to be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The coins would be issued at par and only upon request of the Booker T. Washington Birthday Memorial.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6528) to authorize the coinage of 60-cent pieces to commemorate the life and perpetuate the ideals and teachings of Booker T. Washington.

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

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, as I understand, this follows the established form for the issuance of such coins.

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Was the bill unanimously reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. WAGNER. The bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as I understand, this is a bill to provide for the issuance of the Booker T. Washington memorial coin.

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

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

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BARKEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.), the Senate took a recess. It met in the Supreme Court Chamber, Friday, July 26, 1946, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 25 (legislative day of July 5), 1946:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Richard Seymour Bodine, of Delaware, to be United States district judge for the district of Delaware. (Nomination.)

GOVERNORS OF PUERTO RICO

Jesús T. Piñero, of Puerto Rico, to be Governor of Puerto Rico, vice Reford Guy Tugwell.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

The following-named persons to be members in said Council of Economic Advisers: Leon H. Keyserling, of New York; John Davidson Clark, of Wyoming.

OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION

The following-named person to be a member of the National Board, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion:

PUBLIC MEMBER


SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Commander John F. Robinson for appointment as State director of selective service for Connecticut 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 will be at the rate of $7,561 per annum.)

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States:

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANT


CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 25 (legislative day of July 5), 1946:

UNITED NATIONS—GENERAL ASSEMBLY TO BE HELD IN NEW YORK CITY, SEPTEMBER 1946 TO BE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AT THE OPENING SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Warren R. Austin, United States Senator from the State of Michigan; Tom Connally, United States Senator from the State of Texas; Arthur H. Vandenberg, United States Senator from the State of Michigan; Mrs. Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, of New York; Sol Bloom, a Member of the United States House of Representatives from the State of New York.

TO BE ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SECOND PART OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Charles A. Elton, a Member of the United States House of Representatives from the State of New Jersey; Helen Gaahagan Douglas, a Member of the United States House of Representatives from the State of New York.

TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO ITALY

James Clemen Dunn

TO BE A CONSUL GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Harry F. Hawley

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS, UNCLASSIFIED, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA


DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mustin G. White, to be Solicitor of the Department of the Interior.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

Harry E. Kokolade, to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Theodore Levin, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Michigan.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Dan B. Shields, to be United States attorney for the district of Utah.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Donald A. Draughon, to be United States marshal for the district of Puerto Rico.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 25, 1946

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m. Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the Lord and Master of us all, grant that we may in the midst of the strain and stress of our days we may have a vivid assurance of Thy sovereignty, not as an arbitrary power, but as the guiding intelligence whose wisdom never falters and whose love and whose thoughts concerning us are those of love and peace.

We humbly confess that we try to plan wisely and labor conscientiously, and yet how feeble our human wisdom and how fruitless all our efforts! May we respond more earnestly and eagerly to the leading of Thy spirit as Thou dost seek to instill within us a sense of what Thou wouldst have us do.

Emancipate us from weakness and weariness, from doubt and despair, from impatience and timidity as we are challenged to give life and all its experiences a more valiant reading.

Help us enter into a deeper and more joyous fellowship with Thee and with all mankind by making a daring trial of those cardinal virtues of trust, obedience, and fidelity, and those lofty principles of justice, righteousness, and good will which Thou hast ordained.

Make us one with Thee and our fellow men in the spirit of the Christ in whose name we offer our prayers. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1426. An act to provide for the replanning and rebuilding of alum, bighted, and other areas of the District of Columbia, and the assembly, by purchase or condemnation, of real property in such areas and the sale or lease thereof for the redevelopment of such area in accordance with said plans; and to provide for the organization of, procedure for, and the financing of, the planning, acquisition, and sale or lease; and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (H. Res. 225) entitled "An act to enable debtor railroad corporations expeditiously to effectuate reorganizations of their financial structures;
to alter or modify their financial obligations; and for other purposes; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing vote of the Senate, and appoints Mr. Wheeler, Mr. Johnson of Colorado, Mr. Tunnell, Mr. Reed, and Mr. Moos to be the conferers on the part of the Senate.

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 to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 371) entitled "An act extending the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 4051) entitled "An act to grant to enlisted personnel of the armed forces certain benefits in lieu of accumulated leave," disagree to the House; agrees to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Thomas of Utah, Mr. Johnson of Colorado, Mr. Hill, Mr. Gurney, and Mr. Revery to be the conferers on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. Barkley and Mr. Brower members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following department and agencies:

1. Department of the Navy.
3. National Archives.
4. Veterans' Administration.

KARL E. BOND
Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 789) for the reorganization of the Government Printing Office, wishing it to be referred to the Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the joint resolution, and ask for a conference with the House on the disagreeing vote of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico? (After a pause.) The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferers: Messrs. Fernandez, Hendrick, and Jennings.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Recom and include two newspaper clippings.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Recom and include a brief article by Mr. Horace Fisher Fuller, Jr.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE
Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?
There was no objection.

(Mr. Baldwin of New York addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.)

REPUBLIC ADMINISTRATION WILL REDUCE FEDERAL EXPENDITURES
Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a Republican-controlled House of Representatives next year will reduce Federal expenditures below $32,000,000,000 for the fiscal year following its election, will balance the budget, and provide a surplus to be applied on the reduction of the national debt.

Total expenditures during the current fiscal year have been estimated at $42,000,000,000 by Government economists and at $47,400,000,000 by Senator Taft. This means a deficit of $8,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000.

It is futile for the Democratic Party, which has become the pliant servant of Federal bureaucrats, to promise much-needed reductions in Government spending by the House which would be under no obligation to the personnel in Federal departments and bureaus and would consider all appropriation bills with the interest of the country as a whole in mind. It will be the definite purpose of Republicans on the appropriation committee and in charge of the legislative machinery of the House to dismantle this Government machine built up by the New Deal in the thirties and overexpanded during the war years.

It will be history repeating itself. After the First World War, the country returned from the Democratic Party to the Republicans. The Republicans dismantled the war government, balanced the budget, reduced taxes three times, and had surplus revenue of $10,000,000,000 to apply on the national debt. The pattern of what is ahead of us in 1947 and 1948 is identical. Governor Dewey's famous slogan, "Time for a change" is most appropriate.

CONSENT CALENDAR
The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call first the bill on the Consent Calendar.

COAST GUARD ENLISTMENTS FOR DUTY AT LIFEBOAT STATIONS
The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6210) to authorize the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to extend the enlistments of certain individuals for duty at lifeboat stations during the year 1946.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?
There was no objection.

FIRST WAR POWERS ACT, 1941
The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6850) to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?
There was no objection.

INDIAN SERVICE IRRIGATION PROJECTS
The Clerk called the bill (S. 115) to modify sections 4 and 20 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934, with reference to certain funds collected within the operation of Indian Service irrigation projects, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Sec. 1. (a) The provisions of the Act of March 13, 1934, (48 Stat. 589) entitled "An act to provide for the operation and maintenance of irrigation projects in connection with the disposal of water from public domain and Indian and forest lands," in so far as the same may be required or permitted to be under no obligation to the personnel in Federal departments and bureaus and would consider all appropriation bills with the interest of the country as a whole in mind. It will be the definite purpose of Republicans on the appropriation committee and in charge of the legislative machinery of the House to dismantle this Government machine built up by the New Deal in the thirties and overexpanded during the war years.

It will be history repeating itself. After the First World War, the country returned from the Democratic Party to the Republicans. The Republicans dismantled the war government, balanced the budget, reduced taxes three times, and had surplus revenue of $10,000,000,000 to apply on the national debt. The pattern of what is ahead of us in 1947 and 1948 is identical. Governor Dewey's famous slogan, "Time for a change" is most appropriate.

CONSENT CALENDAR
The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call first the bill on the Consent Calendar.

COAST GUARD ENLISTMENTS FOR DUTY AT LIFEBOAT STATIONS
The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6210) to authorize the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to accept enlistments of certain individuals for duty at lifeboat stations during the year 1946.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?
There was no objection.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER PARKWAY
The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6690) to authorize the survey of a proposed Mississippi River Parkway for the purpose of determining the feasibility of such a national parkway, and for other purposes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?
There was no objection.

FIRST WAR POWERS ACT, 1941
The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6850) to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?
There was no objection.
The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled
"An act to provide benefits for injury, death, or detention of employees of contractors with the United States outside the United States," as amended, for the purpose of making the 100-percent-earning provisions effective as of January 1, 1942.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

COMPENSATION TO EMPLOYEES OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6997) to amend the act entitled "Compensation for injury, death, or detention of employees of contractors with the United States outside the United States," as amended, for the purpose of making the 100-percent-earning provisions effective as of January 1, 1942.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled
"An act to provide benefits for the injury, death, or detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes," approved December 2, 1942, is amended by adding to the final proviso in the last paragraph of section 101 (b) (1) thereof, as added by title I of the act approved December 29, 1943 (57 Stat. 626), upon changing the final period to a semicolon, the following:

That hereafter the funds of any tribe of Indians under the control of the United States shall be set aside for payment of insurance, premium for protection of the property of the tribe against fire, theft, tornado, hail, earthquake, or other natural disaster, and for protection against liability on account of injuries or damages to persons or property and other like claims.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPOSAL AGENCY FOR SURPLUS PROPERTY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6997) to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to extend the disposal agency for surplus property outside the continental United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes.

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES CAPITOL GROUNDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6998) to extend the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 2465, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States Capitol Grounds shall comprise all squares, parks, streets, parks, and other areas as defined on a map entitled "Map showing areas comprising United States Capitol Grounds," approved by the Architect of the Capitol and recorded in the Office of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia in book 16, page 8, and the jurisdiction and control over the United States Capitol Grounds, heretofore vested by law in the Architect of the Capitol, is hereby extended to the entire area of the United States Capitol Grounds as defined on the aforementioned map, and the Architect of the Capitol shall be responsible for the maintenance and improvement thereof: Provided, That the said streets and roadways in said United States Capitol Grounds shall be shown on said map as being under the jurisdiction and control of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, who shall continue to exercise jurisdiction and control, and said Commissioners shall be responsible for the maintenance and improvement thereof: Provided further, That the District of Columbia shall be permitted to enter any part of said United States Capitol Grounds for the purpose of repairing or maintaining, or, subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, for the purpose of constructing or reconstructing, any utility service of the District of Columbia government.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6997) to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to extend the disposal agency for surplus property outside the continental United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes.

There was no objection.

DISPOSAL AGENCY FOR SURPLUS PROPERTY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6997) to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to extend the disposal agency for surplus property outside the continental United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this bill contains items of major importance and consideration, I adjudge that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES CAPITOL GROUNDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6998) to extend the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 2465, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States Capitol Grounds shall comprise all squares, parks, streets, parks, and other areas as defined on a map entitled "Map showing areas comprising United States Capitol Grounds," approved by the Architect of the Capitol and recorded in the Office of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia in book 16, page 8, and the jurisdiction and control over the United States Capitol Grounds, heretofore vested by law in the Architect of the Capitol, is hereby extended to the entire area of the United States Capitol Grounds as defined on the aforementioned map, and the Architect of the Capitol shall be responsible for the maintenance and improvement thereof: Provided, That the said streets and roadways in said United States Capitol Grounds shall be shown on said map as being under the jurisdiction and control of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, who shall continue to exercise jurisdiction and control, and said Commissioners shall be responsible for the maintenance and improvement thereof: Provided further, That the District of Columbia shall be permitted to enter any part of said United States Capitol Grounds for the purpose of repairing or maintaining, or, subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, for the purpose of constructing or reconstructing, any utility service of the District of Columbia government.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6997) to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to extend the disposal agency for surplus property outside the continental United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes.

There was no objection.

DISPOSAL AGENCY FOR SURPLUS PROPERTY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6997) to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to extend the disposal agency for surplus property outside the continental United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this bill contains items of major importance and consideration, I adjudge that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES CAPITOL GROUNDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6998) to extend the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 2465, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States Capitol Grounds shall comprise all squares, parks, streets, parks, and other areas as defined on a map entitled "Map showing areas comprising United States Capitol Grounds," approved by the Architect of the Capitol and recorded in the Office of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia in book 16, page 8, and the jurisdiction and control over the United States Capitol Grounds, heretofore vested by law in the Architect of the Capitol, is hereby extended to the entire area of the United States Capitol Grounds as defined on the aforementioned map, and the Architect of the Capitol shall be responsible for the maintenance and improvement thereof: Provided, That the said streets and roadways in said United States Capitol Grounds shall be shown on said map as being under the jurisdiction and control of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, who shall continue to exercise jurisdiction and control, and said Commissioners shall be responsible for the maintenance and improvement thereof: Provided further, That the District of Columbia shall be permitted to enter any part of said United States Capitol Grounds for the purpose of repairing or maintaining, or, subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, for the purpose of constructing or reconstructing, any utility service of the District of Columbia government.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6997) to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to extend the disposal agency for surplus property outside the continental United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes.

There was no objection.

DISPOSAL AGENCY FOR SURPLUS PROPERTY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6997) to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to extend the disposal agency for surplus property outside the continental United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this bill contains items of major importance and consideration, I adjudge that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES CAPITOL GROUNDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6998) to extend the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 2465, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?
The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 6969) was laid on the table.

DISPOSITION OF VESSELS, TROPHIES, RELICS, AND MATERIAL OF HISTORICAL INTEREST BY THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1547) to provide for the disposition of vessels, trophies, relics, and material of historical interest by the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The Speaker, Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized, upon such terms and conditions as he may in his discretion prescribe, to transfer by gift or otherwise obsolete or condemned vessels of the United States Navy or captured vessels in the possession of the Navy to any of the several States, Territories, or possessions of the United States, and political subdivisions, or municipal corporations thereof, the District of Columbia, Canal Zone, or any recognized war veterans associations, or associations whose charter or articles of agreement denies them the right to operate under the regulations of the Secretary of the Navy, and for the disposition of any vessel shall include a stipulation that the transferee shall maintain the vessel as a museum for the benefit of the public.

The Speaker, Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was passed.
models, and other condemned or obsolete material, trophies, and flags, and other material of historic interest which shall not include any records of the Federal Government as defined in the act approved July 7, 1945 (57 Stat. 290, U. S. C. 290).

Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to loan or give to any individual who sponsored a ship or vessel, the name plate or any article, material, or equipment, including donations of silver service, may receive such devices and trophies as he may determine to be of war or victory bonds, and to any other person, State, group, or organization named in this act who furnished any material, article, or equipment at the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy. The loans or gifts described in sections 2 and 3 of this act shall be made subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, and the Governor shall be at no expense in connection with any such loan or gift.

Sec. 4. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to transfer, without reimbursement, such devices and trophies as he may, in his discretion determine, to the Secretary of the Treasury for the promotion of the sale of war or victory bonds, and to any other Government agency for scientific, experimental, monumental, or display purposes. The Secretary of the Treasury shall be entitled to sell or donate such war devices and trophies for the promotion of the sale of war or victory bonds.

Sec. 5. Any person who gave or loaned binoculars to the United States or to the United Nations in order that such binoculars might be used in the naval service during World War II and to whom the binoculars or loaned cannot be returned shall be entitled to receive from the Secretary of the Navy binoculars similar in type to the binoculars given or loaned.

Sec. 6. No loan, in or gift authorized by section 1 or 2 of this act shall take effect until a statement of the proposal to make such transfer shall be transmitted to the Congress. The transfers authorized by section 1 of this act shall take effect upon the expiration of the first period of sixty calendar days of continuous session of the Congress following the date on which information of the proposal to make such transfer is transmitted to the Congress; but only if, between the date of transmittal and the expiration of the sixty-day period, no transfer has not been passed by the two Houses a concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress does not favor the proposed loan or gift.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

Mr. SPRINGER. The Clerk read the title of the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE ACT TO PROVIDE FOR RETIREMENT ANNUITIES OF CIVILIAN MEMBERS OF TEACHING STAFF AT UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6993) to further amend the act of January 18, 1936; as amended, entitled "An act to provide for the retirement and retirement annuities of civilian members of the teaching staff at the United States Naval Academy and the Postgraduate School, United States Naval Academy." The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute the bill S. 2253.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill:

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Be it enacted, etc., That the act of January 16, 1936 (49 Stat. 1092; 28 U. S. C. 1073-1078), entitled "An act to provide for the retirement and retirement annuities of the civilian members of the teaching staff at the United States Naval Academy and the Postgraduate School, United States Naval Academy," as amended by the act of November 29, 1935 (49 Stat. 1276; 77 Stat. 275), is further amended by inserting therein two new sections Nos. 4B and 4C, reading as follows:

Any civilian teacher who is forced to retire under this section shall be entitled to his full annuity, which under the amendment provided for the Military Academy was not to exceed the military annuity and which is hereinafter referred to as the actuarial value of the single life annuity provided by this act, or as the amount of his actuarial value as defined in section 4A of this act, at the option of the individual, shall be provided for in one of the following ways:

1. A single life annuity at the actuarial value of the single life annuity provided by this act, as defined in section 4A of this act, shall be provided for the lifetime of the individual.

2. A double life annuity at the actuarial value of the single life annuity provided by this act, as defined in section 4A of this act, shall be provided for the lifetime of the individual and his dependent spouse, if any.

3. A single life annuity at the actuarial value of the single life annuity provided by this act, as defined in section 4A of this act, shall be provided for the lifetime of the individual and his ages surviving spouse, if any.

4. A joint and survivor annuity at the actuarial value of the single life annuity provided by this act, as defined in section 4A of this act, shall be provided for the lifetime of the individual and his dependent spouse, if any, and the individual's surviving spouse, if any.

The act and the present act are hereby repealed.
The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 6993) was laid on the table.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGE TO PROPERTY UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE NAVY DEPARTMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6994) to the journal of the Navy to delegate the authority to compromise and settle claims for damages to property under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute a similar bill, S. 2349.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of December 5, 1945 (Public Law 246, 79th Cong.) is hereby amended by adding another section thereto as follows:

"Sec. 4. Where the net amount received in settlement does not exceed $1,000, the authority of the Secretary of the Navy as set forth in this section may be exercised by such person or persons as he may designate."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 6994) was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 304 OF THE NAVAL RESERVE ACT OF 1938

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7039) to further amend section 304 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, so as to grant certain benefits to naval personnel engaged in training duty prior to official termination of World War II.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

"Be it enacted, etc., That section 304 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

In the following new proviso immediately before the final proviso of the section: "Provided further, That any member of the Naval Reserve performing active duty with or without pay for periods of 30 days or less, with or without pay, on duty or drills, equivalent instruction or duty, appropriate duty, or prescribed duty, or while performing authorized travel or in the performance of such duties, prior to the official termination of World War II, shall be entitled to all the benefits provided by this section to the members of the Naval Reserve in time of peace.""

Sec. 2. This amendment shall be effective as of December 1, 1945.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a second time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ATOMIC ENERGY CONFERENCES

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Bacon] has been called out of the city. He is one of the conferees on the bill S. 1717, the atomic energy bill. Due to his enforced absence, I ask unanimous consent that he be excused from serving as a conferee and that the Speaker appoint some other Member in his place.

The Speaker. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Speaker. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Durham] as a conferee, and the Senate will be notified of this action.

CONSENT CALENDAR

WAR CONTRACT HARDSHIP CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1477) to authorize relief in certain cases where work, supplies, or services have been furnished for the Government under contracts during the war.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

"Be it enacted, etc., That where work, supplies, or services have been furnished between December 7, 1941, and August 14, 1945, under a contract or subcontract, for any department or agency of the Government which prior to the latter date was authorized to enter into contracts and amendments or modifications of contracts under section 201 of the First War Powers Act, 1941 (50 U. S. C. Supp. IV, app. sec. 611), such departments and agencies are hereby authorized, in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the President, where the date of approval of this act, to consider, adjust, and settle equitable claims of contractors, including subcontractors and materialmen performing work or furnishing supplies or services to the contractor or another subcontractor, for losses (not including diminution of anticipated profits) incurred between December 7, 1941, and August 14, 1945, without fault or negligence on their part in the performance of such contracts or subcontracts. Settlement of such claims shall be made or approved by such authority as the President shall designate, and may be adjusted in accordance with principles of fairness, equity, and public policy. The authority to adjust such claims may be exercised by any department or agency concerned or by a central authority therein designated by such head.

Sec. 2. (a) In arriving at a fair and equitable settlement of claims under this act, the respective departments and agencies shall not allow any amounts in excess of the amount of the net loss (less the amount of any relief granted subsequent to the establishment of such loss) on all contracts and subcontracts held by the claimant under which work, supplies, or services were furnished between December 7, 1941, and August 14, 1945, and shall consider with respect to such contracts and subcontracts (1) action taken under the renegotiation act (50 U. S. C. Supp. IV, app. sec. 1191), the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 (50 U. S. C. Supp. IV, sec. 101-125), or similar legislation; (2) relief granted under section 201 of the First War Powers Act, 1941, or otherwise; and (3) relief proposed to be granted under this act. The Board or agency shall have the power to determine the amount, if any, to which such claimant and petitioner may be equitably entitled (not exceeding the amount which might have been allowed by such department or agency concerned under the terms of this act) and to enter an order directing such department or agency to settle the claim in accordance with the finding of the court; and thereafter either party may appeal from the decision of the court as in other equity cases.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "December 7, 1941" and insert "September 16, 1940."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE FUGITIVE FELON ACT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 496) to make it a criminal offense for certain escaped convicts to travel from one State to another.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

"Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act making it unlawful for any person to escape from any criminal punishment in the United States or the District of Columbia, with intent either (1) to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction for murder, kidnaping, burglary, forgery, robbery, rape, treason, or espionage, or (2) to avoid military training or service in the armed forces of the United States, shall not be deemed an attempt to travel from one State to another," be, and it hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"(a) It shall be unlawful for any person to move or travel in interstate or foreign commerce from any State, Territory, or possession of the United States or the district of Columbia, with intent either (1) to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction for murder, kidnaping, burglary, forgery, perjury, espionage, treason, or any other crime under the laws of any State, or (2) to avoid military training or service in the armed forces of the United States, or (3) to avoid performance of any other legal or governmental obligation, shall be punished by imprisonment or fine, or both, for not more than ten years."
SALE OF PUBLIC LANDS FOR USE AND
BENEFIT OF STATE PUBLIC EDUCATIONAL
INSTITUTIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7038) to provide for the sale of certain public lands in the States for the use and benefit of the State public educational institutions.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Page 2, line 17, strike out the word "lower" and insert the word "higher".

SEC. 2. Such land shall be sold to the highest bidder, but at not less than its appraised value, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, after at least 30 days' notice of the sale published in a newspaper of general circulation in the county or counties in which such land is located. For a period of not less than 30 days after the time for presenting bids has expired, however, a preference right to purchase the offered land at the highest price bid or at twice the appraised value, whichever be lower, shall be given: First, to the person who is then the leasing holder; second, to the owner or lessee of any property on or next to said tract or tracts; and third, to the owners of contiguous land who do not qualify for a first preference. Where two or more persons apply to exercise such preference right claimed in a sale the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make an equitable division of the land among such applicants. In addition to the sale price the purchaser shall pay to the United States the cost of advertising for sale the tract or tracts purchased by him.

SEC. 3. In any case where the Secretary of the Interior determines that the land offered for sale under this act shall be upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or by both such fine and imprisonment. Violations of this Act may be prosecuted only in the Federal courts.

SEC. 4. Sales under this act shall be subject to the General Appraisals Act of 1946, as amended (49 U.S.C. sections 11-113), which the land be in isolated or disconnected tracts or parcels of 2,560 acres or less, and are unsuitable or undesirable for settlement under the homestead law, or for any present or future Federal use or project. In the event that a tract or parcel subject to sale under this act is not sold pursuant to such offer, it shall be reoffered for sale at any time prior to the expiration of a period of not less than 90 days after the time for presenting bids has expired, or of the receipt of offers which are less than the appraised value of the land.

SEC. 5. Any sale under this act shall be subject to leases, easements, or other rights existing in or to the land at the time of the act, but any rentals or other charges except those relating to the mineral rights retained by the United States, which shall have been reserved by the Secretary, shall be paid to the purchaser or to his successors in interest. No sale shall defeat any valid right which has already attached to the land under any pending entry or location.

SEC. 6. Patents for any land purchased under this act shall contain a reservation to the United States of oil, gas, coal, and all other mineral deposits in the land, together with the right to prospect for, mine, remove, or lease the same.

SEC. 7. All moneys received for the sale of lands under this act shall be deposited in the Treasury and at the end of each fiscal year 90 percent of all such moneys except the amounts paid to the present and future Federal use or project, shall be remitted by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State in which the lands for which such moneys were received are situated, to be expended for the use and benefit of the public schools or other public educational institutions, as the legislature of the State may direct: Provided, That the funds remitted to the State of Wyoming shall be used for the benefit of the University of Wyoming for either or both of the following purposes: Construction of permanent buildings for the university or for the retirement of indebtedness on existing permanent buildings.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 3, line 9, after the word "discharge", delete the period and insert a comma, and after the comma insert the words "and who will personally use the land or will use it to establish and maintain their own gainful enterprise."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEMKE: Page 3, line 9, after the comma, insert the words "at not more than $1.50 per acre: page 3, line 17, strike out the word "white"; and page 2, line 23, strike out the word "lower" and insert the word "higher."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming: Page 5, line 5, insert a new section as follows: "Sec. 9. All moneys received in this act an economic unit is defined to be an area capable of supporting year around sufficient cattle or sheep to provide a livelihood for a family at a reasonable cost."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to recon sider was laid on the table.
Mr. RANKIN. I do not know about that.

Mr. KEAN. In other words, in the past it has been done only once in 15 years.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not know whether it would establish a precedent; it would depend upon conditions in the future, as to whether the practical thing in the situation might be to publish them more frequently.

Mr. RANKIN. It certainly would be a convenience to the Members of Congress; I have no doubt about that.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree with that statement.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, created under section 3 of the River and Harbor Act, approved June 13, 1902, is authorized to prepare a revised edition of House Document No. 106, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, containing all preliminary examination and survey and review reports transmitted to Congress prior to July 31, 1946.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read, the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENACTMENT OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS NOW INCLUDED IN THE NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1946

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1917) to enact provisions now included in the Naval Appropriations Act, 1946, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

BE IT ENACTED, That when authorized by the Secretary of the Navy, and when in his opinion it will be of benefit to the conduct of the work of the Navy Department, personnel in naval establishments may attend meetings of technical, professional, scientific, and other similar organizations and meetings in their personal capacity, or at their expenses at the rates authorized by law.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy may provide for the physical examination by civilians of employees engaged in hazardous occupations where the professional services of the Medical Department are not available, and may compensate such civilians on a contract or fee basis for such professional services at the rates customary in the locality.

SEC. 3. In addition to all other allowances authorized by law, the following amounts may be paid annually, out of the naval appropriations available for pay, to the officers serving in the following capacities, such amounts to be expended in their respective budgets on the provisions for the maintenance of the Government of the United States in the act of March 4, 1921 (29 Stat. 950; 34 U. S. C. 907), are hereby repealed:

SEC. 5. The third paragraph under the head "Naval Department" in the act of March 4, 1904 (33 Stat. 117; 5 U. S. C. 415.), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 6. Within the limits of appropriations made therefor, the Secretary of the Navy may authorize to provide for all emergencies, and extraordinary expenses arising in the Naval Establishment, and for the maintenance of all nonrecurring and unexpected contingencies, such assistance as he deems proper, and may determine thereon shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officer of the Government, and he may make a certificate of the amount of such expenditures as he may consider advisable not to specify and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended.

SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to employ such civilian professors, lecturers, and instructors as he may deem necessary for the proper instruction of naval personnel at the Naval War College and the Naval Academy, and the professors, lecturers, and instructors are authorized to be paid out of the public Treasury from such funds as may be available, such compensation as the Secretary of the Navy may, from time to time, and pass, to his opinion, it will be of benefit to the professional personnel in naval establishments.

(b) The first paragraph under the head "Naval Academy" in the act of August 23, 1916 (39 Stat. 607), as amended (34 U. S. C. 1771), and section 9 of the Act of August 1, 1921 (35 U. S. C. 1072), are hereby repealed.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to award medals, trophies, badges, and cash prizes to naval personnel or groups thereof (including personnel of the reserve component to whom he may direct the attention thereon shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officer of the Government, and he may make a certificate of the amount of such expenditures as he may consider advisable not to specify and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended.

SEC. 9. Uniforms and other equipment or material issued to the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps in accordance with law may be furnished from surplus or reserve stocks of the Navy without payment.

SEC. 10. Officers and personnel of the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve on active duty shall not be entitled to receive pay, allowances, travel, or other expenses while engaged in attending meetings of technical, professional, scientific, and other similar organizations and meetings in their personal capacity, or at their expenses at the rates authorized by law.

SEC. 11. Other than members of the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve and eligible to be appointed as midshipmen or to be appointed as naval officers by the Secretary of the Navy, to act as midshipmen, officers engaged in hazardous occupations in the Naval Establishment and for the maintenance of the Government of the United States in the act of March 4, 1921 (29 Stat. 950; 34 U. S. C. 907); and the proviso in the first paragraph under the head "Naval Home" in the act of July 25, 1940 (40 Stat. 721), are hereby repealed.

SEC. 12. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to provide for the maintenance and operation of the Naval Home, including the transportation, admission, entertainment, and care of beneficiaries, at the rates authorized by law.

SEC. 13. The Secretary of the Navy may, when authorized by the Secretary of the Navy, connect the Coast Guard Academy with the Naval Academy, and in connection therewith there shall be provided for all emergencies and extraordinary expenses arising in the Naval Establishment, and for the maintenance of all nonrecurring and unexpected contingencies, such assistance as he deems proper, and the Secretary of the Navy may determine thereon shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officer of the Government, and he may make a certificate of the amount of such expenditures as he may consider advisable not to specify and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended.

SEC. 14. Under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, enlisted personnel of the Navy or the Marine Corps may be authorized to provide lodging accommodations for naval personnel, including members of the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve, while on active duty, and as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, as they may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, naval personnel, including members of the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve, while on active duty.

SEC. 16. (a) No table linen, dishes, glassware, silver, and kitchen utensils shall be furnished for use in the residence or quarters occupied by officers with their dependents except for messing temporarily set up on shore for bachelor officers and officers attached to seagoing or district defense naval forces, or for cadet units based on seagoing vessels, to the fleet bases, to the submarine bases, or to land stations.

(b) Enlisted naval personnel may be assigned to duty in a service capacity in officers' messes when it is found that the use of such personnel for such work is desirable for military reasons. No provision of law shall be construed as preventing the voluntary employment in any such capacity of officers and enlisted personnel of the Fleet Reserve without additional expense to the Government.

(c) The sale of meals to naval personnel while on active duty or on authorized leave or furlough therefrom, midshipmen and cadets shall be allowed to receive the full charges for such meals, including messes at base, and ashore is authorized under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe.

SEC. 17. (a) All enlisted naval personnel on active duty or on authorized leave or furlough therefrom, midshipmen and cadets shall be allowed a ration, or commutation therefrom in money, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe. Such regulations shall fix rates at which rations shall be commuted in money. Members of the Nurse Corps may be authorized to engage in nursing in hospitals, and the rates of pay authorized, including disaster compensation, or other employment as the Secretary of the Navy may determine, shall be paid to such members of the Fleet Reserve without additional expense to the Government.

SEC. 18. During the existence of war or national emergency as declared by the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Navy may require that such personnel as the Secretary of the Navy may determine, who are eligible, shall be eligible for appointment to the Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy if they will have completed 9 months' active duty prior to September 1, 1946.
(b) Midshipmen and cadets discharged or dismissed from the Naval Academy or the Coast Guard Academy shall be furnished transportation in kind and subsistence en route from the place of discharge to their homes.

Sec. 21. Section 126 of the act of June 3, 1910 (Pub. L. No. 61-309; 36 U.S. C. 309), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"An enlisted person of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, including reserve components thereof, upon discharge except by way of punishment for an offense, retirement, partial discharge from active duty under such regulations as the head of the department concerned may prescribe for personnel of the Reserve, and in the case of such personnel of the Reserve components thereof, upon discharge except by way of punishment for an offense, retirement, partial discharge from active duty under such regulations as the head of the department concerned may prescribe for personnel of the Reserve, shall be entitled to the allowance of 5 cents per mile for the distance from the place of discharge or release from active duty to his home, or place of acceptance for active duty, or place from which ordered to active duty, or such other place as may be determined to be most appropriate by the head of the department concerned.

For sea travel involved in travel between place of discharge or release from active duty and place to which travel is authorized only transportation in kind and subsistence en route is authorized.

Sec. 22. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to make such expenditures out of available naval appropriations as he may deem proper for the transportation and delivery of deserters, stragglers, and prisoners and for the operation of shore patrol service.

Such transportation or disposal of persons for transportation by ship or by rail shall be available for the payment or reimbursement of ferry, bridge, and similar tolls and streetcar, bus, and similar fares paid in connection with such transportation or travel.

Sec. 24. (a) The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to make such expenditures as he may deem appropriate for scientific investigations and research out of and in accordance with naval appropriations available for such purposes.

(b) The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to make such expenditures as he may deem appropriate for promotion and maintenance of the safety and occupational health of, and the prevention of accidents affecting, personnel of the Naval Establishment, including the purchase of clothing, equipment, materials, and aids thereto, and naval appropriations available for the activities in which such personnel are engaged.

Sec. 25. Without deposit to the credit of the Treasury, any proper allowance for transportation or travel shall be available for the payment or reimbursement of ferry, bridge, and similar tolls and streetcar, bus, and similar fares paid in connection with such transportation or travel.

Sec. 26. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to expend out of naval appropriations available for the purchase or manufacture of equipment or material, for the purchase of letters patent, applications for letters patent, and licenses under letters patent and applications for letters patent that pertain to the equipment or material for which the appropriations are made.

Sec. 27. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized, in his discretion and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to award a prize of not to exceed $5,200 for any suggestion or series of suggestions by an employee of the Navy, in such manner and subject to such conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, in furtherance of any program or policy of the Naval Establishment or other persons in civil life when, due to a suggestion or series of suggestions by him, there results an improvement or economy in manufacturing or production by patients of products incident to the convalescence and rehabilitation of such patients in naval hospitals or other naval medical facilities, and research or development new to the Navy.

(c) The last paragraph appearing on page 718 of volume 40 of the Statutes at Large (5 U. S. C. 416) which is a part of the act of July 1, 1918 (40 Stat. 704), is hereby repealed.

Sec. 28. The Secretary of the Navy, in requesting competitive bids for the construction of new vessels, is authorized to require each bidder to file with his bid the estimates on which the bid is based.

Sec. 29. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to pay the expense of travel to and from the place of discharge of any person to any place to which travel is authorized only transportation in kind and subsistence en route is authorized.

Sec. 30. Proceeds from the sale by the Coast Guard of rations, supplies, uniforms, and other clothing shall be credited to the current account of the Coast Guard, and the proceeds from the sale of interest or payment of principal of bonds of the Coast Guard shall be credited to the current account of the Coast Guard.

Sec. 31. The first sentence of section 10 (a) of the act of June 6, 1940 (34 Stat. 248; 14 U. S. C. 135), is hereby amended by inserting in the first line thereof the words "working parties in the field," in the words "enlisted men of the Coast Guard.

Sec. 32. The Coast Guard may pay rewards for the apprehension and conviction, or for information helpful therein, of persons found interfering in violation of law with aids to navigation or with the Coast Guard.

Sec. 33. Existing limitations on the number of enlisted personnel of the Coast Guard who may be detailed to duty in the District of Columbia or at Coast Guard headquarters shall not be withdrawn while the Coast Guard is operating as a part of the Navy.

Sec. 34. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to provide, out of naval appropriations available for the purchase or manufacture of equipment or material, for the purchase of letters patent, applications for letters patent, and licenses under letters patent and applications for letters patent that pertain to the equipment or material for which the appropriations are made.

Sec. 35. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized, in his discretion and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to award a prize of not to exceed $5,200 for the suggestion or series of suggestions by any employee of the Naval Establishment or other persons in civil life when, due to a suggestion or series of suggestions by him, there results an improvement or economy in manufacturing or production by patients of products incident to the convalescence and rehabilitation of such patients in naval hospitals or other naval medical facilities, and research or development new to the Navy.

The provisions of section 32 of title 22, United States Code, together with the...
provisions of regulations prescribed thereunder, are eligible to civil service in the naval officers and employees of the Navy Department who are citizens of the United States and who are permanently stationed in foreign countries."

On page 14, in line 1, after the word "war," insert the words "November 10, 1939," and strike out the remainder of the sentence to the end of the first fiscal year thereafter."

Or page 15, add title II, as follows:

"TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO THE PAY READJUSTMENT ACT"

"SECTION 201. The third paragraph of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 is amended to read as follows:"

"(e) Every officer and employee of the executive departments concerned is authorized to prescribe rates of pay in lieu of per diem rates on duty not exceeding those prescribed for naval officers in a travel status, without in either case the payment of per diem rates for transportation in excess of that prescribed for naval officers in a travel status. Provided, That for travel by air under competent orders on duty without troops, under regulations to be prescribed respectively by the heads of the departments concerned, members (including officers, warrant officers, contract surgeons, enlisted men, aviation cadets, and members of the Corps) of the services mentioned in the title of this act, and in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, are authorized to receive such per diem rates as the head of the executive department concerned may authorize the payment of members of the services mentioned in the title of this act, and in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to the extent to which such per diem rates are in excess of the per diem rates authorized by the National Defense Act, to the extent to which such per diem rates are in excess of the per diem rates authorized by the National Defense Act, and in any case not to exceed $8."

"SEC. 202. The first paragraph of section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended by section 9 of the Act of September 7, 1944 (57 U. S. C. 112), is amended to read as follows:

"Officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, including active and retired personnel of the Regular Establishments and general staff of the Reserve Components thereof and the National Guard, while on active duty in the Federal service, when traveling or ordered without troops, including travel from home to first station in connection with their appointment or duty and return to home in connection with the length of time away from their temporary-duty stations in a pay status: Provided, That allowances for subsistence shall not accrue to such an enlisted man while he is in fact being subsisted at Government expense, when traveling or ordered without troops, or while participating in exercises, or performing duties under sections 92, 84, 97, or 99 of the National Defense Act, shall, in lieu of mileage or other travel allowances, be allowed and paid their actual and necessary expenses not to exceed $8 per day, or, in lieu of subsistence, per diem allowances at rates not to exceed $7 per day. Without regard to the monetary limitations in this act, and in accordance with regulations prescribed by the head of the executive department concerned, members (including officers, warrant officers, contract surgeons, enlisted men, aviation cadets, and members of the Corps) of the services mentioned in the title of this act, and in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, shall be allowed to receive such allowances as the head of the executive department concerned may authorize the payment of members of the services mentioned in the title of this act, and in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to the extent to which such allowances are in excess of the per diem rates authorized by the National Defense Act, and in any case not to exceed $8.

Under regulations prescribed by the heads of the departments concerned, (1) officers entitled to transportation (as distinguished from mileage) and enlisted personnel of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, shall be allowed and paid their actual and necessary expenses not to exceed $8 per day, or, in lieu of subsistence, per diem allowances at rates not to exceed $7 per day. Without regard to the monetary limitations in this act, and in accordance with regulations prescribed by the head of the executive department concerned, members (including officers, warrant officers, contract surgeons, enlisted men, aviation cadets, and members of the Corps) of the services mentioned in the title of this act, and in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, shall be allowed to receive such allowances as the head of the executive department concerned may authorize the payment of members of the services mentioned in the title of this act, and in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to the extent to which such allowances are in excess of the per diem rates authorized by the National Defense Act, and in any case not to exceed $8.

Such allowances for subsistence shall not accrue to such an enlisted man while he is in fact being subsisted at Government expense, when traveling or ordered without troops, or while participating in exercises, or performing duties under sections 92, 84, 97, or 99 of the National Defense Act, shall, in lieu of mileage or other travel allowances, be allowed and paid their actual and necessary expenses not to exceed $8 per day, or, in lieu of subsistence, per diem allowances at rates not to exceed $7 per day. Without regard to the monetary limitations in this act, and in accordance with regulations prescribed by the head of the executive department concerned, members (including officers, warrant officers, contract surgeons, enlisted men, aviation cadets, and members of the Corps) of the services mentioned in the title of this act, and in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, shall be allowed to receive such allowances as the head of the executive department concerned may authorize the payment of members of the services mentioned in the title of this act, and in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to the extent to which such allowances are in excess of the per diem rates authorized by the National Defense Act, and in any case not to exceed $8.

