Custom-milling and kiln-drying of lumber (New England)	Producer	20 percent.
Do	Beef and veal, lamb, and pork (dressed carcass, civilian sales).	All except retail	Average 45 cents, 50 cents, and 55 cents, respectively, per hundredweight.[2]
Do	Lard	do	Sales to civilians, 25 cents per hundredweight; sales to Government, 75 cents.
Do	Lumber custom-mill clipping (New England)	do	50 cents per M. b. m.
Do	Sausage products	do	25 cents to $1.75 per hundredweight.
Do	Chrysler, DeSoto, Dodge, and Plymouth automobiles (1946)	All	Producer: 2.5 percent. Retailer: About 1 percent.
Do	Ford, Lincoln, Mercury, and Hudson automobiles (1946)	do	Producer: 4 percent. Retailer: About 1 percent.
Mar. 12, 1946	Binders board (sold east of the Rocky Mountains)	Producer	$6 per ton.
Do	Custom log sawing (low-cost operators in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont).	do	$1 to $3 M. b. m.
Do	Green coffee (RFC subsidized)	Importers	3 cents per pound on sales.
Do	Steel castings and railroad specialties (except armor, Navy, ordnance).	All	4 percent.
Mar. 13, 1946	Mack trucks (3 models)	do	8.0 to 12.9 percent.
Do	West coast logs	Producer	$1.25 per M feet.
Do	Builders' hardware and certain screen cloth	do	10 percent over October 1941; and 16 percent on low-end items.
Do	Container ship paperboard (east of Rocky Mountains)	do	$4 per ton.
Do.	Diamond T trucks (6 models)	All	19.6 to 33.3 percent.
Do	Electrical clay conduit	Producer	About 10 percent.

[1] Reflects $5-per-ton increase for carbon and alloy steels, ordered by Stabilization Administrator.
[2] On sales to Government 25 cents additional.

Price increases—Continued

Effective date	Commodity	Level of action	Amount of increase
Mar. 13, 1946	Live hogs (sold to buying stations, terminal and interior markets in Kentucky, Alabama, Virginia, Tennessee, Illinois, Indiana, and Washington).	Producer	5 to 15 cents per hundredweight.
Mar. 14, 1946	Canned dried beef (sales to civilians)	All except retail	$3.75 to $6 per hundredweight.
Do	Canned pork products (sales to the Government)	do	70 cents to $2.70 per hundredweight.
Do	Nonpork canned meats (except dried beef to civilians).	do	Sales to civilians, 75 cents to $1.75 per hundredweight; sales to Government, $1.25 to $2.32.
Mar. 15, 1946	Black and white pepper (ex-dock New York, except CCC imports of black pepper from India).	Importer	Black pepper, 5 cents per pound; white pepper, 11½ cents per pound.
Do	Cuprammonium (Bemberg) sheer grey goods	Producer	3 cents per yard.
Do	Domestic cookers and heaters (except electrical)	Producer and wholesaler	Producer, 5 percent.
Do	Hardwood charcoal (ton or more quantities)	Producer	Michigan-Wisconsin area, $9.50 per ton; New York-Pennsylvania area, $10.50 per ton; Tennessee-Arkansas area, $11.80 per ton.
Do	Pig iron	do	75 cents per gross ton.
Do	Strawberry crates (complete with cups and dividers)	do	10 percent.
Do	Western softwood plywood (construction grades)	do	Average, 20 percent.
Mar. 16, 1946	For sash and windows (Boise, Puget Sound, Portland, and Spokane).	Jobber	Varied.[4]
Mar. 18, 1946	Fuel oils (residual Nos. 4, 5, and 6, including Navy special, gas enrichment, heavy Diesel, and bunker C) and asphalt and asphalt products (except road oils).	All	PAW district 5, 15 cents per barrel; PAW districts, 1–4, 21 cents per barrel.
Do	Kerosene and lighter distillate fuel oils	do	PAW districts 1–4, ½ cent per gallon; district 5, ¼ cent per gallon.[5]
Do	Tractor fuel (PAW districts 1–4)	do	0.5 cent per gallon.
Do	Shelled almonds (in small containers)	Sheller, packer, primary distributor.	Blanched, 2 cents per pound; natural, 1 cent.
Do	Shelled pecans, walnuts, and filberts (packaging differentials for additional sizes and package types).	do	Varied.
Mar. 19, 1946	Thermostats (for home gas and electric cookers)	Producer	10 percent.
Do	International Harvester trucks (13 models)	All	Producer, 13 to 24 percent.
Do	Dodge trucks (13 models)	do	Producer, 19.3 to 27 percent.
Mar. 20, 1946	Gas appliance valves (for gas or petroleum heaters or cook stoves).	do	Varied.
Do	Hay	do	$1 per ton.
Do	Western softwood shingles	do	30 cents per square.
Mar. 21, 1946	Automobile radios (Chrysler, Hudson, Nash, and Studebaker).	do	Producer: 49.7, 51.3, 56.7, and 35.4 percent, respectively. Retailer: 11.2, 7.5, 12, and 10.4 percent, respectively.
Do	Ferrous forgings	Producer	16.3 percent over 1941.
Do	Fresh spinach	All	Country shipper: 5 cents per bushel until April 20. Retailer: About ½ cent per pound.[6]
Do	Specified steam-generating equipment, and cast-steel rolls	do	12 and 9 percent, respectively.
Do	Studebaker trucks (6 models)	do	Producer: 31.5 to 42.9 percent.
Do	Nash automobiles (1946)	do	Producer: 3.5 percent. Retailer: About 1 percent.
Mar. 22, 1946	Hardwood flooring (maple, birch, and beech)	do	Average, 9 percent.
Do	Hardwood heel blocks	Producer	18 percent.
Do	Mill-finished cotton piece goods and sheeting	Wholesaler	Regular wholesalers: 9½ per cent. Institutional wholesalers: 11 percent.[7]
Mar. 24, 1946	Roofing flux (St. Paul-Minneapolis area, Wichita, Kans. reference point).	Refiner	About $1.50 per delivered ton.
Mar. 25, 1946	Bituminous coal (from strip mines in district 15)	Producer	6 cents per net ton.
Do	Forge steel freight car axles	do	35 cents per hundredweight.
Do	Machinery, parts, and industrial equipment	All	4 percent.
Do	Wrought steel freight car wheels (two common sizes)	Producer	$2 and $2.20 per hundredweight.
Mar. 26, 1946	Low-pressure valves and fittings	All	Producer: 10 percent for five groups and 20 percent for 6 low-end groups, until Aug. 31, 1946.
Do	Ponderosa pine cut stock (for doors, window frames, and sashes).	do	6 percent.[8]
Do	Steel shipping containers	Producer	10 percent.
Mar. 27, 1946	Bed linens, towels, napery, and blankets	Wholesaler	Regular wholesaler: 5 to 7 percent. Institutional wholesalers: 8½ to 13 percent.
Do	Innerspring mattresses	All	At retail, up to $1.50 over 1942.
Do	Cast-iron plumbing drainage staples (specified items)	do	10 to 20 percent.
Do	Eastern railroad cross ties (5 sizes)	Producer	5 cents per tie.
Do	Heavy-duty mechanical jacks (except automotive)	All	15.8 percent.
Do	Radish crates (western area)	Producer	$2 per M b. m.
Do	Ready-mixed concrete (southern United States producing area).	do	Varied.[9]
Do	Snap beans (f. o. b. Pompano, Fla.)	Country shipper	Country shipper: 25 cents per bushel until Apr. 20, 1946. Retailer: About 1 cent per pound.
Mar. 28, 1946	Cast-iron radiation	Producer and jobber	Slightly over 5½ cents per square foot.
Mar. 29, 1946	Imported vegetable tanning materials	Importer, grinder, liquefier	4 and 9 percent.
Do	Soft mattresses	All	Producer: 15 percent over 1942. Retailer: Up to $1.25 per mattress.
Do	Softwood lumber items (retail distribution yard sales)	Retailer	$1.56 per M b. m.
Do	Western shingles (retail distribution yard sales)	do	35 cents per square.
Mar. 30, 1946	Coal, coke, and other solid fuels (except to resellers)	do	10 cents per ton.[10]
Do	Western softwood plywood (construction grades)	Reseller	Average, 17 percent.
Apr. 1, 1946	Bolts, nuts, screws, and rivets	Producer	7 percent.
Do	Brass mill products	do	Average 1½ cents per pound.
Do	do	Warehouse distributors	Average 1.5 cents per pound.
Do	Carcass veal (freezing and storage allowance on Government sales).	Packer	15 cents per hunderedweight.
Do	Chestnut corrugating medium paperboard	Producer	8 cents per M square feet.
Do	Clay glass melting pots, tank blocks, accessories	do	16 percent.
Do	Crude oil	do	10 cents per barrel.
Do	Fireclay and silica refractory brick (Missouri and east of the Mississippi).	All	11 percent, rounded to the nearest 5 cents.
Do	Fourdrinier Kraft containerboard	Producer	$8 per ton.
Do	Imported Hawaiian molasses (f. o. b. west coast tank stations).	Importer	$2.78 a ton.
Do	Paperboard	Producer	Varied.
Do	Railroad parts and assemblies (90 percent steel castings)	do	15½ percent (over October 1941).
Do	Retail meat and variety items	Retailer	Beef and veal, average ½ cent per pound; lamb and mutton, ¼ cent.
Do	Retail pork items	do	Average ¾ cent per pound; 1½ cents per pound on 80 percent of all sausage products.
Do	Waterproof rubber footwear	Producer	10 percent.
Do	West-coast ethyl alcohol (from imported Hawaiian molasses).	Distiller	About 5 cents per wine gallon.
Do	Wire-tied cushion-spring units (with sisal pads)	Producer	11.2 percent on base models.

[3] Wholesalers absorb 25 percent and retailers 75 percent of rise.
[4] Increases reflect ½ the exact increase in cost resulting from a 10 percent producer increase.
[5] Indefinite extension of increases scheduled to terminate Apr. 30, in districts 1–3, and June 30 in district 5.
[6] Continuation of an increase scheduled to expire Mar. 30, 1946.
[7] Pass-through of prior Bankhead increases.
[8] For extra services, 24-100 percent.
[9] Reflects pass-through of 10 percent rise in portland cement ceilings.
[10] Continuation of an increase scheduled to expire Apr. 30.

Price increases—Continued

Effective date	Commodity	Level of action	Amount of increase
Apr. 2, 1946	Cast-iron gas-fired heating boilers	All	10½ percent.
Do	Dried fruits	do	Processor: 0.8 to 1.6 percent.
Do	Hog pancreas glands	Slaughterer	4 cents per pound.
Do	Home laundry machines	Producer and wholesaler	Producer: 9.5 percent (over 1941).[11]
Apr. 3, 1946	Blankets (cotton-wool and cotton-wool-rayon mixtures made by Chathan and Pepperell).	Wholesaler and retailer	Wholesaler: 16 to 25½ cents. Retailer: Indeterminate.
Apr. 4, 1946	Carded cotton yarns	Producer	¾ to 1½ cents per pound.
Do	Douglas-fir doors	All	Producer: Average 28 percent.
Do	Ford auto radios (2 models, uninstalled)	do	Producer: 56.6 percent (above 1941); wholesaler: 28 percent; retail 14 percent.
Do	Special cherry boxes and display lugs (Yakima and Wenatches, Wash., area).	Producer	About 3 cents per box.
Apr. 5, 1946	Plug fuses	do	21.4 percent over 1941.
Do	Southern hardwood lumber (all species except yellow cypress and all grades except construction).	Mill	8½ percent.
Do	Western pine and associate species	All	Average $4.60 per M b. m.
Apr. 6, 1946	Douglas fir and western hemlock lumber	Mill	About $3 per M b. m. for Douglas fir and hemlock boards; about $2 per M b. m. for Western hemlock.
Do	Sand lime building brick	All	$2 per M.
Apr. 7, 1946	Wooden beverage cases (printing charge—east of and including Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas).	Producer	$1 per 100 cases, half-depth cases; $2, full-depth.
Apr. 8, 1946	Awning cloth	Converter and jobber	Indeterminate.
Do	Berry cups and dividers (sold separately)	Producer	10 percent.
Do	Electrical wire and cable (containing silver)	All	Varied.[12]
Do	Friction tape and splicing compound	Producer	10 percent (over October 1941).
Do	Hard rubber SLI battery containers, covers, and vents, and standard items of molded, extruded, lathe-cut, and chemically blown sponge rubber.	do	15 percent over January 1942.
Do	Maraschino, glace, and brine cherries	Processor	½ to 1 percent.
Do	Metal stampings	Producer	19 percent.
Do	Nonneoprene rubber hose, belting, and packing	do	12 to 26 percent.
Do	Red sour pitted cherries (packed in Utah and Colorado)	Processor	13 cents per dozen No. 2 cans, 43 cents No. 10 cans.
Do	Retail meat and variety items (Kosher)	Retailer	Beef and veal, 4/10 cent per pound; lamb and mutton, ⅗ cent.
Do	Rubber braid building wires (low-end items)	Producer and wholesaler	Indeterminate.
Do	Specified medium and low capacity tanks and vessels, 585 gallons or less (except tanks designed for use with industrial equipment).	All	Producer: 17 percent (over July 1941).
Apr. 9, 1946	Barrels, nail kegs, and slack (except west coast)	Producer	10 percent for staves, hoops, and headliners; 5 percent for all headings, 2 cents per finished keg; 5 cents per barrel.
Do	Canned slab bacon (sold to Government)	All except retailers	$1.70 per hundredweight in 14-pound tins.
Do	Pine nail keg stave and heading bolts (truck deliveries in 11 Virginia counties).	Producer	11 percent.
Do	Pork chops (sold to purveyors of meals)	All except retailers	25 cents per hundredweight.
Do	Smoked hams	do	$1 per hundredweight for smoked, skinless, boneless, and fatted hams weighing over 12 pounds.
Do	Work clothing (jean, drill, twill, and poplin)	Producer	Varied.
Apr. 10, 1946	Basic construction machinery, equipment, and parts	All	4.8 percent.[13]
Do	Glazed sash, windows, and garage doors	do	Producer: Approximately 1 percent.
Do	Ground black pepper	do	Processor: About 8¾ cents a pound for bulk; 9 cents a pound for 3 pounds or less. Retailer: 2 cents for 1½-ounce tins, 3 to 4 cents for 4-ounce tins.
Do	Ground white pepper	do	Processor: About 13 cents a pound for bulk; 12 cents a pound for 3 pounds or less. Retailer: 2 cents for 1½-ounce tins, 3 to 4 cents for 4-ounce tins.
Do	Men's waterproofed garments, (low-end items)	Producer	10 percent.
Apr. 11, 1946	General Motors, 50 models (Pontiac, Buick, Oldsmobile, and Cadillac).	All	Producer: 8.3 to 17.5 percent over 1942. Retailer: 5 to 15.9 percent.
Do	Appalachian hardwood (except timbers and dimensions)	do	10 percent.
Do	Carded cotton coutils (gray goods)	Producer	35.2 and 26.5 percent.[14]
Do	Photographic equipment (except commercial 35-millimeter motion-picture cameras, and items already released from control).	All	Producer: 14 percent over October 1941, or 7 percent over March 1942. Retailer: About 9 percent over 1941.
Apr. 12, 1946	Western agricultural shook	Producer	$7.50 per M b. m.[15]
Apr. 13, 1946	Ceylon No. 2 cinnamon	Importer	5 cents per pound.
Apr. 15, 1946	Defluorinated phosphate (100-pound paper bags)	Processor	$1.48 per ton.
Do	Distribution transformers (industrial transformers 500 kilovolt-amperes and under, and parts and accessories with specified exceptions).	Producer and reseller	5.4 percent.
Apr. 16, 1946	Chrysler auto radios (2 models, uninstalled)	All	Producer: 49.7 and 34.7 percent; special brand purchaser: 23.6 and 17 percent; distributor: 22 and 15.6 percent; retailer: 10.3 and 10.6 percent, respectively.
Do	Fruit preserves, jams, jellies, and apple butter	do	Retail: About 1 cent per pound jar.[16]
Do	Southern pine grain doors (for freight cars)	Producer	11 percent.
Do	Women's, girls', children's, and toddlers' outerwear	Retailer	Indeterminate.
Apr. 17, 1946	Cotton textiles (2 combed broadcloths for men's shirts)	All	5 percent.
Do	Little cigars	do	$1 per M.
Do	Oranges, lemons, and tangerines	do	Country shipper: Oranges, 20 cents in California and Arizona, 15 cents in Florida and Texas; lemons, 28 cents; tangerines, 22 cents in California and Arizona, 14 cents in Florida and Texas. Retailer: About 1 cent per pound.
Do	Overwrapping packaged rice (heat sealed, moisture-proof cellophane).	Distributor	30 cents per hundred 12- or 16-ounce packages.
Do	Peeled pine and hardwood insulation bolts (Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana east of Mississippi River).	Producer	$1.10 per cord for pine and 5 cents for hardwood.
Do	Primary slab zinc (packing and loading charges)	Supplier	10 cents per ton for wiring and strapping in bundles, and 50 and 70 cents, respectively, on wooden and steel pallet.
Do	Staple work clothing (men's and boys'—made of chambrays, coverts, denims, drills, jeans, and whipcords).	All	Producer: 12 to 15 percent. Retailer: About 22½ to 29 cents per garment.
Do	Wool floor coverings	do	Producer: 4½ percent.
Apr. 18, 1946	Dyed carded and combed cotton yarns	do	Producer: 5½ to 6¾ cents, per pound, by type and ply.[17]
Do	Household mechanical refrigerators	do	Producer: 8 percent. Retailer: About 4 percent.
Do	Packard (10 new models)	do	Producer: 14.1 to 19.7 percent. Retailer: 10.8 to 15.4 percent.
Apr. 19, 1946	Industrial power transmission equipment	do	7.8 percent.
Do	Machine tools (including hand- and foot-powered immobile machine tools).	Producer and reseller	Producer: 20 percent over October 1941.
Do	Screw-machine products	All	Producer: 5.2 percent.
Do	Screw-machine services (except bolts, nuts, screws, and rivets, and automotive parts).	do	Supplier: 10 percent over 1942.
Do	Snap beans	do	Country shipper: 50 cents per bushel.[18] Retailer: About 5 cents per pound.[18]

[11] Instead of 7.7 percent granted in October 1945.
[12] To reflect higher cost of foreign silver content.
[13] Until June 15.
[14] For mills paying and not paying, respectively, WLB wage increases.
[15] Increase effective until May 31, 1946.
[16] Reflects rise in sugar costs. Only processors with a no-balance inventory processed from sugar purchased before Feb. 10, 1946, may take the increase.
[17] Distributed in 2 bands for producers paying and not paying WLB wage rises.
[18] Increases effective until Apr. 30.

Price increases—Continued

Effective date	Commodity	Level of action	Amount of increase
Apr. 20, 1946	Cotton bedspreads and table napery	Wholesaler and retailer	Wholesalers: 14 to 34 percent. Retailers: 1 to 20 percent.
Apr. 22, 1946	Cement, except white (southern California, Arizona, and southeastern Nevada).	All	10 cents per barrel.
Do	Cotton grey rope, yarn, twine, and cord	Producer and jobber	5 percent, per pound of cotton content.
Do	Cotton rope, twine, yarn, and cord	Producer	¾ cent, per pound of contained cotton.
Do	Ford (new model)	All	Producer: 48.8 percent above most comparable 1942 car. Retailer: 43 percent.
April 22, 1946	Gummed cloth tape (sheetings and cansburgs)	Producer	35 cents per M 1-inch yards.
Do	Manganese steel castings and castings products	do	9.6 percent.
Do	Mercury (new model)	All	Producer: 51.6 percent over most comparable 1942 car. Retailer: 45.2 percent.
Do	Special American and Asiatic cotton blankets, and wool blankets.	Producer	About 14 percent on cotton and 5 percent on wool.
Do	Tidewater red cypress lumber	All	Mill: 10 percent over 1942.
Do	Western red cedar lumber (bevel, bungalow, and special sidings).	do	Average 7½ percent.
Do	White cedar shingles (Lake States)	Mill	About 23 percent.
Apr. 23, 1946	Preservative treatment of lumber by nonpressure methods	Supplier	Indeterminate.
Do	Steel ducts for electric wires (except tubing, fittings, flexible conduit, and raceways, including fittings).	All	Producer: 13 percent over Oct. 1, 1941.
Apr. 24, 1946	Chrysler, 9 models (Dodge, DeSoto, Chrysler)	do	Producer: 8 to 16.4 percent over 1942. Retailer: 2 3 to 11 percent.
Do	Industrial casein (inedible)	Producer	9 cents per pound.
Do	Northeastern hardwood lumber (except timber and dimension items).	All	Producer: From 3 to 7½ percent according to grade.
Apr. 25, 1946	Cigarettes	do	Producer: 25 cents per M. Retailer: 1 cent on 2 packs; vending machine sales, except "economy," 1 cent per pack.
Apr. 26, 1946	Malleable iron castings	Producer	Average 7 percent.
Apr. 25, 1946	Metal upholstery springs, construction, and accessories	All	Producer and wholesaler 8 to 10 percent.
Apr. 26, 1946	Tools, dies, jigs, fixtures, molds, and patterns (sold with machines, parts and industrial equipment).	Producer	Varied.[19]
Apr. 29, 1946	Caskets and shells and shooks (low-end)	do	15 percent, and 25 percent, respectively.
Do	Clay drain tile (Ohio and Michigan)	All	$1.20 per ton.
Do	Lamb and mutton wholesale cuts	All, except retailer	10 cents per hundredweight for kosher foresaddle, forequarter, bracelet, and all whole or half chuck; 25 cents per hundredweight for fabricated cuts (WSA specifications) sold to specified buyers.
Do	Lead—special packing and leading (at buyer's request)	Supplier	20 and 40 cents per ton.
Do	Spectacle frames (low-end)	Producer	25 percent.
Apr. 30, 1946	Rye bread (not less than 1 part rye to 4 parts wheat flour)	All	Producer: 2 cents per pound.[16] Wholesale: Maximums limited to 12 cents per pound.[20]
Do	Waterproof rubber footwear	Wholesaler	10 percent.
Apr. 19, 1946	Metal nonhousehold furniture	All	Producer: 10.5 percent over October 1941 to resellers.
Do	Warm-air furnaces, subassemblies, and repair parts	do	Average, 12.3 percent.[21]
Apr. 20, 1946	Metal cots, beds, and springs	Producer and jobber	Producer: 5 to 35 cents per item as listed.
Apr. 22, 1946	Market woodpulp (on listed grades)	Producer	Average, 10 percent.
Do	Vitrified clay sewer pipe and allied products (Eastern and East Central States).	All	Producer: 15 percent.
Apr. 23, 1946	Pole-line hardware and line construction specialties (except for overhead trolley lines).	do	Do.
Do	Levers, raschel, and barmen laces (82 low-priced laces)	Producer and jobber	½ cent to 22 cents per yard, depending on width.[22]
Apr. 24, 1946	Cutting tools and machinery attachments and accessories	All	Producer: 17.3 percent over March 1942.
Apr. 25, 1946	Milk-bottle stock paperboard (2 major manufacturers) [23]	Producer	$10 and $26 per ton, respectively.
Do	Fluorescent and specialty transformers	All	Producer: 11 percent on fluorescent; 19 percent on specialty over October 1941.[24]
Do	Maple sirup and sugar (bulk sirup, and block sugar, containers of 24 ounces or less).	Packer, wholesaler, retailer	Packer: About 3 cents per pound.
Do	Mufflers, tail pipes, and exhaust pipes (replacement)	Producer [25] and wholesaler	Producer: 12 percent above March 1942.
Apr. 26, 1946	Pontiac auto radios (2 models, uninstalled)	All	Producer: 45.5 and 46.3 percent. Pontiac to distributor: 25 and 27.1 percent. Wholesaler: 21.3 and 23.3 percent. Retailer: 8.8 and 10.2 percent. All over 1941 prices.
Do	Pennsylvania anthracite (group I mines, when shipped via the Great Lakes and sold on dock on the United States bank of Lake Superior or the west bank of Lake Michigan, north of and including Waukegan, Ill.).	Dealer	5 to 15 cents per net ton.
Do	Linoleum and felt-base floor and wall covering (except carpets).	All	Producer: About 15.5 percent over March 1942.[26] Retailer: 6 percent.
Do	Steel shovels, spades, and scoops	do	Producer: 9 percent. Retailer: About 7 to 10 cents each.
Apr. 29, 1946	Metal household furniture	Producer	7 percent above 1941.[27]
Apr. 30, 1946	Home washing and ironing machines	All	Producer: 6.8 percent over current ceilings.[28]
Do	Cast iron radiation and accessories (convectors, convector baseboard, and bathroom radiators, radiators for blower and ventilator systems, and radiator bushings, plugs, nipples, brackets, pedestals, and chaplets, including steel chaplets).	do	Producer: 37 percent over October 1941.
Do	Nonmetallic sheathed cable (type R, insulated with synthetic rubber).	do	11 percent over October 1941.
Do	Repair and replacement parts under GMPR (for domestic cooking and heating stoves, washing and ironing machines, mechanical refrigerators, vacuum cleaners and attachments, business and office machines).	do	5 percent, 9.5 percent, 16.5 percent, 6 percent, and 12 percent, respectively.
Apr. 1, 1946	Crude oil (19 pools in California, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas).	Producer	5 to 35 cents per barrel.
Apr. 3, 1946	Men's knitted underwear (low-end athletic shirts, union suits, drawers).	do	About 25 percent above March 1942.
Apr. 23, 1946	Woven decorative fabrics (low-end, distributor sales)	Reseller	Indeterminate.[29]
Apr. 30, 1946	Chevrolet (9 models)	All	Producers: 11 to 14 percent over 1942. Retailers 4.9 to 7.9 per cent over 1942.
Do	General Motors automobiles (except Chevrolet and Pontiac).	do	Producer: 4.5 to 7.4 percent. Retailer: 1.6 to 3.5 percent.
Do	Pontiac (4 station wagons)	do	Producer: 23 to 24 percent over 1942. Retailer 20 to 20.8 percent.[30]
May 1, 1946	Brass mill products	do	Producer: Average 13.3 percent over March 1942.
Do	Crude oil (8 pools in California, Kansas, Michigan, and Oklahoma).	Producer	1 to 35 cents per barrel.
Do	Hand lawn mowers	All	Producers: 9.4 percent.
May 2, 1946	Bedspreads, napery, and woven decorative fabrics (at least 95 percent cotton).	Producer	About 8½ percent.

[19] New ceilings may reflect current instead of base-period costs.
[20] Until June 30.
[21] Replaces reconversion factors for furnaces of 9 percent for oil burners and 12.5 percent for gas.
[22] Ceilings may not exceed established cut-off prices.
[23] Producing 60 percent of output.
[24] Replaces increase factors of 6.3 and 14.4 percent issued in January.
[25] Except automotive producers.
[26] Replaces 9-percent rise granted in February.
[27] Replaces reconversion increase factor of 5 percent issued in February.
[28] Total 17 percent over 1941.
[29] Partial pass-through of producer rise in November.
[30] For nearest comparable model.

Price increases—Continued

Effective date	Commodity	Level of action	Amount of increase
May 2, 1946	Radio receiver and special-purpose tubes	Producer and wholesaler	Producer: 20 percent for replacement tubes; 15 percent for all others.
May 3, 1946	Asphalt coated insulating sheathing (25 x 32 inches)	All	Producer $4 per M square feet.
Do	Gray iron castings	Producer	16 percent for ceilings frozen August 1941 through January 1942 prices; 12 percent for those fixed by formula from October 26 1942, through December 1943; 6 percent for those with pre-base-period ceilings or with ceilings fixed in 1944.
Do	Pearling barley	Merchandisers (except producers, country shippers, trucker-merchants, and retailers).	5 cents per bushel.
Do	Special millwork	All	Indeterminate.
May 6, 1946	Bolts, nuts, and screws	All except producers	7 percent for products sold on a list or discount basis.
Do	Chemical cordwood (Missouri)	Mill	11 percent.
Do	Finished corduroy and velveteen	Producer	11.8 percent on carded corduroy, 21.3 percent on combed; 11.3 percent on carded velveteen.[31]
Do	Green Spanish olives	All	25 to 50 percent.
Do	Insulation and felt cordwood (produced in West Virginia, Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri).	Producer	3.5 to 17.5 percent; also $2 per cord for deliveries to mill by truck.
Do	Low-cost apparel (sold by credit retailers)	Retailer	17 percent on cash sales.
Do	Prefabricated dwelling structure and subassemblies (uninstalled).	All except producer	Varied.
Do	Pulpwood (Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri).	Producer	Average 7 to 8 percent per standard cord; also, zone V, $2 per cord, for deliveries to mill by truck.
Do	Vises and parts (except machine attachments and hinge or chain pipe vises).	All	Producers: 8 percent over March 1942.
Do	Western pine stock millwork	do	Mill: Average 23 percent.
Do	Wire-tied innerspring mattresses	do	Producer: additional 2 percent over October 1941.[32]
May 7, 1946	Audio transformers and chokes (having fixed iron cores)	Producer	7.7 percent.
Do	Combed cotton yarns (sold for making zipper tape)	do	5.4 percent.
Do	Knitted products (men's, women's, and children's knit underwear, sleepers, and hosiery of cotton, wool, or mixtures of the two; and flat and circular fabrics, tubing, wristlets (for gloves), and bags).	All	Producer: 75 cents to $5 per pound of contained cotton yarn. Retailer: About 2 to 5 cents per pair for hose, and 5 to 35 cents per undergarment.
Do	Mechanics hand service tools	do	Producers: 5 percent over March 1942.
Do	Oats (shipped to Kansas for feeding purposes)	Merchandiser	Average less than 1/10 cent per bushel.
Do	Radio transformers, and vibrators	Producer	3.4 percent.
Do	Reverse twist carded yarn (exclusively for making cotton hose).[33]	do	1½ cents per pound.
Do	Wood boring and cutting tools (manually operated	All	Producer: 17.3 percent.
May 8, 1946	Armored (BX) cable	do	Producers: Average 14 percent.
Do	Bathing and shower caps (synthetic, substitute, or natural rubber).	do	Producer: About 33⅓ percent. Retailer: About 10 percent.
Do	Business machines	do	Producers: 12 percent. Retailer: About 3½ percent over 1942.
Do	Copper wire products and services	All except retail	Average 12½ percent.
Do	North hemlock lumber (Lake States area)	All	Mill: Average 14 percent. Retail: Average 10 percent.
Do	Northeastern softwood lumber (square edge hemlock, spruce, Norway pine, eastern white cedar, jack pine, and the same species imported from eastern Canada).	do	Mill: $3.50 per M. b. m.
Do	Northeastern softwood lumber (round edge white pine)	do	Mill: $2 per M. b. m.
Do	Northeastern softwood lumber (eastern spruce lath)	do	Mill: 75 cents to $1 per M pieces.
Do	Northeastern softwood lumber (white cedar shingles)	do	Mill: 25 to 40 cents per square.
Do	Northeastern softwood lumber (white and Norway pine imported from Ottawa Valley, Canada).	do	Mill: 8 percent f. o. b. mill.
Do	Plastic products	Producer	Indeterminate.
Do	Retail shoe resoling (Avonite, Neo-cord, O'Sullivan plastic)	Repairman	15 cents for men's and boys' sizes under 3½ and all women's sizes; 25 cents for men's and boys' large sizes.
Do	Stock screen goods	All	Producer: Average 14.5 percent f. o. b. mill or 13.4 percent delivered.
Do	Textile awnings	All except retailer	Producer: 12 percent on sales to distributors.
May 9, 1946	Compressors-condensing units, and parts (5 horsepower or less).	All	Producer: 17 percent.
Do	Finished rayon piece goods	Producer and converter	Indeterminate.
Do	Northern white cedar and tamarack fence posts (from Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin).	All	Producer: 11 percent.
Do	Window shades and rollers	do	Producer: 15 percent for cloth; 20 percent for fiber and paper: 9 percent on direct sales to consumers.
Do	Wooden fence posts (small sales by retail yards)	Retailer	20 percent on sales of less than $10.
May 10, 1946	Abrasive products	All	Producer: 22.3 percent over October 1941 for artificial abrasive grain; 24.2 percent for coated and bonded products using the grain.
Do	Asphalt and tarred roofing products	do	Producers: Average 7.5 percent for East, and 3 percent across-the-board for the West.
Do	Farm machinery	do	Producer: Average 10 percent. Retailer: 5 percent on new equipment.
Do	Iron and steel products (prime hot and cold rolled sheets and strip made from selected rimmed stock or aluminum killed steel).	Warehouse	15 to 35 cents.
Do	Barley	All	9 cents per bushel.
Do	Corn	do	25 cents per bushel.
Do	Grain sorghums	do	$18 per hundredweight.
Do	Grains and feeds (meat scrap, hominy feed, corn-germ meal, brewers' dried grains, dried beet pulp, rice bran, mill feeds, and mirror meals (babassu, etc.)).	do	$10 per ton.
Do	Feeds and meals (soybean, cottonseed, peanut, and linseed meals, gluten feed, and gluten meal).	do	$14 per ton.
Do	Fish meal and fish scrap and tankage	do	$10 per ton and $7.50 per ton, respectively.
Do	Oats	do	5 cents per bushel.
Do	Rye	do	10 cents per bushel.
Do	Wheat	do	15 cents per bushel.
Do	Women's bend outsoles (heavier-weight leather, 8- to 9½ inch stacks of 20 pairs).	Producer	Average 20 percent.
May 11, 1946	Cotton waterproofed clothing (low-end)	Wholesaler	Varied.[34]
Do	Milling services by lumber distribution yards	Mill	25 cents to $1.75 per M b.m. according to service performed.
Do	Snuff	All	Producers: Average 5.2 cents per pound. Retailers ½ cent to 5.9 cents depending upon size of package.
Do	Tire-inflation stands	do	Producer: 11 percent over October 1941.
Do	Veneer logs (southeastern area)	Producer	$10 per 1,000 feet on logs 16, 17, and 20 inches and larger.
May 13, 1946	Casein glue	All	Producer: Average 25 percent.
Do	Clocks and nonjeweled watches (domestic)	do	Producer: 20.5 percent for watches; 17 percent for spring-wound clocks; 15 percent for electric clocks.
Do	Cotton textiles (15 new major item groups).[35]	Mill	From 12.2 to 24.2 percent.
Do	Electric motors (fractional horsepower and integral horsepower motors).	All	Producer: About 17 percent.

[31] To mills paying approved wage increases; other mills somewhat lower.
[32] Total 18 percent rise.
[33] Use must be certified to OPA.
[34] Pass on of 75 percent of the recent 10-percent rise to producers.
[35] Such as luggage, cap, and Girl Scout uniform clothes; export suitings and rayon-decorated gray trouserings; woven, checked, or striped cheesecloth; print-cloth yarn gray reinforced mosquito netting, and packaged polishing cloth; six colored yarn dress goods; fancy whipcords and cotton suitings, both less than 25 percent wool and woven on woolen system; cotton velvet with combed yarn back and carded pile; and knitted polishing cloth and laundry padding.

Price increases—Continued

Effective date	Commodity	Level of action	Amount of increase
May 13, 1946	Furniture, low-end (sales to commercial and institutional users).	Wholesaler	10 percent.
Do	Internal-combustion engines and equipment	All	Producers: 15.5 percent.
Do	Mixed animal and poultry feeds	Producer	About $6 to $10 per ton.
Do	Softwood moldings	do	Varied.
Do	Steel power boilers and equipment	All	Producer: 16 percent over June 1941.
Do	Upholstered furniture (low-end)	Producer	Indeterminate.[36]
Do	Yarn-dyed slack suitings	Mill	2 to 18 percent on deliveries before Mar. 8, 1946, and 10 to 39 percent for all others.
May 14, 1946	Bleached sulfite waxing paper	Producer	About 10 percent.
Do	Coated and combined fabrics	All	Converter: 7 percent approximately.
Do	Hardwood stock stair parts	do	Varied.
Do	Solid wood pulp paperboard	Producer	Average 13 percent.
May 16, 1946	Radios	All	Producer: 8 percent.[37]
May 17, 1946	Flaxseed	Country shipper	25 cents per bushel.
Do	Hardwood flooring (oak, beech, pecan, and gum)	All	From 4½ to 12½ percent; premium of $4 per M b. m. for bona-fide less-than-carload lot rail shipments restored.
May 18, 1946	Civilian trucks, truck tractors, and motorcycles (except racing motorcycles).	Producer	Indeterminate.
Do	Low-quality hull fibers (with 58 percent alpha cellulose content or less).	Oil crusher	Do.
May 19, 1946	Soft-filled cotton twills and drills	Mill	1 cent per yard for goods 3.32 yards to the pound and heavier; ¾ cent, 3.33 yards and lighter.
May 20, 1946	Evaporated milk (domestic and British standard)	All	Producer: 25 cents to civilians and 15 cents to Government. Retailer: 1 cent per 6- or 14½-ounce can.
Do	Small electrical appliances	do	Producer: 9.3 percent.[38] Retailer: 4 to 5 percent over 1942.
Do	Staple work gloves (made of canton flannel, jersey, combination leather, and fabric).	do	Producer: 10, 3, and 4.1 percent, respectively. Retailer: 2 to 3 cents per pair.
May 21, 1946	Bicycles (prewar models)	do	Producer: 18 percent over October 1941 or 10 percent over March 1942. Retailer: About 10 percent.
Do	Cast-iron boilers and radiation	do	Producer: 15 percent and approximately 4 percent, respectively.
Do	Imported natural resins	Importer	Indeterminate.[39]
Do	Industrial air compressors (10 horsepower and under, including integral parts and accessories).	All	Producer: 18 percent.
Do	Outboard motors	do	Producer: 10 percent over October 1941. Retailer: About 6 percent.
Do	Western pine moldings (low-end, household and industrial)	do	Producer: Average 20 percent and 6 percent, respectively. Retailer: 10 to 13 percent.
May 22, 1946	Automobiles (Chevrolet, Pontiac, Oldsmobile Buick, Cadillac).	do	Producer: 3.9 to 5.5 percent. Retailer: 3.9 to 5.2 percent.
Do	Automobiles (Ford, Mercury, Lincoln)	do	Producer: 6.1 to 8.4 percent. Retailer: 4.7 to 5.8 percent.
Do	Automobiles (Hudson)	do	Producer: 7.7 to 10.6 percent. Retailer: 6.4 to 9.2 percent.
Do	Automobiles (Plymouth, Dodge, De Soto, Chrysler)	do	Producer: 8.5 to 11.2 percent. Retailer: 6.7 to 9.7 percent.
Do	Automobiles (Nash)	do	Producer: 7.8 to 8 percent. Retailer: 6.2 to 6.6 percent.
Do	Automobiles (Packard)	do	Producer: 11.1 to 13.4 percent. Retailer: 6.5 to 9.2 percent
Do	Automobiles (Studebaker Champions and Commanders, 1947 model).	do	Indeterminate.[40]
Do	Waterproof rubber footwear (mail order sales)	Retailer	9 percent.
May 23, 1946	Cast-iron soil pipe and fittings	All	Producer: 4½ percent.
Do	Recoopered used whisky barrels	Coopers	80 cents per barrel.
May 24, 1946	Feed screenings	All	Producer: $6 to $10 per ton.
Do	Automatic electric temperature controls	Manufacturers and distributors	15 percent.
Do	Corrugated metal culverts	Producer	7 percent.
Do	Fir stock millwork (screen doors and combination screen and storm doors, etc.)	All	Producer: 26 to 29.6 percent. Retailer: 16 to 18 percent.
Do	Fresh peaches	do	Retailer: about 1 cent per pound.
Do	Rubber-, pyroxylin-, or oil-coated fabrics (except window shade cloth).	do	Producer: 13.6 percent.
Do	Spearmint natural oil	Producer and dealer	About 40 percent.
Do	Tools, dies, jigs, fixtures, molds, and patterns	Producer	Indeterminate.[41]
Do	Veneer (box grade veneer from cottonwood, same veneer of other species, and commercial basswood veneer).	do	19, 23, and 22 percent, respectively.
May 26, 1946	Hawaiian molasses (sales to feeders, feed producers, industrial users, and intermediate distributors).	Importer	25 cents for 5 to 20 tons loaded in trucks and 50 cents for less than 5 tons; $6.33 for loading in 600-pound drums.
May 27, 1946	Anklets and hosiery	All except producer	Varied.
Do	Asbestos-cement shingles	All	Producer: 15 percent for roofing, and 5 percent for siding. Retailer: Approximately 10 and 3 percent.
Do	Baled southern pine wood excelsior (Gulf and Atlantic coast (Delaware and south) States, and Arkansas and Tennessee).	do	Producer: About 23 percent.
Do	Baled southern pine wood excelsior (Gulf and Atlantic coast States (Delaware and south), and Arkansas and Tennessee.)	do	Producer: $2 per ton for l. c. l. shipments of 1 to 10 tons, $4 for less than 1 ton, and $2 on sales to direct consumers.
Do	Citrus fruits	do	Country shipper: 6 to 26 cents per standard box. Retail: About 1 cent per pound.
Do	Gears, pinions, sprockets, speed reducers	do	Producer: 13 percent.
Do	Hardwood flooring (oak, beech, gum, and pecan flooring)	Retail	3 to 8 percent.
Do	Mica capacitors	All except producer	Indeterminate.
Do	Machines, parts, and industrial equipment	Producer[42]	Do.
Do	Stock millwork	All except producer	Retailer: ½ percent.
May 28, 1946	Corn milling products (except hominy feed, corn bran, germ cake, and germ meal).	All	Processor: 50 cents per hundredweight.
May 29, 1946	Melons	do	County shipper: About 12 to 17½ percent. Retailer: About 1 cent a pound.
Do	Woodworking and timberworking machinery	do	Producer: 10 percent.
Do	Yellow bar laundry soap	do	Producer: About 20 percent. Retailer: 1 to 2 cents per bar.
Do	Yellow-pine fence posts (Eastern States)	do	Producer: 20 percent.
May 30, 1946	Boxsprings and hand-tied boxspring constructions	do	Producer: 16 percent over 1941. Retailer: About 2 percent.
May 31, 1946	Hardwood lumber (South Central area, listed grades)	Mill	11 percent.
Do	Hawaiian molasses	Importer and wholesaler	$3 per ton.
Do	Lumber (Douglas fir, western hemlock, and true fir)	All	$3.50 per M. b. m.
Do	Mohair yarns, matchings, and tops	Producer	20, 5, and 2 to 3 cents per pound, respectively.
Do	Oil field and water drilling machinery and equipment (except drillpipe, casing, engines, and tanks).	All	Producer: 10 percent.
Do	Rubber reclaiming service and reclaimed rubber	Mills and reclaimers	6.7 percent.
Do	Shoes (low-end, similar to 1942)	All	Producer: Approximately 10 to 15 percent.
Do	Sleeping pillows (feather and down filled)	do	Producer: Average 1.8 percent. Retailer: About 25 cents per pair.
Do	West coast ethyl alcohol (of Hawaiian molasses)	Distiller	About 2.7 cents per gallon.
Do	Western agricultural shook	Producer	$7.50 per M b. m.[43]

[36] Reflects Bankhead textile increases.
[37] Resellers pass on dollar-and-cent amount except for sets retailing under $21.
[38] 18 percent over October 1941.
[39] 2 to 3 times former specific ceilings.
[40] Producer 1947 price ranges from $834 to $1,178, compared with $707 to $746 for 1941 car. Retail—1947; $1,046 to $1,477; 1941, $674 to $992.
[41] To reflect current instead of base-period costs.
[42] On sales to a purchaser in a price class by himself.
[43] Extension to June 30 of rise which was to have expired May 30.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks numerous telegrams from my constituents in Colorado with respect to the pending measure.

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

GLENWOOD SPRINGS, COLO., *June 25, 1946.*
Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We the undersigned pledge our support of the mass meeting at Glenwood Springs, Colo., June 21 of the businessmen and the public. We wish to go on record as backing their resolution.

The resolution is as follows, to wit:

Be it resolved, That the OPA voted out June 30, 1946, OPA has outlived its usefullness, especially to food control.

The OPA has been and is unfair to the little businessman. Supply and demand has always controlled American business and will continue to do so if OPA is abolished.

"America controlled her own business for 150 years and will continue to do so when OPA is thrown out."

Tom E. Dever, C. E. Slim Marshall, Chas. J. Hopkins, L. E. Schinkle, L. E. Barrett, M. O. Colohan, Dorothy Olsen, Alta Olsen, Pay Ryan, E. F. Waters, E. A. Rowe, C. D. Stull, Hazel Meyers, John D. Vanderhoff, L. J. Wilson, Nell Keith, Johnnie Zupancis, Roy McCoy, Walter Hill, Anna Wilson, Floyd E. Wilson, Mary Shammo, Elmer L. Barrett, Ben Christman, Chas. Walls, P. J. Gallagher, Robert Young, Herbert L. Gardner, Cleo R. Huntley, R. E. Flood, Mrs. R. E. Overlin, R. E. Overlin, Earl S. Hart, W. E. Bryant, Francis W. Wilson, V. H. Frickey, W. F. Heberling, C. B. Rader, J. W. Sutherland.

DENVER, COLO., *June 26, 1946.*
Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

According to reports the Senate will approve the OPA as passed by the House. Please put forth every effort to modify the regulations governing the slaughter of livestock and discontinue the rule governing cost compliance which is a big handicap to the packing industry and is the cause of the large packers being unable to operate as usual. If the cost compliance and quota regulations are discontinued it will in a very large measure do away with the black market that is such a detriment to the livestock industry. Any decrease in subsidy should be offset by like increase in ceiling prices of meat.

C. G. SMITH,
John Clay & Co., Stockyards.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO., *June 26, 1946.*
Hon. ED C. JOHNSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

If OPA extension bill becomes law Holly's livestock feeding operations will suffer unless some changes are made in meat compliance regulations so as to permit the buyers of the larger meat packers competing on any livestock market with other buyers in purchase of fat cattle and lambs which we produce at our various feed yards. Under present regulations the larger packers are being forced out of the market. Our feeding operations are large enough that we have to depend principally on these large packers when we sell and if they are regulated out of the market we will be hard put to properly and efficiently conduct our feeding operations. It seems to us that the consuming public would also benefit through a continuation of the operation of the larger packers.

HOLLY SUGAR CORP.,
WILEY BLAIR, Jr., *President.*

GLENWOOD SPRINGS, COLO., *June 24, 1946.*
Senator Ed JOHNSON,
United States Senate Office Building:

Supporting 144 businessmen, Garfield County Organization for Elimination of OPA, we unanimously endorse this nonpartisan action individually and collectively and request you act accordingly.

GARFIELD COUNTY REPUBLICAN WOMAN'S CLUB.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 25, 1946.*
Senator EDW. C. JOHNSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Under today's reported version on OPA bill you may be sure to see black markets increase spread and proper meat will not receive equitable distribution. Hope you can help straighten out the House thinking on this terrible situation. Regards.

HERBERT M. SONNERS.

HOTCHKISS, COLO., *June 25, 1946.*
Senator ED C. JOHNSON:

We favor rejection on final conference report on price-control bill unless it specifically recommends removal of price ceilings on dairy products.

NORTH FORK COOPERATIVE CREAMERY ASSOCIATION.

GREELEY, COLO., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator ED C. JOHNSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Beef settlement means continued restricted production and that we cannot feed. Suggest Bowles for "propaganda minister." Maybe he will furnish fertilizer for farms. We cannot produce without cost of production return.

FRANK B. DAVIS.

STERLING, COLO., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

We earnestly request your vote to resubmit price-control bill to conference committee with instructions to replace amendment to decontrol livestock, and meat. Conditions of our industry are rapidly getting worse, and after grass run of cattle public will be without beef. Feeding of cattle impossible under present conditions, and our greatest agricultural business is being ruined.

W. C. HARRIS GRAIN & CATTLE CO.
A. A. SMITH & CO.

DENVER, COLO., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator ED C. JOHNSON,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Conditions make it impossible to operate unless beef controls are relaxed. Must close Friday, affecting 99 employees. We favor Senate amendment to OPA.

CAPITOL PACKING CO.

DENVER, COLO., *June 28, 1946.*
EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Democrat of Colorado,
Washington, D. C.:

Long of opinion OPA should terminate and let natural economic laws function. Believe many of our opinions have been reticent to speak up.

GEORGE W. MASTEN, Jr.
GEORGE C. HAHN.