Under regulations prescribed by the head of the department concerned, (1) officers entitled to transportation (as distinguished from mileage) and enlisted personnel of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, shall be allowed and paid their actual and necessary expenses not to exceed $8 per day, or, in lieu of subsistence, per diem allowances at rates not to exceed $7 per day. Without regard to the monetary limitations in this act, and in accordance with regulations prescribed by the head of the executive department concerned, members (including officers, warrant officers, contract surgeons, enlisted men, aviation cadets, and members of the Corps) of the services mentioned in the title of this act, and in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, shall be allowed to receive such allowances as the head of the executive department concerned may authorize the payment of members of the services mentioned in the title of this act, and in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to the extent to which such allowances are in excess of the per diem rates authorized by the National Defense Act, and in any case not to exceed $8.

"SEC. 204. Section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 is amended by inserting between the fifth and sixth paragraphs thereof the following new paragraph:

"Under regulations prescribed by the head of the department concerned, (1) officers entitled to transportation (as distinguished from mileage) and enlisted personnel of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, shall be allowed and paid their actual and necessary expenses not to exceed $8 per day, or, in lieu of subsistence, per diem allowances at rates not to exceed $7 per day. Without regard to the monetary limitations in this act, and in accordance with regulations prescribed by the head of the executive department concerned, members (including officers, warrant officers, contract surgeons, enlisted men, aviation cadets, and members of the Corps) of the services mentioned in the title of this act, and in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, shall be allowed to receive such allowances as the head of the executive department concerned may authorize the payment of members of the services mentioned in the title of this act, and in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to the extent to which such allowances are in excess of the per diem rates authorized by the National Defense Act, and in any case not to exceed $8.

Under regulations prescribed by the head of the department concerned, (1) officers entitled to transportation (as distinguished from mileage) and enlisted personnel of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, shall be allowed and paid their actual and necessary expenses not to exceed $8 per day, or, in lieu of subsistence, per diem allowances at rates not to exceed $7 per day. Without regard to the monetary limitations in this act, and in accordance with regulations prescribed by the head of the executive department concerned, members (including officers, warrant officers, contract surgeons, enlisted men, aviation cadets, and members of the Corps) of the services mentioned in the title of this act, and in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, shall be allowed to receive such allowances as the head of the executive department concerned may authorize the payment of members of the services mentioned in the title of this act, and in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to the extent to which such allowances are in excess of the per diem rates authorized by the National Defense Act, and in any case not to exceed $8.

"SEC. 205. (a) Section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 is amended by inserting between the fifth and sixth paragraphs thereof the following new paragraph:

"Upon changes of station, members of the services mentioned in the title of this act shall be entitled to transportation (including packing, crating, draining, temporary storage, and unpacking) of baggage and household goods and effects, or reimbursement therefor, as authorized by the heads of the departments concerned, which shall be uniform for the services mentioned in the title of this act, and for the President. Such transportation may be by rail, water, or van, without regard to comparative costs."

(b) The fifth paragraph of section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 is amended by striking out the following proviso: "Provided further, that no pay for transportation of household goods and effects shall be allowed or paid to members of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for the transportation of household effects.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT TO PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1946

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6802) to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 for the purpose of making a clerical correction.

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

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute in lieu of House bill, S. 2259, for the House bill.
The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill:

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.* That section 104 (c) of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 is amended to read as follows:

Sec. 104. (c) All lands owned by the United States, which were the property of the Philippine Government at the time it was declared to be a commonwealth shall be made available to the Philippine Government for the purposes aforesaid, it being understood that all rights in the same, now vested in the United States, shall pass to the Philippine Government, subject to the following provisions, to wit:

(a) The Philippine Government shall have no right to acquire the property of the United States in any of the places named in subsection (b) of this section, without the approval of the President of the United States, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section:

(b) The Philippine Government shall have the right to purchase the property of the United States in any of the places named in subsection (b) of this section, subject to the provisions of section 105 of this act, provided that the amount of the purchase price shall not exceed the sum of the expenses of the purchase, including transportation and insurance, for which the property is acquired, plus fifteen per cent. of such expenses for interest on the purchase price, and provided also that the United States shall have the right to reject any offer of purchase made by the Philippine Government, in which case the property shall revert to the United States, and the Philippine Government shall have no right to acquire the property of the United States in any of the places named in subsection (b) of this section, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section.

(c) The property of the United States in any of the places named in subsection (b) of this section, shall be held by the Philippine Government for the exclusive benefit of the people of the Philippines.

The Speaker was heard to move that the bill be read a third time.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**GRANTING TO MILES CITY, MONT., CERTAIN LAND IN CUSTER COUNTY, MONT.**

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6896) to grant to the city of Miles City, State of Montana, certain land in Custer County, Montana, for industrial and recreational purposes and as a museum site.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I point out to the gentleman from Florida that the last committee amendment provided to be added to this bill does not appear to be very coherent or sensible.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I shall ask unanimous consent to withdraw that amendment. It is repetitive and is simply a typographical error.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to convey by patent to the city of Miles City, a municipal corporation, described as existing under the laws of the State of Montana, the following tracts of public lands:

Thirty-seven and twenty-six and one hundredths acres of land, to be used for industrial and recreational purposes and as a museum site.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.
bridge across the Mississippi River at or near a point known as Dalmar Boulevard and Cole Avenue in the city of St. Louis, Mo., and a point opposite thereto in the city of East St. Louis, Ill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7030) granting the consent of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Allegheny River, between a point in or near the Borough of Tarentum, in the county of Allegheny, and a point near the boundary of the city of New Kensington and Lower Burrell Township in Westmoreland County in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7030) granting the consent of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Allegheny River, between a point in or near the Borough of Tarentum, in the county of Allegheny, and a point near the boundary of the city of New Kensington and Lower Burrell Township in Westmoreland County in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 33, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

Sec. 2. If tolls are charged for the use of such bridge, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches thereto across the Allegheny River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near the point in or near the Borough of Tarentum, in the county of Allegheny, and a point near the boundary of the city of New Kensington and Lower Burrell Township in Westmoreland County, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 33, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.
The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 2, strike out the word "Avenue" and insert the word "Street.

Page 3, line 16, strike out the comma, insert a period, and strike out the balance of the line down to and including the word "Deltmar" on line 18.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the city of East St. Louis, Ill., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near a point between Deltmar Boulevard and Cole Street in the city of St. Louis, Mo., and a point opposite thereto in the city of East St. Louis, Ill."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREE HIGHWAY BRIDGE ACROSS THE SAKONNET RIVER, NEWPORT COUNTY, R. I.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2036) 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.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to facilitate interstate commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for military and other purposes, the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations shall be authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge over the waters of the Sakonnet River at a point opposite in the city of Tiverton, R. I., and a point opposite thereto in the city of Newport, R. I., and to fix and charge tolls for transit over and across said bridge.

Extending the authority of this act to the request of the gentleman from Pennsyl-

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBBINS of Kentucky (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts)
was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a newspaper article.

Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. CHURCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

MRS. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record relative to the charter of the World Health Organization. One woman delegate signed, our own Dr. Martha Elliot, Associate Director of the United States Children's Bureau.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a commen­ tary thereon from the Chicago Daily Tribune headed “Republican Program.”

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

HEMPSTEAD WAREHOUSE CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1349) for the relief of Hempstead Warehouse Corp.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ANNE ROBINSON NOORDWICk

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4496) for the relief of Anne Robinson Norwood.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

DR. THEODORE A. GEISSMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6231) for the relief of Dr. Theodore A. Geissman.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF ROBERT OLSN, A MINOR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1004) for the relief of the legal guardian of Robert Olsen, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,000, to J. W. Williams, Jr., of Petal, Miss., in full settlement of any and all claims against the United States for the death of their son, Rodney Edwin Williams, as a result of being struck and killed by a United States Army truck at Fort Knox, Ky., on August 30, 1944: Provided. That no part of the amount appropriated by this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out “$5,000” and insert “$3,000.”

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. LEROY A. ROBBINS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1887) for the relief of Mrs. Leroy A. Robbins.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Leroy A. Robbins, Gonzales, La., the sum of $989.65. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Leroy A. Robbins against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by her as a result of an accident in Alexandria, La., on September 20, 1944, involving the automobile in which she was riding and a United States Army truck.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLYDE O. PAYNE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3219) for the relief of Clyde O. Payne.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Clyde O. Payne, of Tacoma, Wash., the sum of $246.64, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by his daughter and expenses incurred resulting from a collision on or about the 18th of April, 1943, in which the car being driven by Clyde O. Payne collided with a United States Army "jeep" in Tacoma, Wash.: Provided. That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per-
cent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRY D. KOONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3619) for the relief of Harry D. Koons.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harry D. Koons, Kernersville, N. C., the sum of $1,433, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and loss of wages and personal property, as a result of an accident involving a National Youth Administration vehicle on March 24, 1944. Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRY D. KOONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3619) for the relief of Harry D. Koons.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harry D. Koons, Kernersville, N. C., the sum of $1,433, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and loss of wages and personal property, as a result of an accident involving a National Youth Administration vehicle on March 24, 1944. Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PITTSBURGH DeBOIS CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4615) for the relief of Materials Handling Machine Co., Inc.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

PAN AMERICAN PETROLEUM & TRANSPORT CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4827) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Pan American Petroleum & Transport Co., against the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the jurisdiction be, and the same is hereby, conferred upon the Court of Claims of the United States, notwithstanding any prior determination, any statute of limitations, release, or prior acceptance of partial allowance, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Pan American Petroleum & Transport Co., against the United States, for which said work and for which said fuel oil furnished pursuant to the terms and conditions of the contracts aforesaid.

Sect. 3. Any suit brought under the provisions of this act shall be instituted within 1 year from the date of the approval hereof, and the court shall determine in such suit for the purpose of determining the actual cost to the Pan American Petroleum & Transport Co. of the construction work performed and the actual cost to it of the fuel oil furnished and delivered into such storage facilities, all pursuant to the terms of the aforesaid contracts, all evidence here­ tofore taken by either party in the case of the United States of America against the Pan American Petroleum & Transport Co. for the construction work performed and the actual cost to it of the fuel oil furnished and delivered into such storage facilities as aforesaid.

With the following committee amendment:

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MATERIALS HANDLING MACHINERY CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4890) for the relief of Materials Handling Machinery Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the United States, not­withstanding any prior determination, the sum of $3,236.10 to Materials Handling Machinery Co., Inc., in full and final settlement of all claims for price adjustment as agreed to by the Government but not paid, growing out of War Department contract No. W-2709- to-2160, as amended and modified, dated August 25, 1943, for the furnishing of 14,000 pallets, hardwood: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the presentation of this claim to the proper committees of Congress, and the same shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.
The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is directed to cancel forthwith any outstanding warrant of apprehension, deportation, and banishment issued by any order of any court in the United States or any other foreign country, and to receive and destroy any and all records pertaining thereto.

The payment of such sum shall be made by the Treasurer of the United States not otherwise appropriated, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That notwithstanding sections 303 of the Nationality Act of 1948, as amended (54 Stat. 1140; 8 U. S. C. 703; 2 Stat. 600), and section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1943 (43 Stat. 161-162; 50 Stat. 156; 46 Stat. 608; 5 U. S. C. 213 (c)), the Attorney General is directed to record the admission of Mrs. Fuku Kurokawa Thurn to the United States at the port of New York on September 9, 1943, as a lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUDOLPH K. BARTELS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4374) for the relief of Rudolph K. Bartels.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Rudolph K. Bartels, of 3460 Corporation Boulevard, Honolulu 12, T. H., the sum of $1,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries suffered by his son, Rudolph K. Bartels, Jr., a minor, who was seriously burned when it came in contact with an automobile in which he was a passenger, which was wrecked in the Kalibi kai district of the city and county of Honolulu, T. H., on June 8, 1940.

The payment of such sum shall be made by the Treasurer of the United States not otherwise appropriated, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That notwithstanding sections 303 of the Nationality Act of 1948, as amended (54 Stat. 1140; 8 U. S. C. 703; 2 Stat. 600), and section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1943 (43 Stat. 161-162; 50 Stat. 156; 46 Stat. 608; 5 U. S. C. 213 (c)), the Attorney General is directed to record the admission of Mrs. Fuku Kurokawa Thurn to the United States at the port of New York on September 9, 1943, as a lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUDOLPH K. BARTELS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4374) for the relief of Rudolph K. Bartels.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Rudolph K. Bartels, Jr., a minor, $1,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries suffered by his son, Rudolph K. Bartels, Jr., a minor, who was seriously burned when it came in contact with an automobile in which he was a passenger, which was wrecked in the Kalibi kai district of the city and county of Honolulu, T. H., on June 8, 1940.

The payment of such sum shall be made by the Treasurer of the United States not otherwise appropriated, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That notwithstanding sections 303 of the Nationality Act of 1948, as amended (54 Stat. 1140; 8 U. S. C. 703; 2 Stat. 600), and section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1943 (43 Stat. 161-162; 50 Stat. 156; 46 Stat. 608; 5 U. S. C. 213 (c)), the Attorney General is directed to record the admission of Mrs. Fuku Kurokawa Thurn to the United States at the port of New York on September 9, 1943, as a lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUDOLPH K. BARTELS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4374) for the relief of Rudolph K. Bartels.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Rudolph K. Bartels, Jr., a minor, $1,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries suffered by his son, Rudolph K. Bartels, Jr., a minor, who was seriously burned when it came in contact with an automobile in which he was a passenger, which was wrecked in the Kalibi kai district of the city and county of Honolulu, T. H., on June 8, 1940.

The payment of such sum shall be made by the Treasurer of the United States not otherwise appropriated, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That notwithstanding sections 303 of the Nationality Act of 1948, as amended (54 Stat. 1140; 8 U. S. C. 703; 2 Stat. 600), and section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1943 (43 Stat. 161-162; 50 Stat. 156; 46 Stat. 608; 5 U. S. C. 213 (c)), the Attorney General is directed to record the admission of Mrs. Fuku Kurokawa Thurn to the United States at the port of New York on September 9, 1943, as a lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUDOLPH K. BARTELS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4374) for the relief of Rudolph K. Bartels.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Rudolph K. Bartels, Jr., a minor, $1,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries suffered by his son, Rudolph K. Bartels, Jr., a minor, who was seriously burned when it came in contact with an automobile in which he was a passenger, which was wrecked in the Kalibi kai district of the city and county of Honolulu, T. H., on June 8, 1940.

The payment of such sum shall be made by the Treasurer of the United States not otherwise appropriated, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That notwithstanding sections 303 of the Nationality Act of 1948, as amended (54 Stat. 1140; 8 U. S. C. 703; 2 Stat. 600), and section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1943 (43 Stat. 161-162; 50 Stat. 156; 46 Stat. 608; 5 U. S. C. 213 (c)), the Attorney General is directed to record the admission of Mrs. Fuku Kurokawa Thurn to the United States at the port of New York on September 9, 1943, as a lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUDOLPH K. BARTELS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4374) for the relief of Rudolph K. Bartels.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Rudolph K. Bartels, Jr., a minor, $1,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries suffered by his son, Rudolph K. Bartels, Jr., a minor, who was seriously burned when it came in contact with an automobile in which he was a passenger, which was wrecked in the Kalibi kai district of the city and county of Honolulu, T. H., on June 8, 1940.

The payment of such sum shall be made by the Treasurer of the United States not otherwise appropriated, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That notwithstanding sections 303 of the Nationality Act of 1948, as amended (54 Stat. 1140; 8 U. S. C. 703; 2 Stat. 600), and section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1943 (43 Stat. 161-162; 50 Stat. 156; 46 Stat. 608; 5 U. S. C. 213 (c)), the Attorney General is directed to record the admission of Mrs. Fuku Kurokawa Thurn to the United States at the port of New York on September 9, 1943, as a lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.
Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:
Page 1, line 5, strike out "Rudolph K. Bartels", and all of lines 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, legal guardian of Rudolph K. Bartels, Jr., of Honolulu, the sum of $500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by Raphael Elder as the result of an accident which occurred on April 15, 1943, when the automobile in which he was a passenger was in collision with an Army vehicle between Bowling Green and Wauchula, Fla.: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH A. BROWN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4924) for the relief of Joseph A. Brown.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ernest C. Heine and Harriet W. Heine, $2394 Waimano Drive, the sum of $500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of property damage caused by the United States engineers on April 25, 1943, when the automobile in which they were passengers was in collision with an Army airplane in the Kalihi-Kai district of the city of Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, on January 8, 1944.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAPHAEL ELDER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5166) for the relief of Raphael Elder.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Raphael Elder, Avon Park, Fla., the sum of $5,000. The amount of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by Raphael Elder on January 25, 1945, when he was struck by an Army jeep belonging to the United States of America at the intersection of Michigan and Pacific Avenues in the city of Atlantic City, county of Atlantic, and State of New Jersey.

With the following committee amendment:
Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$5,000".

Page 1, line 7, all of lines 8, 9, and 10, and on page 2, strike out lines 1 and 2, and all of line 3, and including the words "New Jersey" and insert "$5,000". In full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries, loss of earnings and property damage sustained, and medical and hospital expenses incurred, as the result of an accident which occurred at the intersection of Michigan and Pacific Avenues, in Atlantic City, N. J., on January 26, 1945, when he was struck by an Army vehicle: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERNEST C. HEINE AND HARRIET W. HEINE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5031) for the relief of Ernest C. Heine and Harriet W. Heine.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Warren M. Miller, Philadelphia, Pa., is relieved of all liability to refund any part of the amount paid to him for part-time services as an employee of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce, during the period when he was not eligible because of being in the service of the War Department, Philadelphia Engineer District, to receive from funds appropriated for the Coast and Geodetic Survey. Any amounts heretofore credited to him on account of the part-time services shall be considered to have been authorized.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HIRAM H. WILSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5463) for the relief of Hiram H. Wilson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Hiram H. Wilson, the sum of $10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the services of Hiram H. Wilson, who died February 10, 1946, and personal injury sustained by the said Hiram H. Wilson, on February 10, 1946, when the automobile in which he was a passenger was in collision with an Army vehicle between Bowling Green and Wauchula, Fla.: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:
Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THOMAS A. BEDDINGFIELD AND HIS WIFE, OPAL MAY BEDDINGFIELD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6255) for the relief of Thomas A. Beddingfield and his wife, Opal May Beddingfield.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Thomas A. Beddingfield, and his wife, Opal May Beddingfield, of Pyote, Tex., the sum of $5,000 for the death by drowning of their son Bobbe Glenn Beddingfield in the enlisted men's swimming pool at Pyote Army air base, and to compensate them properly for funeral expenses.

With the following committee amendment:
Page 1, line 7, strike out "$5,000" and the balance of line 7, all of lines 8 and 9, and line 10, and on page 2, strike out the word "expenses" and insert "$13,400, in full settlement of all claims against the United States.
for damages sustained by them as a result of the death of their minor son, Bobbie Glenn Beddington, in the enlisted men's swimming pool at the Pyote Air Base, Pyote, Tex., on December 23, 1945, for damages sustained by them as to the contrary notwithstanding. Any contract entered into in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THOMAS L. BRETT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6381) for the relief of Thomas L. Brett.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JESSE A. LOT'I

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1144) for the relief of Jesse A. Lott.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAYMOND CROSBY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1633) for the relief of Raymond Crosby.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WALTER S. FAULKNER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 162) for the relief of Walter S. Faulkner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.
penses incurred by him as a result of such injuries; Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CROSBY YACHT BUILDING & STORAGE CO., INC.
The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3990) for the relief of the Crosby Yacht Building & Storage Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Crosby Yacht Building & Storage Co., Inc., of Osterville, Mass., the sum of $1,120. Such sum represents the amount of compensation which the said Crosby Yacht Building & Storage Co., Inc., of Osterville, Mass., was entitled to due to the destruction of a 37-foot carrying boat by an accident involving an Army truck on Airport Way in Seattle, Wash.: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD A. MASON
The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3209) for the relief of Edward A. Mason.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edward A. Mason, of Tacoma, Wash., the sum of $21,425.33, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, pain and suffering and loss of earnings sustained and medical and hospital expenses incurred by him, for the death of his wife, Mrs. Lina L. Mason, and for expenses incurred by him for the burial of his wife, which he was riding on Route No. 5, was occurred on February 4, 1944, on United States Highway No. 90, near Grants Pass, Oreg.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MINNIE P. SHOREY
The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5050) for the relief of Minnie P. Shorey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Minnie P. Shorey, of Olympia, Wash., in settlement of her claim, the sum of $1,120. Such sum represents the amount of compensation which the said Minnie P. Shorey would have received as an employee of the War Department in the performance of work performed by her for said War Department, at the rates of pay prescribed for the period beginning September 4, 1944, and ending May 2, 1945, if she had not been suspended for alleged insubordination on September 3, 1944. On an appeal taken by the said Minnie P. Shorey from the order of suspension, she was held not guilty of insubordination by a board of officers and was restored to her employment on May 2, 1945; Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,120" and insert "$640."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILFORD B. BROWN
The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5603) for the relief of Wilford B. Brown.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Wilford B. Brown, of Iaip, Suffolk County, N. Y., the sum of $10,000 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, pain and suffering, medical and hospital expenses, and loss of earnings sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Army jeep on Airport Way in Seattle, Wash.: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BERTHA LILLIAN AND CHARLES ROBBINS
The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5469) for the relief of Bertha Lillian Robbins and Charles Robbins.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Bertha Lillian Robbins and Charles Robbins, of Tacoma, Wash., the sum of $10,000 to be granted in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, pain and suffering, medical and hospital expenses, and loss of earnings sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Army jeep on Airport Way in Seattle, Wash., on May 31, 1943.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CROSBY YACHT BUILDING & STORAGE CO., INC.
The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3990) for the relief of Crosby Yacht Building & Storage Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Crosby Yacht Building & Storage Co., Inc., of Osterville, Mass., the sum of $1,120. Such sum represents the amount of compensation which the said Crosby Yacht Building & Storage Co., Inc., of Osterville, Mass., was entitled to due to the destruction of a 37-foot carrying boat by an accident involving an Army truck on Airport Way in Seattle, Wash.: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "gr," strike out the balance of the line, also lines 8, 9, and 10 and lines 1 and 2 on page 2, and insert the following: "$4,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, hospital and medical expenses, and loss of earnings sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Army jeep on Airport Way in Seattle, Wash., on May 31, 1943."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILFORD B. BROWN
The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5603) for the relief of Wilford B. Brown.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Wilford B. Brown, of Iaip, Suffolk County, N. Y., the sum of $10,000 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, pain and suffering, medical and hospital expenses, and loss of earnings sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Army jeep on Airport Way in Seattle, Wash., on May 31, 1943.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARENCE W. OHM
The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5134) for the relief of Clarence W. Ohm.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Clarence W. Ohm, of Compton, Md., the sum of $330.80. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Clarence W. Ohm against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by him on August 22, 1945, when the automobile in which he was riding, driven by him, was struck, at Camp Springs, Md., by a United States Navy truck: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.
The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. GRACE A. PHILLIPS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5849) for the relief of Mrs. Grace A. Phillips.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Grace A. Phillips, Long Beach, Calif., the sum of $15,000, for such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Grace A. Phillips against the United States, as the result of injuries sustained by him, on the 7th day of February, 1945, at Long Beach, Calif., when he was struck by a United States Army vehicle. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. IVAN B. HOFMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6423) for the relief of Mrs. Ivan B. Hofman.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALBERT WHILDEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5092) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Albert Whilden.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any provision of law to the contrary, the claim of Albert Whilden, Millville, N. J., against the United States, on account of personal injuries sustained by him on June 27, 1945, as the result of being struck in Millville, N. J., by certain falling tow ing apparatus which became separated from a United States Army airplane engaged in towing a target for aerial gunnery practice. The court shall have such jurisdiction, as is hereby conferred, vested not later than one year after the date of enactment of this act, and the liability of the United States in such suit shall be determined upon the same principles and measures of liability as in like cases between private individuals. The judgment, if any, rendered in such suit shall not exceed the sum of $10,000.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. IVAN B. HOFMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6423) for the relief of Mrs. Ivan B. Hofman.
DUANE N. THOMPSON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1549) for the relief of the legal guardian of Duane N. Thompson, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $149, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by the said Michael Joseph Bennett, a minor, when he was accidentally shot by a member of the United States Marine Corps who was searching for escaped naval prisoners, in Dover, N. H., on November 24, 1943, and for reimbursement of medical expenses incurred as a result of such injuries, to the estate of the said named person and estates against whom the injury occurred, in full settlement of all claims of each of the said named persons and estates against which such injury occurred, in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Lester A. Dessez

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1721) for the relief of Lester A. Dessez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lester A. Dessez, colored, United States Marine Corps, the sum of $603.95. Such sum is to be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for emergency travel of dependents (less a payment of $47.63 already made) to which the said Lester A. Dessez would have been entitled, if he had had the necessary orders. For the period August 1, 1940, to December 15, 1941, for travel of dependents from Tutuila, American Samoa, to Washington, D. C.: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESMARK WRIGHT AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1733) for the relief of Desmark Wright; the estates of Alberta Wright, Desmark Wright, Jr., and Harold Evans; and the legal guardians of Bobby Dennis Wright and Irvin Lee Wright, minors.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Desmark Wright, of Little Rock, Ark., the sum of $2,000; to the estate of Alberta Wright, deceased, the sum of $100; to the legal guardians of Bobby Dennis Wright, a minor, and Irvin Lee Wright, minors, the sum of $500; to the estate of Harold Evans, deceased, the sum of $3,000; to the legal guardians of Desmark Wright, Jr., deceased, the sum of $700, in full settlement of all claims of each of the said named persons and estates against which such injury occurred, in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MICHAEL JOSEPH BENNETT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1674) for the relief of Michael Joseph Bennett, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Michael Joseph Bennett, a minor, of Dover, N. H., the sum of $149, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by the said Michael Joseph Bennett, a minor, when he was accidentally shot by a member of the United States Marine Corps who was searching for escaped naval prisoners, in Dover, N. H., on November 24, 1943, and for reimbursement of medical expenses incurred as a result of such injuries, to the estate of the said named person and estates against which such injury occurred, in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Legislature

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1751) for the relief of J. E. Bennett.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of J. E. Bennett, deceased, the sum of $250, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation to the estate of the said named person and estates against which such injury occurred, in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM S. BROWN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1277) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of William S. Brown.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims of the United States, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of William S. Brown, of Greenville, S. C., for the sum of $608.95, which sum is to be paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of William S. Brown, deceased, the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES H. WILKINSON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1573) for the relief of James H. Wilkinson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to James H. Wilkinson, of Weymouth, Mass., the sum of $8,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries and loss of earnings sustained by him, and for future medical and other expenses incurred by him and for any and all property damage sustained by him as a result of an automobile accident which occurred when the automobile which he was driving was struck by a United States Navy aircraft, on the intersection of Quincy Avenue and Mount Pleasant Avenue, in Braintree, Mass., on February 5, 1945: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.
Rock, Ark., on September 12, 1945: Provided, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "$2,000" and insert "$1,000."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "$2,000" and insert "$1,500."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAYNE PARKER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1751) for the relief of Wayne Parker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Wayne Parker, of Portland, Oreg., the sum of $1,500, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him as a result of having been accidentally shot by a member of the United States Army guard who was escorting an armed guard on a naval vessel, at the Willamette Iron & Steel Corp., in Portland, Oreg., On May 7, 1945: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE D. KING

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1910) for the relief of George D. King.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George D. King, of Phoenix, Ariz., the sum of $500, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries and loss of earnings sustained and medical expenses incurred by him as a result of an accident which occurred when the automobile in which he was riding was struck by a United States Army airplane, near Phoenix, Ariz., on June 22, 1944: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YELLOW CAB TRANSIT CO. OF OKLAHOMA CITY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6215) for the relief of the Yellow Cab Transit Co., of Oklahoma City.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Yellow Cab Transit Co., of Oklahoma City, the sum of $9,702.87. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States by claimant and in payment of all losses incurred by claimant resulting from the death of its employee, Marion Overcash, driver of claimant's vehicle, which occurred in a collision with a United States Army truck on United States Highway 66, near Hazelgreen, Mo., on August 10, 1941: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM MITCHELL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 881) authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously in the name of Congress a Medal of Honor to William Mitchell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to award posthumously, in the name of Congress, a Medal of Honor to the late William Lendrum Mitchell, formerly a colonel, United States Army, in recognition of outstanding pioneer service and foresight in the field of American military aviation. The President may present such Medal of Honor to Mrs. Martin Flades, of Milwaukee, Wis., sister of the said William Lendrum Mitchell.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the President of the United States is requested to cause a gold medal to be struck, with suitable emblems, devices, and inscription to represent the late William Lendrum Mitchell, formerly a colonel, United States Army, in recognition of his outstanding pioneer service and foresight in the field of American military aviation.

SEC. 2. When the medal provided for in section 1 of this act shall have been struck, the President of the United States shall transmit the same to Mrs. Martin Flades, of Milwaukee, Wis., sister of the said William Lendrum Mitchell, to be presented to her in the name of the people of the United States.

SEC. 3. A sufficient sum of money to carry this act into effect is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARGARET DUNN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 957) for the relief of Margaret Dunn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Margaret Dunn the sum of $8,226 to cover pension rolls for the period from February 3, 1917, to February 20, 1929.
The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACTAEPCTED OF CERTAIN FOREIGN DECORATIONS

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 387) granting permission to Thomas Farran, Surgeon General of the Public Health Service; Rolla E. Dyer, Assistant Surgeon General, Public Health Service; Howard F. Smith, Assistant Surgeon General, Public Health Service; Herbert A. Spencer, medical director, Public Health Service; Vance B. Murray, medical director, Public Health Service; and Gilbert L. Dunnahoo, medical director, Public Health Service, to accept and wear certain decorations bestowed upon them by France, Cuba, Mexico, Chile, Finland, and Luang-Prabang.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be stowed on them.

Mr. Speaker. There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

CHET WALKER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 976) for the relief of Chet Walker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

To be engrossed, etc., that in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers, Kerr, Rockwell, Roe, N.Y.

D'Watt, Kidney,

Dingle, Kirwan

Demangeaux, Lablanc,

Dooder, Durman

LeCompte, Luce

Engel, Michel

Er, Morcet

Fallon, Follas

Fernandez, Moxon

Gary, Maloney

Gaskins, Mannix

Geelan, Memfield

Gibson, Mont.

Gilleloom, Mansfield, Tex.

Gossett, Marcusantonio

Grewal, Mervin

Grieve, Arthur Miller, Wisc.

Hailey, Hart

Hart, Hatfield, Ariz.

Hart, O'Konsk, Harris, Wisc.

Hart, Patrick, Pa.

Hendricks, Patterson

Hill, Petersen, Pa.

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 288 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 717 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

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 (S. 2177) to provide for increased efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not exceeding two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. Moore, and the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Griffin, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order as a substitute for the bill the provisions contained in the committee print of July 29, 1946, and printed in the Congressional Record of July 18, 1946, page 9496, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been ordered, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered by the bill on any amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to reconsider.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order S. 2177, commonly known as the congressional reorganization bill. The time for general debate is 2 hours. Under the rule the
time is to be equally divided between the majority and minority members of the select committee who, for over a year, have been working so ardously on this subject. It waives points of order.

We now have the second rule on this matter. It makes in order as a substitute for the Senate bill the bill which has been devised by the House members of the select committee. There is also a provision in this resolution that the substitute bill may be treated as an original bill in order that after it is substituted it will be in order in the Committee of the Whole. It waives points of order on any amendment which may be adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The rules waives all points of order, due to the fact that the bill deals with a number of subjects, and so might be considered subject to a point of order unless that were done.

I may say to the House that I do not expect much needed piece of legislation on this side and I understand that it is not desired on the other side to consume very much time under the rule, in order that we may get down to general debate and try to pass the bill today. I do want to say while I have the floor, however, that I am supporting the rule and I am supporting the bill. I think this is a bill of tremendous importance to the Members and to the country at large. We have been operating here under machinery that has long since outgrown its usefulness and is outmoded. While all the provisions of this bill will not suit everybody, if you take the bill as a whole the good in it so much outweighs the bad, and the improvement of the machinery of Congress is so very important, that the bill ought to be passed.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as has been explained to you by the gentleman from Virginia, this resolution, House Resolution 717, makes in order this substitute bill to provide for increased efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government. The measure contains a number of amendments to the original bill which have been worked out by the Legislative Committee of the House of Representatives. The committee has eliminated, for instance, the provision that each House Member shall be furnished with an $8,000 executive assistant, but has left the same provision in the Senate portion of the bill. This bill which comes before us is a very much needed piece of legislation, and I believe we are to make the legislative branch of the Government more efficient and more effective.

At the proper time, as I stated in the Committee on Rules, I expect to offer an amendment to section 601 which you will find on page 93 of the bill. My amendment will provide for a reduction of the rate of pay from $15,000 to $12,000 per year, and will contain an additional paragraph which will provide for the payment of an expense allowance of $3,600 per annum to assist each House Member in paying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which no tax liability shall incur or accounting be made, and that such sum is to be paid in equal monthly installments. This amendment is a very simple one. Yet I think it is one that should prevail in connection with this important legislation. The amendment reduces your annual salary $12,000 instead of $15,000, and makes absolutely legal, without question, the authority needed for the payment of $3,600 a year to each Member to assist in the defraying of his expenses in connection with his official duties. We debated and argued on this floor, some time ago, the whole problem or question of whether a Member of Congress should be the only public official anywhere in America who is required to pay his own official expenses out of his salary. The Congress, by its action some time ago on an appropriation bill, did come to the proper conclusion that, after all, a Member of Congress is just as much entitled to be reimbursed for his expenditures in connection with his official work as any public official, or as any individual engaged in private business or professional activities. I do not want to see this bill enacted as it is presented because the American people will believe we have raised our salaries by 50 percent. Actually, we would not be doing so, for under this original bill we would be required to pay all of our expenses out of the $15,000 salary. In any event I doubt we can justify such a salary increase. Instead, I think we can justify an increase of 20 percent. I think we are entitled to that, and probably more. We can justify the 20 percent increase because it is in line with the present wage policy of the administration, a similar pay increase has been granted in industry everywhere. We have also allowed the same sort of an increase for Federal employees. Certainly we can justify, without question, that we are entitled to reimbursement for the money which we pay out of our own pockets for expenses incurred in connection with our official work.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. We all will recall the amendment which you offered an amendment to increase the expense allowance by $500, making it a total of $3,000?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. Does that in any way affect the mileage allowance?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No. The mileage allowance does not mean anything to most Members anyway. The fact is the mileage allowance does not cover one-tenth of the expense most of us have in connection with our travel.

Mr. HARRIS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS of Indiana. Does your amendment have anything to do with fixing the situs of residence of Member of Congress?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No. Nothing at all.

Mr. HARRIS of Indiana. Would the gentleman have any objection to including such an amendment?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think that could be done, but I would not want my amendment confused by that issue, because the issue as to whether a Member of Congress is to be reimbursed for his official expenses is fundamental, according to my view.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House proceed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2177) to provide for increased official expense allowance for Members of Congress.

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 consider-

ation of the bill S. 2177, with Mr.

Smith of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first read-

ing of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the
gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. 
Monroney] is recognized for an hour, and
the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. 
Michener] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, this bill
comes to the House of Repre-

sentatives as the end result of more than
16 months' work of the joint committee of
the House and Senate on the reor-

ganization of Congress.

The bill represents no individual views
and no individual authorship. It is a
combination, a compilation, of the very
best testimony, the very best evidence
that your Special Committee on Reor-

ganization of the Congress could acquire
in more than 6 months of hearings in
which over 300 witnesses were heard.

More than 60 Members of Congress
appeared to testify on various phases to
inform your Committee on what in their
considered judgment based on experience
were the defects of our legislative sys-

tem and things which needed improve-

ment.

Senate bill 2177 is now being amended
by substitution of a committee print agreed
to by 41 Members of the Com-

mittee on the Reorganization of Con-
gress.

There is only one primary purpose con-
sidered in this bill. It is nonpolitical in
its approach. It deals not with any
ideologies or anything except the func-
tional reorganization of the Congress.

One Test Alone

One test and one test alone has been
applied to the suggestion that has now
been incorporated in the bill in the com-
mittee's recommendation and that is simply
this question: "Will it help the Congress
do a better job?"

Mr. Chairman, sitting before me knows
that the work load of the Congress has
increased by geometric proportions
through the several years just passed.

This is the trend: In the last few
months we have had legislation on the
atomic bomb, we have had legislation on
OPA dealing with the economy of $140,-
000,000,000 annual business, with the
draft extension, with the problems of
the United Nations organization, with
UNRRA, with the disposal of many bil-
ions of surplus property, of finding
housing for 15,000,000 veterans, dealing
with the problems of the veterans in the
postwar period, and also the grave prob-
lems of how to handle a $285,000,000,000
public debt and keep this Nation afloat
with the debt, which, to my knowledge, the greatest any
nation has ever carried.

Must Equip Ourselves

I believe anyone will say that we sim-
ply cannot struggle along under this type
of work load unless we equip ourselves
to do the job. The challenge that the con-
stitution framers intended the Congress
to carry. They talk of the giants of the
past, the men who once walked these
Halls back in the 1850's and 1870's; but,
Mr. Chairman, they were not dealing
with the complex problems that we are
dealing with in this Congress.

Most of the Congress in those past
years had three important bills before
them. Usually they would meet and de-
cide which cities and towns needed new
post offices and harbors which had to
to be deepened and improved, and
then if the Republicans were in power
they might tinker with the tariff a little
bit. The actual general was much of the
work load of the Congresses that once
sat in this Hall.

Tools Hopelessly Obsolete

Today we are confronted and con-
fronted by the problems of a $35,000,-
000,000 government trying to do the job
with tools so absolutely obsolete and
antiquated that 435 saints could not pos-
ibly do with our present equipment and
organization.

Yes, reform is long overdue, it is over-
due in many ways. We are using the
tools of the gay nineties and, Mr. 
Chairman, you might as well try to repair a
B-29 airplane with a monkey wrench as
the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, we are sitting before
this country today serving as the board
of directors of the world's largest enter-
prise. It is a hundred times larger than
General Motors, Ford Motor Co., A. T.
& T., the Pan American Railroad System,
and General Electric all rolled into one.
Yet we are trying to do this work sitting
on an old-fashioned high bookkeeper's
stool with a slant-top desk, a Civil War
ledger, and a quill pen. Unless we get
new techniques, the tools, the organiza-
tion, we simply cannot handle the func-

tional work load that the country expects us to carry.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gen-
teleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman think
that any legislation provision which
requires a legislative budget to be put
through which could not be put through
under the machinery set up here before
the 1st of the year by now that the
appropriations Committee to function is
a forward-moving step or is it one that
really should be thrown out? I am won-
dering if the gentleman believes that a
step forward is the way to progress?

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gen-
teleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the first place, the
gentleman from New York is entirely
mistranslated in his dates; secondly, it
can come within the flexibility of the provi-
sions that have been written herein, and
third, it has the endorsement of men like
the former Secretary of the Treasury,
the present Acting Director of the Bureau
of the Budget, Mr. Fairchild of Yale Uni-

versity, fiscal adviser to the United States
Chamber of Commerce, and a great many
others. I would not say that it is reac-
tionary or that it is particularly difficult
or insurmountable.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the gen-
teleman from Illinois for that contribu-

tion.

Last Bastion of Democracy

Mr. Chairman, we in America and we
in Congress are the last firm bastions of
democracy. All around the rest of the
world which looks to us to make de-
mocracy work.

The framers of our Constitution in-
tended the Congress to be coequal. In the
small agricultural economy that we had
for over a century, the Congress was
able without improved staffs, without in-
creasing our facilities, to rely only on the
judgment that the Members of the
Congress had themselves, without re-
search or without data and careful in-

vestigation and analyses, to largely an-
swer the questions that then came up.

Constitutional Duty

We cannot be coequal; we cannot do
this fundamental task of supervision that
the framers of the Constitution had in
mind unless we are virile, strong enough and well equipped
to handle this magnitude of work that is
dumped on us.

Five hundred and thirty-one men that
compose the membership of the House and
Senate are going to have a pretty
hard time in handling, in supervising, in
surveying the work of over 2,000,000 men
throughout the executive departments.
It is like trying to move a battleship with a jeep or a model T Ford.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gen-
teleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. I want to ask a question
about the disposition of court claims as
provided in title IV. As I understand it, the
Committee on Claims and the Com-
mittee on War Claims are abolished and
provision is made that all claims accru-
ing after January 1, 1945, may be settled
by the administrative agencies if they
are not more than $1,000. My question is,
What happens to those claims accruing before January 1, 1945?

Mr. MONRONEY. Under this pro-
cedure those bills would still be admiss-
able in the Congress. There is pro-
vision in the Senate bill which will be
adjusted in conference, making it possi-
ble to consider bills only for permit-
ting court action on arising from 1939 to
1945.

That is a difference we will have to
adjust, but in this clause section every
time we have closed the door of ad-
mittance of a claim on the floor of Con-
gress we have opened up another door
in the administrative departments or in the
courts of the land so that those claims can be adequately adjudicated.

Therefore, there will be no claims
blocked.

Either they have a right to come up
on the floor of the House or to come be-
fore the Congress or they can go into
the courts.