CRIPPLE CREEK, COLO., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. EDW. C. JOHNSON,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

May we earnestly ask you to use your every influence right and responsibility of your office in supporting Senator O'DANIEL in his stand relative to the OPA. We believe, as millions of other Americans do, that this branch of our unparalleled democratic Government should be stripped of its drastic powers at the earliest possible moment. We are sick, tired, and fed up, and thoroughly disgusted with what we honestly believe to be very much uncalled for Government regimentation in our daily American way of life. We also believe that the OPA is a farce from true Americanism grossly infringing on the rights and privileges of free-born, upright, loyal, and true citizens of the United States. May we, the undersigned residents of Teller County, count on and thank you for your usual fine judgment in making important decisions that concern your constituents, also for voicing and supporting our opinion this very important question. The following names are those of citizens engaged in each and every walk of life in Teller County, namely, miners, leasers, owners and operators, merchants, doctors, dentists, garage owners, mechanics, bookkeepers, stenographers, druggists, bankers, farmers, housewives, truckline operators, public officials, cafe and hotel owners, railroad employees, hospitals, school faculties, cattle and ranch owners. This communication is on file and signed in person by 203 Teller County citizens.

Bryan S. Jones, Democratic Chairman, James McMillan, Guy Rorabaugh, Sam Fowler, James Harshbarger, Clarence Parrell, Fred Rutan, Mrs. Cora Hatcher, Frank Walton, Leroy Yarbrough, Walter Round, Mrs. Oscar Ridgeway, Shirley Johnson, Charles Clark, Henry McDonald, Earl Bedee, Robert Moos, Lewis Stiner, K. W. Geddas, Robert Welch, Mrs. Minnie Hemby, Herman Conrow, Melvin Salsbury, Mrs. Cora Long, Earl Fry, Mrs. Nettie Bebee, Mrs. John Stark, Gertrude Coffin, Virgil Marquis, Mrs. Bernard McKahn, Roy Stitt, Al Bebee, Mrs. Eugene Beagles, Henry Martin, Joseph Melber, Mrs. Martha Nash, C. L. Fry, M. B. Kilpatrick, Joe Crompton, Mrs. Alfred Gilling, James Ahearn, Clyde McLaughlin, Mrs. Sid Cottier, Harry Andrew, Mrs. Charles McIlray, Mrs. William Walke, Howard Stone, Charles Turnquist, Mrs. Marion Higgins, Mrs. C. G. Kocher, Jess Vetter, Rufus Jones, John Thome, W. H. Merwin, Walter Wilkinson, Cecial Simpson, C. R. Rutledge, Harvey Meacham, Mrs. John Thinkle, Dewey Collier, Mrs. Helen Jones, Mrs. C. J. Rose, John White, W. L. Ramsey, Ralph Dial, Don Nikirk, Mrs. John Sauls, John Asbury, C. B. Hamilton, Mrs. Howard Meacham, William Stone, W. W. Smith, P. H. House, E. T. Sly, James Housell, Harry Porter, Jack Dwar, Kenneth Yarbrow, Mrs. Anna Houston, Fred Cunningham, Stanley Kehr, Don Willy, W. D. Samson, Art Tremayne, Bert Bergstrom, W. L. Ramsey, Dewey Collier, Jack Schwab, Tom Rolofson, Louis Lebow, Mrs. R. B. Rutherford, William Ackelbein, W. O. Fay, Flora Rickman, Stanley Gray, Frank Frederick, Charles Carlton.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement to the effect that I intend to vote against ap-

proval of the conference report. I shall so vote because I am hopeful that the report will be defeated, although my judgment is that it will not be defeated. I wish to make my statement in order that the record may show that I am hoping to be able to vote to send the bill back to a new conference for consideration strictly along the lines of the decisions reached by the Senate in the amendments which went to conference.

I have spoken on the bill a number of times, so I shall not consume the time of the Senate at this moment, except to say that I have not yet satisfied myself that all controls should be taken off and the law completely killed. I still feel that there are certain things which must be controlled, such as rents, and probably some other things, but I cannot believe that the conference report properly represents the views of the Senate, when the amendment which I so strongly favored, decontrolling meats, poultry, and dairy products, was destroyed.

Many very able committees of farmers, packers, poultrymen, and groups of dairymen have come to my office and told me what the effect of price control on their products will be in the future. They have told me not only what the effects will be in the immediate future, but what the real effect will be in the future on dairy products, meat, and so forth—particularly on dairy products. They have told me what the effect will be a year or two from now, because of the course being followed by certain farmers and dairymen who, I can assure the Senate, are good American citizens. Those men are getting rid of their herds and their poultry, and the effects will not be felt by us for some time.

That is all I wish to say at this late hour, because I should like to have the conference report come to a vote. But I wish to have it understood that if I had my choice I would not vote to kill the bill entirely. However, I am not in favor of the conference report as it has been submitted to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate for only about 30 seconds.

Today I received a letter from Mr. R. W. Peaslee, general manager of the Merrimack Farmers' Exchange, Inc., which does business with most of the farmers in my State of New Hampshire. While this is a personal letter, I wish to read one sentence therefrom, bearing on the action which we shall take this afternoon:

> If ceilings had been taken off meat and poultry products New England would have lost what little grain it is now getting.

I think that speaks for itself. It is expert testimony.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to have the majority leader answer a question in regard to the bill which is now before the Senate in the form of a conference report. In relation to the conference report, on page 3, under subsection (A) at the bottom of the page, it is provided that—

> an agricultural commodity shall be deemed to be in short supply unless the supply of such commodity equals or exceeds the requirements for such commodity for the current marketing season.

My question is this: Unlike most crops, dairy products are produced and marketed all through the year. Under such circumstances, is the full year to be considered as the marketing season for dairy products, under this act?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Michigan, I think subsection (A) refers to agricultural commodities that have a seasonal marketing time. We all understand that fruits and even certain types of wheat at threshing time might be regarded as having a seasonal marketing time. But in the case of commodities or foods or products which are produced and consumed the year 'round, with slight variations, such as dairy products—milk, butter, and so forth—I think the marketing season would be the entire year, because there is no substantial variation between the production at different times in the year.

Mr. FERGUSON. That being true, if the estimated production for the year is sufficient to meet requirements—and let us take milk as an example—does the Senator believe that it should be decontrolled under this law?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think the Secretary would be required necessarily to take into consideration the supply for the entire year. If he found that the supply and demand were in balance during any substantial part of the year, he would be justified in decontrolling.

Mr. FERGUSON. Even though it were not for the whole year?

Mr. BARKLEY. Even though it were not for the whole year.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator. I appreciate his answer as an interpretation of the language I have referred to.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I understand that yesterday there was a colloquy, at a time when I was absent from the Chamber, as to bringing various commodities, agricultural and nonagricultural, into a state of balance, and as to what would happen at that time. It seems that there was some doubt as to the effect of price on the state of balance. Am I correct in saying that when the supply of a commodity, agricultural or nonagricultural, comes into balance with demand, it is eligible for decontrol, regardless of whether the price would go up if it continued in that state?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is my interpretation of the bill. As a matter of fact, the Senate eliminated a provision of the bill as reported from the committee which would have been entitled to a different interpretation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. But as it is now written, I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to remind the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that it was eliminated in order to get rid of that very question.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement of my position on this question. I have found myself in a very difficult situation in connection with this measure. I feel that it has been weakened until I am very much afraid that it is not going to hold the price line even as it has been held in the past, and none of us contends that it has been held rigidly, by any means. However, as previous speakers have stated, the question is whether we shall have any price control or none at all. I cannot conscientiously open the floodgates of absolutely unchecked inflation upon the American people. So it is with very sincere misgivings as to the efficacy of the bill that I shall vote for it.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, after most careful deliberation, I have decided to vote for the conference report. In order to avoid any confusion or misunderstanding of my position, I wish briefly to express my reasons for so doing.

My position on effective price control and on the proposals in the pending bill are set forth in the minority report from the Banking and Currency Committee and in my remarks on the floor when the bill was here for consideration. That position is unchanged.

The bill which the Senate approved was far worse than that reported from the Banking and Currenc Committee, from the standpoint of effective price control and the sound economy of the country in the immediate and distant future. The Senate bill specifically decontrolled all meats, eggs, milk, petroleum, poultry, tobacco, and all the products thereof. The Senate also wrote into that bill the Taft amendment, which I opposed as the most potent inflationary device put forward in the entire congressional deliberations on this bill.

The Taft amendment is based on industry's largest profit margin in history, and would operate regardless of increased volume since 1941 or adequate total profits of the individual manufacturer. It would result in widespread price increases on countless thousands of products, with tremendous cumulative effect. It would impose an impossible administrative burden on the Office of Price Administration. It would launch labor on another round of wage demands and strikes to achieve them. It would bring price and cost uncertainties that would slow up rather than advance production. It would commit us to a spiral of price increases and wage increases that can be uttery disastrous to our postwar economy.

With all my heart, I hope that these results will not follow; that somehow the country may win through to an era of industrial peace and soaring prosperity. But the dangers that I see in the Taft amendment and the textile amendments are so great that I could not give the measure my approval when it was before the Senate.

The Senate went even further and wrote into the measure the Wherry amendment, which would have given every distributor, wholesaler, and retailer his current cost plus perwar mark-up, regardless of his present volume or present profits, and regardless of the basic objective to increase the production of goods in order to bring demand and requirements into effective balance.

As a conferee, I labored as diligently as I could to improve the measure and bring back a workable price-control law which Congress and the President would approve, and under which the country could enjoy greater production and continuing industrial peace. The conferees in my judgment brought back a bill which greatly improved on either the Senate or House version.

All the specific decontrols were eliminated. The Wherry amendment was substantially modified and the bill was improved in several other respects. I signed the report because it was the best we could get in conference, and because my vote was necessary in order that any conference report could be brought back to the Senate for its consideration. Similar reasons of necessity compel me to vote for the measure in order that some bill may go to the President for his consideration, in accordance with our historic and constitutional processes.

Voting against the conference report will be a substantial group favoring the specific decontrols, as well as those who frankly oppose continuance of any price control whatsoever beyond June 30 of this year. If I, and those who feel as I do about the pending measure, should aline our votes against the conference report, there is the immediate danger that the votes of those at either end of the proposition will combine to defeat it altogether. That would throw the entire matter back into conference, with further delay of congressional action and with the clear indication that the measure will be made even worse by writing in specific decontrols.

Mr. President, this is the 28th of June. All price control, all stabilization authority as to wages and prices, and all rent control, will expire on the 30th of June unless renewed by some congressional action and approved by the President or passed over his veto.

Those who declare that the measure does not go far enough in protecting price control appear to be divided into two groups: Some believe that Congress is confronted with the choice of this bill or no price control legislation at all; others still hope for a Presidential veto, sustained by Congress and followed by a simple continuing resolution. But, as a practical matter, the best way to further either course is to get this bill to the President just as quickly as we possibly can in these last few days that remain.

I do not pretend to know what action the President will take with regard to this measure.

In my judgment, a Presidential veto would be sustained. Thereafter, a continuing resolution would be in order. But at this moment, we have no choice but to send some bill, the best bill we could get in conference, to the President's desk for his consideration. For that reason and that reason alone I am voting for the conference report.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I merely wish to say a few words before the vote is taken. I realize that many Members of this Senate have been disturbed with reference to their duty in regard to this conference report, and I recognize that the choice which many of them are required to make is a very difficult one. But, Mr. President, the choice must be made. There is no alternative to making that choice. It might be a tragic choice if things turn out badly with respect to what we do here today.

This morning the President of the United States called to the White House the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the majority leader of the House, and the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate and the majority leader of the Senate, to discuss this legislation. The President was very sincere in seeking our viewpoint with respect to it. Inasmuch as he authorized us to say what we had recommended, when we departed, and inasmuch as it is now a matter of public knowledge, there is no need to keep from the Members of this body what we urged him to do.

With all the force that we could command, in view of the situation which presents itself to us and to him, we urged him to sign the bill when it reached him, on the same ground that I urge that we adopt it here, because the choice is between this bill and nothing. To hope that a joint resolution continuing price controls after next Sunday will be adopted by the two Houses of Congress is an idle dream. We might as well understand that, because that is what it is. It cannot be done. If an attempt were made to do it by the introduction of a joint resolution, it would have to go to the Committees on Banking and Currency of the two Houses of Congress and be there considered, and subsequently be reported back to the two Houses of Congress; and every provision in the conference report now before us could be added to it, and in all likelihood would be added to it, and more, too, so that we would ultimately be confronted with the necessity of having to vote on a worse bill than this one is, even if it is as bad as its enemies describe it to be. If we could ever pass such a joint resolution—and it might require a week, or 2 weeks, or 3 weeks to get it to the President—he would be confronted with the same choice with which he is confronted at this time, and it might be an even worse choice; and in the meantime there would be no OPA law, and prices would go up without restraint. Not only would prices go up, but rents would go up in every city in the United States—not only the rents for ordinary tenants, but rents for veterans who seek quarters. If they could not pay such increased rents, they would be evicted; and if they were not evicted, in many cases they would be made the victims of unconscionable increases in rents.

Mr. President, I say to the Senate, as I said to the President, that if there were in this bill nothing except a provision for the control of rents for one more year, it would be worth voting for and worth signing. However, it does contain more than that. Under this bill, any possible increases in prices will not be so great as the increases would be if the bill were not enacted.

So I say that in voting on the conference report no Member of the Senate should vote under the delusion that if the bill is defeated, we can get another one. The choice is between this bill or nothing at all. It is a choice which we do not like to make, but we have to make it, because it is here before us.

I hope with all my heart that the Senate will adopt the conference report and that the President will sign it.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays have been ordered. Those in favor of agreeing to the conference report will vote "yea" when their names are called, and those who are opposed will vote "nay."

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. MCCLELLAN (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK]. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and the Senator from South

Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are necessarily absent.

The Senators from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO and Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are detained on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business, having been appointed to the commission on the part of the Senate to participate in the Philippine independence ceremonies.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State. He has a general pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

I also announce that on this question the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea" and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] would vote "nay" if present.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] have a general pair.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent by leave of the Senate, being a member of a committee designated by the Senate to attend the atomic bombing at Bikini.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of the Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr, BUTLER] are absent on official business, being members of the commission appointed to attend the Philippine independence ceremonies.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 23, as follows:

YEAS—47

Aiken	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Huffman	Overton
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Burch	Kilgore	Radcliffe
Byrd	Knowland	Revercomb
Carville	La Follette	Russell
Chavez	Lucas	Smith
Donnell	McCarran	Stewart
Downey	McKellar	Swift
Fulbright	McMahon	Taft
George	Magnuson	Taylor
Gossett	Mead	Tobey
Green	Millikin	Tunnell
Hart	Mitchell	Wagner
Hayden	Murdock	Walsh
Hill	Myers	

NAYS—23

Ball	Gurney	Stanfill
Bridges	Hawkes	Thomas, Okla.
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Wherry
Bushfield	Moore	White
Capehart	Morse	Wiley
Capper	O'Daniel	Willis
Ferguson	Reed	Wilson
Guffey	Robertson	

NOT VOTING—26

Austin	Eastland	Murray
Bailey	Ellender	Saltonstall
Bilbo	Gerry	Shipstead
Brewster	Hatch	Thomas, Utah
Briggs	Hickenlooper	Tydings
Buck	Langer	Vandenberg
Butler	McClellan	Wheeler
Connally	McFarland	Young
Cordon	Maybank	

So the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the motion for cloture which was filed yesterday in connection with the conference report on the price-control bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the motion is withdrawn.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I have several speaking engagements during the next few days which I cannot very well avoid. I ask unanimous consent to be excused from the sessions of the Senate until July 9.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma obtained the floor.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have asked the Senator from Oklahoma to yield to me so that I may make a statement.

Mr. President, it is the desire of the Committee on Appropriations that the Senate now take up, in their order, the appropriation bills on the calendar. They may have to go to conference. Therefore it is the desire of the committee that they be passed at once.

I believe that the committee on appropriations reported a bill today which may not yet have been printed on the calendar, and if we have time to dispose of it, I should like to have it disposed of today so that if it should become necessary, it may be sent to conference.

I have been asked with reference to a possible session tomorrow. Ordinarily if we could dispose of the appropriation bills we might avoid a session tomorrow, but in view of the situation which exists, or may exist in regard to the legislative business of the Senate, it seems obvious at this time that we must hold a session tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the majority leader give some indication of his intentions with respect to a session of the Senate on July 4? A number of Senators have asked me whether there will be a session on that day.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the unfinished business which was temporarily laid aside is Senate bill 1850, the National Science Foundation bill. It is obvious that that bill will probably not be discussed until Monday. How long it will take to dispose of it, I do not know. It is not my purpose to ask the Senate to sit on July 4 unless it becomes absolutely necessary, and I cannot believe that it will. What will happen between July 4, which is on Thursday of next week, and the following Monday, I cannot say, but it will be necessary to hold a session of the Senate on Friday because we cannot recess from Wednesday over to Monday. Moreover, there may be matters which will demand the Senate's attention. However, at the present time it is not my purpose to ask the Senate to hold a session next Thursday, July 4.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. As the Senator from Kentucky will recall, I sought his advice with reference to when the rivers and harbors and flood-control bills will be taken up. I am in daily receipt of many inquiries, not only from persons throughout the United States who are interested, but from Members of the Senate who wish to know when the bills will be taken up. They will, I presume, go to conference after the Senate passes them. I should like to ask the majority leader to indicate the time when he believes the bills can be taken up.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is impossible to indicate a day on which the bills will be taken up, because none of us can tell how long it will require to dispose of the unfinished business. A prediction has been made that the bill may be disposed of in 2 days, or possibly in only 1 day. We never know in the Senate how long it will take to dispose of a bill which is at all controversial. But as soon as it is possible for me to do so I shall be glad to cooperate with the Senator from Louisiana in bringing before the Senate the rivers and harbors and flood-control bills. If it is possible to do that before July 4, I shall be glad to do so, or as soon thereafter as the bills can be reached.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1620, House bill 6837, the Military Establishment appropriation bill for 1947.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6837) making appropriations for the Military

Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, of course, if the appropriation bill for the Military Establishment is taken up, it will not displace the unfinished business before the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It is not my intention to displace the unfinished business. The Senator from Kentucky has already referred to the bill which is the unfinished business, and there is no intention on my part to displace it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6837, the Military Establishment appropriation bill for 1947.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6837) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

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

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

AMENDMENT OF SECOND WAR POWERS ACT, 1942, AS AMENDED—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5716) to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Title XV of such Act, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

" 'SEC. 1503. Nothing contained in this Act or any other Federal Act (except the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, or the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended), shall be construed to authorize the establishment by any officer or agency of the Government of maximum prices for any commodity or maximum rents for any housing accommodations.' "

And the House agree to the same.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
JAMES W. HUFFMAN,
HOMER FERGUSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,
SAM HOBBS,
C. E. HANCOCK,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

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

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator make a statement as to what is involved in the report?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very glad to do so. This is the conference report upon the Second War Powers Act.

The extension was voted in the House of Representatives earlier in the year, the bill came to the Senate, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary without dissent.

The bill was considered upon the floor of the Senate last Friday, an amendment was offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] which was accepted, and the bill went to conference between the two Houses upon that amendment.

The House conferees have agreed to the Senate amendment with a slight modification, which clarifies the effect of the amendment. The purpose of the amendment was to make certain that none of the war powers should be used for the purpose of carrying into effect any of the powers granted by the Price Control Act, the Stabilization Act, and the amendment in conference included the Emergency District of Columbia Rent Act. There is no dispute. The modifications made in conference were designed to make certain that the Senate amendment could not be interpreted to invalidate rent control in the District of Columbia under the Emergency Rent Act or in any State or city under any State law or local ordinance.

Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

REGISTRATION OF TRADE MARKS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I call up the conference report on House bill 1654, to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes.

(See conference report printed in RECORD of June 27, 1946, at p. 7635.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the report.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, this is the trade-mark bill which has passed the House of Representatives three times and the Senate twice. The report of the conferees is unanimous. I hope the report will be agreed to. Two of the other conferees, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], wish to make statements with reference to the agreement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the trade-mark bill is of such great importance that I have a feeling that a statement should be made to explain briefly and concisely the effect of the Senate amendments which, with slight modifications, have been accepted by the House conferees. I make this statement because in reading the RECORD of the proceedings in the House with regard to the bill, I felt that there might be some misinterpretation of the language which was employed by one of the Members of the House in attempting to explain the Senate amendment.

The statement of the managers on the part of the House, which was printed at length in the RECORD of the House proceedings in accordance with the rule, makes what I conceive to be a correct description of the effect of the amendment added by the Senate, making the use of a trade-mark to violate the antitrust laws a defense to a suit by the trade-mark registrant.

It should be remembered, in the first place, that this trade-mark bill is an attempt to perfect the system under which trade-marks are now registered in the United States.

The Constitution of the United States does not give Congress any original power with respect to trade-marks as it does with respect to patents and copyrights. The Constitution, as every Member of the Senate knows, prescribed that Congress should have the power to grant exclusive rights to the use of inventions for limited periods. The trade-mark is a right which is acquired under the common law, and is a permanent right.

The bill which came from the House upon several occasions undertook to provide that trade-marks under certain circumstances and conditions should be incontestable, but, in the view of Senators, did not contain sufficient safeguards against restraints of trade. The word "incontestable" is perfectly clear and understandable. After the period prescribed in the act a trade-mark should become incontestable.

It appeared, however, from the history of litigation in the United States, that trade-marks from time to time—not at all as a general practice, I want it understood, but only from time to time—have been used in the violation of the antitrust laws. It was also felt that under the language of the bill trade names could be used to prolong a patent monopoly after the expiration of a patent. One of the Senate amendments, agreed to with slight modification by the House, was intended to eliminate this possibility. I think it is effective for that purpose.

The trade-mark has come into existence under the common law for the purpose of protecting both the consumer and the producer. The trade-mark or trade name is designed to give notice to the public that the commodity to which it is attached is produced by a particular producer. Thereby the consumer knows that this particular producer is the one who has produced the material he seeks to buy.

There have been occasions, however, when trade-marks have been misused. There have been occasions when trade-marks have been used in connection with cartel agreements. There have been occasions when trade-marks have been used to restrain the trade and to the disadvantage of little business.

So it was provided by a Senate amendment that one of the defenses or defects which would make a trade-mark contestable even after this period was a showing that the trade-mark had been

or was being used to violate the antitrust laws of the United States.

The Senate adopted the amendment. The amendment was changed in conference to make it perfectly clear that what was meant was that the trade-mark itself was being used to violate the antitrust laws.

It should be understood from the language of the law—and I shall read it now so that there can be no possible ground for misinterpretation—that the use of a mail to violate the antitrust laws is a defense to an infringement suit. Section 33 (b) provides:

If the right to use the registered mark has become incontestable under section 15 hereof, the certificate shall be conclusive evidence of the registrant's exclusive right to use the registered mark in commerce on or in connection with the goods or services specified in the certificate, subject to any conditions or limitations stated therein except when one of the following defenses or defects is established.

I emphasize that last clause:

except when one of the following defenses or defects is established.

Then seven defenses or defects are listed. They are as follows:

(1) That the registration or the incontestable right to use the mark was obtained fraudulently; or

(2) That the mark has been abandoned by the registrant; or

(3) That the registered mark has been assigned and is being used, by or with the permission of the assignee, so as to misrepresent the source of the goods or services in connection with which the mark is used; or

(4) That the use of the name, term, or device charged to be an infringement is a use, otherwise than as a trade or service mark, of the party's individual name in his own business, or of the individual name of anyone in privity with such party, or of a term or device which is descriptive of and used fairly and in good faith only to describe to users the goods or services of such party, or their geographic origin; or

(5) That the mark whose use by a party is charged as an infringement was adopted without knowledge of the registrant's prior use and has been continuously used by such party or those in privity with him from a date prior to the publication of the registered mark under subsection (a) or (c) of section 12 of this act: *Provided, however,* That this defense or defect shall apply only for the area in which such continuous prior use is proved.

(6) That the mark whose use is charged as an infringement was registered and used prior to the publication under subsection (a) or (c) of section 12 of this act of the registered mark of the registrant, and not abandoned: *Provided, however,* That this defense or defect shall apply only where the said mark has been published pursuant to subsection (c) of section 12 and shall apply only for the area in which the mark was used prior to the date of publication of the registrant's mark under subsection (a) or (c) of section 12 of this act.

(7) That the mark has been or is being used to violate the antitrust laws of the United States.

Mr. President, the point which I wish to make perfectly clear is that the use of such a mark to violate the antitrust laws, constitutes a defense in an infringement suit. The House managers so stated in their statement to the House.

Now I read from the statement of the House managers:

Amendment No. 28: This amendment provides that the use of a registered mark in violation of the antitrust laws shall constitute a defense to a suit by the registrant. The House recedes with an amendment substituting the words "to violate" for the words "in violation of". This amendment provides an additional defense to the conclusive evidence rule of a certificate of registration of a mark which has become incontestable under section 15. It does not and is not intended to enlarge, restrict, amend, or modify the substantive law of trade-marks, either as set out in other sections of this act or as heretofore applied by the courts. The amendment does not and is not intended to affect the validity of the mark nor affect the right of the registrant to continue use or enforce his rights in the mark. If it is established that a registrant has used or is using his registered mark, which has become incontestable, as the legal, causal, and efficient instrumentality to violate the antitrust laws of the United States, such registrant is denied the benefit of the rule that the certificate of registration is conclusive evidence of his exclusive right to use the mark. Under such circumstances, the certificate is only prima facie evidence of his exclusive right to use and he must be prepared to carry the additional burden of proof as though his mark had not become incontestable.

Here I emphasize the first sentence:

This amendment provides that the use of a registered mark in violation of the antitrust laws shall constitute a defense to a suit by the registrant.

I did not want the RECORD, Mr. President, before the approval of the conference report, to be susceptible of any misunderstanding. It is a matter of great importance to the consumers of the United States that they shall know that trade-marks are being used as it was intended under the common law that they should be used. By reason of the invention of the radio, the great improvement in communications, the invention of the airplane and the great improvement in travel, it is now possible for management in a central point to send goods all over the country, indeed, all over the world. And it is possible to abuse trade-marks. But it is of such great importance to the public of the United States that restraints of trade shall not be permitted, that the Senate insered this amendment to make it a defense to an infringement suit as well as to make it a ground of contestability if it should be shown that the registrant was using the mark itself to violate the antitrust law.

As the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], one of the conferees, has well said in a notable speech which he made to a graduating class in New York State a week or so ago, those who seek equity must do equity; and when we seek the protection of the laws of the United States we must be prepared to do so with clean hands. The Senator from New Jersey has announced that principle, which is, of course, old in the law of equity, and to which we all subscribe.

The intent of Congress to protect the public from the abuse of trade-marks and trade names was demonstrated by the adoption of an amendment permitting the Federal Trade Commission to apply to cancel a mark. This proviso reads as follows:

Provided, That the Federal Trade Commission may apply to cancel on the grounds specified in subsections (c) and (d) of this section any mark registered on the principal register established by this act, and the prescribed fee shall not be required.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming suggested that I read the report. I think it is unnecessary to take the time of the Senate to do so, because I had printed in the RECORD a statement which will be found in the RECORD of June 27, on page 7636.

First, I should like to thank the Senator from Wyoming for his cooperation. I think he has made a very clear statement, and I am sure that he does not misunderstand what happened the other day when he was not on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, certainly not.

Mr. HAWKES. There was no intention of doing anything contrary to the wishes of the Senator.

I should like to read into the RECORD the last paragraph of the statement I had printed in the RECORD yesterday. I should like to have it go into the RECORD as my statement at this point:

Although the words "used to violate the antitrust laws of the United States" are general in their nature, their meaning is clear. A registrant of a trade-mark might violate the antitrust laws by entering into an agreement to restrict output or to suppress competition and yet the use made by the registrant of his trade-mark in his business might have no legal, causal, or efficient relation to the violation of these laws. The relation of the trade-mark to these illegal acts might be purely physical or coincidental. If a trade-mark should be used as the legal, causal, and efficient intrumentality to effect a contract, agreement, or arrangement which violates the antitrust laws, then the actual use of the mark to carry out such a scheme would constitute a use in violation of the antitrust laws; but if the mark is in no true sense an essential legal element of the unlawful conduct, then the fact that the registrant may have violated the antitrust laws independently of the mark or its use would not bring paragraph (7) of paragraph (b) of section 33 into operation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I might make a comment on what the Senator has said. I read the last sentence of his statement:

But if the mark is in no true sense an essential legal element of the unlawful conduct, then the fact that the registrant may have violated the antitrust laws independently of the mark or its use would bring paragraph (7) of paragraph (b) of section 33 into operation.

That is just shading it a little too much, as I pointed out to the Senator yesterday. Paragraph (7) was not intended, as I read it, to say, as the Senator has said in his statement, that the use of the trade-mark should be in itself the single, only, legal, causal, and efficient instrumentality which violates the law. In other words, what I want to make clear is that the use in the statement the Senator has read of the phrase

"an essential legal element of the unlawful conduct" should not be interpreted as so narrowing the effect of a trade-mark violation of the antitrust law that nevertheless the trade-mark owner could use the trade-mark in such violation, but if it were shown that some other act were the proximate cause of the violation, then the trade-mark should become incontestable. That is what we mean when we say, as I have quoted the Senator's words, that the holder of the trade-mark must come into court with clean hands.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, would my fellow conferees agree that the Senator from New Jersey is not saying that he is insisting that the trade-mark must be the sole and efficient cause? The Senator from New Jersey is not saying that the trade-mark must be used in the violation of the antitrust laws as the sole and efficient cause, but it must at least be one of the active, proximate causes in the violation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. HAWKES. I am thoroughly in agreement with that. In other words, the trade-mark, to have its incontestability removed, must have been a part of the process of violating the antitrust laws. The Senator from Wyoming agrees with that?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no question about that.

Mr. HAWKES. I think we are all in agreement.

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

The report was agreed to.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5990) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, 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 6, 17, 19, 22, 50 and 64.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 4, 5, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 35, 37, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 52, 54, 55, 57, 60, 61, 62, 63, 68, 69, and 72, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$174,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$190,850"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "purchase and maintenance of one passenger automobile;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$425,972"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbred 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$10,710,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,248,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,297,680"; 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 insert "$859,500"; 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 insert "$767,309"; 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 matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"For the acquisition of parcel 101/25, known as the Emery estate, as a site for recreational, library and other community purposes in the discretion of the Commissioners, $204,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,225,000"; 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 insert "$3,106,000"; 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 named in said amendment insert "$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,630,657"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$723,260"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "'Victory' gardens and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,033,500"; 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 insert "$2,200,000"; 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 insert "$581,600"; 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 proposed by said amendment insert:

"Capital outlay, District Training School: For the construction and equipment of laundry building, $140,000; and for the improvement of roads, $35,000; in all, $175,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$586,152"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,211,923"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 67, and 71

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
ELMER THOMAS,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
CLYDE R. HOEY,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
RAYMOND E. WILLIS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOHN M. COFFEE,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
EMMET O'NEAL,
KARL STEFAN,
WALT HORAN,
GORDON CANFIELD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 5990, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 27, 1946.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67 to the bill (H. R. 5990) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71 to said bill and concur therein with

an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 3. 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 the Government of the District of Columbia 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 the Government of the District of Columbia, 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 or the Government of the District of Columbia, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States or the Government of the District of Columbia, 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 any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or the Government of the District of Columbia 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 the Government of the District of Columbia, 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."

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 1 to said bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 71.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment No. 1, request a further conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the same conferees at the further conference.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HOEY, Mr. BALL, Mr. WILLIS, and Mr. FERGUSON conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT, 1947

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6837) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will proceed to state the committee amendments.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, before we begin consideration of the committee amendments I desire to make a brief statement with respect to what the bill does and what it means. I regret that the bill did not reach the Senate before last Monday. The Senate committee could not consider the bill until it reached this body. Hearings were started on Tuesday of this week, and they were held continuously until we had completed the repertoire of witnesses. Today is Friday, so we had only 4 days to consider a bill which calls for an appropriation of some $7,000,000. I now desire to make a brief statement to explain just what the bill provides.

In presenting for the consideration of the Senate the Military Establishment appropriation bill for fiscal year 1947, I will at the outset state the total amounts which have been involved in the consideration of this bill. The War Department budget estimates for fiscal year 1947, as submitted by the President to the Congress on May 6, 1946, totaled $7,246,335,200. On June 13, 1946, the President recommended certain adjustments in the budget estimates to eliminate funds for the care and handing of property subsequent to its declaration of surplus. These adjustments were contained in House Document 657 and called for a net decrease in the budget estimates of some $38,000,000, bringing the total submission to $7,208,207,429. As passed by the House, H. R. 6837 provided for a total appropriation of $7,091,034,700—a further decrease in the budget estimates of $117,172,729. The bill which I am presenting for your consideration today provides a total appropriation to the War Department of $7,595,449,868, which is an increase of $504,415,168 over the amount passed by the House.

This bill is based upon the assumption that Army strength will total 1,550,000 on July 1, 1946, and will decrease to 1,070,000 by the end of fiscal year 1947. An average strength of 1,279,000 has been used in computing requirements. Of this average strength, it is estimated that 596,000 will be in the United States and 683,000 will be overseas. General Eisenhower, the Chief of Staff, has assured us that this average strength of 1,279,000 is the minimum required to efficiently perform his many tasks during fiscal year 1947.

In the very limited time available for the consideration of this bill the committee heard the testimony of General Eisenhower, the Chief of Staff; General Richards, budget officer for the War Department; and a number of the chiefs of the several operating agencies of the War Department. Based upon this testimony, the committee concluded that H. R. 6837 as passed by the House would not be adequate to finance the carrying out of the heavy responsibilities which must be discharged by the War Department and the Army during the fiscal year 1947. It must be borne in mind that though actual hostilities have ceased, there remain many tasks which must be efficiently performed if we are to have any assurance that the victories which were won at so great a sacrifice of American manpower and matériel will result in the complete restoration of peace and orderly existence for the peoples of of the world.

In taking action upon this bill, the House reduced the budget estimates for "Government and relief in occupied areas" from a total of $500,000,000 to a total of $350,000,000. The Senate Appropriations Committee is of the opinion that the reduction of $150,000,000 would have international repercussions, would jeopardize our occupation forces, and would greatly handicap the performance of the responsibilities which the United States Government has undertaken in Japan, Germany, Korea, and Austria. The committee, therefore, has restored the House reduction in this appropriation.

Based upon the testimony of the Chief of Staff, the Commanding General of the Army Ground Forces, and the Chief of Engineers, the committee reached the conclusion that insufficient funds were included in H. R. 6837, as passed by the House, to provide minimum essential facilities for the operation of our Army both at home and in foreign areas. The committee requested and was given recommendations by the War Department as to additional funds required to provide these essential facilities. The bill now before the Senate for consideration provides an additional $100,000,000 for the construction of required facilities at our permanent overseas bases. The great majority of this money is required for housing for the military garrisons at these bases. Tents and flimsy shelter for housing our troops must be replaced promptly by more substantial structures. In addition, we have restored the House reduction of some $25,000,000 in this appropriation.

The testimony before our committee indicated that H. R. 6837 as passed by the House did not contain sufficient funds for the provision of housing and training facilities at our permanent posts in the United States. The committee has therefore added another $99,000,000 to the bill to provide these facilities. The Commanding General, Army Ground Forces, stated that this was one of the most pressing requirements in the Army today. It must be remembered that before the war we had facilities for an Army of only some 167,000. If these permanent posts in the United States are to be expected to perform their mission in the postwar Army, they must have adequate facilities.

Our committee has also provided an additional $50,000,000 for repairs and maintenance of the facilities which the Army now has. It has been the observation of several members of our committee, and perhaps some other Senators, that structures at our Army posts in this country are badly deteriorated. It is the opinion of our committee that it is unsound economy to allow these facilities to further deteriorate. It is further our opinion that the construction, repair, and maintenance of Army facilities can be executed at the present time probably more cheaply than at some future date.

In passing H. R. 6837, the House reduced the Budget estimates for the Ordnance Department by $12,719,000. The Chief of Ordnance explained to our committee that this reduction meant further delay in the renovation and

storage of the huge quantities of ammunition which we now have on hand, and in the complete demilitarization of the obsolete and badly deteriorated ammunition. Delay in this important work will be dangerous. The ammunition will continue to deteriorate to the point where rehabilitation will be impossible, and there is the possibility of bad explosions with resultant loss of life and property. The committee has therefore restored the House reduction to this appropriation.

The Chief of Transportation informed our committee that the House reduction of some $49,000,000 in his appropriation would result in a lack of adequate transportation facilities for the movement of Army personnel on their return from overseas theaters and of their replacements. It might also mean the slowing up of the handling of this personnel. In addition, the committee's attention has been called to the fact that H. R. 6064, which is now in the status of an enrolled enactment awaiting the signature of the President, will require the return of many soldiers from overseas who have completed their term of service as specified in this act. This act also provides that any father who is in the service shall, upon his request after August 1, 1946, be released therefrom. The War Department anticipates that this requirement will throw a heavy additional burden on the already limited transportation facilities. Additional boats, crews, and facilities will have to be provided to carry out the provisions of this act.

In view of these considerations, the committee has restored to this appropriation $45,000,000 of the reduction made by the House. It is our opinion that the Transportation Corps will be able to provide adequate facilities with this additional amount.

The committee has made a number of other changes in this bill and has fully detailed them in its report. The above discussion covers the principal ones.

There is one change in the general provisions of this bill to which I should call attention. By language in section 4 the House has made the War Department appropriations available for the care, handling, and disposition of surplus property in overseas areas. The Chief of Staff and the Budget Officer for the War Department assured our committee that this bill does not contain any funds for the care and handling of property either at home or abroad after it has been declared surplus. It is therefore necessary that the language provision which was included in the bill by the House be deleted.

Mr. President, in order that this presentation may be somewhat more complete, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a list of the several appropriations which have been made by the Congress for the support of the Army, beginning with the year 1916 and ending with the year 1946. This list is found on page 101 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

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

War Department Military Establishment expenditures, fiscal years 1916–46

1916	$122,392,363
1917	401,418,217
1918	5,632,730,914
1919	8,915,973,973
1920	1,008,300,356
1921	439,485,095
1922	329,050,896
1923	284,112,900
1924	250,714,592
1925	252,087,036
1926	267,260,488
1927	267,124,843
1928	294,957,279
1929	313,093,228
1930	328,738,873
1931	345,274,202
1932	344,610,560
1933	298,417,427
1934	243,329,151
1935	273,485,712
1936	382,654,083
1937	374,260,149
1938	421,985,682
1939	496,074,929
1940	668,586,382
1941	4,029,774,043
1942	13,543,996,420
1943	41,814,973,713
1944	49,528,144,771
1945	51,348,427,060
1946	[1] 28,532,985,445

[1] Estimated.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I now ask that the committee amendments be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Military activities—Office of the Secretary of War—Contingencies of the Army," on page 2, line 17, after the word "purposes", to strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$14,480,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General Staff Corps—Field exercises," on page 3, line 10, after "(31 U. S. C. 223b)", to strike out "$7,000,000" and insert "$10,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Finance Department—Finance Service, Army," on page 7, after line 2, to insert:

Appropriations available to the Military Establishment for the fiscal year 1947 shall be available for reimbursement to such appropriations of the Naval Establishment as may be designated by the Secretary of the Navy, for the pay, allowances, and other expenses as authorized by law, for such number of naval dental officers as may be authorized by the President to perform service with the Military Establishment: *Provided*, That such military and naval personnel, as may be detailed for duty with other than the War and Navy Departments, respectively, on a reimbursement basis may be employed in addition to the numbers otherwise authorized and appropriated for.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 19, to strike out:

No appropriation for the pay of the Army shall be available for the pay of any officer or enlisted man on the active list of the Army who is engaged in any manner with any publication which is or may be issued by or for any branch or organization of the Army or military association in which officers or enlisted men have membership and which carries paid advertising of firms doing business with the War Department: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to prohibit officers from writing or disseminating articles in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary of War;

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 23, after "Finance Department", to strike out "$30,000,000" and insert "$31,578,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 10, after the word "Army", to strike out "$2,584,800,000" and insert "$2,586,378,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Quartermaster Corps—Quartermaster Service, Army," on page 21, line 5, after "maintenance)", to strike out "$100" and insert "$200,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 6, after the word "Army", to strike out "$597,750,100" and insert "$597,950,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Transportation Corps—Transportation Service, Army," on page 22, line 2, after the word "station", to strike out "$475,000,000" and insert "$524,664,256."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Signal Corps—Signal Service of the Army," on page 24, line 18, after the word "thereof", to strike out "$100,000,000" and insert "$104,115,112."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Corps of Engineers—Engineer Service, Army," on page 30, line 5, after the word "thereof", to strike out "$350,000,000" and insert "$475,544,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 10, before the word "*Provided*", to strike out "$115,500,000" and insert "$215,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 19, after the word "for", to strike out "$300,000,000" and insert "$350,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 11, after "In all, Engineer Service, Army", to strike out "$765,500,000" and insert "$1,041,044,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Ordnance Department—Ordnance Service and Supplies, Army", on page 34, line 15, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$315,000,000" and insert "$327,719,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Board for Promotion of Rifle Practice, Army," on page 50, line 8, after the name "Secretary of War", to

strike out "$167,000" and insert "$281,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Government and relief in occupied areas," on page 52, line 9, after the word "information", to insert "expenses incident to the operation of schools for American children"; and in line 17, after the word "accomplished", to strike out "$350,000,000" and insert "$500,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Atomic service," on page 53, line 11, after the word "appurtenances" to insert "the provision and operation of community facilities, including facilities for the housing, health, medical care, safety, schooling, welfare and recreation of atomic service personnel, to the extent and in the manner deemed necessary by the officer in charge for the proper conduct of atomic service activities"; and in line 22, after the figures "$375,000,000", to insert a comma and "to be available until expended."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Printing and binding, War Department," on page 56, line 19, after the word "law", to strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$13,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, page 57, line 3, after the word "work", to insert "unless representatives of the employees are given the opportunity to check any such time studies as may affect the amount of work asked of them and to protest under the established grievance procedure any work requirements believed unreasonable."

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

All in favor——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, to that amendment I offer the following amendment: On page 57, in line 3, strike out all of the committee amendment beginning in line 3, down to and including the word "unreasonable," in line 7.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the vote would come on agreeing to the committee amendment. It will not be necessary to move to strike it out.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand that, but I was not certain whether the Chair had put the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is now pending. The Senator from Washington will be heard.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to speak against this committee amendment. It is similar to an amendment which was placed in the Navy appropriation bill. It is rather a back-door approach to a matter which has been a question for many years in the Army and Navy working establishments.

Last week, during the discussion of the naval appropriation bill, I stated to the Senate the history of the prohibition which has been included in all Army and Navy appropriation bills for approximately 30 years. Prior to 1916, both the Army and the Navy in their industrial establishments used what is known as a time-check system on their employees. It is also called the Taylor system or the Bedaux system. It is a speed-up system in which stop watches are used to check on the employees. Prior to 1916 the practice became so vicious and was abused to such an extent that the Senate by resolution created a committee to examine into the practice. That committee was headed by the late Senator Borah, of Idaho. It made a lengthy report to the Senate at that time, and the Senate unanimously agreed to place prohibitions against the use of time-check and stop-watch systems against the employees, and the Senate has consistently done so for 30 years.

Last year an attempt was made, I believe, by the Senator from Minnesota to change that custom and to strike out the prohibition, which has been included in these bills all these years. That attempt was defeated by the Senate.

This year the Senator from Minnesota and other Senators have placed in both the Navy and the Military Establishment appropriation bills what they claim to be a modification——

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Let me advise the Senator from Washington that since this amendment was proposed to this bill by the committee, the conferees on the naval appropriations bill have agreed to eliminate a corresponding provision from that bill. Because of that fact, I am not prepared to insist that the amendment remain in this bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was about to remark that a similar amendment was acted upon by the Senate the other day. I supposed that the Senator from Minnesota favored it. Then the Senate voted, 28 to 27, on the question of the adoption of the amendment. But since that time the conferees on the Navy appropriation bill have eliminated the amendment.

So I hope the Senate will eliminate it from this bill. There is a great deal of difference between having a time-check system on Government employees and having it on private employees.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I see no point in prolonging the argument, inasmuch as the chairman of the subcommittee is not going to insist on the amendment. I myself think that at this time in the session, inasmuch as the amendment did not stay in the Navy Department appropriation bill, there is not much point in adding it to this bill, although I certainly do not abandon my position, and in this particular case the Army asked for the amendment because the Army has certain operations in which time studies are very important.

I am not giving up the battle. Next year I shall renew it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. In view of his statement, I shall have nothing further to say.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I should like to point out, as has already been stated, that the conferees on the Navy Department appropriation bill have already agreed to eliminate such an amendment from that bill. I commend the Senator from Washington for bringing the matter to the attention of the Senate again. I hope that inasmuch as we have discussed the matter this year, such an amendment will not be contained in appropriation bills next year. It seems to me that we have decided both in the committee and here on the floor of the Senate that we do not want this system. So I hope the Army and the Navy will refrain from insisting upon having such an amendment included next year.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I, too, want to express my desire that the wishes of the Senator from New York and the Senator from Washington be carried out in the future, in respect to the Army and Navy appropriation bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 53, beginning in line 3.

The amendment was rejected.

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

The next amendment was, on page 67, after line 7, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 20. None of the funds appropriated in this act for the War Department and the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, other than funds for which reimbursement is made hereunder, shall be available for any expenses (including the pay, allowances, and subsistence of military personnel) for care, upkeep, repair, handling, and assistance in the sale of any property, material, or equipment subsequent to the date of a declaration of surplus covering such property to a disposal agency, or, if procedures are prescribed whereby declarations of surplus are made at approximately the time of disposal or removal, subsequent to the date of notice by the owning agency to the disposal agency that property has been determined to be surplus and is subject to such procedures. With respect to all such expenses, disposal agencies shall provide reimbursement to the War Department, for credit to the appropriations from which such expenses would be normally paid: *Provided*, That advance payments based on the estimated expenses of the War Department may be made by any disposal agency: *Provided further*, That in lieu of ascertaining the direct expenses and the applicable portion of the indirect expenses, the War Department and the disposal agencies may agree on any basis for determining such expenses as will equitably accomplish the purpose of this section.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, after line 6, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 21. Not to exceed 10 percent of any of the appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year 1947 may be transferred with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget to any other of such appropriations, but no appropriation shall be increased more than 10 percent thereby.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 13, to change the section number from 20 to 22.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HART. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 27, in line 10, it is proposed to to strike out the period and insert the following: "*Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated to the Air Corps be expended in research in or procurement of rockets or guided missiles which come under the normal cognizance of the Ordnance Department."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, this amendment was not presented to the committee; hence, it could not be considered there.

As chairman of the committee, I have no information regarding what effect the amendment will have upon the bill. Inasmuch as we have had only a short time to consider the bill, I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment and take it to conference. In the meantime we can look into it, and the conferees can pass upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 6837) was passed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. REED conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, 1947

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6777, making appropriations for Government corporations and independent establishments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947.

I shall not make a statement about the bill, but if there are questions regarding any amendment which has been proposed or if there are questions which Senators wish to ask in regard to other matters, I shall attempt to answer them to the best of my ability.

So, Mr. President, I have made the motion.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6777) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will proceed to state the amendments reported by the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Tennessee Valley Authority," on page 2, line 2, after the name "Watauga Dam", to insert "and beginning construction of a fertilizer manufacturing plant at or near Mobile, Ala."; in line 13, before the word "together", to strike out "$25,906,000" and insert "$46,572,000"; and in line 16, after the word "appropriations", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That of the $46,572,000 appropriated herein, $17,666,000 shall be available for the immediate resumption of construction and continued prosecution of the work on the Watauga and South Holston Dams with a view to the completion of the work on both dams at the earliest possible date and $3,000,000 toward the construction of a fertilizer manufacturing plant at or near Mobile, Ala."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Department of Agriculture—Federal Crop Insurance Corporation," on page 4, line 4, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$6,800,000" and insert "$7,880,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Independent agencies and corporations," on page 6, line 1, before the word "shall", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$525,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Loan Agency," on page 6, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$33,553,000" and insert "$35,553,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Housing Agency," on page 11, line 17, after the words "total of", to strike out "$1,400,000" and insert "$1,501,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$4,500,000" and insert "$5,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 2, to strike out:

Liquidation of resettlement projects: Not to exceed $99,500 of the receipts derived from the operation of the projects transferred under paragraphs 1 (g) and 6 of Executive Order 9070 of February 24, 1942 (7 F. R. 1529), shall be available for necessary expenses in connection with and to facilitate disposition of the improved or unimproved lands in the suburban resettlement projects known as Greenbelt, Greendale, and Greenhills, pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 (49 Stat. 115), including temporary employment of persons or organizations, by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and the civil-service and classification laws, for making surveys, plans, and plats, and expenses of additions, alterations, and improvements to streets and utilities.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 2, to insert:

Liquidation of resettlement projects: Not to exceed $99,500 of the receipts derived from the operation of the projects transferred under paragraphs 1 (g) and 6 of Executive Order 9070 of February 24, 1942 (7 F. R. 1529), shall be available for necessary expenses in connection with and to facilitate disposition of the improved or unimproved lands in the suburban resettlement projects known as Greenbelt, Greendale, and Greenhills, pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 (49 Stat. 115), including temporary employment of persons or organizations, by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and the civil-service and classification laws, for making surveys, plans, and plats, and expenses of additions, alterations, and improvements to streets and utilities.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$75,000" and insert "$98,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Department of Agriculture," on page 20, line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$8,000,000" and insert "$8,760,000"; on page 21, line 3, after the word "hereof", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That none of the fund made available by this paragraph shall be used for administrative expenses connected with the sale of Government-owned or Government-controlled stocks of farm commodities at less than parity price as defined by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 or the comparable price as provided by section 4 (a) of the act of July 1, 1941, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a–8); and the method that is now used for the purposes of Commodity Credit Corporation loans for determining the parity price or its equivalent for seven-eighths inch Middling cotton at the average location used in fixing the base loan rate for cotton shall also be used for determining the parity price for seven-eighths inch Middling cotton at such average location for the purposes of this proviso: *Provided further*, That the foregoing shall not apply to the sale or other disposition of any agricultural commodity substantially deteriorated in quality (or in the case of perishable fruits, vegetables, and animal products if there is danger of deterioration or of accumulation of stocks) or sold for the purpose of feeding, or the extraction of peanut oil, or commodities disposed of for export pursuant to section 21 (c) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (Public Law 457) or commodities sold to farmers for seed or for new or byproduct uses, or com-

modities sold for the purpose of establishing claims against persons who have committed fraud, misrepresentations, or other wrongful acts with respect to such commodities: *Provided further*, That no wheat or corn will be sold for feed at a price less than the parity price of corn at the time such sale is made: *Provided further*, That in making regional adjustments in the sale price of corn or wheat the minimum price need not be higher in any area than the United States average parity price of corn."