Mr. HOPE. Well, under the legisla-
tion then what committee would have
jurisdiction of the residue claims?
Mr. MONRONEY. The Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DIRksen. I would direct the attention of my friend from Kansas to section 123 on page 46, which has a residuary clause. In the case of claims of a foreign nature they go to the Foreign Affairs Committee and all other claims would go to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HOPE. I thank the gentleman.

That answers the question.

CORNERSTONE OF PLAN

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, the cornerstone and keystone of this reorganization is in the recognition of the fact that the committee structure of this Congress has so grown in importance that the committees actually comprise little congresses of the Congress.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I would like to have the matter clarified with reference to tort claims. I understand if it is less than $1,000 the percentage for attorney fees does not apply.

Mr. MONRONEY. On tort claims?

Mr. HENDRICKS. That is correct. Supposing you had a case involving $1,500. As I understand, the attorneys' fees amount to 10 percent.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think the attorneys' fees are 20 percent if suit is filed and 10 percent if adjudication is made by the department.

Mr. HENDRICKS. On $1,500, that would be $300. Does the gentleman think that a person with such a small claim is going to be able to get competent counsel to go into the Federal Court to represent him?

Mr. MONRONEY. This does not provide for a jury trial. It is heard before the judge sitting without a jury. I understand there will be some discussion later on changing the amount of attorneys' fees.

Mr. HENDRICKS. When a Member of Congress handles a case there are no attorneys.

Mr. MONRONEY. Here 10 percent is allowed for attorneys' fees, for the claimants' attorney.

Mr. HENDRICKS. But we handle it quite adequately without attorneys' fees.

Mr. MONRONEY. But a general attorney has to dig up the facts and obtain affidavits for his clients, much as he would have to dig up evidence if the matter was heard before a Federal court.

Mr. HENDRICKS. My interest is in the client, in that he is not able to get an able attorney for that amount.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The first point I would like to particularly stress to the membership of the House is that in our operation of the Congress the committee system has become of paramount importance. Ninety-five percent of all the legislation that becomes part of the Congress is in the shape that it came from our committees. Therefore, if our committee work is sloppy, if it is bad, if it is inadequate, our legislation in 95 percent of the cases will be bad and inadequate as well.

It is on this vital and important point that we have placed our reorganization rests. If you are not willing to reorganize this overlapping crazyquilt pattern of committee structure, then just do not try very hard because it is the basis and the keystone of this reorganization bill.

You cannot continue to operate in the year 1946, the 80th Congress, just as we did in the 86th Congress. That would be like Topsy from the beginning of this Nation. We have got to reorganize their functions and realign them, so that the members of the committees will have a chance to specialize on one major committee and have the time to devote to it.

We have now 970 committee seats filled by the Members of this House. That is 2.2 seats per Member on an average. Many men have five, six, and seven committees. It is impossible for them to specialize and do the kind of a job that is necessary. Fortunately, in the House we have a large number of committees that are of great importance in handling the major part of the legislation.

REDUCE FROM 49 TO 19

So the committee has recommended and in the bill we provide that basically our committee structure shall all be composed of major committees. We are indebted to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Wadsworth) for the contribution of the committee reorganization; a man who has served both in the Senate and the House, who thoroughly understands from a practical standpoint the importance of this thing, and I believe whose judgment can be greatly relied on.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three additional minutes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I should like to have it: gentleman point out what advantage would be derived from the consolidation which will result in a large committee having quite extensive jurisdiction and which, in order to function, must inevitably break down into subcommittees. I would like to have the gentleman elaborate on that.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not quite agree with the gentleman that they should all be broken down in subcommittees. Some committees will undoubtedly operate either temporarily or permanently through subcommittees; others will operate through standing committees.

But you get away from the tremendous overload of one committee and the complete absence of any work on the part of many other committees. You will give a Member a chance to specialize on the line of work that he is interested in. He can become familiar in all respects with the legislation that he handles.

SURVEILLANCE BY COMMITTEES

Another subject of tremendous importance is the legislative budget provisions. I think that the adoption of this section will for the first time since the Civil War give the Congress an over-all viewpoint on its fiscal policy.

 Another subject of tremendous importance is the legislative budget provisions. I feel that the adoption of this section will for the first time since the Civil War give the Congress an over-all viewpoint on its fiscal policy.
For years we have been operating our revenue-raising committees and our revenue-spending committees completely apart from any relationship one with the other. You simply cannot have adequate budgetary control by such an inadequate procedure.

I agree with the President that these two committees of the House, and the two committees of the Senate, must consider the entire fiscal situation at the start of each session. They will then report, not on the annual budget, but on whether, if the expenditures exceed the income, the Congress must authorize the creation of additional public debt for that year. If we are going to run into debt, I think we should be businessmen enough and have courage enough to do it for a certain amount and do it before we start to appropriate.

Today we start out without any idea of how much we will spend, or where the money is to come from. We wind up the year wondering how many billions we are going to spend and if it is certain that we may be asking too much to consider these two important things, income and outgo, together.

I am certain if the Congress adopts the reorganization we will save many, many times over the cost of this congressional reform.

COST IS $4,601,735

Careful studies have been made on the entire cost of this project, including all necessary changes on the Government. While it is a considerable amount of money, I am certain that it will save many hundreds times the annual cost in increased efficiency and in decreased expenditure of government. Often good auditors save many businesses far more than their salaries.

The total cost of the entire reorganization, including improvements in staff help, improved research in the Library of Congress, doubling of the Legislative Drafting Service, and all expenses, totals $4,601,735. This includes, I believe, the cost for the increase in Members salary at $15,000 a year as well as the full annual contribution of the Congress to the congressional retirement plan.

This total, $4,601,735 is the complete annual cost of the reorganization. Does it run the cost of the Congress too high? As one of the three great divisions of government, I think we should put a yardstick against it and measure it against one of the smallest of all the governmental bureaus.

Take the Office of Indian Affairs, which supervises the business of the Nation's Indians. Their annual operating cost in 1945 was a total of $29,100,891. Under present operation, without reorganization, the Congress, including both House and Senate, salaries of all Members, their clerks, staffs, investigators, mileage—all legislative expense of both bodies totaled $16,325,790.

In other words, the Congress today is spending just under 52 percent of what it costs to operate the Office of Indian Affairs—just a little more than half as much for the entire Government Job that Congress does.

With this new additional expense, we will run 72 percent of the cost of the Office of Indian Affairs. I think the Congress is finding a good business way of making this improvement, even if we do cost 72 percent of what it costs to manage the affairs of the Nation's Indians.

SYSTEM ON TRIAL IN WORLD

Gentlemen, representative democracy is on trial as to how well and how much for the entire Government job that Congress does. The Library of Congress, doubling of the annual cost of the reorganization. Does it run the cost of the Congress too high? As one of the three great divisions of government, I think we should put a yardstick against it and measure it against one of the smallest of all the governmental bureaus.

Today we start out without any idea of how many billions we are going to spend and if it is certain that we may be asking too much to consider these two important things, income and outgo, together.

I am certain if the Congress adopts the reorganization we will save many, many times over the cost of this congressional reform.

COST IS $4,601,735

Careful studies have been made on the entire cost of this project, including all necessary changes on the Government. While it is a considerable amount of money, I am certain that it will save many hundreds times the annual cost in increased efficiency and in decreased expenditure of government. Often good auditors save many businesses far more than their salaries.

The total cost of the entire reorganization, including improvements in staff help, improved research in the Library of Congress, doubling of the Legislative Drafting Service, and all expenses, totals $4,601,735. This includes, I believe, the cost for the increase in Members salary at $15,000 a year as well as the full annual contribution of the Congress to the congressional retirement plan.

This total, $4,601,735 is the complete annual cost of the reorganization. Does it run the cost of the Congress too high? As one of the three great divisions of government, I think we should put a yardstick against it and measure it against one of the smallest of all the governmental bureaus.

Take the Office of Indian Affairs, which supervises the business of the Nation's Indians. Their annual operating cost in 1945 was a total of $29,100,891. Under present operation, without reorganization, the Congress, including both House and Senate, salaries of all Members, their clerks, staffs, investigators, mileage—all legislative expense of both bodies totaled $16,325,790.

In other words, the Congress today is spending just under 52 percent of what it costs to operate the Office of Indian Affairs—just a little more than half as much for the entire Government Job that Congress does.

With this new additional expense, we will run 72 percent of the cost of the Office of Indian Affairs. I think the Congress is finding a good business way of making this improvement, even if we do cost 72 percent of what it costs to manage the affairs of the Nation's Indians.

SYSTEM ON TRIAL IN WORLD

Gentlemen, representative democracy is on trial as to how well and how much for the entire Government job that Congress does. The Library of Congress, doubling of the annual cost of the reorganization. Does it run the cost of the Congress too high? As one of the three great divisions of government, I think we should put a yardstick against it and measure it against one of the smallest of all the governmental bureaus.

Today we start out without any idea of how many billions we are going to spend and if it is certain that we may be asking too much to consider these two important things, income and outgo, together.

I am certain if the Congress adopts the reorganization we will save many, many times over the cost of this congressional reform.

COST IS $4,601,735

Careful studies have been made on the entire cost of this project, including all necessary changes on the Government. While it is a considerable amount of money, I am certain that it will save many hundreds times the annual cost in increased efficiency and in decreased expenditure of government. Often good auditors save many businesses far more than their salaries.

The total cost of the entire reorganization, including improvements in staff help, improved research in the Library of Congress, doubling of the Legislative Drafting Service, and all expenses, totals $4,601,735. This includes, I believe, the cost for the increase in Members salary at $15,000 a year as well as the full annual contribution of the Congress to the congressional retirement plan.

This total, $4,601,735 is the complete annual cost of the reorganization. Does it run the cost of the Congress too high? As one of the three great divisions of government, I think we should put a yardstick against it and measure it against one of the smallest of all the governmental bureaus.

Take the Office of Indian Affairs, which supervises the business of the Nation's Indians. Their annual operating cost in 1945 was a total of $29,100,891. Under present operation, without reorganization, the Congress, including both House and Senate, salaries of all Members, their clerks, staffs, investigators, mileage—all legislative expense of both bodies totaled $16,325,790.

In other words, the Congress today is spending just under 52 percent of what it costs to operate the Office of Indian Affairs—just a little more than half as much for the entire Government Job that Congress does.

With this new additional expense, we will run 72 percent of the cost of the Office of Indian Affairs. I think the Congress is finding a good business way of making this improvement, even if we do cost 72 percent of what it costs to manage the affairs of the Nation's Indians.
in the preparation of two others to enact into law certain titles of the United States Code, which will be legal evidence of all the laws in the respective titles. Five of these bills have been passed by the House of Representatives on three separate occasions, in 1941, 1943, and 1945. Last week this body also passed our bill relating to the collection of internal laws of the United States for the first time since 1909. Unfortunately, these bills have never been reported out of the standing committee of the other body to which they were referred. As a result, the laborious and important work of codification and revision has been nullified because the standing committee of the other body to which the bills were referred has been too busy with its regular business.

However, the fact that five codification bills, which were reported from the House Committee on the Revision of the Laws and were passed by the House in the seventy-seventh, seventy-eighth, and seventy-ninth Congresses, have never been reported out of the Senate standing committee even though the bills make absolutely no change, seems to me quite conclusive proof that our present system of the establishment of such a joint committee is inadequate. The pending bill, in my opinion, would do nothing to improve the situation.

There seems to me to be only one solution of the problem. That is the creation of a Joint Committee on the Revision of the Laws. Many of the benefits of the establishment of such a joint committee are obvious. For example, only by speedy action in both Houses can codification bills be reported out of committees. Such speedy action would be insured by having the work done by a joint committee. A splendid example of the working of a joint committee was the enactment of the Internal Revenue Code as Public Law No. 1 of the Seventy-sixth Congress. The period of time between the passage of the bill in the House and in the Senate was so short that no additional legislation affecting internal revenue was enacted which would require an amendment of the bill in the Senate after it had passed the House.

It is inconceivable to me that the Congress should permit such a serious defect in our legislative process to continue. It is not in the interest of the Senate Members now in explaining the great need for codification of our laws. They have made some progress, but there is still much to be desired and it is my sincere hope that some provision will be made for continuing the work in the most efficient manner possible.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Wadsworth).

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I cannot agree with the statement that every one of these intricate problems that is possessed by the members of the special committee because I was not a member of it. My principal concern from the beginning of all this discussion has been in the committee organization of the House. I would like to say a word about that.

Cold machinery does not necessarily work efficiently. We might set up something that is apparently agreeable in the beginning, and which is logical to the legislative body, but unless it appeals to the Members and gives each Member an opportunity to be useful in the line of work which appeals to him, the machinery itself is not effective. As a matter of fact, perhaps I may use that expression—that I have appr...
Mr. WADSWORTH. I remind the gentleman that I am not a member of the special committee and consequently have not been able to read their minds. I have not heard of any such disposition.

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I say to my friend from Alabama that there was no disposition on the part of the joint committee that party minders as distinguished from the machinery under the rules of the House. On this side the committee on the committees and on the other side the Committee on Ways and Means will function just as they do now. There is no change there.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I say a word—very briefly it must be—with regard to the attitude of the Federal Government. There are instances where two or three committees now existing under the present organization actually pass upon very similar things. The proposal here is that when there is a group of functions to be performed by the Federal Government, functions similar one with the other, then a committee of the House as well as a committee of the Senate shall be so constituted as to get an over-all view of the whole problem involved in those particular functions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MICHELEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, we know perfectly well, of course, that we have three pension committees. It is obvious that the pension policy of the United States should be standardized under one statute or one series of statutes and that the best way to have those policies formulated in the way of legislation is to have the Senate and the House sole question of military pensions and benefits and be in position to bring to us better conceived programs. Then, too, the Federal Government has embarked upon a large number of public works involving authorization of literally hundreds of millions of dollars; indeed, they go up into the billions of dollars.

The Rivers and Harbors, there is Flood Control, there is Roads, citing three, all of them involving construction. We have three different committees to handle the problem of public works generally and each committee works in its own compartment with seldom an opportunity of ascertaining what another committee is doing in a similar field and what the effect of the other committee's action will be on the Federal finances. Would not our legislation be sounder and better considered if a strong central committee of the House were better consulted on this whole public works program, a committee authorized to do so without any vote by the members of the Senate. Under this bill he cannot do so because of the requirement of a majority vote of the members. I am very doubtful whether the statute of limitation which would bar claims after a year allows sufficient time to always prove equitable.

While I consider these objections worth while, and could mention others, they really fade into insignificance in comparison with one which to me stands out.

The fact has been published throughout the Nation that this bill would raise our salaries to $13,000 or 50 percent, as it ostensibly does; in fact, on page 41 of the report we find the statement: "It increases the compensation of Members of Congress to $15,000 per annum.

While this is technically true, we all know that the fact is no such act. It is merely a reorganization of existing salaries. There may be a surmise from the fact that this bill, while raising the actual salaries from $10,000 to $15,000, repeals the $2,500 nontaxable expense allowance we have received for 2 years. Consequently, the raise is actually from $12,500 to $15,000, or 20 percent. If this bill becomes law, I do not wish it to go out to the country that we have raised our salaries 50 percent, whereas the actual raise is 20 percent.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I wish to propound to you a question or two. The distinguished gentleman heard the reference made a while ago as to committee chairmanships. The gentleman will recall that in the press—I do not know whether it was the attitude of the members of his committee, but it was so published—and it was said that there was an attitude on the part of some members of the committee to change the established seniority custom regarding existing chairmen. I recognize that is a preposterous of the House, and it was publicized that the gentleman's committee was going to take it up. I would like to know if there is any disposition on the
part of the gentleman’s committee to change that custom.

Mr. MONROONEY. I would like to assure the gentleman from Alabama that under the rule by which the committee was established, our committee was deprived of any power to make a change in either practice, precedent, custom, or tradition of either House, and under that rule we felt we were bound by the rule not to touch any matters of that sort, although we had witnesses to testify regarding it. We had testimony to that effect. I think the gentleman is concerned with whether any attempt will be made to change that custom. We had testimony to that effect. I think the gentleman is concerned with whether any attempt will be made to change that custom.

Mr. JARMAN. I thank the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] for his statement, and I ask the gentleman from Alabama that in the matter of these provisions in this bill I should be glad to support them. There are others to which I am opposed.

I am opposed to the increase of $5,000 a year in Members of Congress, in this bill. Although I believe more than that, expenses have increased for Members of this body, since they were fixed 20 years ago. Living costs in Washington are higher than anywhere in the country. But, Mr. Speaker, times are unsettled. Members of Congress should not establish these increases when we are expected to hold the line in other places. This is not the first time I have expressed opposition to this sort of thing.

Mr. Chairman, I am also opposed to the next section in the bill that allows Members of Congress to come under the retirement program, instead of affording civil-service employees. They are a different group. They are appointed career people. We are elected officials and Members of Congress. Members were required to pay full contribution during the entire period of service, it would not be quite so inequitable, but this section contains a provision that would allow a Member to retire after 6 years service after paying about $3,000 and get about $2,000 per year the remainder of his life. As I have seen in accordance with his contribution, it would not be quite so inequitable. It is certainly asking too much, even if you favor the policy of allowing retirement pay to elective officials. At the proper time I shall expect to offer to strike the retirement section from the bill. If offered by another Member, I shall support such amendment.

Mr. Chairman, unless the bill is amended in line with my proposal to strike both these sections from the bill, I shall vote against it.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, this proposal for reorganizing Congress has some meritorious features. These things relating to committee changes and the like, which will add to the efficiency of Congress, are commendable.

I do not approve, nor will I support, those provisions raising the pay for Members of Congress and providing for their retirement benefits. The Federal budget has not their balance. We are still going into debt, and in view of my opposition to excessive spending in other fields, I cannot support this proposal.

Mr. MONROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this general plan of reorganization. I think we can improve our system of government, by improvement in congressional organization. I hope we will not lay so much stress upon organization that we overlook the real product of legislation. I was impressed with the suggestion made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REES] that the House decided to offer an amendment at a certain page in the bill. I, too, have had difficulty in bringing myself to approve a 50 percent increase in salary for Members. For the other difficulty whatever bringing myself to approve a same retirement provision for Members of Congress. In fact I heartily approve—not for Congressmen—but a proper, self-contributory retirement plan for Members of Congress. This is not only for individual security but for the general benefit. Without a retirement plan Congress may tend to become a rich man’s club. I have spoken in favor of congressional retirement on at least one or two earlier occasions.

I think I shall support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio when it is offered, for I believe we will be unable to face our constituents and say to them, ‘We have increased our own pay all out of proportion to that which we have provided for employees of the Government and permitted in the case of Members of Congress to do the same.’ I recall we have not been generous with our elderly citizens, nor other groups which could be mentioned.

I want to ask the chairman a question. I notice on page 48, lines 20, 21, and 22, there is set out part of the former jurisdiction of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation which would be included in the jurisdiction of the proposed Committee on Public Lands. At present the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation deals with acquired private lands as well as public lands. Does the gentleman feel this language covers the entire ground?

Mr. MONROONEY. No; may I say to the gentleman that in the matter of these jurisdictional specifications we could not attempt without reporting a bill which would probably be several hundred pages long to cover every specific matter that would come under a committee’s jurisdiction.

Where not otherwise specified, the precedents of the House will apply. I believe the gentleman’s committee now has jurisdiction to acquire the lands of which he speaks. There is no effort to take that away from the committee. We just felt that we did not have space enough to cover everything that could possibly arise on the question of committee jurisdiction.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the gentleman. It may be that on further thought the gentleman may offer an amendment here to make the matter clear. As chairman of that Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation today, I have no particular pride in chairmanship on my own part, but I do have a pride in committee business. I have a pride in this committee. I have an obligation to the committee and to the great cause of reclamation not to be taken lightly. I do not want the Murdock Committee bill impaired or to be reduced if it should be merged with another committee.

The Bureau of Reclamation was established in 1879. It has put out billion dollars worth of projects, adding
The required notice may be given by a Member of Congress within 6 months after the date of enactment of the pending bill, or within 6 months after any date on which he takes an oath as a Member of Congress.

Election could not be made by a former Member of Congress unless and until he again takes oath as such Member.

Paragraph (2)—contribution rate: Provides that any of the Members who elect to come within the retirement law shall contribute 6 percent of his basic compensation for all service after the effective date of the law.

All others subject to the Retirement Act now contribute 5 percent of basic pay.

Purchase of past service: Deposit for the purpose of purchasing credit for past service performed prior to the date of enactment of pending bill would be at the same rate as required of all others subject thereto, as follows:

Two and one-half percent of base pay for service August 1, 1920, to June 30, 1926.

Three and one-half percent of base pay for service July 1, 1926, to June 30, 1942.

Five percent of base pay for service from July 1, 1942.

No deposit is required for service before August 1, 1920, but credit is automatically granted therefor in all cases.

Paragraph (3), requirements for annuity: Requires that a Member of Congress shall have served at least 6 years in service after the age of 62 before he shall be entitled to receive an annuity except, that if a Member becomes disabled, a minimum of 5 years of service shall be required, irrespective of age requirements.

For all except Members of Congress, at least 5 years of service is required for a discontinued service benefit at age 62.

Members of Congress and all other members of the retirement fund must have a minimum of 5 years of service for a disability benefit and there is no age requirement in any disability case.

Paragraph (4), contribution rate: Provides that a Member shall make contributions to the fund for at least 5 years, or deposit, the equivalent thereof with interest, to be entitled to any annuity benefit.

No such requirement for other members of the retirement fund.

Paragraph (5), annuity rate: Assuming deposit for all past services as a Member of Congress subsequent to July 31, 1920, the annuity would be 2½ percent of the Member's average basic salary as such Member, multiplied by the number of years of such service, but no annuity shall exceed an amount equal to three-fourths of the salary received at the time of his separation from the service.

If a Member of Congress fails to make deposit for all his years of congressional service—beyond the 5 years actually required—the years for which he did not contribute or make a deposit would be counted in computing his annuity, but the annuity would be reduced by the amount of such annuity purchasable with the deposit not made.
his service as such Member toward regular civil-service annuity.

If, however, the Member of Congress has less than 6 years of such service, or if all of his service was before the effective date of the pending bill, such service may be credited toward any annuity under Civil Service Retirement Act for which he may be eligible.

No service is creditable toward an annuity for a Member of Congress, under the bill, except the service as such Member.

No period of service creditable for the purpose of congressional annuity computation shall be used also for the purpose of a regular annuity computation under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Paragraph (9): no separation age. All laws relating to automatic separation from the service on account of age are waived for Members of Congress.

Paragraph (10): Defines the term "Member of Congress" as all Members of Congress, including those who have resigned their seats.

Cost figures: It is estimated that the normal cost for the retirement benefits of the pending bill will be $198,000 a year. Normal cost is that figure resulting in the retirement fund.

The deficiency cost, or accrued liability, would total $3,000,000. If this cost be amortized over a period of 52 years—failing the procedure of the Civil Service Retirement Act—there would be an annual cost of about $106,000 until the liability is liquidated.

The deficiency cost or accrued liability arises because of credit allowance for past or previous service.

The above figures are in line with those arrived at by the Retirement Division of the Civil Service Commission.

We take into consideration that a Member of Congress may now, upon failure of re-election, secure an appointment therefrom secure credit for his present membership. We are legislating for their information in the Congressional Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the record of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks so that Members will have for their information in the Record, my discussion of the retirement pay provided in this bill so that the material appears in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the record of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, no information presents itself to me that the Congress is adequately organized or equipped to perform the duties which the framers of the Constitution anticipated it would perform. The framers of the Constitution thought in prospect and showed marvelous vision in what they wrought. It was impossible, however, for them to even visualize, much less contemplate, the economy of our country and safeguard our interests.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I have long felt the need for a reorganization of the committees of Congress as a means to improve the standing of the House. Streamlining of Congress is long past due. I feel that the provisions provided for congressional reorganization, as now made up, will bring far greater dispatch and efficiency in the handling of legislative matters. I am also convinced that the consolidation of committees with more efficient staffs, will make possible a closer scrutiny of all legislative proposals, which will result in the saving of billions of dollars annually for American taxpayers.

I shall vote for the rule to bring this proposal up for consideration.

I cannot agree to the provision which increases the salary of Members up to $15,000, and I will, therefore, vote for the amendment to retain the present salary. I do not feel that Congress should increase the salary of Members until the budget has been balanced. While the provision does not affect the Members of the present Congress, it is my opinion that a mistake will be made to take such action now. We should take the leadership in keeping expenses of government down.

I recognize that many Members are interested in the retirement fund proposed in this legislation. I want to hear the proposed legislation discussed by the members of the committee. If the retirement fund is established, I suggest that all Members desiring to join should be required to make full payment retroactively for any prior service, in order that the system may be considered in accordance with sound actuarial principles. No Member of Congress should receive anything for nothing after his service has been terminated. He should be required to pay the same as though he purchased an annuity from a private insurance company.

The recent recovery of Congress should not be a personal matter with any of the present membership. We are legislating for the future. Congress needs streamlining now. We are dealing with the largest business in the world, and our constituents expect us to handle their affairs in a businesslike manner. The realization that we are the official representatives selected by them to protect the economy of our country and safeguard its interests.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, no information presents itself to me that the Congress is adequately organized or equipped to perform the duties which the framers of the Constitution anticipated it would perform. The framers of the Constitution thought in prospect and showed marvelous vision in what they wrought. It was impossible, however, for them to even visualize, much less contemplate, the economy of our country and safeguard its interests.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I have long felt the need for a reorganization of the committees of Congress as a means to improve the standing of the House. Streamlining of Congress is long past due. I feel that the provisions provided for congressional reorganization, as now made up, will bring far greater dispatch and efficiency in the handling of legislative matters. I am also convinced that the consolidation of committees with more efficient staffs, will make possible a closer scrutiny of all legislative proposals, which will result in the saving of billions of dollars annually for American taxpayers.

I shall vote for the rule to bring this proposal up for consideration.

I cannot agree to the provision which increases the salary of Members up to $15,000, and I will, therefore, vote for the amendment to retain the present salary. I do not feel that Congress should increase the salary of its Members until the budget has been balanced. While the provision does not affect the Members of the present Congress, it is my opinion that a mistake will be made to take such action now. We should take the leadership in keeping expenses of government down.

I recognize that many Members are interested in the retirement fund proposed in this legislation. I want to hear the proposed legislation discussed by the members of the committee. If the retirement fund is established, I suggest that all Members desiring to join should be required to make full payment retroactively for any prior service, in order that the system may be considered in accordance with sound actuarial principles. No Member of Congress should receive anything for nothing after his service has been terminated. He should be required to pay the same as though he purchased an annuity from a private insurance company.

The recent recovery of Congress should not be a personal matter with any of the present membership. We are legislating for the future. Congress needs streamlining now. We are dealing with the largest business in the world, and our constituents expect us to handle their affairs in a businesslike manner. The realization that we are the official representatives selected by them to protect the economy of our country and safeguard its interests.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, no information presents itself to me that the Congress is adequately organized or equipped to perform the duties which the framers of the Constitution anticipated it would perform. The framers of the Constitution thought in prospect and showed marvelous vision in what they wrought. It was impossible, however, for them to even visualize, much less contemplate, the economy of our country and safeguard its interests.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I have long felt the need for a reorganization of the committees of Congress as a means to improve the standing of the House. Streamlining of Congress is long past due. I feel that the provisions provided for congressional reorganization, as now made up, will bring far greater dispatch and efficiency in the handling of legislative matters. I am also convinced that the consolidation of committees with more efficient staffs, will make possible a closer scrutiny of all legislative proposals, which will result in the saving of billions of dollars annually for American taxpayers.

I shall vote for the rule to bring this proposal up for consideration.

I cannot agree to the provision which increases the salary of Members up to $15,000, and I will, therefore, vote for the amendment to retain the present salary. I do not feel that Congress should increase the salary of its Members until the budget has been balanced. While the provision does not affect the Members of the present Congress, it is my opinion that a mistake will be made to take such action now. We should take the leadership in keeping expenses of government down.

I recognize that many Members are interested in the retirement fund proposed in this legislation. I want to hear the proposed legislation discussed by the members of the committee. If the retirement fund is established, I suggest that all Members desiring to join should be required to make full payment retroactively for any prior service, in order that the system may be considered in accordance with sound actuarial principles. No Member of Congress should receive anything for nothing after his service has been terminated. He should be required to pay the same as though he purchased an annuity from a private insurance company.

The recent recovery of Congress should not be a personal matter with any of the present membership. We are legislating for the future. Congress needs streamlining now. We are dealing with the largest business in the world, and our constituents expect us to handle their affairs in a businesslike manner. The realization that we are the official representatives selected by them to protect the economy of our country and safeguard its interests.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, no information presents itself to me that the Congress is adequately organized or equipped to perform the duties which the framers of the Constitution anticipated it would perform. The framers of the Constitution thought in prospect and showed marvelous vision in what they wrought. It was impossible, however, for them to even visualize, much less contemplate, the economy of our country and safeguard its interests.
improving agency in the Federal Government, the acts of Congress affect the vital interests of the country in many of which maintain legislative agents on or near Capitol Hill. These agencies seek to transform the aims of the government into public policy by having them embodied in general legislation, by changing the tax laws to suit their purposes, by creating an influence to reduce or eliminate the appropriations for agencies they dislike and to increase the appropriations for those they favor, and by pressing for the ratification or rejection of treaties. Presidential nominations, and constitutional amendments, too, are bills. Other bills may be intended to affect the economy given rise to government by whirlpools of special-interest groups in which the national welfare can be neglected. The pulling and hauling of powerful pressure groups create delays and distortions which until national safety in wartime and threaten paralysis and bankruptcy in time of peace. The public welfare suffers in the warfare of private groups and Congress becomes an arena for the rationalization of group and class interests.

Without Impairing In any way the right of petition or freedom of expression, the bill provides for the registration of organized groups and their agents whose principal activity is seeking legislation, it also requires them to file detailed quarterly accounts of their receipts and expenditures. Full information regarding the membership, sources of contributions, and expenditures of such organized groups would prove helpful to Congress in evaluating their representations. Publicity is a mild step forward in protecting Congress under pressure and in promoting the democratic way. A constitutional amendment would provide for the registration of organized groups, many of which lack adequate facilities for the continuous inspection and review of administrative performance. We often delegate the rule-making power to administrative departments and commissions, without making any provision for follow-up to see if the administrative agencies and regulations are in accord with the intent of the law. Several of the postwar acts, for example, require certain agencies to submit quarterly reports to Congress, but assign the responsibility for scrutinizing these reports to no legislative committees.

To remedy this situation, the substitute would authorize the committee of both Houses to exercise continuous surveillance of the execution of the laws by the administrative agencies and demands. Staffed with qualified specialists in their respective provinces of public affairs, these investigative agencies would be given a continu­ous review of the activities of the agencies administering laws originally reported by the legislative committees. If the substituted committee will, it is hoped, roughly parallel the reorganized administrative committees of both Congresses, the government and will be utilized as vehicles of coordination and collaboration between Con­gressional Record.
gress and the corresponding administrative agencies, respective jurisdictions.

As a further check upon the financial operations of the Government and its care in handling public funds, the substitute authorizes the Comptroller General to make expenditure analyses of each agency in the executive branch, including Government corporations. Such analyses, with those made by the Bureau of the Budget, will furnish Congress a double check upon the soundness or adequacy of administrative management. Reports on such analyses would be submitted by the Comptroller General to the Appropriations, Appropriative, and appropriate legislative committees of the two Houses.

SAYING CONGRESSIONAL TIME

Congress is surrounded by many local and private matters which divert its attention from national policy making and which it ought not to have to consider. It functions as a common council for the District of Columbia. It serves as a tribunal for the settlement of private claims. It spends much time on pension bills, the construction of bridges over navigable waters, and other private and local matters. The substitute bas the House, Senate, and the District of Columbia claims and pension bills, bridge bills, and other local and private legislation. Title IV provides for administrative and financial adjustment of tort claims against the United States which Congress is poorly equipped to settle. Title V grants the consent of Congress since 1940, to the bridges over navigable waters, subject to the approval of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War. Self-government for the District of Columbia—reform long overdue and a step toward the construction of bridges over navigable waters, subject to the approval of the Executive to the Expenditures, Appropriations, and private matters.

The substitute provides that, except in time of war or national emergency, the two Houses shall stand adjourned at the end of July each year. Such a regular adjournment at definite annual intervals will insure the return of the House with the Senators and Representatives of Members. I think it well to point out that refreshment of contact and exchange of opinion and experience so essential to the responsive representation of the people.

The substitute also provides for the separate and House caucus rooms, for the more efficient assignment of available space within the Capitol, and more convenient dining facilities.

The usefulness of the Congressional Record to all its readers would be increased by the printing in it of a daily calendar of legislative events, together with a résumé of congressional activities and an index of its contents.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, provision is made for increased compensation for the Members of the House and the Senate. It is also provided that Members, if they so desire, may take advantage of a retirement system; that is, under certain conditions, Members of Congress may contribute toward an annuity to be paid when they retire, but not before they reach age 62 years. This feature of the payment of our expenses of living when we reach age 62, is entirely optional. In order to get the benefit of this retirement provision, the Member must pay 6 percent per annum on his salary, and the amount of such annuity is based upon this feature. There is no need in taking time to explain the provisions of this section because every Member here is familiar with it. Sufficient to say, but there is no apparent reason why Members of Congress should not be permitted to purchase annuities when they are at least $2,500, available to all civil service and other employees. No retirement or pension, or whatever you want to call it, should be allowed except by contribution by those who desire to purchase this type of security.

This bill may be amended in any way a majority of the House desires. No limitation is placed on amendments. As a free and open discussion will be had and the House will be permitted to work its will for or against any provision or amendments. That is fair, and it is to be expected. The House will for or against any prejudices or personal interests in and the final analysis vote for that which they believe to be in the best interests of the country as a whole.

The entire bill will be read during its consideration and will be printed in the Record so that no further explanation of the terms is necessary at this time. I shall vote for amendments and shall then vote for the bill.

Mr. MONROE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the reorganization of the Congress is long overdue. I think it would be a mistake if the House failed to go along with the Senate in the matter of the reorganization of both the Senate and the House. I have been a Member of the House for a good many years. I speak from my experience.

The fundamental thing that influences me in the consideration of this bill is the consolidation of the committees of the House so that every Member may be given an important assignment. It is a matter of common knowledge that there are many similar functions considered by different committees. The consolidation therefore of the committees and the concentration of all the work in the Senate pending bill will make for efficiency and will promote morale and better service in my judgment in the discharge of our official duties and services of the Government.

In respect to the increase in the salaries of Members I should like to say that personally I oppose the increase from our existing salary of $10,000 to $15,000. I am unable to square an increase now of 50 percent in our salaries, when I maintain it would be unwise for such a general increase in wages or salaries to be made in industry, manufacturing, and agriculture. Personally, I favored increasing salaries within the Littke Steel formula, but, inasmuch as wages and salaries have been increased about 30 percent, I do believe that Members should be increased to $12,500.

I do believe, however, that there should be an increase in the aggregate of approximately $5,000 in the total compensations of Members. I think it would be wise for $2,500 of that amount to be for the payment of our expenses of living that we duplicate in being required to maintain homes in our districts and in Washington. I therefore favor an amendment that our salaries be increased to $12,500 and that in addition thereto there be allowed a definite stipulated amount of $2,500 for each Member to provide for the duplication of our expenses. I think that would be preferable to the straight increase of $5,000 as provided in the bill. I have insisted for years that rent and similar expenses be allowed as deductions, as Members have homes in their districts and must maintain homes in Washington.

Another matter—it is rather minor—is the so-called stenographic pool. There are a number of details in the bill about the stenographic pool with respect to the over-all matter of reorganization, but I do not believe that any Member of the House should be given an advantage with respect to additional public assistance. I believe that principle should be acceded to every other Member. We provide for the chairmen of committees and we provide for staffing those committees, but I urge on the special committee in charge of the bill that there ought to be one yardstick with respect to salaries and with respect to stenographic allowances that is applicable to every Member of the House.

If that provision is not made definite and certain in this bill, the provision or section should be eliminated.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIREKSEN] a number of questions on the retirement of other Government employees. Members of the Senate and Members of the House must pass upon all the legislation for the retirement of other Government employees. If the President and the Vice President are to be eliminated from retirement benefits, as provided in this bill, in my judgment, in principle, I believe that retirement benefits should not be made applicable to elected public officials, including Senators and Representatives, and I therefore oppose that provision in this bill and favor its elimination. Retirement benefits for elected officials is contrary to sound public policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman for Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIREKSEN], a member of the joint congressional committee and one who has given much attention to this whole matter over a period of years.

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

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

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois to take the time while he is addressing the Committee to...
explain title III, particularly the section with reference to legislation concerning labor. For 44 years ago, that I should permit myself to become so inert in my thinking that the old-time religion of congressional procedure was good enough for me if I had been guided by the views of those who early and late has carried water and shed your eyes. That is an unconscionable distortion of the facts, for when we were sitting in the House office, we explored every item in the bill. We wanted to get a bill that we thought would be given consideration and receive favorable attention. So what was finally contrived was contrived out of a rare and understanding fellowship. So, I salute the gentleman from Texas, the beloved Speaker of this House, for having helped to give direction and help to pilot this thing so that before this Congress expires some final action can be had on this bill and, I hope, on the conference report that will follow.

Now, Members of the House, it is a question of the approach to this thing. I have not the slightest doubt that you can find lots of things in this bill that can be attacked. Obviously, no finite minds, if they were imbued with all the wisdom of 10 Solomonos, could bring a bill of such magnitude, with so much detail and modification, to the attention of this House but what some item would be subject to attack.

We have to carry out a basic and fundamental premise. The first part of that premise or formula is to save and economize on time for the Members. I have emphasized again and echoed and reemphasized in the well of this House the need for more time so that you can get your feet on the desk, so that you can reflect free from the pressure and the chores, and do a job of a better job. So you have to know that when you get to your offices in the morning the telephone rings. There is a pile of mail, there are callers from here and everywhere. Everybody is interested in the operation of government, and if this is in the early season of the Congress, by the time your committees begin, has there been any opportunity to reflect? You hear witnesses, and in the afternoon you are on the floor trying to digest the legislative proposals that come before us. What time is left, when night after night you have to lug your brief case or a bag of papers to your room or apartment or to your home, and there find a little time free from the jingle of the telephone bell that strikes like oh, some great fire on your perceptions when you are trying to piece out a little something by way of legislation for the country.

What is done here with respect to banning private bills under a residual clause, those that are not covered by the tort claims title, by title can go to the Judiciary or Foreign Affairs Committee. On the average, about 3,500 private claims are introduced in every session of Congress. Somewhere between 250 and 300 get action. But there is a committee that has to go through all that matter. You as a Member representing a constituent must do it. Could we devise any better program, for instance, than to draw a line and say, 'Now, look. In connection with tort claims title and property are involved, and personal injury and death, why not confer upon the administrative heads of the departments the authority to consider that matter where no matter involved?' Let him wrestle with it and let him make a report to Congress. In other cases, what better than to endow upon the citizen of the country the right and the authority, in connection with a federal railroad under which the king could not be sued by a subject, to go into the district courts? We confer upon the district courts of the country the right to sue, and that immunity is waived. Let the district judge do it. After all, it is his responsibility. So that is the essence of the tort claims title that is here. I think it is very good.

Such a bill was passed a long time ago in the administration of President Coolidge. It passed both Houses and it was vetoed, as I recall, for only one reason, and that was that the General Accounting Office instead of the Attorney General was made the monitor of the public interest in that respect. Then again it passed either the Senate or the House another time, and as of this good hour there is on the Union Calendar of this House a bill which is almost identical with the bill introduced in the House. I have been a marine contractor once upon a time and having something to do with bridges I know what the mechanics are. First of all, the Department engineers must determine whether the location is suitable and whether or not it will obstruct navigation. If some dredges and pile drivers are to be brought in to pick up spoils where the caissons are to be sunk, will it constitute an obstruction to navigation in the stream? Who determines that? The War Department. What is the nature of the bridge that is to be built? Is there room? Is the bridge in line with the stream or does it run diagonally? Is it a traffic hazard? Is the clearance sufficient to take care of the existing bridges and other boats and smaller river craft? When they have made that determination they send it up and the committee considers it and sends in the committee report. Is that a sensible thing to do? Very well. Let us give the War Department blanket authority to consider this question of bridge bills. They have to do the work anyway. We enlarge their authority a little bit under existing bridge acts, and those are not invalidated by the title that is contained in this bill.

The purpose is, you understand, to save time in those chores and those routine matters that are of course indispensable to the country and to the people and particularly to our constituents, but to hold them and done by any member of the staff of your committee and to give you more time. The staffing provisions have the same thing in mind.