And on page 22, line 16, after "(15 U. S. C. 713a–4)" to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That no part of any funds appropriated in this act for the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be used, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, to make any payments to other than domestic producers, under any subsidy program operation not in effect on the date of enactment of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 23, to strike out:

Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation: *Provided*, That funds acquired by the Corporation as an agency of the United States, other than funds transferred pursuant to the act of June 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 323), shall remain available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the purpose of liquidation and dissolution of the Corporation: *Provided, however*, That not to exceed $40,000 of such funds may be expended for administrative expenses during the fiscal year 1947.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 9, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$3,750,000" and insert "$3,875,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 23, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$1,500,000" and insert "$1,688,501."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 2, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$1,600,000" and insert "$1,644,912."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 5, after the word "exceed," to strike out $341,000" and insert "$391,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—General provisions," on page 27, line 20, before the word "vehicles," to strike out "nonserviceable."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I send forward an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, after line 16, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 306. In order to meet emergencies or contingencies arising subsequent to approval of the Budget and not provided for in the Budget program, a corporation. or agency covered by the provisions of this act may, with the approval of the President, adjust its budget program to provide, within the limits of available funds and borrowing authority, for the immediate initiation of programs authorized by law and not specifically set forth in the Budget: *Provided*, That the new program shall be promptly transmitted to the Congress as an amendment to the Budget: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall be construed as authority for increasing the amount available for administrative expenses under any limitation on such expenses.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object very strenuously to the amendment. It seems to me that it would absolutely abolish the Budget Act. As I read the Byrd-Butler law, I can form no other conclusion.

Mr. McKELLAR. The amendment was sent to the committee by the President and by the Bureau of the Budget. I do not see why it would have been sent by the Director of the Budget if the amendment would abolish the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. TAFT. The Byrd-Butler Act was passed in order to require that a budget be submitted by each Federal corporation for its own operation. Allow me to read the language of the amendment:

In order to meet emergencies or contingencies arising subsequent to approval of the budget and not provided for in the budget program, a corporation or agency covered by the provisions of this act may, with the approval of the President, adjust its budget program to provide, within the limits of available funds and borrowing authority, for the immediate initiation of programs authorized by law and not specifically set forth in the budget.

That language removes all limitations. The RFC, for example, has some $5,000,000,000 available for borrowing, and they, therefore, operate under no limit whatever.

The purpose of the Budget Act was to require corporations to tell Congress in advance what their programs were to be. If we agree to this amendment, we say, in effect, to those corporations, "You no longer must do that." It may be said, "There is a new emergency, and the President says you should go ahead. So go ahead and undertake programs which have not been authorized by the Congress." It is just the same as if we were to say, in connection with appropriations, "Because there is an authorization of $100,000,000 we are now appropriating $50,000,000. But if the President wants to spend more money, up to the limit of the total authorization, he may do so."

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no.

Mr. TAFT. That is the way I read the language.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I understand the amendment. The purpose of it is to enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to have some flexibility within its limitations in dealing with certain contingencies which might arise with respect to some program for which provision was not made in the Budget. The only testimony presented before the committee in urging the amendment came from the Commodity Credit Corporation. It wished to be enabled to deal with the farm program.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, there also came a letter from the President, dated June 19, 1946, strongly urging the amendment, and after the Senator has concluded his remarks I shall wish to read the letter into the RECORD.

Mr. RUSSELL. My only interest is not to tie the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation in its present program dealing with farm crops. The amendment states, in part, "within the limits of available funds and borrowing authority."

Mr. TAFT. That is no limit whatever, because the corporations in question have a considerable amount of borrowing authority beyond anything which they may spend. The very purpose of the passage of the Budget Act was to require Government corporations to say in advance what their programs were to be. If the Senator desires to incorporate a special provision with regard to certain things which the Commodity Credit Corporation may do within the limit of their field, I would have no objection, but it seems to me that this amendment takes off the limit. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has five or six billion dollars of borrowing power. Under this amendment they may undertake any project which they may wish.

Mr. RUSSELL. It would have to be authorized by law.

Mr. TAFT. What must be authorized by law? The RFC is authorized by law to do almost anything. The very purpose of the Byrd-Butler law is to tie them down in the same way that we tie down an ordinary department provided for in an appropriation bill.

Mr. President, it seems to me very clearly that this is legislation on an appropriation bill. I believe that I should make the point of order that the amendment is not in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the amendment were amended so as to apply solely to the Commodity Credit Corporation would the Senator from Ohio withdraw his point of order? I do not believe that we should tie down the Commodity Credit Corporation when the Steagall and other acts guarantee farmers a certain program.

Mr. TAFT. My understanding of the act is this: the Commodity Credit Corporation should file a budget program. They do not have to be particularly specific. They must merely indicate the programs which they intend to undertake during the following year.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, unfortunately they did set forth a very specific program. They indicated an amount which they would pay within the limitations of the price control act to the producers of milk, and so much for sugar. There is a likelihood that the Congress will be in adjournment for 5 or 6 months, and if no relief is granted the producers of some commodities will be absolutely wiped out unless they are able to get Government aid. Of course, the amendment is subject to a point of order.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator indicate where in the bill the Commodity Credit Corporation is dealt with?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not have the bill before me. Allow me to ask the Senator if he would be willing to agree to an amendment on line 3, after the words

"Budget program" to insert "the Commodity Credit Corporation, with the approval of the President."

Mr. TAFT. Here is another question I was about to ask the chairman of the committee. What is the relation between this bill and the OPA extension bill which was passed this afternoon which expressly provided authority to pay subsidies, and buy and sell at a loss if both the RFC and the Commodity Credit Corporation set out a specific limitation of the money which may be used for that kind of a program?

Mr. RUSSELL. The specific over-all limitation carried in the OPA bill would be binding on the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other agency of the Government which might be paying a subsidy. The Commodity Credit Corporation set up the programs which they anticipated handling during the coming fiscal year. I think we will be apt to work a great hardship on some group in this country which already has received assurances in other legislative measures unless the Commodity Credit Corporation has been given power to adjust their budget to meet any emergency which might arise.

Mr. TAFT. I have some doubt whether language of the kind proposed might not completely set aside the limitation of the subsidy program which we just approved in the Price Control Act.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think so.

Mr. TAFT. I do not see why not.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not believe that that issue could arise, and certainly I have no such idea in mind.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, what is the meaning of the following language on page 22 of the bill?

Provided further, That no part of any funds appropriated in this act for the Commodity Credit Corporation——

Incidentally, there are no funds appropriated except $8,000,000, so far as I know. The other appropriation is a deficiency appropriation. I continue reading:

shall be used, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, to make any payments to other than domestic producers, under any subsidy program operation not in effect on the date of enactment of this act.

Under the provisions of the Price Control bill which the Senate has just passed, it is provided that no payments may be made to any producer under any subsidy program not in effect on the date of the act. So this seems to me to imply repeal of the Price Control Act which was just passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. It was put in for a wholly different purpose. It was offered by the Senator from Nebraska, who feared that some authority in the OPA Act might be applied to sugar, and he wanted the domestic sugar producers protected by the amendment. It could not possibly extend the limitations in the OPA Act to affect the subsidy which can be used, nor is there anything in the pending amendment or the legislation which would allow the payment of any subsidy beyond the limitations contained in the OPA Act.

Mr. TAFT. Why have it, then?

Mr. RUSSELL. I presented that viewpoint to the Senator from Nebraska, that they could not pay any new subsidies, but he was apprehensive that within the limitations of the OPA Act some new subsidy might be paid for sugar, and the purpose of the amendment which the Senator has just read was to prevent that being done.

Mr. TAFT. But the implication is, as I see it, that some subsidy may be paid somehow under the authority of the appropriation bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, that cannot be done unless it is done out of the $8,000,000 for administration, because that is the only appropriation contained in the bill. That was the point I urged on the Senator from Nebraska, but he and others who were interested in the sugar problem felt it would be at least an admonition to the Commodity Credit Corporation not to engage in any new subsidy program with respect to sugar, other than as to domestic producers. It cannot possibly have any effect on the OPA Act. It is merely a limitation on this appropriation in the first place. It is not legislation.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. After quoting the proposed amendment, the President said this, which I think is pertinent to what the Senator is suggesting:

This section is substantially the same as that included in the corporation supplement to the Budget for the fiscal year 1947 which I transmitted to the Congress on May 2, 1946. In transmitting this Budget approval language was recommended which would restrict the programs of each corporation to those set forth in its 1947 Budget. However, it was recognized that, because of its urgencies or contingencies arising subsequent to the approval of the Budget, a corporation might be called upon to immediately undertake a program which, while authorized under basic law, had not been specifically set forth in its budget. Under these circumstances I recommended that if a corporation had sufficient funds it should be permitted, with my approval, to initiate immediately such a program, and that it be promptly transmitted to the Congress as an amendment to the Budget.

I consider that a provision which is designed to meet emergencies or contingencies is within the spirit of the Government Corporation Control Act, a view which is concurred in by the House Appropriations Committee, since the act clearly states that such a provision may be included in the Budget programs for each corporation. However, rather than make such provision in the Budget for each corporation, it is considered that a general provision, applicable to all corporations, would be more satisfactory and thereby improve the Budget estimates. Obviously it would appear quite improbable that emergencies or contingencies would arise in each corporation during a given year.

In view of the foregoing I strongly urge that the provision for meeting emergencies and contingencies in the Budget programs of corporations included in H. R. 6777 be restored.

That was the purpose.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the purpose stated is clearly a purpose to nullify the whole Byrd-Butler Act, so far as corporation control is concerned. If we are to adopt an amendment which provides that a corporation may spend any money it wants to spend, if the President says there is an emergency, then why have a budget at all, why present a budget, why adopt this whole new procedure which is required by the law?

Mr. President, I feel compelled to make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Ohio is entirely correct, for the reason that all these corporations have authorizations which they have not yet used. They can use revolving funds, for example. The Byrd-Butler law was supposed to put them under the control of Congress, just as is any other department of the Government. Under this amendment that control would be lifted. In my judgment, it clearly and completely nullifies the Byrd-Butler Act, which it took Congress 10 years to pass. If the Senator from Ohio does not make a point of order, I certainly shall.

Mr. TAFT. I make the point of order. I would like to say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that I should like to consult with him. I think we can work out some language. There will be other bills in connection with which I think this matter could be handled. I should like to study the relationship of the different provisions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know of any other bill on which it can be put. I appreciate the consideration of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I am not at all satisfied with the relation between the provisions for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the Price Control Act limitations on subsidies. I think they should be carefully examined.

Mr. RUSSEL. I have here the language of the Byrd-Butler Act, and certainly as it relates to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and what I have in mind, this amendment, if confined to the Commodity Credit Corporation, can do no violence to the spirit of the Byrd-Butler Act. I read from it:

The Budget program shall be a business-type budget, or plan of operations, with due allowance given for the need of flexibility, including provision for emergencies and contingencies, in order that the Corporation may properly carry out its activities as authorized by law.

It may be that this budget is in that shape, but from my examination of the Commodity Credit Corporation budget I am very apprehensive of what will happen if some leeway is not given which will permit the Corporation to carry out the instructions of Congress as provided in other basic legislation.

Mr. BYRD. Why can it not be put in the Budget, just as in the case of other corporations?

Mr. RUSSELL. They could not spell out everything for emergencies and contingencies.

Mr. BYRD. They should have set it up, and if it is the fault of the Commodity Credit Corporation in not bringing in the proper kind of a budget, they certainly should not be exempted.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the point of order is good; there is no question about it.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Georgia knows I do not want to do anything to interfere with the Commodity Credit Corporation, but if we exempt one corporation from the Byrd-Butler Act, we shall have to exempt all of them. If we exempt one, the others will want to be exempted.

Mr. RUSSELL. Congress has told the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out certain programs in certain eventualities, and this amendment would only allow them to initiate programs which are authorized by law.

Mr. BYRD. That is all they could do anyway. The Commodity Credit Corporation has resources and authority to borrow. The purpose of the Byrd-Butler law was to reduce the blanket authorizations which have been made. They have the right to use revolving funds. No one knows how much they may amount to.

I wish to say to the Senator from Georgia that I shall be glad to confer with him and the Senator from Ohio, but no one seems to understand this amendment, and I certainly could not sit here and have it agreed to when it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. McKELLAR. I call the Senator's attention to this statement of the President:

> The act clearly states that such a provision may be included in the Budget programs for each corporation.

Mr. BYRD. Why was it not included? The Senator from Georgia states it has not been properly prepared, and it is up to the Commodity Credit Corporation to prepare it properly. This would give them an exemption.

Mr. McKELLAR. Instead of having it for each corporation, he included them all together.

Mr. BYRD. That was not the purpose of the Byrd-Butler Act. Each corporation was to come before the Congress, as the Senator from Tennessee knows—and he helped in the passage of the act—and present its budget, just as any other department does.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I, too, took the same position, not on account of the Byrd-Butler law, but I took a position against the amendment because it seemed to me that what we were trying to do was to limit the corporations.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the object of the Byrd-Butler Act was to restrict these corporations, and take away from them the power they had exercised. I do not know how much excess buying power the Commodity Credit Corporation has.

Mr. WHERRY. I said, "Why do you not come in and ask for it in your budget?"

Mr. BYRD. They have to come to Congress, anyway, to get it.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Congress is in session, it is all right, but if Congress is not in session, how are they to have authority to borrow money to take care of the needs for which the original corporation was set up?

Mr. McKELLAR. It could not be done.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I do not know who has the floor, but will the Senator who has the floor yield to me for a moment?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understand that a point of order has twice been made against this amendment by two different Senators.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. It seems to me to be conceded by all that the point of order is well taken. That would suggest to me the wisdom of letting this matter go over until tomorrow in the hope that the interested Senators might get together, study the language, and accomplish the purpose sought without offense to the rules of the Senate, and really make progress toward the ultimate disposition of the legislation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should be glad to do that, if the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and other Senators interested meanwhile would get together.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am tremendously concerned about the situation as it might apply to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and I would be glad to take any steps which would protect the farmers in the program that has been prescribed by the Congress for them.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator from Ohio be willing to undertake to consider the matter with other Senators between now and the time we reconvene tomorrow?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Since that is the case, Mr. President, I shall ask that the bill go over at this point until tomorrow. But before the bill goes over I wish to ask unanimous consent that an amendment be agreed to. On page 3, at the bottom of the page, in line 21, there is a proviso as follows:

> *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein shall be used to pay contributions with respect to projects constructed under authority of Public Law 671, Seventy-sixth Congress.

I ask that that language be stricken out, and that the amendment be taken to conference, if no Senators object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I now ask that the bill go over until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be passed over until tomorrow.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, respecting the last item mentioned by the Senator from Tennessee, I tried to get on my feet before the bill was passed over.

Mr. McKELLAR. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is satisfactory to me that the language be stricken out, but only for the purpose of taking the amendment to conference. I think the conferees should give due consideration to this question. We should not be appropriating money to take care of these matters when there is some other way to take care of them; that is that the State or the municipality may take care of the costs of amortization of these buildings. I think it is a bad practice for the Federal Government to be subsidizing anything that the State or the municipality or the building organizations may determine should be paid.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am rather inclined to think the Senator is right.

Mr. FERGUSON. When the Senate passes a measure making certain appropriations I do not consider that we are bound thereafter to appropriate money for such purposes. If there is any place where sovereignty applies it is right here at home. Sovereignty applies at home as well as in our foreign relations. The Government is not bound to appropriate continuously and on into the future without a determination by each House.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield for a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. FULLBRIGHT. I wanted to ask the Senator about the RFC. I understand that agency expires at the end of this year. Does it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think it does.

Mr. FERGUSON. It expires in 1948.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not sure, but I believe it expires in 1948. It does not expire this year.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. May I ask the Senator from Ohio. Does not the RFC expire, under the terms of its charter, at the end of this calendar year?

Mr. TAFT. We have a bill on the calendar to extend the life of the RFC. I do not think it expires tomorrow.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No, I say the end of this calendar year.

Mr. TAFT. I think some time in that neighborhood. I think it is February 1947.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The appropriation appearing on page 6 is based on the theory that RFC will be extended for the period of a year.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. It is based on the theory that the organization will be in existence the full year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At the request of the Senator from Tennessee, the bill will go over until tomorrow.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE COAST GUARD, TREASURY DEPARTMENT, 1947

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill (H. R. 6428) making appropriations for the Coast Guard, Treasury Department.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6428) making appropriations for the Coast Guard, Treasury Department, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will proceed to state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Coast Guard," on page 5, line 19, after the word "stragglers", to strike out "$72,000,000" and insert "$76,020,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 11, after the word "ordnance", to insert "ordnance stores."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). That completes the committee amendments.

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

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. WHITE, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. REED conferees on the part of the Senate.

BILLS AFFECTING THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of three bills which are on the calendar and which relate to the District of Columbia. The three bills have been unanimously reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia. There is no objection to them that I know of from any source. The expiration date in each case will be June 30, so it is necessary that the bills be passed today. The bills are Senate bill 2234, Calendar No. 1593; House bill 5933, Calendar No. 1648; and House bill 6516, Calendar No. 1649. I have spoken to both the majority and the minority leaders with respect to these bills and told them they were reported unanimously from the committee.

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

Mr. HOEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from North Carolina spoke to me earlier today about these three bills. I made an effort to contact the minority members of the District Committee with respect to them. I found no opposition on the part of any of the District Committee minority members who are present, and I know of no objection to the bills.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 2234, Calendar No. 1593.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2234) to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, to strike out the following:

Section 3 (c) (4) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) (i) No employer's rate of contribution for any calendar year or part thereof shall be reduced below the standard rate unless and until his account could have been charged with benefits paid throughout the 36-consecutive-calendar-month period ending on the computation date applicable to such year or part thereof.

"(ii) No employer's contribution rate for any calendar year shall be reduced below the standard rate unless records filed with the Board indicate he has established taxable wages in each of the three annual pay rolls as used in calculating his average annual pay roll.

"(iii) (1) Contribution rates after termination of military service. Notwithstanding any inconsistent provisions of this act, the contribution rates of trainees shall be determined in accordance with the following provisions of this subsection for the periods and with respect to the matters specified herein. Except as herein otherwise provided, all other provisions of this act shall continue to be applicable in connection with such contribution rates.

"(2) The term 'military service' as used in this subsection means active service in the land or naval forces of the United States, but the service of an individual in any reserve component of the land or naval forces of the United States who is ordered to active duty in any such force for a period of 30 days or less shall not be deemed to be active service in such force during such period.

"(3) The term 'trainee' as used in this subsection means an individual who entered military service after March 31, 1940, who continued such service for more than 30 consecutive days, whose military service was terminated under conditions other than dishonorable, on or before the 6 months after the war in which the United States is now engaged has been terminated by proclamation by the President of the United States.

"(4) Upon written application by a trainee, who was formerly an employer subject to the provisions of this act and who has returned to engage in substantially the same type of business in which he was engaged prior to his entrance into the military service, the entire period between the time of his entrance into military service and the date of termination of such service shall be excluded in determining his contribution rate. The Contribution Rate Review Committee may in its discretion exclude a reasonable period before and after the trainee's actual period of military service if such Committee finds that the trainee was out of business solely because of such military service.

"(iv) If the amount in the fund as of the computation date is less than 5 percent of the total pay rolls subject to contributions under this act for the twelve consecutive month period ending on said computation date, the contribution rate for each employer shall be increased by the percentage differential between said 5 percent of such total pay rolls and said fund's percentage of such total pay rolls, but in no event shall the contribution rate for any employer be more than 2.7 percent. Said percentage differential for each employer shall be computed to the next highest one-tenth of 1 percent.

"(v) If, on December 20 of any calendar year, the amount in the fund becomes less than 2.4 percent of the total annual pay rolls subject to contribution under this act for the 12-consecutive-month period ending on the preceding June 30, the Board shall make a declaration to that effect. Effective the quarter following such announcement, each employer's rate of contribution shall be the standard rate."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, approved August 28, 1935, as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"Section 3 (c) (5) is amended to read as follows:

"'(5) The Board shall for any uncompleted portion of the calendar year beginning with the effective date of this act and for each calendar year thereafter classify employers in accordance with their actual experience in the payment of contributions and with respect to benefits charged against their accounts. Each employer's contribution rate for each subsequent year or part thereof shall be calculated on the basis of his records filed with the Board and benefit payments disbursed through the applicable computation date.'

"Section 3 (c) (7) is amended to read as follows:

"'(7) (a) If the business of any employer is transferred in whole or in part, the transferee shall be deemed a successor for the purpose of this section. In case the transfer of any of the assets of a covered employer's business by any means whatever, otherwise than in the ordinary course of trade, such transfer shall be deemed a transfer of business and shall constitute the transferee a successor hereunder, unless the Board, on its own motion or on application of an interested party, finds that all of the following conditions exist:

"'(1) The transferee has not assumed any of the transferor's obligations; and

"'(2) The transferee has not continued or resumed transferor's good will; and

"'(3) The transferee has not continued or resumed the business of the transferor, either in the same establishment or elsewhere; and

"'(4) The transferee has not employed substantially the same employees as those the transferor had employed in connection with the assets transferred.

"'(b) The successor, if not already subject to this section, shall become an "employer" subject hereto on the date of such transfer, and shall accordingly become liable for contributions hereunder from and after said date.

"'(c) The successor shall take over and continue the employer's account, including its reserve and all other aspects of its experience under this section, in proportion to the pay roll or employees assignable to the transferred business as determined for the purposes of this section by the Board. The successor shall be secondarily liable for any amounts owned by the employer to the fund at the time of such transfer; but such liability shall be proportioned to the extent of the transfer of business and shall not exceed the value of the assets transferred.

"'(d) The benefit chargeability of a successor's account under section 3 (c) if not accrued before the transfer date shall begin to accrue on the transfer date, in case the transferor's benefit chargeability was then accruing; or shall begin to accrue on the date otherwise applicable to the successor, or on the date otherwise applicable to the transferor, whichever is earlier, in case the transferor's benefit chargeability was not accruing on the transfer date. Similarly, benefits from a successor's account, if not chargeable before the transfer date shall become chargeable on the transfer date, in case the transfer was then chargeable for the benefit payments; or shall become chargeable on the date otherwise applicable to the succes-

sor or on the date otherwise applicable to the transferor, whichever is earlier, in case the transferor was chargeable for the benefit payments on the transfer date.

"'(e) The account taken over by the successor employer shall remain chargeable with respect to accrued benefit and related rights based on employment in the transferred business, and all such employment shall be deemed employment performed for such employer.

"'(f) The contribution rates applicable with respect to the accounts of the successor employer and a transferring employer shall be respectively determined or redetermined as of the next preceding June 30 computation date, to apply from the date of transfer of business until the close of the current calendar year, and shall thereafter be determined whenever required by section 3 (c), as follows: For the purposes of section 3 (c), the Board shall determine the "experience under this section" of the successor employer's account and of the transferring employer's account by allocating to the successor employer's account for each period in question the respective proportions of the transferring employer's pay roll and the benefits which the Board determines to be properly assignable to the business transferred.

"'(g) Special combinations of experience: Any successor employer who has failed to obtain credit for its predecessor's experience, solely because of the provisions of section 3 (c) (7) of the act prior to its amendment by this act, may file a written application for such allowance after the effective date of this act. In the event the board finds that such employer is entitled to such combination of experience under the provisions of section 3 (c) (7) as amended by this act, the combination shall be allowed effective for the calendar year next succeeding the date of such application.'

"Section 3 (c) (8) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"'(iii) Except as otherwise provided in this section, whenever through inadvertence or mistake erroneous charges or credits are found to have been made to experience-rating accounts, the same shall be readjusted as of the date of discovery and such readjustment shall not affect any computation or rate assigned prior to the date of discovery but shall be used on the next computation date in calculating future contribution rates.'

"Section 3 (c) (10) is amended by inserting, after the words 'employer thereof' found at the end of the third sentence of said section, the following additional sentence: 'All such hearings shall be held before a Contribution Rate Review Committee composed of three members who shall be employees of the Board and appointed by the Board. The findings and decision of this committee shall not be subject to review by the District Auditor.'

"This act shall take effect as of 12:01 antemeridian on the first day of the next succeeding calendar quarter following the enactment of this act."

NURSERY AND NURSERY SCHOOLS FOR DAY CARE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HOEY. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 5933, Calendar No. 1648.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5933) to authorize and direct the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to establish and operate in the public schools and other suitable locations a system of nurseries and nursery schools for day care of school-age and under-school-age children, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments.

The first amendment was on page 1, line 4, after the words "Board of" to strike out "Education" and insert "Public Welfare."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on the same page after line 7, to strike out section 2 as follows:

SEC. 2. On and after July 1, 1946, the Board is authorized and directed to establish, maintain, and operate in and on the buildings and grounds of the public schools of the District of Columbia and at other suitable locations, a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of children of school or under-school age of parents residing in the District of Columbia who are employed and are financially unable otherwise to provide for the day care of their children or who are so handicapped that they cannot otherwise provide for the day care of their children. The Board is authorized to employ teachers, attendants, clerks, custodians, and other persons necessary to provide such day care and to pay compensation for their services in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

And to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 2. On and after July 1, 1946, and until June 30, 1947, and no longer, the Board is authorized and directed to establish, maintain, and operate in and on such of the buildings and grounds of the public schools of the District of Columbia, as may be designated and approved by the Board of Education, and at such other suitable locations, as may be designated and approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, not to exceed a total of 14 nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of children of school or under-school age of parents residing in the District of Columbia and who have resided therein for not less than 1 year immediately preceding the entry of their children into such nurseries or nursery schools and who are employed and are financially unable otherwise to provide for the day care of their children or who are so handicapped that they cannot otherwise provide for the day care of their children. The Board is authorized to employ teachers, attendants, clerks, custodians, and other persons necessary to provide such day care and to pay compensation for their services in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. Appropriations now or hereafter available for the maintenance and operation of the buildings and grounds of the said public schools shall be available for the maintenance and operation of such of the buildings and grounds of the said public schools in and on which such nurseries and nursery schools may be established, maintained, and operated.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to authorize and direct the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia to establish and operate in the public schools and other suitable locations a system of nurseries and nursery schools for day care of school-age and under-school-age children, and for other purposes."

INCREASE IN SALARIES OF METROPOLITAN POLICE AND OTHERS

Mr. HOEY. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 6519, Calendar No. 1649.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6516) to increase the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SIMPLIFICATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF CREDIT SERVICES TO FARMERS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, early this year the Senate passed unanimously a bill offered by the late lamented senior Senator from Alabama, Mr. Bankhead, respecting the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. The bill since that time has been in the House committee. The House passed its own version of the bill H. R. 5991, and it was referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and was unanimously favorably reported by that committee, and is now on the calendar, Calendar No. 1353. I should like to have the measure considered now.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question? I have received telephone calls from the National Grange and from two other farm organizations who are not in favor of this measure. They tell me there were no hearings held on the bill at all.

Mr. RUSSELL. I can say to the Senator that that statement is certainly not correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Was any evidence submitted before the House committee except evidence on the part of Government agencies?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know about that.

Mr. WHERRY. I understood that perhaps a hearing was held, but that only Government agencies were represented. They were heard in a great hurry one afternoon, and no one else was invited to attend. No farm group or any others interested were invited to come to the hearing, and no testimony was adduced on their behalf. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know about that. Hearings were held in the Senate committee, at which all persons who wanted to testify were permitted to testify, and the committee reported the bill unanimously. When it comes to the question of the bill which has passed the House, I do not know how extensive the House committee hearings were.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia, whom I should like to accommodate, that three or four Senators have asked me that if the bill came up to object its consideration.

Mr. RUSSELL. If that be the case, I shall not press the matter.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senate will be in session tomorrow.

Mr. RUSSELL. The situation is rather unusual. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] objected to the bill on the call of the calendar. I spoke to

him about it and he stated that he had no further interest in the bill, and no objection to its passage.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to read a letter, which convinces me that there should be hearings on the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I know that hearings have been held on the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. This letter is from the National Grange. According to the letter, none of the farm organizations had an opportunity to appear and testify in the hearings on the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. They may not have had such an opportunity when the bill came up the second time, but they certainly had opportunity to be heard when the first hearings were held.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not wish to interfere in any way with the wishes of the Senator from Georgia. Will he permit the bill to go over until tomorrow?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to do so. However, let me say that some of the farm organizations have always been opposed to the Farm Security Administration. If something is not done to put these two bills in conference, where a bill can be drafted before this session of Congress is over, it may be that the opponents of the Farm Security Administration will succeed in destroying it.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not wish to do that; but I would appreciate it very much if the Senator would withhold his request until tomorrow. By that time I shall be able to give my answer one way or the other relative to taking up the bill by unanimous consent.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, I shall not press the matter now; but I apprehend that if the Senator from Nebraska is satisfied, perhaps we shall find another objector. I regret that I did not discuss the question with the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Three Senators have spoken to me this afternoon and asked me to object to consideration of the bill. I do not know all of their objections, but I am certain that the Senator would not press his request under those conditions.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course not.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 2341. An act to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6042. An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

George B. Harris, of California, to be United States district judge for the northern district of California (new position);

Bunk Gardner, of Kentucky, to be United States district judge of the Canal Zone; and

Louis LeBaron, of Hawaii, to be associate justice of the supreme court, Territory of Hawaii.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry officers for appointment in the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Granville Mellen to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James H. Flanagan to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Commodore Ellis Reed-Hill to be Engineer in Chief of the United States Coast Guard, with the rank of rear admiral, effective from August 1, 1946, for a term of 4 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, June 29, 1946, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 28 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons for promotion in the foreign service of the United States of America, to be effective as of May 19, 1946:

FROM FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 3 TO FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 2

Maurice W. Altaffer, of Ohio.
George R. Canty, of Massachusetts.
Fayette J. Flexer, of Illinois.
Julian C. Greenup, of California.
George J. Haering, of New York.
Joel C. Hudson, of Missouri.
Lester DeWitt Mallory, of California.
Earl L. Packer, of Utah.
J. Bartlett Richards, of Maryland.
Paul P. Steintorf, of Virginia.
George H. Winters, of Kansas.

FROM FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 4 TO FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 3

Ware Adams, of Georgia.
Sidney A. Belovsky, of New York.
Burton Y. Berry, of Indiana.
Russell M. Brooks, of Oregon.
Allan Dawson, of Iowa.
Charles H. Derry, of Georgia.
Bertel E. Kuniholm, of Massachusetts.
John H. Morgan, of Massachusetts.
Sidney E. O'Donoghue, of New Jersey.
Harry L. Troutman, of Georgia.
Carlos J. Warner, of Ohio.

FROM FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 5 TO FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 4

Glenn A. Abbey, of Wisconsin.
Roy E. B. Bower, of California.
Robert Y. Brown, of Alabama.
Montgomery H. Colladay, of Connecticut.
John Davies, Jr., of Ohio.
Henry B. Day, of Connecticut.
Edmund J. Dorsz, of Michigan.
Ernest E. Evans, of New York.
Dorsey Gassaway Fisher, of Maryland.
Willard Galbraith, of California.
James W. Gantenbein, of Oregon.
John N. Hamlin, of Oregon.
Randolph Harrison, of Virginia.
Thomas A. Hickok, of New York.
Frederick W. Hinke, of New York.
Morris N. Hughes, of Illinois.
J. Winsor Ives, of Illinois
Henry P. Leverich, of New Jersey.
Raymond P. Ludden, of Massachusetts.
Cecil B. Lyon, of New York.
Robert Mills McClintock, of California.
Walter P. McConaughy, of Alabama.
Thomas J. Maleady, of Massachusetts.
Patrick Mallon, of Ohio.
Edward S. Maney, of Texas.
Gerald A. Mokma, of Iowa.
John B. Ocheltree, of Nevada.
Troy L. Perkins, of Kentucky.
Joseph P. Ragland, of the District of Columbia.
Charles S. Reed 2d, of Ohio.
Arthur R. Ringwalt, of Nebraska.
James C. Sappington 3d, of Maryland.
Willard Quincy Stanton, of Montana.
Tyler Thompson, of New York.
Clifton R. Wharton, of Massachusetts.
Charles W. Yost, of New York.

FROM FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 6 TO FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 5

R. Austin Acly, of Massachusetts.
Stephen E. Aguirre, of Texas.
William K. Ailshie, of Idaho.
Daniel V. Anderson, of Delaware.
Carl H. Boehringer, of Michigan.
Ellis A. Bonnet, of Texas.
Reginald Bragonier, Jr., of Maryland.
Richard W. Byrd, of Virginia.
Carl E. Christopherson, of Iowa.
Harlan B. Clark, of Ohio.
Glion Curtis, Jr., of Missouri.
Sherburne Dillingham, of New Jersey.
Howard Elting, Jr., of Illinois.
James Espy, of Ohio.
Edmund A. Gullion, of Kentucky.
James E. Henderson, of California.
Paul C. Hutton, of North Carolina.
Beppo R. Johansen, of Florida.
U. Alexis Johnson, of California.
Perry Laukhuff, of Ohio.
F. Ridgway Lineaweaver, of Pennsylvania.
Elbert G. Mathews, of California.
Gordon H. Mattison, of Ohio.
Ernest de W. Mayer, of New York.
Miss Kathleen Molesworth, of Texas.
Robert Newbegin, of Massachusetts.
Carmel Offie, of Pennsylvania.

John Ordway, of the District of Columbia.
Marselis C. Parsons, Jr., of New York.
Edward E. Rice, of Wisconsin.
W. Garland Richardson, of Virginia.
Winfield H. Scott, of the District of Columbia.
William P. Snow, of Maine.
Carl W. Strom, of Iowa.
Robert M. Taylor, of Washington.
Charles W. Thayer, of Pennsylvania.
Ray L. Thurston, of Wisconsin.
Jay Walker, of the District of Columbia.
T. Eliot Weil, of New York.
Rolland Welch, of Texas.
H. Bartlett Wells, of New Jersey.
Evan M. Wilson, of Pennsylvania.

FROM FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 7 TO FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 6

Waldo E. Bailey, of Mississippi.
William Belton, of Oregon.
Niles W. Bond, of Massachusetts.
William O. Boswell, of Pennsylvania.
Robert P. Chalker, of Florida.
H. Francis Cunningham, Jr., of Nebraska.
Philip M. Davenport, of Maryland.
Arthur B. Emmons 3d, of Massachusetts.
Nicholas Feld, of Mississippi.
William N. Fraleigh, of New Jersey.
Fulton Freeman, of California.
Forrest K. Geerken, of Minnesota.
John Goodyear, of New York.
Robert Grinnell, of New York.
Theodore J. Hadraba, of Nebraska.
Parker T. Hart, of Massachusetts.
Richard H. Hawkins, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Outerbridge Horsey, of New York.
Randolph A. Kidder, of Massachusetts.
Joseph Palmer 2d, of Massachusetts.
Robert W. Rinden, of Iowa.
M. Robert Rutherford, of Montana.
Robert C. Strong, of Wisconsin.
Alfred T. Wellborn, of Louisiana.

FROM FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 8 TO FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 7

Charles W. Adair, Jr., of Ohio.
H. Gardner Ainsworth, of Louisiana.
Donald B. Calder, of New York.
Leonard J. Cromie, of Connecticut.
C. Vaughan Ferguson, Jr., of New York.
Robert S. Folsom, of Massachusetts.
Paul E. Geier, of Ohio.
Lewis E. Gleeck, Jr., of Illinois.
Richard E. Gnade, of Pennsylvania.
Richard A. Johnson, of Illinois.
M. Gordon Knox, of Maryland.
Alfred H. Lovell, Jr., of Michigan.
David H. McKillop, of Massachusetts.
John M. McSweeney, of Massachusetts.
Henry T. Smith, of Georgia.
William L. Smyser, of Pennsylvania.
John L. Topping, of New York.
John W. Tuthill, of Massachusetts.
William W. Walker, of North Carolina.
Fraser Wilkins, of Nebraska.

FROM FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICER, UNCLASSIFIED, TO FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 8

Philip H. Bagby, of Virginia.
Walter W. Birge, Jr., of New York.
Byron E. Blankinship, of New York.
George F. Bogardus, of Iowa.
Robert M. Brandin, of New Jersey.
Gray Bream, of Wyoming.
Findley Burns, Jr., of Maryland.
Kenneth A. Byrns, of Colorado.
Ralph N. Clough, of Washington.
William A. Crawford, of Pennsylvania.
Juan de Zengotita, of Pennsylvania.
Thomas P. Dillon, of Missouri.
James M. Gilchrist, Jr., of Illinois.
George McM. Godley 2d, of New York.
Alden M. Haupt, of Illinois.
James C. Lobenstine, of Connecticut.
Wilfred V. MacDonald, of Missouri.
Edwin W. Martin, of Ohio.
W. Paul O'Neill, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Albert E. Pappano, of Missouri.
Richard A. Poole, of New Jersey.
Lubert O. Sanderhoff, of California.
William Langdon Sands, of Florida.
Harold Shullaw, of Illinois.
Ernest V. Siracusa, of California.
Joseph S. Sparks, of California.
James P. Speer 2d, of Oklahoma.
Walter J. Stoessel, Jr., of California.
F. Lester Sutton, of New Jersey.
Temple Wanamaker, Jr., of Washington.
Byron White, of North Carolina.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

George F. Luthringer, of New Jersey, to be United States alternate to the Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 2 years and until his successor has been appointed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mastin G. White, of Texas, to be Solicitor of the Department of the Interior.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Daniel O. Omer for appointment as General Counsel and Chief, Legal Division, national headquarters, Selective Service System, under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Compensation for the position of General Counsel and Chief, Legal Division, national headquarters, Selective Service System, will be at the rate of $8,179.50 per annum.

J. Watt Page for appointment as State director of selective service for Texas, under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Compensation for the position of State director of selective service for Texas will be at the rate of $8,179.50 per annum.

IN THE NAVAL RESERVE

Capt. Erl C. B. Gould, United States Naval Reserve, to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service, while serving with the Foreign Liquidation Commission, State Department, and to continue during any assignment commensurate with the rank of commodore or until release from active duty.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 28 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

Granville Mellen to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission for the unexpired term of 6 years from September 26, 1944.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

James H. Flanagan to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years from July 1, 1946.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Commodore Ellis Reed-Hill to be Engineer in Chief of the United States Coast Guard, with the rank of rear admiral, effective from August 1, 1946, for a term of 4 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 28, 1946

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

Rt. Rev. Louis V. Vaeth, archdiocesan director of the Propagation of the Faith, Baltimore, Md., offered the following prayer:

This is the victory that overcometh the world—our faith.—St. John.

O God! the true, omnipotent, wise, infallible, and divine Legislator, graciously and constantly and abundantly flood the souls and minds of these Members of the House of Representatives with that heaven-bestowed, peace-promoting, justice-dispensing and mountain-moving gift—faith. Faith in Thee, the one and only true God, the divine Lawgiver and just Rewarder of nations and peoples; the ever-vigilant and successful Builder and Protector—"Unless the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it; unless the Lord keep the city, they watch in vain that keepeth it"—faith in their Nation as Thy singularly blessed and approved model to other nations as a builder of cities and also of men; faith to consistently and honestly realize that:

"We all are blind until we see
That in the human plan
Nothing is worth the making if
It does not make the man.
Why build these cities glorious
If man unbuilded goes?
In vain we build the world unless
The builder also grows."

—*E. Markham.*

Faith in their Chief Executive and all lawfully elected and appointed authority, as the sincere, honest, and capable human representatives of Thy divine authority benignly established to promote our human happiness and to protect and defend our divine and natural rights and liberties; faith in their august organization, the House of Representatives, whose integrity, honesty, loyalty and deathless devotion to duty constitute it the palladium of the people's privileges and the defender of the Nation's rights to such a recognized degree of selfless service that both their personal and professional actions will give a satisfying and solacing answer to the heartfelt and soul-stirring prayer of today's masses:

"God give us men; times like these demand
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith and ready hand.
Men whom the lust of office does not kill,
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy,
Men who have honor, men who will not lie,
Men who can stand before a demagog,
And down his treacherous flatteries without winking,
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog,
In public duty and private thinking.
For, while the rabble with their thumb-worn creeds,
Their large professions and their little deeds
Mingle in selfish strife, lo, freedom weeps,
Wrong rules the world and waiting justice sleeps."

—*J. C Holland.*

Faith in themselves as specially selected men and women so God-blessed with the courage of their convictions and so convinced of their courage that their courage, convictions, sincerity, loyalty, and honesty become a spectacle to the world, to angels, and to men, causing them to see and respect and reverence the same spiritual, national, personal,

and professional character qualities in their fellow members, whether as allies or opponents.

Finally, faith in the happy hope of procuring that priceless promise of the divine Legislator—"Well done, thou faithful servant, because thou hast been faithful in a few things, I will place thee over many," which promise the priest, poet, and patriot, Abram Ryan, so beautifully sang—

"Better than grandeur better than gold,
Than rank and titles a thousandfold,
Is a healthy body and a mind at ease,
And simple pleasures that always please,
A heart that can feel for another's woes
With sympathy large enough to enfold
All men as brethren, is better than gold."

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 agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5356. An act to provide assistance to the Republic of China in augmenting and maintaining a naval establishment, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6429. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had ordered, That Mr. TYDINGS be excused as a conferee on the part of the Senate to the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5452) entitled "Making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include a speech delivered by Hon. Hamilton Fish before the Committee on Banking and Currency on the British loan, and in the other to include a speech delivered by William S. Bennet at the John Hay Republican Club in April 1946.

Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain editorials from a dairying magazine in his district.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. LEFEVRE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

REORGANIZATION PLANS NO. 1, NO. 2, AND NO. 3

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 155, and I ask unanimous consent that House Concurrent Resolutions 154 and 151 be considered; that the debate be limited on the three resolutions to 3 hours, the time to be divided equally between myself and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; that after 3 hours of general debate on the resolutions, the resolutions be voted on separately.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, in these 3 hours a Member may talk about any one of the three resolutions.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And that at the end of general debate the resolutions will be voted on separately.

Mr. MANASCO. Each resolution separately.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent also that the plans be voted on in their order, plan 1, first; plan 2, second; and plan 3, third.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is the resolutions that must be voted on.

Mr. MANASCO. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, the gentlemen have agreed on time, which is very satisfactory. The only suggestion I have to make is that I hope they do not use the entire 3 hours.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that there be 3 hours of general debate on these resolutions, at the end of which time the resolutions are to be voted on separately in this order: Plan No. 1, plan No. 2, and plan No. 3.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TUESDAY, JULY 2

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday next it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock on Tuesday.

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

There was no objection.

BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 685, Rept. No. 2399) providing for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 138 to implement further the purposes of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out an agreement with the United Kingdom, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 138) to implement further the purposes of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out an agreement with the United Kingdom, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said joint resolution are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 16 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 686, Rept. No. 2400) providing for the consideration of H. R. 5234 to authorize the Federal Securtiy Administrator to assist the States in matters relating to social protection, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5234) to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to assist the States in matters relating to social protection, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour and to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. HORAN. 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. 183]

Adams	Baldwin, N. Y.	Boren
Allen, Ill.	Barrett, Pa.	Boykin
Anderson, Calif.	Barry	Bradley, Mich.
Andrews, N. Y.	Bates, Mass.	Bradley, Pa.
Auchincloss	Bell	Buckley
Baldwin, Md.	Bennet, N. Y.	Byrne, N. Y.

Camp	Harris	Peterson, Ga.
Cannon, Fla.	Hartley	Ploeser
Case, S. Dak.	Hedrick	Powell
Celler	Heffernan	Rankin
Cochran	Hoffman, Mich.	Rayfiel
Coffee	Holifield	Reece, Tenn.
Cole, N. Y.	Hook	Robertson, N. Dak.
Colmer	Izac	Robinson, Utah
Courtney	Jackson	Rodgers, Pa.
Cox	Johnson, Luther A.	Roe, N. Y.
Crawford	Kee	Rooney
Cunningham	Kefauver	Short
Curley	Keogh	Slaughter
Dawson	Kerr	Sparkman
De Lacy	Klein	Stevenson
Dolliver	Latham	Stewart
Dworshak	LeCompte	Stigler
Eberharter	Ludlow	Stockman
Elsaesser	McGehee	Tolan
Engel, Mich.	McKenzie	Torrens
Ervin	Mahon	Vinson
Fisher	Mansfield, Mont.	Weaver
Gardner	Mansfield, Tex.	Welch
Gerlach	Miller, Calif.	West
Gibson	Murphy	Wickersham
Gillespie	Norrell	Winstead
Granger	Norton	Wolfenden, Pa.
Grant, Ala.	O'Hara	Woodhouse
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Patrick	Worley
Hancock	Patterson	
Harness, Ind.		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 319 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HERTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a resolution he is introducing.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1, NO. 2, AND NO. 3

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 155, House Concurrent Resolution 151, and House Concurrent Resolution 154.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolutions 155, 151, and 154, with Mr. THOMAS of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolutions.

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

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, there have been so many comments and criticisms of me in the public press in Washington in the last 10 days about the alleged delay in reporting legislation on the atomic bomb question that I feel it incumbent upon me to make a statement.

I wish to start my statement by saying that most of the comments as to my attitude on the legislation you have read are lies of the whole cloth. I have made diligent and repeated effort to bring the legislation to this House so that the Representatives of the people may, after debate and consideration, work its will.

When the committee first met after 8 months of delay waiting for the Senate, I made three efforts to have the bill reported just as the Senate had passed it, but the committee, in keeping with its customary practice of years' standing, decided they would consider the bill for amendment in the usual way. We have been working on that. We have had 10 days of meetings, and I believe there have been 20 or 25 roll calls in the committee.

I want it understood that what I am saying is not critical of my committee, but in justification of its efforts to bring to this floor legislation on this subject that you may consider. The committee is meeting at 7 o'clock tonight in an effort to report the bill out. My committee more than 8 months ago reported favorably a bill that had the unqualified support of the War and Navy Departments, and that bill still lingers on the calendar of this House. The reason for the delay was to await action by the Senate, and the bill we are considering came here and was promptly taken up by your Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that as many Members as possible will stay on the floor and hear the arguments presented on both sides of this question. Due to the press of business it is impossible for us to devote as much time as we would like for the consideration of these reorganization plans.

On December 20, 1945, the President signed the Reorganization Act of 1945. The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments held extensive hearings in October and November of 1945.

Mr. Chairman, we all realize that the Federal Government has grown in such proportions that it is absolutely necessary for some reorganization to take place in order to reduce expenditures and increase efficiency in Federal agencies. We also realize that it is very important that many bureaus and independent agencies be placed under Cabinet heads in order to take off the tremendous load that our President is under at the present time and has been for some time in an effort to administer properly the Federal agencies. We realize the Congress cannot or will not reorganize the executive departments and as evidenced by these resolutions will not permit the President to do so.

When we passed that bill we hoped that the President would immediately send up some reorganization plans which would carry out the objectives of section 2 of the Reorganization Act. So far as I know the representatives of the Bureau of the Budget did not consult any Member of the Congress about the reorganizations before the President transmitted them. Among those objectives were the following:

To reduce expenditures and promote economy to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government.

To increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable within the revenues;

To group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;

To reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and to abolish such agencies or functions as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government; and

To eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort.

We had hoped that they could reduce administrative expenses by 25 percent, but I never thought they could for the only way to reduce expenditures is to cut off employees or reduce wages and you run into opposition to either course.

On May 16 the President submitted three reorganization plans to the Congress. Reorganization plan No. 1 contained, among other things, a reorganization of the housing agencies. In 1942, under the War Powers Act, the President issued an Executive order consolidating some 13 housing agencies that had grown up over a period of years. Some of them were in the building business, some in the rental business, some insuring loans. The agency was known as the National Housing Agency.

We had hoped that in this reorganization plan all similar functions would be consolidated. It was the opinion of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments that reorganization plan No. 1 violated the Reorganization Act of 1945 in that it tended to extend the functions of this Agency beyond the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter. I doubt the validity of that argument.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the committee also objected to this plan on the ground that it abolished the Federal Housing Administration, the agency recognized by the Congress and by the general public as being the one agency in the Federal housing program that believes in home ownership by individuals. The committee was also of the opinion that this agency should not be placed under the head of an organization the primary purpose of which was the construction of homes for Federal ownership and Federal operation.

The committee feared that if this reorganization plan went into effect that the encouragement given by the Federal Housing Administration and other lending agencies to individuals to build their own homes would be dampened by the National Housing Agency. For that reason the committee asks the House to reject reorganization plan No. 1.

Reorganization plan No. 2 contains, among other things, a provision for the abolition of the Employees' Compensation Commission. It was the opinion of the committee that that part of the plan was in violation of section 5(a), subsection 6, which prohibited the abolition of quasi-judicial agencies in the reorganization plans.

The Federal Employees Compensation Commission is a bipartisan board, and it was the opinion of the committee that

bipartisan boards should not be abolished by reorganization plans. If they are to be abolished, it was the opinion of the committee that the Congress itself should do it by direct action. As far as I recall, that was the only objection to reorganization plan No. 2.

Let me advise the House that under the terms of the Reorganization Act you cannot amend these reorganization plans. You must either vote them up or vote them down.

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

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Is the Employees Compensation Commission one of the independent agencies that was originally exempted from the basic Reorganization Act last before us by the report of the committee?

Mr. MANASCO. It was not exempted in the Reorganization Act of 1945. It is my understanding that it was exempted in the Reorganization Act of 1939.

Mr. HALLECK. But the gentleman's committee, in its original proposal, in the bill as reported, exempted certain of the independent agencies.

Mr. MANASCO. That is correct. They did exempt certain independent agencies, and it was the opinion of the committee that the provision of section 5, which exempted quasi-judicial agencies, also exempted the Employees' Compensation Commission. The Employees' Compensation Commission has been recognized by the Congress and the courts for some time as being a quasi-judicial body.

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

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. The gentleman has stated that the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is recognized as a quasi-judicial body by the Congress. As a matter of fact, it is recognized as such by the Supreme Court of the United States. As such, it must be exempted from any reorganization plan proposed by the Chief Executive. Plan No. 2 violates section 5 (a) (6) of the Reorganization Act because, as an agency exercising quasi-judicial functions, the Commission no longer could give the collective three-member bipartisan judgment upon cases which the present law requires; in fact, the Commission would be abolished. Moreover, under the plan, a super appeals board would have power to veto the exercise of judgment which the present Compensation Act authorizes. The "limitation on judgment" which the Reorganization Act forbids is apparent.

Mr. MANASCO. That is right.

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

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Does the United States Employees' Compensation Commission also administer longshoremen's compensation?

Mr. MANASCO. That is correct.

The main objection that the committee had to plan No. 3 was because it transferred the Marine Inspection Service permanently from the Department of Commerce to the Coast Guard, where it should be, for the Coast Guard is charged with the safety of people who are shipwrecked on our coast and should be charged with the seaworthiness of seagoing vessels. Of course, I do not know whether that is such an important thing, but the other matter was the weakening of St. Elizabeths Hospital. Our colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] is more informed on that particular question than am I, and he will be able to explain to the House why the committee objected to that particular provision.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would like to ask the gentleman if there is any saving at all in these three reorganization plans?

Mr. MANASCO. When the Director of the Budget appeared before the committee, that question was asked him several times, and we never could get an answer from him that it would save anything.

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

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER].

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, I will try to not take more than just a few minutes, because I know that time is of pressing importance. First I want to say that I appreciate the courtesy of the House leadership in cooperating with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO] in bringing up these three resolutions: House Concurrent Resolution 151, House Concurrent Resolution 154, and House Concurrent Resolution 155. Each resolution seeks to repeal, in effect, one of the reorganization plans submitted by the administration on May 16 of this year.

The act of 1940 provides that unless both branches of Congress within 60 days after a reorganization plan has been submitted to the Congress affirmatively disapprove the plan, the plan then becomes law, with the same force and effect as though it had been passed by a roll-call vote in the House and in the Senate. The 60 days is fast expiring. If I figure correctly, on the 14th or 15th of July, unless this body disapproves any one or all three of these plans—and I hope it disapproves all three of them—and unless the other body does likewise, then that plan becomes a law.

Mr. Chairman, the resolutions which I have introduced disapproving these plans ought to pass, because the Members of Congress have not had an opportunity to give study and consideration to these complicated reorganization plans. This is very important. The Members are busy with many, many things, and the Members of the House have much to do. What happened? The administrative agencies—and I do not criticize the President, because he has to act through his administrative agencies, but what I say is directed at the administrative agencies—had from the 20th of December to take such time as they wanted to bring before this House at the earliest possible moment any reorganization plan in which they were interested. What did they do? They waited from the 20th of December until the 16th day of May, a time when the party leadership of this House was beginning to talk about an adjournment during the summer months.

It seems to me in the interest of good legislation that it is not unfair to suggest that this House ought to adopt these Concurrent Resolutions, 151, 154, and 155, and let this matter go over until the new Congress convenes in January, when the administrative agencies can submit their proposed legislation early in the session and not late in the session, so that Congress can study the complications and the effect of the proposed plans and give proper consideration to them.

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

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

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman says that Members of Congress have not had an opportunity to study these plans. I find that the committee of which the gentleman is a distinguished member has held hearings that run to 341 pages, and that this committee, having studied these plans, recommends their disapproval. That is the same sort of consideration we give to other legislation. The only question is whether we are going to follow the recommendations of a committee that has given exhaustive study to these plans.

Mr. PITTENGER. May I correct the gentleman by saying that I am not a member of that distinguished committee. Otherwise, the gentleman's remarks are correct.

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

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. How much more time does the gentleman believe Congress would require to determine that plan No. 2 is clearly in violation of the Constitution?

Mr. PITTENGER. May I say to the gentleman, who is a very able and learned student of the law, that other Members of the House have said the same thing about plans Nos. 1 and 3, and I think they are correct. All violate the law.

Referring to the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], what we say is this, and this is an added reason why these resolutions should be adopted. Just as soon as I made application to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO], the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, he cooperated 100 percent by calling his committee together, by arranging for hearings, and by conducting hearings.

I was not present at all of these meetings although I attended several of them. It is significant that the members of the

Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments, men of ability and standing in this House and men whose judgment you respect and in whom you have confidence, after hearing the testimony and after studying the plans by a vote which unofficially has been reported to be 11 to 3, voted to report favorably on the Pittenger resolution, which in effect is an unfavorable action on reorganization plan 1, reorganization plan 2, and reorganization plan 3. The committee has set forth, probably not as elaborately as you and I might do after more lengthy study, some objections to these plans in the committee reports which accompany these House concurrent resolutions. If you have not done so, I would urge you to talk to Mr. MANASCO, to Judge WHITTINGTON, to Mr. BENDER, to Mr. CHURCH, to Mr. JUDD, and to Mr. HENRY, all members of the committee who were regular in attendance at these meetings and who approached these plans without any prejudice but solely with a desire to report to this House information on which the House could act.

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

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. If these resolutions should fail, it would mean that the country would then have a permanent housing administration; is that not correct?

Mr. PITTENGER. I have been told that is absolutely correct. That is the effect and the purpose, although I do not think any Government agency can be justified that way, but the purpose of plan No. 1 would be permanently to put the Government in the housing business.

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

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. JUDD. On May 31 the Director of the Budget, Mr. Smith, wrote to the chairman of our committee, and on page 2 in the second paragraph in talking about the changes in this reorganization plan he says: "Among these are the provisions which make permanent the National Housing Agency." There is the Director of the Budget speaking. There is no authorization for that in law whatsoever.

Mr. PITTENGER. I do not think there is any question about the correctness of my colleague's statement.

I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I want to go on record as being opposed to making such an agency permanent. That seems to me to be one place where the Government should not intrude any further into the privacy of American life.

Mr. PITTENGER. In one way or another all three plans have that same legal defect—making wartime agencies permanent.

I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. HENRY. Is it not true that if it does make permanent the National Housing Agency that is in direct conflict with the intent of the original reorganization law as it was passed?

Mr. PITTENGER. I do not think there is any question about that. I think all three of these plans violate some provision of the act which Congress passed last year. I supported that Reorganization Act. I did so because I believed that these Government agencies ought to be consolidated instead of expanded. You have just the opposite in these plans. Here and there, they have a couple of little sections and, in my opinion, if they put them together they do not even need a reorganization plan to do it.

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

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Is my memory not correct that when we supported that resolution the argument was that it would reduce the number of bureaus and agencies rather than create new ones?

Mr. PITTENGER. I will say to my colleague that is the reason I supported the reorganization or consolidation plans, as I recall it, first under Mr. Hoover and then under Mr. Roosevelt. I announced last summer a year ago that I was going to support the President's reorganization plan in the hope that he would give us some real reorganization plan. But they have fallen short of the purpose of the law.

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

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to plan No. 1, section 501:

> National Housing Agency: The agencies and functions of the National Housing Agency established under the First War Powers Act, 1941 (55 Stat. 838), by Executive Order No. 9070 of February 24, 1942, are consolidated to form a permanent agency of the same name.

Can there be any doubt of the intent to create a permanent housing agency?

Mr. PITTENGER. I think one of the representatives of one of the bureaus used a lot of words, but I do not believe he explained away the objections that my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania has raised. Let me say in a little different way that plan No. 2 and plan No. 3 have in them the same elements of danger. They are not properly prepared.

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

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. As a matter of fact, these plans are a regrouping of existing agencies, some created by law, others created by Executive order. There is no worth-while elimination. No economy is claimed. The real effect will be to give permanency to Executive orders which were made in the first instance as war necessities. We certainly should be timid before giving life and vitality permanently to all of these war agencies.

Mr. PITTENGER. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. When our committee was in Moscow we held a conference with Mr. Andrei Vyshinsky. We asked him how the Soviet system functioned in a legislative capacity. He said the executive department agrees on policy and then comes to the Presidium for ratification. There is something strangely analogous to that procedure and the one we are called upon to ratify this afternoon.

Mr. PITTENGER. I will say if you will study these plans you will find they are a step in the direction of having legislation by Executive decree. That was not the purpose of the act of 1945.

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

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield.

Mr. MANASCO. I think we should clear up one thing in these statements. If the reorganization plan is defeated and the War Powers Act expires, we will still have certain housing functions that were created by act of Congress.

Mr. PITTENGER. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. MANASCO. They will go back like the United States Housing Authority, and various others that were established by the Congress, and this plan will not have an effect on those.

Mr. PITTENGER. That is correct. You do not affect any of the existing housing agencies passed under law. You have got all that even though you defeat plan numbered 1.

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

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. Did the committee make any findings as to the desirability of transferring the Bureau of Marine and Fisheries Inspection to the Coast Guard?

Mr. PITTENGER. I talked to one of the members of the committee and I am told that that failure to comment on that was an oversight; probably a little confusion. I will say to the gentleman that I have very decided views on that subject. I think that is one of the objectives that the committee passed on when they reported adversely to plan numbered 3. I will say that the shipping interests, the merchant marine, and seamen's unions, appeared before the committee and opposed reorganization plan No. 3. They do not want to remain under the Coast Guard. They want to be returned to the Department of Commerce. I hope you read the testimony of John Hawk, an official of the Seafarers International Union, of New York City. He pointed out very ably the objections to Reorganization Plan No. 3. This plan ought to be rejected.

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

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, it was former President Hoover who remarked:

> Proposals for reorganization of the Federal Government always prove to be the signal for the mobilization of opposition from all quarters, which has destroyed the possibility of constructive action.

An editorial in the Washington (D. C.) Star correctly observes that—

> Insofar as the mobilization of opposition is concerned the observation is as true today as it was when Mr. Hoover was having difficulty in obtaining congressional cooperation in his reorganization program. President Truman's threefold plan for administrative

reform has collided head on with opposition from the House Committee on Expenditures. There are indications that the House will follow the committee's advice and disapprove the plan. The committee's action in turn reflects the opposition voiced by sundry groups and individuals against various phases of the President's program.

The three-part presidential recommendation called for a consolidation of Federal housing agencies, a merger of welfare activities and a series of interagency functional shifts—all for the announced purpose of promoting administrative efficiency, eliminating duplication of effort and saving money. Mr. Truman made no claim that his proposals were perfect or all-inclusive. To a large extent, however, they did meet in part the demands which repeatedly have been made at the Capitol for a businesslike reorganization of the executive machinery. The Joint Committee on Nonessential Expenditures, for example, advised President Truman last November that a "multiplicity of agencies" were doing "identical, similar, or related" work, as in the case of the housing field, where there are 22 units in 11 different agencies.

We are seeing again an evidence of the view expressed many years ago by a Chief Executive of this country. Under the plea of my beloved colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER] and those who join with him, we are requested at this time to thwart the efforts not of a Democratic President but of a reorganization ideal that was first expressed in the request of President Hoover, again urged by President Roosevelt, and now in the third instance brought forward by President Truman. It is important for the membership to recall what a former member of this body, a very able one, said. I refer to the Comptroller General, Lindsay C. Warren.

We know—

Declared Mr. Warren—

from past experience, indeed from sad experience, in this body that the Congress will never of its own accord and of its own initiative reorganize the Government of the Nation.

I think it might be appropriate to call to your attention the words of Secretary of State James F. Byrnes, when he was a Member of Congress. He said:

I have yet to talk with reference to reorganization to one man in the Government service who did not make this answer: "I know it should be done, but" and then when he joins the great old order of "butters" you will find that he says: "Do not touch my department, do not touch my bureau, do not touch my division."

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman will admit that nobody in the committee had any objection to 23 or 24 of the 28 reorganization moves. The gentleman will admit that, will he not?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think the membership of the committee largely agrees with reorganization but——

Mr. JUDD. Therefore, we were not against reorganization, we were against four particular things which would not cut down, but extend. We favored the 24 that make some real reorganization along the line of the law passed by Congress. If we pass these resolutions and send them back to the President and he deletes those four or five, they will come back and go through automatically. We cannot accept the reorganization the way it has been submitted because there is no real saving achieved.

Mr. RANDOLPH. We talk reorganization but we fail to act. No legislation is perfect. We cannot get all we individually desire in these matters. My thinking goes to something deeper and that is the preservation of our democracy, our responsible Government, using the best connotation of the expression, and likewise the maintenance of a system of executive organization and administration which is effective and which functions as economically as possible. Although technically the gentleman from Minnesota is correct in saying "Yes, we agree with most of them but not with all," but then you come here against the proposition. We should meet the impact of this challenge.

My colleagues, we act unwisely if we turn down plan 1, or 2, or 3, or all of them, when for the first time really under any administration, and I refer not to a Democratic or a Republican leadership, this Congress, responsive to the will of the American people, attempts to put the executive house in order——

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. With reference to the quotation from the present Comptroller General, Lindsay C. Warren, I think that if the gentleman will refer back to that debate he will find that in that very reorganization bill that Mr. Warren presented to the House he made some very notable and very wide exceptions and the House responded and approved those exceptions. One of them I happen to recall was the United States Army engineers. At that time there was considerable agitation to put the Army engineers in the Interior Department; and I am not so sure that the gentleman would not agree with me that it would be a right unwise thing to have done at that time. The facts and circumstances that have taken place since made it such.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Of course, if the gentleman is referring to individuals, I do not desire to enter that realm of discussion because I submit my argument today on the plans themselves and what is contemplated for the better functioning of our Federal agencies. Mr. Chairman, to return to my theme I shall emphatically say that nothing in any plan changes the substance of any governmental program. Charges were made before the committee that the rights and privileges of citizens would be adversely affected; the plans make no changes which decrease such rights. The sole effect is to adopt or continue organizational arrangements which will permit the more effective conduct of governmental activities which have been authorized by the Congress. The organizational changes proposed in each case meet one or more of the requirements imposed by Congress of promoting increased efficiency, reducing overlapping and duplication of effort, consolidating agencies and functions according to major purpose, reducing the number of agencies, and promoting economy.

I shall be very happy to yield to those Members standing, but I have only a short time because of limitation of debate. I am not sure I can add to the intelligent reflections which the House would take after I have spoken. I shall go into these plans 1, 2, and 3, in the hope that the purposes of both opponents and proponents may be better served than if I am interrupted. But the discussion even in that manner will of necessity be brief.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER] makes a case for the opposition in an over-all way. Of course, it will be supplemented and expanded by others. He says he is in full agreement with the need of reorganization but that the plans should be rejected due to lack of study up to the present time of the proposals. In refutation of that statement, I may say that although we may not agree, each and every reorganization plan by the President has been carefully considered. In eight instances the plans make permanent organizational changes which have been in existence for many, many years, and full opportunity has been available to judge the wisdom of the arrangements that have been made. In cases involving new consolidations or transfers almost every item has a considerable background of study, both in the departments and agencies which originally proposed the action, and in the Bureau of the Budget and in the staff attached to the Presidential office.

There should be none of these items which should be rejected alone on the basis that further study is required. On the contrary, if full advantage is to be taken of the possibilities for economy and increased efficiency which are apparent, I believe, in the plans under consideration, they should be approved so that we can at the beginning of the next fiscal year start on an improved basis.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER], before our committee and in the House, speaks against the plans and says they will not consolidate and eliminate agencies. When a man makes that statement and nobody answers it, we can believe, at least, that he stands on ground that no one desires to oppose. Some of the items in the plans will yield immediate economies by the abolition of jobs and functions and in the long run will make possible the continuance in the postwar years of organizational arrangements which have proved their effectiveness under the stress of war. While no new economies result from this type of action, no one can deny that additional confusion and expense would be entailed if these organizations were to be broken up, and if six of the major departments and agencies of the Government were to be forced to abandon purely organizational arrangements which they adopted for reasons of increased economy and efficiency and which have proven to be practical over a period of several years.

Let us take them one by one. Plan No. 1 does abolish the office of the United States High Commissioner to the Philippines and the Office of Contract Settlement. In both of these instances savings,

therefore, can be effected, because they will be attributable directly to the abolition of the two offices.

Let us go to plan No. 2. We abolish the Social Security Board, and we abolish the Employees' Compensation Commission.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman has referred to the abolition of the office of High Commissioner to the Philippines. It would seem to me that after July 4 there will not be any need for a High Commissioner to the Philippines, because the Philippines will then become independent.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. The gentleman has mentioned another instance of the abolition of an office, namely, the Office of Contract Terminations. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that this is an agency consisting of an administrator and three clerks, the work of which has been 98 percent completed.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I did not say the degree in which savings will be effected, but said they would be abolished and there would be economies.

I continue with plan No. 2. We abolish not only the Social Security Board and the Employees' Compensation Commission, but we abolish the Board of Vocational Rehabilitation and the Board of Visitors to St. Elizabeths Hospital. We also consolidate the functions of the Employees' Compensation Commission, the Children's Bureau, and the Bureau of Vital Statistics and other activities of the Bureau of the Census into the Federal Security Agency.

I will ask the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Pennsylvania if these agencies I have mentioned are not being abolished.

Mr. WALTER. Yes; they are being abolished in name only. However, an illegal attempt is being made to impose the duties of those agencies in a place where they are unable to perform them.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Oh, let us be reasonable. We know direct savings should result from the abolition of the Social Security Board. No substantial sums are involved in either the Board of Vocational Rehabilitation or the Board of Visitors of St. Elizabeths so that no appreciable savings can be claimed for these items. While the functions consolidated in the Federal Security Agency may not immediately reflect savings in their administrative costs, some savings should certainly be reflected over a long term. More important than this, however, a greater return in terms of program effectiveness and service to the public should be received for each dollar spent under this regrouping of functions.

Plan No. 3 consolidates the Grazing Service in the General Land Office into a Bureau of Land Management in the Department of the Interior, consolidates the Paymaster General and Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps into a Supply Department, consolidates the administration of minerals on agricultural lands in the Department of the Interior, consolidated certain housekeeping functions at Hyde Park, makes possible the continued consolidation of certain functions of various bureaus in the Department of Agriculture into the Production and Marketing Administration, abolishes the Canal Zone Biological Area and consolidates its functions in the Smithsonian Institution.

The consolidations in the Interior Department and the Marine Corps will definitely result in direct savings. The other consolidations may result in savings. Each of these consolidations will result in increased efficiency and greater service from the dollars spent.

Aside from these direct abolitions and direct consolidations, the plan—as just noted—provides for the maintenance of several organizational arrangements which have worked well for several years. Unless the plan is approved, these arrangements must be broken up; and great confusion and inefficiency for a period of time will inevitably develop. That is particularly true in case of the National Housing Agency, Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation, National Observatory and Hydrographic Office, and the supervision of credit unions.

In summary the contention of the opponents that the plan does not contain the consolidations and eliminations of agencies, is patently untrue. I recall that Representative PITTENGER referred, in his remarks, that the increased costs of plan No. 2 could be figured in terms of tens of millions of dollars in the program of the Federal Security Agency.

This statement is absolutely wrong. Mr. PITTENGER and others were referring to the increased appropriations for old-age assistance and public health grants to the States recommended for 1947 as compared to 1946. Obviously, neither of these programs are involved in the reorganization plan. The fact that a substantive program of the Federal Security Agency which is primarily a grant to the States is increasing in cost has nothing to do with these proposals.

I think it is important that in plan No. 1 we check back just a moment to the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER] in reference to making temporary wartime emergency housing projects permanent. I believe that no wartime emergency housing projects are made permanent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I believe that we in no way alter any of the basic legislation which has been enacted by this Congress. I know that is true. We have not done so.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. I inquired of the Housing Expediter, Mr. Wilson Wyatt, as to his opinion with reference to making this a permanent agency, and with the gentleman's permission I would like to read one paragraph:

> Only two real arguments have been advanced against reorganization plan No. 1.
>
> The first of these is that it violates the provision of the reorganization law which prohibits the making permanent of a temporary agency. In reality, reorganization plan No. 1 does not make any temporary agency permanent. It does not continue any function or activity beyond the term specified by statute. It merely makes permanent a consolidation which was effected during the the war under the First War Powers Act.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I feel the gentleman is correct and I believe the opinion he has read is of benefit to the House in resolving the question.

In the minute and a half I have remaining I pose the question once again to my colleagues. Those who served under the two previous Chief Executives, Mr. Hoover and Mr. Roosevelt, have said that we are in favor of reorganization. In the first instance, when the measure was finally brought to the floor many exemptions were written into it. Then again in 1937 through 1939 there were fewer exemptions contained in the legislation. When we passed in 1945 the third reorganization legislation only a few exemptions crept into the measure. We thus indicated that by and large there was an increasing tendency in the Congress of the United States to show that individually and collectively there was a belief in reorganization. In 1932, 1937 through 1939, in 1945, and now in 1946 we meet this problem.

Having admitted our failure to do the job of reorganization, having by mandate of the Congress told the President of the United States, "We desire you to take affirmative steps," when the first three plans are sent to this Congress, are we going to say not only to the President but to the country, "We have admitted our failure to act. We put the burden into the hands and on the shoulders of someone else, and now, on the first occasion when plans come to us we weakly respond, 'Mr. President, we cannot approve'?" I do not believe the country is going to appreciate such an answer.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from West Virginia, may I say that neither the Reorganization Act of 1939, nor the First War Powers Act, nor the Reorganization Act of 1945 conferred any semblance of authority on the President to create new agencies. Indeed, the latter in express terms forbids it.

What was the purpose of this Reorganization Act that we passed on October 20, 1945? The express purpose of that act was to save the taxpayers' money, not to substitute new departments but to eliminate departments, to take people off the Government pay roll and to reduce the cost of government. That was written right in this bill.

Let me read from the act that passed on December 20 this language:

> The Congress declares that the public interest demands the carrying out of the purposes specified in subsection (a).
>
> It is the expectation of the Congress that the transfers, coordinations, and abolitions under this act shall accomplish an over-all

reduction of at least 25 percent in the administrative costs of the agency or agencies affected.

The act that was passed in December of 1945 states in so many words that the cost of government must be reduced by at least 25 percent. When the Director of the Budget, Mr. Smith, appeared before the committee and I questioned him as to how much would be saved by these reorganization plans, he said, and his testimony is here and I can read it to you, that this was not even considered by the Bureau of the Budget when they adopted these three plans.

It is an amazing thing for the Director of the Budget to say that he had not even considered a reduction in the cost of Government. All of us here are aware of the fact that everywhere throughout the country the taxpayers are sick and tired of being welfared and inspected and wet-nursed from Washington.

They want it stopped. They want the cost of government reduced. Here, instead of reducing the cost of government, we are increasing the cost of government by over $546,000,000 as the 1947 Budget will indicate. These three plans are a part of that increase in the cost of the civil functions of government. I do not know of any individual who appeared before our committee who could stand up and be questioned and who could support an argument that this would bring about any kind of economy.

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

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. What will be accomplished by the proposed consolidation in the Department of Agriculture? I understand that by this proposed plan No. 3 the functions of certain agencies of the Department of Agriculture are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture. And it refers to the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, the Surplus Marketing Administration, the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. What economies will be effected by that?

Mr. BENDER. No economies would be effected except more control would be given to certain individuals who want more control and who want to control these agencies—for what purposes I do not know except that they want to be big shots.

Mr. COOLEY. Would the personnel be reduced any?

Mr. BENDER. The personnel would be increased by all three of these plans. The personnel would be substantially increased, except in two or three minor instances. Now what in the world did we pass a reorganization plan for other than to reduce the cost of government? Every Member of Congress runs on a platform of reduced cost of government. You know we owe approximately $285,000,000,000 in this country.

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

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

You know we cannot go on indefinitely spending two or three times as much tax money as we put into the till of the Federal Government. Mr. Smith and all other members of the administration who appeared before us did not offer testimony in support of these plans claiming a reduction in the cost of government. What did you have in mind, any of you, when you voted for this reorganization plan last year? If you will read the hearings on that plan and if you will read what happened on the floor of the House and in committee when that plan was passed, you will find that everyone who spoke on this reorganization plan said they were interested in economy. Of course, we want efficiency and we do not want to stop anything that would improve the efficient operation of the Government even if it does cost a little more money. But this does not improve the efficient operation of the Government. It impedes the efficient operation of the Government.

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

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Was there any testimony before your committee that would indicate an increase in the cost of government in the event that these reorganization plans were adopted?

Mr. BENDER. Only the figures that were prepared for members of the committee by experts who analyzed the effect and the cost of these plans and in all but two or three minor instances there is a substantial increase in the cost of the Government in the event these plans become effective.

Mr. KEEFE. I was interested in asking that question because of the interrogation of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] who is now on his feet, wherein he indicated a few moments ago that the committee was unanimous on all of the suggestions in these three reorganization plans with the exception of some four or five of the proposals. As to all of the proposals except those four or five, the committee was in accord with the suggestions of the President that those reorganizations should take place. That is what I understood him to say.

Mr. BENDER. I say to the gentleman the contrary is true.

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. If I said that, I did not give the impression that I wanted to give. I said our major objection to the plans was because of four or five of the proposals and that there might be greater efficiency achieved by many of these other transfers. But I asked Mr. SMITH over and over again, trying to get some evidence that this would actually save any money and he would not give us a figure. So that they do not achieve the purpose, although the other 24 do not violate the terms of the act.

Mr. KEEFE. I was prompted to ask the question because I was rather astounded at what I understood the plain import of the gentleman's statement, which was agreed to by the gentleman from West Virginia, that the committee was in unanimous accord as to all of these proposals with the exception of four or five items. If that is true, then it ought to call for some explanation.

Mr. BENDER. At no time was there any evidence of any real enthusiasm on the part of the members of the committee for any one of these plans, either on the Republican or the Democratic side. As a matter of fact, with the exception of one member of the committee, who rather weakly supported some of the provisions of this plan, no other member of the committee appeared to show any enthusiasm for that plan.

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

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. As a matter of fact, there were dozens of witnesses, groups, and organizations from all over the country in opposition to all three plans.

Mr. BENDER. That is right.

Now, in connection with plan No. 1, the Housing Agency, which I supported and which I believe is a temporary Agency and has done some good things—they are making that Agency a permanent branch of the Government. Do you want to do that? If you do, vote for this plan. If you want some of these war agencies made permanent, if you want to keep these office buildings occupied with thousands of employees on the Federal pay roll, go ahead and vote for the plans. But if you believe your own campaign statements back home, that you want this Government to be operated economically and that you want to save money, you cannot possibly vote for any one of these plans. The whole purpose of this reorganization business was to reduce the cost of Government. Now, after 6 months' time the Bureau of the Budget writes these three plans. I think they were written by Mr. Appleby of the Bureau of the Budget. I think they were handed to the President. I am not criticizing the President at all. I think the Bureau of the Budget is in error. I think they did not read the law when they prepared these plans. If they had read the law they would have had some testimony to offer, revealing that the cost of Government would be reduced 25 percent.

Mr. PITTENGER. And when they abolished the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, right away they created an appeal board of three members. They not only do not reduce the number of employees but they increase them.

Mr. BENDER. They increased them and provided fat salaries.

Now, do we want to pass another unconstitutional law here? That plan in connection with the employees' fund is wholly out of order, and wholly illegal.

Mr. PITTENGER. And they abolish the Social Security Board and appoint somebody else to function there, and take away from the Board any security, any independence, so that it can decide cases that come before it free from political interference. It is a bipartisan board.

Mr. BENDER. Not only that, but they increased the cost of the operation of that agency by $12,000,000. Now, if you want to increase the cost of these agencies, go ahead and vote for this plan. Is there anyone on this floor who will

offer testimony to the effect that these plans will reduce the cost of Government one thin dime?

I have great respect for my good friend the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. He and I are on the same side of the fence most of the time on this committee. I am surprised that he did not appear before the committee and offer this testimony and show such enthusiasm for these plans.

He did not voice the sentiments there as he is voicing them today. If he had voiced them he would have been the only Member to have voiced these opinions. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANDOLPH. And the hearings will show that I did voice my belief in the plans during the testimony of the witnesses, particularly when the gentleman from Atlanta, Mr. West, was testifying.

Mr. BENDER. Yes; I want to correct my statement to that extent and say that the gentleman was active in the committee. The gentleman is one of the most active members of our committee.

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

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Then the gentleman from West Virginia agrees with the statement of the Speaker here that the National Housing Administration under plan No. 1 would be made a permanent agency of the Government.

Mr RANDOLPH No; I disagree with that, and so stated in my remarks. They are reaffirmed, however, by the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. COOLEY. How can the gentleman take that position in view of the very language which states that the agencies and functions of the National Housing Administration established under the Second War Powers Act are consolidated to form a permanent agency of the same name?

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield that I may answer that question?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. MANASCO. I think it is unfortunate that that statement was contained in the transmittal of this plan, that the National Housing Agency is being made a permanent organization.

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

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MANASCO. That statement is unfortunate on the part of the Administration because when the National Housing Agency was created it was created to consolidate agencies that had already been created by Congress. It would have been better had the plan said that these consolidated agencies were already created by act of Congress and merely grouped together under the Second War Powers Act under the name United States Housing Agency. I do not think there would have been any objection to that part of it. I do not think most of the members of our committee object to a continuance of the functions but they objected to the abolition of the Federal Housing Administration and putting it under the National Housing Agency or any other agency.

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

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman agree that this plan seeks to make it a permanent agency?

Mr. MANASCO. I think that plan is unfortunate. If they had drawn it properly it would not have caused so much objection but it does make the agency permanent. The opinion of the committee was that it does not extend the Second War Powers Act.

Mr. BENDER. This not only makes that agency permanent but makes all these agencies and bureaus and departments created by Executive order permanent agencies of Government. That is what these plans do.

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

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the dean of the Ohio delegation.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman knows that in the State of Ohio the building and loan companies are outstanding in the State and are the greatest building force in the State. They are firmly convinced that this will be permanent and will seriously handicap them in their activities.

Mr. BENDER. And they represent a pretty substantial section of the common people.

Mr. JENKINS. They represent over 2,000,000 people in our State.

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

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I call attention to this further statement in the report which says that these agencies and functions will constitute a permanent organization and further I quote from Harold Smith's own letter:

> Among these are the provisions to make permanent the National Housing Agency.

How can the gentleman say that it is not going to be permanent?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I refer the gentleman to the statement I have placed emphasis on in the minority report that I believe the plan carries out the congressional mandate as set forth in the Reorganization Act of 1945 when we specifically used this language:

> To create, coordinate, and consolidate agences and functions as nearly as may be, according to major purposes.

It will bring together within a single agency the major functions of Government relating to housing. I believe that is true.

Mr. COOLEY. And make them permanent.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I do not use the word "permanent" because we do not change any substantive law which has been passed.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman does not but Mr. Smith does and the plan does.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am not speaking for Mr. Smith. It was unfortunate language, I will be frank.

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

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. But the law said that no reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of, continuing any agency beyond the period authorized by law for its existence or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made.

We all know if this reorganization plan is not agreed to this agency will terminate at a certain time. This extends it ad infinitum.

Furthermore, it says that no reorganization plan shall provide for continuing any agency beyond the period authorized by law for its existence and no reorganization plan shall provide for continuing any function beyond the period authorized by law for its exercise. There is no authorization under law for this.

Mr. MANASCO. Under the law we created the United States Housing Authority and other agencies, that were charged with building houses and they will revert back to an independent status. We will have about 12 to 15 such agencies.

Mr. JUDD. But you will not have the National Housing Agency.

Mr. MANASCO. You can call it anything.

Mr. JUDD. There is another limitation. No reorganization shall provide for authorizing any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law. This function is not authorized by law. It is under Executive order.

Mr. MANASCO. The functions performed by these war agencies were functions already authorized by law, and then consolidated and grouped together.

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

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. If it would produce a more smoothly functioning operation, why are not these agencies grouped together under the authority given the Chief Executive by the First War Powers Act?

Mr. MANASCO. They are now.

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

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has used the term "permanent," and our chairman has said that was an unfortunate use of language. Does not the gentleman now addressing the House think that unless the House acts and rejects this plan that the House will be approving the permanency of it; therefore it is necessary to turn down the plan?

Mr. BENDER. I think the gentleman has made a very fine point. In the event we fail to turn down these plans they become part of the law on July 15.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman is equipped now to show the tremendous additional expense and I hope he will use his time to do that. I want to make another comment. The gentleman does know the contempt almost that some of

the witnesses had for the subsection (c) of section 2 of the act which says:

It is the expectation of the Congress that the transfers, consolidations, coordinations, and abolitions under this act shall accomplish an over-all reduction of at least 25 per centum in the administrative cost of the agency or agencies affected.

I hope the gentleman will bring out before he leaves the floor these tremendous additional expenditures.

Mr. BENDER. I will be glad to make them a part of the record. It will take too much time to present the figures at the present time. Our time is too limited.

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

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Because there has been injected into each one of these plans something that is not apparent to the eye of the average Member, does not the gentleman believe the wise thing to do is to defer these matters until the next session of Congress?

Mr. BENDER. Frankly, the wise thing to do is to defeat them, not defer them.

Mr. DONDERO. I mean defeat these plans so that they may be given further consideration later?

Mr. BENDER. Yes.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. This is the same agency, the NHA, and about the same personnel, that brought up a bill which the Congress defeated in 1939, a bill before the Banking and Currency Committee. Most of the Members now on the floor who were Members at that time were so utterly disgusted with the personnel and the way they lobbied Congress and put millions of dollars into projects just to influence votes in the various districts, and all sorts of skulduggery, that I cannot understand how anybody who was here at the time would ever vote for a bill of this kind to put all these good housing agencies under it.

Mr. BENDER. I do not know about the gentlewoman's statement, but I am sure she knows what she is talking about. However, I may say that at no time did the committee consider personalities or inject personalities into this thing. I may add further that the majority of the members of the committee were present when we voted on these plans. Not one of these plans at any time had over 3 votes for it in the committee. The most votes that any one of these plans had were 3 votes, and, you appreciate that the minority party does not control any committee of the House.

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

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. Is it a proper Federal function for the Government to build homes for the people?

Mr. BENDER. I think the gentleman answers that question himself.

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

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

Mr. JUDD. On this question of the National Housing Agency may I read a paragraph from the President's message in which he transmitted reorganization plan No. 1:

I fully recognize that S. 1592, the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, approved by the Senate on April 12 of this year, provides for the permanent organization of the housing activities of the Government along the lines set forth in this plan. However, since the House must act before S. 1592 can become law, and because of the heavy legislative schedule now facing the House, it is difficult to foretell when such action can be expected. On the other hand, action by the President, taken under the authority of the Reorganization Act, assures decision on the matter in 60 days.

Therefore the President has taken over the legislative function. If we had passed the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill and it was law, then he would have a right to reorganize, because he would have a National Housing Agency expressly authorized by law. He thinks we are too slow, so he is going about it in this way. He says:

It also seems desirable to confirm under this reorganization plan as many as possible of the organization changes that were effected under the First War Powers Act, 1941, and that it seems desirable to make permanent.

I do not know how anybody can get away from the language of the intent of the President.

Mr. BENDER. I think the gentleman is right.

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

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. This morning one of the distinguished Members of the other body testified before the Committee on Banking and Currency on the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill. As I understood him, while urging the passage of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, he pointed out that the approach made through this Presidential plan No. 1 was entirely different from that contained in the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill in that it did not preserve the autonomy and independence of these various housing agencies as the authors of that bill sought to do. In the plan they placed everything under the control of one Administrator so that he can dictate the policies and actions of each one of these subsidiary agencies, and that was one element which they sought to avoid in this very carefully prepared and thought out Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill.

Mr. BENDER. I might add this, that most of the time before our committee on any controversial issue there are many able witnesses who appear in support of programs, but the testimony in support of these programs or these plans, in my humble opinion, was most pitiful.

Let me say this in closing. You have repeatedly heard that great man, Thomas Jefferson, quoted by Members on both sides of the aisle. He said time and time again that "that government is best which governs least." Now, what you are doing here is writing into permanent law temporary agencies, agencies that were created under Executive order, and rather than decreasing the cost of government as you have written into the law on December 25, you are increasing the cost of government; not decreasing it by 25 percent but increasing the cost of government in practically all of these agencies by at least 18 percent.

Mr. DONDERO. And governing more.

Mr. BENDER. That is right. To vote against these three reorganization plans vote for all the Pittenger resolutions.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. WOODHOUSE].

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, both in and out of Congress there has been for years widespread recognition of the need for realining, regrouping, and pruning the agencies and divisions of the administrative branch of the Government to the end of increase in efficiency and decrease in cost. Today the problems facing us are more complex than ever. Today the need for efficient administration is urgent. Today economy in expenditures is imperative. And yet, as we all know, there are far too many independent boards, commissions, and agencies, the heads of which report directly to the President. It is physically impossible, with his other pressing duties, for the President to supervise and coordinate their diverse activities. Moreover, the public is confused by a multiplicity of separate agencies, each dealing with the same general field of activity. Too often it is difficult for us, Members of Congress, to locate the right man in the right agency to deal with a given question. How much more difficult, if not impossible, it is for the pertinent committee and for Congress itself to ascertain where an agency may not be hewing strictly to the program Congress authorized it to administer.

Every factor in the situation points to the urgent need for reorganization. Congress, by the Reorganization Act of 1945, placed upon the President the task of such reorganization.

Today we have the opportunity of taking the first steps toward such reorganization. The three plans before us are far from radical. They deal almost entirely with minor administrative adjustments, many of which have functioned effectively on a temporary basis during the war.

Reorganization plans have been blocked in the past because someone wanted to retain a specific job or because some vested interest might be affected. If we wait for a reorganization plan which will not disturb any person or any group, we will wait in vain. But we cannot afford to wait. We cannot afford to let our governmental machinery break down from sheer weight and disjointedness. Our Government has got to function and function efficiently. The world is watching us for an answer to the question, "Can democracy work?" That may sound dramatic. It is not. It is a cold, hard fact. And in this House today we have to decide whether we want democracy to work or whether we prefer to risk its breakdown in favor of the apparent immediate interest of a special-interest group. And I say apparent interest, because efficient Government machinery is to the real advantage of everyone.

The objection to plan 1 turns on the establishment of a National Housing Agency, which coordinates the activities of some 17 different agencies which were dealing with housing problems at the start of the war. Members who were here at that time will remember that it was practically impossible for Congress to find out what was being done by the Government in housing, let alone to determine what needed to be done. It was a situation of utter confusion.

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

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. When the gentlewoman speaks of utter confusion I think it is important that we remember that prior to 1942 that was so, and there came into being a better housing program when we consolidated the various units. I do not think the statement should go unchallenged here that we are setting up new housing agencies or that we are making temporary bureaus permanent. Each and every constituent housing agency which came under the National Housing Agency as a temporary program was authorized by Congress. These were passed prior to our entrance into World War II—each and every agency dealing with housing. We cannot forget that. It was not a temporary program. It was not by directive of the President, but was by authorization of the Congress of the United States prior to the emergency of war.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. When Congress saw all that confusion at the beginning of the war it knew steps had to be taken to correct it and it therefore passed the War Powers Act giving the President that power. Whether all these agencies are to be consolidated under the NHA during peacetime depends on whether or not the Congress decides to give such power to the President. But we did not give him that power in the Reorganization Act. We specifically withheld from him such power in peacetime. My primary objection to this part of the reorganization plan is that the President is taking action that is not authorized by law. We authorized him to do that in the War Powers Act, but we did not authorize him to do it in the Reorganization Act.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Congress made the agencies permanent.

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. I know from experience as an elected State official in a State rapidly converting to war production, with thousands of war workers pouring into my State, how utterly frustrating and inefficient the situation was. It was always a question of whether it was the Federal Home Loan Bank Board which had jurisdiction over a particular problem, or whether it was the Federal Housing Administration, or the United States Housing Authority, or the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation or the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, or the United States Housing Corporation, or the Defense Homes Corporation, or the Division of Housing Coordination, or the Central Housing Committee, or the Farm Security Administration, or the Public Buildings Administration, or the Mutual Ownership Division of the Federal Works Agency, or perhaps even the War or Navy Department.

The private builders were just as confused. Here is a brief paragraph from a bulletin of the National Association of Real Estate Boards issued shortly after Pearl Harbor, before the temporary wartime consolidation of housing agencies and activities was effected:

> The urgent need of coordinated Federal housing agencies was highlighted last week in hearings before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor when the $50,000,000 District Housing Bill was under consideration. Members of the committee gave up in despair after hearing representatives of 20 different agencies offer a description of how they thought the $50,000,000 for emergency housing in Washington should be spent.

Now compare this situation as it was before the war with our experience under the wartime consolidation of government housing agencies.

First. The difficult war-housing job whose accomplishment had seemed so doubtful was done, and, more important, it was done in time and in a manner which was of worth-while assistance to the war effort.

Second. And especially significant is the fact, first pointed out by the National Association of Home Builders, that, while before the unification of the housing agencies the outlook for private enterprise doing a part of the war housing job was dubious, the simplified and intelligent housing program made possible by unification, in turn made it possible to assign to private enterprise the major part of the war housing job.

These statements do not represent merely my own personal findings. Practically every witness, including representatives of the various trade organizations, who testified before the postwar hearings of the Lanham committee in 1943 and 1944, the hearings of the Senate postwar Committee on Housing and Urban Redevelopment in 1944 and 1945, and the hearings of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill a few months ago, attested to the excellent results achieved from the wartime consolidation of housing agencies.

Further, in one publication after another during the war period, the various trade organizations interested in housing paid tribute to the accomplishments of the NHA for the job it did, and in a number of cases these very organizations took the initiative in advocating its continuance for the postwar period. Such statements and recommendations were made, to cite several examples, in news letters or other releases of the National Association of Home Builders, the National Association of Real Estate Boards, and the Producers' Council.

There are certain trade organizations who now oppose a National Housing Agency because of their opposition to public housing. Actually, the question of public housing is entirely irrelevant, because the reorganization plan has nothing to do with the substantive housing program. The Congress, and only the Congress, can determine, by specific legislation, the scope of any public housing program undertaken by the Federal Government.

It is significant that over a long period of years many of these trade organizations have strongly favored a unification of the housing activities of the Federal Government and have clearly shown their hearty approval of the results already attained through the temporary unification of housing activities through Executive Order 9070 of February 24, 1942. The following statements by various of these organizations illustrate this point:

Mr. Douglas Whitlock, testifying as president of the Producers' Council at the hearings on postwar planning held by the Lanham committee of the House of Representatives in January 1944, made the following statement:

> So long as housing is deemed a concern of Government, Federal housing policies should be stipulated by Congress, and the carrying out of all such established policies should, in our opinion, be vested in a central agency of the executive branch of the Federal Government, which would be charged as well with the conduct of research and advance planning activities in the related fields of housing, both urban and rural, the development of urban communities, and financing. It should provide over-all supervision and coordination of the programs of its constituent agencies. This means that an agency, either the National Housing Agency or a similar type of unit, should be established by legislative enactment for postwar operation. I am sure you will agree that a field of activity of such great importance as housing and construction deserves representation in the executive branch.

Similarly, a press release issued by the Producers' Council on June 13, 1944, stated:

> BOSTON, June 13.—The functions of the National Housing Agency should be continued by Congress after the war in order to coordinate all Federal housing activities and to encourage a sound governmental housing policy for the postwar era, James W. Follin, managing director of the Producers' Council, stated here today at a meeting of the Boston Building Congress held at the Architectural Club.
>
> "It is essential that this agency—NHA—or some similar branch of the Federal Government be set up with adequate authority and facilities to prevent a recurrence of the unsatisfactory experiences during prewar years when there was a multiplicity of agencies dealing with housing matters and offering incompatible and conflicting programs."

Likewise, the National Association of Home Builders in its Washington Letter, dated February 25, 1944, made the following statement:

> NHA OBSERVES SECOND ANNIVERSARY
>
> Born of a war need, and created February 24, 1942, by Executive order, NHA looks back on its accomplishments with modest satisfaction. Only those who were intimate with the housing situation, prior to NHA, have a full appreciation of the benefits of the consolidation. Nearly a score of governmental bodies had a finger in the housing pie. No one was sure as to the size of the war job, or how it should be done. Priority procedure was something of a mystery, the wildest sort of rumors existed, and red tape ensnared

everyone in a chaos of confusion. The outlook for private enterprise doing a part of the war housing program was dubious, and the accomplishment of the total job seemed doubtful.

Alphabetically we had the following: DDHC, FHA, FHLBB, HOLC, FSLIC, USHR, USHA, FWA, PBA, TVA, FSA, and DHC. These stood for the Division of Defense Housing Coordination, Federal Housing Administration, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Home Owners' Loan Corporation, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, United States Housing Corporation, United States Housing Authority, Federal Works Agency, Public Buildings Administration, Tennessee Valley Authority, Farm Security Administration, and the Defense Homes Corporation. In addition to all of this the Army, Navy, and Maritime Departments were very much in the building picture, as were other agencies of lesser importance not listed here. Under Mr. Blandford's able administration uniform control was set up and an intelligent housing policy established and carried out.

A brief review of the war housing program under NHA is evidence of fine accomplishment.

The report of the Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Redevelopment sums up, as follows, the reply made by the National Association of Real Estate Boards in mid-1944 to a written questionnaire of the subcommittee:

The National Association of Real Estate Boards favors placing all those concerned with housing and community developments under one general agency. It stresses the aspect of community development, feeling that the character of a neighborhood or community has just as much to do with good housing conditions as the construction of dwellings. A Federal community development authority is urged comprising all the agencies now included in the National Housing Agency as well as a certain portion of public works dealing with community development.

Again, in its brochure, Postwar Cities, issued September 1, 1944, this same organization stated:

The first thing the Federal Government should do in this field is to get all of its eggs into one basket. They are now scattered through a dozen independent agencies temporarily consolidated under the National Housing Agency.

The president of the Mortgage Bankers' Association, in testifying before the Senate subcommittee, while stating that the consensus of the membership of the association was that FHA be divorced from the National Housing Agency, had this to say:

At the beginning of the present war, 1941, we found on the urban side a cumbersome and varied group of Government agencies. * * *

With respect to urban housing, it is obvious that without central direction, the many existing agencies created at different times for entirely different purposes, and by various authorizations, will be working at cross-purposes with a duplication of effort. We believe also that the cost can be greatly reduced if a comprehensive program is developed under unified direction.