Then in addition, the time element was not overlooked in terms of efficiency and economy. The staff of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of
Congress is an instance in point. We provide and authorize more money for the Legislative Reference Service. I am very devoted to that Service. I think it is a very fine thing. I have often thought what a fantastic business it is, too, with over 12,000,000 exhibits, books, charts, and documents in the Library, the greatest volume of them, not even the Bodleian in London excepted, and then to have it managed in a form in which we are unable to do good, even when we try to do good, unless we have senior experts to digest it when legislation is before the committees? That is what the public feels that is that should be made of our Library. It is designed, of course, to bring information, to bring data, and to bring a finer degree of efficiency in the discharge of our legislative responsibilities.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I just want to say that my experience with that outfit has been discouraging. Just yesterday a very important matter came up which I wanted to work on and I tried to reach the head of the outfit, my gentleman, and was unable to do so—he was too busy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In two Congresses before the present one I appeared before the Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations and asked for $100,000 for the Legislative Reference Service. I did not get it. If my memory serves me correctly, and I apologize in advance if it does not, my distinguished friend from New York was one of those who opposed it. They have been understaffed. They have been so loaded with work the marvel is that they have done as much work as they have.

Mr. TABER. But the attitude of the outfit toward Members of Congress is wrong.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have never found anything wrong with the attitude of the Library of Congress, and I have especially found nothing wrong with the attitude of Mr. Math, the Director of the Legislative Reference Service, who has been so helpful and so cheerful about it, and he has assumed every responsibility that I have ever placed in his hands.

Mr. TABER. I was concerned that I probably use the Library of Congress as much as any Member of the House or of the Senate. I have found them a great instrumentality in helping me to do my work. I use them freely. I have never had occasion to doubt their patriotism, to doubt their loyalty, or to doubt their efficiency, but I have had occasion to wonder why the Congress year after year has starved them to death. Here we make authorizations for necessary funds so that they can have special assignments.
bilities here, even if it does cost some more money.

Finally, I have said not once but a dozen times, up in Madison, Wis., over in Youngstown, Ohio, over in Dayton, and elsewhere, where I have had an opportunity to crusade for congressional reorganization, I said; Write your Congressman and make him do it, because the one way to get an independent Congress that will stand up squarely, face every issue no matter how feverish on any side, may be to send them also as we have given to all the other millions of this country a little sense of security in their jobs.

One other item has been a pet of mine. I have been so distressed about the appropriations procedures in the Congress. I have served on the Appropriations Committee for quite a long time. I try to be diligent in my efforts and I leave the verdict in your hands. I have said so often on this floor that a lot of it is farcical; and let me underline the probability that I may be guilty of violating a rule. Let me flush into one meeting and pull out the truth. It is good for the country and it is good for us that we be shocked on occasions. When Paul Porter and Adkins came to us on the deficiency subcommittee recently and we had hearings there about next year's operations, the amount asked was $142,000,000. We had some sessions on the third of July and finally we put it on a 9 months' basis and gave them $106,000,000, which is about two-thirds of $142,000,000. We virtually took Mr. Porter at his word and I am afraid why these committees could examine into the techniques and the office procedures, into the investigatory techniques of OPA and see whether they were spending too much or too little? No; we had no investigation, even though we passed resolution No. 59 several years ago under which we have a staff. But it was not investigated, and this is up to the day when somewhere somebody these committees could examine into the techniques and the office procedure, into the investigatory techniques of OPA and see whether they were spending too much or too little?

What do the taxpayers think about it? They are the people who are in the streets after all. Here in Washington they sometimes ask me, 'Does the OPA have to pay for their own salary?' They do. If you look at the book, you can go on with deficits. So, I say to you that the chairman of the committee, at the end of the year, June 30, 1947, let us say, and there at that point we know we will find a balanced budget.

Now, then, who is for this sort of proposal? Does the name of Dr. Fred A. Fairchild, of Yale University, mean anything to you? He is one of the greatest financial men of the United States so great that thousands of hard-headed businessmen who belong to the United States Chamber of Commerce have hired him as a fiscal adviser. Mr. Fairchild came before the committee and said on page 53 of the hearings:

That a budget committee be established in the House of Representatives and in the Senate to set annually an over-all figure for appropriations.

That is what we have written into this bill. Here is our good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. Herter], who made such a great record in the Massachusetts Legislature. He was explaining the principle before the joint committee, and said:

In the financial operation of Congress, on the other hand, there is so much parallelism and association of these sums that it is almost a sin to give them a separate figure.

You never knew how right I was really until we can set a ceiling, then we can move on in the direction of that ceiling and correlate our revenues and our expenditures to get a balanced budget when the year begins.

There is Harold Smith, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, now with the Bretton Woods organization. Here is what he said:

The Budget and Accounting Act (the act of 1921) contemplated close relationships between the Bureau of the Budget and the committees dealing with revenues and expenditures. Unfortunately, these relationships have never been fully developed.

Oh, Mr. Former Budget Director, how right you are. They have not been developed.

Here is Mr. Adkins, director of the Connecticut Public Expenditure Council, on page 776 of the hearings:

We suggest that procedures be developed to set up an over-all fiscal plan. The present procedure is weak because appropriation bills are passed piecemeal.

Here is former Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau, who served a long time as Secretary of the Treasury, and you will find this on page 273 of the hearings: If, for instance, the Ways and Means and Appropriations Committees of the House and the Finance and Appropriations Committees of the Senate were to set up a joint committee on fiscal policy to consider the over-all aspects of the expenditure and revenue programs, simplification and greater effectiveness would result.

That from a former Secretary of the Treasury. Finally, here is what the Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget said in a letter to Senator Murray, member of the joint committee, dated June 10, 1946:

So far as section 130 is concerned, it seems entirely proper for the Congress in the spring of each year to state the sense of the Congress in respect to Federal expenditures, revenues, and deficits.

I submit this question: If the argument is made here that there are no committee rooms in which we can meet, are we going to let a hundred-billion-dollar business suffer because of some momentary physical difficulty? They say, "Oh, your subcommittees cannot start their hearings." Is that so? I have always served on one committee that started in December, and you can go on with your hearings just the same and hold up the marking of the bill until the gentleman who are referred to in that over-all joint committee come in and say, "Look, here is the ceiling." Is there anything to prevent it? There is no argument that has been made against it.

Notwithstanding that fact, I feel impelled to say to you that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who has never been for "reamlining," the Congress needed a more responsible committee on Appropriations yesterday morning, and out of 43 Members there were 21 present, and only 20 voted, and he came along with a substitute proposal which
carried by a vote of 17 to 3, which simply recites what the section contained in the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, and the chair did not move to strike this out. I hope the House will not go along with that proposal.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am certain the gentleman wants to be accurate. The chair did not move to strike it out. The chair made no motion at all.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman has brought in a substitute motion.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Tanner] made the motion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; but who brought the resolution to us. Who was the moving spirit that brought the resolution that lay on the committee table yesterday morning?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman begs the question. The gentleman says the chairman made the motion when all who were present will recall that he did not make the motion. In answering the question of the gentleman's last question, the ranking majority and minority members of the committee met with the two ranking majority members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations and all agreed that this shall not be stricken from the bill. It was decided to submit it to the entire membership of the Committee on Appropriations and get their reaction. If the reaction was positive, it would be submitted orally but when the committee convened the clerk, with his usual efficiency, had prepared for each member of the committee the print to which he referred. I had not directed that it be printed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Who engineered it? The clerk certainly does not engineer things like that. Somebody did it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman has had the exact facts in the case.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Maybe it came from Mars.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. And the gentleman made many other misstatements.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is a good deal involved here, and I do not take this sort of thing laying down. I never did.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is too much involved to make misstatements.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has been busy getting this booklet entitled "An Anvil Which Has Worn Out Many Hammers—Congress and Its Traducers." There are three speeches made there. One was made when the resolution creating the joint committee was before this House. You should read that little booklet. He is not for staffing. He is opposed to committee realignment. He is opposed to making a legislative body. The gentleman from Missouri who is opposed to committee realignment. He is opposed to making a legislative body. The gentleman from Missouri who has adopted the other method of appropriation because it has been found that it is possible to cut the deficit by proceeding with people who are not interested in special projects. I hope the thing will be explored before we get through so people will understand what you are doing in getting at and how you propose to proceed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is the whole weakness of the whole fiscal procedure of Congress today. We get so interested in the trees that we cannot see the forest. We get so interested in a few $5,000 and $10,000 items that the whole business of the government finally escapes us. The thing to do is to keep on the main lines and in perspective, to get a real policy, to kick out the policies we do not want that cost money, and then finally resolve it and let your subcommittees work under that ceiling, and even make that a target under which they can effectuate even greater reductions in appropriations and finally in the national debt.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Some one is interested in getting the old volumes of the Congressional Record and the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921. On that occasion one might have heard the familiar cry, "It will not work." How often that was reechoed in the well of this House. How do we know it is not going to work unless we try it? There is just enough of adventurous and the pioneering instinct in me to want to try it, because the great goal is an ordered budget, a reconstruction of the whole structure of confidence, that is so necessary in the hearts and souls of the American people today, and a better and a more improved Congress than we have ever had before. That is a goal worthy of any pioneer and of any adventurer who wants to move down into the great caverns and abysses of fiscal orderliness. It is a bit of adventure really lies. Let no small argument be permitted to prompt the removal of that thing out of the bill, because you will rue it all the days of your congressional service.

Mr. TABER. I am anxious that we do everything that can be done constructively toward improving the operation of Congress. I want to see every forward-looking move made. But I do not like to see something undertaken here without the full explanation of how it would work or whether or not it would.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MONROE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I should like to see this thing explored on the floor. I do not mind somebody who is not familiar with congressional procedure. I should like to see the thing brought out clearly. If you are going to have an over-all ceiling upon a budget—a legislative budget—you have to explore for a time and then you have to apprise that proposition. You are going to be subject to all sorts of pulling and hauling and pressure. It is going to be just like an omnibus appropriation bill, where you would have logrolling. We have adopted the other method of appropriation because it has been found that it is possible to cut the deficit by proceeding with people who are not interested in special projects. I hope the thing will be explored before we get through so people will understand what you are doing in getting at and how you propose to proceed.
ity from income—and then not have something constructive and useful to give to the 140,000,000 people who pay the tax on it, is a condition that is abhorrent and appropri-
ated by this body.

I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The origi-
nal proposal to this task is that of an administrative assistant. I believe that is not contained in the House ver-
sion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is taken out.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I wish to in-
quire whether with the consolidation of the com-
mittees the does the gentleman feel that the individual member will have more work placed upon his shoulders and that he might therefore be in need of an ad-
ministrative assistant?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am hoping that he will have less. As a member of the com-
mittee that has one or more senior spe-
cialists attached to it he can do more work and perhaps have a little time for leisure.

Members of the House, we have brought you a bill that is compelling. If you are going to kick it around, it will be like taking the mainspring out of a watch. It will not work. It will be like taking one of the jewels out of the works of a watch. The watch will not run. Of course, I am not so arbitrary as to feel that you cannot offer an amendment here. But so far as the committee structure is con-
cerned and the staffing of these com-
mittees—that has been integrated and worked out. If you kick out one of these things without good and persuasive rea-
sons, then, of course, you are going to break up the definite and precise proce-
dures we are trying to write into this bill. Let the amendments be very persuasive before you permit them to be written into the bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished member of the committee the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

THE REORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, it was en-
couraging to me that it was compelling. It was extraordinary. I refer to the overwhe-
ming single fact observed by the Special Com-
mittee on the Organization of Con-
gress on which I served as a member. As you know, this special committee, composed of Members of both the Senate and House, devoted a year's full and complete study to the pressing question of congressional reorganization. And the standing question was the virtual accord of criticism and suggestion proposed by the numerous and expert observers who ap-
ppeared before us. Here is in Congress where the urgent interests of the Nation meet and toss turbulently before being channeled into legislative direction, we rarely get such a concord of deliberate opinion. The prevailing impulses, the dire need and the vital interest of all our people are represented here and the diversities of public opinion find their expressed before us. It is as if the waters of our great rivers and our countless streams all flowed in one great sea, met and thrashed and tossed violently before being finally channeled and directed into a great and mighty canal which served the entire Nation.

The special committee devoted a full year's research to the problem of an ad-
ministrative assistant. I heard a great variety of testimony from Members of Congress, political scientists, students of government, and so forth. Yet despite the significant and funda-
mental nature of the study and the great diversity of testifiers, a substantial, unanimous opinion prevailed. Without exception the witnesses, as we may call them, were outspoken in their criticism. Their criticisms reasoned and penetrat-
ing, their suggestions basic and formative. I impress this fact because it sounds as a trumpet call to positive and immediate action.

And this clear trumpet call sounds as an impressive contrast to the confused disagreeable sound of isolated and often violent cries raised not infrequently against Congress and its individual Mem-
bers. No Member of either of our Houses can have failed to hear often in the past, and ever continuing, the attacks on this body and its Members. Since we have had bitter, harsh, unjust, and mean attacks, we have had either to ignore them, which is disingenuous, or protest them, which is to expose one to degrad-
ing controversy. But when there has been a measure of truth in such attacks, in our experience we have had to bear their entire burden while knowing at the same time that our efforts have been arduous, our intentions sincere. And we have realized more and more, as the burden becomes greater, and the instance more severe, that the fault lay not in ourselves so much as in the legislative machinery we have been operating with.

The problems we face daily are of the complexity of our times, of the variety of our people and its concerns. Legislative work has multiplied, committee work grown more demanding, office work has become staggering. At the same time our effectiveness in our legislative prerogative greatly deferred to the executive branch, our power of policy making disorganized, our oversight of administration negligible, our access to essential information cut off. Small wonder that our great and unceasing efforts have often ended in confusion. "The mountain was in la-
bor."

And small wonder too that there has been a tremendous surge in recent years and out of Congress for reorganiza-
tion, a surge which we hope will gain momentum. There is not one faction in this body. There is not one of us in Congress who did not know that our constant and often distressing burden must be eased, our vigor restored. There are many of us who made specific proposals. And beyond our walls there have been since 1941 a series of independent surveys of the machinery and me-
thods of our National Legislature by public and private organizations. The work and study of the joint committee was the culmination of that surge and the bill proposed, passed by the Senate, and now before us, is the peak of that surge which should sweep over the top. Here in Congress we know the necessity of reorganizing our machinery. The most astute observers of political science have urged it with compelling force. And we owe it to the people we represent to guarantee that their National Legisla-
ture is strong and effective. Recent his-
tory and new alertness of the consequence of the default of legisla-
tures. The decay of national vigor or the surrender of all power to the dictator be the consequence of the existence of the legislature in modern times.

The joint committee has proposed, and the Senate has passed with some limiting amendments, a bill designed to eliminate most of our present machinery and to enable Congress to perform adequately its main func-
tions of determining policy, authorizing administrative organization and app-
lpropriations to carry out policy, and su-
ervising execution of the resultant prog-
gram. The term "streamlining Con-
gress" is frequently heard in reference to these proposals. Such a term ignores the structural and basic element of re-
organization incorporated. We are equipping ourselves with a modern and efficient engine which eliminates waste, restores power, utilizes energy to the fullest, and assures continued per-
formance.

Mr. Chairman, I refer to the proposed changes as basic and structural, de-
signed to improve the machinery and method of both Houses and of the Con-
gress as a whole. Before I analyze the separate provisions and indicate their structural improvements, I would like to point out that there is one proposal which I regard as extraneous and not basic. It is a proposal which I do not believe should be part of the constructive plan whose design is reorganization. In the select committee I affirmed for the Roscoe as noted in the committee report my opposition to the proposed increase in salary for Members of Congress. I repeat here in insistence that this provision should not be included in the bill, that it is alien to the basic intent of the bill. In declaring that the mental defects as part of the bill, I must object to its passage.

My endorsement and unstinting sup-
port of the reorganization bill is a main-
rally based and endorse-
ment here. Consequently, I feel obliged to state why my objection to this single provision is so strong. In so doing I regret the necessity of disagreeing with the other capable and distinguished members of the committee. My opinion is a minority one and this emphasizes the necessity for declaring my reasons. But in this instance I am not prepared to ass-
ert, since the issue might be regarded as a delicate one, that this difference of opinion reflects no discredit on either party.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has pro-
posed to correct the practice of attaching riders to appropriation bills, a proposal which has all the most sincere people are alien to the intent of the particular bill. These riders tagged on to bills which are assured of final passage thus ride into the realm of law not on their merits but because they are provisions which would not otherwise receive the approval of Con-
gress. So they are extraneous to the intent of the bill, usually quite unrelated
and even alien, and they do not stop for review and approval before passing into the realm of law. This is not right; we propose to eliminate such a practice.

But consider the proposal to charge a salary in a bill which is designed to improve the machinery of Congress, we are doing much the same thing. The salary question is extraneous; it is all too likely that the proposal for salary would be a waste of legislative energy. Let the question of salary pass or fail on its own merits, debated and voted upon under open scrutiny.

But it is argued that such a proposal is at odds with the intent of the bill, namely to improve the functioning of Congress, since a salary increase would substantially improve the caliber of the membership. I regard this as a gratuitous assumption. I believe that the salary received by Members of Congress is of slight weight in determining its membership. Members are elected to Congress on the strength of their own record of public service, and that alone. It is significant in this respect to note that Members seek election, to Congress, and that Congress, having elected the Members, and voted their membership. I regard this as a gratuitous assumption. I believe that the salary received by Members of Congress is of slight weight in determining its membership. Members are elected to Congress on the strength of their own record of public service, and that alone. It is significant in this respect to note that Members seek election, to Congress, and that Congress, having elected the Members, and voted their membership.

But it is argued that such a proposal is at odds with the intent of the bill, namely to improve the functioning of Congress, since a salary increase would substantially improve the caliber of the membership. I regard this as a gratuitous assumption. I believe that the salary received by Members of Congress is of slight weight in determining its membership. Members are elected to Congress on the strength of their own record of public service, and that alone. It is significant in this respect to note that Members seek election, to Congress, and that Congress, having elected the Members, and voted their membership.

But it is argued that such a proposal is at odds with the intent of the bill, namely to improve the functioning of Congress, since a salary increase would substantially improve the caliber of the membership. I regard this as a gratuitous assumption. I believe that the salary received by Members of Congress is of slight weight in determining its membership. Members are elected to Congress on the strength of their own record of public service, and that alone. It is significant in this respect to note that Members seek election, to Congress, and that Congress, having elected the Members, and voted their membership.

But it is argued that such a proposal is at odds with the intent of the bill, namely to improve the functioning of Congress, since a salary increase would substantially improve the caliber of the membership. I regard this as a gratuitous assumption. I believe that the salary received by Members of Congress is of slight weight in determining its membership. Members are elected to Congress on the strength of their own record of public service, and that alone. It is significant in this respect to note that Members seek election, to Congress, and that Congress, having elected the Members, and voted their membership.

But it is argued that such a proposal is at odds with the intent of the bill, namely to improve the functioning of Congress, since a salary increase would substantially improve the caliber of the membership. I regard this as a gratuitous assumption. I believe that the salary received by Members of Congress is of slight weight in determining its membership. Members are elected to Congress on the strength of their own record of public service, and that alone. It is significant in this respect to note that Members seek election, to Congress, and that Congress, having elected the Members, and voted their membership.
people, its vital role in the conduct of public
instrument of representative governance.
As we go up to the present Congress, lobbying
requirements have been put on the record in
order to curtail the rights of free speech, of freedom of
the press and the right of petition, without applying
to publishers of newspapers or other periodicals or limiting people who appear openly and frankly before committees of Congress to their right to be heard. Committees on the Library and Printing organize. Lobbying regulated. This requires a word without curtailing
the liberties of the press and the right of petition, without applying to publishers of newspapers or other periodicals or limiting people who appear openly and frankly before committees of Congress to their right to be heard.

Here are a few of the numerous wise and progressive provisions that make the present bill the epoch-making legislative proposal that it is:

Charles A. Beard, in an article entitled "In Defense of Congress," remarked:

It has spent time, energy, and money in unacceptable subject of national concern, but it has never made a thorough inquiry into its own record, into its own weaknesses, and into need of raising its competence as a principal branch of National Government.

That inquiry has now been made, a systematic, courageous, and comprehensive inquiry. We have an historic opportunity. We can effect a modernization of Congress by approving the most significant changes in its structure since its very first session. And simultaneously we can lessen our burden and help our people. Reorganization of the committee system can restore our prestige and effectiveness. We can free our hands then to be able to grasp the great issues of these crucial days. We can refute the thesis of the gentleman from Oklahoma that the committee system is an instrument of representative government. We can restore the democratic process to government action.

The words of Walton H. Hamilton, professor of law, Yale Law School, in a New York Times article entitled "Blueprint for a Virile Congress" are pertinent:

These proposals are addressed to a situation already overdue for reform. They stand directly in the line of our great common tradition. They represent the very minimum of adjustment of our accepted political order to the conditions under which the Government must operate today. A further adaptation of the committee system and more efficient, representative government. We can restore the democratic process to government action.

Mr. Chairman, I join with those others who have spoken this afternoon in paying tribute to the chairman of the House part of the joint committee which has brought in this bill, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Monroney), and to the other Members on both sides of the aisle who, in my judgment, have brought before us today one of the most important bills to come before the present Congress. It is not perfect. It has flaws. It does not go far enough in many respects, but if we are going to perform the duty that we as public officials should perform and do that job adequately, we are going to have to make a great many changes in congressional procedure.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Dirksen), in his opening presentation, referred to the past phases of the bill and there is no point in my duplicating them. I would say in passing, however, that the heart of this bill is the reorganization of the committee system. Whenever we start to make any change, somebody's toes get stepped on. Whenever we start to reduce the number of committees, there is going to be an automatic reduction in the number of committee chairmen. But I am sure we realize, Mr. Chairman, that committees are not ends in themselves. Committees are a means to an end, and that goal is the better performance of the job we have been sent here to do. If by a reduction of the number of committees and the consolidation of their functions we can perform a more effective job for the American people, then we should be glad to reduce the number of committees and glad to reduce the number of committee chairmen.

It is quite true that each committee will lose certain functions which it has in the past. I am proud of the fact that I am chairman of the National Committee on Banking and Currency of this House. I think our chairman is one of the most splendid men in this House. Our committee will lose some functions. So will other committees. But the loss of prestige of the part of any particular committee is not the main issue; the issue is over-all congressional functioning.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OuLAND. I yield.

Mr. HAYS. I want to join my colleague from California in this matter of surrendering committee functions. He would agree, would he not, that it is incumbent upon us to think not only of our committee and its functions, but we are proceeding by a conscious, systematic, courageous, and thorough inquiry into our own record, into our own weaknesses, and into need of raising our standing and competence as a principal branch of National Government.

One of the most important things I want to see in this measure is the registration of lobbyists here in Washington, I do not care from what source an individual receives money or to whom he gives it, but if this Congress is to carry out its full constructive assignment to the American people it should make every individual who represents an outside organization state his income and his outgo. It is a worthwhile provision. I hope it will be adopted.

Then, finally, there is a provision which I think is excellent, which sets a definite date for congressional adjournment. If we had had a definite date set for the adjournment of this House when we started this year we would not do so little work on Mondays and do so little work on Fridays, but we would be here 5 and 6 days a week and the work of the House would have been finished before today. It will be a very good thing to have Congress set a definite date for adjournment. Then it will be possible for us to return to our districts more often and keep more closely in touch with our people. Then it will be fair to the 48 States instead of just a few located near the seat of government.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the chairman comment on the provision that is made to consider legislation which would not be considered under present rules?

Mr. OuLAND. Yes; I would like to, but I may say to the gentleman from West Virginia that my time is nearly up. I wanted to make two or three other
Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee substitute in the nature of a committee print dated July 20, 1946, which is at the Clerk's desk. I offer that as a substitute for the Senate bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute offered by Mr. MONRONEY: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

short title
That this act, divided into titles and sections according to the following table of contents, may be cited as the "Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946":

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title I—Changes in Rules of Senate and House
Sec. 101. Rule-making power of the Senate and House.
Part 1—Standing rules of the Senate (Sec. 102-108).
Standing committee of the Senate.
Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.
Committee on Appropriations.
Committee on Armed Services.
Committee on Banking and Currency.
Committee on Civil Service.
Committee on the District of Columbia.
Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.
Committee on Finance.
Committee on Foreign Relations.
Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.
Committee on the Judiciary.
Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.
Committee on Rules and Administration.
Sec. 109. Appropriations.

Part 2—Rules of the House of Representatives (Sec. 110-118).
Standing committee of the House of Representatives.
Committee on Agriculture.
Committee on Appropriations.
Committee on Armed Services.
Committee on Banking and Currency.
Committee on Civil Service.
Committee on the District of Columbia.
Committee on Education and Labor.
Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.
Committee on Foreign Affairs.
Committee on House Administration.
Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.
Committee on the Judiciary.
Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.
Committee on Public Lands.
Committee on Public Works.
Committee on Rules.
Committee on Un-American Activities.
Committee on Veterans' Affairs.
Committee on Ways and Means.
Sec. 119. Delegates and Resident Commissioners.
Sec. 120. Reference of private claims bills.
Part 3—Provisions applicable to both Houses
Sec. 123. Private bills. (Sec. 124-132.)
Sec. 125. Congressional adjournment.
Sec. 126. Committees of procedure.
Sec. 127. Committee powers.
Sec. 128. Conference rules on amendments in nature of substitute.
Sec. 129. Legislative oversight by standing committees.
Sec. 130. Decisions on questions of committee jurisdiction.
Sec. 131. Legislative Budget.
Sec. 132. Hearings and reports by Appropriations Committees.
Sec. 133. Records of Congress.
Sec. 134. Preservation of committee hearings.
Sec. 135. Effective date.

Title II—Miscellaneous

Part 1—Statutory provisions relating to Congressional personnel
Sec. 136. Stenographic pool.
Sec. 137. Increased compensation for certain congressional officers.
Sec. 138. Committee staffs.
Sec. 139. Legislative Reference Service.
Sec. 140. Office of the Legislative Counsel.
Sec. 141. Studies by Comptroller General.
Sec. 142. Expenditure analyses by Comptroller General.
Sec. 143. Correction of Military and Naval Records.

Part 2—Statutory provisions relating to committees of Congress
Sec. 144. Improvement of Congressional Record.
Sec. 145. Joint Committee on Printing.
Sec. 146. Transfer of functions.
Sec. 147. Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

Part 3—Provisions relating to Capitol and pages
Sec. 149. Remodeling of caucuses rooms and restaurants.
Sec. 150. Assignment of Capitol space.
Sec. 151. Senate and House pages.
Sec. 152. Effective date.

Title III—Regulation of Lobbying Act
Sec. 153. Short title.
Sec. 154. Definitions.
Sec. 155. Detailed accounts of contributions.
Sec. 156. Receipts for contributions.

Sec. 157. Statements to be filed with Clerk of House.
Sec. 158. Statement preserved for 2 years.
Sec. 159. Persons to whom applicable.

Sec. 160. Registration with Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House.
Sec. 161. Reports and statements to be made under oath.

Sec. 162. Penalties.
Sec. 163. Exception.

Title IV—Federal Tort Claims Act
Part 1—Short title and definitions
Sec. 164. Short title.
Sec. 165. Definitions.

Part 2—Administrative adjustment of tort claims against the United States
Sec. 166. Claims of $1,000 or less.
Sec. 167. Reports.

Part 3—Suits on tort claims against the United States
Sec. 168. Jurisdiction.
Sec. 169. Procedure.
Sec. 170. Review.

Part 4—Provisions common to part 2 and part 3
Sec. 171. One year statute of limitations.
Sec. 172. Exceptions.
Sec. 173. Attorneys' fees.
Sec. 174. Exclusiveness of remedy.
Sec. 175. Certain statutes inapplicable.

Title V—General Bridge Act
Sec. 176. Short title.
Sec. 177. Consent of Congress.
Sec. 178. Toll.
Sec. 179. Acquisition by public agencies.
Sec. 180. Statements of cost.
Sec. 181. Sinking fund.
Sec. 182. Applicability of title.
Sec. 183. International bridges.
Sec. 184. Eminent domain.
Sec. 185. Penalties.
Sec. 186. Rights reserved.
Mr. MONRONEY (interrupting reading of amendment). Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

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

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

Mr. Celler. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 3 words, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I feel that this question of section 138 should be brought out in the open and that we should discuss it from the standpoint of its merit and not from the standpoint of generalities. Section 138 creates the legislative budget. It is my desire and my hope that whatever comes out of this bill will help to make the Congress a better legislative body and will permit us to do things in a better way than we can now.

The first question is, is the legislative budget to be anything more than a pious gesture? What would happen at the present time? If we are going to have a legislative budget set up after the President's budget is sent in here approximately the middle of January, what would be the procedure? Either the joint committee of the Appropriations and Ways and Means Committees and the Senate Finance Committee and the Senate Committee on Appropriations, containing 104 members, can go ahead and get into the details through subcommittees or other committees, and the Budget estimates that are sent down here and establish a ceiling relating to each appropriation bill, after complete and thorough hearings, and that ceiling would have to go through that Finance Committee, or we can have a very cursory examination of the picture by that large committee and they can then present a resolution, if the thing is going to be changed, that it has to be after thorough hearings. We might just as well be honest with the people back home and these organizations that have been interested in this thing.

The feeling of the committee is—and I am sure it will be the feeling of the House—that unless otherwise specifically provided the existing precedents of the House will apply to committee jurisdictions.

The feeling of the committee is—and I am sure it will be the feeling of the House—that unless otherwise specifically provided the existing precedents of the House will apply to committee jurisdictions.

Mr. Celler. I thank the gentleman. I now ask this question: What about the question of seniority? For instance, the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am the ranking Democratic member, assumes the duties and responsibilities of the Committee on Claims, the Committee on Patents, the Committee on Revision of the Laws, and the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. I presume that some Members of the Appropriations Committee will try to get membership on the Committee on the Judiciary. What will be their status in reference to seniority?

Mr. MONRONEY. I will reply to the gentleman that I know that it can do no change or interfere in any degree with existing practices in the House regarding committee assignments or the places which are assigned.

Mr. MONRONEY. We do nothing whatsoever about the seniority rule or try to regulate the places on the committee.

Mr. Celler. It is not the gentleman's recommendation, then, that the seniority rule that now prevails should be changed?

Mr. MONRONEY. We do nothing whatsoever about the seniority rule or try to regulate the places on the committee.

Mr. Celler. I thank the gentleman. Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 3 words, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I feel that this question of section 138 should be brought out in the open and that we should discuss it from the standpoint of its merit and not from the standpoint of generalities. Section 138 creates the legislative budget. It is my desire and my hope that whatever comes out of this bill will help to make the Congress a better legislative body and will permit us to do things in a better way than we can now.

The first question is, is the legislative budget to be anything more than a pious gesture? What would happen at the present time? If we are going to have a legislative budget set up after the President's budget is sent in here approximately the middle of January, what would be the procedure? Either the joint committee of the Appropriations and Ways and Means Committees and the Senate Finance Committee and the Senate Committee on Appropriations, containing 104 members, can go ahead and get into the details through subcommittees or other committees.

The feeling of the committee is—and I am sure it will be the feeling of the House—that unless otherwise specifically provided the existing precedents of the House will apply to committee jurisdictions.

The feeling of the committee is—and I am sure it will be the feeling of the House—that unless otherwise specifically provided the existing precedents of the House will apply to committee jurisdictions.

Mr. Celler. I thank the gentleman. I now ask this question: What about the question of seniority? For instance, the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am the ranking Democratic member, assumes the duties and responsibilities of the Committee on Claims, the Committee on Patents, the Committee on Revision of the Laws, and the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. I presume that some Members of the Appropriations Committee will try to get membership on the Committee on the Judiciary. What will be their status in reference to seniority?

Mr. MONRONEY. I will reply to the gentleman that I know that it can do no change or interfere in any degree with existing practices in the House regarding committee assignments or the places which are assigned.

Mr. MONRONEY. We do nothing whatsoever about the seniority rule or try to regulate the places on the committee.

Mr. Celler. It is not the gentleman's recommendation, then, that the seniority rule that now prevails should be changed?

Mr. MONRONEY. We do nothing whatsoever about the seniority rule or try to regulate the places on the committee.

Mr. Celler. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 3 words, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I feel that this question of section 138 should be brought out in the open and that we should discuss it from the standpoint of its merit and not from the standpoint of generalities. Section 138 creates the legislative budget. It is my desire and my hope that whatever comes out of this bill will help to make the Congress a better legislative body and will permit us to do things in a better way than we can now.

The first question is, is the legislative budget to be anything more than a pious gesture? What would happen at the present time? If we are going to have a legislative budget set up after the President's budget is sent in here approximately the middle of January, what would be the procedure? Either the joint committee of the Appropriations and Ways and Means Committees and the Senate Finance Committee and the Senate Committee on Appropriations, containing 104 members, can go ahead and get into the details through subcommittees or other committees.

The feeling of the committee is—and I am sure it will be the feeling of the House—that unless otherwise specifically provided the existing precedents of the House will apply to committee jurisdictions.

The feeling of the committee is—and I am sure it will be the feeling of the House—that unless otherwise specifically provided the existing precedents of the House will apply to committee jurisdictions.
or 5 months before the Budget is presented to Congress, hold hearings which are conducted by representatives of the Budget as to each particular department? They have a large number of these hearings running at the same time. The President's Budget is due on the end of any value and is to have any integrity, it means 2 or 3 months' work. What does that mean? It means before the Appropriations Committee could go to work and put through its bills and get anywhere it would probably have to wait until that legislative budget was established.

Under the amendment, that proposed by the chairman of the committee, the date at which the report would have to be made by that committee would be February 15. They have changed it from the way the proposed bill stood. Would that legislative budget then have to go through the House and the Senate? Where it would probably have to wait until that legislative budget was established. If it is proposed that that be done. We were not enlightened on that subject when our friends discussed the matter. I do not know.

In other words, it is a kind of a pig in a poke. We do not know where we are at in regard to that. If we were to wait until after that resolution could be considered by the House and Senate, we could not start the detailed hearings of the committee.

I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Cass].

Mr. CASS of South Dakota. I simply want to point out that the bill, of course, makes no requirement that the congress shall adopt the report of the Budget.

Mr. TABER. No; that is true. It could make no such requirement. But I do not know what their program is or what ideas they have in mind. I could get a better idea of what might be done if I knew.

Let me look at another feature of this. Is this going to result in an omnibus appropriation bill or is it going to result in an omnibus appropriation bill where log-rolling can be done? It was the idea of Martin Madden in charge of the Appropriations Committee that the Budget and Accounting Act was passed that no one should serve on one of the subcommittees if he had a special interest which could be promoted by such an arrangement. As a result of the way he laid out the procedure for the Committee on Appropriations, the committee has been able to approach that with men on the subcommittees who have no special interest to serve and has been able to cut large sums out of those bills. Whether we are to continue that practice or whether we are as a result, are we to have an omnibus appropriation bill and have it put through by special interests as a result of log-rolling is the question involved. All of these recommendations of the Budget should have been considered by this 104-man committee and decided in that way. Is it going to be that kind of a budget or is it going to be a budget which the Budget Committee will have over 6 months to work on the budget. The Budget Committee expects to tell them where their interest which could be promoted by such an arrangement should be used.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. In the summer of 1945, when the Ways and Means Committee had before it a bill to repeal the excess-profits tax, did not the Secretary of the Treasury testify before that committee that the budget for the fiscal year 1947 would be approximately $25,000,000,000, and is it not a fact that it went up to $42,000,000,000?

Mr. TABER. I remember when he went over there once and was $20,000,000 off on his estimate for the current year. I was asked to come before the committee and I gave my figures about 6 months before the end of the fiscal year, and I was within a billion or two of the total. But I do feel that this is a serious thing.

Now, look at this budget-ceiling proposition. Suppose you put on a budget ceiling and without having that ceiling allocated to different appropriations and different departments the Propriations Committee should attempt to recommend to the Congress to slice the personnel throughout the Government by a certain percentage to bring it down to the proposed ceiling, that would mean using a slipshod sense.

Mr. TABER. That might be a good suggestion. I can see how that might work.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. GEARHART. I notice it is necessary for the new committee of 104 members to first give consideration to the Presidential Budget.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. GEARHART. In order to properly analyze and understand the Presidential Budget, it must take this committee of 104 almost as long as it took the Bureau of the Budget to prepare it. Can the gentleman tell us how long it takes the Budget to be sent to us?

Mr. TABER. At least 4 months.

Mr. GEARHART. Then, this committee would have to do that and complete the Budget and have it before the House before the 15th of February.

Mr. TABER. They could not possibly do it short of 4 or 3 months.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. O'NEAL. The Bureau of the Budget met in June and is meeting again this month in the consideration of Budget items for 1948.

Mr. TABER. In other words, they are laying out a program where they will have over 6 months to work on the Budget.

Mr. O'NEAL. And in 30 days this committee expects to tell them where they are wrong.

Mr. TABER. Well, I want to see something done that will help. I want to see these specialists that are going to be provided here go to work and I want to see them have authority to do something, but I do not want to do something destructive.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to make the next point.

Mr. Chairman, I hope I am not the only Member of this body who thinks that this is a very good section of the legislative program and who feels that, if it were properly considered, it will be thought to be workable. As one who has
spent much time in the past quarter century with the very thing which is being discussed. I would like to suggest that we translate this into simple language. Perhaps we can understand it better.

If you were preparing a household budget for its first year or for the calendar year, you would first set up, from some knowledge on your part, the probable amount of money that you expected to have during that year. You would then work out the groups of expenditures into which you expected to put your personal income for that year. You would not worry about the details of every group of expenditures, but you would divide your income under the general classifications. You would be very sure in your family, which no government ever is, that you have only so much money to spend, and you would have to keep within that. So here the proposal is to set up the amount of money the Government is probably going to have in its financial situation, and then to realize that the Appropriations Committee and the Ways and Means Committee should work together, first to appropriate money, and within that money which do not exist at the present time, and then for the Ways and Means Committee to raise the money as it may safely be raised and still preserve safely its form of government. I think you will see that it will work, and if you will realize that at the present time there is little coordination between the subcommittee on Appropriations and the Appropriations Committee, you will see that anything of the kind would be an improvement over present methods. At the present time you have each subcommittee considering appropriations separately from the other appropriations.

I think the principal thing that must be understood is that in the first year of the application of this new procedure, there would be difficulty. No one here should deny it. It would be the first year, but in subsequent years the experience of the preceding years would tend to make the preparation of the new budget, and in the long run the taxpayers of the United States and the country as a whole would be infinitely benefited.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, to carry the gentleman’s analogy of a family budget a little further, if the family were setting up its budget and it appeared they might want to spend more money than they had immediately in sight, would the gentleman think they should immediately go out and try to borrow the money that would be necessary to meet the excess?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is what the Government does not do and that it what I do not suggest we do.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Nor I, but I am afraid that is what is proposed in paragraph (b) here. I cannot understand why in advance of maturing obligations Congress should adopt a resolution saying the public debt should be increased until there is an actual need for the cash. That is why I think (b) should be revised to accomplish the apparent objective.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That may be, but I think even if we left it in we would be trying to decide how much we want to spend, and then to consider the ability of the taxpayers to pay. Taxes have already been fixed at the historic 25 percentage set down as a safe limit.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And certainly I think there should be coordination in the definition of revenues and expenditures.

Mr. PHILLIPS. This paragraph of the bill I think aims at a most desirable objective; but I do not see why the Government should go out and increase the public debt in advance of actual cash needs for maturing obligations.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman makes a good point.

Mr. O’NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, having been on the Appropriations Committee for many years and also having handled the legislative business in the Committee on Ways and Means, I am very interested in the reorganization of Congress, I have had some occasion to review the history of legislation of this character, and I think in this paragraph of the bill presented has been discussed by Members of Congress for 50 years. The proposals that are in this bill today on that subject were discussed on the floor of Congress at least 30 years ago and Congress during that period of time, having investigated the matter thoroughly, has found that such way of handing the business is not the scientific nor the best way.

On the question of saving money and handling appropriations, in my humble judgment, the most authoritative and most expert witnesses that you could possibly call into this picture would be the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Cannon) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. Tabor). I know of no two men who have done more with the budget or who are more sincerely interested in those things than the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from New York. That is a fact.

It has been their daily occupation for years. They know what has happened for many, many years, and they tell you without the slightest doubt in their minds that this provision is impractical, it is idealistic, it is wishful thinking, that it will not do a thing to better the situation. In fact, they tell you it will interfere with the proper handling of business on the floor of the House. I concur entirely with their expressions.

There is absolutely nothing constructive or practical in this provision, and any who will take the time to go into the matter can see why it is a futile gesture and the result of a futile gesture develops a lack of confidence next year or at some other time when nothing has been accomplished by it.