The Federal Government, in our opinion, acted wisely in simplifying the organization in order to expedite war housing and to prepare the Nation for any emergency which might arise to improve our war effort and production. * * * We believe that many benefits were derived by this simplified organization and that the program for war housing and the program for financing such housing was expedited and was very beneficial during the wartime emergency.

In brief, a plan of organization of the housing activities of the Government along the very lines embodied in the reorganization plan is vigorously supported by the organizations representing the general public. Also, a number of the very organizations who oppose a single housing agency, because of their opposition to public housing, are actually on record as being in favor of a single agency when this question is divorced from that irrelevant issue.

How then can anyone object to the President's reorganization plan for consolidating the housing activities of the Government on the grounds that it is a public-housing plan, that under it, public housing would come to dominate private enterprise in housing? Since this was not the result of unification in wartime how much less likely is such a result in peacetime?

The actual facts are that there is nothing in either the Reorganization Act or the reorganization plan to serve as a basis for such fears or objections. In the first place, there is absolutely nothing in the plan which in any way expands or broadens the public-housing program. There is no way in fact in which it possibly could, for under the Reorganization Act, any plans are necessarily limited to matters of organizational set-up and can have nothing whatsoever to do with expanding substantive programs for making permanent any temporary functions.

The only way in which the reorganization plan has to do with public housing is that it places the public-housing functions of the Government, just as it does all of the other basic housing functions of the Government, under a single National Housing Administrator. If this, therefore, makes the plan a public-housing plan, by the very same token it makes the plan an FHA plan, it makes the plan a home loan bank plan, and so on.

It has been suggested in this connection that the public housing people in the Agency will manage somehow to exercise a dominating influence. Again, it is not clear by what mysterious alchemy that they rather than the FHA people or the home loan bank people will do the dominating, especially so when the public-housing unit will be outnumbered 2 to 1 by the private housing units. Similarly, there is absolutely no basis on which to suppose that the National Housing Administrator, to whom the Public Housing Commissioner would be completely subordinate in authority, show favoritism to public housing. Certainly the experience during the war, when the opportunities for favoring public housing were much greater, completely belie the fears of public-housing domination. I say this on the basis of investigations made by committees in both Houses of this Congress on this very question. For example, in one of its reports in connection with a war-housing appropriation, the Lanham committee of this House stated that the question as to whether private enterprise is being aided and encouraged to do as much of the war-housing program as it possibly can was a question of constant concern to the committee. This committee then stated and I quote:

The committee has been well impressed with the attention and efforts which the National Housing Agency has concentrated upon this aspect of the problem.

Perhaps as effective a refutation of this argument of public housing domination as any is that made by the chairman of the Republican steering committee in the Senate, Senator TAFT, who was also chairman of a Senate committee which made a thorough investigation lasting over 2 years into the administration of our housing program during the war under a single housing administrator. This statement was as follows:

Considerable objection has been voiced by the building and loan people, and also the builders, on the ground that they do not want the FHA and home-loan banks consolidated into one department under the housing program. They fear that the overall appointee may lean toward public housing. I believe that such fear is unjustified, because Congress writes into the statute laws governing the FHA and laws governing the home-loan banks. I can see no way by which the Administrator can swing everything under public housing. After all, he may be a private housing man. * * * I believe that any fear to the effect that by adopting the suggested policy we subject one person to someone else is completely fallacious.

But even completely aside from the question of personalities, this fear of public-housing domination is completely untenable and fallacious on two very distinct grounds. In the first place, it completely overlooks and depreciates the function of Congress itself. It neglects the fact that the Congress, and the Congress alone, can and will determine the size and scope of the various housing programs undertaken by the Government, whether they relate to private housing or to public housing. No matter what may be the leanings of a particular appointee, no National Housing Administrator can administer a larger public-housing program or a larger program of insuring privately mortgaged houses, or a larger program of rural housing, than the Congress itself authorizes or desires. Further, I have complete faith in the ability of our Banking and Currency Committee, and also in the ability of our Appropriations Committee, to see to it that any administration of the housing program, contrary to the intent of the Congress, is stopped before it can make any headway at all.

The second weakness in this argument of the opposition is that, in effect, it constitutes an assumption that the various housing activities which the Congress has approved are, and should be, highly competitive with one another. Such as assumption embraces in turn the further assumption that since these various activities are competitive, they should be lodged in separate agencies, where they can be more free to engage in combat with one another.

These assumptions are wholly untenable. The various housing activities of

the Government should not be competitive; they should not be working at cross-purposes with one another. On the contrary, they should be reconciled through a well-thought-out, well-administered, and unified policy laid down by the Congress, and this is possible only if we have a unification of our housing activities and functions in a single agency.

The third and very important justification for the reorganization plan is that it strengthens Congress in the control over our housing policy. This was demonstrated by the results of the wartime consolidation of the housing agencies which enabled the committees and individual Members of Congress for the first time to obtain from one source a complete and integrated picture of the entire housing program of the Federal Government. It was possible for our committees and individual Members to review our national housing program and activities in detail and directly shape the course of its development. For the first time the Congress had real facilities for knowing fully and promptly what is being done in housing and so what ought to be done and what ought not to be done. For the first time therefore this body had readily been in a position to execute its own prime function of determining basic policy on housing and checking on its administration.

To cite one typical example, our ability to work with a single agency and to obtain from it a thorough and understandable picture of housing needs and problems made it possible for us to give attention to the problems of demobilization on the housing front long before we were able to give similar attention to the case of other war programs. In fact Congress was able as early as the summer of 1943 to enact legislation which set forth the basic plan for the postwar disposition and removal of all temporary housing financed by the Government.

Certainly we do not want to do ourselves the tremendous disservice of returning to the hopeless confusion of the prewar period when we had a score of governmental bodies to deal with and to supervise, and when it was well nigh impossible for us to exercise any sort of effective control over the housing activities of the Government. Certainly, where we have finally managed to reach the point where we really get the facts on housing where we can know both what is being done and what should be done, and where we can actually direct our housing activities, we would think twice before hastily wiping out this achievement as we will if we vote for House Concurrent Resolution 155.

On the basis of our war experience, the President could, so far as the housing functions of the Government were concerned, give only one meaning to our declaration on the Reorganization Act that the public interest demanded that he prepare such reorganization plans for consolidation of the Government agencies and activities as will promote economy, increase efficiency, eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort and consodlidate and coordinate agencies having similar functions under a single head.

Today housing is a top priority domestic problem. It covers one of our more urgent obligations to the veteran. And the nonveteran, too, has desperate need of adequate housing. Here is an area in which we just have unified Government action. The very fact that housing programs have controversial elements makes it essential that we have a unified agency whose actions can be followed by the Congress. In this field of housing there is every reason why we should make it clear that we really mean business in passing the Reorganization Act. A vote for the resolution is a declaration of intent to nullify that act.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, as a result of such study as I have been able to give these three proposals coming from the executive department, I am convinced that all three of them should be defeated; that is, the measures now before us should be adopted.

However, I particularly want to address myself to that proposal or plan which has to do with the destruction of the independence of two of the great independent agencies of the Government—the Social Security Board and the Employees' Compensation Commission. Prefacing that, I would like to take you back just a little bit to 1938. Many of you were here then, and if you were not here you were reading the newspapers and you knew about the great controversy that was raging at that time about a proposed reorganization bill. That reorganization bill aroused a storm of protest which resulted in its defeat here in the House, principally, I think, by reason of two things which were included. One, it sought to destroy the independence of the Comptroller General who is the agent of the Congress of the United States to ride herd on expenditures of the Government. The second was it sought authority for the Executive Department to destroy the independence of the great quasi legislative and judicial agencies of the Government, such as the ICC, the FTC, the Employees' Compensation Commission, the Social Security Board, and all of the rest of them. I say that proposal was defeated. The conviction in the Congress and in the country was that those agencies should be continued as independent agencies of the Government.

Later, another reorganization proposal came along that did not undertake to interfere with the Comptroller General and which provided for certain specific exemptions for those independent agencies. That proposal was adopted by the Congress. There was one independent agency which was not exempted—the Civil Aeronautics Authority. History will record that subsequent to that time a reorganization proposal came up from the Executive to destroy the independence of the Administrator of the CAA and in large measure the independence of that Board and put that great independent agency in the Department of Commerce. When that proposal came on under the legislative veto system which prevailed then as now prevails in this matter, the House of Representatives, led by the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], turned back that proposal which sought to destroy the independence of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. But when the measure went to the Senate, the Senate did not concur in the action of the House. So the reorganization went into effect. There is no one who knows anything about the situation today who can deny that that reorganization under which one cannot tell whether the Department of Commerce is running it or the CAA is running it has brought about bad administration. Today there are bills seeking to undo the wrong that I think was done at that time. I venture the suggestion that the gentleman from West Virginia voted against that proposed reorganization which sought to destroy and did destroy the independence of the CAA.

The last time a basic reorganization bill came on was in 1945. Many of you will recall that the committee bill as reported undertook to exempt three agencies. I am sure the ICC was one of them. I sought to extend the exemption to other independent agencies. We were told during the course of debate that no one had any designs on these independent agencies and that no one was seeking to destroy them or subject them to political control. At any event, after action in the other body the exemptions were not included in such a manner as to protect the two independent boards that are here involved.

Why has the Congress through all of this history insisted that these agencies be continued as independent agencies?

It is, first of all, because they are the agencies of Congress, to administer an act that the Congress has enacted. The Congress insists that they shall have a measure of responsibility to the legislative branch. Many of them are bipartisan in character. The Employees Compensation Commission is bipartisan in character. There are three members of the Board, not more than two of whom shall be of one political party. It is an extension of the whole philosophy of a two-party government and two-party responsibility. There is a man there to speak the minority viewpoint, even as there is a minority in the Congress to speak the minority viewpoint.

These agencies are quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial. The report of the Chairman of the Employees Compensation Commission as to their purposes and functions says this:

> The Commission was created and its status as an independent agency exercising quasi-judicial functions has been recognized and continued for the purpose of administering the Federal laws relating to workmen's compensation benefits.

They are quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial. Is it not better that these legislative functions be exercised, these judicial decisions be made, by an independent agency made up of members appointed for a term, answerable to the Congress of the United States, rather than that they be made by someone in the executive branch of the Government, subject to political control in many ways, not the

least of which is that he may be removed by the Executive at any time? It just seems to me to be indisputable that that situation should prevail.

In spite of the assurance that we had at the time the 1945 Reorganization Act was before us, we have now this proposal to destroy the independence of these two agencies. I would like to call on a witness about this matter of the desirability of independence and the desirability of avoiding too much concentration of control in the executive branch. My witness is President Truman, then Senator Truman. I am going to quote from a speech he made in opposition to the proposal to reorganize the Civil Aeronautics Authority and transfer it to the Commerce Department. This is what Senator Truman said, in part:

The order requires that the Board report through the Secretary of Commerce, whose degree or indirect control is obviously unlimited. In fact, the Secretary is the Board. The whole set-up becomes political. Air regulation by a bipartisan board is out of the window.

Then he went on to say:

This and many other queries come to mind, but I need not here enumerate them further in order to illustrate the clever indirection with which the independent regulation of American aviation is being sacrificed on the altar of concentrated executive control of governmental functions.

Now, the immediate issue is, does President Truman believe what he then expressed so vigorously and so well as a Member of the Senate of the United States? If he still believes it, if that is still good logic and good common sense and good governmental doctrine, then we will be doing him a favor by turning down these plans, saying that the Congress of the United States is not going to stand by and see independent agencies destroyed and subjected to political control.

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

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman speaks about the Employees' Compensation Commission. Is it not a fact that not as a board but as the deputy commissioner, the law gives full power to hear and determine questions with respect to claims?

Mr. HALLECK. I am not sure about that feature.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think that is true. The appeals go not to the Commission but to the courts. We make no change in the reorganization.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course the gentleman knows and understands that the activities of that Commission are directed by the Commission. Here is what we find in the United States Government Manual as a statement by the Chairman of the Commission as to the activities of the Commission:

Activities: The Commission administers the act of September 7, 1916, which provides workmen's compensation benefits for civil employees of the United States who suffer personal injuries while in the performance of duty.

* * * * *

The Commission is required to determine all questions arising under this law, and there is no statutory provision for review of its decisions. Among other functions, the Commission is required to determine what employments come within the scope of the law, whether the injury for which compensation is claimed occurred while in the performance of official duty, the period for which compensation may be paid, the amount thereof and, in case of death, the persons entitled to receive such compensation. The Commission is required to make arrangements to provide prompt and competent medical and hospital service for employees injured in the Federal service, irrespective of the place of their employment. It is also required to make studies and investigations of the causes of injuries to employees in the Federal service and recommend means for the prevention of such injuries.

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

Mr. HALLECK. Let me proceed just a moment; then I will yield.

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

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Indiana three additional minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. There are some people who have a very direct interest in this thing because they represent employees. One of those organizations is the American Federation of Labor. I have a telegram that I suppose was sent to all of you, addressed to me by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor. It reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 25, 1946.*

Hon. CHARLES A. HALLECK,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

The governmental reorganization plans 2 and 3 should be opposed because plan 2 continues wartime Coast Guard control of merchant seamen instead of returning control to Commerce Department in accordance with 1884 act. Plan 3 is illegal, according to House Judiciary Committee, in that it wipes out the United States Workmen's Compensation Commission set up by law. Please aid in rejecting both plans 2 and 3.

WILLIAM GREEN.

I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I will have to admit I know very little about this proposal, but from the argument the gentleman has made I have gotten the impression that this will constitute a very severe centralization of power in the Executive, more so than we have had heretofore, if it is approved.

Mr. HALLECK. That is, of course, undoubtedly true. As I say, I do not know whether the President fully understood the import of these suggestions. In respect to these independent agencies, what he has recommended here is certainly not in line with the definite policy announced by him a few years back when he was a Member of the Senate.

This is clearly an extension of one philosophy of Government which I hold is clearly not the majority opinion of this country, that all of these independent agencies should be destroyed, that they should all be brought under political control. I say there is too much tendency in that direction already; there is too much centralization of power; there is too much political control by which friends can be rewarded and enemies punished, by which the great institution of free elections upon which the very preservation of our country depends may be further endangered.

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

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I wish to say to the gentleman in reference to this control of power in governmental agencies that I talked to one of the very high ranking Government officials recently. I asked him why he did not call in some man like Lindsay Warren, who knows about governmental agencies probably as well as any one man in this country. He replied that the Government today did not want to lose any power it now has; that it wants to keep in power those people they have in control; and that they want the Government operated by bureaus rather than by law laid down by the Congress.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman, of course, expresses the fear we all have.

I wish now to quote from a statement made by the Brookings Institution because of its clear and logical reasoning. I quote the following:

The regulatory agencies * * * have the power to make rules and regulations having the force of law and, consequently, in a real sense are legislative agencies. They also perform adjudicatory functions that should be carried out in an impartial manner free from political influence. Moreover, in order to preserve the necessary degree of continuity in public policy their freedom from the potentiality of partisan political action is also desirable. It is argued by some that administrative expenses could be cut by placing these agencies in the regular departments. But such savings would be very small. Since, as will be shown, administrative costs are but a small part of total expenditures. Consequently, the President should not have the power to place them in executive departments headed by political appointees.

In conclusion, may I say I agree with the chairman of the committee when he states that if the independence of these agencies is to be destroyed, then the Congress of the United States should carry that responsibility and initiate the action.

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

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND].

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, plan No. 3 includes the transfer of the duties and functions of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation to the Coast Guard. I am in favor of that transfer.

The purpose of the transfer is to insure the best administration of measures looking to the safety of navigation and the protection of human life upon the oceans, lakes, and inland waters.

When the 13 States first became united there were only 12 lighthouses upon the Atlantic coast, all built by the individual States and precariously supported by lotteries or local taxes on shipping. The first lighthouse on the Great Lakes was built in 1818; the first on the Pacific coast

was built in 1854. Not until 1850 was our system of buoyage standardized and made uniform in all ports by act of Congress. Buoys on the western rivers were nonexistent until 1874.

The administration of lighthouse service was initially in the hands of the collectors of customs, then under the Commissioner of Revenue or the Treasury Department, subsequently placed under a Lighthouse Board in the Treasury Department, from there transferred to the Department of Commerce in 1903, and finally to the Coast Guard in 1939.

The various Federal agencies in the maritime safety field overlapped in many directives. Consolidation of agencies improves safety, affords better organization, more highly trained personnel, greater efficiency in service, and more far reaching economy of operation. Opportunity is afforded for a higher degree of intelligent, efficient, and forward looking administration with a continuity of policy.

Such an agency should be intimately acquainted with the industry it is to serve, protect, and police.

In dealing with vessels on the oceans, the lakes, and rivers, from the largest liners to the smallest motorboat, the safety agency must be able to evaluate the risks and the problems in all of the varying conditions under which they operate. The diversity of these conditions is shown by the fact that in the year ending June 30, 1945, annual inspections had been made of 5,320 ocean and coastwise craft, 2,430 in lakes, bays, and sounds, and 1,970 on inland waters.

The Coast Guard is peculiarly qualified for the work of inspection in all of its phases. Its vessels have been putting to sea on police or rescue missions under extreme weather conditions since the inception of the service. The Coast Guard contains capable engineers, constructors, and radio technicians. Through its experience with lifeboats, it is well qualified to pass upon boat equipment carried on board, to pass upon fire fighting and fire protection.

The Coast Guard is a military type organization with large experience in the administration of civil functions.

The Coast Guard is fully acquainted with the safety problems of shipping on all waters, oceans, lakes, and rivers.

It has been maintaining and establishing aids to navigation on all waters. Its ice breakers have been opening channels to prevent damage to frozen-in vessels and to keep traffic moving. It knows merchant ships, fishermen, and yachts. It has given them medical aid, warned them of storms, towed them out of danger, or rescued them for years. Of all the Federal services no other has been so closely connected with oceans, lakes, or inland shipping as the Coast Guard.

The Coast Guard's policy is to promote a close association between the Coast Guard and all affected interests of the maritime industry so that the regulatory functions of the Coast Guard shall be intelligently administered and a harmonious relationship shall insure the attainment of best results with least burden to this vital industry.

The Coast Guard will endeavor to encourage all types of shipping to be safety conscious on their own initiative, mindful that self-discipline is the best discipline and that prevention is better than cure. The success of such a policy is illustrated in the formation of the Coast Guard Auxiliary, wherein thousands of motorboat owners, subject to only limited supervision under present statutes, have been encouraged by the Coast Guard to adopt of their own volition higher safety standards for their boats and to acquire greater professional skill for themselves.

The transfer should be made permanent now. The war has ended and plans should be initiated and consummated at once for the postwar future. The present uncertainty is delaying efficiency and economy. Many new techniques can be inaugurated, new safety measures can be adopted, new plans can be promulgated, new devices developed, and new methods inaugurated.

No long-range planning is possible while the present uncertainty continues. Certain of the civilian personnel may, at their option, be commissioned, if qualified, and if not, or if they do not choose commissions, the civilian personnel may be continued in their civilian status.

In 1942 our merchant tonnage was approximately 12,988,615 tons as compared with approximately 36,687,547 now.

In 1941, 136,788 seamen's documents were issued as against 318,448 for 1946.

If plan 3 should be rejected the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation would revert to a bureau status, a number of administrative divisions would need to be created to care for the personnel, budget and supply needs of the new bureau. These are handled now by the Coast Guard as part of its over-all operations.

Failure to approve the plan necessitates re-creation of a bureau.

The Nation has now, for the first time, a single agency which is charged with the administration of all maritime safety procedures.

The Coast Guard is organized along military lines for the better discharge of its maritime duties, and is fundamentally and basically a civilian arm of the Government. The Coast Guard has performed a splendid service and can do an even better job during the normal peacetime operation of the merchant marine.

In support of the proposed transfer I contend:

First. That one agency of the Government should be charged with the complete responsibility of all phases of maintaining safety of life at sea and on the navigable waters of the United States. Since the Coast Guard has for many years been charged with all remedial phases and part of the preventive phases of such responsibility, it is logical and desirable that it be the agency to which all the functions of maritime safety should be assigned in the interest of efficient operation, greater economy, and good government.

Second. That the Coast Guard is the only civilian agency equipped with facilities and knowledge for proper and adequate administration or discharge of the maritime safety function without requiring the services and assistance of any other agency or department.

Third. That economy can be achieved by the elimination of another agency performing similar duties. Under the law the Coast Guard is required to assist in the discharge of the maritime safety functions in any case, and by transferring them to the service it lodges all responsibility in one agency where it properly belongs, thus avoiding duplication of offices since only one maintenance staff and a reduced number of facilities are necessitated.

Fourth. That the Coast Guard brings to the problem a trained corps of officers and men, who, augmented with the personnel of the former Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation, have demonstrated during the difficult war years the ability to provide under adverse conditions progressive leadership in the maritime field. This augurs capable and understanding administration of the problems connected with the merchant marine in the future.

Fifth. That the transfer of the merchant marine inspection functions to the Coast Guard was accomplished in 1942 by virtue of the Executive Order 9083, under the War Powers Act, and it is desirable that this transfer be made permanent at the earliest possible date in order that the personnel of the Coast Guard, particularly that transferred from the former BMIN under the Executive order, can be assured of their status. Further, the lack of permanency in the transfer precludes long-range planning on the part of the Coast Guard for the proper and effective administration of the inspection functions.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, in what I am about to say I do not want to be construed in any way as being critical of the President in submitting these various reorganization plans. Any attempt at reorganization, of course, is a complicated, difficult problem. Apparently, however, we are always to be disappointed in the operations under the various reorganization bills which the Congress has passed. In passing a reorganization bill some months ago the argument was made here, and I think it was generally agreed, that the Congress itself cannot reorganize the executive branch of the Government.

The whole purpose and objective of the reorganization bill, as you know, was to effectuate economy in Government and to reduce the size, cost, and activities of the executive branch of the Government. These reorganization plans that we have submitted to us wholly fail to carry out the purpose, the spirit, and the objectives of the reorganization bill. Generally speaking, with few minor exceptions, they simply shuffle the agencies around.

Reorganization plan No. 1 in particular is vicious and undesirable in that it not only fails to abolish agencies but seeks to make permanent one of the temporary wartime agencies. That is a thing that we have all feared would happen.

There must be a reduction in the number of agencies and bureaus of government or eventually this is going to become a government simply of bureaucracy.

All of us know that our system of checks and balances wisely written into the Constitution by our founding fathers has largely disappeared. The legislative branch of the Government—the Congress—one of the coordinate branches of the three departments of Government, is today unable to cope with the tremendous size and complexities of the executive branch. Not only is the cost item a factor with which we should be gravely concerned, but the numerous activities of these various agencies has grown into a reprehensible, at times overlapping, complexity.

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

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman mentioned that under plan 1 some temporary war agency is to be made permanent. What agency is that?

Mr. GOSSETT. The National Housing Agency, which was created under the First War Powers Act by Executive Order 9070. Most of the housing agencies are now transferred to the National Housing Agency and it is set up under Reorganization Plan No. 1 as an over-all housing administrative bureau and made permanent under this reorganization plan.

In the Reorganization Act passed some time back it was specifically provided that this sort of thing should not be done. Subdivision 3 of section 5 states:

> No reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of continuing any agency beyond the period authorized by law for its existence or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made.

There is other language in the act to the same effect. As a matter of fact, when the President sent his message to the Congress asking for this reorganization bill, he himself stated that there was a great need for effective reorganization and the abolition of functions and agencies, and he indicated clearly in this message that he expected, if given authority under the reorganization bill, to use the axe, so to speak, and to ruthlessly go down the line and eliminate certain governmental agencies and activities.

I am sure some of you noticed in the press the other day that an agency set up during World War I to buy spruce for airplanes on the west coast is still in existence. Twenty-five years from now I venture to say that we will have most of these temporary World War II agencies with most of their employees still hanging on the Federal pay roll.

So, the only way we are going to get any reduction, any vitally needed reduction, any essential reduction, in the cost and activities of the Federal Government, is to abolish and not simply to shuffle and transfer agencies.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we should disapprove these reorganization plans for the specific reason that they fail to comply with the spirit and the objective of the reorganization bill which we passed. We should respectfully ask and urge the Chief Executive, regardless of pressure, that he abolish and not simply shuffle agencies.

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

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I feel that since Congress set up as temporary war agencies a number of organizations, in each one of which they fixed a time limit when they should expire, that that question should be settled by the Congress when the time comes for it and not this way.

Mr. GOSSETT. I think the gentleman has made a very good point there. Certainly we do not want to be put in the position of approving reorganization plans that extend a lease on life to an agency that was set up under Executive order as a temporary wartime agency to deal with an emergency problem brought on by the war.

For these reasons, in addition to others heretofore given, it seems to me that we should pass the concurrent resolutions now pending and refuse the reorganization plans. We must insist that reorganizations be done in line with efficiency, economy, reduction of Government expenses, and the elimination of overlapping and duplicating Government agencies and bureaus.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, to make certain that the full case is properly developed, let me dig up just a little ancient history. In 1932 the Congress created the Federal Home Loan Bank Board under the Federal Home Loan Bank Act. It had a board of five directors. That act also created 12 home loan banks in the 12 Federal Reserve districts of the country. The purpose of those banks was to discount mortgage paper on homes. It bears the same relationship to the building and loan industry that the Federal Reserve banks do to the banks of the country.

For 10 years that whole system operated beautifully and it operated efficiently. The mortgages of millions of home owners who were building homes under mortgage with funds that they got from a local institution—and there are thousands of them in every section of the country—could be discounted or used for security and so, more money could be available for this constant process of building homes.

I say that Board was in effect and that act was in effect for 10 years. Then came the First War Powers Act. In December of 1942 when the war was on, the National Housing Agency was created under that act. The interesting thing about the War Powers Act is that there was a proviso to the effect that the powers should be exercised only as they related to the conduct of the war. For the life of me, in all that time, I have never been able to discern what relationship the refinancing or financing of a mortgage for John Jones out in Illinois, had to do with the war. However, as the result of that Executive order the Federal Home Loan Bank Board was abolished. All the powers and all the functions were given to one man, to Mr. John Fahey, who became the Commissioner of that agency in the National Housing Agency. He has the authority today to appoint directors of the banks, mind you. You talk about centralization, you talk about regimentation. The President, by Executive order, virtually set aside an act of Congress which had no relation to the war, and conferred all those powers on one man, and he has been using them arbitrarily and capriciously, and I use the words advisedly.

For years the Independent Offices Subcommittee on Appropriations, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, and I on this side, and Judge WOODRUM and others on that side, have gone into this matter thoroughly. Constantly we were confronted with this business of arbitrary and capricious action, and all of it stemmed from the fact that an Executive order under the War Powers Act had abolished the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and conferred those powers upon one man in Washington, where they are today.

Suppose you make the National Housing Agency permanent? The net result will be that you have made permanent one of the most grave injustices that has ever been done to the people of this country, the humble people, who can go to some thrift institution in their own town, unmindful and insensible to Government control and regulation, and get a mortgage, and then if necessary have that mortgage discounted at one of the Federal Home Loan Banks, always under private control. But now it becomes an entirely centralized, planned Government operation. The day that that reorganization plan to make the National Housing Agency permanent is approved you will place the stamp of approval on one of the great injustices of the last decade and you will have lifted that entire function out of the hands of private business, which has done such a splendid job in the field of home mortgage refinancing, and hand it to one man in the Government of the United States.

If it requires nothing else, that would be sufficient for me to raise my voice in as stentorian fashion as I could and to reject that plan, because I will not put the seal of approval upon that kind of an injustice and make it permanent.

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

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield three additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. HENRY. I have two questions I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Illinois. First, did the gentleman vote for the reorganization bill last winter?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did.

Mr. HENRY. I did, too.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am confident that I did.

Mr. HENRY. Can the gentleman see anything inconsistent in a Member of the House who voted for the reorgani-

zation bill yet voting against these three reorganization plans?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Definitely not. And for this reason: The guidelines and standards of conduct under which a reorganization plan must be submitted have been very meticulously recited in the law. When they submit a reorganization plan and it is not in conformity with the very pattern and very guide that Congress has established, it is not only the right thing to do but I think a responsibility rests upon every Member of Congress to reject it under the circumstances because it is not in conformity with the instructions given by this body.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman does not contend there is any basic change in what Congress already put into law in connection with these agencies; is that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. A basic change?

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is right.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Why, the very thing that I have recited here which was done in the fervor of war is basic and now it is proposed to make it permanent.

Mr. RANDOLPH. No; these agencies were created before World War II.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Federal Home Loan Bank Act was put on the statute books in 1932, but can anybody in this body relate to me where there is a single relationship between the function of refinancing the mortgage of a humble citizen in West Virginia or Minnesota or Illinois and the conduct of the war? Yet that is the very abolition of function undertaken by means of Executive order in December 1942, when the National Housing Agency was created that you will now make permanent if you do make this a permanent agency with its present constituent subagencies.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Is this not the point: That if we do not approve Reorganization Plan I, then when the First War Powers Act expires the abolition of the Board of Directors by Executive order will also expire?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly so.

Mr. JUDD. But if we allow the reorganization plan to go into effect then we have endorsed the permanent abolition of a board which was temporarily abolished during the war supposedly for war purposes only.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I might amplify that by saying there were several Members of the House, I believe one from Oklahoma and one from New York, as well as myself, who have dropped bills in the hopper to roll back this abolition. Yet all of that will be futile and will be frustrated if the thing recited in the reorganization plan prevails.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Does the gentleman agree with me that the FHA as an independent agency has done a good job?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Federal Housing Administration?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It has done a very good job.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I would hate to see that Agency hampered in any way.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would, too. The gentleman being one of the outstanding members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, would agree that it was unsound practice for the administration, under the Executive order creating the National Housing Agency, to lump public housing, the Insurance and Mortgage Act, and credit functions in one agency, and that they should have been separated.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, the Constitution places exclusively in the Congress the power to legislate. This is a power that cannot be delegated. The Supreme Court on many occasions has stated that Congress cannot abdicate or transfer to others the essential legislative functions with which it is vested. It can delegate fact-finding and rule-making powers provided it enacts standards within the framework of which such delegated functions can be confined. Beyond that it cannot constitutionally go.

In plan No. 3 the President abolished the United States Employees' Compensation Commission. This is very clearly in violation of the rule I have just in substance stated. Under the United States Employees' Compensation Act there are functions of other laws that were expressly placed within the Employees' Compensation Commission by laws reported to the Congress unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary, among them being the Longshoremen and Harbor Workers' Acts. To delegate legislative power to the President to abolish unclassified agencies under a general policy which is concerned with custom in general is to abdicate an essential legislative function which is plainly unconstitutional.

The power that was given in the Reorganization Act is the power to act, not to carry out ministerial functions within well-defined standards. If the power were to only make findings for affirmative action by Congress, such delegated power would be valid, but the power to abolish on specified agencies is power which cannot be delegated.

We had an experience not too long ago when we attempted in the National Recovery Act to delegate to the executive branch powers which the Supreme Court in the Schechter case, reported in 295 United States 495, held was clearly a violation of the terms of the Constitution. Under this plan we are attempting to do practically the same thing. Of course it is not within the province of the Congress to pass on questions of constitutionality, but it certainly seems to me it is a grave reflection on all of us if we knowingly report a bill which is in clear violation of the terms of the Constitution. I cannot conceive of a case which violates the rule more plainly stated within the rule in the Schechter case than plan No. 2. I think it is our duty, under the circumstances, to support the committee in its recommendations that plan No. 2 be rejected.

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

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Does not the record show that the rule was laid down in the Schechter case by a unanimous court?

Mr. WALTER. Oh, yes. There is no question about that. The rule in the Schechter case was by a unanimous decision.

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

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. HENRY. Would the gentleman favor these reorganization plans if he were satisfied that the procedure was constitutional?

Mr. WALTER. Certainly. It seems to me it would be a very simple matter for the executive branch to pay attention to the objections raised by the Congress and then report back to the Congress plans that are not in violation of those things that we feel are not proper. Reorganization must come and it can only come on the recommendations of the executive branch. It is impossible for the legislative branch to reorganize the Government, but I feel it can and should and must be done within the rules as we lay them down, and within the rules of the Constitution.

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

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. MAY. If these plans are rejected, as presented by the President, can he make other plans and submit them to the Congress?

Mr. WALTER. Why, of course. Plan after plan can be submitted.

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

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true that if we in our debate and committee report suggest those parts of the reorganization plans to which we are opposed all he need to do is delete those parts and send the plan back and it can become effective?

Mr. WALTER. Of course.

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

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that the executive department, and for that matter the Congress itself if not the Supreme Court, needs reorganization, and it is with a great deal of reluctance that I bring myself to oppose a reorganization plan that has merit. But it does seem to me from the arguments made, if we need further persuasion, that the suggestions made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] with respect to plan No. 1 and the suggestions made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] with respect to plan No. 2, are sufficient reasons for at least rejecting those two plans, as much as we need reorganization in all branches of

the Federal Government. I have, however, heard very little criticism of plan No. 3, and I am interested in plan 3 because it seems to me that the plan transferring the Maritime Inspection Service to the Coast Guard permanently (where it has been for the last 4 years) is a meritorious plan, and I respectfully suggest to the committee (because I will not have time to read it in the limited time at my disposal), that Members read page 14 of reorganization plan No. 1. I think the gentleman from West Virginia in the course of his minority report is right in saying that the plan transferring that service permanently to the Coast Guard is a good plan. The committee has criticized the plan, as I understand it, only on one score, and that was with respect to St. Elizabeths Hospital. While there may be some ground for criticism in that respect, it seems to me there are other provisions in the plan which are of sufficient importance to warrant its adoption.

I do not believe we should turn these plans down simply because we want to fuss with the White House. On the contrary, we ought to adopt them if we can. Specifically, I think we should discriminate between them. Plans 1 and 2, I feel, are bad, but plan 3, it seems to me, is good, and I urge its adoption and will vote against Resolution 154.

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

Mr. HAND. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. I am in thorough accord with the gentleman's statement about the transfer of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation.

Mr. HAND. And I may say the gentleman from Virginia knows more about navigation and shipping than any other man in the Congress.

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

Mr. HAND. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. But the gentleman could introduce a bill and include the bureaus he wants in that bill. The trouble here is that this plan includes other things that this committee, after long hearings has decided should not be approved.

Mr. HAND. Only with respect to St. Elizabeths Hospital.

Mr. CHURCH. I am a member of the same committee the gentleman is a member of and of which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] is chairman. I may also say that everyone wants reorganization, but the trouble is there is almost unanimous opposition by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to these three plans before us today.

Mr. HAND. But on plan 3 only with regard to one particular subject.

Mr. CHURCH. I know; but that subject is enough; we cannot amend the plan.

Mr. HAND. I do not think that one objection is sufficient grounds to reject the whole plan. We cannot expect perfection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, when we approved the reorganization bill in December 1945 it made one specific reservation—that whatever program or plan of reorganization the President might submit must be submitted to the House and the Senate for their approval or disapproval. This action must be taken within 60 days. The President submitted three plans of reorganization, and the House, well within its rights, has made certain objections to each one of these three plans. These objections are well founded. The Committee on Executive Expenditures of the House, made up of 21 Members, 13 Democrats and 8 Republicans, after a thorough study and hearings from many witnesses, came to an almost unanimous conclusion that these 3 organization plans should be rejected for the reasons set out in the report. That does not, of course, mean that we object to everything that was put in the plans, but we do find some fundamental objections to each one.

Three resolutions were introduced. One was House Concurrent Resolution 155, which stated that Congress does not favor reorganization plan No. 1 of the President, because it makes permanent the National Housing Agency, a war emergency agency created by Executive Order No. 9070, and this agency was not created by Congress which would swallow up the Federal Housing Administration. The President thereby exceeded the authority granted him under the Reorganization Act and would destroy the Federal Housing Administration which is engaged in insuring loans to private builders and home owners. It is designed to encourage private ownership of homes.

The committee states in its report—and I share in that view—that we should favor and encourage private construction and private ownership of homes. While on the other hand, the National Housing Agency that would swallow up the Federal Housing Administration is an agency of the Federal Government whose primary purpose is to build houses with Federal funds and manage federally owned housing projects. It is just the opposite of private enterprise, and private construction, and private ownership of homes. The National Housing Agency was and is a war emergency agency. The President's plan undertakes to make this a permanent agency in violation of the Reorganization Act of Congress. The Federal Housing Administration is not a war emergency agency. It is especially intended to encourage and strengthen private enterprise in the construction and ownership of homes, while the other agency is designed to encourage Government construction, ownership, management, and control of homes.

House Concurrent Resolution 151 states that the Congress does not favor reorganization plan No. 2 of the President and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments sets forth in detail the objections to plan No. 2. This plan is very objectionable, inasmuch as it takes away the independence and efficiency of the St. Elizabeths Hospital, and this would seriously interfere with efficient administration of this great institution that means so much to the disabled veterans of this Nation.

House Joint Resolution 154 urges that reorganization plan No. 3 of the President be rejected. It abolishes the Employees' Compensation Commission and transfers its functions to the Federal Security Agency. This, in the opinion of the committee, and in this view I join, violates section 5 (a) of the Reorganization Act in that it takes away the quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial functions of this Commission and sets up two groups where there was only one.

The objectives of the Reorganization Act of December 20, 1945, were, among other things, "to reduce expenditures and promote economy to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government." It will be observed that it was the purpose of Congress in passing the Reorganization Act to secure efficiency in Government and a reduction in the cost of Government. In fact, the act provided that every effort should be made to reduce the cost of Government at least 25 percent.

According to the overwhelming weight of testimony, both of these objectives have been ignored in all three of these reorganization plans. It is beyond question that they have increased the number of agencies and employees and the expenses. No one argues here that it has cut down the number of agencies or cut down the number of employees or has cut down the expenses of Government and I have heard no valid argument that it has increased efficiency, but on the other hand, these changes will increase inefficiency, increase the number of employees and increase the cost of Government. Each one of these plans defeat each and all the purposes sought to be attained in the Reorganization Act.

The thing that each Member of Congress, as well as all the officials of our Federal Government, should strive for is to increase efficiency and cut down the expense of Government. Everyone admits that the present set-up of our Government is inefficient, greatly overmanned and there is a tremendous waste of the taxpayers' money. No public official or administration can lay just claim for continuance in power unless he and the administration strive consistently to bring about efficiency and cut down expenses of Government and especially is this true when we have a staggering national debt and the people are burdened with the heaviest tax load in all the history of our country.

The President, having failed to submit a plan that would accomplish the purposes set forth in the Reorganization Act, there is no good reason why the House and Senate should not reject each one of these three plans and therefore, I shall vote to reject each of the plans. When the Congress rejects these plans, the President can then submit new plans, eliminating these objectionable features, subject to the approval of the House and Senate.

The President in these plans makes temporary agencies permanent and takes

away the quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial functions of a commission established by Congress. In this way, the President undertakes to legislate. He has no authority under the Reorganization Act except to take the departments, bureaus, agencies, and commissions, with their functions, as created by Congress, and eliminate such as may not be necessary and coordinate the other agencies and functions to the end that we may increase efficiency and reduce expense.

Under the Russian Government, Premier Stalin and his aides formulate policies and then they call in the law-making body and have them approve these policies. Under our Constitution, Congress formulates policies and enacts them into laws and it is up to the executive branch to execute these policies and laws. The President has undertaken in some respects to follow the Russian system and ignore our system of government and in some of these plans there is a clear violation of the Constitution of the United States.

The Congress should not abdicate its powers to legislate within and under the Constitution and in rejecting these plans, the Congress is rightfully assuming its constitutional authority and powers, and is acting within the expressed provisions and reservations of the Reorganization Act of December 20, 1945.

There are many desirable provisions in these plans but the Congress must accept it in toto or reject it. We have pointed out, as provided in the Reorganization Act, the provisions the Congress does not approve. If the Senate concurs in the action of the House, the President can submit at such time as he may desire, additional new plans and eliminate the objectionable features and, of course, such reorganization plans would then be promptly approved.

We have pointed out that the Committee on Expenditures in the executive branch of the Government is made up of 13 Democrats and 8 Republicans. To show the lack of partisan consideration these plans have received, the chairman and practically all the members of that committee voted to reject the three plans of the President, and I observe in the debate today that many able speeches have been made by Democrats as well as Republicans, urging the rejection of these plans and these resolutions rejecting the three plans will be adopted, in my opinion, by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, some question has been raised about the report on reorganization plan No. 3. The gentleman who now has the floor will tell you that he understood somebody else would probably write some additions to that report. I want to say that there was a lot of opposition to certain parts of reorganization plan No. 3 and they do not appear in the report because of this oversight.

The Bureau of Marine Inspection is bitterly opposed to having jurisdiction over that agency placed permanently under the Coast Guard. I have received a lot of correspondence from shipping interests in Philadelphia, New York, New Orleans, and elsewhere to that effect. In addition to that, the men who sail our merchant marine are almost universally opposed to reorganization plan No. 3. They do not want to be put under the jurisdiction of the Coast Guard. They all want to go back as a permanent proposition to the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce, which Department had jurisdiction before the Coast Guard took over. There was a witness representing the merchant seamen, a Mr. John Hawk, of the Seafarers Union of New York City. If you have not read his testimony, you ought to do so. He gave very conclusive testimony against putting the Marine Inspection Bureau permanently under the Coast Guard. I say this without any reflection on the Coast Guard, but I agree with these people who oppose the plan on the ground that the Coast Guard is a semi-naval insitution that ought not to have this power in peacetime.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. The Coast Guard is primarily charged with safety at sea, the inland waters and on the oceans, is it not, and that is the duty of Marine Inspection.

Mr. JUDD. I think the gentleman is correct.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not fair to say that in reporting these resolutions the chairman and the other members reporting them were instructed by the committee to report the items on which objections were based, regardless of the views of those who appeared and testified before the committee?

Mr. JUDD. That is right. In voting out these resolutions the committee specified the various changes and transfers to which it objected, as a committee, and the reports indicate them. While there was a difference of opinion about the wisdom of putting the Bureau of Marine Inspection under the Coast Guard, the committee took no action on the matter.

Mr. Chairman, as has been said again and again today, the main reasons for reorganization are two: The first is reduction in governmental functions and bureaus, with resulting greater economy, and the other is greater efficiency in operations.

Mr. Lindsay Warren, the Comptroller General, when he was testifying before us last fall in our hearings on the Reorganization Act, said this:

> What we must be after is this monstrous Frankenstein created under the name of bureaucracy, or anything you please. It already in some instances is becoming bigger than Congress, its creator. Sooner or later, it will tumble of its own weight unless something is done to coordinate or check some of this.

He added:

> Now, we have an Executive who says he will do it. He says if he is given this authority he will do this job fairly and efficiently and fearlessly.

It was on the basis of testimony like that that we reported out the Reorganization Act.

My criticism of the first reorganization plans submitted under the act is not that they go too far in most of their proposals. My criticism is that they do not go far enough. Many of us feel, on the basis of our own observations as well as the testimony of men like the Comptroller General, that it is just as imperative that we demobilize the Federal Government as it was that we demobilize much of the Army and the Navy and the Marine Corps and the Air Forces. Therefore, I am disappointed that the plans do not effect any significant reduction of our Frankenstein.

I brought this question up with Mr. Smith, Director of the Budget, and he frankly admitted that we will not get a real abolition of functions except by cutting off funds in appropriation bills. He said, "I think you can get that (abolition of functions) more particularly in other ways which involve legislation." I said, "What you are saying then is, if we want to cut down the Government, the one way to do it is to cut off money in the appropriations?" Mr. Smith replied that that would be the way to reduce the functions. It is clear we cannot expect real abolition of functions and agencies unless we here cut down their money. It is a real disappointment that the President and his advisers have not been able, for whatever reasons, to do that which we believed and hoped they would be able to do.

While the plans do not cut down the governmental agencies and give us as great economy as we desire, there still remains the other question: Do they increase efficiency? If they increase efficiency and do not increase expenditures, I think we should approve them, even though they do not reduce expenditures and give greater economy. A good case on the ground of efficiency can perhaps be made out for 23 or 24 of the 28 changes proposed though I think some of them definitely will increase costs. Therefore I will raise no protest and would not myself vote against 24 of the 28 changes, if it were possible under the law to separate them from the 4 to which I do object. I am disappointed that the 24 do not go further, but at least, there is no damage done in approving those. However, the fact that we may approve 24 of the changes does not mean that we should accept the 4 that we do not approve. I personally object to legislative riders whereby a proposal that perhaps will not stand on its own feet is tacked onto a good bill. The Executive and the public frequently criticize Congress because it sometimes hooks on legislative riders. In order to get an important provision that the President wants he must accept something that he does not want. I am opposed to such legislative riders, and I am equally opposed to Executive riders which is what

some of the provisions in these plans amount to.

Each of the three plans has some wholly desirable provisions in it. We want those good parts; but each of them also has at least one rider in it, which most of us on the committee believe is not proper or desirable. The only way we can prevent that is to disapprove all three plans, send them back, let the President delete the objectionable features and return the plans. I think they will then be approved by Congress without any difficulty at all.

Why do we object to these four or five provisions? Because some of them are illegal; some are not authorized in the Reorganization Act; and some are not in the public interest. Those which I believe are illegal, because they violate the law under which we authorized the President to carry out these reorganizations, have been dealt with by several Members in the debate, especially by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]. They continue agencies beyond the period authorized by law for their existence, or they continue functions beyond the period authorized by law for their existence, or they authorize agencies to exercise functions not expressly authorized by law. Every one of those three is expressly forbidden in section 5 of the Reorganization Act.

The second objection to some of them is that they are not authorized by the law, in that they do not accomplish any of the objectives laid down in the act.

On page 1 of the Reorganization Act eight major objectives are stated. Some of these proposals in the reorganization plans cannot possibly be represented as achieving a single one of those objectives. Therefore, while they are not in violation of the act, they are not authorized by anything in the act.

There is a third objection to some of these riders and that is that we believe they are not in the public interest. I wish I had time to deal adequately with the abolition of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, about which the gentleman from [Mr. HALLECK] spoke so convincingly. That is a bipartisan Commission. Because there are members of all political parties among Federal employees, it was provided by law that at least one member of the Employees' Compensation Commission should be a member of a minority party. What will be the situation under reorganization plan No. 2? Let me read it carefully.

> Section 3. The functions of the United States Employees Compensation Commission are transferred to the Federal Security Agency and shall be performed in such manner and under such rules and regulations as the Federal Security Administrator shall prescribe.

No matter what Congress prescribed when it set up the Employees' Compensation Commission, if this plan goes into effect those functions will be carried out "in such manner and under such rules and regulations as the Federal Security Administrator shall prescribe."

Obviously if he is to have such unrestricted power we should be careful to give adequate appeal rights for any persons who feel that the Federal Security Administrator has not properly acted upon their claim for compensation. Look at the next sentence:

> Such regulations shall provide for a board of three persons to be designated or appointed by the Federal Security Administrator with authority to hear and, subject to applicable law, make final decision on appeals taken from determinations and awards with respect to claims of employees of the Federal Government or of the District of Columbia.

The Federal Security Administrator is authorized by this plan to lay down such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe, and if anybody wants to appeal he can appeal to a board set up by that same Federal Security Administrator. Its members do not have to be approved by the Senate. It authorizes appointees of the Federal Security Administrator, which means whatever administration is in power, to make final decisions on appeals from the decisions of its other appointees.

I asked several witnesses who testified before us, including a representative of the Attorney General, "Would it not be possible under this plan for the Federal Security Administrator's appointees in charge of the functions now vested in the Employees' Compensation Commission to grant a favorable decision if the employee agreed to vote right, say, or to take the proper position on some administration policy or program; or for them to make an opposite decision if he failed to do so?" He said it could happen, but that of course, we all believe in the integrity of Government agencies.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have no right to put such power or temptation into anybody's hands, Republican or Democrat, without adequate safeguards. There are such safeguards in the present Employees' Compensation Commission, which this plan would remove. I submit that apart from the illegal characteristics of it, it is a great injustice to permit any chance of favoritism in administering what amounts to the insurance fund of several million persons, a fund built up out of their own pay rolls.

Mr. KEEFE. Would there be any opportunity for an appeal to a court from a decision of this appeal board if this reorganization plan goes into effect?

Mr. JUDD. There would be for private employees in the District of Columbia and for longshoremen and harbor workers throughout the country. Under the present law their appeals go directly to the courts rather than come down here to the Employees' Compensation Commission. But Federal employees, two or three million of them, including postal workers and employees of the District of Columbia, would have no way of going into court. The decision of the Board of Appeals set up here by the Federal Security Administrator would be final.

Now, I would like to say a word about the home-lending agencies which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] was discussing. If you have reorganization plan No. 1 before you and will look at the bottom of page 3, I think you will be astonished at what is provided:

> SEC. 505. (a) The following functions shall be administered by the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration: (1) The functions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and its members under the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended.

There will continue to be a Home Loan Bank Administration, but the functions of its Board shall be transferred to a Commissioner and the Board itself and the offices of the members shall be abolished as provided in section 507 (2).

The functions of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation will be transferred to a Commissioner and the Board abolished.

The functions of the Board of Directors of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation will be transferred to a Commissioner and the Board abolished.

Thus the controlling boards of various home-loan agencies, set up by acts of Congress, are abolished and their functions taken over by commissioners under the National Housing Agency, which was set up by Executive order under the First War Powers Act, and is made permanent by this reorganization plan even though the Reorganization Act specifically prohibits "authorizing any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law at the time the plan is transmitted to Congress."

Then there is some language we could not understand clearly:

> SEC. 504 (3). The Federal Public Housing Authority which shall succeed to the corporate status of the United States Housing Authority with a Federal Public Housing Commissioner who shall be the head thereof.

We asked the lawyers from the Department of Justice just what is meant by one agency succeeding to the corporate status of another. The Government Corporation Control Act we passed last year provided that: "No corporation shall be created, organized, or acquired hereafter by any officer or agent of the Federal Government or by any Government corporation for the purpose of acting as an agency or instrumentality of the United States except by act of Congress." Under this plan the National Housing Agency acquires the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration which acquires the functions of two corporations—the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. Is that an evasion of the Government Corporation Control Act provision I have just read? In addition, another constituent unit of NHA, the Federal Public Housing Authority, "shall succeed to the corporate status of the United States Housing Authority," which is a Government corporation.

The chairman of our committee asked if that would permit the new Federal Public Housing Commissioner to borrow money under the charter of the United States Housing Authority to whose corporate status his organization had succeeded. The attorney said he would like to examine that further.

He was asked if the language referred to merely meant that the name of the United States Housing Authority was changed to the Federal Public Housing Authority. If so, why did not it say so plainly instead of saying one "shall succeed to the corporate status" of the other. The reply, on page 103 of the hearings was, "For some reason, the people in the Housing Agency preferred this form of

expression for their purposes." Apparently they are the ones who drew up that part of the plan. Just what are "their purposes"?

Mr. Chairman, these plans contain several such jokers which we were unable after days of testimony to decipher so that we could be sure what was meant. I believe that without any question they should be returned to the President for him to eliminate the reorganizations that are objectionable and clarify the ones that are so obscure that the Department of Justice could not tell us just what they meant.

Mr. Chairman, I want to devote the remainder of my time to reorganization plan No. 3. Our major objection is to section 201 which would transfer or abolish some of the functions now vested in St. Elizabeths Hospital. Let me give you a brief sketch of its history. St. Elizabeths Hospital was established to take care of the mentally ill of the Army and Navy and the Marine Corps. During the years more groups of patients have been added, including civilian employees of the Federal Government, and the mentally sick residents of the District of Columbia. But its primary obligation was to the armed services. Men were brought here from all over the United States and from duty all over the world. It had a greater variety of mental cases than any such institution in America, if not ir the world. That fact coupled with extraordinarily able professional leadership during the decades has enabled it to develop a high standard of research and teaching with respect to mental diseases which no institution in America, and I think in the world, can surpass or perhaps even match.

Under this plan, St. Elizabeths Hospital is to be split up. The veterans must be taken care of separately by the Veterans' Administration; Army personnel by the Army; Navy personnel by the Navy; Marines by the Navy; Coast Guard personnel must be taken care of elsewhere; psychotic Federal prisoners are to be taken care of by the Department of Justice, and other civilians by the Federal Security Agency.

What are the objections to this? First, many of these agencies are not equipped to give equally good treatment to the patients. Even more important, it will cripple the outstanding institution in America for the training of psychiatrists at the very time when the need for them is most urgent and the shortage most acute.

Perhaps 10 or 20 years from now such a disruption of St. Elizabeths would be justifiable, if by that time the new National Institute of Mental Health, for which legislation is pending, is able to take over some of the teaching functions now served so well by St. Elizabeths. But it is certain that it will take the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service at least that long to erect the Mental Health Institute out in Bethesda—instead of at St. Elizabeths where I think it ought to be because that is where the patients are—and build up a superior staff and establish a reputation and professional standing comparable to that of St. Elizabeths so that physicians desiring to specialize in psychiatry want to take their graduate training at the Mental Institute, as they now desire appointments to St. Elizabeths. Ten years from now, I say, this plan might make sense to psychiatrists, but to disorganize St. Elizabeths just now is like taking West Point and Annapolis to pieces in the midst of a war.

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

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield three additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. I thank the gentleman. Sixty percent of all hospitalization by the Veterans' Administration is for psychiatric cases. Fifty percent of all disability pensions for veterans are for disability because of psychiatric disorders. We have only 4,000 psychiatrists in the United States when we need 15,000. The leading institution in the country for the training of psychiatrists, psychiatric nurses, psychiatric social workers, and psychiatric attendants, is St. Elizabeths Hospital. Now we come along and all but abolish it. I cannot believe that would be of service to the veterans, or to the Army and Navy, or to civilians. When we are appropriating millions for a new mental research institution because the whole field of psychiatric research and training is so important, it does not make sense to be tearing down the old institution, especially inasmuch as it is the best one of its kind in existence.

I hope, therefore, that all three of these resolutions will be voted up, that everybody will vote "aye", which means that we disapprove of the reorganization plans in their present form and send them back to the President, having made clear what features we object to. If he will delete those, and send the others back, I think they will be allowed to go into effect without any serious opposition.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. HENRY. Can the gentleman from Minnesota give us any idea what would happen to St. Elizabeths Hospital in case this reorganization plan became effective?

Mr. JUDD. If this reorganization plan becomes effective, it would inevitably demoralize in considerable degree the hospital and its professional staff It is the only mental hospital in the United States which is approved for rotating internship. It has about 20 residents all the time training to become psychiatric specialists. It would demoralize the staff and teaching functions because it would make St. Elizabeths just about like an ordinary county insane asylum instead of perhaps the outstanding institution for the study of mental diseases in the world today.

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

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

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman referred in a previous part of his remarks to the fact that some of the departments wanted that kind of language in the reorganization plan.

Mr. JUDD. Yes.

Mr. McDONOUGH. And in your remarks you referred to the President's plan. Whose plan is this?

Mr. JUDD. I may say that we asked that question again and again, and we asked it from the Director of the Budget among others. Who actually prepared these plans we never could find out. For instance, not a physician in the American Psychiatric Association was ever consulted, so far as I have been able to learn, on the plans regarding St. Elizabeths. It is, I fear, a perfect illustration of what would happen if we should ever get governmental control of medical care. Laymen would be able to sit down with their paper plans and rearrange some things here and some others there, and the patient's welfare would be all but lost in the shuffle.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Is that true also with reference to the National Housing Authority and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board?

Mr. JUDD. We could not get a witness to testify as to who drew up any of these plans or who was responsible for them.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Then, we should refuse to adopt the plan.

Mr. JUDD. I believe all three should be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] has again expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, it is pretty bad when we have such a short time to discuss this question with the House of Representatives, when you are supposed to vote it up or down. Is my face red? I was the only Republican who voted for putting this power into the hands of the President for reorganization. I was condemned by my colleagues on this side and I want to apologize to them now for putting this power in his hands, because I do not see that I have gotten any place, in efficiency in Government or in saving Government funds. I will say I am terribly disappointed. I wanted efficiency and economy. In the first place, we took this matter up to try to find out who sent in these plans for reorganization.

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

Mr. RICH. I do not have time now. I am embarrassed enough already.

Mr. TABER. Your trust was misplaced?

Mr. RICH. That is right. That is exactly so. I thought we would have a bill proposed that would give us some economy in Government and give us some more efficiency in Government, but after all the weeks of hearings I am unable to tell the House that we have that kind of legislation proposed by the President. Of course, he had these proposals made by the Budget Bureau and

I do not believe they are the ones to do the job.

Let me say, I asked the chairman to get Lindsay Warren up here and ask him what he thought of these bills, but Lindsay Warren, the Comptroller, did not wish to come. I have more confidence in him than any other man I have ever seen in Washington as being qualified to suggest efficiency and economy in Government operations. He is a Democrat. He is from North Carolina, and he is a fine fellow, able and capable of doing a good job. He would give us just what he thought were the facts. Let me show you what he said when he came before our committee some months ago about Government inefficiency. He said, "There are 29 agencies of Government lending Government funds."

Three agencies of Government deal with deposits and loans. Thirty-four agencies of Government deal with the acquisition of land; 16 agencies of Government deal with wildlife preservation; 10 agencies of Government deal with Government construction; 9 agencies of Government deal with credit and finance; 12 agencies of Government deal with home and community planning; 10 agencies of Government deal with materials and construction; 28 agencies of Government deal with welfare matters; 14 agencies of Government deal with forestry; 4 agencies of Government deal with the examination of banks; 65 agencies of Government deal with the gathering of statistics; 75 bureaus, divisions, and agencies of Government deal with transportation; 8 agencies of bureaus and departments deal with labor; and 3 agencies of Government deal with the collection of customs.

There is no man in Government as well qualified as Lindsay Warren to know about matters of Government; yet his counsel and advice were not asked for by the President. Instead of that the President went to the Budget Bureau, one of the greatest spending agencies we have had in the history of our country, and asked them to suggest some economy in Government. Ever since Louis Douglass left the Budget Bureau, we have not had any economy in Government spending.

It is time we did something about Government efficiency; it is time we voted these resolutions through, send them back to the President and let him try it over, he certainly should be able to profit if we do and the country will certainly benefit if we do.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1, HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 155—REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2, HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 151—REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3, HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 154

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the above resolutions were reported by the committee by a divided vote. There were votes of "present," and there were negative votes. It is fair to say that a large majority of the members of the committee voted to report the resolutions.

REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1945

The Reorganization Act of 1945 provides that the plans of reorganization submitted by the President will take effect in 60 days unless the two Houses pass a concurrent resolution stating in substance that Congress does not favor the reorganization plan. The committee conducted extensive hearings which are published and are available. Under the act the resolutions are highly privileged, and there must be a straight vote up or down. Plans submitted by the President cannot be amended.

The committee had 10 days in which to conduct hearings and submit a report.

THE THREE PLANS

I think the language in part V of plan 1 consolidating housing agencies under the National Housing Agency most unfortunate. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] submitted the report in opposition to plan 1. The objection was based upon the National Housing Agency. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO], the chairman of the committee, submitted the report against plan 2. The objection was based upon the Employees' Compensation Commission being abolished and its functions transferred to an Administrator. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] submitted the report in opposition to plan 3, and while the report states that the opposition was based upon the disapproval of the transfer and abolition of the functions of St. Elizabeths Hospital, it is fair to state that there was some objection to the plan because it provided for the continuance of the Marine Inspection and Navigation under the Coast Guard. In each of the reports, the committee state that if the said provisions had not obtained in the three plans, the plans would not have been objectionable, thus indicating that the committee would have approved the plans if the objections named in the reports, consisting of substantially one part in each plan had been eliminated.

THE PRESIDENT ENTITLED TO BENEFIT OF DOUBT

When the President submits these plans I feel that he should have the benefit of the doubt, and if by and large these plans would provide for coordinating and grouping or for the elimination of overlapping and the reduction of agencies and the abolition of functions, they should be approved. I have advocated reorganization for years. I will support all plans submitted by the President unless there is involved in any one of the plans a policy or a program that is utterly unsound. The President has the right to name the over-all agency of all housing groups the National Housing Agency. Inasmuch as the Reorganization Act prohibits the continuance of agencies established under the War Powers Act, it is most unfortunate that the President used the phraseology of his Executive order establishing the National Housing Agency and transferred to the supervision of that agency the insuring and financing of housing. Federal housing is in the field of public welfare. Financing private housing and dealing with physical matters in housing is entirely different from Federal Housing which makes loans and grants and promotes subsidized housing and operates in the field of social welfare. This establishes a new policy, and I think that the President made a mistake in trying to establish a policy that Congress had not approved. I believe the policy to be unsound, and hence reluctantly oppose plan 1.

If I had been writing the other plans, I would have eliminated the transferring of the functions of St. Elizabeths as they relate to the Army and the Navy. I would not have included the transfer of the Employees' Compensation Commission. I would at least have pursued the policy of expediency with respect to bipartisan boards. I am more concerned, however, with the substance, and it is the substance of approving Federal housing at Federal expense in times of peace that forces me to oppose plan No. 1. I am aware that the Federal Housing Administration will revert when the War Powers Act expires, but I am also aware that Congress has discontinued appropriations for further construction. It will revert to its former status, but that status will be in supervising projects already established.

I favor administration generally by a single Administrator rather than by a board. The Employees' Compensation Commission handles thousands of cases of employees and makes adjudications aggregating millions of dollars. The Veterans' Administration with a single Administrator adjudicates millions of claims and adjudicates claims involving billions of dollars. If a single Administrator in the Veterans' Administration can function satisfactorily, it can function satisfactorily in handling the functions of Federal compensation.

CONSTITUTIONALITY

The constitutionality of the Reorganization Act has been questioned. The constitutionality of the transfer of the Employees Compensation Commission has been particularly questioned.

The question of the constitutionality of the Reorganization Act has been foreclosed. Congress has decided against the contention. Some two or three reorganization acts were passed during the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt. I repeat, that Congress has decided that the Reorganization Act is constitutional. It rejected the contentions of those who asserted that there was an abdication of legislative power. When the reorganization bill was before the House I submitted a brief in connection with my presentation of the bill in favor of the constitutionality of the act. That brief is in the congressional debates. In a word, the question of constitutionality has no place in the pending bill.

Again it is asserted that the provision of plan No. 2, abolishing the Employees Compensation Commission, is illegal and unconstitutional. It is particularly maintained that it violates section 5 (a) (6) of the Reorganization Act with respect to quasi-judicial functions. The provision prohibits any greater limitation than existed with respect to the exercise of the function by the agency in which it was vested prior to the reor-

ganization. The provision does not prevent the transfer of the functions. It does prevent limiting the functions. The act authorizes the abolition of the Commission. The plan does not limit the quasi-judicial authority and thus does not violate section 5 of the Reorganization Act.

EXEMPTIONS

The Reorganization Act exempts the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and other quasi-judicial agencies from the terms of act. There is no effort in any of the pending plans to reorganize the exempted agencies.

There is nothing in the plans involving the Civil Aeronautics Administration or the Civil Aeronautics Board. The arguments with respect to this Board are not applicable. They are not in point. We have heard them previously, and there is no occasion to repeat them about the pending bill.

TWENTY-EIGHT AGENCIES

The three plans cover 28 individual items embracing a broad area of governmental activity. There is an average of nine agencies in each of the plans. Only one is objected to in plan 1, only one in plan 2, and not over two of the items in plan 3. Twelve of the items have the effect of consolidating related functions and programs. There are economies in the consolidations. There are economies in the abolitions. Nine of the items clean up administrative problems, but 24 or 25 of the items are generally acceptable.

REORGANIZATION

There is no more difficult problem than reorganization. Congress through the years has failed to reorganize. We were realistic. Congress gave the Executive the power to reorganize, but reserved the right to reject the reorganization plans of the President. The Reorganization Act states the needs, the purposes, provides for the plans and limits the powers of the Executive in reorganization.

The pending three plans do provide for grouping and consolidating. They do provide for abolishing both agencies and functions. They provide for eliminating overlapping and duplication of effort. They should result in some economies, but they do not involve major reorganization problems, nor will they materially reduce in and of themselves the number of Federal employees. While the act expressed the hope for an overall reduction of 25 percent, it is fair to say that there was no claim that the plans proposed would provide for a reduction of 25 percent in the administrative costs of the agencies affected.

CRITICISM

Inasmuch as Congress has not provided for reorganization, Congress is not in position to criticize the proposals of the President even though some of the proposals may not be satisfactory to Congress. The fundamental question involved is whether or not there should be reorganization. If the plans are not approved, there is a set-back in reorganization that is unfortunate.

The reports of the committee point out that the objection to each of the plans is based largely, if not wholly, on one part of each plan. The committee, therefore, leads the Congress and the country to believe that if the reorganizations are submitted with the objectionable parts eliminated, the plans would be satisfactory. In the event Congress rejects the plans, I trust that the plans will promptly be resubmitted with the parts to which there was no substantial objection.

MINORITY REPORT

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] filed a minority report to the reorganization plan No. 1, and while his minority report is attached to the report on that plan, it is a minority report covering not only plan 1 but the remaining plans 2 and 3. While I did not sign the minority report, as disclosed by the hearings, and as is known in the committee, I share very largely the views set forth in the minority report. I shall vote most reluctantly for the resolution opposed proposing plan No. 1 because it includes part 5 which attempts to make the National Housing Agency, a war agency constructing housing at Federal expense, a permanent over-all agency. There is no authorization for making a war agency permanent.

However, I am opposed to the resolutions rejecting plans 2 and 3, for while I regret that plan 2 provides for transfering the United States Employees' Compensation Commission and abolishing the commission itself in plan 2, I believe that the other provisions of plan 2 are of enough importance to warrant the approval of the plan as a whole. I am especially of the opinion that the rights of Federal employees will not be prejudiced in any way merely by abolishing the commission and establishing an administrator for the functions of the commission obtain and the rights of the Federal employees are better safeguarded.

I see no valid reason for rejecting plan 3. It was disapproved as shown by the report because of the elimination of Army and Navy patients from the St. Elizabeths Hospital. There is no testimony to show that the hospital would not still be operated to full capacity and that it would not be available for teaching and for psychiatry in the future as in the past. The hospital would probably be continued without increased enlargements that really impair its efficiency, but in all events, the rejection of plan 3 was based upon the transfer or abolition of the functions of St. Elizabeths Hospital.

REORGANIZATION OR NOT REORGANIZATION

The basic question involved is whether or not there will be a reorganization of Government or not. I regret the setback in reorganization that would be caused by the rejection of a single one of the plans. With the exception of the National Housing Agency in plan 1, I believe that the reorganizations are an improvement. There will never be any reorganization by Congress, and there will never be any reorganization that is satisfactory to Federal employees. We have had the experience of the last 40 years to profit by. It is almost as difficult for the President to reorganize as it is for Congress. The plans of President Hoover were rejected, and the plans of President Roosevelt were limited in scope.

BIPARTISAN BOARDS

It must be admitted that the Federal Employees Compensation Commission and the Social Security Board fall within the so-called category of bipartisan boards. However, there isn't as much in the argument as appears on its face. The fundamental law establishing these two boards provides that not more than two of the members should be of the same political faith. The better method, as in the case of the Veterans' Administration, is to provide for a single administrator with boards from which appeals may be taken. The plans so stipulate.

PLAN 1. NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

The committee bases its objection to plan 1 on part V. The report thus shows that if part V were eliminated the plan would be acceptable.

Part V provides for the consolidation of the Federal Housing Authority, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration under an agency to be designated the National Housing Agency. The committee believes that there should be a permanent consolidation and a grouping of all related housing agencies and functions, but the committee does not believe that lending agencies such as the Federal Housing Agency which insures loans for private builders and private home owners should be placed under the administrative control of the National Housing Agency or any other Federal agency whose primary function is to build homes with Federal money and manage Federally-owned housing projects. The committee advocates private ownership of homes, and does not believe that the private construction of homes for private ownership would be encouraged or promoted by an agency whose policy favors Federal building and Federal control of homes.

The Federal Housing Agency was established by Executive Order 9070 on February 24, 1942. This Agency will expire with the expiration of the War Powers Act. It was designed to provide temporary housing for war purposes. Congress has previously discontinued appropriations for new public housing except for war purposes. While the President may designate the consolidated agency by calling it the National Housing Agency or the National Housing Administration, it is most unfortunate that the President names a temporary war agency as the consolidated agency. It is still more unfortunate that the President in transmitting the plan 1 based his recommendation largely upon S. 1592, the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill that was approved by the Senate on April 12, 1946. This bill has not passed the House. While I do not believe the President intended to force the passage of this bill on the House, the fact remains that much of

the argument for the proposed part V of plan 1, with the National Housing Agency as the head of all housing agencies, is based upon the fact that the President concluded that the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill would pass the House. A mistake was made. Further subsidies for housing have not been determined by Congress. Federal Housing contemplates subsidized Federal housing under Federal control. The committee believes in private homes under private control and under private construction. Congress has provided for supplementing private construction and private ownership by insuring loans. I regretfully repeat that while I only oppose part V in plan 1 that this is the major proposal in plan 1 and more objectionable than the other six parts of the plan. I trust that the President will promptly resubmit plan 1 with a regrouping of the housing agencies under an agency that will promote the objectives of home loans and home insurance under private construction and will not undertake to force Congress to commit itself to a policy of federalized housing by approving a war agency dedicated to constructing Federal housing at Federal expense as the over-all control agency of private homes and private construction.

There were no objections to parts I, II, III, IV, VI, and VII before the committee. It is most regrettable that part V was included, and I repeat that I reluctantly favor the resolution rejecting plan 1 solely because of part V which establishes a temporary Federal wartime agency as a permanent agency supervising all housing. There is desperate need for a consolidation of housing agencies, but the consolidation should be sound and should not perpetuate an agency that is reported to have done more propaganda work for federalized housing at Federal expense than should have been done by any agency that was entrusted with temporary housing to promote the war and for housing for veterans following the war. My information is that Mr. Wilson Wyatt, the Administrator, is a most capable official, and I do not believe that he would permit the continuance of the reported propaganda that the Federal Housing Agency has indulged in if he continues to be the Administrator. The fact that Mr. Wyatt is the Administrator and a most capable one is another reason why I will reluctantly vote against plan 1 on account of the inclusion of the National Housing Agency as part V.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2, HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 151

Mr. Chairman, under the Reorganization Act the President submitted reorganization plan No. 2. It was referred to the Committee on Expenditures, and the committee submitted a divided report. A large majority of the committee opposed the plan but a minority favored the plan. The committee conducted extensive hearings, and in its report it based its objections to section 3 of said plan 2, which abolishes the United States Employees' Compensation Commission. This Commission was established by an act of Congress. It was urged that it is bipartisan. The Commission was established about 1916. It was provided that not more than two of the three members should be of one political party. I do not agree with the report, which states that the transfer of the functions of the Commission to the Federal Security Agency violates section 5 (a) (6) of the act.

The Commission was established, as I have stated, in 1916. At that time its functions were limited. The number of employees was rather small. Since it was established, the Administrator, rather than the Board, idea in executive authority has obtained. Many Federal employees are afraid that their claims of compensation would be prejudiced. I listened carefully to all of the testimony. I would oppose the plan if I thought that the rights of any Federal employees would be jeopardized under the proposal. Instead of being jeopardized, I believe that the claims will be handled more expeditiously and more thoroughly than at present. The bipartisan character of the Board has been overemphasized. I doubt if the matter of party or politics has ever occurred to any employee or any member of the Board. The Board, as such, can examine but few of the many, many cases submitted to them. It must depend upon its examiners and employees.

The said section 5 (a) (6) of the act stipulates that no reorganization plan shall provide for, or have the effect of, imposing, in connection with the exercise of any quasi-judicial or quasi-legislative function possessed by an independent agency, any greater limitation upon the exercise of independent judgment and discretion, to the full extent authorized by law, in the carrying out of such function than existed with respect to the exercise of such function by the agency in which it was vested prior to the taking effect of such reorganization. This provision does not forbid transferring such functions from an independent agency providing the agency to which they are assigned has an equal independence of judgment and discretion.

The administration of workman's compensation, which is the only type of activity carried on by the agency, involves, of course, quasi-judicial functions. The greater part of the quasi-judicial work, however, arises under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act and the act applying to private employees in the District of Columbia. The quasi-judicial functions under these two acts are not vested in the Commission as a body, but in Deputy Commissioners, who are given by law "full power and authority to hear and determine all questions" with respect to claims. Appeals do not go to the Commission, but directly to the courts. Plan 2 makes no change whatever in the functions of the Deputy Commissioners. The plan merely transfers the functions of the Commission to a Commission under the Federal Security Agency, and it provides for the transfer from one independent agency to another and it does not subject the functions to any greater outside control than before. The Agency will have the same degree of independence of judgment as the Commission had.

The truth is that the plan affords claimants greater protection than exists under the present arrangement. There is no provision of appeals by Government employees at present. The plan provides for an appeals board to hear and determine appeals. The decisions of this board will not be subject to review or modification by an administrative officer. This procedure is fully in accord with the Administrative Procedure Act recently passed by Congress.

The number of agencies is reduced. There is one administrator instead of three members. The work of the Federal Security Agency is similar. Increased efficiency by bringing workman's compensation under the Federal agency having knowledge of insurance administration should result.

The provision reduces the number of Government agencies, provides for better administration of workmen's programs. The Department of Justice has testified that it is legal. Congress cannot criticize the President and at the same time block his efforts to simplify the administrative structure.

BOARD OF VISITORS OF ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

There was some objection to the abolition of the Board of Visitors of the St. Elizabeths Hospital. According to the hearings, there was no occasion for the continuance of this Board. There would be a duplication of its functions. At all events, it is an immaterial matter.

SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD

The Social Security Board is among the so-called bipartisan agencies. The act establishing the Board provides that not more than two of the three members shall belong to the same political faith. There were few objections to the transfer of the functions of the Board to an administrator. The bipartisan character of the Social Security Board and the Employees Compensation Commission was emphasized. I believe that the better administration can be obtained from an administrator than by a board. A single administrator is more efficient. There is no agency of the Government that handles more funds than the Veterans' Administration. There is a single Administrator. The Administrator, however, is authorized and empowered to set up boards. I repeat that the better way for administration is by an administrator rather than by a board. We have but one President, we have but one Cabinet member for each Department. The better way is to provide for a single head with assistant administrators and with boards for the adjudication of appeals, with the right of appeal.

OTHER SECTIONS OF PLAN NO. 2

There are but two sections in plan No. 2, I repeat, that the committee objected to: section 3 involving the Employees' Compensation Commission and the section against abolishing the Board of Visitors of St. Elizabeths Hospital. There was substantially no protest in the hearings against the other 10 sections of the plan. Eighty or 90 percent of the plan is sound. Personally, I would not have disturbed the Employees' Compensation Commission. I have every confidence in the members of the Board, but I do not believe that the plan should be rejected because the essential functions of the Commission and the rights of employees are preserved and promoted. I believe

that plan No. 2 should be approved and that the pending House Concurrent Resolution 151 should be rejected. If we are for reorganization, we should say so. If we are against reorganization, that issue was settled by the passage of the Reorganzation Act.

Something was said as I have stated about the legality of the abolition of the Employees' Compensation Commission. Congress settled that question when it passed the Reorganization Act. I concur with the Department of Justice that that act is valid and the proposed reorganization of the Congress is legal.

I repeat, plan No. 2 should be approved and that the resolution in opposition to the plan should be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3, HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 154

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Expenditures by a divided vote disapproved section 201 of plan 3 respecting the functions of St. Elizabeths Hospital, and they recommended against plan 3 because it would transfer or abolish functions for which St. Elizabeths Hospital was established. Section 201 is part II of the plan. There are nine other parts of the plan and according to the hearings there are substantially no sound protests against the other nine parts of the plan. I have high regard for the views of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] who submitted the report to reject plan 3. I cannot concur. The plan provides for the transfer of the responsibility for the care of military and naval mental patients from St. Elizabeths Hospital to the War and Navy Departments. It is contended that this transfer would reduce the effectiveness of the institution as a teaching hospital. The answer is that the load at St. Elizabeths without the patients from the Army and Navy is equal to the capacity of the plant. Its further growth would make the plant unwieldy. The high standards maintained would be threatened. The War and Navy Departments provide extensive medical service, including the care of the insane, for Army and Navy patients. The effect of the plan is to extend on a permanent basis the organizational arrangements which have been developed at the close of the war. I repeat that there is less merit in opposition to plan 3 than the opposition to any of the proposed plans. I have already indicated that the functions of the Board of Visitors of St. Elizabeths Hospital overlap the functions of the Federal Security Administrator. The performance by the Board of statutory functions that are long outdated would mean a dual control of the institution and would seriously interfere with its administration. It might be admitted for the sake of the argument that point 2 of plan 3 might well have been omitted, but here are nine other parts without substantial objection that will promote efficient regrouping, coordination, and reorganization. There is a reduction in expenses. There will be an increase in efficiency.

BUREAU OF MARINE INSPECTION AND NAVIGATION

While there was objection to part 1 which includes sections 101, 102, 103, and 104 of plan No. 3 to the continuance of the Marine Inspection under the Coast Guard, the objections were not very impressive. The arguments of those who opposed were not convincing. I was impressed that part 1 was really one of the most constructive provisions in the reorganization plan No. 3.

The Coast Guard is an excellent institution. It has a good reputation. It has a responsibility in maritime safety. Air, sea patrol, and rescue operations are being developed. The close relationship between the Coast Guard and the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation is obvious. While it has a military form of organization, the Coast Guard in peace is not a military organization in the same sense as the Army and Navy. It was composed of men who wanted to follow the sea as a career, and not as a part of the fighting force.

The rejection of part 1 of plan No. 3 means that the Bureau of Inspection would go back under the Department of Commerce. There is certainly a lot more reason for its being under the Coast Guard. There are no reasons for its being returned to the Department of Commerce. When it was under Commerce, there was an antiquated, ineffective administration. It has been under the Coast Guard for 4 years. It has improved vastly. There is no occasion for the fears of the workmen. It has been tried for 4 years. Experience is better than fear. There are other parts of part 1 that were most meritorious. There were no objections. On the whole I believe that Marine Inspection and Navigation would be promoted by being under the Coast Guard rather than being returned to the Department of Commerce. It is rather strange that the Department of Commerce did not oppose the Marine Inspection and Navigation continuing under the Coast Guard.

THE ISSUE

The issue is clear cut. If we block the reorganization of the executive branch we thereby set back reorganization. We refuse to permit the President to do what Congress has been unable to do. We either want reorganization or we do not want reorganization. Plan 3 conforms to the purposes, and the plan is in accordance with the provisions of the Reorganization Act. Much is said about there not being a 25-percent reduction in all the agencies embraced in plan 3. The Reorganization Act expressed a hope for an over-all reduction in administrative expenses of the Government of 25 percent. It was not confined to any other plan. I believe that the pending Resolution 154 rejecting plan 3 should be defeated and that plan 3 should be approved. The defeat of the pending resolution will promote reorganization and efficiency in Government.

It will be kept in mind that after all the costs of the ordinary normal functions of the Government are a small part of the annual appropriations. Not more than one-fourth of the appropriations are involved in Government reorganization. The costs of wars, past and present, and of maintaining the Army and the Navy take substantially 80 to 85 percent of every tax dollar. I do not, however, minimize the importance of reorganization and of the reduction of the costs of Government. I believe reorganization should reduce the expenses of Government. I emphasize that, after all, expenses can be reduced where there is a will to reduce. The cost of any agency or department depends more upon the administration than upon the actual provisions of the act.

No Federal agency, no Federal employee ever asked either the Congress or the Executive for reorganization.

I now yield, to the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman says these plans are 80 percent good, and I agree with him. Would he not prefer to have them 100 percent good, if that can be done without serious difficulty?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Of course, I would, and I have so stated. But, frankly, if that argument were followed to its conclusion, every bill voted on by Congress would be sent back to the committee, because you and I did not agree with 10 percent of it. With all due deference to the gentleman, and I like him. I like his views about St. Elizabeths, and I told him frankly that I would have left it out had I been writing reorganization plan 3, but I think there is involved a substantial reorganization and regrouping in plan 3 that, in my judgment, does not warrant the Congress constantly criticizing bureaucracy, waste, and extravagance, in rejecting a plan that is 90 percent good.

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

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman referred to the Veterans' Administration, headed by one Administrator, and then he compared that with Federal employees.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What is the question, please?

Mr. CHURCH. They are working for the Government. The veterans are not working for the Government. Give them a fair show with their bipartisan board.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In my judgment, the man who offered his life upon the altar of his country is entitled, to say the least of it, to just as careful and just as judicial consideration as the man who works for his Government.

Mr. CHURCH. But he is not on the pay roll.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have answered the gentleman's question. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and I trust he will not make a speech about Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Mr. HALLECK. I am glad to know the gentleman is opposed to plan No. 1. I am surprised that he is not opposed to the other two plans.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What is the question, please?

Mr. HALLECK. You have referred to the fact that the Employees' Compensation Commission, after all, has no real function. I have in my hand pages from the United States Government Manual which recites the functions of that Commission. With your permission, I will put those in the RECORD.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am thoroughly familiar with them. I will refer to them. I am familiar with the act. I want to be clear in response to your question because the gentleman means to be fair.

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

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman the balance of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for six more minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I stated that when we passed the Reorganization Act we provided for the transfer of functions. That is exactly what would obtain in transferring it to a single administrator.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I think the committee is entitled to know what the Commission says its functions are.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I know what they are. I do not want to conceal anything. I want to yield to other Members and my time is limited.

Mr. HALLECK. It will take only a minute to read these into the RECORD.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Everybody in this Congress knows that it is physically impossible for three persons on a board to pass on the claims of hundreds of thousands of employees. We know in practice that they have to be handled by examiners.

Mr. HALLECK. But we know that in practice and in operation they run the affairs of the Commission.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes. I am glad to have your views, always.

I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I hope I can get along with my colleague without any controversy. I understood you to say there was very little abolition and very little saving of funds in any of the plans. When I voted to authorize the President to reorganize the executive agencies of Government, I thought I was voting for authority to abolish some of them so as to save money and eliminate bureaucracy.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes.

Mr. MAY. Now, have we got any of that relief?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes, we have. I said there were no major abolitions and that there were no major savings or economies. We talk about reorganization as we do about the weather, but we do not do very much about it. I want to be fair. I stated it was hard for the President to reorganize. We have not done it in Congress. Let us keep in mind that substanially 80 to 85 cents out of every dollar that we appropriate has nothing to do with reorganization or administration. It goes to wars past and future and to the Army and the Navy. I wish to be fair and say there there were no savings of major amount. There were savings but they were not major.

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

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman mentioned, in his clear-cut and helpful statement, that there are 28 items contained in the 3 plans. It is fair to say that 12 of those items actually concern consolidation of programs and agencies. Therefore, we do get economy, do we not?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I stated that, but I wanted to be fair and I stated there are no major economies, because frankly these 28 agencies are not agencies that ought to cause the Congress of the United States to take issue with the Chief Executive except in one case. I stated I came to the conclusion to oppose plan 1 reluctantly. That was with reference to National Housing.

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

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. RICH. There are certain items in these plans that we all agree are satisfactory. The gentleman states there is 20 percent of these plans that he does not like. Why not send the plans back to the President? He could send them back here within a week's time with the objectionable features eliminated and the Congress would agree to them.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have answered the gentleman's question by saying that no plans that could be offered would be 100 percent satisfactory to all the Members of Congress. I think that when the President submits a plan that is 80 or 90 percent satisfactory that he has done a pretty good job.

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

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. I know the gentleman is always fair and I have always admired his fairness. I want the gentleman to point out to the committee, since he is the last speaker——

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What is the gentleman's question, please?

Mr. BENDER. Since the gentleman is the last speaker and since he is expressing his own views I would like the gentleman to answer whether or not he is expressing the views of the majority of the committee.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I do not speak for the majority of the committee. As I indicated at the very inception of my argument even a majority of the committee makes mistakes. They made mistakes in reporting unfavorably all three plans. I agree on one resolution. I know the gentleman's views. I differ with him.

Mr. BENDER. But only three Members voted for any one plan.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I stated the situation in the opening of my argument. I stated, furthermore, that in my judgment, it is not a question of what the committee did but it is a question of what the committee did that can be supported, that can stand careful analysis, that can be supported in fact and in argument; and in my judgment, I have stated that the only fundamental policy that the Congress of the United States has thus far not adopted, that is proposed in these three plans, is that of continuing the wartime National Housing Agency that the Congress has not authorized, and I think reluctantly, much as I would like to vote for reorganization, that Congress is justified in voting against plan 1; but notwithstanding their defects, whether they be 10 percent, 5 percent, or 15 percent incorrect, Congress is not justified in disapproving plans 2 and 3.

Congress itself has not reorganized in 40 years. We might just as well admit that when we reject these reorganization plans we are setting back reorganization. The President of the United States, according to the testimony of all the witnesses, submitted a satisfactory plan with the exception of about five items.

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

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield briefly.

Mr. CHURCH. Does not the gentleman feel that since the committee reported against all three plans——

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is not a question, that is just a statement in accord with the gentleman's views. I decline to yield further.

I believe that plan 1 should be rejected, but I do urge that plans 2 and 3 should be approved.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan No. 1 of May 16, 1946, transmitted to Congress by the President on the 16th of May 1946.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan No. 2 of May 16, 1946, transmitted to Congress by the President on the 16th day of May 1946.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan No. 3 of May 16, 1946, transmitted to Congress by the President on the 16th day of May 1946.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. The Clerk has now read the three concurrent resolutions with respect to plans Nos. 1, 2, and 3. Do I understand the proposal is that we vote on these resolutions en bloc?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order of the House, they will be taken up separately when we go back into the House.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman asked whether or not we would vote on these resolutions separately or en bloc in the Committee. It strikes me—and I propound this inquiry of the Chair—even though it may be in order to vote on them en bloc, could we not ask for a division of the question and they be voted on separately in Committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say that the order of the House is that they be considered en bloc in the Committee.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, the wording of the three resolutions is such that if one desires to vote against the reorganization plan, should he vote "aye" or "no"?

The CHAIRMAN. In the House, if you want to disapprove the plan you would vote "aye."

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report back to the House, House Concurrent Resolutions 155, 151, and 154, with the recommendation that the several resolutions be passed.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMAS of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration House Concurrent Resolutions 155, 151, and 154 had directed him to report them back to the House with the recommendation that each of the resolutions do pass.

The SPEAKER. Under order of the House each resolution must be voted on separately.

The question is on House Concurrent Resolution 155, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan No. 1 of May 16, 1946, transmitted to Congress by the President on the 16th of May 1946.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. In reference to the three votes on plans Nos. 1, 2, and 3, a vote of "no" would be in support of the Presidential recommendation, a vote of "aye" to override the President, is that correct?

The SPEAKER. A vote of "aye" will adopt the resolution rejecting the President's plan.

The question is on House Concurrent Resolution 155.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANDOLPH) there were—ayes 180, noes 37.

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report Concurrent Resolution 151.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan No. 2 of May 16, 1946, transmitted to Congress by the President on the 16th day of May 1946.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANDOLPH) there were—ayes 166, noes 40.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. RANDOLPH. 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. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and forty Members are present, a quorum.

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next resolution (H. Con. Res. 154).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan No. 3 of May 16, 1946, transmitted to Congress by the President on the 16th day of May 1946.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

THIRD DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6885) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, to provide appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6885, with Mr. COOLEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION

Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of the Office of Defense Transportation, fiscal year 1947, including salary of the Director at not to exceed $12,000, and the Deputy Director at $10,000, traveling expenses (not to exceed $50,000), including reimbursement, at not to exceed 4 cents per mile, of employees or others rendering service to said Office for official travel performed by them in privately owned automobiles within the limits of their official stations and attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the agency; personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; contract stenographic reporting services; lawbooks, books of reference, newspapers, and periodicals; maintenance, operation and repair of passenger automobiles; acceptance and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services; printing and binding (not to exceed $10,000); not to exceed $4,000 for deposit in the general fund of the Treasury for cost of penalty mail as required by section 2 of the Act of June 28, 1944 (Public Law 364); payment, at rates not in excess of those fixed by law for witnesses attending in United States courts (28 U. S. C. 600c), of fees, mileage, and subsistence of witnesses appearing at hearing held by the Office of Defense Transportation in connection with the performance of its functions; $525,000; *Provided*, That the payment of subsistence to witnesses shall be subject to certification by the Director of the Office of Defense Transportation or his designee as to the necessity therefor: *Provided further*, That in operating any commercial railroad or truck line the Office of Defense Transportation shall pay whatever license or inspection fees and highway use compensation taxes such lines would have been obligated to pay had they continued in operation under the control of the owners thereof.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk read a letter which I send to the desk.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION,
June 28, 1946.

DEAR CLARENCE: I have just written to Representative JOHN TABER concerning his amendment. I sincerely hope that the Taber amendment will be reconsidered, since it limits the use of funds for shipments after December 31, 1946, and March 31, 1947, to Europe and China, respectively.

You will recall that a limitation now applicable to the present appropriation is in the law. That fixes the date of shipment to June 1947, affording ample time to clear the European situation.

The amendment will not do what is contemplated. It will waste some $300,000,000 worth of food, supplies, and equipment for which deliveries to UNRRA cannot be made within that time. It will tie up food, material, and equipment paid for by other contributing nations. The operations are centrally controlled, and there is no way in which operating, administrative, communication, and transportation costs can be separated from the general fund. For instance, an order of 75 locomotives from Australia for China out of the Australian contribution, now in manufacture to be delivered about midsummer of 1947, though originally intended for early 1947, could not be shipped in time. This is but an illustration. There are several hundreds of such orders. Agricultural machinery on order in this country which should be in process of delivery now, in all likelihood we will not get until after the 1st of the year because of stoppage of production caused by strikes. The same is true of water and sewer pipes which should have been shipped weeks ago. These have been delayed and we will not get them until the end of the year because of, first, the steel strike, and then the coal strike. I could go on indefinitely and give you instance after instance.

As I testified before the committee, I estimate that it would be about March or April before European shipments will have been completed, and perhaps the fall of 1947 for China. I do not see how it would be possible to carry out the intent of the limitation on the dates fixed by the Taber amendment without simply junking some $200,000,000 to $300,000,000 worth of supplies that would be on hand and could not be shipped. The United States has enough surplus supplies on our hands now. I am sure you will agree.

I fully understand what Mr. TABER has in mind, but I can assure you that the amendment does not do it, and that there is no way of limiting such a large operation as UNRRA has had for the past 2 years on midnight of a given date. Frankly, I am not smart enough to do it. I have conferred with my staff, and there is no way that it can be done. If the amendment is passed, it is tantamount to a reduction of the appropriation to which the United States is committed of some $300,000,000. In that event, I will ask the President to relieve me and then the UNRRA Council, as it will require someone much smarter than I am who can perform miracles to take over the job. While I did not intend to remain here permanently, and took over because of an emergency, I do want to have a definite plan of operation to turn over to a successor, or to a new agency, to complete a plan which will not be wasteful and which will give 100 cents value for every dollar appropriated by mine and other countries.

You have been so understanding and helpful that I will greatly appreciate it if you will bring the situation to the attention of the House.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

F. H. LAGUARDIA,
Director General.

P. S.—A limitation, if necessary, as to purchase of supplies, food, etc., after December 31, 1947, could be administered.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, Mayor LaGuardia called me this morning. He said he had not been advised of this amendment until he got it over the ticker. He was very much concerned about it. He said he was mindful of Mr. TABER'S interest and was in thorough agreement with his objective but when applied to the situation it was impossible of administration. He said there would be no alternative if this amendment went into the bill but to resign. He did not want that to be understood as a threat but such an amendment would leave a situation impossible of administration. He said he did not believe the House really understood the situation when the amendment was passed; if they wanted to place a limitation upon purchases, upon the expenditure of money, that was all right, but not upon delivery, because most of these supplies have already been bought or contracted for. The money has already been spent or committed and time must be afforded in which to deliver them. He said he could not be a party to the wasting of $300,000,000, and to the failure to keep our solemn agreement with 44 UNRRA nations, and the nations which had been promised relief.

We will have an opportunity to again vote on this amendment when the bill is reported back to the House. I trust all Members will consider this not from the point of view which we took when the matter originally came up, but in the light of what Mayor LaGuardia has said in the letter just read. "All the boys down there know me," he said. "They know I would not take advantage of anybody and that I would try to administer it if it were possible, but under such limitations, administration would be hopeless. When they reconsider it I hope they will decide to leave it out."

Mr. Chairman, I trust he is not amiss in that hope.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have tried to pay attention to what Mr. LaGuardia and what Mr. Wood told us when they were before the committee on hearings. May I read from the top of page 248:

Mr. WOOD. That leaves us a carry-over for the January-to-March period in this table, which is based on finishing by the end of the year, except to China, of about $20,000,000.

What am I going to say and when am I going to be able to correctly size up a situation which is presented to the committee? I am not in the least unsympathetic with providing the needed relief which we should give to these people. On the other hand, I am forced to take the position that some time we must come to the point where these people in these other lands, as a result of their own efforts in tilling the soil and producing and mining, will be able to support themselves.

I went out of my way, beyond the picture that was formally presented to us, to ask Mr. LaGuardia several questions. The answer appears in part on page 264 and in part on the pages following.

I asked about the Polish situation. Frankly, I was unable to get a clear picture of that, and frankly I do not believe Mr. LaGuardia could then or can now give a clear picture as to Poland.

I asked about the Italian situation. I was told that if Italy could find markets for her citrus fruits she ought to be able to take care of her own wheat situation.

I asked about the Greek situation and on page 265 you will find the answer that if Greece could get her tobacco produced and exported after the 1947 crop, she should be in a greatly improved condition.

About the Chinese picture we were told by Mr. Wood. I said: "You would not anticipate that you can get $500,000,000 over there for quite a while?"

Mr. Wood's answer was:

Of course, UNRRA shipments to China are not scheduled to cease until March 1947.

There was no idea of expansion from that answer.

With reference to Yugoslavia, frankly, I do not believe we know much and I do not believe they do. That is about the picture. To be honest, I could not withdraw the amendment on the basis of the facts that were developed before our committee and what appears now to contradict it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I feel absolutely constrained at this time to bring to the attention of the membership Discharge Petition No. 32 which is now on the Speaker's desk. The petition relates to H. R. 6384, introduced by the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts, my colleague [Mrs. ROGERS]. There are also two similar bills, one by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY], and the other by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND], to provide automobiles for amputees and paralyzed victims of actual warfare who have service-connected disabilities.

There is nothing that I could possibly say to emphasize the merits of this measure because they are very obvious. To be sure, it may lead—and properly so—to other measures broadening the privileges and benefits to our wounded and incapacitated. Objections based on the need for economy may be raised against it, but so far as I am concerned, I can conceive of many and better ways to economize than at the expense of those who have been handicapped so seriously and so grievously as a result of gallant service in the war.

Many of these young heroes to whom I have referred are in the galleries today. I hope that every Member of this House in response to their appeal, in response to the appeal which I am so honored and happy to be able to make to you today, will come forward as soon as possible and sign this petition so that we may speedily consider and pass tihs worthy bill. In my opinion, the Congress cannot act too expeditiously to take favorable action on this most vital and most important matter. There is no valid reason for further delay. The bill has the greatest merit, its objective is humane and necessary to lighten the burdens and brighten the outlook of these fine boys. We must discharge our obligation at the earliest possible moment to those who have sacrificed so much for our country.

I urge and hope that every Member will sign the petition forthwith and thereby insure the early passage of this meritorious bill.

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

Mr. PHILBIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, I want to join my colleague from Massachusetts in this petition in reference to the legislation to which he referred and to say that it takes in not only the amputees but the paralytics as well.

Mr. PHILBIN. That is true. I thank the gentleman from his contribution.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I insist that the gentleman who has just spoken was speaking out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order comes too late.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to offer an amendment because I do not like to take time on matters which are bound

to fail anyway. But, to me, it is absolutely shocking and incomprehensible that Congressmen who read the newspapers will vote for a half billion dollars for UNRRA, which is run by Russia, England, and the various countries in Europe and when it is shown on the face of it that much of the aid goes either to Russia or to countries which are dominated by Russia to such an extent that they might as well be Russia.

Out in the cloakroom practically the only argument for the British loan is this hush, hush stuff that, "Now you can say you voted for something to stop Russia."

I certainly know, and when the time comes I will demonstrate it, that handing $5,000,000,000 to the British Empire is not going to save the United States from communism. The idea of Members of this Congress going to the country and asking for reelection, going to the people of the country with blood on their hands, and the campaign argument, "I handed a half billion dollars to Russia and at the same time I voted to hand $5,000,000,000 to England to stop Russia" is pure hypocrisy. I cannot understand why there are not any votes on this floor against UNRRA.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the subject matter that was opened by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] would it be out of order for one to address himself on that particular matter?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may ask unanimous consent to do so.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I scarcely regard the matter as either in or out of order in view of the fact that it relates to a very germane subject in this bill.

Let me refresh you on the subject of the so-called Taber amendment. As the bill came on this floor it carried language that had been prepared in the Budget Bureau. That language stated in effect that all of the consolidated funds in the $465,000,000 for UNRRA plus any unobligated and unexpended sums provided in prior appropriations might be pooled and could be expended without the limitations in the original law.

The limitations referred to are the fact that we decided that December 31, 1946, would be the deadline for UNRRA for all purposes except China. In the case of China the deadline was March 31, 1947. The letter from the Director of UNRRA, Mr. LaGuardia, would indicate that within the limitations of that time he says he cannot acquire and deliver the goods that are contemplated here and finish the job.