Mr. Chairman, these budgets come to us after a thorough study of from 4 to 6 months by 650 employees of the Bureau of the Budget. They have sat there and worked on them; all the American people sit there today on the 1948 budget, examining every item. They bring it to us after cuts, the best that they can do under the circumstances. They bring it to us, and the Appropriations Committee divides this vast budget among subcommittees, going over it for months and trying to cut and trim where it should be cut and trimmed. We do everything we can to save a dollar for the taxpayers. The result is that vast amounts of money are being saved. Every year, and I am most convinced, and because he is so eloquent and convincing, I felt the need to rise on this occasion to point out that the Bureau of the Budget is not so very much interested in saving money. Obviously they were not interested in saving money in the reorganization plans.
I personally feel that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], who sponsored this legislation, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DINKSEN], who was on the other side, are either hard-working men down there who are on the right track. We have been talking about improving our machinery, and now we have an opportunity to act. Frankly, the cost of government is going up all the time. I do not think so much of the economy job they are doing. I do not think the Bureau of the Budget is so wonderful. I am for this bill, and I am for the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown]. I think we are doing a good job for the country by voting up this resolution and voting for it unanimously. I trust the gentleman from Kentucky will change his mind as far as this particular feature is concerned.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky. Mr. O'NEAL. If the gentleman is attacking something that we have fought for, I wish he would stick to the amendment. As far as the bill is concerned, we are all for the bill.

Mr. BENDER. I am glad to hear that. Mr. O'NEAL. If the gentleman had been on the floor he would have understood it.

Mr. BENDER. I have been on the floor all the while.

Mr. O'NEAL. But the gentleman directs his remarks against the gentleman from Kentucky. Mr. BENDER. I would not make any argument against the gentleman from Kentucky, because I like the gentleman too well. He is a fine public servant. But I will say this about his statement regarding the Bureau of the Budget economy program. I do not share his view at all.

Mr. O'NEAL. I think the Congress has gotten into a very bad habit of attacking the Budget and giving no credit to any hard-working men trying to do their job as sincerely as the gentleman is trying to do his.

Mr. BENDER. Frankly I do give credit to the Budget. Many times when they are working there I think there are many good men working there. I have no criticism of them except when you tell us how much money they saved and how anxious they are to save money, all I know is that the public debt is going up all the time, and obviously they are not saving any money.

Mr. O'NEAL. Let me say to the gentleman that if he will put it on the doorstep of Congress he will find the answer. It is not the Bureau of the Budget. In this very Congress we appropriated $3,000,000,000 over and above what the Budget sent us here, $50,000,000 for airports, $3,750,000,000 for a loan, $400,000,000 for housing and other vast amounts. The Budget cannot change it. They carry out what they have to do and I vote for the amendment.

Mr. BENDER. But the Budget has made many recommendations that we revised downward, and we do it regularly, on every appropriation bill.

Mr. O'NEAL. I have been on the Appropriations Committee for a number of years and have tried in the performance of my duties on that committee to give everything I possess in the way of energy, talent, and ability. I want to place my recommendation to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DINKSEN]. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DINKSEN] has today given to the House of Representatives a challenge. So far as I that they know just exactly what they can spend in that home. If they spend more than they take in, when they have a deficit, they are in debt for it; they know that it is a burden on the family in future days to get rid of that debt. The only way to get rid of it is to pay it off. That is the only honest and honorable thing to do, to pay it off.

In operating its business the directors of a corporation get together and say, "We are going to do this and we are going to go into debt for it; they know that it is a burden on the family in future days to get rid of that debt. The only way to get rid of it is to pay it off. That is the only honest and honorable thing to do, to pay it off.

The Nation's pressing problems will be better solved and more adequately considered if this congressional reorganization takes place. Under the terms of the bill now before us, each one of the committees remaining in existence would have to be effective in cooperation, keeping its membership informed and working in close contact with executive agencies carrying out the legislative intent of Congress in its field. A Joint committee of the Senate and the House would assure effective cooperation would be set up. Another joint committee representing the majority and minority parties in Congress could be created. Still a third joint committee would become a legislative-executive council.

The need for change in our legislative procedure is apparent to every citizen who follows daily news. Duplication of investigations, long delays in considering legislation, the ease with which issues distasteful to a few individuals can be effectively shelved are all too evident in Washington.

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

Mr. Chairman, section 138, the legislative budget, provides something I have been wishing would come before the House of Representatives for a long, long time. I tried many times to get the Appropriations Committee and the Ways and Means Committee not to pass the appropriation bills and determine how much money the Congress was going to have to spend for a session of Congress, and then figure out just how they were going to raise the money they wanted to spend. By that means, a joint committee of those committees of the House and similar committees of the Senate would determine just what our budget would be, and then we would try to have the line of a balanced budget.

Mr. VORYS. Of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yielding to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Of Ohio. Does not this section provide the answer to the gentleman's famous question, "Where are we going to get the money?"

Mr. RICH. Yes; it provides the answer to the mechanics of how we are going to get the money. It does not provide the answer of where, exactly.

The situation is this. Let us take the home as an example. In any home the father and mother know what the earning power of the home is. Then from
am concerned as a member of the Com-
mittee on Appropriations, I endorse the
position as I understand it, now the House of Representatives is not going to
turn its beck upon the provisions in
this bill which the sponsors of the bill
say is necessary, that is, it is necessary, in
my own State of Wisconsin [Mr. La
Follette] says, are the very guts of this
bill. Now, let us see what they are argu-
ing when they say, "Oh, nothing is
going to happen if you set up this great
superduper committee and if you bring
the representatives of the Committee on
Ways and Means and the Committee on
Appropriations of the House together
with the representatives of the Finance
Committee and the Committee on App-
propriations of the Senate in a joint
meeting to take a look at this budget to
which the President submits at the be-

coming of each session." Why not? I
ask you. Why should they not take a
look? Why should they not examine that
the Presidential budget to try to
the question as to whether or not it is
possible to adopt a legislative budget—
a legislative mark, if you please—that the Congress may shét at in an attempt to balance the budget?
The budget that the President will sub-
mitt in January 1947 is in process of
being prepared right now. The chances are
that the figures contained in that budget will be 6 months old when they
are submitted on the 3d of January.
Why should not the Congress, through
this committee, have up-to-the-minute
estimates of the Treasury Department as
to the revenues? Why should they not
have the up-to-the-minute figures of
these departments submitted so that we
can have an up-to-the-minute legisla-
tive budget? Perhaps it may interfere
somewhat with this Subcommittee on
Deficiency Appropriations that has al-
ready reported out 3 deficiency bills in-
volving billions of dollars which never
were considered by any of the subcom-
mittees of Congress charged with appro-
priations containing and requiring
deficiency appropriation bills. So far
as I am concerned, I am willing to take
this step in the direction of an effort to
secure a balanced budget. Despite the
things that my friend from New York
has said and despite the argument made
by my friend the gentleman from Ken-
tucky [Mr. O'Neal] I have not heard
one sound argument advanced which
me is a compelling argument against the
adoption of the provisions of this reor-
ganization bill which will give this
joint committee an opportunity to go
over these things from top to bottom and
set up an over-all budget, if you please,
that will be up to date on the basis of
up-to-date financial estimates from the
Treasury department and set a minute
that the subcommittees of the Commit-
tee on Appropriations can shoot at.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the
CHAIRMAN. Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask
unanimous consent to proceed for two
additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, there is
nothing in this proposal that tops the
subcommittees from going to work.
They will have the Presidential budget
before them and there is nothing to stop
them from going ahead with their
hearings.

I want to tell you, if you sat in these
hearings, despite all this breast beating
year after year down here, the whole sit-
tuation has been so handled that I have
experienced it, it is "by guess and by
God." That is about what it amounts to.
I think it is about time that we began to
take some steps in the direction of hav-
ing a more scientific approach to this
matter of budget making and the matter of
appropriating the public's money. It
is because I have such a sincere convic-
tion in that regard that I, as one mem-
ber of the Appropriations Committee who
has spoken on this question many times
before, want to endorse to the Congress
of the United States the sentiments so
eloquently and powerfully expressed by the
distinguished gentleman from Illinois
[Mr. Dirksen].

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the
CHAIRMAN. Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I
ask unanimous consent that all debate on
this paragraph and all amendments thereto
be disposed of in 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I move
to strike out the last three words.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Mr. Chairman, there are many fea-
tures of this bill which I think are im-
portant. The Senator from Wisconsin
[Mr. La Follette] and the gentleman from
Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney] and their
committee have worked long and
hard in preparing a measure reorgan-
izing the activities of Congress. Prac-
tically all of us are in sympathy with
their views, even though some points may
be controversial. But because it is a
good bill, because it will do the job and
help improve congressional procedures,
there is no reason why some other con-
troversial features should be introduced
at this time when these important fea-
tures which might not be adopted if they inde-
pendently came before the House.

It was only a few months ago that this
House had the privilege of voting di-
rectly on the question of pensions for
Congressmen. The bill was sent back to
committee. The House refused to take
any action whatsoever regarding it.
Now, if for purposes of argument, I
will return to the point on which I
spoke before the Congress has and been
discussed and turned down. Yet, because this is
an important bill and because it is a step in
the right direction, I am of the opinion that
is not complete in all particulars, again we
have this question of congressional pen-
sions inserted. I happened to be among
those who opposed congressional pen-
sions during many Congresses and I con-
tinue to oppose them.

Another is the provision for the in-
crease of salaries of Senators and Rep-
resentatives. There is a way of increas-
ing the salaries of Members of Congress
if that should be wise to do so, and that
is to bring a bill out of the proper legis-
lative committee, let it receive favorable
consideration in both the House and the
Whole, and then a vote by the House,
on a yea and nay vote. That is the way
to increase salaries and do it fairly and
uniformly. There is no reason that a
particular salary provision should be put
into this bill. There is nothing in the
procedures of Congress that depends
upon the salaries of Members. I favor. Unless those two features are stricken
out, notwithstanding that I favor the
purposes of this bill, I shall not vote for it.

Only yesterday the House passed the
so-called social-security bill. There are
some 60,000 pensioners in the State of
Wisconsin depending more or less upon
Federal aid for social security in the
small amount allotted to them. Such
old-age assistance amounts to about $30
a month, half payable from Federal aid
and the rest by the State and county.

Under the so-called social-security
bill passed by the House, yesterday, the
old-age pensioners, blind persons, and
those children under pension in the
State of Wisconsin will receive an addi-
tional $640,000 of Federal aid. That
will be for the 46,000 pensioners
drawing old-age assistance and about
14,000 more on the pension lists of the
blind and children's aid. The increase of
Federal aid to them will probably amount to not to exceed $20 per year
for every pensioner on the lists. Cer-
tainly if there is any reason why salaries
should be increased in Congress, why
there should be a wage increase every-
where else, there is every reason in the
world why these people, two million and
a quarter of them in our country should
receive a more reasonable increase in
their assistance payments.

Unless amendments are adopted to
strike out these, the provision for con-
gressional pension and pay increases,
which I do not think are properly in this
bill, I shall be compelled to vote against
it even though I am heartily in favor of
the General Post Office measure.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—CHANGES IN RULES OF SENATE AND
HOUSE

RULE-MAKING POWER OF THE SENATE AND
HOUSE

SEC. 101. The following sections of this
title are enacted by the Congress:

(a) As an exercise of the rule-making
power of the Senate and the House of Repre-
sentatives, respectively, and as such they
shall be considered as part of the rules of
each House, respectively, or of that House
with which they specifically apply; and such
rules shall supersede other rules only to the
extent that they are inconsistent therewith;

(b) With full recognition of the constitu-
tional right of either House to change such
rules as it may see fit, so far as relates to
such House] at any time, in the same man-
ner and to the same extent as in the case of
other rule of that House.
expedite consideration of the bill to treat it in this manner.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection. (The portion of the bill referred to follows.)

PART I—STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE
Standing committees of the Senate.
Sec. 102. Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"RULE XXV
"Standing committees"
"(1) The following standing committees shall be appointed at the commencement of each Congress, with leave to report by bill or otherwise:
"(a) Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:
"1. Agriculture generally.
"2. Inspection of livestock and meat products.
"3. Animal industry and diseases of animals.
"4. Adulteration of foods, feeds, and pharmaceutical products.
"5. Agriculture colleges and experiment stations.
"6. Forestry in general, and forest reserves other than those created from the public domain.
"7. Agricultural economics and research.
"8. Agricultural and industrial chemistry.
"11. Human nutrition and food economics.
"13. Agricultural educational extension services.
"14. Extension of farm credit and farm security.
"15. Rural electrification.
"16. Agricultural production and marketing and stabilization of prices of agricultural products.
"17. Crop insurance and soil conservation.
"(b) Committee on Appropriations, to consist of 21 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:
"1. Appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government.
"2. Committee on Armed Services, to consist of 18 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:
"1. Marine and War Department.
"2. The War Department and the Military Establishment generally.
"3. The Navy Department and the Naval Establishment generally.
"4. Soldiers' and sailors' homes.
"5. The production, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the armed forces.
"6. Selective service.
"7. Size and composition of the Army and Navy.
"8. Forts, arsenals, military reservations, and military installations.
"10. Maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including the administration, sanitation, and government of the Canal Zone.
"11. Conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves.
"12. Strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense.
"(d) Committee on Banking and Currency, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:
"1. Banking and currency generally.
"2. Financial aid to commerce and industry, other than matters relating to such aid which are specifically assigned to other committees.
"3. Deposit insurance.
"4. Public and private housing.
"5. Federal Reserve System.
"6. Gold and silver, including the coinage thereof.
"7. Issuance of notes and redemption thereof.
"8. Valuation and revaluation of the dollar.
"9. Control of prices of commodities, rents, or services.
"(e) Committee on Civil Service, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:
"1. The Civil service generally.
"2. The status of officers and employees of the United States, including their compensation, classification, and retirement.
"3. The postal service generally, including the railway mail service, and measures relating to oceanic and submarine service, but excluding post roads.
"4. Postal-savings banks.
"5. Census and the collection of statistics generally.
"6. The National Archives.
"(f) Committee on Commerce, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:
"1. All matters relating to the municipal affairs of the District of Columbia in general, other than appropriations therefor, including:
"1. Public health and safety; sanitation, and quarantine regulations.
"2. Regulation of sale of intoxicating liquors.
"3. Adulteration of foods, feeds, and pharmaceutical products.
"4. Taxation and tax sales.
"5. Insurance, executors, administrators, wills, and divorce.
"6. Municipal and juvenile courts.
"7. Incorporation and organization of societies.
"8. Municipal code and amendments to municipal laws.
"(g) Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:
"1. Budget and accounting measures, other than appropriations.
"2. Reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government.
"(h) Such committee shall have the duty of:
"1. Receiving and examining reports of the Comptroller General of the United States and of submitting such recommendations to the Senate. The Senate shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:
"1. Revenue measures generally.
"2. The bonded debt of the United States.
"3. The Democratic and governmental disbursements of the United States.
"4. Customs, collection districts, and ports of entry and delivery.
"5. Reciprocal trade agreements.
"6. Transportation under dutiable goods.
"7. Revenue measures relating to the following subjects:
"1. Inland waterways.
"13. Foreign loans.
"(i) Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:
"1. Interstate and foreign commerce generally.
"2. Regulation of interstate railroads, buses, trucks, and pipe lines.
"3. Communication by telephone, telegraph, radio, and television.
"4. Civil aeronautics.
"5. Merchant marine generally.
"6. Registering and licensing of vessels and small boats.
"7. Navigation and the laws relating thereto, including pilotage.
"8. Rules and international arrangements to prevent collisions at sea.
"10. Measures relating to the regulation of commercial carriers by water and to the inspection of merchant marine vessels, lights and signals, life-saving equipment, and fire protection on such vessels.
"11. Coast and Geodetic Survey.
"12. The Coast Guard, including life-saving services, lighthouses, lightships, and ocean derelicts.
"13. The United States Coast Guard and Merchant Marine Academies.
"(j) Committee on Appropriations, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:
"1. Revenue generally.
"2. The bonded debt of the United States.
"3. The Democratic and governmental disbursements of the United States.
"4. Customs, collection districts, and ports of entry and delivery.
"5. Reciprocal trade agreements.
"6. Transportation under dutiable goods.
"7. Revenue measures relating to the following subjects:
"1. Inland waterways.
17. Fisheries and wildlife, including research, restoration, refuges, and conservation.

18. Bureau of Standards including standardization of weights and measures and the metric system.

(k) Committee on the Judiciary, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

1. Proceedings, civil and criminal, generally.


3. Local courts in the Territories and possessions.

4. Revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.


6. Protection of trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies.

7. Holidays and celebrations.

8. Bankruptcy, mistrial, espionage, and counterfeiting.

9. State and Territorial boundary lines.

10. Meetings of Congress, attendance of Members, and their acceptance of emoluments of the United States affecting their revenue and appropriations.

11. Preservation of prehistoric ruins and objects of interest to such ruins.


13. Irrigation and reclamation, including water control projects, easements of public lands for irrigation projects.


15. Mining interests generally.


18. Mining schools and experimental stations.


20. Relations of the United States with the Indians and the Indian tribes.

21. Measures relating to the care, education, and management of Indians, including the care and allotment of Indian lands and general and special measures relating to claims which are paid out of Indian funds.

(n) Committee on Public Works, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

1. Flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors.

2. Public works for the benefit of navigation, and bridges and dams (other than international bridges and dams).

3. Water power.

4. Oil and other pollution of navigable waters.

5. Public buildings and occupied or improved grounds of the United States generally.


7. Measures relating to the Capitol building and the Senate and House Office Buildings.

8. Measures relating to the construction or reconstruction, maintenance, and care of the buildings and grounds of the Botanic Gardens, the Library of Congress, and the Smithsonian Institution.

9. Public reservations and public parks within the District of Columbia, including Rock Creek Park and all public reservations; and the Washington Monument, and in cooperation with the Committee on the District of Columbia or of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may serve on three standing committees and no more.
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HR 108. Rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

\textit{Rule XVI}

\textit{Amendments to appropriation bills} \textit{a}

1. All general appropriation bills shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and amendments to any general appropriation bill the effect of which shall be to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add a new item of appropriation, unless carried out by the House of Representatives.

2. The Committee on Appropriations shall not report an appropriation bill containing amendments proposing new or general legislation or any restriction on the expenditure of the funds appropriated which proposes a limitation not authorized by law.

3. All amendments to general appropriation bills moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, or proposed in pursuance of an estimate submitted in accordance with law.

4. The Committee on Appropriations shall not amend the bill by proposing new or general legislation or any restriction on the expenditure of the funds appropriated which proposes a limitation not authorized by law.
be received; in like manner, amendments proposing new items of appropriation to river and harbor bills, establishing post roads, or proposing new post roads, shall, before being considered, be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

"4. No amendment which proposes general legislation not germane to the purpose of a general appropriation bill, nor any amendment not germane or relevant to the subject matter contained in such bill, or which proposes a limitation not authorized by law, or is of a nature to crowd or obstruct the business of the committee, or which proposes any amendment to any item or clause of such bill be received; nor shall any amendment to any item or clause of such bill be received which does not directly relate to the purposes of the bill, or is of a nature to crow or obstruct the business of the committee, or which proposes any amendment to any item or clause of such bill be received which does not directly relate to the purposes of the bill, or contains any amendment which contains any amendment which does not directly relate to the purposes of the bill.

"5. No amendment, the object of which is to provide for a private claim, shall be received to any general appropriation bill, unless it be to carry out the provisions of an existing law or a treaty stipulation, which shall have been in effect for five years at the time of the amendment.

"6. (a) Three members of the following-named committees, to be selected by their respective committees, shall be ex-officio members of the Committee on Appropriations, to serve on said committee when the annual appropriation bill making appropriations for the purposes specified in the following table opposite the name of the committee is being considered by the Committee on Appropriations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Number of Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Agriculture- Forestry</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Civil For the Post Office</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Armed Forces</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on the District of Columbia</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Public For rivers and harbors</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Foreign For the diplomatic</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and consular relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) At least one member of each committee enumerated in subparagraph (a), to be selected by his or her respective committee, shall be ex-officio member of any committee appointed to confer with the House upon the annual appropriation bill making appropriations for the purposes specified in the foregoing table opposite the name of his or her respective committee.

"7. When a point of order is made against any restriction on the expenditure of funds appropriated in a general appropriation bill on the ground that the restriction violates this rule, or that the rule shall be construed more strictly and, in case of doubt, in favor of the point of order.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma a question: Would we by the provisions embodied in this bill have the right to change the rules of the House of Congress despite the fact that this bill was passed by the Senate and the House?

Mr. MONRONEY. No. It specifically recognizes the right of either House to change its rules at any time. We are merely doing it jointly for the purpose of convenience and clarification. The rules can be changed by the new Congress or by this Congress at any time.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman restate his request?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read by titles of sections, each section to be considered open for amendment when the titles are read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman means to read the title and not the sections?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how many sections are there in the bill?

Mr. MONRONEY. Probably a hundred sections.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the reading by sections be according to the consent request?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Clerk will read the titles of the sections.

Mr. PATMAN. All right; starting now with section 121, how far would the Clerk read before an amendment would be offered?

Mr. MONRONEY. He would read the first part, of course, and then an amendment would be in order.

Mr. PATMAN. The first part down to where?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Clerk would read:

Rule X of the rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

And then the section would be considered as read.

Mr. PATMAN. Then he would get down to page 27?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, when the section number is read it will be open to amendment. Then rule XI on page 27 would next be in order?

Mr. MONRONEY. That would be the next subtitle the Clerk would read and it would be open to amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object. I think if the gentleman wants to give us a chance he will let the bill be read by sections. He can call the sections without reading them, then let us offer amendments.

Mr. MONRONEY. I was trying to do that.

Mr. TABER. Let him call the number of the section and ask for amendments to that section. I think that would be all right. The titles are so hard to find, unless one is exceedingly familiar with it. It will be difficult for anyone to follow.

Mr. MONRONEY. I will be glad to modify my request.

Mr. TABER. Let the Chairman call off the section numbers one at a time and amendments may be offered. I would be willing to do that.

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree with that.

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

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the Chair just state what the request is so that all Members will be apprised?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that the section numbers be read as they are reached, that the reading of the language in the bill be dispensed with but that when the section number is read it will then be in order to offer amendments to any part of that section.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The Chair will announce the page of the bill?

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

PART II—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Standing committees of the House of Representatives

Sect. 121. (a) Rule X of the rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"Rule X

"Standing committees

(a) There shall be elected for each Congress, by the House, the following standing committees, to consist of 27 Members.

1. Committee on Agriculture, to consist of 27 Members.

2. Committee on Appropriations, to consist of 43 Members.

3. Committee on Armed Services, to consist of 27 Members.

4. Committee on Banking and Currency, to consist of 27 Members.

5. Committee on Civil Service, to consist of 27 Members.


7. Committee on Education and Labor, to consist of 25 Members.

8. Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to consist of 25 Members.

9. Committee on Foreign Affairs, to consist of 25 Members.

10. Committee on House Administration, to consist of 25 Members.

11. Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to consist of 27 Members.

12. Committee on the Judiciary, to consist of 25 Members.

13. Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to consist of 25 Members.

14. Committee on Public Lands, to consist of 25 Members.

15. Committee on Public Works, to consist of 25 Members.

16. Committee on Rules, to consist of 12 Members.

17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine Members.

18. Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to consist of 27 Members.

19. Committee on Ways and Means, to consist of 27 Members.

(b) (1) The Speaker shall appoint all select and conference committees which shall be ordered by the House from time to time.

(2) At the commencement of each Congress, the House shall elect as chairman of each standing committee one of the members thereof; in the temporary absence of the chairman, the member next in rank in the seniority in the election of the committee, and so on, as often as the case shall happen, shall act as chairman; and in case of a permanent vacancy in the chairmanship of any such committee the House shall elect another chairman.

(3) All vacancies in standing committees in the House shall be filled by election by the House. Each Member shall be elected to fill a vacancy in the committee and no more; except that Members who are elected
to serve on the Committee on the District of Columbia or the Committee on Un-American Activities may be elected to serve on two standing committees and no more, and no member of the majority party who is elected to serve on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments or on the Committee on House Administration may be elected to serve on two standing committees and no more.

(b) Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"RULE XI
Powers and duties of committees
"(1) All proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the subjects listed under the standing committees named below shall be referred to such committees, respectively:

"(a) Committee on Agriculture.

"1. Agriculture generally.

"2. Inspection of livestock and meat products.

"3. Animal industry and diseases of animals.

"4. Adustration of seeds, insect pests, and protection of birds and animals in forest reserves.

"5. Agricultural colleges and experiment stations.

"6. Forestry in general, and forest reserves other than those created from the public domain.

"7. Agricultural economics and research.

"8. Agricultural and industrial chemistry.


"10. Entomology and plant quarantine.

"11. Human nutrition and home economics.


"13. Agricultural educational extension services.

"14. Extension of farm credit and farm security.

"15. Rural electrification.

"16. Agricultural production and marketing and stabilization of prices of agricultural products.

"17. Crop insurance and soil conservation.

"(b) Committee on Appropriations.

"1. Appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government.

"2. Committee on Armed Services.

"1. Common defense generally.

"2. The War Department and the Military Establishment generally.

"3. The Navy Department and the Naval Establishment generally.

"4. Parks and recreation areas.

"5. Pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the armed forces.

"6. Selective service.

"7. Size and composition of the Army and Navy.

"8. Forts, arsenals, military reservations, and navy yards.


"10. Maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including the administration, sanitation, and government of the Canal Zone.

"11. Conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil shale reserves.

"12. Development of critical materials necessary for the common defense.

"(c) Committee on Banking and Currency.

"1. Accounting and auditing accounts generally.

"2. Financial aid to commerce and industry, other than matters relating to such aid which are specifically assigned to other committees of the House.

"3. Deposit insurance.

"4. Public and private housing.

"5. Federal Reserve Bank.

"6. Gold and silver, including the coinage thereof.

"7. Issues of notes and redemption thereof.

"8. Valuation and revaluation of the dollar.

"9. Control of prices of commodities, rents, or services.

"(e) Committee on Civil Service.

"1. Determining its economy and efficiency.

"2. The status of officers and employees of the United States, including their compensation, classification, and retirement.

"3. The postal service generally, including the railway mail service, and measures relating to Federal postal and telegraph service, but excluding post roads.

"4. Postal-savings banks.

"5. Census and the collection of statistics generally.

"6. The National Archives.

"(f) Committee on the District of Columbia.

"1. All measures relating to the municipal affairs of the District of Columbia in general, other than appropriations therefor, including:

"2. Public health and safety, sanitation, and quarantine regulations.

"3. Regulation of sale of intoxicating liquors.

"4. Administration of food and drugs.

"5. Taxes and tax sales.

"6. Insurance, executors, administrators, wills, and decedent's estates.

"7. Municipal and juvenile courts.

"8. Incorporation and organization of societies.

"9. Municipal code and amendments to the criminal and corporation laws.

"(g) Committee on Education and Labor.

"1. Measures relating to education or labor generally.

"2. Mediation and arbitration of labor disputes.

"3. Wages and hours of labor.

"4. Convict labor and the entry of goods made by convicts into interstate commerce.

"5. Regulation or prevention of importation of foreign laborers under contract.


"7. Labor statistics.

"8. Labor standards.

"9. School-lunch program.

"10. Vocational rehabilitation.


"12. Columbia Institution for the Deaf, Dumb, and Blind; Howard University; Freedmen's Hospital; and St. Elizabeths Hospital.


"(h) (1) Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

"1. Budget and accounting measures, other than appropriations.

"2. Reorganizations in the executive branch of the Federal Government.

"(2) Such committee shall also have the duty of:

"(A) Receiving and examining reports of the Comptroller General of the United States and of submitting such recommendations to the House as it deems necessary or desirable in connection with the subject matter of such reports.

"(B) Studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency.

"(C) Evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

"(D) Studying intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, and between the United States and international organizations of which the United States is a member.

"(i) Committee on Foreign Affairs.

"1. Relations of the United States with foreign nations generally.

"2. Establishment of boundary lines between the United States and foreign nations.


"5. International conferences and congresses.


"7. Intervention abroad and declarations of war.

"8. Measures relating to the diplomatic service.

"9. Acquisition of land and buildings for embassies and legations in foreign countries. Measures relating to foreign commercial intercourse with foreign nations and to safeguard American business interests abroad.


"11. Foreign loans.

"(1) Committee on House Administration.

"1. Employment of persons by the House, including clerks for Members and committees, and reporters of debates.

"(2) Expenditure of the contingent fund of the House.

"(3) The auditing and settling of all accounts which may be charged to the contingent fund.

"(4) Measures relating to accounts of the House generally.

"(5) Appropriations from the contingent fund.

"(F) Measures relating to services of the House, including expenditure and administration of the House Office Buildings and of the House wing of the Capitol.

"(G) Measures relating to the travel of Members of the House.

"(H) Measures relating to the assignment of office space for Members and committees.

"(1) Measures relating to the disposition of useless executive papers.

"(J) Except as provided in paragraph (o) 8, matters relating to the Library of Congress and the House Library generally.

"(K) Except as provided in paragraph (o) 8, measures relating to the Smithsonian Institution and the incorporation of similar institutions.

"(L) Matters relating to printing and correction of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

"(M) Measures relating to the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress, corrupt practices; contested elections; credentials and qualifications; and Federal elections generally.

"Such committee shall also have the duty of:

"(A) Examining all bills, amendments, and joint resolutions after passage by the House; cooperating with the Committee on the District of Columbia or the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, of examining all bills and joint resolutions which shall have passed both Houses, to see that they are correctly enrolled; and when signed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, shall forthwith present the same, when they shall have originated in the House, to the President of the United States in person, and report the fact and date of such presentation to the House.

"(B) Reporting to the Sergeant at Arms of the House the travel of Members of the House.

"(C) Arranging a suitable program for each day observed by the House of Representatives as a memorial day in memory of Members of the Senate and House of Representatives who have died during the preceding period, and to arrange for the publication of proceedings thereof.

"(K) Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

"1. Interstate and foreign commerce generally.

"2. Regulation of interstate railroads, buses, trucks, and pipe lines.

"3. Communication by telephone, telegraph, radio, and television.

"4. Civil aeronautics.
"5. Weather Bureau.
"6. Interstate oil compacts.
"7. Lead labels and railroad retirement and unemployment, except revenue measures relating thereto.
"8. Public health and quarantine.
"9. Inland waterways.
"10. Bureau of Standards, including standardization of weights and measures and the metric system.
"(1) Committee on the Judiciary.
"(2) Constitutional amendments.
"(3) Federal courts and judges.
"(4) Local courts in the Territories and possessions.
"(5) Revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.
"7. Protection of trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies.
"8. Holidays and celebrations.
"10. State and Territorial boundary lines.
"11. Meetings of Congress, attendance of Members, and their acceptance of incompatible offices.
"13. Civil liberties.
"14. Patents, copyrights, and trade-marks.
"15. Immigration and naturalization.
"16. Appropriation of Representatives.
"(q) Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.
"1. Merchant marine generally.
"2. Registering and licensing of vessels and small boats.
"3. Navigation and the laws relating thereto, including pilots.
"4. Rules and international arrangements to prevent collisions at sea.
"5. Merchant marine officers and seamen.
"6. Measures relating to the regulation of common carriers by water and to the inspection of merchant marine vessels, lights and signals, lifesaving equipment, and fire protection on such vessels.
"7. The Coast Guard, including lifesaving service, lighthouses, lightships, and ocean derelicts.
"8. United States Coast Guard and Merchant Marine Academies.
"9. Coast and Geodetic Survey.
"(c) Except as provided in paragraph (e), the Panama Canal and Intercoastal canals generally.
"10. Fisheries and wildlife, including research, restoration, refuges, and conservation.
"(n) Committee on Public Lands.
"1. Public lands generally, including entry, escheats, and grazing thereon.
"3. Forfeiture of land grants and alien ownership, including alien ownership of mineral lands.
"4. Forest reserves and national parks created from the public domain.
"5. Forest preserves and battlefields, and national cemeteries.
"6. Preservation of prehistoric ruins and objects of the public domain.
"7. Measures relating generally to Hawaii, Alaska, and the inalien possession of the United States thres, except those affecting the revenue and appropriations.
"8. Irrigation and reclamation, including water supply for reclamation projects, and easements, licenses for use of lands for irrigation projects.
"9. Interstate compacts relating to appropriation of waters for irrigation purposes.
"10. Mining interests generally.
"11. Mineral land laws and claims and entries.
"13. Mining schools and experimental stations.
"15. Relations of the United States with the Indians and the Indian tribes.
"16. Measures relating to the care, education, and general welfare of Indians, including the care and allotment of Indian lands and general and special measures relating to claims against the United States.
"(o) Committee on Public Works.
"1. Flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors.
"2. Public works for the benefit of navigation, and bridges and dams (other than international bridges and dams).
"3. Water power.
"4. Oil and other pollution of navigable waters.
"5. Public buildings and occupied or improved grounds of the United States generally.
"8. Measures relating to the construction or reconstruction, maintenance, and care of the building and grounds of the National Zoological Park, the Library of Congress, and the Smithsonian Institution.
"9. Public reservations and parks within the District of Columbia, including Rock Creek Park and the Zoological Park.
"10. Measures relating to the construction or maintenance of roads and post roads, other than appropriations thereof; but it shall not be in order in any bill providing general legislation to contain any provision for any specific road, nor for any bill in relation to a specific road to embrace a provision in relation to any other specific road.
"(p) Committee on Rules.
"2. Recesses and final adjournments of Congress.
"(q) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.
"(r) (A) Un-American activities.
"(s) (2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations into the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.
"The Commerce on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House, if not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.
"For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any member thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as may appear necessary.
"Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.
"(2) Committee on Veterans' Affairs.
"1. Veterans' measures generally.
"2. Penalties of all kinds of the United States, general and special.
"3. Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the armed forces.
"4. Compensation, vocational rehabilitation, and education of veterans.
"5. Veterans' hospitals, medical care, and treatment of veterans.
"6. Soldiers and sailors' civil relief.
"7. Readjustment of servicemen to civil life.
"(s) Committee on Ways and Means.
"1. Revenue measures generally.
"2. The bonded debt of the United States.
"3. The deposit of public moneys.
"4. Customs, collection districts, and ports of entry and delivery.
"5. Reciprocal trade agreements.
"6. Transportation of dutiable goods.
"7. Revenue measures relating to the insular possessions.
"8. National social security.
"(a) The following-named committees shall have leave to report at any time on the matters herein stated, namely: The Committee on Rules—on rules, joint rules, and order of business; the Committee on House Administration—on the right of a Member to his seat, enrolled bills, on all matters relating thereto that would aid Congress in any investigation pending before the House; the Committee on Ways and Means—on bills raising revenue; the Committee on Appropriations—on the general appropriation bills; the Committee on Public Works—on bills authorizing the improvement of rivers and harbors; the Committee on the Public Lands—on bills for the forfeiture of land to the United States, and bills preventing speculation in the public lands, bills for the reservation of the public lands for the benefit of actual and bona fide settlers, and bills for the admission of new States; the Committee on Veterans' Affairs—on general pension bills.
"(b) It shall always be in order to call up for consideration a report from the Committee on Rules (except it shall not be called up for consideration on the same day that it is presented to the House, unless so determined by a vote of not less than two-thirds of the Members voting, but the decision shall not apply during the last 3 days of the session), and, pending the consideration thereof, the Speaker may, upon the request of the House, refer the bill or the House adjourn; but after the result is announced he shall not entertain any other dilatory motion until the said report shall have been fully disposed of. The Committee on Rules shall not report any rule or order which which shall operate to prevent the motion to recommit being made as provided in paragraph 4 of rule XVI.
"It is ordered that the Committee on Rules shall present to the House reports concerning rules, joint rules, and order of business, within thirty days after the first day of the time when ordered reported by the committee. If such rule or order is not considered immediately, it shall be referred to the calendar and, if not passed by the House, the committee shall make an adverse report on any resolution pending before the committee, providing for an order of business for the consideration by the House of any public bill or joint res...
The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

Amendment offered by Mr. MONRONEY: Page 27, line 16, after the word “respectively,” insert a colon and the following: “Provided, except as otherwise provided herein any matter within the jurisdiction of a standing committee prior to January 2, 1947, shall continue to be within the jurisdiction of that committee or of the consolidated committees succeeding generally to the jurisdiction of that committee.”

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONRONEY: Page 29, line 24, after the word “on,” insert, “Post Office and—”

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONRONEY: Page 35, strike out lines 18 to 24, inclusive, and lines 1 to 7, inclusive, on page 38 and insert the following:

1. Interstate and foreign commerce generally.
2. Regulation of interstate and foreign transportation, except transportation by water not subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission.
3. Regulation of interstate and foreign communications.
4. Civil aeronautics.
5. Weather Bureau.
6. Insulation of interstate and foreign transportation, except transportation by water not subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission.
7. Security and exchanges.
8. Regulation of transmission of power, except the installation of connections between Government water-power projects.
9. Railroad labor and railroad retirement and unemployment, except revenue measure relating thereto.
11. Inland waterways.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee if he will refer to the matter of rural electrification under “agriculture” and tell me whether this in any way conflicts with that.

Mr. MONRONEY. I say to the gentleman this does not conflict in any way with rural electrification. The purpose of this amendment was to clearly specify that the jurisdiction of the generation of electric power by water and connecting grids for those projects was in the public-works domain, and this leaves the rate-making activities and the stock relationships in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONRONEY: Page 39, line 5, after “Petroleum conservation,” insert “on the public lands.”

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONRONEY: Page 39, line 16, strike out “and” and insert “including.”

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: Page 25, line 21, strike out “26” and insert “27.”

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, there is a basis in this bill the number of Members on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce decreasing from 27 to 25, despite the fact that a great deal of more work is imposed on the committee. Because of the avalanche of business before the Committee on the Judiciary, we have divided our committee into five subcommittees; one on bankruptcy and four separate subcommittees on general legislation. Those committees are now behind in work, because the number of bills are continually being referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Added to the work of that committee is the work of the Committee of Claims. Of the 1,000 claims filed this session of Congress, about four or five other sections of the United States Code that must be codified. It will be essential to set up a separate subcommittee to consider bills involving patents, copyrights, and trade-marks.

We have also the added work of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. There will be several hundred more bills involving immigration and naturalization.

We have the added work of the Committee on Revision of the Laws. There will be considerable additional work in that regard assigned to the Committee on the Judiciary. It took that committee on law revision assignments to the utmost code. There are about four or five other sections of the United States Code that must be codified. It will be necessary to have a separate subcommittee to handle these.
revisions. How we are going to do all that work with 25 members is beyond my comprehension. I earnestly hope that you will give us at least two more members to help us out in the difficult tasks that will confront the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman permit an amendment to his amendment? The amendment, Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the bill requires that the committees of the House meet on regular days, such meeting days to be selected by the committees. It is not applicable to the Committee on Appropriations for the reason that that committee has no stated days of meeting and could have no stated days of meeting. The committee meets only in response to reports from subcommittees. It is very seldom there is a meeting of the full committee for other business than handing over the work of the subcommittees to the full committee.

Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Amendment offered by Mr. WADSWORTH. On page 29, line 11, after the word "House", insert "other than the Committee on Appropriations."
Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this select committee originated by a resolution of the House in February 1945. Under a resolution to investigate and report, they held hearings for some ensuing weeks and months. No bill was ever introduced in the House until today. A bill was introduced in the Senate. No reference was made to a legislative committee in the other body. The statement was made by the majority leader in the other body that undoubtedly in the House the bill would be referred to a legislative committee and there would be hearings.

This bill has been brought before you today, introduced from the floor. There have no hearings by a legislative committee in regard to this bill. I say that merely introductory of this: The bill contains in this section which is now before the committee, the Postmaster General, or anyone else in this far-flung enterprise has the duty, the power, and the authority to do the thing they have recommended.

I have in my hand a letter from the Acting Postmaster General. He has been a career man in the postal service, Jesse Donaldson. There is no partisanship in this statement and this paragraph which is in response to my request for advice. He writes as follows:

Title 5 of United States Code, deals with executive departments and Government officers and employees. Title 39 of United States Code contains 23 chapters dealing entirely with the Postal Service. These chapters cover laws involving post office laws, such as classification of post offices, city delivery service, rural delivery service, establishment of airmail service, postal-savings service, air-mail service, rural delivery service, foreign service, as well as those states and interests of the postal service. It would, therefore, appear to me that there should be some distinction between postal legislation and purely civil service employees problems. I would think that the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads would be better equipped to handle these various postal problems, aside from the employee problems than would a committee handling civil-service matters. There are many problems handled by the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads having to do with the conduct of the Postal Service, especially with reference to legislation affecting the Postal Service, not to mention the Post Office Department. I would ask the committee to refer the bill to the Postmaster General and the Civil Service Commission.

I do not know what motive might have existed in the mind of the committee to make this recommendation. It certainly had nothing to do with any testimony produced in the hearings and it certainly had nothing to do with legislative efficiency.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. Mason. Mr. Chairman, I am in full accord with the objectives of the majority committee in the streamlining of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee of this House is a major committee and always has been. This major committee has departmental rank because the head of the civil service is a member of the President's Cabinet. This Post Office and Post Roads Committee handles not only the personnel, which is a small part of it, but handles the complex rates and the complicated schedules of the Post Office Department.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that is bringing about effectiveness or are you saving time? I want to ask if anyone in this House can justify that kind of telescoping? It is a billion-dollar corporation that the largest business in the world. You propose to do away with its board of directors and hand that billion-dollar business over to another committee which has had no experience whatever in the major field that this committee handles.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that is bringing about efficiency. I do not think that is saving money; in fact, in my opinion, it is going to bring about a period of chaos, and goodness knows, we have had enough of that.

We ought to adopt this amendment which would preserve the Post Office and Post Roads Committee in order to handle the very complicated business of the postal service.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Cole).

Mr. Cole. Mr. Chairman, the Post Office and Post Roads Committee of the House is one of the oldest committees of the House. Its 25 members are the board of directors of the Post Office Department. We all know that the Postmaster General is going to make a change of administration and we all know that most postmasters throughout the United States are changed with each change in administration; therefore it is
the Post Office and Post Roads Committee that is the balance wheel for the Post Office Department, the greatest business in the world.

It would be a serious mistake to change this committee and place the business of the Post Office Department under the Committee on Civil Service, a committee that has heretofore dealt entirely with the Civil Service employees. But that is what this reorganization bill proposes to do. The Post Office and Post Roads Committee have made a study of the postal services. At this session of Congress we have reported and passed bills pertaining to postage, to air mail, to air mail parcel post, and to salary increases for postal employees. We are familiar with these subjects. We are familiar with all the workings of the Post Office Department. To do away with this committee and place it under a committee that has had nothing to do with and no knowledge of the workings of the Post Office Department would, in my opinion, be detrimental to the postal service.

I sincerely hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, this is not just an amendment to reestablish the Post Office Committee. This is an amendment to decide whether you want a sprawling, overlapping, crazy-quilt of 48 standing committees or whether you want to do a job of reorganizing these committees as proposed.

You vote this amendment up and the House will be here until next week establishing other committees, giving back old jurisdictions, and we will find ourselves in the same hopeless morass of legislative difficulties that we are now certainly under.

I regret very much that some Members might be displaced from a standing committee called the Post Office Committee, but aside from that I can see no legitimate objections to the proposal as made in the committee bill.

We have changed the name of the committee from the Civil Service Committee, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. We make that a major committee. The Civil Service Committee is now composed of 21 Members. Many of those Members enjoy high seniority on other committees, and they will choose their committees. You have the opportunity not to waste the learning, the astute understanding, the complete knowledge of postal laws that have accumulated during the years by the Members of the Post Office Committee.

They surely will be eligible for membership on this merged committee and they will be able to enjoy and exercise this learning that they have. At the same time you will be putting their learning on the Committee which handles practically the entire load of the Government personnel and personnel problems and now will include post-office personnel as well.

I surely think with the capable and intelligent gentlemen of the Post Office Committee on this merged committee, that the rate-making difficulties that have been worried about here can surely be resolved.

I have more confidence in the Members of Congress who have been on the committee, who are doing a good, hard job wherever they are placed, to not believe that we work in an absolute vacuum; that Members of the Civil Service cannot know or learn anything about the post-office work.

My experience is that when legislation comes to us from the departments for consideration, it is pretty adequately documented and adequately explained, so the man who is conscientiously working to understand this thing will be able to understand what the department is trying to do.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Would the gentleman tell us what testimony he had before his select committee to support this provision that has raised the testified to us all the way through and I have not been able to find anybody informed on postal matters that made the recommendation to support this provision in the bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. I will say to the gentleman that if we had called in all of the hundreds of agencies of government, whose business is scattered over the 48 overlapping committees, to testify, that the year would be 1966 before you would ever have a report from this committee. We placed the Post Office Department in the same position that we placed other departments of government. This is a congressional reorganization and I, for one, as a Member of Congress do not intend to let the executive agencies tell us what our organization should be on Capitol Hill.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Are we putting the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads under the Committee on the Civil Service, or are we putting the Committee on the Civil Service under the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads by this move?

Mr. MONRONEY. The committees go together. We have explained time after time that we are not interfering with the prerogatives of the Committee on Committees on the Republican side or the Committee on Ways and Means on the Democratic side to determine these committee assignments. I think that has been rather well and adequately handled by the two parties of the House and under the traditions of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYNN].

The amendment was rejected.
wanting to know why they used the word "democracy" to describe the Government of this country. He has inferred they were un-American because they used the word "democracy" and the Committee might have to investigate them. I think most of the Members of the Committee are aware of the fact, for example, that in the initial opening proceedings of the American Legion the Government of the United States is described as a democracy. Furthermore, this country has fought two wars in defense of democracy. Who is this man, Adamson, who says democracy is un-American? We cannot let this type of activity continue and think we are going to enhance the prestige of the House of Representatives. So, I repeat, I simply offer this amendment today to give to those Members who are opposed to maneuvers like those of Mr. Adamson a chance to express their opinions. We are debating a bill to create a new committee structure in the House and I do not want the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment be dispensed with and the question be taken.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED).

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have taken the floor quite a number of times heretofore when the House has not seen fit to pass some of the provisions which you find in this bill. The reason I am taking the floor now is simply that I do not like to hear the Members, although they have a perfect right to do so, take the floor and speak as if this bill was going to bring in a new civilization. As a matter of fact, this old country of ours for more than 150 years has met every crisis that our country has had to meet and it has met each crisis under the system by which we legislated for both a half-century through the Civil War which tore this country from one end to the other. We went through the Spanish-American War. We went through the First World War, and we went through the Second World War successfully. We not only met the issues themselves, but we helped other countries to meet the issues involved in these wars. I think the committees of Congress have functioned very well. To get up here and call the rules and procedure a "cracy quilt" is something upon which I do not agree.

The country has done well in the past under time-tested rules of procedure. Of course, there are certain provisions in this bill that I do not like, but there are many of which I do not approve. The new members of the special committee have worked hard and conscientiously and they feel that they have brought forth something for the American people—I hope they have. With certain modifications of the bill, I shall support the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MONRONEY).

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would completely wreck the committee reorganization and it really has no place in the project that we have under discussion.

I happen to have opposed the establishment of the Committee on Un-American Activities when it was before the House of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the greatest government in the world for the benefit of all of the people of all the time.

I urge the defeat of the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BIEMILLER) to abolish the Un-American Activities Committee of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BIEMILLER).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BIEMILLER) there were—ayes 25, noes 127.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Delegates and Resident Commissioner

Sec. 122. Rule XII of the Standing Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"Delegates and Resident Commissioner"

"1. The Delegates from Hawaii and Alaska, and the Resident Commissioner to the United States from Puerto Rico, shall be elected to serve as a special committee on the Committees on Agriculture, Armed Services, and Public Lands; and they shall possess in such committees the same powers and privileges as in the House, and may make any motion except to reconsider."

Reference of private claims bills

Sec. 123. Paragraph 3 of rule XXXI of the Standing Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"3. No bill for the payment or adjudication of any private claim against the Government, or for any other purpose, shall be referred to any committee, unless the same shall be founded on a bill previously introduced."

PART 2—PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO BOTH HOUSES

Private bills banned

Sec. 131. No private bill or resolution (including so-called omnibus claims or pension bills), and no amendment to any bill or resolution, authorizing or directing (1) the payment of money for property damages, for personal injuries or death for which suit may be instituted under the Federal Tort Claims Act, or for a pension (other than to carry out provisions of law or treaty stipulation); (2) the construction of a bridge, aqueduct, or navigable stream; or (3) the correction of a military or naval record, shall be received or considered in either the Senate or the House of Representatives.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we may pass by the first paragraph of section 131 and return to it after the Committee has acted on the second.

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

There was no objection.
The Clerk read as follows:

Congressional adjournment

Sec. 132. Except in time of war or during a national emergency proclaimed by the President, the two Houses shall adjourn sine die on the last day of each session (excepted) in the month of July in each year unless otherwise provided by the Congress.

Committee procedure

Sec. 133. (a) Each standing committee of the Senate and of the House of Representatives shall fix regular weekly, biweekly, or monthly meeting days for the transaction of business of committees, and additional meetings may be called by the chairman as he may deem necessary.

(b) Each such committee shall keep a complete record of all committee action. Such record shall include a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded.

(c) It shall be the duty of the chairman of each such committee to report or cause to be reported promptly to the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, any measure approved by his committee and to take such necessary steps to bring the matter to a vote.

(d) No measure or recommendation shall be reported from any such committee unless a majority of the committee were actually present.

(e) Each standing committee shall, as far as practicable, require all witnesses appearing before it to file in advance written statements of their proposed testimony, and to limit their oral presentations to brief summaries of their argument. The staff of each committee shall prepare digests of such statements for the committee.

(f) All hearings conducted by standing committees or their subcommittees shall be open to the public, except executive sessions for marking up bills or for voting or where the committee by a majority vote orders an executive session.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HERTER: On page 49, after line 4, insert a new subsection to read as follows:

"Sec. 133. (g) Each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall set aside a regular period during each month at which and the House of Representatives shall meet for the transaction of business of committees, and additional meetings may be called by the chairman as he may deem necessary."

"Sec. 133. (a) Each standing committee of the Senate or of the House of Representatives shall fix regular weekly, biweekly, or monthly meeting days for the transaction of business of committees, and additional meetings may be called by the chairman as he may deem necessary."

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

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman's amendment provide that they shall also take action or just give a hearing?

Mr. HERTER. It does not require them to take action of any kind and does not even order them to give hearings. It merely permits a Member who wants to come before the committee and say a few words in support of a bill he had funding before the committee to explain his bill and why he feels it is of sufficient importance to warrant consideration. From that point on it does not compel the committee to do anything.

Mr. RIVERS. Does not the gentleman think there should be disposition made of the bill after hearing?

Mr. HERTER. I do not think so necessarily. This would not be a full hearing. It would merely allow the Member to appear before the committee and say a few words in support of the bill.

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

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Would the gentleman's amendment allow a Member to get his bill before the committee despite unfavorable action on the part of a particular chairman regardless of the reason for his action?

Mr. HERTER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I have had that experience and I think other Members have.

Mr. JUDD. I am heartily in favor of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. HERTER. We have all had experiences with the chairman of a committee or a subcommittee arbitrarily refuses to let certain bills come before the committee. This amendment would at least secure to the Members an opportunity to say a few words in support of their bill and not face their constituents and say they could not even get five minutes' time in which to speak before a committee on the bill. It would not be left entirely up to the whim of the chairman.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to explain this amendment. It was in the original Senate bill. In conference with the leadership we agreed to delete it from the bill because of controversy that would seem to arise. I do not, however, feel that the committee could accept the amendment and must register our opposition to its adoption.

It is up to the House to determine the question on that basis.

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

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 46 for the purpose of offering an amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PITTENGER: On page 46, line 19, strike out all of lines 19 to 24, inclusive; and on page 47, line 6, strike out of lines 1 to 9 inclusive.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, I realize that an amendment at this time with the present disposition in evidence may be more or less futile, but I want the Record to show that I think the House is making a mistake to abolish one of the old, historic committees of the House and Senate, namely, the Committee on Claims. There would have to be some perfecting amendment if this one were adopted.

In my opinion the machinery set up in this bill for handling claims against the Government is worse than any objection that may be found with existing committees. I hope the House will retain the Committee of Claims, unless we have reached a point where we want to make a brand new departure in the history and theory of our Government. Does not the gentleman think that an amendment at this time with the present disposition in evidence may be more or less futile, but I want the Record to show that I think the House is making a mistake to abolish one of the old, historic committees of the House and Senate, namely, the Committee on Claims. There would have to be some perfecting amendment if this one were adopted. I hope the House will adopt the amendment and retain the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MONROONEY. Mr. Chairman, this does not reestablish the Committee on Claims. This merely messes the whole thing up because there would be no committee to which we could refer these matters.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

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

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 46 for the purpose of offering an amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONROONEY of Missouri: Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONROONEY of Missouri: On page 48, line 1, after the word "Representative", insert "except the Committee on Appropriations."
Mr. Chairman, I am not here in the well of the House advocating the separate retention of a committee that is to be merged with others under the pending bill, although some are to be merged which I would have remained separate. I merely inquire about the powers, prerogatives, and the duties formerly held by the committee. Will the jurisdiction of the bureau be divided among the new committees? Would the chairman explain a bit further what provision has now been adopted regarding retention of the jurisdiction of the various committees in the merger?

Mr. MONROONEY. The jurisdiction of the new committees is as contained in the printed bill, with the addition of the provision by an amendment which was adopted a short while ago by the House. This provides that where not otherwise specified in the bill the jurisdiction will have the precedence established in the House for the assignment of legislation to the committees.

That amendment was adopted a short time ago in the list of committee amendments. Several chairmen and committee members asked that it be placed in there since we could not make the jurisdictional list all-inclusive to cover everything that might possibly come up in the course of the introduction of bills and the consideration of legislation.

Mr. MURDOCK. It was the intention of the special committee to retain the funds already gathered into the new committee organization?

Mr. MONROONEY. That is correct, but unless the jurisdiction is otherwise specified in here the precedents established in the House will apply.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the gentleman for this explanation. As an illustration, I call attention to the fact that the jurisdiction has for many years under numerous acts of Congress passed since 1932 to the present had charge of hydroelectric power produced on irrigation projects and incidental thereto. I assume that the new committee with which the present Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation is to be merged will have all the jurisdiction over reclamation works established by the existing committee. I am not only proud of my committee but jealous of its functions and I insist on preserving them fully.

The Clerk read as follows:  

Committee powers  

Sec. 134. (a) Each standing committee of the Senate, including any subcommittee of any such committee, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places as it may from time to time fix, not including adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to take such testimony and to make such examinations of deponents as authorized by their standing committees, at the reasonable and customary fees of $100 per day for each witness and $100 per day for each committee. The expenses of the committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the chairman.

(b) Every committee and subcommittee serving the Senate and House of Representatives shall report the name, profession, and total salary of each staff member employed by it, and shall make an accounting of funds appropriated to it and expended by it to the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives, as the case may be, at least twice a year, and such information shall be published periodically in the Congressional Directory when and as the same is compiled for the Senate and House documents, respectively, every 3 months.

(c) No standing committee of the Senate or the House, except the Committee on Rules of the House, shall be authorized to hold special hearings while the Senate or the House, as the case may be, is in session.

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

The Clerk read as follows:  

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: Page 49, line 6, after the word "Senate", add the words "and House of Representatives."  

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, you will note if you read the committee print that section 134 (a) provides that only the standing committees of the Senate shall have the express power of investigation with the right to subpoena and require the attendance of witnesses, coroners, and gether with the suppressing of books, papers, documents, and correspondence, and so forth.

The original bill provided that only the standing committees but the House standing committees should have the same right. Why are we being treated like stepchildren? Why should the Senate standing committee have the right of subpoena and that right be denied to the standing committees of the House? Is not our work just as important as the work of the Senate? Is not our work just as painstaking? Should not we have the concomitant right with the Senate to subpoena? The power of investigation is a very important power. It should not be denied to us without being compelled to go to the Rules Committee and then to the House. It is unavailing that we have witnesses appearing before our standing committees voluntarily. We may need the right, in order to do our work properly, to compel witnesses to divulge certain information that we seek. We should have the right to demand the production of books and documents and letters and correspondence. We cannot have that right unless you adopt my amendment. We must first get power from the Senate.

In addition you will note that the Senate standing committees can spend for purposes of investigation $10,000 each without authorization whatsoever. Now why should not our standing committees likewise have the right to spend upwards of $10,000 for purposes of investigation? If you feel that our work is just as important as is the work of the Senate, you must adopt my amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, the House has always carefully considered by the House committee, and our set-up is considerably different from the set-up in the Senate. The Senate is pluggod with too many special committees. It is a rash that has broken out over there which practically destroys the continuity and the power of the standing committee.

In order to get away from that outbreak of special committees the Senate wrote in this provision for subpoena power by their standing committees.

In discussing this with the leadership on both sides of the aisle and with many of the other leaders of the House it was determined that we have the machinery and the facilities in the House at this time that we can carry on our special committees.

An amendment is going to be offered to the appropriation section by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Messrs. MONROONEY, that is going to arm all of the investigators and clerks of the new Committee on Appropriations with the proper powers.

But I do not think that this House at this time wants to vote $10,000 to all committees, without reference to the House itself, to be spent in investigations, having the right to take added testimony, and then also to have them running around, whether Congress is in session or out of session, with the right of subpoena.

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

Mr. MONROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In view of the fact that I am still possible to set up select committees in the House where the subpoena power can be lodged, it is a pretty broad power to grant to all of the standing committees.

Mr. MONROONEY. I thank the gentleman. It is also possible to give subpoena power to any of the standing committees if they go to the Committee on Rules and ask for that power.

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

Mr. MONROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Is the gentleman willing to give that power to standing committees without the $10,000 provision?

Mr. MONROONEY. No; I do not believe so. I think we are either going to have to maintain the status of this House bill on the floor or tear up the carefully planned and considered judgment given by it all together.

This bill is not coming into this House at this late date simply because I want it to or because the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Dirksen) wants it to. Somebody in the leadership had to take the time and
the care to go over this bill section by section and line by line. I refuse to be a party to breaking any agreement that has been made for the changing of this bill. I think the distinguishing the majority and the minority leaders, who helped us bring this bill to the floor, are entitled to more consideration than that.

Mr. CELLER. I agree with the gentleman that the bill is an exceptionally fine one and I want to vote for it, but that is no reason why we should not offer amendments if we think the amendments are proper and just. I think the amendment I have offered is a proper amendment.

Mr. MONROONEY. It is perfectly all right for the gentleman to offer the amendment, but I differ with the gentleman and I hope the Committee will vote down the amendment.

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

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOOK: On page 50, after line 11, insert the following:

"HEARINGS OF LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEES"

"(a) A legislative committee may hold either public or private hearings and may examine witnesses and receive documentary evidence in such hearings.

"(b) If the testimony of a witness in a private hearing shall be reported, there shall be a stenographic copy of such testimony, upon payment of the costs of such transcript, as soon as the committee shall make any public reference to such testimony.

"(c) A witness at a private hearing shall have the right to have his attorney present: Provided, That such attorney shall be allowed only to observe the proceeding and not to participate in it nor to advise the witness while on the witness stand, unless the committee, under the direction of the hearing shall at his discretion allow such attorney other privileges.

"(d) A witness who testifies in a public or private hearing shall have the right at the conclusion of his testimony either to make an oral statement or to file a sworn statement, which shall be made part of the record of such hearing.

"(e) If a witness at a public hearing shall by oral testimony or documentary evidence defame, libel, or otherwise comment adversely upon any individual, partnership, association, corporation, or governmental agency, or officer or employee thereof, or the committee shall strike such material from the record, such individual, partnership, association, corporation, or governmental agency, or officer or employee thereof, shall have the right to file with the chairman a sworn written denial, defense, or other explanation, which shall be made part of the record of such public hearing, and in addition the person individually defamed or otherwise commented upon may have another hearing before the committee, and the committee shall strike such material from the record, such individual, partnership, association, corporation, or governmental agency, or officer or employee thereof, shall have the right to file with the chairman a sworn written denial, defense, or other explanation, which shall be made part of the record of such public hearing, and in addition the person individually defamed or otherwise commented upon may have another hearing before the committee, and the committee shall strike such material from the record.

"(f) No witness shall be deemed in contempt of a legislative committee for refusing to obey a subpoena issued by one or more of its members, and until the full committee has, upon notice to all its members, met, considered the alleged contempt, and by a majority of those present voted such witness in contempt of such committee: Provided, That this subdivision shall not apply to a witness who having obeyed a subpoena declines to answer a question at such hearing or otherwise acts contumaciously.

"REPORTS OF LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEES"

"(a) A legislative committee shall not publish or file any interim or final report unless and until a meeting of the committee has been called upon proper notice to all such report and presented to a majority of those voting at such meeting.

"(b) A legislative committee, its members, counsel, employees, or agents, shall not publish or file any statement or report alleging misconduct by or otherwise commenting adversely upon any individual, partnership, association, corporation, or governmental agency, unless and until such individual, partnership, association, corporation, or governmental agency has been advised of the alleged misconduct or adverse comment and has been given a reasonable opportunity to present its sworn written denial, defense, or other explanation to such committee; nor shall any such statement or report be published or filed until such committee, upon notice to all of its members, has met and approved such public release.

"NO PRIVATE PROFIT FOR COMMITTEE MEMBERS"

"No member of a legislative committee, its counsel, employees, or agents, shall for compensation speak, lecture, or write about such committees, its proceedings, recommendations, procedures, accomplishments, or reports, during the existence of such committee."

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, this is procedure governing legislative investigating committees. I have talked about this amendment before, but I think the membership of the House is well acquainted with it. I do believe there should be proper procedures of investigating committees set up in the House. You and I know that we do not have them at the present time. You know and I know that a very prominent Member of this House was asked to be given the opportunity to testify in this bill for his own protection. I think that for the protection of witnesses brought before committees, and persons being investigated, and in the interest of orderly procedure, we should adopt this amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am confident this matter was not submitted to the joint-committee (Mr. MONROONEY) or myself or to any member of the joint committee. So far as I know, it was not submitted at the time the joint-committee hearings were in progress. Here is a long textual amendment which is very prolix.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HOOK. This was submitted to the committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It has never come to my attention, I am sorry to say, and I sincerely hope the House will vote down the amendment. It may have been submitted to the committee but it has not come to my attention.
The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MONROE: On page 51, line 29, after the words "the committee or duly authorized subcommittee thereof," insert "members of the committee."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman explain the amendment? Mr. MONROE. This section deals with the legislative budget. The question was raised, that full committees of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees and full committees of the Ways and Means and Senate Finance Committees would be unwieldy because of the large number of items involved in the preparation of this legislative budget will meet to take it up. The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONROE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MONROE: On page 52, line 11, strike out "March 1" and insert in lieu thereof "February 15."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TASS: On page 51, line 18, to page 52, line 20, inclusive, strike out all of section 136.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I took the floor a little while ago and explained what this amendment would do. I was hoping that the floor would be open so that this section would have something to offer other than bald generalities and would explain how the thing would work. We have received nothing in support of the section but bald generalities.

I am offering this amendment from a deep sense of public duty. It will absolutely destroy the operations of the Appropriations Committees in the House of Representatives. It will increase spending. It will prevent any kind of orderly procedure by the House. Instead of being a progressive, forward-looking proposal, it is a reactionary proposal and a step backward. We might just as well be honest about it. If this proposal is adopted and an attempt is made to set up a legislative budget on any kind of a scale that is accurate enough to be any good, it means long, arduous hearings upon those items, just as our committees are obliged to give them. I do not know why we have it here. In addition to that, the committee that is set up is absolutely cumbersome—

104 members of the committee. Of course, under this provision it can act through subcommittees, but they would know absolutely nothing about it unless they came up to the House and asked what would happen. Would they have to establish by resolution what that ceiling might be? If it was to be effective, we would have to break down the bills for agencies and departments a ceiling for each one. If we were to do that, it would be absolutely impossible for the Appropriations Committee to start hearings under a resolution after that procedure had been followed.

The question here is whether we want to do the right thing and do a constructive thing or whether we want to do something that will destroy legislative processes. I want to see the House a better representative agency of the people, but if you pass this section and try to put it into effect, you will fix things so that it will be absolutely impossible to have thorough hearings upon appropriation bills and make the cuts that need to be made if this Government is going to be preserved. If you undertake to do this job in this way it will be impossible for the House of Representatives to control the initiative on appropriation bills. It is going to be a lopsided, about-as-bus appropriation bill, with all kinds of logrolling and all kinds of efforts to destroy any economy in government.

The Appropriations Committee was set up. We have had a legislative budget in a way in such a way that the men would be judges, independent of special interests. No one was permitted on the subcommittees who had any special interest or wanted favors. If you throw this thing into a mass where there are representatives of every special interest, and allow lobbying and logrolling to fix the original budget and then cut down the time within which the Appropriations Committee can operate by itself, you are just absolutely destroying that independence that was set up when the original Appropriations Committee was set up. No one has presented anything but generalities and the statement that lots of people outside were looking for this and interested in it, but not one explanation as to how it could possibly work, and work effectively and efficiently. To my inquiries I received no answer except generalities: I will receive none because there is none. If this were workable I would support it and I would go along with it wholeheartedly, but I know it is not, and I cannot.

I hope the amendment will be adopted and that we will try to follow a procedure in the House of Representatives where the Congress can cut down the bureau of the Government and we will not have the appropriations of the Government in the hands of bureaucrats and self-seekers. That is the thing that would be sustained if this proposal were put up. I do not want to see it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MONROE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section be adjourned.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have not talked on this bill at all. I should like to have 10 minutes on this section. This is the only section I wish to talk about.

Mr. MONROE. I will modify my request and make it 20 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have not talked on this bill at all, either on the rule or in general debate, and this is perhaps the only time I will ask recognition. I therefore ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five additional minutes.

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

Mr. DIRKSCH. Mr. Chairman, I must object.

The CHAIRMAN. The hour is getting late, and many Members are going home tomorrow.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not think it was very kind of the gentleman to have objected. We have had a legislative body having an extension of time. It does seem that on a bill of this importance we should have just a little time to dispose of it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may proceed for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important amendment; I am in favor of its adoption. It sets up what might be termed a caste system in Congress. It leaves to 2 committees in the House and 2 committees in the Senate the power to control all important legislation involving appropriations for 435 Members of the House and 96 Members of the United States Senate. That is what it does.

HOUSE RULES UP TO DATE

I am not joining this anvil chorus proclaiming that our House rules are so obsolete and unworkable that we should absolutely make every radical change that is proposed. I am in agreement on a number of these proposed changes, but I consider the document that contains the rules of the House as the most modern document in the Library of Congress or here in the House of Representatives. For 157 years these rules have been up under trial and error. A majority of the Members can always work its will under the rules of this House. We have gone through the greatest depression in all history and
we have gone through the greatest war in all history. We whipped them both under the present rules of the House of Representatives. Now, this is a departure. And the thing is bad and the amendment striking it out should be adopted. Any time you propose to set up a caste system here and make it impossible for the majority of the Members in the House to be what they want to do, I say we should look into it and carefully consider it.

Here is what the result will be. These committees and others would have power. The Appropriations Committee would appropriate money for certain things only, just certain things only. Something like the terminal-leave bill comes up. If we had had this proposal in force this year we could not have passed the terminal-leave bill. If we were to have some kind of emergency arise, of course, unexpectedly, we could not take care of that if it required money. It would be a violation of the rule that we adopt on February 15 each year.

Mr. Chairman, this is a far-reaching proposal and should be stricken from the bill. If it were left in this bill it would be their opinion, 'Now, we would like to pay old-age assistance, we would like to pay social security, we would like to appropriate money for certain things only, just certain things only.'

Mr. Chairman, this is a far-reaching proposal and should be stricken from the bill. If it were left in this bill it would be their opinion, 'Now, we would like to pay old-age assistance, we would like to pay social security, we would like to appropriate money for certain things only, just certain things only.'

Mr. Chairman, this is a far-reaching proposal and should be stricken from the bill. If it were left in this bill it would be their opinion, 'Now, we would like to pay old-age assistance, we would like to pay social security, we would like to appropriate money for certain things only, just certain things only.'

Mr. Chairman, this is a far-reaching proposal and should be stricken from the bill. If it were left in this bill it would be their opinion, 'Now, we would like to pay old-age assistance, we would like to pay social security, we would like to appropriate money for certain things only, just certain things only.'

Mr. Chairman, this is a far-reaching proposal and should be stricken from the bill. If it were left in this bill it would be their opinion, 'Now, we would like to pay old-age assistance, we would like to pay social security, we would like to appropriate money for certain things only, just certain things only.'

Mr. Chairman, this is a far-reaching proposal and should be stricken from the bill. If it were left in this bill it would be their opinion, 'Now, we would like to pay old-age assistance, we would like to pay social security, we would like to appropriate money for certain things only, just certain things only.'

Mr. Chairman, this is a far-reaching proposal and should be stricken from the bill. If it were left in this bill it would be their opinion, 'Now, we would like to pay old-age assistance, we would like to pay social security, we would like to appropriate money for certain things only, just certain things only.'

Mr. Chairman, this is a far-reaching proposal and should be stricken from the bill. If it were left in this bill it would be their opinion, 'Now, we would like to pay old-age assistance, we would like to pay social security, we would like to appropriate money for certain things only, just certain things only.'

Mr. Chairman, this is a far-reaching proposal and should be stricken from the bill. If it were left in this bill it would be their opinion, 'Now, we would like to pay old-age assistance, we would like to pay social security, we would like to appropriate money for certain things only, just certain things only.'

Mr. Chairman, this is a far-reaching proposal and should be stricken from the bill. If it were left in this bill it would be their opinion, 'Now, we would like to pay old-age assistance, we would like to pay social security, we would like to appropriate money for certain things only, just certain things only.'
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on this amendment close in 30 minutes. We have been over this subject for an hour in general debate and for over an hour under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. RAYBURN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, may I say to the chair that the special order calls for a general debate on this matter? I believe before handling this matter that I have two amendments that I wish to offer. I think they are very important. This matter of the joint committee as it concerns the Appropriations Committee could check over the general appropriation bills and make recommendations to the Congress as to what could be eliminated so that the budget could be in better balance. I believe that the Evans voters and myself have cut out hundreds of millions of dollars of excessive expenditures. The New Dealers have shown, however, no inclination to save the taxpayers money, nor do I expect them to do so in the future. The House will be doing a great disfavor to the people of America by retaining this particular section. I hope Mr. Tauxe's amendment is adopted.

Mr. Chairman, at this time let me say that I cannot vote for this bill if the provisions for salary increases to Members of the House remain in the measure. The old people of America have had little, if any, consideration from this Congress. In the past 8 years I have voted against the increasement in our own salaries, feeling that, unless I oppose my own pay raise, no justification can be had in opposing increases for those in the Government employ. Unless here in Congress show some resistance to the tide of inflation sweeping upon America, how can we expect other groups to do so. It is my hope that the House will not approve the raise in our own salaries nor the provision for retirement pay. Otherwise, I must vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate very much to get into a debate on what is a fairly technical matter with the distinguished members of the Ways and Means Committee who have spent many years in handling the technical processes of appropriation bills. We do so only with great reluctance, but I feel qualified in a small way because I had to struggle with this problem for many years in the home legislature, and also as chairman of a committee of the Council of State Governments, working on the same subject.
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and then have unexpected legislation come along that completely upsets an orderly program.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Jones] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, it is indeed regrettable that a matter so important as this has to be decided in so short a time. Let us see what the apparent purpose of section 138 is. It is to lead the people to believe that some way, somehow, appropriations will be limited by the amount of the income of now and we will wake up after all the Government. That is the intended purpose of section 138 is. It is to bring the President's appropriation committee, the House Ways and Means Committee, the Senate Appropriations Committee, and the Senate Appropriations Committee. Thus super committee will get publicity.

Headlines will be spread stating how the budget will be reduced and a decrease to the President's $35,000,000,000 budget to $25,000,000,000. Then we proceed to start to commence to appropriate on individual appropriation bills just as we do now. After all bills have passed to find that the present spending deficit spending membership of both Houses want to appropriate more than this "superduper" appropriation ceiling committee has recommended.

You find Congress has appropriated $45,500,000,000 and Congress has the same members, the same administration, New Deal majorities, who want to spend, and spend, and spend; and then you will find that the gentleman from Illinois said he threw an ax at the OPA budget of $156,000,000 and finally OPA got $76,000,000. Under present procedure for a Budget estimate of $156,000,000 for OPA, the House allocate or appropriated $106,000,000. The Senate had a different idea and the item went to conference. The gentleman from Illinois says they threw an ax at the OPA in conference. It is silly to think the procedure will be otherwise with a $35,000,000,000 Presidential budget and in 1, 2, or 3 months' time, not having any analytical or scientific foundation or basis upon which to act, that this "superduper" can throw anything but an ax at it and cut $10,000,000,000 or $5,000,000,000 off or any amount that seems politically desirable. The section 138 is ill-advised, silly, ridiculous, will make fools out of the Members of Congress unless you adopt an amendment which says the recommendation of this committee will be the ceiling, item for item, and that any amendment or bill offered by the Appropriations Committees, or any Member increasing the amount above the "superduper" committee's recommendation will be subject to a point of order and illegal. Then you make this "superduper" committee do what you are trying to make the public believe; declare the ceiling on expenditures based upon a Budget estimate and upon the best brains of the "superduper." Committee.

I will offer amendments to make section 138 do what you say you want to do. Make a balance in the income. My amendments will legally make the section 138 "superduper" committee ceilings the legal ceilings on appropriations for the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate cannot break through. Without such amendments section 138 is silly, meaningless, and an expression of a will-o'-the-wisp hope, published for political purposes, which will rise to plague Members of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Smith] for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, what about subsection (b) of section 138? Let me read what that says:

(b) The report shall be accompanied by a concurrent resolution fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in each year. If the estimated expenditures for the fiscal year exceed the estimated receipts, the concurrent resolution shall include a section substantially as follows: That is the Congress that the public debt shall be increased in an amount equal to the amount by which the estimated expenditures for the ensuing year exceed the estimated receipts, such amount being

What kind of a proposition is that? What does it do? Why, it gives sanction to deficit spending. It is bad enough to have this curse of deficit spending on us without any law, but why pass a law specifically legalizing deficit spending? I would like to have somebody answer that for me.

This language would add a section to the whole program of deficit spending that has been going on for the last 15 years. This would have the effect of putting our stamp of approval on the deficit spending that the New Deal planners are contemplating for the future.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Does not the gentleman think it is absolutely futile to pass a law like this to reform Congressmen's uneconomical habits? To reform Congress you have to reform Congressmen; is that right?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am reminded again of the statement made by a prominent historian who spoke about the great delusion, faith in the sovereign power of political machinery. Let the people of this country understand that there is no faith in this Congress that promises them any more statesmanship than they have been receiving in recent years.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. This bill just gives Congress a face-lifting.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Take out from this measure pensions and the increase of salary for Congressman and I fear there will be little interest in it. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Sumner] was unable to get the attention of the committee until he mentioned pensions and salary raise for Congressmen. Then he got some attention.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Does not the gentleman think this bill could be defeated very easily if we were not being rolled-through?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Certainly.

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

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Has the gentleman ever seen a regular appropriation bill leave the House and go to the Senate without it being increased considerably in that body?
Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I know it is a common practice for the other body to increase appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is recognized.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I offer an amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: On page 52, line 14, strike out the period and the balance of the paragraph, lines 14 to 20, inclusive, and insert "and upon passage of the concurrent resolution, no appropriation bill shall be passed appropriating funds in excess of the budget; so adjudged except in a vote of two-thirds of the Members voting in each House, a quorum being present."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, on the whole, I think it must be said that the special committee has done a good job in the sections on committee reorganization. I think an attempt to establish a review of appropriations in the light of prospective revenues is commendably bound; but if I may have the attention of the chairman of the special committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], I would like to ask a question about its operation. The first paragraph of section 138 concludes by saying that such reports shall be made by March 1 or February 15, as now amended. Then, section 15 says:

The report shall be accompanied by a concurrent resolution adopting such budget, and fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated in apportionment in each year.

Now, I want to ask the gentleman what would happen if nothing is done with the report?

Mr. MONRONEY. I will say to the distinguished gentleman that there will be no restriction on appropriations. Congress can break the financial budget which we set. But the country will know that we are morally bound, the newspapers and Members of Congress voting in the affirmative for this resolution adopting the budget.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Wait just a minute. All that this language requires is that such report shall be made by March 1 or February 15; there is nothing in here that says that Congress has to adopt the report.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thought the gentleman was referring to the next section relating to the adoption of the concurrent resolution, fixing the total over-all appropriations, and if a deficit is running, to specify that the Congress authorize the making of that much debt for the fiscal year. I think properly we are making an approach to a definitely improved fiscal policy.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the gentleman for his frank reply which, in effect, is that there is nothing to give effect to the budget ceiling except public opinion. That is my objection to paragraph 15-2. It does not go far enough. In fact, it does nothing to give real effect to the findings. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] complained about this section. I find that in the hands of Congress. My complaint is that it does no such thing. It merely holds out a little gesture to the country and says that we told a committee to make a report and recommend a ceiling on appropriations, but it does not bind the Congress to that ceiling. It does not indicate how this report shall be accompanied by a resolution which Congress may or may not adopt, saying that the national debt should be increased if the ceiling is exceeded.
the great Committee on Ways and Means would be spurred on to an earlier consideration and presentation of their bills and perhaps that committee then might not feel constrained to act in any or to vote on every bill from that committee. This is the very heart of the effort made by this bill to implement the very heart of the effort made by this bill to implement the

not feel constrained to

at least attempt to follow a sound fiscal policy. The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dinkins] is recognized for 5 minutes to close debate.

Mr. DURKIN, Mr. Chairman, then has some rather astounding arguments here today. It has been said by the gentleman from Kentucky that this is a futile gesture. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Tanna] said it would be an overwhelming task to implement this bill. Another one said it would not work. When the income-tax amendment was first offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Tanna] said it would be more

Another one said it would be futile. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Tanna] said it would be absurd and embarrassing to the Congress. The gentleman from Ohio said it would be an unpopular task. Another gentleman said it would make Congress and the country too closely. Just make up your minds. But what you see today is the recurring pattern of history. When the

Yes. That is the inertia of age talking. "It is not my personal experience, but I know from experience that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Tanna] said it would be infeasible. It is true, but it is also true that if we do not do anything about it, this bill does not work, I thank God, we move forward in a progressive line.

I suggest that all amendments, including the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Tanna] be voted down.

If the proposal which we present in this bill does not work, I shall be the first to confess my error if it has had a fair trial. But I do not propose to succumb to the defeatism which has been expressed over and over on this floor that it will not work. The taxpayers of the Nation are entitled to an opportunity to see whether or not it will work. Perhaps you recall the old expression, "Where there is a will, there is a way." Instead of the defeatist attitude expressed here today, could we be optimistic about this bill? Could it be made to work and it will work. We have used red ink a long time in chalking up recurring deficits. Let us see what can be done about changing the color to black.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question recurs on the perfecting of the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Case] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Tanna].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may again be reported.

There being no objection, the Clerk again reported the amendment offered by Mr. Case of South Dakota.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Case] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Tanna].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Case of South Dakota: On page 52, after line 20, insert: "(c) Until the concurrent resolution specified in subsection (b) has been agreed to by both Houses by record vote no general appropriation bill appropriating revenue for the ensuing fiscal year shall be passed by either House." The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment. The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Tana].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Jones: On page 52, line 8, after the word "committee" and the period, insert "No amendment to any general appropriation bill shall be in order in either House proposing an increase in such bill which will result in an increase in the over-all amount which may be appropriated for any executive department or agency; and the over-all amount which may be appropriated for the several independent establishments including the District of Columbia shall be reduced to the total amount included in said legislative budget bills for the several independent establishments including the District of Columbia prior to the consideration of the estimate of appropriations by the several subcommittees thereof."
Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, this section reads:

No general appropriation bill, other than deficiency appropriation bills, shall be considered in either House unless, prior to the consideration of such bill, printed commit­tee hearings and reports on such bill have been available for at least three calendar days for the Members of the House in which such bill is to be considered.

My amendment seeks to eliminate the words “other than deficiency appropriation bills.”

Mr. Chairman, it is very plain to see why this amendment is needed. The main reason is that the regular subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee sit for weeks and months hearing the testimony of people from the departments who come before the respective subcommittees to justify their appropriations. We finally pass a bill out of the subcommittee. It then goes before the full committee where it is rarely amended one iota. In most instances the subcommittee reduces the appropriations requested by the departments, if any, to a very marked degree. The bill finally goes through the Congress and is signed by the President. But it has become a habit for the departments to continue to spend as though they were not restricted simply because they know they can come back to the deficiency committee any time and get most any amount of money they desire.

I do not have to tell you this because all of you know it is a fact. My amendment would make it mandatory that all deficiency bills and reports shall also be available 3 days previous to the time the bill is considered on the floor for the Members of Congress to examine.

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

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

Mr. JUDG. If the amendment of the gentleman is accepted and deficiency appropriations have to be brought before the committee i.e., with a report 3 days before they are considered and a real emergency arises, requiring immediate action, all we need to do is suspend the rules on a two-thirds vote. I am sure the House would do that in a real emergency. This would prevent them from using it on every deficiency bill when there is no emergency.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is right. The Appropriations Committee has been criticized severely, and rightly so, because great appropriation bills come to the House with little or no advance notice. The Congress has had an opportunity to see the report or the bill until it comes to the floor. Even the members of the Appropriations Committee rarely see a bill from any other subcommittee except the ones they are on until the day it is brought before the full committee some forenoon and often not the forenoon it is brought before the House.

The criticism has been justified and certainly if any subcommittee should be required to bring a committee report before 3 days in advance of action, it should be the deficiency committee because it is less understood than any other report that comes before the House.