Let me tell you what is behind the Taber amendment and why the thing is so important. Let us go to lend-lease for just a moment and see what our experience has been. I got very curious about the number of contracts that Lend-Lease Administration is still processing. Mind you, the President of the United States proclaimed on VJ-day or the day thereafter, which was away back in August, that lend-lease had come to an end. So, when they came before the Deficiency Subcommittee recently I raised the question as to how many contracts under lend-lease were still being processed. You will find it on page 662 of the hearings, and I will give it to you. There are over 1,464 lend-lease contracts that have not yet been completed. But that is not the most impressive thing about it.

On the same page you will find the number of unscheduled contracts. Listen to this: Notwithstanding the fact that on the 15th of August lend-lease was brought to an end by Presidential proclamation there are over 414 lend-lease contracts on which they have not even started. They have not even started to produce the goods. When will the shipments be made? Why, possibly in 1947, but if it involves a lot of mechanical equipment that is precise in quality and requires fine machining, it is conceivable that we will be under commitments of sending lend-lease goods abroad perhaps 2 years from now, notwithstanding the fact that the American people generally have felt that it came to an end.

So now, let us come to UNRRA. We set December 31 for all countries except China. We set March 31, 1947, for China. If the Taber amendment is voted out it means that there is no limitation. It means that they can process the contracts and commitments from hereon out well into 1947 and, for all I know, to 1948. There is no limit.

How far do you want to go with this thing? I want to be just as gracious as I can to Mayor LaGuardia. I recognize that he has a difficult job, but, after all, are you going to delegate a very sovereign power involving hundreds of millions of dollars for an almost interminable period? That is the question that is involved here. It certainly richly deserves to be made clear. So out of the experience that we have had with lend-lease, when there are 414 contracts on which production has not even started, what will be the situation with UNRRA if they cannot get the goods, or if, for some reason, there is delay in production? How long will it run and how long will this entity continue to provide relief and rehabilitation when we made it so abundantly clear that there was a terminal date, namely, December 31, for all countries, except China, and March 31, 1947, for China? Let us have it fully understood what is involved here. That is the nub of the issue.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to take the full 5 minutes, but I still believe the matter is not clearly understood, and I am taking this time in the hope that I can make it perfectly simple and clear. I think all the arguments that have been made about processing and collateral matters are really not germane to the subject matter of the amendment.

In the first place, UNRRA's authorization dies on June 30, 1947, by law. There was a proviso in Public Law 259, and this proviso was waived by the bill which we presented. That waiver was stricken by the Taber amendment. That should be very clear. That proviso in the law was waived by the bill we brought in, and that waiver was stricken by the Taber amendment. Let me read you the original provision in the bill as it came to the House for action. It has to do with just one thing:

> That no relief or rehabilitation supplies procured out of funds heretofore or herein appropriated shall be shipped to any country except in the Far East after December 31, 1946, and in the case of any country in the Far East after March 31, 1947.

The only thing the Taber amendment did was take out of this bill the exception as to the time limit dealing with shipping alone. It merely meant that the bill which we brought out attempted to make it possible to ship after those dates, not to carry on the work. It simply provided that those things which we bought or had processed or manufactured for UNRRA, if they were in some warehouse in this country or on the docks, and had not been able to be delivered quite as promptly as we thought they would be, might still be shipped abroad for the purposes of UNRRA after the fixed date in Public Law 259. That is all that is involved, the shipping, not the manufacturing, nor the processing. It did seem very reasonable to me that if we had bought the goods and processed them, or whatever we had put into them, and because of shortages of labor or because of strikes we were not able to get them on board the ships to go abroad, we certainly should remove the restrictions which made it impossible to ship them after those dates. The question of the continuation of UNRRA and all the things brought up by the gentleman from Illinois seemed to me to be out of line, because all this amendment speaks of is shipping the goods after those dates.

I did not think a slight extension of time would be out of line. I offered an amendment which would have extended the time 90 days. But that amendment went out on a point or order. This whole tempest in a teapot is because the committee attempted to allow articles to be shipped after those dates. It seems to me that it did not warrant opposition from Congress. It is highly important to UNRRA, in order that the goods they bought and paid for with American dollars could be delivered to the unfortunate people of the world. There is nothing else involved.

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

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I certainly did not so read that language. It seems to me that the minute a commitment was made,

whether it was financial or not, and once we were obligated, irrespective of whether or not the goods were on the docks, we could go right ahead with the business just as we did before.

Mr. O'NEAL. No one in the House has any higher regard for the gentleman from Illinois than I, but if the gentleman will read this one paragraph in the law which I have just read he will find that it has to do only with shipping, and nothing else.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, we have here the unprecedented situation of the head of an international body lobbying Congress by means of a letter to a Member which is read from the Clerk's desk.

Last December when this termination date was put into the law it was not an original date determined upon by the action of this Congress, as Mayor La Guardia would have you believe; it was fixed pursuant to a resolution adopted by the UNRRA Council at their London meeting last summer, when the International Council of UNRRA, our own representative being their and voting, decided to wind up UNRRA on December 31, 1946. In our legislation we went the Council one better and, because of the lamentable and pitiable showing UNRRA had made in delivering any relief goods to the Far East, gave UNRRA 90 days more to deliver goods to the Far East.

I have been attempting to find out whether the UNRRA council has reversed its formal action of last summer. Unless there has been more recent UNRRA legislation which I have been unable to find, we have the spectacle of Mayor LaGuardia, the International Director General of UNRRA, making a proposal that his powers be extended beyond the date that has been formally fixed for the termination of the work of UNRRA by the international council of that very body.

Here is the practical point involved. Relief requires a degree of speed. You cannot delay 90 days or 6 months in feeding starving people or they will be dead when you get the food there. Relief delayed is relief denied. When we are talking about next year, 2 years after the war is over, we are not talking about postwar relief but are talking about something else. When we are furnishing industrial machinery to a country a couple of years after the war is over, it is not for the purpose of relief but it is merely giving the country free material for its reconstruction. In the original UNRRA resolutions adopted at Atlantic City and in our original legislation it was made clear that UNRRA was to be for relief and not for reconstruction. But Mayor LaGuardia and his predecessor, Governor Lehman, have twisted the purposes of UNRRA to make it a great free reconstruction agency. For instance, out of this $465,000,000 involved here, only $40,100,000 is going for food and $66,000,000 is going for industrial reconstruction. I am one of those who felt at the outset that money spent for seed, for farm machinery, and for repair of railways and bridges to get relief supplies into destitute areas of countries were proper relief items, but we have found in the past year that this matter of relief has been stretched into a vast reconstruction project. The element of time is important, because after a certain amount of time passes you cannot furnish relief because the people who needed it are dead. When you are furnishing supplies 2 years after a war, then it is for free reconstruction, or permanent support, but not for relief of suffering caused by the war.

This House should not reverse itself on winding up UNRRA.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, a question arose here yesterday and today as to what becomes of a great deal of the material which is sent abroad under UNRRA. I think I owe it to the House to refer to a statement given to me in my office about a month ago by a young man, a neighbor of mine who is a farmer. He was selected by his church—he is a member of the plain people—to take over a lot of livestock to Europe. He is now on the Atlantic or over in Poland with the third shipment. He told me they take about 800 bred heifers and about 1,000 horses in a load. He said the horses were purchased by UNRRA in St. Louis and were so poor and in such bad shape that 129 of them died in transit on the last trip. Now there is no sense in shipping half-starved horses to a country that has no feed. Then most of them were unbroken and half wild and no good when they get them there. It would be interesting to know what they cost landed in Poland. I said, "What evidence do you have that your brethren get these horses and these heifers when you get them there?" He said, "None whatever." I said, "Have you talked with people over there and have you any evidence?"

He said, "Yes. I have talked with members of our church over there as to what becomes of these bred heifers when they get them there." He said, "The Russians take them all." He says, "They have to surrender them to the Russians, and if they get any back they steal them. If they are caught stealing them they are shot on sight." I have every reason to believe what my neighbor told me. I grew up with him and I know him. He is a Christian man. When I get these reports I believe them.

In the light of that I think we ought to be a little more careful with the money we spend for these things if we are going to try to aid our people over there. If you cannot get food and supplies to the needy through the church circles to their brethren, then I am sure you cannot get it there through the Government. The governments over there have never had any compassion on their poor, or they would not have so many poor.

There has always been starvation in a lot of these countries because the governments pay no attention to the poor.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It has been explained in the papers by Constantine Brown about Yugoslavia. The Government takes the material and sells it to some rich man and uses the money for war supplies, as in Yugoslavia, Poland, and no doubt in other Russian-controlled countries.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Did your friend say anything to you about what policy they have established for the distribution of the food that we are sending?

Mr. GROSS. No. We did not discuss that. He is not working in the transporting of food. He is working for his church in the delivery of livestock. These heifers are a contribution of the Plain People in several counties in southeastern Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this subject, which is not in order, of course, but I think we have had enough of it—I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this particular subject close in 5 minutes

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

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: There is hereby appropriated from the special fund account in the Treasury as provided for in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946, not to exceed $435,000,000 for the fiscal year 1947 for all necessary expenses of the War Assets Administration established by Executive Order 9689; for allocation or reimbursement by the War Assets Administrator to Government agencies designated by the Administrator as disposal agencies by or pursuant to the Surplus Property Act of 1944; for payment to Government agencies designated by the Administrator for rendering special services in connection with the disposal of surplus property in such amounts as shall be approved by the Bureau of the Budget; and for allocation or reimbursement to owning agencies in such amounts and upon such basis as shall be approved by the Bureau of the Budget, for the care and handling (including pay and allowances and subsistence of military and naval personnel) of surplus property subsequent to the filing of a declaration of surplus covering such property with a disposal agency designated by the Administrator, or, if the Administrator prescribes procedures whereby declarations of surplus are made at approximately the time of disposal or removal, subsequent to notice by the owning agency to the disposal agency that property has been determined to be surplus and is subject to such procedures, such funds to be available for personal services in the District of Columbia; fees and mileage of witnesses at rates provided by law for witnesses attending in the United States courts (28 U. S. C. 600c); temporary (not in excess of 1 year) or intermittent services of experts or consultants or organizations thereof, including stenographic reporting services, by

contract or otherwise, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws; lawbooks, books of reference, newspapers, and periodicals; acceptance and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services; printing and binding; travel expenses, including reimbursement, at not to exceed 4 cents per mile, to employees for expenses incurred by them in performance of official travel in privately owned automobiles within the limits of their official stations; expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the Administration; procurement of supplies, equipment, reports, and services in connection with the care, handling, and disposition of surplus property without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5) upon determination by the Administrator or by any official designated by him for this purpose that such method of procurement is necessary; purchase and procurement of reports of experts or consultants or organizations thereof; advertising, including radio time; purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of passenger automobiles; maintenance, operation, and repair of aircraft in the Territories and possessions in connection with disposal activities and, in the continental limits of the United States in connection with the disposition of aircraft and airports; acquisition of buildings, lands, lease-holds, and other interests therein, and temporary use thereof for the care, handling, and disposition of surplus property; payments to States or political subdivisions thereof of sums in lieu of and equivalent to taxes accruing against real property declared surplus to the Administration by Government corporations; authority to advance money to Administration cashiers and collection officials upon furnishing bond, for the purpose of handling cash transactions and making change at surplus property sales: *Provided*, That the Administrator may delegate to any official in the War Assets Administration the authority to make appointments of personne and he may also delegate to any subordinate official the authority to make other determinations necessary for the conduct of the administrative management within said Administration: *Provided further*, That any employee of the War Assets Administration is authorized, when designated for the purpose by the Administrator, to administer to or take from any person an oath, affirmation, or affidavit, when such instrument is required in connection with the performance of the functions or activities of the War Assets Administration: *Provided further*, That the Administration may procure by contract or otherwise and furnish to governmental employees and employees of Government contractors at the reasonable value thereof food, meals, subsistence, and medical supplies, emergency medical services, quarters, heat, light, household equipment, laundry service, and sanitation facilities; and erect temporary structures and make alterations in existing structures necessary for these purposes, when such employees are engaged in the disposal of surplus property, or in the preparation for such disposal, at locations where such supplies, services, equipment, or facilities are otherwise unavailable, the proceeds derived therefrom to be credited to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the provisions of subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) of section 14 (a) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 (Public Law 390) shall not apply with respect to officers and employees of the War Assets Administration.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: On page 11, line 14, after the word "exceed", strike out "$435,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$335,000,000."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to save $100,000,000.

As pointed out yesterday under general debate, the War Assets Administration requested for administrative expenditure the enormous sum of $545,100,000.

In the bill now before us the committee has included the figure $435,000,000, but in its report has indicated that the balance of $110,000,000 is in effect to be held in abeyance. In other words, the agency is to go ahead and dispose of property and come back later to be reimbursed on the basis of actual expenditure.

So, Mr. Chairman, there is no real cut made by your committee in this request for over half a billion dollars.

What is $545,000,000 in terms of $2,900,000,000 which with good luck the War Assets Administration hopes to realize in the course of the fiscal year 1947?

It is about 20 percent of the figure $2,900,000,000; it is about 25 percent of the figure $2,100,000,000 which appears elsewhere in the justifications as the net proceeds hoped to be realized. In other words, the agency plans to spend from 20 to 25 cents in administrative expenditure for every dollar which it recovers.

That to my mind, Mr. Chairman, is out of all reason. I have talked with businessmen of experience and competency, who state that in their judgment, 10 percent should be adequate; that 12½ percent should cover all contingencies.

If we allow 10 percent, on $2,900,000,000, which WAA hopes to recover on property costing $15,400,000,000, that amounts to $290,000,000. If we allow 15 percent on the same figure that amounts to $435,000,000.

I propose to allow 15 percent and to allow $435,000,000, but to allow it as a maximum, and not as a minimum. I propose to carry in this bill the sum of $335,000,000, holding in abeyance the balance of $100,000,000 just as the committee proposes to do on the larger basis.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that no one can read this testimony in this connection without feeling that WAA's estimate is in large measure guess work. One thing is clear, and that is that the agency does not need this great sum of money at the present time. It seems to me far better to go slow and let the agency come back, if necessary. It must come back anyway, even under the committee proposal, in respect to the $110,000,000 that is held in abeyance.

My amendment cuts less than 20 percent from the enormous request made by this agency. It provides 15 cents in administrative expenditure for every dollar which it is hoped to collect. It allows $435,000,000 for the fiscal year 1947 as compared with $199,000,000 provided for the present fiscal year—more than twice the amount allowed for the current year. It saves $100,000,000 for the taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the committee will see fit to adopt this amendment and save $100,000,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, after all this Roman holiday in denouncing UNRRA, may I say a word as one who has watched the activities of UNRRA on the spot in certain countries. In the first place, it should be pointed out that UNRRA was given a dual name. It is United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation. Very often relief alone would be an endless drain without rehabilitation. UNRRA was created to help nations to help themselves.

It might be interesting to state that in many of the countries the heads of the missions are Americans. In the two Russian republics it is worth mentioning that they are prominent Americans who head these two missions. They are New York lawyers, Marshall McDuffy, for the Ukraine, and Richard Scandrett, for the Byelo mission. Mr. Sandrett is a nephew of Dwight Morrow and a prominent Republican, some of you may be relieved to recall. He has served on the National Republican Committee, has been treasurer of the New York County Republican Committee, and was a candidate for Congressman-at-Large in 1938.

In Greece, Buel Maben, also an American, heads the mission. There we find a country in which a thousand towns have been destroyed, 25 percent of the homes burned down, about 50 percent of the livestock either killed or taken away, practically all farm machinery stolen or ruined, factories destroyed, every bridge in the country blown up, and transportation disrupted.

The thin and mountainous soil of that country has been tilled for thousands of years and desperately needs fertilizers. But in Europe, outside of Germany, there has been no commercial fertilizer available since the war.

We in America may gripe about our hardships, but in fact we are the only major land not bombed, invaded, nor starved. We can begrudge those other lands the help which they so greatly need, for unless you have seen a bombed-out region you cannot imagine the utter blight that has come to those countries in the war.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentlewoman has seen firsthand the great need for relief Would not the gentlewoman agree that this is a case where relief delayed is relief denied, and it is our interest and should be to the interest of UNRRA to speed relief supplies there before the need for relief is over because the people are all dead?

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Definitely On the other hand, it is a dual program,

relief and rehabilitation in these countries. I for one would not presume to shackle Mr. LaGuardia by a program which he says he cannot and will not try to administer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the expenditures on account of surplus property agencies so far this year have been $87,461,000. Those have largely come in the last 2 months. I am reading this from the Treasury statement, so I assume it is right. The expenditures in the month of June have stepped up to $34,000,000. The receipts for the month of June, so far, are $9,622,000. The receipts have gone up $5,000,000 since yesterday. I do not know whether that is because some of us criticized the way that they were doing business, or not. I hope that what we have said has produced some results.

The total receipts in the Treasury so far are $345,000,000 for this fiscal year, and the expenditures are at the rate of 25 percent of the receipts.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Is that broken down to show foreign countries?

Mr. TABER. No.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. As to foreign countries, some of those purchases are made with American money through American loans from the Export-Import Bank, and history shows that loans made to foreign governments are not paid back. So it is really American money that is being paid out.

Mr. TABER. I want to read a little bit about the way they do business. In their official publication of the War Assets Administration for February, accumulated sales totaled $862,843,000. That is through February 28.

Now, listen to this: In the March issue there were reported cash receipts of $583,000,000 and accounts receivable of $89,000,000, totaling $672,000,000. That leaves more than $190,000,000 unaccounted for. That is the way they are doing business. They have 28,000 employees. The figure that they were ask-for would give them 14,000 more. It seems to me perfectly ridiculous when a veteran asks a priority for something that he is entitled to that they should not give it to him instead of holding out and holding back and turning it over to some speculator, like Gimbel Bros. in New York, or some of these other outfits around the country. If they did, they would get along a lot better and a lot cheaper. They could do this job on the basis of 10 percent of the amount they receive if they would only go at it in a businesslike way. The trouble is that they do not. If they would run it in a businesslike way and keep up to date on their collections and get the money in before the account gets cold, they could cut down on this appropriation very readily to what the gentleman from Massachusetts has suggested. That is, we could save $100,000,000 and they could do a better job, and the whole thing would be cleaned up. I have no desire to prevent them from having the money they need to operate, but I want to see them operate efficiently and honestly and have their books in shape so they will jibe. I do not like to have to call attention to this sort of thing in governmental operation—I am disturbed by it—but I think the only salvation is to go along through with what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] has proposed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, this is a very difficult subject to do justice to in a matter of 5 minutes. In passing, I would like to comment on the figures given by the distinguished minority member on the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York. The gentleman is talking about cash receipts when he speaks of what appears on the Treasury statement. It takes some time to record sales as cash receipts.

There never was such a merchandising job in the history of the world, I presume, as that which the War Assets Administration has to perform now. Not only is the amount tremendous beyond the contemplation of man but the distribution is from one end of the earth to the other, from the smallest isles in the Pacific to New York City, all over the world. The war assets are spread everywhere and the total volume runs into so many billions that I do not believe we can contemplate it. I understand that there are reasons to criticize, because in a job of that sort there is not such ability in the mind of any one man to do a perfect job on such a proposition. But we do have honest, honorable, capable men working to handle this proposition, even though mistakes are made.

I think if you will look at the cut proposed in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts you will see that it is taking a tremendous chance as to the sale of this vast hoard of material. The gentleman's amendment, if it is considered carefully, shows that it would provide for the War Assets Administration a net total of about $230,000,000 for 1947. I will say frankly that neither he nor anyone else in the United States can know the amount required with any real accuracy. His amendment proposes approximately $230 000,000 for the operation of the War Assets Administration for the next year.

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

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. My proposal is $335,000,000 for the War Assets Administration plus the $100,000,000 that would be held in abeyance.

Mr. O'NEAL. The net figure, with what has been taken off of the $435,000,000, would be $387,000,000, less what the gentleman has, and another figure of $48,000,000, which would be approximately $230,000,000, as well as I can figure.

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

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. May I ask the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky if it is not true that when we gave the veterans first preference we added to the responsibility of the War Assets Corporation in making disposal of this property, because we forced individual sales rather than bulk sales?

Mr. O'NEAL. There is no question about that.

They used $227,000,000 to handle $9,000,000,000 worth of material up to February, and the disposals there amounted to $1,900,000,000. Yet by this amendment it would give them only $230,000,000 in 1947 to handle $25,000,000,000 worth of property, of which War Assets hopes to dispose of $15,400,000,000 worth. In other words, if this amendment is adopted the War Assets Administration will have appropriated the same amount of money to handle $25,000,000,000 of paper as against $9,000,000,000 handled to February of this year, and to dispose of eight times the amount they hope to dispose of as compared with last year. It is an impossible task to do this job satisfactorily with that cut in the bill, in my opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 80, noes 59.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. O'NEAL and Mr. WIGGLESWORTH.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported there were—ayes 91, noes 77.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of the Office of Price Administration in carrying out the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by the act of October 2, 1942 (50 U. S. C. App. 901), and the provisions of the act of May 31, 1941 (55 Stat. 236), as amended by the Second War Powers Act, 1942 (50 U. S. C. App. 622), and acts amending or supplementing such acts, and all other powers, duties, and functions which may be lawfully delegated to the Office of Price Administration, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; lawbooks, books of reference, newspapers, and periodicals; expenses of in-service training of employees, including salaries and traveling expenses of instructors; not to exceed $55,000 for the employment of aliens; not to exceed $30,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations, by contract or otherwise, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, or the civil-service and classification laws; contract stenographic reporting services without regard to said section 3709; witness fees; printing and binding (not to exceed $790,290, which limitation shall not apply to the printing of forms prescribed for use of trade or public; instructions, regulations, coupon books, price lists, and printing required for the conduct of litigation); not to exceed $300,000 for test purchases of commodities, services, or ration currency for enforcement purposes, authorization in each

case to have approval prior to purchase of the Administrator, regional administrator, or the district director in the region or district in which the purchase is contemplated; traveling expenses (not to exceed $7,674,330), including reimbursement, at not to exceed 4 cents per mile, of employees for expenses incurred by them on official travel in privately owned automobiles within the limits of their official stations, expenses of appointees from point of induction in continental United States to their first post of duty in the Territories and return and expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the Office of Price Administration; hire, maintenance, operation, and repair of passenger automobiles; not to exceed $2,509,000 for deposit in the general fund of the Treasury for cost of penalty mail as required by section 2 of the act of June 28, 1944 (Public Law 364); fiscal year 1947, $106,650,000: *Provided*, That the aggregate of expenditures of any kind directly incident to informational functions shall not exceed for the period of the fiscal year $1,750,000: *Provided further*, That within 30 days after the enactment of legislation extending the termination date of the Office of Price Administration beyond June 30, 1946, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall reconsider the estimate of appropriation contained in House Document No. 653, Seventy-ninth Congress, and within such period of 30 days make such revision (in no case upward) of the component parts and within the total amount thereof as would, in his judgment, enable compliance with the provisions of such legislation, and such revision shall be published promptly in the Federal Register and shall be binding upon the Office of Price Administration: *Provided further*, That obligations in pursuance of such revision, if justified thereby, may be incurred at quarterly rates not exceeding (except for liquidation expenses and the added cost of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946) those that would have been permissible under an appropriation made in accordance with the estimate of appropriation contained in the afore-mentioned House Document No. 653: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the compensation of any officer, agent, clerk, or other employee of the United States who shall divulge or make known in any manner whatever to any person the operations, style of work, or apparatus of any manufacturer or producer visited by him in the discharge of his official duties, or the amount or source of income, profits, losses, expenditures, or any particular thereof, set forth or disclosed in any questionnaire, report, return, or document, required or requested to be filed by order or regulation of the Administrator or to permit any questionnaire, report, return, or document or copy thereof or any book containing any abstract or particulars thereof to be seen or examined by any person except as provided by law; nor for any person who shall print or publish in any manner whatever, except as hereinafter provided, any questionnaire, report, return, or document or any part thereof or source of income, profits, losses, expenditures, or methods of doing business, appearing in any questionnaire, report, return, or document: *Provided further*, That the foregoing provisions shall not be construed to prevent or prohibit the publication or disclosure of studies, graphs, charts, or other documents of like general character wherein individual statistics or the source thereof is not disclosd or identified directly or indirectly nor to prevent the furnishing in confidence to the War Department, the Navy Department, or the United States Maritime Commission, such data and information as may be requested by them for use in the performance of their official duties: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for making any subsidy payments: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to enforce any maximum price or prices on any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, including milk and its products and livestock, unless and until (1) the Secretary of Agriculture has determined and published for such agricultural commodity the prices specified in section 3 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by Public Law 729, approved October 2, 1942, as amended; (2) in case of a comparable price for such agricultural commodity, the Secretary of Agriculture has held public hearings and determined and published such comparable price in the manner prescribed by section 3 (b) of said act as amended; and (3) the Secretary of Agriculture has determined after investigation and proclaimed that the maximum price or prices so established on any such agricultural commodity, including milk and its product and livestock, will reflect to the producer of such agricultural commodity a price in conformity with section 3 (c) of said act as amended: *Provided further*, That such maximum price or prices shall conform in all respects to the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 729, approved October 2, 1942, as amended: *Provided further*, That any employee of the Office of Price Administration is authorized and empowered, when designated for the purpose by the head of the agency, to administer to or take from any person an oath, affirmation, or affidavit when such instrument is required in connection with the performance of the functions or activities of said Office: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be directly or indirectly used for the payment of the salary or expenses of any person who directs the formulation of any price policy, maximum price, or price ceiling with respect to any article or commodity unless, in the judgment of the Administrator, such person shall be qualified by experience in business, industry, or commerce; but this limitation shall not apply to the Administrator or Acting Administrator as the case may be, in considering, adopting, signing, and promulgating price policies, maximum prices, or price ceilings formulated and prepared in compliance herewith: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used to pay the salary or expenses of any person fixing maximum prices for different kinds, classes, or types of processed fruits and vegetables which are described in terms of specifications or standards, unless such specifications or standards were, prior to such order, in general use.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 17, lines 20 and 21, after "1947" strike out "$106,650,000" and insert "$80,000,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to save $25,000,000. Some people may want to know why I offer that amendment. I offer it because I believe it will improve the administration of the Office of Price Administration.

Now, how have they operated, and why do they need to have their appropriation curtailed? Instead of having a few people involved who are competent in connection with any operation with reference to pricing or regulation, they have had an enormous number. If you had occasion to go over there with reference to the pricing of any commodity, you would be ushered into a room, as I have been on many occasions. Sometimes there might be a dozen, sometimes there might be 30 people involved in an operation where there should never be over 2 or 3. The thing has had to go through innumerable agencies in the OPA, to such an extent that they have delayed their procedure so long that it has been impossible to get anything through. The result of that has been a curtailment of production and the promotion of inflation and higher prices and black markets. That is one of the principal reasons why they have made a failure of their job. If you make them cut down on that operation and get down to earth and be honest with the people of the United States, instead of having such a cumbersome operation that it will be impossible to function you will be improving the efficiency of the Price Administration set-up.

On top of that, including printing and binding, they are spending approximately $2,500,000 on publicity and propaganda, a very large percentage of which is in violation of the law and is designed deliberately to misrepresent the picture in that Office.

I hope this amendment will be adopted, and that we will be able not only to save to the Treasury a very large volume of money but that also we will be able to promote efficiency in the Office of Price Administration by making them simplify their procedure, that we will put it on a businesslike basis instead of having it so involved and cumbersome and going through so many hands that there is no efficiency about it whatever. It takes so long that production is thwarted and the OPA is deliberately promoting inflation and higher prices.

I hope this amendment will be adopted.

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

Mr. Chairman, of all the blows that have been leveled at our inflation control program, this attack on the appropriations for OPA seems to me to be the strangest and the worst.

By congressional mandate, after both Houses of the Congress have long and carefully considered the OPA bill, the Congress has approved the act extending OPA for 12 months.

Mr. Chairman, by a vote of the Congress we passed a bill that told OPA that they must administer the bill within the dozens of new price-raising changes that Congress laid down. I do not need to remind the Members that I did not support any of those changes. But the gentlemen on the Republican side of the aisle from which this amendment comes, sponsored and approved practically every single one of those changes. The adjustments of prices to those legislative changes are not automatic.

We do not believe in self-pricing. The new bill does not provide for self-pricing. It provides for careful administration

and adjustment upward, according to congressional formulas, a big percentage of the 8,000,000 prices in the OPA maximum-price books.

Yet the gentleman from New York comes before the Congress at this late date and seeks to reduce this appropriation by about twenty-five million to $80,000,000 for the coming year. He does this in spite of the most terrific and stupendous workload of price adjustments upward that has been dumped on the Office of Price Administration.

The Members on the other side of the aisle legislated that these modifications in prices be made according to their formulas, and in many instances these price increases by legislative mandate must be made within 30 days after the passage of the act.

Now you cripple the organization by reducing their funds to $80,000,000, cutting the Budget estimate from one hundred and forty-two million even before the changes in the price bill were carried out by the OPA and prices adjusted on millions of items as required by the new law.

Scarcely a day has passed but Members of the Republican side of the aisle have risen and condemned the black markets that are going on in this country. Yet such shortsighted economy as we see here in crippling enforcement funds is largely responsible for the growing condition of black markets throughout this country.

You cannot stop a black market without enforcement agencies. The honest, legitimate dealer who is on one side of the street competing with a black marketer, or a man who is evading price ceilings on the other side is powerless when you take away the OPA enforcement agency. When you do that you are driving a knife into the heart of the honest, decent merchant who is trying to live within the rules of the game.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I voted against the OPA originally and I have taken the floor day after day against the OPA. In my opinion, it is nothing but a cancer on the body politic of this country and we will have black markets, we will have a shortage of everything, as long as this crew of 60,000 snoopers are on the Federal pay roll.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is the gentleman's opinion and, may I say, he has taken a consistent position in that respect. But I believe the House by a large majority has stated that we want to continue inflation-control, even if in greatly weakened form.

If you believe in continuing it, then give that agency enough money to carry on the job that they have to do, and particularly to carry out the amendments that you put in the bill that forced these price adjustments. You are not going to get good administration or enforcement by denying them the money to do this work.

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

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

Mr. VOORHIS of California. All I want to say is "Amen" to what the gentleman has stated. It seems to me that in all probability the new Price Control Act is going to be a much more difficult instrument to enforce than the old one, therefore it is more incumbent on the Congress to provide sufficient funds for the staff now than it was before.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman is correct. I have heard it informally estimated that the changes the Congress has written into the act will require 9,000,000 man-hours to make the price adjustments. Now, here comes an amendment from the Republican side seeking to cut the Budget estimate of $142,000,000 down to $80,000,000, almost one-half of the amount required to do this job.

I can't understand the illogical line of reasoning of the gentleman from New York or the members of his party. I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma 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 51, noes 68.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: On page 21, after line 18, insert the following: "*Provided*, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be spent for publicity or propaganda."

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not need much explanation. You understand it. It simply prohibits the OPA from using any of the funds herein appropriated for publicity or propaganda purposes. If there is one thing needed more than any other it is to stop the bureaucrats from using the funds that are appropriated to them to propagandize the country to keep themselves in power.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. Would the gentleman define exactly what he means by publicity and propaganda? Of course, the OPA has a function to inform the people about the work of OPA, which is absolutely essential to do the work. I know the gentleman does not have that in mind. It seems to me that the words "publicity" and "propaganda" should be better defined in order to determine what the gentleman is trying to arrive at.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. When Chester Bowles said the country was going to be wrecked if OPA were discontinued, that is plain propaganda. I think everybody understands the meaning of the term "propaganda."

I hope the amendment is adopted.

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

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. THOM. Would the gentleman eliminate the practice of OPA in issuing public statements on price changes and price regulations by his amendment?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. No; I would not eliminate that practice; I would eliminate the OPA.

Mr. THOM. But that is part of publicity.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment, but I do believe that it directs attention to the full question of publicity, information, and propaganda. Obviously, there is something that the Congress is going to have to do about it. It occurs to me that somewhere along the line we are going to have to set up a certain pattern, a certain guide line that shall not be exceeded by administrators with respect to what they call publicity and information. I frankly confess that I do not know exactly what the dividing line is. I tried, in fact, to prepare some amendment to develop mandatory language within the limitations, but in an appropriation bill it is simply too difficult. However, I think everybody who has had any experience with this matter of publicity and information and propaganda recognizes the fact that there ought to be a limitation. I recognize also that in an agency of this kind, and for that matter most every Federal agency, obviously it has to tell its story, but it seems to me that the story ought to be confined, with certain limitations, to facts rather than propaganda, and rather than naked opinion, which is certainly not informational.

Here is one of the radio speeches that Mr. Bowles made, and I will quote you a line:

The forces of organized greed must seem to you oblivious to the public interest, determined to get theirs while the getting is good, and that is not a pleasant picture for you to look upon.

By what virtue does he assail men of integrity who are engaged in business and who generate a little profit to pay taxes for the purpose of defraying the expenses of government? There is a wholesale indictment by a Federal administrator, and I submit to you that notwithstanding what the private citizen may say, that is not within the province or within the functions of an administrator of government. His business is not to render an unsupported opinion and indict people within this country but rather to stay within the limit of facts.

He says another thing in that speech. These are from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because the speech was inserted over

on the Senate side by Senator HICKENLOOPER. I quote further:

So as might be expected the greatest organized lobbying program in the history of our country was launched.

Is that a fair thing for a Federal administrator to say? It is our business to make the law, it is our business to determine the policy, not Mr. Bowles'. It is his business to administer, and to remain scrupulously within the limitations of fact. So it occurs to me that sooner or later Congress is going to have to deal with this matter and delimit or demark the place beyond which the Administrator cannot go.

Here is something that was inserted in the RECORD by the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] on the twenty-eighth of March. This is where they made a determined effort to get out these questionnaires to school children. This is addressed from the Office of Price Administration in northern California to high school principals and teachers. It says,

In an attempt to determine the average student's knowledge of price control and its effect, we are asking the cooperation of the principals and teachers in making a survey.

There is a list of six questions. First it says "Students interviewed" and then "Name of school" and then follows question No. 1:

Was there price control after World War I?

The high school student would be about 16 or 17 years old. World War I concluded about 28 years ago, and this precious youngster was not yet on God's footstool, so they are asking his opinion about World War I, whether there was price control.

Then they say:

Did you know that there were more than 100,000 stores (wholesale and retail) forced out of business by the depression that followed World War I?

But Mr. Bowles did not draw the distinction between those that retired from business and those that went into bankruptcy, and that is an altogether different matter. If they are going to get out this kind of material, they ought to stay by the facts, but who can defend that sort of thing on the ground that that is informational, to quiz the high school youngsters of the country as to whether there was price control after World War I, and all that sort of thing. It directs attention to the fact that sooner or later there must be some legislation of some kind that will deal with this whole matter of information.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to use the remainder of the time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is very kind of the gentleman.

I have submitted to the House before, the informational cost for the fiscal year 1946 as estimated by the Budget Bureau, and if you are interested I suggest that you call up the Senate Committee on Appropriations and ask them to send you a copy of the hearings on the Second Urgent Deficiency Appropriation bill. In that hearing, as requested by Senator FERGUSON and also Senator MCKELLAR, is a complete list of all the agencies of Government and the estimate of informational cost as determined by the Bureau of the Budget, which is in the executive branch of the Government. And how much is it? It is nearly $75,000,000, of which about $2,500,000 was estimated for OPA; $2,500,000 for one agency is a lot of money with which to tell the story. I am quite in sympathy with the fact that they are entitled to keep informed those people who have an interest in the rules and regulations, the ukases, decrees, and directives, and all those things that emanate in a continuous flow from Washington, but I do say it is not in good taste, it is not proper, and it is not within the proper domain of an administrator of the Government to rush to the radio like Paul Revere of old and to attack lobbies and organized greed, when that is merely naked opinion as distinguished from fact. So I submit to you that this is worthy of your best attention, in the hope that perhaps we can contrive a bill to meet this question of information, publicity, and propaganda.

If you want the rest of the details about the millions of things that have been issued by OPA, I think you will find them on page 801 of the hearings. At the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], all the statistical information was set out, and it does make pretty interesting reading.

As for the pending amendment, I am opposed to it, and I hope it will be voted down.

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

The amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, my purpose in rising is to convey to the Members of the House the problem that confronts us today and tomorrow, and to take the Members into my confidence, as I always like to do when I have information to give to the House. We are now on page 21 of this bill and I note there are 67 pages. We must complete this bill in the House today. Conference reports on the following bills are due for consideration before tomorrow night by the House:

Treasury appropriations; State, Justice and Commerce appropriations; Coast Guard appropriation; Navy appropriations; Labor Department appropriations; Government Corporations appropriations; War Department appropriations; District of Columbia appropriations. Then there is the conference report on the Second War Powers Act.

All of these must be disposed of by tomorrow night. In addition, of course, there is the pending bill which could go over until later, but if it can be disposed of I know it would be advisable to do so. There are two other conference reports available for consideration which, of course, are not urgent as far as the June 30 deadline is concerned, and those are the conference reports on the Public Health Service Act, the bill relating to the Public Health Service, and the naval assistance to China.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How many of these conference reports are going to be ready tomorrow? I understand some of these conferences have not been held yet.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true. But I am just presenting to the House the problem that confronts us. If they are ready, of course, we naturally want to act on them if it is possible. Even though they are not all taken up, which they should be, there is quite a program for tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would think the problem is in getting the conferees to work. As I understand, only one conference report is ready for action on the part of the House, and that is the conference report on the naval appropriations bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The conference report on the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriations bill will be ready for tomorrow, and we hope to get the District of Columbia appropriation bill conference out of the way tomorrow, and perhaps one other report. It just depends on the cooperation we get from the other body. We are ready to confer at any time, and we hope that we will be able to get most of them out of the way by the end of the week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What I am trying to bring out is that the House is not to blame if they are not ready to confer with us. We are ready to act.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is correct. The House is well along with its program. The conference report on the naval appropriations bill was filed last night, and we could have taken it up any time today. The conference report on the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill can be taken up any time tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. They can be taken up at any time?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; at any time. There are no major controversies involved, and I do not think they will take more than a few minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would like to observe that my remarks were not at all along the line of placing any blame on the House, because the House has been very cooperative. I just wanted to give the House the information as to the problem which confronts us, knowing that the House and the leadership on the other side always cooperate. I wanted to present to the Members of the House the problem that confronts us as to the work we have to do between now and tomorrow night.

I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The Government corporations appropriation bill has not even been considered in the Senate up to this time.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true.

Mr. JENSEN. The conferees have not met, so, of course, the conference report could not be ready.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. As I understand it, we have already passed a continuing resolution, so if these conference reports are not ready by the deadline tomorrow no harm will be done.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, if we can get them through, it will be much better.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I agree with the gentleman.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. In view of what the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations says about getting through with this bill, is it intended when we go into the House to have a roll-call vote on the Dirksen or Taber amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There may be one or two roll calls when we go into the House. I might say also there is every indication that the War Department appropriation bill, Government corporations bill, and the Coast Guard bill will be passed by the Senate today. In that event, we can go to conference on all of them tomorrow.

The Clerk read as follows:

Printing and binding: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Printing and binding," $5,000.

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

Mr. Chairman, of course all of us are interested in seeing that our contribution to the great relief and rehabilitation program is spent properly. None of us wants to see any part of our contribution used for political purposes.

In taking final action on the amendment that was adopted yesterday, I think it is important for us to consider a statement made by Mr. Marshall MacDuffie, New York attorney, who was associated with one of the leading law firms in New York City, Sullivan & Cromwell. He made a statement yesterday contradicting the basic contention of the Congressman advocating curtailment of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration's allocations to Russia on the ground that press restrictions made it impossible to check on the disposition and utilization of these funds.

Mr. MacDuffie said he had as full an opportunity as it was possible to have to inspect every section of Russia. He, together with nine other men working as a team, moved from Kiev to eight or nine different provinces and cities ranging in population from 100 to 800,000 people; that he visited all of the rural areas in those republics; that they were in nowise molested, and they were given full and complete information by Russians from cabinet rank to the humblest ration store manager; that no attempt was made to keep from this team any of the information they sought.

To quote Mr. MacDuffie, he states:

There is nothing that we have not been able to see and no place that we have not been able to visit. In fact, it should be mentioned that some of this territory was opened in May to a party of foreign correspondents, including Drew Middleton, and aside from the escorting officers, which were necessary on account of the shattered transportation and road systems, they experienced no handicaps that I could discover in gathering whatever material they desired. I myself accompanied them to one free market and talked with many natives exclusive of official supervision, through my own interpreter. Therefore I feel that real injustice will be done if these crucially needed funds are withheld on this basis.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe every member of the committee had an opportunity on yesterday to examine a very interesting statement that appeared in the Washington News. It was prepared by Parker La Moore, who is one of the Scripps-Howard staff. He comments upon the dismissal of the information officer at Belgrade in Yugoslavia, who was attached to the UNRRA Commission. I shall insert all of the article in connection with my remarks, but I think there are a few items that ought to be mentioned as a comment upon the observations just made by my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

In this statement of yesterday is this language, which refers to Mr. Hochstetter, the UNRRA information officer:

Mr. Hochstetter charged in a statement at Belgrade that the Yugoslav public was not being fully informed as to the nature of UNRRA aid.

Subsequently the author remarks as follows:

Hochstetter charges than even news releases prepared by UNRRA headquarters in Washington are censored before they are given to the Yugoslav press.

Freedom is after all an indispensable fabric and you take it or leave it as a whole; you cannot impair it and say there is any principle of freedom in the world. So I think it is time there was a reannouncement and reassertion of free press everywhere.

And in that connection you remember the treatment that was experienced by Reuben H. Markham, for 20 years Balkan correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor, in Rumania. I am not insensible of the fact that Rumania is not an UNRRA country, but Rumania is dominated by Soviet representatives and the thing that happened to Markham could happen elsewhere. Mr. Markham is no novice in the newspaper field. He has been in the Balkans for the Monitor for 20 years. Anybody who reads the Monitor knows that it is a paper of the highest character that seeks to render a careful public service.

In that connection Mr. Markham is quoted in an Associated Press dispatch from Athens as saying:

The worst that any tyrant ever did in the way of violence, personal humiliation, the breaking up of meetings, censoring the press, and preventing the expression of public opinion is now being matched by the Communist-dominated governments in Bulgaria and Rumania as I personally saw it.

That is his language. Then finally in the last part of this rather long dispatch, and I shall also include it in my remarks, Mr. Markham said:

In the latter part of March a particularly vicious attack was made on him by a Communist paper "speaking in the name of the Red Army and only with the approval of Moscow," and he subsequently was called to appear before Russian General Vinogradov, the second most important official in Rumania.

Finally, he was forbidden to file any dispatches out of that country. You talk about freedom of the press. Well, there you have it.

I recall, Mr. Chairman, that when the book of William Allen White's son, young Bill White, hit the press and was condensed in the Reader's Digest, a story came out of Moscow that condemned that book and everything that was connected with it. I encountered a correspondent, and a very good one, in Cairo who when he was asked to sign a condemnatory article and would not do it was told to get out. There was a case of pressure on a member of the press to betray his own convictions or forfeit his press card and when a press card is your meal ticket if you have been in that game for most of a lifetime it is very serious. We must have honest reporting.

Make no mistake about it, the best thing this Congress can do is by a ringing vote to reassert the freedom of the press. Join in upholding this amendment. Otherwise we are simply following the course of appeasement.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MATHEWS. If the things said by the gentleman from Pennsylvania are true and there is no censorship how can it be said that the amendment offered by the gentleman yesterday would keep food from these people?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Precisely so, and no one can take offense who studies the purport of the amendment.

I am including the two articles referred to in their entirety.

[From Washington Daily News of June 27, 1946]

UNITED STATES UNRRA AIDE OUSTED BY RUSSIAN, COULD LIFT CURTAIN

(By Parker La Moore)

Colonel Sergeichik, Russian Army officer who heads the UNRRA mission in Yugoslavia, has ousted his American director of public information in a disagreement over censorship of news relating to UNRRA activities.

The American, Leo Hochstetter, has been ordered to return to Washington. On his arrival here he may be able to lift the curtain from one of the blacked-out areas of the UNRRA question.

Yugoslavia was second on the list of UNRRA beneficiaries last year, having received, as of December 31, 976,000 long tons of supplies of various kinds. But even though the country has been up near the front on the breadline, Yugoslavia has been able to finance the most ambitious military program in central Europe.

LINKED TO TRIESTE

It has been charged that Marshal Tito has used part of the proceeds from the sale of UNRRA goods to build the big army currently

threatening Italy in the Trieste controversy. UNRRA officials here deny this, insisting that proceeds from the sale of UNRRA goods must be used to finance further relief and rehabilitation activities.

This denial, however, must be taken with salt. The facts are that the goods are sold and that the money passes into the hands of the local governments. It is charged, and generally believed in central Europe, that most of it is used to finance the local governments. And there is reason to believe that in Yugoslavia it is used to finance military activities.

If this is not true, a documented report showing just how the money has been spent would clarify the situation.

BUYING ILL WILL

Mr. Hochstetter charged in a statement in Belgrade that the Yugoslav public was not being fully informed as to the nature of UNRRA aid. A similar report concerning the distribution in Czechoslovakia was heard some time ago.

It is to the interest of the United States that the full facts concerning the UNRRA operation be made known to the receiving countries, because we are buying ill will due to the prevailing misunderstanding. Consumers are paying what they regard as excessive prices for food and clothing we are giving to their governments, and the people think we are profiting by their misfortune, when the facts are we aren't even getting our initial donation back.

Mr. Hochstetter charges that even news releases prepared by the UNRRA headquarters in Washington are censored before being given to the Yugoslav press. If this is true, it is easy to understand why so much misunderstanding exists with respect to the world relief program.

[From Washington Star of June 27, 1946]

RED BALKAN REPRESSIONS WORST IN HISTORY, OUSTED WRITER SAYS—COMMUNIST-DOMINATED BULGARIA AND RUMANIA MATCH GREATEST TYRANTS, MARKHAM CHARGES

ATHENS, June 27.—Reuben H. Markham, for 20 years Balkan correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor, today said history's worst repressions of freedom were "being matched by the Communist-dominated governments in Bulgaria and Rumania."

Mr. Markham arrived in Athens Monday from Bucharest after his expulsion from Rumania despite vigorous protests by the United States Government. Acting Secretary of State Dean Acheson announced the expulsion and failure of the Government's efforts on Mr. Markham's behalf Tuesday.

Mr. Markham said in an interview today that "the worst that any tyrant ever did in the way of violence, personal humiliation, the breaking up of meetings, censoring the press, and preventing the expression of public opinion is now being matched by the Communist-dominated governments in Bulgaria and Rumania as I personally saw it."

The correspondent, whose most recent Balkan assignment started last August, said he had been under constant attack by the Communist-controlled press because of his dispatches.

(The newspaper Graiul Nou, organ of the Soviet Red Army, published in Rumanian in Bucharest, said yesterday that Mr. Markham had been expelled for "repeated violations of the usages of foreign correspondents, such as misrepresenting the situation in Rumania and spreading provocative rumors prejudicial to the cause of unity among the great powers." During the last 3 months Graiul Nou has published a series of attacks accusing the United States of expansionist and reactionary tendencies.)

Mr. Markham said his dispatches reported Russian-imposed dictatorial methods of Communist-dominated governments, including concentration camps and executions in the form of legal massacres, the victims of which are placed in unmarked graves in Bulgaria. Bulgarian courts, he said, are "a travesty of justice and people are killed by the thousands."

Mr. Markham said he talked to hundreds of peasants and delegations in both countries and witnessed a number of terroristic acts.

Around the end of March, Mr. Markham said he was covering a series of opposition party meetings when he was invited to spend the night with the local leader of the Peasant Party in Bucovina, Rumania, after the meeting had been broken up by a band of ruffians.

Later the band of ruffians wearing masks came into the house at midnight and killed the political leader with bursts of machine-gun fire, Mr. Markham said.

On another occasion he was having dinner in Bacau, Rumania, and Ion Mihalache, vice president of the Peasant Party and one of the three strongest opposition leaders in Rumania, when Mihalache was attacked by a band of armed Communists. He and the Rumanian fled across the roof tops, where they were besieged, but finally managed to slip through the cordon during the early morning.

Mr. Markham said a car bearing the number of the Prime Minister's office, carrying a group of Rumanians, kidnaped a young Rumanian working for American military authorities; he had not been released yet.

One meeting Mr. Markham said was actually broken up by Red Army soldiers.

In the latter part of March, Mr. Markham said, a particularly vicious attack was made on him by the Communist paper speaking in the name of the Red Army and only with the approval of Moscow, and he subsequently was called to appear before Russian General Vinogradov, the second most important official in Rumania.