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

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman’s amendment is a most excellent one, and I hope it will carry.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman for his support.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not true that the generally established subcommittees’ procedure is fixed, well known, and more or less standardized?

Mr. JENSEN. Certainly.

Mr. CURTIS. This 3-day availability of hearings and reports is not nearly as necessary for them as it is the deficiency committee which might take up anything?

Mr. JENSEN. Right.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman is a member of the Appropriations Committee. He knows whereof he speaks. I want to congratulate him on his courage and his forthrightness in stating these facts as they are.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman and I sincerely hope my amendment will be adopted as I am certain it will have the effect of eliminating many millions of needless Government expenditures.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, throughout the day I have been considering offering an amendment similar to the one offered by the gentleman from Iowa. I decided not to do so upon the advice of the gentleman from Illinois. Direction, because I sincerely support the obvious improvement in the organization and operation of Congress in this legislation as subcommittees do not know anything about them. If I think this amendment would be most constructive. I call your attention to the fact that when this measure passed the other body, this particular section was not contained in the legislation. I would like to read the comments from the joint committee report, because it emphasizes another phase of this matter which I think is of equal importance to all of the Members:

Reports of the full committee on major bills customarily reach the floor soon after committee approval. Under these circumstances, the findings and printed hearings on appropriation bills are usually not available for careful study by the membership at large for a significant number of days before being reported to the House for its action. The hearings are naturally massive in size and complex in detail. As a result, it is not easy for Members of the House fully to inform themselves on the complex contents of appropriation bills before they come up for final action on the floor.

In my judgment, if this same principle were applied to legislative bills, we would have far more efficiency and much better legislation in the House. It urges that the amendment be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, in considering this matter there was a very well and carefully made case by the leaders on the Committee on Appropriations that they have to have some elbow room for urgent deficiencies. We recently had an emergency appropriation for the veterans; to pay within a day or two the fund necessary for unemploy­ment compensation. They have set aside for this 3-day period. This amendment would provide that all appropriations will have to come in the regular way, with a 3-day intem, and only excludes from this rule deficiency appropriations.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I knew the gentleman was going to bring that up and talk about the veterans, but if it is already taken care of, why not strike this language out and then we will know it is taken care of. That is what the gentleman said.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is a most excellent one, and I hope it will carry.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As a matter of fact, there have been occasions when we have had to work fast and include deficiencies and bring them in as an emergency measure.

Mr. JENSEN. That was during the war.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That was recently when General Bradley came before us and said that he ran out of money for the payment of unemployment money for soldiers. We had to bring this up here and get immediate action, so you have a bit of a flexible factor. I hope the amendment of my good friend will be voted down.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The other section of the bill will help a lot by eliminating so many deficiencies, which is important, too.

The CHAIRMAN. The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.
The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JENSEN) there were—ayes 86, noes 79.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON. On page 55, lines 8 to 14, inclusive, strike out section 201.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I shall detain the Committee but a moment, and only to say that I favor the general purposes of the pending bill and am supporting it. This bill contemplates a reduction in the number of committees, more adequate staffs, clerical assistance, and stenographic service for the committees. The section under consideration, section 201, provides that the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House shall establish a stenographic pool in each of the Senate and House Office Buildings for the use of Members during peak periods when their existing clerical facilities are inadequate to their needs, and shall make its facilities available, within proper limits, to the Members of Congress, under such rules and regulations as they may prescribe.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON. On page 55, lines 8 to 14, inclusive, strike out section 201.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I shall detain the Committee but a moment, and only to say that I favor the general purposes of the pending bill and am supporting it. This bill contemplates a reduction in the number of committees, more adequate staffs, clerical assistance, and stenographic service for the committees. The section under consideration, section 201, provides that the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House shall establish a stenographic pool in each of the Senate and House Office Buildings for the use of Members during peak periods when their existing clerical facilities are inadequate to their needs, and shall make its facilities available, within proper limits, to the Members of Congress, under such rules and regulations as they may prescribe.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON. On page 55, lines 8 to 14, inclusive, strike out section 201.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I shall detain the Committee but a moment, and only to say that I favor the general purposes of the pending bill and am supporting it. This bill contemplates a reduction in the number of committees, more adequate staffs, clerical assistance, and stenographic service for the committees. The section under consideration, section 201, provides that the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House shall establish a stenographic pool in each of the Senate and House Office Buildings for the use of Members during peak periods when their existing clerical facilities are inadequate to their needs, and shall make its facilities available, within proper limits, to the Members of Congress, under such rules and regulations as they may prescribe.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON. On page 55, lines 8 to 14, inclusive, strike out section 201.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I shall detain the Committee but a moment, and only to say that I favor the general purposes of the pending bill and am supporting it. This bill contemplates a reduction in the number of committees, more adequate staffs, clerical assistance, and stenographic service for the committees. The section under consideration, section 201, provides that the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House shall establish a stenographic pool in each of the Senate and House Office Buildings for the use of Members during peak periods when their existing clerical facilities are inadequate to their needs, and shall make its facilities available, within proper limits, to the Members of Congress, under such rules and regulations as they may prescribe.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON. On page 55, lines 8 to 14, inclusive, strike out section 201.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I shall detain the Committee but a moment, and only to say that I favor the general purposes of the pending bill and am supporting it. This bill contemplates a reduction in the number of committees, more adequate staffs, clerical assistance, and stenographic service for the committees. The section under consideration, section 201, provides that the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House shall establish a stenographic pool in each of the Senate and House Office Buildings for the use of Members during peak periods when their existing clerical facilities are inadequate to their needs, and shall make its facilities available, within proper limits, to the Members of Congress, under such rules and regulations as they may prescribe.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON. On page 55, lines 8 to 14, inclusive, strike out section 201.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I shall detain the Committee but a moment, and only to say that I favor the general purposes of the pending bill and am supporting it. This bill contemplates a reduction in the number of committees, more adequate staffs, clerical assistance, and stenographic service for the committees. The section under consideration, section 201, provides that the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House shall establish a stenographic pool in each of the Senate and House Office Buildings for the use of Members during peak periods when their existing clerical facilities are inadequate to their needs, and shall make its facilities available, within proper limits, to the Members of Congress, under such rules and regulations as they may prescribe.
an extra clerk at $5,000 per year for each Member. This clerk would in my office, and in the offices, find that veterans' matters would consume practically his full time.

I have fixed the sum at $5,000 per year simply because I feel that it is the amount for which we can expect to secure the help we so clearly need. I have also taken into consideration the fact that the bill provides an increase of $5,000 in congressional salaries. If I propose, if recognized, at the proper time to offer an amendment to strike out all of the provisions relative to an increase in salary for the Members. In short, I propose that we forego any increase in our own salaries in an effort to contribute to the maintenance of economic stability. On the other hand, I suggest that we devote the same amount of money to providing our constituents with a better service from our offices. I could use the salary increase just as well as the next Member. My experience has come up just as have yours. I know that Congressmen have had no increase for more than 20 years, but I also know that our action on our own salaries will be taken as a basis for other wage adjustments. I do not want to be responsible for setting off a new wave of inflation. I believe that the national interest should control. At the same time, I propose that the clerks in the various offices, for an extra clerk would not profit the Members at all. It would not set a precedent for higher wages and higher prices. It would, however, help each Congressman to do his work, and I feel, in making each Member a better legislator.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I favor some reorganization of Congress in order to eventually bring about a balanced budget, but I cannot support this bill. I hope that you have a rather unique position. This bill contains many provisions which in my opinion would eliminate overlapping work. There are provisions which would consolidate committees and save much time. There are provisions which would make better budgeting work. There are provisions which, in my opinion, would make better scrutiny of expenditures. But there are other provisions which do not belong in the bill. I feel that this bill should come to us with all of the provisions which would save the taxpayers' money and eliminate numerous committees which could be consolidated with others. But the retirement and salary-increase sections should be stricken out or brought up in some other bill and debated separately on their merits. It is one thing to say that we should streamline Congress in order to balance the budget and bring about the business up to date. But it is another thing when you put into the same bill two items which in my opinion would nullify the real purpose of the bill—mainly, balance the budget. I cannot see how you can start balancing the budget with this legislation when you include in it increase of salaries and also include retirement benefits. I fear, Mr. Chairman, this is just another addition to the salary-increase bills which have succeeded in this session. I have not supported them all because they just add to inflation and merely build walls against any attempt to balance the budget. They just add to our tremendous national debt which should be reduced instead of increased. The only place you can get this money is from the taxpayers, and their load is heavy enough.

The House recently passed a bill increasing the salaries of Federal employees. That added hundreds of millions of dollars annually to the taxpayers' burden. I did not support that measure. This House recently passed a bill increasing salaries of the Foreign Service. This bill gave $25,000 annually to some of these employees plus $20,000 a year for entertainment for each of them. I fought against this measure and voted against it. This House recently passed the British gift of $1,000,000,000 for defense. Because we do not have the money and because it was not a business loan. I felt it would add to our inflation. There was some other salary-increase legislation which I opposed. I do not consistently support this measure which will just add millions more toward our annual expenses.

Mr. MONRONEY. The question should do—and what I have been consistently trying to do for a long time is to stop this wild spending and cut down the number of Federal employees and cut down the number of these useless bureaus.

In spite of what some of us have been endeavoring to do toward cutting down the Federal pay roll; in spite of our continued demands for elimination of overlapping Federal work; in spite of our demands that the number of unnecessary employees be cut down, there are still about three million people on the Federal pay roll; in spite of our continued demands for elimination from them for still another wholesale increase in salary. At least 1,000,000 of these people should be eliminated at once. If that is done it would really be a contribution toward balancing the Budget and a contribution toward putting some brakes on inflation.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, this is not just a casual amendment that was dropped in here. It was placed in after testimony was given by the organization of your secretaries, men who have to handle the mail and the inquiries from constituents and problems that come to every congressional office.

One of the criticisms against giving ourselves additional clerk hire is always true, that constitution of Members in certain times they are completely overloaded and swamped with correspondence from their home districts, when down the hall perhaps four or five or six Members should already, or with very little correspondence.

We are trying to reach the situation of furnishing additional help where peak loads occur so that we will not have to give every single Member an additional secretory at $2,000 or $3,000 a year, but give it only in the places where it is needed.

I think it is good, sound business practice and I think the Congress can make contributions. If the Congress is afraid it would not work, then we must say it will not work because we lack the business and administrative ability to make it work.

Mr. MONRONEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY of Michigan. Does the gentleman not think there should be some discrimination in this? There should be no discrimination because of race, color, age, or sex, or something like that? Mr. MONRONEY. I had hoped we would be able to keep this on a functional basis. Mr. MONRONEY of Michigan. That is what I was trying to do, because who would want to function with some of the secretaries they would hire?

Mr. MONRONEY. I believe when the Members use this for a year they will find it is a great help to them in carrying on the business of the House. It would be no trouble for the Members to send letters to the Members’ clerks as to where they put the money in their offices extra clerks that they might not need most of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chairman of the Members from Oklahoma has expired. The question is on the perfecting amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I favor an amendment to section 202.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITTINGTON) there were—aye 141, noes 56.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN CONGRESSIONAL OFFICERS

Sec. 202. (a) Effective January 1, 1947, the annual basic compensation of the elected officials of the Senate and the House of Representatives (not including the President, Vice President or the Speaker) of the two Houses shall be increased by 30 percent; and the provisions of section 501 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946, shall be made applicable to the compensation of said elected officials.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually for the "Office of the Vice President" the sum of $23,130; and there is hereby appropriated to be used for the "Office of the Speaker" the sum of $20,023.

(c) The Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader of the House of Representatives are each authorized to employ an administrative assistant, who shall receive basic compensation at a rate not to exceed $8,000 a year. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the payment of such compensation.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I favor an amendment to section 202.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POAGE: On page 56, paragraph 4, add a period and a new sentence to read as follows:

"Each Member of the House of Representatives shall be entitled to an extra clerk to assist on veterans' and other matters. He shall receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $5,000 a year."
Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section close in 12 minutes, the last 2 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will there be an opportunity to offer a substitute for the Pogue amendment?

Mr. MONRONEY. I would think the Chair would recognize the gentleman to offer a substitute and recognize him for 5 minutes to be heard on the substitute. That would still leave 2 minutes to the committee.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. Pogue) is recognized.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is the one I mentioned a few moments ago to provide an additional clerk at $5,000 a year for each Representative. It seems to me that in no manner can this House do a better thing for the people who represent us than to give ourselves the assistance necessary to perform the duties that are daily becoming heavier. It seems to me that only in that way can we hope for any opportunity for the Members to devote more serious attention to vital public legislation.

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. As a matter of fact, the gentleman’s amendment would restore the executive assistant that was stricken from the Senate bill at a lesser salary and under another name.

Mr. POAGE. I think that is probably a fair statement. I think it was the name that was given in the original bill that brought about a good deal of unjustified criticism for any amendment that would not like the title. If you did not like the title we will call him something else, call him a clerk. Call him what you will. What I want is to get some done here and to leave the Members some opportunity to devote more time to truly legislative matters. What I want is somebody I can call on to handle some of the details of the office. What I want and what I believe you want is someone who can do the job for the people of your districts. I do not care what you call him, whether you call him a clerk or whether you call him a messenger.

The title is insignificant. The work is the thing that is important, and the work is for the people of your districts. If this work is not going to increase next year all you have to do is to see the number of veterans’ cases that are building up for you. If you think these veterans’ cases do not recur or seem somewhat learned in that work, you just try turning these cases over to somebody out of a stenographic pool. If you think you can satisfy the people of your districts by turning over their cases which mean so much to them to some $1,600 a year stenographer, just try doing it. I think it is perfect. I think you must have some ability and some experience and some ability, and I do not think you can get such a person for less than $5,000 a year. It is for that reason I believe it is good for the people who represent us. Otherwise, I am trying to see to it that instead of simply aiding the Members of Congress that this bill should aid the people we represent. Therefore, if I can secure recognition when you read the section of Members’ salaries, I shall offer an amendment to strike out the proposed $5,000 per year increase. I realize that the gentleman from Ohio, a Member of our party, has given an opinion that he will claim recognition on this item and that if he does, I will have no opportunity to offer my amendment, but I am sure that in one way or another we will get a chance to vote to reduce our own salary, and in view of the present effect that this increase may have on our national economy, I feel that we should vote against any increase in our own salary, but that we should use the same money to provide a better service for the people.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Pogue).

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. Judd to the amendment of Mr. POAGE: On page 56, in line 8, insert the following: “Each Senator and Representative in Congress, Delegate from the Territories, and Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico is authorized to employ an administrative assistant whose duty it shall be to perform the duties of the administrative assistant in line 8, insert the following: to carry on departmental business and other duties in Washington. Each such administrative assistant shall receive a salary at a rate not to exceed $5,000 a year.”

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, this substitute amendment is almost exactly the language that was in the bill passed by the Senate. There are only two changes. One is that I have specified that in the administrative assistant must work “in Washington” because the objection was raised that some individuals conceivably might hire a man at $6,000, $7,000, or $8,000 a year instead of the original figure—to carry on political work in his own district; or that it might become just a patronage plum. That is not the purpose of the amendment. So I have modified it to read that it shall be the duty of the administrative assistant to “assist the Member in carrying out his departmental business and other duties in Washington.” It would be permissible for the Member to send him to his district to investigate some problem, of course, but the primary obligation of the assistant would be to work not in the home district, but in the Congressmen’s office in Washington. This should correct that objection by some.

The second change is that the basic compensation is reduced from a mandatory salary of $4,000 a year to “at a rate not to exceed $6,000 a year.” A basic salary of $6,000 a year actually means $6,333.10. If you were to leave it at $8,000 a year, the individual would get $10,000, exactly the same salary a Congressman now gets. Eight thousand, three hundred and thirty-five dollars, that is not exactly the same, but to me it seems to me, is enough to get a top-notch assistant. Furthermore, I do not think the Member should be required to hire at the full amount or nothing. Probably one would not want to hire such an assistant at first at that full rate, without chance for increase. I would prefer to hire him at four or five thousand dollars base, and then raise him gradually to the full amount if and as he makes good.

Mr. Chairman, to me this is the single, most valuable part of the bill, from the standpoint of the Congressman’s work. If the purpose of this bill is, as has been said, to leave our time and to increase our efficiency, no single thing can do more toward that end than to enable us to get a capable high-grade individual who can do far more than clerical work. He can exercise the judgment of the Congressmen, thereby freeing us for our primary responsibilities, namely, to study national problems and devise and enact wise legislation to deal with them.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I have such an administrative assistant now, only she gets $5,000 a year, not $6,000, and every Member of this House could have done the same if they wanted to.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Would the gentleman agree that this will greatly improve our legislation by giving Members of Congress the opportunity to do what is really their job, that is, to understand our economic problems?

Mr. JUDD. I certainly do. The gentlewoman I know had prepared a similar amendment and I am glad that she and many others approve. I hope everyone will agree.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. I want to compliment the gentleman for offering the amendment. I think it goes to the very heart of our problem here and that it is to give the Members more opportunity to look after affairs on the floor of the House.

Mr. JUDD. I hope the Committee will accept the amendment, not for the sake of the Congressmen but for the sake of the country.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the committee as you know considered very carefully the question of an administrative assistant. That was in the bill when it passed the Senate. In an effort to bring this bill to the floor of the House, as I told you before, it was necessary not only for the Members of the special committee to consider this, but to take it up with the leadership on both sides of the aisle.
They have considered the bill as carefully as we have, and it was their considered, conscientious opinion that we should not vote ourselves an administration at this time.

They felt that the matter was being tried out in the other body. Being only 16 of them, they have a great deal more administrative work per Member than we have to do. There was no question that they had to have it in order to remain on the floor to consider legislation. I feel if this plan works in the other body it may well be adopted here later.

The difficulty is in trying to handle the unequal work load that districts have. If you could be sure that only the Members who absolutely have to have this assistant would take it, then I would say it would be a very fine thing for the House to adopt the amendment. But I am afraid that would not be the case.

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 can see where you would have just about one potential candidate for Congress for every Member of the House and you would have to spend more time in your district to keep him from defecting from you.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not agree with the gentleman at all. I would hate to believe that Members of Congress could not choose a secretary or an assistant who would be loyal to him.

But, gentlemen, I believe we have a definite obligation because of the help and the assistance that the leadership gave us in getting this bill to the floor. It has been carefully considered by them, and I do hope that you will give due weight to their suggestions as we consider the adoption of these other two amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired. All are recognized.

The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Jepsen] for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Poage].

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Faust].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Faust) there were aye 33, noes 182. So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMITTEE STAFFS

Sec. 203. (a) Each standing committee of the House of Representatives (other than the Appropriations Committee) is authorized to appoint by a majority vote of the committee not more than four professional staff members in addition to the clerical staff on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of their ability to perform the duties of the office; and said staff members shall be assigned to the chairman and ranking minority member of such committee as the committee may deem advisable. Such each committee is further authorized to terminate the services of any such professional staff member as it may see fit. Professional staff members shall not engage in any work other than committee business and no other duties may be assigned to them.

(b) The Committee on Appropriations of each House of Representatives (other than the Appropriations Committee) is authorized to appoint by a majority vote of the committee not more than four professional staff members in addition to the clerical staff on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of their ability to perform the duties of the office; and said staff members shall be assigned to the chairman and ranking minority member of such committee as the committee may deem advisable. Such each committee is further authorized to terminate the services of any such professional staff member as it may see fit. Professional staff members shall not engage in any work other than committee business and no other duties may be assigned to them.

The Committee on Appropriations of the House also is authorized to conduct studies and make investigations and recommendations with regard to the operation of any executive agency (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) as it may deem necessary to assist it in connection with the determination of matters within its jurisdiction and in accordance with procedures authorized by the Committee by a majority vote, including the rights and powers conferred by House Resolution No. 50, adopted April 10, 1936.

Page 58, line 15, strike out "$6,000" and insert "$8,000."

Page 58, line 17, strike out "$6,000" and insert "$8,000."

Page 58, line 18, after ("j"), insert "Except as otherwise provided in this set.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this series of amendments to section 203 after consultation with the gentleman in charge of the bill, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], and his colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derrksen], to whom they are satisfactory.

The first, offered as a complete substitute for the text of subsection (b), provides for the staffing of the Committee on Appropriations of the House and Senate, in accordance with needs as determined by those committees, and makes permanent provision for the investigative system of the House Committee on Appropriations, which the House heretofore has approved through the medium of House resolutions. This system has been in operation since March 1942, and has proven to be highly effective. It has resulted in the saving of millions of dollars. One of its features is its small cost incident to the employment of experts only when there is work to be done and their prompt dismissal when the work is concluded. We employ a chief investigator continuously, and he recruits experts in matters assigned to him for investigation, and when authorized by the committee.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman agree to strike out the last item, on page 58, line 18? We will agree to the others without amendment, but we cannot agree to that last one.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified to exclude the last item.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri as modified.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri.

Page 58, line 1, in lieu of the matter inserted as subsection (b), insert the following:

"Subject to appropriations which it shall be in order to include in appropriation bills, the Committee on Appropriations of each House is authorized to appoint such staff, in addition to the clerical staff and assistants described in subsection (a), as are necessary to perform the duties of the office of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate shall be continued on the rolls of the House."
respectively appropriations committees established under title I of this act during the fiscal year 1947, unless sooner removed for cause.

(2) Committee employees of all other existing standing committees of each House shall be continued on the pay rolls of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, through January 31, 1947, unless sooner removed for cause by the Secretary or the Clerk of the House, as the case may be.

(3) Appropriations for the compensation of committee employees of standing committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives contained in the Legislative Reference Service Appropriation Act, 1947, shall be available for the compensation of employees specified in paragraph (2) of this subsection and of employees of the standing committees of the Senate and House of Representatives succeeding to the jurisdiction of the standing committees specified in such Appropriation Act; and in any case in which the legislative jurisdiction of any existing standing committee is transferred to two or more standing committees under title I of this act, the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, with respect to standing committees of the Senate, and the Committee on House Administration, with respect to standing committees of the House, shall allocate such appropriations in an equitable manner.

On page 67, line 14, strike out "(and?)" and insert in lieu thereof "(a)" and (b).

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, before the items that are in status quo the items carried in the annual appropriation bills as to standing committees, except those to be abolished, as to which special provision is made.

Mr. CONROY. Mr. Chairman, the committee agrees to that amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE

SEC. 204. (a) The Librarian of Congress is authorized and directed to establish in the Library a separate service to be known as the Legislative Reference Service. It shall be the duty of the Legislative Reference Service:

(1) upon request, to advise and assist any committee of either House or any joint committee, subcommittee, or panel, and to issue and evaluate of legislative proposals pending before it, or of recommendations submitted to Congress, by the President or any executive agency, and otherwise to assist in furnishing a basis for the proper determination of measures before the committee;

(2) upon request, or upon its own initiative in anticipation of requests, to gather, classify, analyze, and make available, in translations, indexes, digests, compilations and bulletins, and otherwise, data for or bearing upon legislation, and to render such data to standing committees, and committees and Members thereof, without partisan bias in selection or presentation;

(b) to prepare summaries and digests of public policies of the Congress, and of bills and resolutions of a public general nature introduced in either House.

SEC. 205. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the work of the Legislative Reference Service the following sums:

(1) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, $150,000;

(2) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, $150,000;

(3) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, $250,000;

(4) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, $300,000;

(5) For the fiscal year thereafter such sums as may be necessary to carry on the work of the Service.

OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

SEC. 206. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the use of the Office of the Legislative Counsel the following sums:

(1) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, $150,000;

(2) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, $200,000;

(3) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, $200,000;

(4) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, $250,000; and

(5) For each fiscal year thereafter such sums as may be necessary to carry on the work of the Office.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will not be in politics any more and I am interested in this matter, but we of the proletariat do not like this bill. I think it is a heads-I-win tails-you-lose proposition. You go to the country and you say, "What you do not like about what the Congress has been doing is all the fault of the way the Congress was run. It is not going to be run that way any more. From now on it is going to be economical, because we passed a law making Congress economical."

Then if the people believe it and you win, you come back and get $15,000 a year and it is all right providing it improves the breed, which it may not, probably will not, and at the same time means raising the salaries of bureaucrats inevitably. But if you attempt to do it in spite of all that, what happens? If you have been here 6 years, and most Members have, and in view of the legislation that has been passed, it is not likely to come back—"It seems they have passed laws to give anybody who has a vote something in the last 6 years—but if you are defeated and you have been here 6 years then you are put on a pension. It seems to me that is unfair to the people. I personally do not want to speak against it and I have nothing against it personally, but it is as difficult to separate Members from this bill as it is to separate a dog from a bone.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Miss SUMNER of Illinois, will you yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As long as the gentleman is not coming back, it does not make any difference to me. Miss SUMNER of Illinois: No: not to me personally, but as a taxpayer. I am a member of the so-called proletariat.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know the gentleman is, and is a very capable one, and I expect to be some time. I only wish she had consented to stand for re-election. Under this bill I will have to bet that an old man like myself will live 4 years in order to get his money back.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentleman is smart; he will get along.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman. I do not expect to live that long but I do expect to be able to take care of myself as long as I live.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I will pay you $15,000 a year if you are smart enough to get along without that pension of $3,000 a year or whatever it is for a few years. It is a challenge to start out at that age and try to make good. After all, it ought to be the kind of a country where there is no place for a man of leisure. If we get too many people from the bureaucracy and the Congress—and this bill just makes the Congress a sort of bureaucracy, and we seem to be heading in that direction—if we get too many people spending all their active life in politics and then the balance of their days on a pension, it certainly is not America. It is just too much like Russia or Germany or whatever you call it, the kind of a state where the government owns and controls everything and everybody. The rest of us, poor worms have to pay for it.

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

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. You see this pension is only to go to those who have reached 62 years of age and, of course, may think a man or woman is not of very much use in a business sense after that age, generally speaking, and that is when the pension is payable.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Well, after all, what is wrong with 62 years of age? It has always been the case in government that the wise men were the old men. You remember what Plato said in the Republic that the old men were the ones with the best experience. I, for one, if this bill would bring such a thing about, am not for any bill that would root out the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Doogrouse]. I think he is wise. And another thing about this legislation that has caused the disintegration of the Government and of the Congress.
The Clerk read as follows:

**Studies by Comptroller General**

Sec. 206. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study of the extent to which any public appropriation act limiting the expenditure of specified appropriations therein finally passed by Congress includes the amount of any Government incident to complying with such restrictions, and to report to the Congress an estimate of the cost of complying with such restrictions and such other recommendations with respect thereto as he deems necessary or desirable.

**Expenditure analysis by Comptroller General**

Sec. 207. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to make an expenditure analysis of each agency in the executive branch of the Government (including Government corporations), which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, will enable Congress to determine whether public funds have been economically and efficiently administered and expended. Reports on such analyses shall be submitted by the Comptroller General, from time to time, to the Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to the Appropriations Committee to the legislative committees having jurisdiction over legislation relating to the operations of the respective agencies for the two Houses.

**Correction of military and naval records**

Sec. 208. The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard, respectively, are hereby authorized to be appointed, with the concurrence of the legislative committees having jurisdiction over legislation relating to the operations of the respective agencies for the two Houses.

**Imigration of Congressional Record**

Sec. 221. The Joint Committee on Printing is authorized and directed to prepare plans and submit them to Congress at the earliest practicable date for the remodeling of the Capitol, which would be utilized for joint committee meetings, conferences, and the presentation of picture or other visual displays on matters of national interest; and (b) the purposes of paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section, said Senate and House restaurants to provide for more convenient dining facilities.

**Assignment of Capitol space**

Sec. 242. The President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall cause a survey to be made of available space within the Capitol which could be utilized for joint committee meetings, meetings of conference committees, and other meetings requiring the attendance of both Senators and Members of the House of Representatives; and shall recommend the rearrangement of such space to accommodate such meetings.

**Senate and House pages**

Sec. 243. (a) The Secretary of the Senate and the clerk of the House of Representatives, acting separately and directed to enter into an arrangement with the Board of Education of the District of Columbia for the public-school system of the District. Such arrangement shall include provision for reimbursement to the District of Columbia for any additional expenses incurred by the public-school system of the District in carrying out such arrangement.

(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the District of Columbia in accordance with the arrangement referred to in subsection (a).

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of this section, said page or pages may be elected to attend a private or parochial school of their own choice:

**Detailed accounts of contributions**

Sec. 303. (a) It shall be the duty of every person who shall in any manner solicit or receive a contribution to any organization or fund for the purposes hereinafter designated to keep a detailed and exact account of:

(1) all contributions of any amount or of any value whatsoever;
(2) the name and address of every person making any such contribution of $500 or more and the date thereof;
(3) all expenditures made by or on behalf of such organization or fund for the purpose of promoting any such contribution, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure.

(b) The term "contribution" includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, deposit, or anything of value or of any value; and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution.

The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, committee, association, corporation, and any other organization or group of persons.

(d) The Joint Committee on Printing shall cause a brief, full, and complete account of contributions received by it to be transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives.

**Receipts for contributions**

Sec. 304. Every individual who receives a contribution of $500 or more for any of the purposes hereinafter designated shall within in 5 days after receipt thereof render to the person or organization, for which such contribution was received, a detailed account.
thereof, including the name and address of the person making such contribution and the date on which received.

Statements to be filed with clerk of House Sec. 307. (a) He shall file with the Clerk of the House a statement containing complete as of the day next preceding the date of filing:
1. The name and address of each person who has made a contribution of $500 or more during the preceding calendar quarter, except that the first report filed pursuant to this title shall contain the name and address of each person who has made any contribution of $500 or more to such person since the effective date of this title;
2. The total sum of the contributions made to or for such person during the calendar year and not stated under paragraph (1);
3. The total sum of all contributions made to or for such person during the calendar year;
4. The name and address of each person to whom he has made an expenditure in cash or of any item of the aggregate amount or value, within the calendar year, of $10 or more has been made, unless made otherwise than in cash, and the amount, date, and purpose of such expenditure;
5. The total sum of all expenditures made by or on behalf of such person during the calendar year and not stated under paragraph (4);
6. The total sum of expenditures made by or on behalf of such person during the calendar year.

(b) The statements required to be filed by subsection (a) shall be cumulative during the calendar year to which they relate, but no statement shall be promptly filed upon notice by the Clerk of its nonreceipt;
(c) A statement shall be promptly filed by the Clerk for a period of 3 years from the date of filing, shall constitute part of the public records of his office, and shall be open to public inspection.

Persons to whom applicable Sec. 308. A statement required by this title to be filed with the Clerk—
(a) shall be deemed properly filed when deposited in an established post office within the prescribed time, duly stamped, registered, and directed to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, Washington, D.C., but in the event it is not received within the prescribed time, it shall be promptly filed upon notice by the Clerk of its nonreceipt;
(b) shall be deemed properly filed with the Clerk for a period of 3 years from the date of filing, shall constitute part of the public records of his office, and shall be open to public inspection.

Titled regulation of lobbying act Sec. 309. The provisions of this title shall apply to any person (except a political committee as defined in the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, and duly organized State or local committees of a political party), who by himself, or through any agent or employee of persons in any manner whatever, directly or indirectly, solicits, collects, or receives money or any other thing of value to be used principally to aid, or the principal purpose of which person is to aid, in the accomplishment of any of the following purposes:
(a) The passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States.
(b) To influence, directly or indirectly, the voting of any member of Congress in any pending or future legislation, by 

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

Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly trespass on the patience of the Committee at this late hour, but I thought I should do so because the antilobbying title is quite an important title and there has been some concern about it in certain quarters.

This has been examined by a good many persons, and the majority opinion is that it would not be actually restrictive. As a matter of fact, a number of suggestions were made to the Committee and those suggestions were carefully considered. The anti­lobbying provisions which suggested amendingatory language thought it was just as well not to have it included.

The gist of the antilobbying provision is contained in section 307. What is being designed is to bring about registration, and a statement of receipts and expenditures on the part of a person who is employed for the principal purpose of accomplishing two things. First, the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States; the second is to influence, directly or indirectly, the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States.

The question has been raised as to whether or not an organization that pays a man to be vigilant upon legislation here would have to schedule all of its assets and all of their receipts and probably file a very long form of statements which would require the Clerk of the House. That is certainly not the intent of the committee. There are some clarifying sections and some exclusions which you will find in section 308. It is thought some word should be addressed to that point at this time.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is not this the situation, that the definition of "person," which includes both a person, association, or corporation, makes it perfectly clear that while an association might not be principally engaged in that work and would therefore not have to make a report, its employee who was principally engaged in that kind of work would have to make a report.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is not this the situation, that the definition of "person," which includes both a person, association, or corporation, makes it perfectly clear that while an association might not be principally engaged in that work and would therefore not have to make a report, its employee who was principally engaged in that kind of work would have to make a report, employee who was principally engaged in that kind of work would have to make a report?

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Would the representative of a chamber of commerce or a manufacturers' association or the farm bureau or labor union have to register? They are created for broad general purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If he comes here and appears before the committee, he will find excluding language on page 73, which says the provisions of this section shall not apply to any person who merely appears before a committee of the Congress of the United States in support of or in opposition to legislation. I raised the question whether or not if the representative of an industry in my area came before the committee and then went back home and struck off some mimeographed data or appeared on the radio in support of or opposition to legislation, it could be inferred that the representative of an industry, within the meaning of this title, there was some additional language as that bill left the Senate. If he went home and in furtherance of that activity carries on any kind of endeavor then he would come within the purview of the section. That language has not been applied to that purpose.

We are trying to do here is to reach those whose principal purpose, not incidental purpose, but whose principal purpose is to come here and influence the passage of legislation either by bringing about its defeat or its enactment.

Mr. CURTIS. What is the situation in reference to the executive department of the Government lobbying?

Mr. DIRKSEN. With reference to the Government lobby, as the gentleman refers to it, there is a provision here that that shall not apply to any official of the Government who comes here in his official capacity. Certainly if they are going to send a lot of folks up here who do not come in their official capacity we are going to find it out quickly and we know what to do with them through the instrumentality of an appropriation bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Just one more question: The lobbying that is going on at the present time is not approaching the Congress directly but it is radio appeals that causes hundreds if not millions of people to contact their Congressmen or somebody else in connection with the Government. What does this bill do to reach that situation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If it is anywhere in the country and the principal purpose is to bring about the influencing of legislation then the person would come within the purview of this legislation.

Now at this point, I want to insert the comment contained in the House report on this title so that it may have wide circulation and come to the attention of those who are particularly interested in this title:

TITLe III—REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

This title deals with a subject that has frequently been before the Congress, in the form of bills to regulate lobbying activities. In the past, it has been generally recognized that the great potential for misunderstanding of the purposes of this title it is desirable to make a statement as to what the title does and what it does not, and follow some of the things that the title does not do:

First it does not curtail the right of free speech or freedom of the press or the right of petition.

Second. It has no application to the publishers of newspapers, magazines, or other publications, acting in the regular course of business.

Third. It has no application to persons who merely appear, openly and frankly, before the committees of Congress.

Fourth. It does not require any reports of any persons or organizations now required to report under the provisions of the present corrupt practices act.

Fifth. It does not apply in any manner to persons who appear voluntarily without compensation.

Sixth. It does not apply to organizations formed for other purposes whose efforts to influence legislation are merely incidental to the purposes for which formed.

On the other hand the title applies chiefly to the distinct classes of so-called lobbyists:

First. Those who do not visit the Capitol but initiate propaganda from all over the country in the form of breakfast meetings, many of which have been based entirely upon misinformation as to facts. This class of per-
sons and organizations will be required under the title, not to cease or curtail their activities in any respect, but merely to disclose the sources of their employment and the methods in which they are disbursed.

Second. The second class of lobbyists are those whose activities are based entirely on the Capitol under the false impression that they exert some persuasive influence over Members of Congress. These individuals spend their time in Washington presumably exerting some mysterious influence with respect to the legislation in which their employers are interested, and in no wise prevent or curtail their activities. It merely requires that they shall register and disclose the sources of their employment and the amount of their compensation.

Third. There is a third class of entirely honest and respectable representatives of business, professional, and philanthropic organizations who come to Washington openly and frankly to express their views for or against legislation, many of whom serve a useful and perfectly legitimate purpose in expressing the views and interpretations of the business, professional, or other matters pending or proposed in either house of Congress.

Section 301. Short title: This section provides a short title, namely, the "Federal Lobbying Act of 1946." Section 302. Definitions: This section contains definitions and explains the purpose of "contributions," "expenditure," and "legislation." These terms are defined herein as follows:

(a) The term "contribution" includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money or anything of value and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution.

(b) The term "contribution" includes a payment, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure.

(c) The term "legislation" means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either house of Congress, and includes any other matter which the committee desires to make the subject of action by either House.

Section 303. Detailed accounts of contributions: This section makes it the duty of every person who receives fees or compensation for services rendered or received in connection with contributions defined in the previous section, to give full details of his employment and the amounts received by him. It is further made the duty of such person to keep receipted bills for expenditures in connection with contributions, and to submit such bills and accounts required to be kept for at least 2 years from the date of filing of the statement required by this section.

Section 304. Receipts for contributions: This section requires every individual who receives fees or compensation for services rendered or received in connection with contributions defined in the previous section, to give full details of his employment and the amounts received by him. It is further made the duty of such person to keep receipted bills for expenditures in connection with contributions, and to submit such bills and accounts required to be kept for at least 2 years from the date of filing of the statement required by this section.

Section 305. Statements to be filed with Clerk of House: This section requires every person who receives fees or compensation for services rendered or received in connection with contributions defined in the previous section, to give full details of his employment and the amounts received by him. It is further made the duty of such person to keep receipted bills for expenditures in connection with contributions, and to submit such bills and accounts required to be kept for at least 2 years from the date of filing of the statement required by this section.

Section 306. Statements to be filed with Clerk of Senate: This section requires every person who receives fees or compensation for services rendered or received in connection with contributions defined in the previous section, to give full details of his employment and the amounts received by him. It is further made the duty of such person to keep receipted bills for expenditures in connection with contributions, and to submit such bills and accounts required to be kept for at least 2 years from the date of filing of the statement required by this section.

Section 307. Persons to whom applicable: This section defines the application of the title and includes any person who by himself, a relative, or their agent or employee, makes a contribution in any manner whatsoever, directly or indirectly, solicits, collects, or receives money or other consideration for the purpose of influencing legislation, to which purpose any other matter which the committee desires to make the subject of action by either House.

(b) This section requires every person engaged in the regular course of business, professional, or philanthropic activities, and includes any other matter which the committee desires to make the subject of action by either House.

Section 308. Registration with Secretary of Senate and Clerk of House: This section requires every person who engages himself for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of legislation, to register with the Clerk of the Senate or the Secretary of the House, giving full details of his employment, and to report each calendar quarter details concerning money received and expended by him during the quarter in connection with the activity in which he is engaged. There are also included in the provisions of this section persons who make contributions to another person in order to induce the other person to support any measure or to vote in favor of or in opposition to legislation; public officials acting in their official capacity; and newspapers and periodicals acting in the regular course of business. All information required to be filed with the Clerk and Secretary shall be compiled by them, acting jointly, and printed in the Congressional Record.

Section 309. Reports and statements to be made under oath: This section requires all reports and statements to be made under oath.

Section 310. Penalties: This section makes a misdemeanor to violate any of the provisions of the title and provides punishment by fine of not less than $500 or imprisonment for not more than 12 months, or both. In addition to these penalties any person convicted of the misdemeanor specified above is prohibited for a period of 3 years from attempting to influence directly or indirectly the passage or defeat of legislation or from appearing before a committee of the Congress in support of or in opposition to legislation. Any person who violates this provision is guilty of a felony and subject to punishment by a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

Section 311. Exemption: This section provides that the title shall not apply to practices or activities regulated by the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, nor construed as repealing any portion of said act.

Now, Mr. Chairman, by way of further clarification, I want to follow with that portion of the Senate report accompanying this bill, which deals with the lobbying activities of business, professional, and philanthropic organizations who come to Washington openly and frankly to express their views for or against legislation, many of whom serve a useful and perfectly legitimate purpose in expressing the views and interpretations of the business, professional, or other matters pending or proposed in either house of Congress.

Third. There is a third class of entirely honest and respectable representatives of business, professional, and philanthropic organizations who come to Washington openly and frankly to express their views for or against legislation, many of whom serve a useful and perfectly legitimate purpose in expressing the views and interpretations of the business, professional, or other matters pending or proposed in either house of Congress.
Section 301. Short title: This section provides a short title, namely, the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act.

Section 302. Definitions: This section contains definitions of the principal terms of reference. The definitions of "contribution," "expenditure," and "legislation" are included herein and are as follows:

(a) The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money of value or anything of value and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution.

(b) The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure.

(c) The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House.

Section 303. Detailed accounts of contributions: This section makes it a duty of every person soliciting or receiving contributions to an organization or fund for the purposes defined in section 307 (post) to keep a detailed and exact account of all contributions; the name and address of the person contributing; the sum of all contributions of $500 or more, and the date thereof; all expenditures made by or on behalf of the organization or fund; and the name and address of every person to whom any expenditure was made, and the date thereof. It is further made the duty of such person to keep receipted bills for expenditures in excess of $10, and to preserve the receipted bills and accounts of such expenditures for a period of 5 years from the date of filing of the statement containing such items.