Mr. Markham said General Vinogradov gave him 5 days in which to leave the country without consulting Brig. Gen. Courtland Schuyler, American member of the Allied Control Commission. General Schuyler and Burton Berry, chief of the American political mission, filed protests and the State Department followed with a vigorous note to Moscow and Bucharest.

The Russian General Susaikov, who Mr. Markham said "runs Rumania," advised the American officials only a few hours before Mr. Markham was ready to board a vessel at Constanta for Istanbul that suspension had been temporarily lifted until it was considered on a higher level.

For 3 weeks Mr. Markham was forbidden to file any dispatches. At 7 p. m., June 22, he was advised by General Susaikov that he must leave Bucharest by June 25.

He departed the following morning in the American military attaché's plane for Athens.

Mr. Markham said "in view of the coming election in Rumania, the Communist-dominated government is determined to eliminate or restrict to the narrowest possible limits the work of American reporters and as a part of that action expelled me."

Mr. Markham said that only one American correspondent was now left in Bucharest, Frank O'Brien of the Associated Press.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC WORKS

No appropriation in this or any other act shall be used for the operation of a testing laboratory of the Highway Department for making tests of materials in connection with any activity of the District government, and the equipment of the existing laboratory, not adaptable to other uses, shall be declared surplus to the War Assets Administration, and such Administration shall undertake the disposal thereof in accordance with surplus property disposal procedures established by or in pursuance of law, the net proceeds of sale to be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the general fund of the District of Columbia.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HORAN: On page 31, line 11, strike out lines 11 to 22, inclusive.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment on behalf of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]. At the time that we held full hearings on the District appropriation bill at that time this language was in the committee print. We went into this testing laboratory matter and eliminated this language from the bill. This, then, went to the full committee where the language was restored. The bill was brought to the floor of the House and on April 5 we eliminated this language by a majority vote.

The bill then went to the Senate where the language was left out, and we assumed that the matter was finished.

I merely call your attention at this time to what has happened. This was the action of a committee of this House, the Subcommittee on District Appropriations. We were somewhat surprised to see this language that had been eliminated by action of the House reappear in the present deficiency bill.

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

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. As a member of the subcommittee, may I make the observation that the gentleman speaks the exact truth. I am inclined to think that this has been put in the bill through error.

Mr. HORAN. I hope so.

Mr. CANFIELD. The amendment offered by the gentleman should prevail.

Mr. HORAN. I am inclined to believe it is an error and I hope the Committee will sustain the action of your subcommittee of some 6 weeks ago.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this provision is a simple effort to reduce the vast number of people who, somehow or other, get on public pay rolls and, once there, it is very difficult to remove them.

This testing laboratory has not been operated by the District of Columbia, according to my information, since 1933. This provision in the bill sought to be stricken by the amendment as I understand it has been in the bill since 1933.

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

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. Is the gentleman familiar with the fact that the hearings disclose that if this testing laboratory had been in operation in the dozen years since it was built and has stood idle that the District through the years would have saved over $100,000? That should be mentioned at this time because yesterday we delved quite deeply into the

operations of the District of Columbia. I want the people of the District and Members of this House to realize that the action of the subcommittee was in the direction of saving fiscal dollars and not adding to the public pay roll either because the work is being carried on by the Bureau of Standards. There might be a saving of personnel, but not a great deal.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, it was thought fit in 1933 to drop this. I do not know all the figures, but I do know that no city in the United States is so fortunate as Washington in having such an organization as the Bureau of Standards to examine all its material, such as cement, which goes into road and other construction. No other city could get such expert advice so easily, and it seems to the committee, and apparently seemed to every committee since 1933, that it would be very well since the Bureau of Standards has all those facilities, not to start the operation of a building for testing purposes. Washington now has these facilities and can get the job done without putting people on the pay roll, by paying the price to the Bureau of Standards for doing the very work which they seek to do with a permanent force.

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

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. Not having had the evidence with reference to this particular subject matter, I, as I think many other Members of the House, would be inclined to rely upon the judgment of the gentleman from Kentucky. But I want to ask him whether or not in his considered opinion the elimination of this language would result in a saving to the District of Columbia or an additional expense?

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] has stated that their studies indicated that. I hardly believe that putting people on the permanent pay roll and opening a building and operating it through 12 months of the year would be a less expensive way of having their raw materials examined than by having it done by the Bureau of Standards here in Washington where the material is to be used.

Mr. TARVER. Then the gentleman is of the opinion that it would be to the interest of the District of Columbia not to eliminate the provision?

Mr. O'NEAL. It is in the interest of the taxpayers of the District of Columbia, in my opinion, from the information I now have, to let the provision stay in the bill and to defeat the amendment.

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

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Is it not true that since this provision was stricken out by the House on April 5th last, no further hearings have been held on the subject by the Subcommittee on Appropriations?

Mr. O'NEAL. There were hearings held, if I recall, this spring, by the Deficiency Subcommittee, or within the last few months. I know that I have attended hearings when the matter has been discussed and possibly testimony taken on it. I do not recall exactly when it was, but there has been testimony long before this committee went into the matter, for 10 years or more. This is an old, old subject that has been discussed many times by the Committee on Appropriations and not approved.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it the gentleman's understanding that if the Bureau of Standards does the testing for the District of Columbia that they will have available to them a very much larger range of scientists and people of that sort to look after these things than if they operated a set-up of their own?

Mr. O'NEAL. The finest testing laboratory in America, I think it is generally conceded, is the Bureau of Standards here in Washington.

Mr. TABER. Would that not give them more opportunity to protect themselves in connection with their contract if they had the Bureau of Standards do the work than if they had such a separate set-up?

Mr. O'NEAL. I would think if the Bureau of Standards, an independent agency, not a part of the District of Columbia, stated that the material was faulty, and they had to go to court about it, that the testimony of the Bureau of Standards would be worth more as impartial testimony than that of the District of Columbia employees?

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

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. That is the important part of this whole thing. The Bureau of Standards exists for the purpose of checking testing laboratories and not to operate them. The idea of this costing the taxpayers of the District of Columbia money, when the record shows that they would have saved over $100,000 during the years, just does not hold water. This is the routine testing of materials. If you want research, go to the Bureau of Standards, but if you want routine work carried on chiefly, it means that you have to set up a testing laboratory.

Mr. O'NEAL. Has the District of Columbia ever offered to reduce their appropriation by $100,000 because of the saving made?

Mr. HORAN. This would do it automatically.

Mr. O'NEAL. They have never offered to do that.

Mr. HORAN. This would do it in a saving to the taxpayers.

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

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, the question of the maintenance of the testing laboratory in the District of Columbia has been a highly controversial subject ever since I can remember, both in the Committee on Appropriations and in the legislative committee for the District of Columbia.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. Has the testing laboratory ever been operated?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I cannot remember just when it operated.

Mr. HORAN. I cannot see how you can pass judgment on an institution that has never been operated.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me get to that point. The last real exploration of this matter was made in June 1941. That is exactly 5 years ago this month. That is when the Director and a great many of the staff of the Bureau of Standards appeared before the Appropriations Committee on the Commerce bill, which contains estimates for the Bureau of Standards. Here is the substance of the testimony. It is probably the most extended testimony that we had on the subject.

They said first of all they had the authority to test for the District of Columbia. Secondly, they said they could test without charge, but where the work was monumental in proportions, they felt in the very nature of things they had to be reimbursed for the testing that was done. They go way beyond research, and it became a testing laboratory for the District of Columbia. They did work for the District for a period of about 7 years. At that time the averages ran from $14,500 to $27,000 a year. Two-thirds of the inspection fees are for cement.

The Bureau of Standards has traveling inspectors. They go to the cement areas like those in Pennsylvania and elsewhere and test right at the mill. The minute the cement goes into a bin it is sealed whether it is for Government account or for the account of the District of Columbia. That is a service you cannot match with equal adequacy and efficiency for less money than what the Bureau of Standards has been doing it for, notwithstanding the fact that there seems to be an apparent saving if the District operates its own laboratory. The reason the saving would be apparent rather than real is that you would get so much less real inspection if they had to do it for themselves, and you would have two different overheads, one for the District laboratory and one for the Bureau of Standards.

I say they have inspectors going about, and two-thirds of all this inspection relates to cement. They do inspection

work today for the Navy Department. The Bureau of Standards has its roving inspectors who inspect for the War Department. They inspect the cement that is bought by the Bureau of Reclamation. They make inspections of all kinds, including inspections for the various States, either with or without charge.

If the fees are too high, then the answer is that some effort ought to be made between the District of Columbia and the Bureau of Standards to iron the thing out and determine a pattern of fees that is fair, but they will get infinitely more for their money through the Bureau of Standards by virtue of the staff and the expertness and the efficiency of the staff that they now have on hand. That is the reason I think this thing ought to be stricken, and particularly so since the Bureau of Standards is right here in the District of Columbia and the testing laboratory is also here. If they were several hundred miles apart and you had additional travel and difficulty of communication, it might be quite a different thing, but I am of the opinion, since they inspect for so many other agencies of the Government and for the States, that it is the part of wisdom to resist the amendment and let the action taken by the Deficiency Subcommittee stand.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman will be good enough to agree that this rider is a contradiction of the prior action taken by the House on April 5?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is quite true. The only explanation for it is that with so many things going through and with so many supply bills, my good friend, being a member of the Appropriations Committee, knows the endless and monumental amount of detail with which we have to contend. Probably that is the reason we did not deal with it at the time.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. Did it get into this deficiency bill by mistake?

Mr. DIRKSEN. As the gentleman knows, the language was sent up here by the Budget Bureau. Usually they draw the language that obtained the year before. But I should want to recheck that observation of mine to be sure.

Mr. HORAN. It was sent up by the Budget?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; it was in the language in which it arrived. That is my impression.

The minute we encountered it, I think every member of the Deficiency Committee got in on the discussion, and we were unanimous that it ought to be taken care of by this rider.

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HORAN) there were—ayes 14, noes 51.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. 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 the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOLEY, 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. 6885) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, to provide appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Taber amendment limiting the time for UNRRA administration, and on the Wigglesworth amendment with reference to the War Assets Corporation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Dirksen amendment.

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

The other amendments were agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 4, line 14, after the colon, strike all of the balance of the line and all of lines 15 to 18.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, on a division there were—ayes, 65, noes 84.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 4, at the end of line 18, add the following proviso:

"*Provided*, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the acquisition, transportation, delivery, or distribution of any supplies, commodities, or equipment to or for any recipient country which fails or refuses to permit the properly accredited representatives of the American press to enter, observe, and report without censorship on the distribution and utilization of relief and rehabilitation supplies and services furnished to such countries."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 228, nays 85, not voting, 119, as follows:

[Roll No. 184]

YEAS—228

Abernethy	Gifford	Miller, Nebr.
Allen, Ill.	Gillette	Mills
Allen, La.	Gillie	Mundt
Almond	Goodwin	Murray, Tenn.
Andersen, H. Carl	Gordon	Murray, Wis.
	Gossett	Norblad
Andresen, August H.	Graham	O'Brien, Ill.
	Grant, Ind.	O'Hara
Andrews, Ala.	Griffiths	O'Konski
Angell	Gross	Pace
Arends	Gwinn, N. Y.	Peterson, Fla.
Arnold	Gwynne, Iowa	Philbin
Barden	Hagen	Phillips
Barrett, Wyo.	Hale	Pickett
Beall	Hall, Leonard W.	Pittenger
Beckworth		Plumley
Bender	Halleck	Poage
Bennett, Mo.	Hancock	Pratt
Bishop	Hand	Price, Fla.
Blackney	Hare	Priest
Bolton	Hart	Rains
Bonner	Hébert	Ramey
Brehm	Hendricks	Randolph
Brooks	Henry	Reed, Ill.
Brown, Ga.	Herter	Reed, N. Y.
Brown, Ohio	Heselton	Rees, Kans.
Brumbaugh	Hess	Richards
Bryson	Hill	Robsion, Ky.
Buck	Hinshaw	Rockwell
Buffett	Hoffman, Pa.	Roe, Md.
Bulwinkle	Holmes, Mass.	Rogers, Fla.
Bunker	Holmes, Wash.	Rogers, Mass.
Butler	Hope	Russell
Byrnes, Wis.	Horan	Ryter
Campbell	Howell	Schwabe, Mo.
Canfield	Hull	Schwabe, Okla.
Carlson	Jarman	Scrivner
Case, N. J.	Jenkins	Shafer
Chelf	Jennings	Sikes
Chenoweth	Jensen	Simpson, Ill.
Chiperfield	Johnson, Calif.	Simpson, Pa.
Church	Johnson, Ill.	Smith, Maine
Clark	Johnson, Ind.	Smith, Ohio
Clason	Jones	Smith, Va.
Clements	Jonkman	Smith, Wis.
Clevenger	Judd	Springer
Clippinger	Kean	Stefan
Cole, Mo.	Keefe	Sumner, Ill.
Cooley	Kelly, Ill.	Sumners, Tex.
Cooper	Kilburn	Sundstrom
Corbett	Kilday	Taber
Cravens	Knutson	Talbot
Cunningham	Kunkel	Talle
Curtis	Landis	Tarver
Delaney, James J.	Lanham	Taylor
	Larcade	Thomas, N. J.
D'Ewart	Lea	Thomas, Tex.
Dirksen	LeFevre	Thomason
Domengeaux	Lemke	Tibbott
Dondero	Lesinski	Towe
Earthman	Lewis	Vorys, Ohio
Elliott	Luce	Vursell
Ellis	Lyle	Wadsworth
Ellsworth	McConnell	Wasielewski
Elston	McCowen	Weichel
Engle, Calif.	McDonough	White
Fallon	McGregor	Whitten
Feighan	McMillan, S. C.	Whittington
Fellows	McMillen, Ill.	Wigglesworth
Fenton	Madden	Wilson
Flannagan	Maloney	Winter
Fogarty	Manasco	Wolcott
Fuller	Mankin	Wolverton, N. J.
Fulton	Martin, Iowa	Wood
Gamble	Martin, Mass.	Woodruff
Gathings	Mathews	Zimmerman
Gavin	May	
Gearhart	Michener	

NAYS—85

Bailey	Biemiller	Buchanan
Barry	Bland	Cannon, Mo.
Bates, Ky.	Bloom	Carnahan

Chapman	Hoch	Patterson
Combs	Hook	Pfeifer
Crosser	Huber	Price, Ill.
D'Alesandro	Johnson,	Rabaut
De Lacy	Luther A.	Rabin
Delaney,	Johnson,	Resa
John J.	Lyndon B.	Riley
Dingell	Kelley, Pa.	Robertson, Va.
Doughton, N. C.	King	Rogers, N. Y.
Douglas, Calif.	Kirwan	Rowan
Doyle	Kopplemann	Sadowski
Fernandez	LaFollette	Sasscer
Flood	Lane	Savage
Folger	Link	Sheppard
Forand	Lynch	Slaughter
Gary	McCormack	Somers, N. Y.
Geelan	McGlinchey	Spence
Gore	Marcantonio	Starkey
Gorski	Monroney	Sullivan
Granahan	Morgan	Thom
Green	Murdock	Trimble
Gregory	Neely	Voorhis, Calif.
Harless, Ariz.	O'Brien, Mich.	Walter
Havenner	O'Neal	Weaver
Hays	O'Toole	Woodhouse
Healy	Outland	
Hobbs	Patman	

NOT VOTING—119

Adams	Ervin	Morrison
Anderson, Calif.	Fisher	Murphy
Andrews, N. Y.	Gallagher	Norrell
Auchincloss	Gardner	Norton
Baldwin, Md.	Gerlach	Patrick
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gibson	Peterson, Ga.
Barrett, Pa.	Gillespie	Ploeser
Bates, Mass.	Granger	Powell
Bell	Grant, Ala.	Quinn, N. Y.
Bennet, N. Y.	Hall,	Rankin
Boren	Edwin Arthur	Rayfiel
Boykin	Harness, Ind.	Reece, Tenn.
Bradley, Mich.	Harris	Rich
Bradley, Pa.	Hartley	Rivers
Buckley	Hedrick	Rizley
Byrne, N. Y.	Heffernan	Robertson,
Camp	Hoeven	N. Dak.
Cannon, Fla.	Hoffman, Mich.	Robinson, Utah
Case, S. Dak.	Holifield	Rodgers, Pa.
Celler	Izac	Roe, N. Y.
Cochran	Jackson	Rooney
Coffee	Johnson, Okla.	Sabath
Cole, Kans.	Kearney	Sharp
Cole, N. Y.	Kee	Sheridan
Colmer	Kefauver	Short
Courtney	Keogh	Sparkman
Cox	Kerr	Stevenson
Crawford	Kinzer	Stewart
Curley	Klein	Stigler
Daughton, Va.	Latham	Stockman
Davis	LeCompte	Tolan
Dawson	Ludlow	Torrens
Dolliver	McGehee	Traynor
Douglas, Ill.	McKenzie	Vinson
Drewry	Mahon	Welch
Durham	Mansfield,	West
Dworshak	Mont.	Wickersham
Eaton	Mansfield, Tex.	Winstead
Eberharter	Mason	Wolfenden, Pa.
Elsaesser	Merrow	Worley
Engel, Mich.	Miller, Calif.	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr Short for, with Mr. Sheridan against.

Mr. Hoffman of Michigan for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Dolliver for, with Mr. Jackson against.

Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Dworshak for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Izac against.

Mr. Hoeven for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Coffee against.

Mr. Gillespie for, with Mr. Rayfiel against.

Mr. Robertson of North Dakota for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Latham for, with Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Kinzer for, with Mr. Rooney against.

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr. Camp for, with Mr. Quinn of New York against.

Mr. Peterson of Georgia for, with Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Adams for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Mr. Drewry for, with Mr. Torrens against.

Mr. Elsaesser for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Buckley against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr Rankin with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Rich.

Mr. Cox with Mr. Rodgers of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Bell with Mr. Crawford.

Mr. Mahon with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Byrne of New York with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.

Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Harness of Indiana.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Gerlach.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Hartley.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Engel of Michigan.

Mr. Norrell with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Davis with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. McGehee with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mrs. Douglas of Illinois with Mr. Cole of Kansas.

Mr. Sparkman with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. West with Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Rizley.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Stockman.

Mr. King with Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. Boren with Mr. Case of South Dakota.

Mr. Courtney with Mr. Bennet of New York.

Mr. Harris with Mr. Andrews of New York.

Mr. Mansfield of Montana with Mr. Sharp.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Traynor with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Page 11, line 14, after the word "exceed" strike out "$435,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$335,000,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH) there were—ayes 144, noes 130.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 152, nays 155, not voting 125, as follows:

[Roll No. 185]

YEAS—152

Allen, Ill.	Cole, Mo.	Hancock
Andersen,	Corbett	Hand
H. Carl	Cunningham	Henry
Andresen,	Curtis	Herter
August H.	D'Ewart	Heselton
Angell	Dirksen	Hess
Arends	Dondero	Hill
Arnold	Ellis	Hinshaw
Barrett, Wyo.	Ellsworth	Hoeven
Beall	Elston	Hoffman, Pa.
Bender	Fellows	Holmes, Mass.
Bennett, Mo.	Fenton	Holmes, Wash.
Bishop	Fuller	Hope
Blackney	Fulton	Horan
Bolton	Gamble	Howell
Brehm	Gavin	Jenkins
Brown, Ohio	Gearhart	Jennings
Brumbaugh	Gifford	Jensen
Buck	Gillette	Johnson, Calif.
Buffett	Gillie	Johnson, Ill.
Butler	Goodwin	Johnson, Ind.
Byrnes, Wis.	Graham	Jones
Campbell	Grant, Ind.	Jonkman
Canfield	Griffiths	Judd
Carlson	Gross	Kean
Case, N. J.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Keefe
Chenoweth	Gwynne, Iowa	Kilburn
Chiperfield	Hagen	Knutson
Church	Hale	Kunkel
Clason	Hall,	Landis
Clevenger	Leonard W.	LeFevre
Clippinger	Halleck	Lemke
Lewis	Pittenger	Stefan
Luce	Plumley	Sumner, Ill.
McConnell	Ramey	Sundstrom
McCowen	Reed, Ill.	Taber
McDonough	Reed, N. Y.	Talbot
McGregor	Rees, Kans.	Talle
McMillen, Ill.	Robsion, Ky.	Taylor
Martin, Iowa	Rockwell	Tibbott
Martin, Mass.	Roe, Md.	Vorys, Ohio
Mathews	Rogers, Mass.	Vursell
May	Schwabe, Mo.	Wadsworth
Michener	Schwabe, Okla.	Weichel
Miller, Nebr.	Scrivner	Wigglesworth
Mundt	Shafer	Wilson
Murray, Wis.	Simpson, Ill.	Winter
Norblad	Simpson, Pa.	Wolcott
O'Hara	Smith, Maine	Wolverton, N. J.
O'Konski	Smith, Ohio	Wood
Pace	Smith, Wis.	Woodruff
Phillips	Springer	

NAYS—155

Abernethy	Forand	Neely
Allen, La.	Gary	O'Brien, Ill.
Almond	Gathings	O'Brien, Mich.
Andrews, Ala.	Geelan	O'Neal
Bailey	Gordon	O'Toole
Baldwin, Md.	Gore	Outland
Barden	Gorski	Patman
Barry	Granahan	Peterson, Fla.
Bates, Ky.	Gregory	Pfeifer
Beckworth	Hare	Philbin
Biemiller	Harless, Ariz.	Pickett
Bland	Hart	Poage
Bloom	Havenner	Pratt
Bonner	Hays	Price, Fla.
Brooks	Healy	Price, Ill.
Brown, Ga.	Hébert	Priest
Bryson	Hendricks	Rabaut
Buchanan	Hobbs	Rabin
Bulwinkle	Hoch	Rains
Bunker	Hook	Randolph
Cannon, Mo.	Huber	Resa
Carnahan	Hull	Richards
Chapman	Jarman	Riley
Cheif	Johnson,	Robertson, Va.
Clark	Luther A.	Rogers, Fla.
Clements	Johnson,	Rogers, N. Y.
Combs	Lyndon B.	Rowan
Cooley	Kelley, Pa.	Russell
Cooper	Kelly, Ill.	Ryter
Cravens	Kilday	Sadowski
Crosser	King	Sasscer
D'Alesandro	Kirwan	Savage
De Lacy	Kopplemann	Sheppard
Delaney,	LaFollette	Sikes
James, J.	Lane	Slaughter
Delaney,	Lanham	Smith, Va.
John J.	Larcade	Somers, N. Y.
Dingell	Lea	Spence
Domengeaux	Lesinski	Starkey
Doughton, N. C.	Link	Sullivan
Douglas, Calif.	Lyle	Tarver
Douglas, Ill.	Lynch	Thom
Doyle	McCormack	Thomas, Tex.
Durham	Madden	Thomason
Earthman	Maloney	Trimble
Elliott	Manasco	Voorhis, Calif.
Engle, Calif.	Mankin	Walter
Fallon	Marcantonio	Wasielewski
Feighan	Mills	White
Flannagan	Monroney	Whitten
Flood	Morgan	Whittington
Fogarty	Murdock	Woodhouse
Folger	Murray, Tenn.	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—125

Adams	Davis	Holifield
Anderson, Calif.	Dawson	Izac
Andrews, N. Y.	Dolliver	Jackson
Auchincloss	Drewry	Johnson, Okla.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Dworshak	Kearney
Barrett, Pa.	Eaton	Kee
Bates, Mass.	Eberharter	Kefauver
Bell	Elsaesser	Keogh
Bennet, N. Y.	Engel, Mich.	Kerr
Boren	Ervin	Kinzer
Boykin	Fernandez	Klein
Bradley, Mich.	Fisher	Latham
Bradley, Pa.	Gallagher	LeCompte
Buckley	Gardner	Ludlow
Byrne, N. Y.	Gerlach	McGehee
Camp	Gibson	McGlinchey
Cannon, Fla.	Gillespie	McKenzie
Case, S. Dak.	Gossett	McMillan, S. C.
Celler	Granger	Mahon
Cochran	Grant, Ala.	Mansfield,
Coffee	Green	Mont.
Cole, Kans.	Hall,	Mansfield, Tex.
Cole, N. Y.	Edwin Arthur	Mason
Colmer	Harness, Ind.	Merrow
Courtney	Harris	Miller, Calif.
Cox	Hartley	Morrison
Crawford	Hedrick	Murphy
Curley	Heffernan	Norrell
Daughton, Va.	Hoffman, Mich.	Norton

Patrick	Robinson, Utah	Thomas, N. J.
Patterson	Rodgers, Pa.	Tolan
Peterson, Ga.	Roe, N. Y.	Torrens
Ploeser	Rooney	Towe
Powell	Sabath	Traynor
Quinn, N. Y.	Sharp	Vinson
Rankin	Sheridan	Weaver
Rayfiel	Short	Welch
Reece, Tenn.	Sparkman	West
Rich	Stevenson	Wickersham
Rivers	Stewart	Winstead
Rizley	Stigler	Wolfenden, Pa.
Robertson, N. Dak.	Stockman	Worley
	Sumners, Tex.	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hoffman of Michigan for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Dolliver for, with Mr Jackson against.

Mr. Dworshak for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Izac against.

Mr Auchincloss for, with Mr. Coffee against.

Mr. Crawford for, with Mr. Rayfiel against.

Mr. Robertson of North Dakota for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Latham for, with Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Kinzer for, with Mr Rooney against.

Mr. Adams for with Mr Eberharter against.

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Sheridan against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Vinson against.

Mr. Elsaesser for, with Mr. Camp against.

Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Gillespie for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Harness of Indiana for, with Mr. Quinn of New York against.

Mr. Bradley of Michigan for, with Mr. Heffernan against

Mr. Rogers of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. McGlinchey against.

Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall for, with Mr. Green against.

Mr. Cole of Kansas for, with Mr. Peterson of Georgia against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Rankin with Mr Mason.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Rich.

Mr. Sparkman with Mr Merrow.

Mr. Mahon with Mr Stevenson.

Mr. West with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Stockman.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Hartley.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Engel of Michigan.

Mr. Davis with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Fernandez with Mr LeCompte.

Mr. Hendricks with Mr Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Mansfield of Montana with Mr. Sharp.

Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Rizley.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Towe.

Mr. Cochran with Mr Gerlach.

Mr. Boren with Mr. Case of South Dakota.

Mr. Harris with Mr Andrews of New York.

Mr. Byrne of New York with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.

Mr. Traynor with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Courtney with Mr. Bennet of New York.

Mr. BROOKS changed his vote from "aye" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct typographical errors and section numbers in the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORTS ON GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on tomorrow to consider various reports on general appropriations bills, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2, rule XXVIII.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all who have spoken on the bill be permitted to extend their remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Gathing, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5716) entitled "An act to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6042) entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes."

STATE, COMMERCE, AND JUSTICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight in which to file a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6056) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Commerce, Justice, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday next week may be dispensed with.

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, I simply take this opportunity to state why I am not going to object. I am not going to object, so as to give an opportunity for the consideration of the Crosser bill on Wednesday and also because it is agreed that the contempt proceedings from the Wood committee will not be called up on Wednesday or next week.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I do not quite understand what the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] means by giving up Calendar Wednesday. Is the gentleman yielding in his effort and the effort of some of the rest of us?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Now, since the gentleman has taken that position——

Mr. BENDER. I am not taking any position. I am simply asking a question.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I can understand what is behind the gentleman's question and I want to answer it. I yield no effort nor any advantage. We want this railroad retirement bill considered. Calendar Wednesday is not being given up except for just one Wednesday, and that is done solely for the purpose of granting the railroad workers a chance to have their pension bill passed.

Mr. BENDER. Of course we do.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. It has been held up. I am not going to permit that bill to be held up any further.

Mr. BENDER. Who has been holding it up?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Just a minute. I am not going to have it held up by insisting on Calendar Wednesday and thus block completion of that bill.

Mr. BENDER. By what process of thinking or by what right does the gentleman assume to make such a statement? Has the gentleman any right to speak for the leadership?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am speaking for myself and for nobody else. I feel it is my responsibility as an individual Member of this House to do nothing that would obstruct further consideration of the Crosser bill. I intend no criticism of the majority leader. He has given full cooperation to bring about passage of the railroad pension bill.

Mr. BENDER. I would like the gentleman to inform me as to what has been done to obstruct consideration of that bill. I am not aware of any obstruction. We have been waiting for that bill just as anxiously as the gentleman has, but other business has come up here. Incidentally, those three resolutions in connection with the reorganization of the Government have been waiting. Those things come in order. I believe the leadership of the House is sincere, is genuine in trying to do this job in a regular and honorable way. I disagree with the gentleman from New York. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is doing the best job he can in order to expedite matters and bring things up here in order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL MENTAL HEALTH ACT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R.

4512) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research relating to psychiatric disorders and to aid in the development of more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such disorders, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers.

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. 4512) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research relating to psychiatric disorders and to aid in the development of more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such disorders, 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 amendment numbered 2.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 4, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: ", but only to the extent necessary for the purposes of such training and instruction"; and the Senate agree to the same.

J. PERCY PRIEST,
ALFRED L. BULWINKLE,
VIRGIL CHAPMAN,
CLARENCE J. BROWN,
THOMAS D. WINTER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CLAUDE PEPPER,
JAMES E. MURRAY,
LISTER HILL,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
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. 4512) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research relating to psychiatric disorders and to aid in the development of more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such disorders, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: In the provisions of the bill relating to the National Advisory Mental Health Council it is provided that six appointed members shall be selected from leading medical or scientific authorities who are outstanding in the study, diagnosis, or treatment of psychiatric disorders. The bill as it passed the House contained a sentence providing that three of the appointed members shall be selected from a panel of six such authorities to be submitted to the Surgeon General by the deans of the approved medical colleges and schools in the United States. This amendment of the Senate struck out this sentence. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 2: The bill in the proposed new section 303 of the Public Health Service Act authorizes the Surgeon General, in carrying out the purposes of section 301 with respect to mental health, to admit and treat, at the National Institute of Mental Health, patients of St. Elizabeths Hospital transferred from the hospital pursuant to the arrangements made by the Surgeon General and the Superintendent of the hospital with the approval of the Federal Security Administrator. In the bill as it passed the House this provision contained a proviso that the consent of a legal guardian shall be obtained before the transfer of any patient from St. Elizabeths Hospital for such treatment. This Senate amendment struck out the proviso contained in the bill as it passed the House. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 3: In the new section 303 of the Public Health Service Act, in the bill as it passed the House, the Surgeon General is authorized by clause (1) of subsection (b) to provide training and instruction, in matters relating to psychiatric disorders, to persons found by him to have proper qualifications, and, by clause (2), to provide such training and instruction, and demonstrations, through grants, upon recommendation of the National Advisory Mental Health Council, to public and other nonprofit institutions. By this amendment the Senate added a provision to clause (2) providing that such grants could include grants to such institutions "for the construction, acquisition, and leasing of hospital, clinic, laboratory, and related facilities, but only to the extent necessary for the purposes of such training and instruction." The House recedes with an amendment which eliminates that part of the Senate language which would authorize grants to such institutions for the construction, acquisition, and leasing of hospital, clinic, laboratory, and related facilities, but retains the other language of the Senate amendment so that clause (2) will read as follows: "(2) to provide such training and instruction, and demonstrations, through grants, upon recommendation of the National Advisory Mental Health Council, to public and other nonprofit institutions, but only to the extent necessary for the purposes of such training and instruction."

Amendment No. 4: Section 11 of the bill as it passed the House authorized the appropriation of not to exceed $4,500,000 for the erection and equipment, for the use of the Public Health Service in the carrying out of the provisions of this legislation, of suitable and adequate hospital buildings and facilities, including necessary living quarters for personnel, and of suitable and adequate laboratory buildings and facilities, such buildings and facilities to be known as the National Institute of Mental Health. This Senate amendment struck out "$4,500,000" and inserted "$7,500,000." The House recedes.

J. PERCY PRIEST,
ALFRED L. BULWINKLE,
VIRGIL CHAPMAN,
CLARENCE J. BROWN,
THOMAS D. WINTER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous report from the committee on conference.

There were four amendments to the bill as it passed the House. The Senate receded on two, the House receded on one, and an agreement with an amendment was worked out on the other. It is a unanimous report.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Tennessee has said, this is a unanimous report of the conference committee. The House yielded, in fact, on only one amendment, and that was a slight increase in the amount set up in the bill for the construction of the research center at Bethesda and was necessary because of the fact that the original estimated cost had been made in 1939 or early 1940 before the present increase in construction costs had come about. The increase allowed is simply enough to cover the increased costs of construction.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I should like to know what the gentleman considers a slight increase these days.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This increase happens to be from $4,500,000 to $7,500,000—a $3,000,000 increase. It does not accurately reflect the cost which has come about under the hold-the-line order of the administration of the gentleman from Tennessee, but we held it down to as close a percentage as we could. If we had provided for the actual increase, we should probably have had to double the amount. In fact, they figure that the total increase would bring the cost to something like $11,500,000, but the House committee as usual stood for economy and was able to hold it to $7,500,000.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECOND WAR POWERS ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5716) to amend the Second War Powers Act of 1942 as amended and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers may 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers.

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. 5716) to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Title XV of such Act, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"'SEC. 1503. Nothing contained in this Act or any other Federal Act (except the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, or the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended), shall be construed to authorize the establishment by any officer or agency of the Government of maximum prices for any commodity

or maximum rents for any housing accommodations.'"

And the House agree to the same.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,
SAM HOBBS,
C. E. HANCOCK,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
JAMES W. HUFFMAN,
HOMER FERGUSON,
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 amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5716) to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The Senate passed the bill after amending it to provide that nothing contained therein or any other act (except the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, or the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended), shall be construed to authorize the establishment by any officer or agency of the Government of maximum prices for any commodity or maximum rents for any housing accommodations. The House disagreed to the Senate amendment and requested the conference, to which the Senate agreed.

The House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate after it was modified to make clear the reference was to any Federal act, and to exempt also the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,
SAM HOBBS,
C. E. HANCOCK,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO].

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may include at this point in the RECORD correspondence from the War Assets Administration in reply to a protest of mine of the action of the Civilian Production Administration in violating the veterans' preference law for surplus property which became law on May 3 of this year.

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

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 25, 1946.

Hon. CARTER MANASCO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MANASCO: In accordance with your request to Mr. Robert J. Hayes, we enclose a copy of a teletype dated June 13, 1946, sent to all regional offices giving the substance of a directive issued by Civilian Production Administration with regard to the sale of rails to Treasury Procurement Division, acting as agent for UNRRA.

Also enclosed is a copy of War Assets Administration Daily Bulletin No. 12, which incorporates the teletype to the regions.

There is further enclosed a copy of the directive from Civilian Production Administration dated June 5, 1946.

As you have been advised, the Civilian Production Administration has issued Priorities Regulation No. 13, which is applicable to the disposal of surplus property, and the CPA from time to time issues specific directions under this regulation. We understand that CPA derives its authority to issue these directions from section 301 of the Second War Powers Act. Section 34 (b) of the Surplus Property Act states that "nothing in this act shall impair or affect the provisions of * * * section 301 of the Second War Powers Act, 1942."

Sincerely yours,

E. A. STANSFIELD,
Acting General Counsel.

JUNE 13, 1946.

To All Regional Offices:

Under date of June 5 the Civilian Production Administration filed with this office a directive pursuant to Priorities Regulation 13 covering 75- and 90-pound rails and accessories. In accordance with this directive, you are to freeze all 75- and 90-pound rails and accessories in your present inventory and all of these items which may be declared surplus to your office in the future. This directive covers the disposal up to 50,000 tons of the items as stated to the Treasury Procurement Division, acting as agent for UNRRA, subject to satisfactory financial arrangements. In accordance with this directive, you are to enter into sales negotiations with UNRRA, notifying this office when sales are consummated so that tonnage sold can be charged against 50,000 tons covered by directive. Acknowledgment this wire requested.

H. W. CORNELL,
For FRANK R. CREEDON,
Deputy Administrator for General Disposal.

JUNE 5, 1946.

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C.

(Attention: Mr. R. A. Stephens, Steel Division.)

GENTLEMEN: The fulfillment of requirements for the defense of the United States has created a shortage in the supply of rails and accessories for defense, for private account and for export.

In view of the urgent need of 75- and 90-pound rails and accessories for the rehabilitation of transportation facilities in China, the following action is taken:

Pursuant to priorities regulation No. 13 you are hereby directed to dispose up to 50,000 tons of 75- and 90-pound rails and accessories to the Treasury Procurement Division, acting as agents for UNRRA, subject to financial arrangements satisfactory to you.

This directive will expire September 30 or as soon as War Assets Administration has made available to the Treasury Procurement Division the 50,000 tons disclosed in this directive if that occurs before September 30, 1946.

Very truly yours,

J. JOSEPH WHELAN,
Recording Secretary.

SECTION V. PRIORITIES REGULATIONS COVERING 75- AND 90-POUND RAILS AND ACCESSORIES

1. Under date of June 5, the Civilian Production Administration filed with this office a directive pursuant to priorities regulation No. 13 covering 75- and 90-pound rails and accessories. In accordance with this directive you are to freeze all 75- and 90-pound rails and accessories in your present inventory and all of these items which may be declared surplus to your office in the future. This directive covers the disposal up to 50,000 tons of the items as stated, to the Treasury Procurement Division acting as agent for UNRRA, subject to satisfactory financial arrangements. In accordance with this directive you are to enter into sales negotiations with UNRRA notifying this office when sales are consummated so that tonnage sold can be charged against 50,000 tons covered by directive. Acknowledgment this wire requested.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICERS IN THE CLASSIFIED GRADES

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5244) to authorize the appointment of additional foreign-service officers in the classified grades, 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 New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5244) to authorize the appointment of additional foreign-service officers in the classified grades, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 to 20, inclusive, and 22, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21 and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 3 of the House bill strike out lines 16 and 17 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 6. The second paragraph of section 32 of the Act entitled 'An Act for the reorganization and improvement of the Foreign Service of the United States, and for other purposes,' approved May 24, 1924 (46 Stat. 1214), as amended, is amended to read as follows: ; and in lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment insert the following: or representatives duly authorized by such committees,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, and agree to the same.

SOL BLOOM,
LUTHER A. JOHNSON,
CHARLES A. EATON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr.,
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. 5244) to authorize the appointment of additional foreign-service officers in the classified grades, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendments Nos. 1 to 10, inclusive: These amendments are clarifying and clerical changes, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 11: This amendment permits personnel of the United States merchant marine to take the examinations for

appointment as a Foreign Service officer under the terms of the bill, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 12: This amendment insures that Government employees, including legislative employees, will be eligible for appointment as Foreign Service officers under the provisions of the bill, and the House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 13 to 18, inclusive: These amendments are clarifying and clerical changes, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 19: This amendment eliminated for appointment as Foreign Service officers vice consuls, not of career. The State Department informed the committee that these officials would be considered in subsequent proposed legislation which is now in process of formulation in the State Department. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 20 and 22: These amendments are clarifying and clerical changes, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 21: The amendment to the act for the reorganization and improvement of the Foreign Service of the United States permits the Legislative and Appropriations Committees of the Congress charged with legislating for and appropriating for the Department of State to have access to the correspondence and records of the Division of Foreign Service Personnel. As the bill passed the House, duly authorized representatives of such committees were also authorized to have access to such correspondence and records. The Senate amendment eliminated representatives of committees. The Department of State advised the conferees that they would have no objection to representatives of such committees having access to such correspondence and records if such representatives were so authorized by a majority of each such committee. The House recedes with an amendment permitting such representatives to have such access if authorized by a majority of their committee. The House amendment also contains a technical amendment amending the proper paragraph and section in the Statutes at Large rather than the United States Code which is only prima facie evidence of the law and was inserted in the House bill by an oversight. The House recedes.

The Senate amended the title to capitalize the words "Foreign Service" and the House recedes.

SOL BLOOM,
LUTHER A. JOHNSON,
CHARLES A. EATON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the conference report?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, the conferees agreed to the Senate amendments which are merely perfecting amendments. The only difference was that we agreed to all of theirs and they agreed to only one of ours. They receded and concurred with reference to the investigations involved in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] to the bill that was presented on the floor.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What is the amendment?

Mr. BLOOM. The amendment as it passed the House was that the Appropriations Committee, the Foreign Affairs Committee, and like committees of the Senate would have the right to investigate and look into all secret papers. The way the Senate had it it looked as if all employees, as well as Members and the committee could do this; so it was amended by the conferees so that any employee who was recommended by a majority of either of the committees of the House or Senate could investigate all of these secret papers. That is all there is to it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The bill went through the House rather quickly before the gentleman had a chance to discuss it thoroughly, including the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan. That was discussed fully in conference?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes. That has all been agreed to by the conferees.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is satisfactory to everybody?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is a unanimous agreement?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

House Resolution 675 was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEBTOR RAILROAD CORPORATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 687, Rept. No. 2405), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5924) to enable debtor railroad corporations, whose porperties during a period of 7 years have provided sufficient earnings to pay fixed charges, to effect a readjustment of their financial structure without further proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final pasasge without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of the bill H. R. 5924, it shall be in order in the House to take from the Speaker's Table the bill S. 1253 and to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H. R. 5924.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND] for today be vacated and that he be given a special order to address the House on Tuesday next for the same length of time.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

WAR PARENTS ORGANIZATION

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of those Members of the House who are members of the Congressional War Parents Organization, that on Wednesday last, June 26, there was placed in the Senate proceedings of the RECORD by Senator BRIDGES a list of parents and service-connected children with the request that any omissions or correction of the list be sent either to me or to him so that the final report on this may be accurate. We are desirous also of having the names and records of all Members who were in the service themselves.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the introduction by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, of his Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, at the occasion of the graduation exercises of the FBI National Academy in the Interdepartmental Auditorium in Washington, this morning.

Mr. WHITE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a communication.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois (at the request of Mr. FLOOD) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a poem by James Patrick McGovern.

Mr. THOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Christian Science Monitor on Farm Production.

Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one a speech by Mr. Raymond W. Miller, and in the other, two letters written by him to the State Department.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include newspaper items.

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST CORLISS G. LAMONT

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to House Reso-

lution 678, Seventy-ninth Congress, he did, today, June 28, 1946, certify to the United States attorney, District of Columbia, the willful and deliberate refusal of Corliss G. Lamont to produce before the Committee on Un-American Activities for its inspection certain books, papers, and records which had been duly subpenaed.

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. 6042. An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2341. An act to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2543. An act to require weekly newspapers enjoying mailing privileges to make sworn statements with respect to their circulation.

H. R. 6064. An act to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6084. An act to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide an increase in pay for personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, June 29, 1946, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1429. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 685. Resolution providing for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 138, a joint resolution to implement further the purposes of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out an agreement with the United Kingdom, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2399). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 686. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 5234, a bill to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to assist the States in matters relating to social protection, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2400). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6859. A bill to amend section 121 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, to authorize the appointment of three additional deputies for the register of wills; with amendment (Rept. No. 2404). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 687. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 5924, a bill to enable debtor railroad corporations, whose properties during a period of 7 years have provided sufficient earnings to pay fixed charges, to effect a readjustment of their financial structure without further proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2405). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. S. 294. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish upon a reimbursement basis certain benefits, services, and supplies to discharged members of the military or naval forces of any nation allied or associated with the United States in World War II, in consideration of reciprocal services extended to the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 2423). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the Civil Service. S. 1489. An act to authorize payment for accumulated and accrued annual leave to female dietitians and physical-therapy aides whose civilian appointments were terminated pursuant to section 4 of the act of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1073); without amendment (Rept. No. 2424). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. S. 1578. An act to clarify the terms "compensation" and "pension" under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 2425). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. S. 2099. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to accept gifts, devises, and bequests in behalf of the general post fund for the use of veterans and for the sale and conveyance of any such property under certain circumstances and the covering of the proceeds thereof into the post fund, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2426). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 2291. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer a vessel to the American Antarctic Association, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2427). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 5148. A bill to provide for the payment of pension or other benefits withheld from persons for the period they were residing in countries occupied by the enemy forces during World War II; with amendments (Rept. No. 2428). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the Civil Service. H. R. 5831. A bill to include the heads of executive departments and independent agencies within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930; without amendment (Rept. No. 2429). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the Civil Service. H. R. 6673. A bill to amend section 6 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2430). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. R. 6810. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provisions of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 2431). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 6836. A bill to establish and provide for the maintenance and operation of a Veterans' Canteen Service in the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2432). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the Civil Service. H. R. 6903. A bill to provide benefits for certain employees of the United States who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for probational civil-service appointments by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2433). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KLEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 1063. A bill for the relief of Marie Valida Antonia Michaud; without amendment (Rept. No. 2401). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 5620. A bill for the relief of Roger Edgar Lapierre; without amendment (Rept. No. 2402). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 5704. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Charles C. Lee; with amendment (Rept. No. 2403). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1070. A bill for the relief of Elmer C. Hadlen; with amendments (Rept. No. 2406). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3099. A bill for the relief of Coy C. Brown; with amendments (Rept. No. 2407). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3197. A bill for the relief of William F. Patchell, Jr.; with amendments (Rept. No. 2408). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1088. A bill for the relief of the Eastern Contracting Co., Inc.; with amendments (Rept. No. 2409). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2161. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon

the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Algernon Blair, his heirs or personal representatives, against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2410). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3833. A bill for the relief of Viola McKinney; with amendments (Rept. No. 2411). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4341. A bill for the relief of James B. McGoldrick; without amendment (Rept. No. 2412). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4375. A bill for the relief of Charles Martin; with amendments (Rept. No. 2413). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4686. A bill for the relief of the estate of Harry Wright; with amendments (Rept. No. 2414). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4947. A bill for the relief of Ethel Guenther; with amendments (Rept. No. 2415). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5198. A bill for the relief of Marjorie B. Marable; with amendments (Rept. No. 2416). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5261. A bill for the relief of David Weiss, with amendments (Rept. No. 2417). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5372. A bill for the relief of Jessie Wolfington; with amendments (Rept. No. 2418). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5414. A bill for the relief of Marie Gorak; with amendments (Rept. No. 2419). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5725. A bill for the relief of Sadie Frey and the estate of Marie Hviding; with amendments (Rept. No. 2420). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6248. A bill for the relief of Capital Office Equipment Co.; with amendments (Rept. No. 2421). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6307. A bill for the relief of Francesco D'Emilio; without amendment (Rept. No. 2422). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 6909. A bill authorizing the appointment of three additional judges of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, prescribing the qualifications of appointees to the municipal court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 6910. A bill relating to the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange sites at Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Fla., for Coast Guard purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina:

H. R. 6911. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 6912. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 6913. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 6914 A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 6915. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 6916. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 6917. A bill to provide for site acquisition and design of Federal buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 6918. A bill to provide emergency relief for the victims of the seismic waves which struck the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. DAUGHTON of Virginia:

H. R. 6919. A bill relating to the display, along with the flag of the United States of America, of flags, banners, and pennants of certain organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 6920. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

H. R. 6921. A bill to amend section 7 (c) of the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PFEIFER:

H. R. 6922. A bill to establish a Department of Health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 6923. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, so as to exempt World War II veterans from liability for further training and service in the armed forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 6924. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act so as to provide insurance for certain crops planted for harvest in 1947; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 6925. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act so as to provide for the United States to pay 25 percent of insurance premiums; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DAUGHTON of Virginia:

H. R. 6926. A bill for the relief of George W. Whitehurst; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 6927. A bill for the relief of Paul C. Juneau; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 6928. A bill for the relief of Dudley Tarver; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEWART:

H. R. 6929. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred H. Gibbons, Chief Clerk, Hugo, Okla., Farm Security Administration, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 6930. A bill for the relief of John Bettencourt, surviving husband of Leona Bettencourt; and for the relief of Nancy Kathleen Bettencourt, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

2043. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution of William B. Mawhinney Memorial Post, No. 1593, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Hawthorne, N. J., calling for the deportation of alien enemy persons interned for subversive activities; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2044. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of City Council of the city of Chicago, for dredging an 18-foot channel for North Branch of the Chicago River between North Avenue and Belmont Avenue; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2045. By Mr. ROWAN: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fourth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, regarding freedom of those who labor; to the Committee on Labor.

2046. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Berry Campbell, Minneapolis, Minn., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the McMahon atomic energy control bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2047. Also, petition of Francis Jean Reuter, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to case, Air Corps against Francis Jean Reuter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

SATURDAY, JUNE 29, 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:

O Father of mankind, to whom all souls are dear and whose tender mercies are over all Thy works, as we come our grateful hearts are singing, "This is the day the Lord has made; therefore we will rejoice and be glad in it." Turning to this morning garden of silence from a world so full of tumult and passion, setting our faces toward waiting tasks, we pray for guidance and for strength. Save us, we beseech Thee, from all error, pride, and prejudice. Grant us that candor which is the high courage of the soul. Help us to find in each problem and perplexity but the prelude to those larger understandings which in a desert of denials and betrayals of truth and freedom shall