Section 304. Receipts for contributions: This section requires every person receiving any contributions or spending any money for the purposes specified in section 307 (post), within 5 days after receipt, to render to the person or organization for which it was received a detailed account thereof, including the name and address of the person contributing the contribution and the date on which received.

Section 305. Statements to be filed with Clerk of the House: This section requires every person receiving any contributions or spending any money for the purposes specified in section 307 (post), within 5 days after receipt, to render to the Clerk of the House a statement showing the names and addresses of persons contributing $500 or more; the total sum of the contributions made to or for such person during the calendar year and not stated under the foregoing requirement; the total sum of all contributions made to or for such person during the calendar year; the name and address of each person to whom an expenditure of $500 or more has been made within the calendar year by or on behalf of such person during the calendar year and not stated under the foregoing requirement; and shall be open to public inspection.

Section 306. Statement preserved for 2 years: Statements required to be filed with the Clerk must be preserved for a period of 2 years from the date of filing, to become a part of the public records of his office, and shall be open to public inspection.

Section 307. To whom applicable: This section defines the application of the title and includes any person who by him-
paid, how much he is to be paid for expenses, and what expenses are to be included. Each such person so registering shall continue, for both the first and each succeeding calendar quarter, so long as his activity continues, file with the Clerk and Secretary a detailed statement of all payments received and expended by him during the preceding calendar quarter in carrying on his work to verify what purpose such expenditures were for, whether the names of any papers, periodicals, magazines, or other publications in which he has caused to be published any articles or editorials in support of or in opposition to legislation; nor to any public official acting in his official capacity; nor in the case of any newspaper or other regularly published periodical (including any individual who owns, publishes, or is employed by any such newspaper or periodical) which in the ordinary course of business publishes news items, editorials, or other news items paid advertisements, which directly or indirectly urge the passage or defeat of legislation, if such newspaper, periodical, or other person engaged in any such or other activities in connection with the passage or defeat of such legislation, other than to appear before a committee of the Congress of the United States in support of or in opposition to legislation; nor to any public official acting in his official capacity; nor in the case of any newspaper or other regularly published periodical (including any individual who owns, publishes, or is employed by any such newspaper or periodical) which in the ordinary course of business publishes news items, editorials, or other news items paid advertisements, which directly or indirectly urge the passage or defeat of legislation, if such newspaper, periodical, or other person engaged in any such or other activities in connection with the passage or defeat of such legislation, other than to appear before a committee of the Congress of the United States in support of or in opposition to legislation. The provisions of this section shall not apply to any person so appearing before a committee of the Congress of the United States in support of or in opposition to legislation; nor to any public official acting in his official capacity; nor in the case of any newspaper or other regularly published periodical (including any individual who owns, publishes, or is employed by any such newspaper or periodical) which in the ordinary course of business publishes news items, editorials, or other news items paid advertisements, which directly or indirectly urge the passage or defeat of legislation, if such newspaper, periodical, or other person engaged in any such or other activities in connection with the passage or defeat of such legislation, other than to appear before a committee of the Congress of the United States in support of or in opposition to legislation. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. The Clerk read as follows:

"Reports and statements to be made under oath."

SEC. 309. All reports and statements required under this title shall be made under oath, before an officer authorized by law to administer oaths.

Penalties

SEC. 310. (a) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this title, shall, upon conviction thereof, be guilty of a felony, and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 12 months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(b) In addition to the penalties provided for in subsection (a), any person convicted of the misdemeanor specified therein is prohibited, for a period of 3 years from the date of such conviction, from attempting to influence, or indirectly, the passage or defeat of any proposed legislation or from appearing before a committee of the Congress in support of or opposition to proposed legislation; and any person who violates any provision of this subsection shall, upon conviction thereof, be guilty of a felony, and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000, or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

Exemption

SEC. 311. The provisions of this title shall not apply to practices or activities regulated by the Federal Corrupt Practices Act nor be construed as repealing any portion of said Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

TITLE IV—FEDERAL TORT CLAIMS ACT

PART 1—SHORT TITLE AND DEFINITIONS

Short title

SEC. 401. This title may be cited as the "Federal Tort Claims Act."

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

Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to see this part of the bill, but there is one situation I desire to call to the attention of the chairman of the special committee as well as the gentleman from Illinois. Mr. DIKGSEN. There are a good many claims that have been investigated by Government authority and have been approved by the Committee on Claims.

I was a call of bills on the Private Calendar this morning. The one I was especially interested in has passed, so far as that is concerned, but there are some that have not.

Yet the Government has gone to great expense in investigating these claims. They have sent certain members of the War Department, in cases of tort, to different parts of the country. Many cases have been decided. They have reported some favorably and on others acted unfavorably. If this act takes effect as of the date of its enactment, as it does do, and if these claims are not disposed of, you have to drive these people back into the courts, and you have lost all the expense that the Government has gone to. It is the same curb you put in this morning, but it is not by the Senate. There might be a race between the two. The rest of it relates to further claims to be on the House Committee. There are some statutes of limitation put in here, too, that might interfere. I do not think the bill ought to apply to claims that have been favorably reported.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Illinois was speaking, I felt that I agreed with her very heartily. I know the Members of Congress join me in being very glad that the amputees have felt that they were welcome in the Congress to plead the cause that they ought not to have to plead, but it is their Capitol; it is their country; the country that they were wounded for. I was told by the Members of Congress, that if a new Members have made them welcome.

Mr. Chairman, there has been brought to my attention a fact that I am loath to believe and I cannot believe, because it is in laughter not the fact that the request of amputees who have been to see their Congressmen on Capitol Hill has been ridiculed. They have asked for legislation to provide an automobile as a means of locomotion to make up for their lost mobility. Several Members introduced bills for that purpose. They felt the idea sound and would serve a useful and greatly needed purpose.

I know that 176 or more Members signed the petition to bring that bill out of committee. With more names concurred I know that some of the Members of our Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation have been working very hard to bring out a bill from that committee. In order to aid them other Members have the Committee on the floor. Also Members on the subcommittee worked very hard to perfect a bill. I would like to tell the House that one of the amputees that I am getting at is Mr. Ray Martin, of Long Island. He was in the Army 6 years and 10 months and had not had a furlough. He got a 45-day furlough from Walter Reed Hospital,
through the kindness of the commanding officer, General Beach, and on December 21, this last Christmas, he went to the Union Station to take the 2 o'clock train. Sergeant Martin was knocked down and trampled and finally rescued and taken back:

finally got his first furlough after 7 years and 6 months he was again able to travel and finally got his first furlough after 7 years and 4 months. You remember how the newspapers of the Nation and the whole story of how Sergeant Martin was trampled at the Union Station in the Nation's Capital.

I hope you will join me in voting to give these amputees anything they need, and if I can't buy a new automobile, I am for it. Certainly they deserve it in order to prevent them from being trampled and knocked down and injured. They have suffered too much already. The chairman of the World War Veterans' Committee promised me to hold another meeting.

The Clerk read as follows:

Definitions

Sec. 402. As used in this title, the term-(a) "Federal agency" includes the executive departments and independent establishments of the United States, or any component of any such department or establishment, whose primary function is to act as, and while acting as, instrumentalities or agencies authorized to sue and be sued in the name of the United States, or to act in any capacity, temporarily or permanently in the service of the United States, whether with or without compensation.

(b) "Employee of the Government" includes officers or employees of any Federal agency, while acting within the scope of his office or employment, while acting in line of duty.

(c) "Acting within the scope of his office or employment," in the case of a member of the military or naval forces of the United States, means acting in line of duty.

Part 2—Administrative Adjustment of Tort Claims Against the United States

Claims of $1,000 or less

Sec. 403. (a) Subject to the limitations of this title, authority is hereby conferred upon the Secretary of the Treasury, as designee for the purpose, acting on behalf of the United States, to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and settle any claim against the United States for money only, accruing on and after January 1, 1945, on account of damage to or loss of property or on account of personal injury or death resulting from negligence or omission of any employee of the Government while acting within the scope of his office or employment, under circumstances where the United States, if a private person, would be liable to the claimant for such damage, loss, injury, or death.

(b) The judgment in such an action shall constitute a complete bar to any action by the claimant or any other person in respect of such claims to the same claimants, in the same manner, and to the same extent as a private individual under like circumstances.

(c) Any award or settlement made pursuant to this section shall not include attorneys' fees.

(d) The acceptance by the claimant of any such award, compromise, or settlement shall constitute a complete bar to any action by the claimant against the United States for personal injury or death resulting from negligence or omission of any employee of the Government whose act or omission gave rise to the claim, by reason of the same subject matter.

Reports

Sec. 404. The head of each Federal agency shall annually make a report to the Congress of all claims against Federal agencies under this part. Such report shall include the name of each claimant, a statement of the amount claimed and the amount awarded, and a brief description of the claim.

Part 3—Suits on Tort Claims Against the United States

Jurisdiction

Sec. 410. (a) Subject to the provisions of this title, the United States district court for the district wherein the plaintiff is resident or wherein the act or omission complained of occurred, including the United States district courts for the Territories and possessions of the United States, shall have jurisdiction over cases where the total amount of the claims does not exceed $1,000, or less.

(b) The judgment in such an action shall constitute a complete bar to any action by the claimant or any other person in respect of such claims to the same claimants, in the same manner, and to the same extent as a private individual under like circumstances, except that the United States shall not be liable for interest prior to judgment, or for punitive damages. Costs shall be allowed in all courts to the successful claimant to the same extent as if the United States were a private litigant, except that such costs shall not include attorneys' fees.

(c) The judgment in such an action shall constitute a complete bar to any action by the claimant or any other person in respect of such claims to the same claimants, in the same manner, and to the same extent as a private individual under like circumstances, except that the United States shall not be liable for interest prior to judgment, or for punitive damages. Costs shall be allowed in all courts to the successful claimant to the same extent as if the United States were a private litigant, except that such costs shall not include attorneys' fees.

(d) The acceptance by the claimant of any such award, compromise, or settlement shall constitute a complete bar to any action by the claimant against the United States for personal injury or death resulting from negligence or omission of any employee of the Government whose act or omission gave rise to the claim, by reason of the same subject matter.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The committee discussed putting a limitation on these
awards, and one of the reasons such a limitation was not adopted is that we might be setting a pattern for making larger awards on claims. If we put a $25,000 limitation in the bill, we would be setting such awards rather than limiting them.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Yes; but we have had that limitation in the Committee on Claims on previous bills during all these years. The danger is not that you will do that but that you will open up the floodgates for inroads on the Federal Treasury by unlimited judgments, which might run as high as $50,000, $75,000, or $100,000.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. I am glad the gentleman makes that statement because the Committee on the Judiciary has already approved my bill which provides for the setting of a $25,000 limitation on federal courts and we have placed a limitation upon judgments in the district courts of $10,000.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I think such a limitation should be in this bill, and if the House were in a mood to consider amendments, which it has shown it is not, I would offer an amendment to limit the amount of recoveries.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROCEDURE

Sec. 411. In actions under this part, the forms of process, writs, pleadings, and motions, and the practice and procedure, shall be in accordance with the rules promulgated by the Supreme Court pursuant to the act of June 19, 1884 (48 Stat. 1044), and the same provisions for counterclaim and set-off, for interest upon judgments, and for payment of judgments, shall be applicable as in cases brought in the United States district courts under the act of March 3, 1887 (24 Stat. 506).

Review

Sec. 412. (a) Final judgments in the district courts in cases under this part shall be subject to appeal—(1) in the circuit courts of appeals in the same manner and to the same extent as other judgments and final decisions of the district courts; or (2) in the Court of Claims of the United States: Provided, That the notice of appeal required under rule 26 of the Rules of Civil Procedure shall have annexed thereto the written consent on behalf of all the appellants that the appeal be taken to the Court of Claims of the United States. Such appeals to the Court of Claims of the United States shall be taken within 3 months after the entry of the judgment of the district court, and shall be governed by the rules relating to appeals from a district court to a circuit court of appeals adopted by the Supreme Court pursuant to the act of June 19, 1884 (48 Stat. 1046)

(b) Sections 290 and 340 of the Judicial Code, as amended, shall apply to cases under this Act in the circuit courts of appeals and in the Court of Claims of the United States to the same extent as to cases in a circuit court of appeals therein referred to.

COMPOUNDS

Sec. 413. With a view to doing substantial justice to the parties, General is authorized to arbitrate, compromise, or settle any claim cognizable under this part, after the institution of any suit thereon, with the approval of the Court in which such suit is pending.

ONE-YEAR STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

Sec. 420. Every claim against the United States cognizable under this title shall be forever barred if not presented to the proper claim officer within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, whichever is later, it is presented in writing to the Federal agency to which such claim is addressed. The fact that such claimant or his representative has engaged in negotiations with such Federal agency to which such claim is addressed, that such claimant or his representative has engaged in negotiations with such Federal agency to which such claim is addressed, that such Federal agency, at the request of such claimant, has withheld from such Federal agency, at the request of such claimant, has withheld from or from the date of mailing of notice to the claimant by such Federal agency as to the final disposition of the claim or from the date of withdrawal of the claim from such Federal agency pursuant to section 410 of this title, if it is presented in writing to the head of the Federal agency thereto the written consent on behalf of all the appellants that the appeal be taken to the Court of Claims of the United States.

Sec. 421. The provisions of this title shall not apply to—(a) Any claim based upon an act or omission of an employee of the Government, exercised in the execution of the laws 1887 (24 Stat. 506).

Sec. 422. The court, in rendering a judgment for the plaintiff pursuant to part 3 of this title, or the head of the Federal agency or his designate making an award pursuant to part 2 of this title, or any contract activity arising if such claim is for a sum not exceeding $1,000, or unless within 1 year after such award, or performance of the discretionary function or duty on the part of a Federal agency or an employee of the Government, whether or not the claim accrued or within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, whichever is later, an action is begun pursuant to part 3 of this title, it is presented in writing to the head of the Federal agency thereto the written consent on behalf of all the appellants that the appeal be taken to the Court of Claims of the United States.

EXCEPTIONS

Sec. 423. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the authority of any Federal agency to sue and be sued in its own name shall not be construed to authorize suits against such Federal agency on claims which are cognizable under part 3 of this title, and the remedies provided by this title in such cases shall be exclusive.

CERTAIN STATUTES INAPPLICABLE

Sec. 424. (a) All provisions of law authorizing any Federal agent or consider amendments, which it has shown it is not, for interest upon judgments, and for payment of judgments, shall be applicable as in cases brought in the United States district courts under the act of March 3, 1887 (24 Stat. 506).
The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. Mr. Chairman, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has said, this amendment is not to preserve the jurisdiction of a committee but to safeguard the proper functions of the Congress. This is another of the constantly recurring efforts by some member of Congress to abridge its power and prerogative to the executive branch of the Government. It is a proposal that Members of Congress surrender their rights in the enactment of bridge bills at the behest of the War Department. Such proposals have been sent more than once by the War Department to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It is not in the form of bills. No action has ever been taken in favor of such a proposal, and no one has ever been introduced to advocate such a measure.

We took the position that no officer in the War Department knows as much about the need for a bridge, its proper location, its relation to the highway system, its financing, and its feasibility as the Member of Congress from that district. A city, a county, a State—sometimes two cities, counties, or States—desire construction of a bridge. The War Department has no knowledge of the problems through their Congressmen than through some bureaucrat in the War Department. The Congressman takes justifiable pride in piloting a bridge bill through for the benefit of his constituents. It is an important bill to them; frequently to that district. No Member can say that the Congressmen who introduced the bills that authorized their construction speak the same language and understand one another’s problems. No Member of Congress designing to expedite the construction of a needed bridge with a sound financial structure has ever failed to receive sympathetic and cordial cooperation from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Within the last few days, on the eve of adjournment, several Members have introduced bridge bills and have received satisfactory reports. We wonder whether they would not prefer to continue to bring their bills to a committee of their colleagues rather than depend on the caprices of some autocratic bureaucrat, who was not elected by the people, and has no feeling of responsibility to the people.

The Congress, through the years, has authorized a fine system of bridges as a part of the highway system. We have practically eliminated private toll bridges, which would have rivaled if this title should become law. We have eliminated many privately owned ferries, dangerous bottlenecks to modern highway travel, through the construction of bridges and publicly owned toll bridges, which, at the expiration of a reasonable amortization period, become free bridges—just as the rural free delivery of the post office is a part of the highway. This bill would fix a definite amortization period of 20 years. That is the usual period, but we have found situations in which it was necessary in the public interest to establish a different period of amortization. The bridge program will be more satisfactory if left to the discretion of the Congress if placed in a bureaucratic strait-jacket.

If this title becomes law the Member of Congress will have no part in authorizing a bridge in his district; but owes unto the highway commissioner, the mayor, city councilman, the county judge, or member of the fiscal court, who fails to obey implicitly every rule and order promulgated by some major or captain in the War Department who will hold the power of life or death over the desire of a city, county, or State for a bridge, because failure to comply with any order or specific condition imposed by the Secretary of War or Chief of Engineers— and that means the functionary or martinet in charge of the bridge bureau—will result in the fine of $5,000, or by imprisonment for not more than a year, or both.

The enactment of bridge bills has never clogged the legislative machinery; it has never slowed the House. Bridge bills have been handled expeditiously and efficiently and I believe, to the satisfaction of the Congress and the country. Beginning with the Seventieth Congress, 112 who are now Members of the House have introduced bridge bills which have been reported by the committee and passed by the House. There was never been the slightest degree of partisanship in reporting bridge bills. No Member can say that he has ever failed to receive fair and courteous treatment by that committee.

Scores of Members have bridges in their respective districts that are pointed out by their constituents as monuments to the public service of the Congressman who introduced the bills that authorized their construction.

Not only has there been a constantly increasing trend to concentrate power in the Federal Government at the expense of the local governments, but the executive department has continued to encroach upon numerous prerogatives of the legislative department. Even were the concentration of power by the executive department the dedication by Congress of its rights and the abandonment of its obligations.

We witness the shameful, pitiful spectacle of the Congress of the United States, clothed by the Constitution with all legislative power, invested with all legislative responsibility, year after year, in session after session, bowing more and more servilishly to the dictates of a bureaucratic clerk.

Unless we stop drifting as we have been drifting and we drift now, representative government will be undermined and destroyed, and on its ruins will rise an autocratic government, because of the bureaucratic nature. Then constitutional government will be dead. Let us get back to the principle of the fathers, that government as an ‘indissoluble Union of indestructible States,’ as a ‘government of laws and not men,’ is not a bureau under a dual form of government, and restore the equipoise which, as the result of the usurpation of legislative ad­ junction, has been destroyed.

Those words which I uttered in this Chamber May 18, 1928, were true then.
They are truer now. Let us stop this supine surrender of legislative prerogatives; this shameless abdication of legislative responsibility.

The bridge program will be more satisfactory if left to the discretion and judgment of Congress than if placed in a bureaucratic strait-jacket.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am quite confident every Member of the House who may be interested in the construction of a bridge across a navigable stream would be genuinely delighted to encourage the initiative of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, but this was the most ingenious argument I have ever heard for striking out a title of this bill. It was for all practical purposes nothing more than an argument to preserve the little opportunity for the Member of Congress to enjoy the fellowship that goes along with presenting a bridge bill before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

You could introduce a thousand bills, you could fill this Chamber with bills and never get a bridge until after the War Department had explored every engineering possibility. It has got to go there anyway, it has to have the approval of the War Department engineers, so why have the Consent Calendar of this House cluttered from one year’s end to the other with unresolved bridge bills when the work has to be done by the War Department engineers?

I hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be voted down by a resounding vote.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York who has had a great deal to do with this bridge business.

Mr. WADESWORTH. I used to be on the bridge subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; and it was a nuisance.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Did you hear that? They want to do this.

Mr. WADESWORTH. I used to be on the subcommittee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce dealing with bridges; and the distinguished gentleman from New York says it is a nuisance.

Now let us eliminate this nuisance by voting down this amendment by a good vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Consent of Congress

Sec. 502. (a) The consent of Congress is hereby granted for the construction, maintenance, and operation of bridges and approaches over the navigable waters of the United States, in accordance with the provisions of this title.

(b) The location and plans for such bridges shall be approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War before construction is commenced, and, in approving the location and plans of any bridge, they may impose any specific conditions relating to the maintenance and operation of the structure which they may deem necessary in the interest of public navigation, and the conditions so imposed shall have the force of law.

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (a) and (b), it shall be unlawful to construct or commence the construction of any privately owned highway toll bridge until a finding of the actual and plans thereof shall have also been submitted to and approved by the highway department or departments of the state in which the bridge is located, and plans thereof shall be unable to agree upon the location and plans therefor, or if they, or either of them, shall fail or refuse to agree upon the location and plans submitted, such location and plans shall then be submitted to the Public Roads Administration and an approval by the Public Roads Administration, approval by the highway departments shall not be required.

Tolls

Sec. 503. If tolls shall be charged for the transport by vehicles, engines, cars, streetcars, wagons, carriages, vehicles, animals, foot passengers, or other passengers, such tolls shall be just and, and, the Secretary of War may, at any time, and from time to time, prescribe the reasonable rates of toll for such transit, and shall file with the bridge, and the rates and the legal rate and shall be the legal rates and be declared and received for such transit.

Acquisition by public agencies

Sec. 504. In the completion of any interstate toll bridge constructed by an individual, firm, or corporation, as determined by the Secretary of War, either of the States in which the bridge is located, or any public agency or political subdivision of either of such States, or any individual, firm, or corporation, which owns or has the right to acquire, any part of such bridge is located, or any two or more of them jointly, may at any time acquire and take over all right, title, and interest in any part of the bridge and its approaches, and any interest in real property for public purposes by condemnation or expropriation. If at any time after the expiration of 5 years after the completion of such bridge the same is acquired by condemnation or expropriation for damages or compensation to be allowed shall not include good, going, value, or prospective revenues of which if any shall be limited to the sum of (1) the actual cost of constructing such bridge and its approaches, less a reasonable deduction for depreciation in value; (2) the actual costs of acquiring such interests in real property; (3) actual financing and interest paid to, or in excess of 10 percent of the sum of the cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches and acquiring such interests in real property; and (4) actual expenditures for speeding improvements.

Statements of cost

Sec. 505. Within 90 days after the completion of a privately owned interstate toll bridge, the owner shall file with the Secretary of War and with the highway departments of the States in which the bridge is located, a sworn itemized statement showing the actual original cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches, the actual cost of acquiring any interest in real property necessary therefor, and the actual financing and promotion costs. The Secretary of War may, and upon request of a highway department shall, at any time during 3 years after the completion of such bridge, investigate such costs and determine the accuracy and the reasonableness of the costs alleged in the statement filed by the owner, and shall make a finding of the actual and reasonable costs of constructing, financing, and promoting such bridge. For the purpose of such investigation, the Secretary of War, the firm, or corporation, its successors and assigns, shall make available all of its records in connection with the construction, financing, and promotion thereof.

The findings of the Secretary of War as to the reasonable costs of the construction, financing, and operation of the bridge shall be conclusive for the purposes mentioned in section 504 of this title, subject only to review by a court of equity for fraud or gross mistake.

Sinking fund

Sec. 506. If tolls are charged for the use of an interstate bridge constructed or taken over by a State or States or by any municipality or any other political subdivision or public agency thereof, under the provisions of this title, there shall be added to such tolls as are charged for any such public purpose, the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economic management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the amount paid therefor, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 20 years from the date of constructing or acquiring the same. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been provided by any bridge, such bridge shall be maintained and operated free of tolls. An accurate record of the amount paid for acquiring, constructing, and maintaining the bridge and its approaches, the actual expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected, shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

Applicability of title

Sec. 507. The provisions of this title shall apply only to bridges over navigable waters of the United States, the construction of which is hereafter approved under the provisions of this title; and the provisions of the first proviso of section 9 of the act of March 3, 1889, (30 Stat. title 33, sec. 401), and the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters", approved March 3, 1906, shall not apply to such bridges.

International bridges

Sec. 508. This title shall not be construed to authorize the construction of any bridge which will connect the United States, or any Territory or possession of the United States, with any foreign country.

Eminent domain

Sec. 509. There are hereby conferred upon any individual, his heirs, legal representatives, or assigns, any corporation, its successors or assigns, or any State, political subdivision, or municipality authorised in accordance with the provisions of this title to build a bridge between two or more States, all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property in the respective States needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches, as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor to be ascertained and paid in accordance with the laws of such State, and the proceedings thereafter shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

Penalties

Sec. 510. Any person who fails or refuses to comply with any lawful order of the Secretary of War or the Chief of Engineers issued under the provisions of this title, or who fails to comply with any specific condition imposed by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War relating to the maintenance and operation of such bridge, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction, be fined not to exceed $500 or imprisonment not to exceed 6 months.
Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, earlier today when I first read this amendment that I said I would introduce at this time, the amount of annual salary for Members of Congress in the amendment was fixed at $12,500 and the expense account at $3,000. Since that time, however, I have had a number of conferences with Members of the House and, as a result, we have arrived at a compromise arrangement which will reduce the salary as given in the bill from $15,000 to $12,500 per year for each Member and Senator and will provide that the expense allowance shall remain as it has been for the past 2 or 3 years, namely, $2,500 per year, with this single exception: The amendment does fix without any question the fact that the expense allowance shall be tax-free; in other words, that there shall be no tax liability incurred on this particular expense allowance, or accounting made thereon.

That is done for the reason that every expense allowance made in business or industry or in a profession is a deductible item for tax purposes. We have a question about that. But there is a question under the internal-revenue laws of the United States with reference to the tax allowance arrangement we now have as the result of a section of a bill recently passed. There is a question as to whether or not a Member of Congress has the right to claim and to obtain an expense allowance for the actual expenses related to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, to be paid in equal monthly installments, is hereby repealed, effective on the day on which the Eightieth Congress convenes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Brown of Ohio:

In line 18, page 93, after the word "of," strike out "$15,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$12,500."

Beginning with line 22 on page 93 strike out all of the following matter up to and including line 37 on page 94 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Effective on the day on which the Eightieth Congress convenes, the salary paid to each Senator, Representative in Congress, Delegate from the Territories, Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, and the Resident Commissioner from Porto Rico, after January 2, 1945, an expense allowance of $2,500 per annum to assist in defraying expenses related to, or resulting from, the discharge of his official duties, to be paid in equal monthly installments, is hereby repealed, effective on the day on which the Eightieth Congress convenes.

(c) The sentence contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1946, which reads as follows: "There shall be paid to each Senator, Representative in Congress, Delegate from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of $15,000 per annum each; the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Vice President of the United States shall be at the rate of $25,000 per annum each; the expenses related to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, to be paid in equal monthly installments," is hereby repealed, effective on the day on which the Eightieth Congress convenes.

SEc. 601. (b) The sentence contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1946, which reads as follows: "There shall be paid to each Senator, Representative in Congress, Delegate from the Territories, Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, and the Resident Commissioner from Porto Rico, an expense allowance of $2,500 per annum to assist in defraying expenses related to, or resulting from, the discharge of his official duties, to be paid in equal monthly installments," is hereby repealed, effective on the day on which the Eightieth Congress convenes.

I offer an amendment.

I do not reduce in any way the salaries of Members of Congress, nor do I do away with their right to alter, amend, or re-write the present law. I do not change the present allowance arrangement we now have as the result of a section of a bill recently passed. That is done for the reason that every expense allowance made in business or industry or in a profession is a deductible item for tax purposes. We have a question about that. But there is a question under the internal-revenue laws of the United States with reference to the tax allowance arrangement we now have as the result of a section of a bill recently passed. There is a question as to whether or not a Member of Congress has the right to claim and to obtain an expense allowance for the actual expenses related to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, to be paid in equal monthly installments, is hereby repealed, effective on the day on which the Eightieth Congress convenes.
But if you are aiming at a stronger Congress, and we are in this bill, then I feel you must consider whether the salary will be great enough to keep your best men in the district to seek the job.

Although I differ, I have no quarrel with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown]. I feel that the committee recommendation saying that it is a $15,000 job is a clean, cut statement, on top of the table, it is direct, it makes it a fixed sum for the job, and it bares Congress for a definite salary for the year.

I do not like the $2,500 expense allowance because I think every Member with in range of my voice knows that the $2,500 does not come within a fraction of paying the additional expense that it costs to sit in this body.

I do not want to have it go out to my constituents and the people of this country that I am receiving $12,500 net with all expenses paid, I believe that is our principal difference. I believe the Congress would stand in a far better position if the salary were made definite for the year.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'NEAL. It is my understanding that the language in the bill which has been amended, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio is to strike out the original language, which has been amended. Therefore, the language of the amendment is not in proper form.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is to strike out the section as amended. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment with considerable reluctance. I know that every Member of the Congress earns, is entitled to, and in many instances needs a higher salary and expense allowance. On the other hand, there has been a curtailment in Government expenses to the end that the Federal budget be balanced as an essential safeguard against rampant inflation. To be consistent, I shall therefore vote against these well-merited increases be postponed until a balanced budget is an accomplished fact. Such postponement is the purpose of my amendment.

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the enactment of the so-called Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as it basar as it would raise the salaries of Members of Congress.

It behooves all of us and especially the lawmakers to prevent insofar as is possible to do so that inflation to some extent.

With millions of people struggling at their present income to meet increased costs of living, it certainly appears to be a bad example if Congress raises their own pay.

While it is generally admitted that it is difficult to make ends meet on present legislative salaries, nevertheless, I find it possible to do so.

It has been necessary for our Government to involve itself in unprecedented debt by reason of the war. Until such time as our country is in better financial condition I cannot justify a vote increasing the salary of Members of Congress.

I am also opposed to that provision in the measure which provides for retirement pay to Members of Congress. I believe it a bad precedent for elected officials participating in any plans for retirement benefits.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, on various occasions in the past I have opposed against Treasury grabs by the bureaucrats and Congress. I shall do so again today on the pending measure. It is unfortunate that many worth-while proposals have been lumped in with pay increases and pensions for Congressmen. I would like to have the opportunity, up vote for a congressional streamlining bill without these objectionable features in it. That opportunity is not presented today. I want my position on this matter to be on the record because this case this bill is passed without a roll call.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, on a previous occasion when this matter of increasing the salary of Members of Congress was up for consideration a few months ago, I stated then that I was opposed to increasing the salary of Members either directly or indirectly. I further pointed out on the matter of so-called pensions for Congressmen that Members of Congress were in a different category from Federal employees. They are elected by the people and occupy public trust. Moreover I stated on the occasion when this pension matter was being considered here on the floor a few months ago this country has the greatest national debt in the history of the world and it is therefore more appropriate that we, as Members of Congress, set the pace by tightening belts and economy rather than increasing our salaries, either directly or indirectly. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against both the salary increase and the pension provision.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I see much good in this reorganization bill. The Congress is very much in need of reorganization. It is important to support the section of the bill which would increase the salary of a Member of Congress or grant him retirement benefits. The cry throughout the country is for economy in government and Members of Congress therefore should set the example. Under the circumstances I feel duty bound to vote against the bill.
Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this is not the time for Congressmen to vote themselves a salary increase. If there is one organ in our whole social and economic structure which ought to set an example for staying the pending inflationary forces, that organ is the Congress of the United States. It is this body which primarily is the custodian of the adoption of measures to prevent the further progress of inflation. Since the raising of our salary would be in principle definitely inflationary, we must utterly destroy the basis without which no conduct on our part could possibly effectuate any control over inflation. One frequently hears the contention advanced that all except Congressmen have received increases in their income. Nothing could be further from the truth. There are still a great many people whose income has not been increased since 1909 and their incomes have by no means kept pace with rising living costs. Should the Congress now raise the salary of its Members, those who are already at their inequitably low income, taxes to meet this increase. A legislative body cannot violate such a principle as this and still retain that independence which is essential for the maintenance of self-respect, and even its very preservation. One more important point should not be overlooked. Congress possesses the arbitrary power to raise the salary of its Members, and I do not consider that this power should be used. Argue as we may that our services are worth more than $10,000 a year; this cannot be proven. In saying this I am not contending that the services may not be worth more than the compensation we now receive, but I, for one, want to make my own position clear. I am not sure that the services which I render to my constituents and to my country are worth more than $10,000, if even that much. Were I to vote for this proposed increase I could find no other reason to satisfy the demands of my constituents except that I simply happen to occupy a position which gives me arbitrary power to do this.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against the certain features in it relating to reorganization of the Congress which I believe to be constructive. Those features I favor. There are, however, other features which I find myself unable to support. Those features I have to do with salaries and annuities. My vote will, therefore, be in the negative when the bill comes up for final passage.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of all the provisions of this bill, save one. In fact I wish it went still further in some respects, in streamlining congressional procedures. I am sorry the committee did not see fit to accept my amendment to restore the provision for an administrative assistant to the Member of the primary duties as legislators. I hope that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Mon­son) will help, as he suggested, in making this bill constructive.

Probably the most important provisions are the first, the reduction of House committees from 47 to 19, eliminating overlapping and giving each Member a real job to do on a major committee as soon as he is sent here by his constituents; and, second, the legislative budget provision that those who raise the Government's money and those who spend it get together to do over-all planning and keep within our means—cut the garment of our appropriations to the cloth of our income.

I would support the inclusion of Members of Congress in the retirement allowance system long in effect for other Government employees. It is not a grant, but a deferred annuity system to which a Member contributes a part of his salary and receives a retirement allowance after reaching 62 years of age, the amount depending directly on the number of years he has contributed. In my judgment this provision is far more valuable from the standpoint of leading to better government than the 25 percent increase in salary that has been voted. This is not only unwise, but is very important things: First, it gives the Member a degree of economic security for his old age which inevitably enables him to be more independent of voting, to make up his mind more on the basis of the rightness or wrongness of a piece of legislation, rather than on the possible political effect, good or bad, on him personally. Second, it is a burden when he is through—when he is no longer able to function at his best. After a man has been here 25 or 30 years, what can he do for a living? His professional skills, his clientele, his business are done. It is almost impossible to start over. So the inevitable tendency is to hang on, term after term, because economic necessity requires it. So I say that it is long overdue for Members of Congress to be made eligible for our regular civil-service retirement allowance system—not primarily for their sake, but for the sake of the country's welfare.

One major change I am strongly opposed to at this time—that is the 25 percent raise in salary. I have for 3 years constantly opposed any general wage increases for labor. I have maintained that we ought not to increase our purchasing power widely until our production could be turned to civilian goods and more supplies of commodities could be made available. Just as soon as it is clear that we are over the hump on these inflationary pressures, just as soon as supply approximates demand so that prices are stabilized, or even decline a little because of natural forces, then I shall urge the raising of wages wherever it can be done without increasing prices too much. I still think that I shall then favor increasing the salaries of Members of Congress which have remained unchanged since about 1927, even though the time spent in Washington has doubled, our work has at least trebled, and the cost of living has advanced greatly for us as for everyone.

But it does not seem to me wise or justifiable to raise wages at this time when prices have risen sharply, when there are strong pressures by some to start another series of strikes to get further wage increases. I should like to vote for these separately. Inasmuch as the salary increases and security features are all part of the same bill, I cannot with good conscience support it. I feel it to be the first duty of Congress to balance the Nation's budget. All expenses should be held down until this has been accomplished.
for ourselves, even though I recognize fully the necessity of higher remuneration if the Congress is to hold and to attract the ablest men in our country, which it so badly needs.

Mr. MONROE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. Cramer], reminding you that section 132 of this bill, which has already been adopted by this Committee, provides that Congress adjourn sine die not later than the last day of July each year so that hereafter the Congress will be in session 7 months or less each year. How, may I ask, can you justify the 50 percent increase in salary provided in section 601 of this bill? Should this provision remain in the bill would not all other Government employees be entitled to a similar increase? Could they not justly present this as a basis for the taxes that in turn pay our salaries. Do you think they will approve this provision? I am sure they will not.

The Buck amendment strikes this provision from the bill and I hope it will be adopted.

I am also opposed to the provisions of section 602 of this bill. This section provides retirement pay for Members of Congress. The amendment I support is an amendment, which I understand is to be offered, to strike this section from the bill. Should sections 601 and 602 remain in this bill I will vote against it, though I favor most of its other provisions.

Mr. SCHWARZ of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, in a few minutes we shall vote on the question of raising our own salaries and also pensions for Congressmen. I hope enough of us will demand a record vote and not pass the bill by a standing vote only.

My experience in Washington, nearly 4 years, has shown that while the cost of living is high, yet if one is content to live on about the same scale to which he was accustomed back home he can not only get along but save a considerable portion of $10,000 per year. My observation is that those Members who attend to business and work hard have less time for Washington society and consequently less opportunity for spending money.

I oppose pensions for elected officials not that the amount involved in this instance in the country but on the wrong principle. We should be an example for the whole country. We propose to fight inflation on the one hand with our checks and around and vote ourselves increased salaries plus lifetime pensions. How then are we going to refuse every other group that comes along requesting handouts? Surely we can wait until the Budget is balanced and the scare of inflation has passed. By our action today we symbolize on the Government spending orgy which is wrecking our economy.

With nearly 3,000,000 Federal civilian employees drawing many billions of dollars per year the power of our dollar is being slowly but surely destroyed. It is one way of robbing the old-age pensioner, the veteran, and all bonds held by the United States as well as other money contracts. Their meager income and savings buy less and less of goods and commodities.

If the good people of this country ever awaken to the way they are being plundered by their own spendthrift Government their wrath and righteous indignation will mount to unknown heights.

Mr. Chairman, I will show that I have refused to open the Treasury of the United States to all comers and I do not propose to abandon that course today.

Mr. MONROE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Retirement pay of Members of Congress

Sec. 602. (a) Section 3 (a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1950, as amended is thereby amended by striking after the words "elective officers" the words "in the executive branch of the Government."

(b) Such act, as amended, is further amended by adding after section 3 the following new section:

"Sec. 3A. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act--

"(1) This act shall not apply to any Member of Congress until he gives notice in writing, while serving as a Member of Congress, of his desire to become entitled to an annuity under this act.

"(2) Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to prohibit a Member of Congress who is entitled to an annuity under this act from receiving as compensation in any additional capacity the average annual basic salary, pay, or compensation for the last 5 years of service as was provided in the Social Security Act of 1946 and the amounts specified in section 9 with respect to so much of such 5 years of service as was performed prior to such date.

"(3) Subject to the provisions of section 9 and of subsections (c) and (d) of section 4, the annuity of a Member of Congress shall be an amount equal to 2% percent of his average annual basic salary, pay, or compensation as a Member of Congress multiplied by his years of service as a Member of Congress, but no such annuity shall exceed an amount equal to three fourths of the salary, pay, or compensation that he is receiving at the time he becomes separated from the service.

"(4) In the case of a Member of Congress who becomes separated from the service before or who completes an additional term of service as a Member of Congress, and who is not retired for disability, the total amount deducted from his basic salary, pay, or compensation as a Member of Congress, together with interest at 4 percent compounded as of December 31 of each year shall be returned to the fund of Member of Congress. No such Member of Congress shall thereafter become eligible to receive an annuity as provided in this section unless the amounts so returned are redeposited with interest at 4 percent compounded on December 31 of each year, but interest shall not be required covering any period of separation from the service.

"(5) If any person takes office as a Member of Congress while receiving an annuity as provided in this section, the payment of such annuity shall be suspended during the period for which he holds such office; but, if he gives notice as provided in paragraph (2) of this section, his service as a Member of Congress during such period shall be credited in determining the amount of his subsequent annuity.

"(6) Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to prevent any person eligible therefor from simultaneously receiving an amount computed pursuant to paragraph (6) of section 10 and an annuity computed in accordance with section 4, but in computing the annuity under section 4 in the case of any person who (A) has had at least 6 years' service as a Member of Congress, and (B) has served as a Member of Congress at any time after the date of enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, service as a Member of Congress shall not be credited.

"(7) No provision of this or any other act relating to automation in the service shall be applicable to any Member of Congress.

"(8) As used in this section, the term 'Member of Congress' means a Senator, Representative in Congress, Delegate from a Territory, or the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, and the term 'service as a Member of Congress' shall include the period from the date of the beginning of the term for which a Member is elected or appointed to the date on which he takes office as such a Member.'

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Rizley: On page 94, line 14, strike out all of the line
Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I suggested to the committee this morning that I would at the proper time offer this amendment. I am not in favor of any last minute provision for Members of Congress. I have always voted against such proposed legislation. I wish I had time to mention a few of the reasons why I do not favor this legislation. I am in favor of what has been said by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] and I am going to vote for his amendment to strike from this bill the retirement provisions for us. If the amendment is not adopted I possibly may find myself unable, for this reason, to support the bill upon final passage in the House.

Mr. CHURCH. I compliment the gentleman from Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the Members of Congress should become a part of the pension system of the Government. If they accept this type of pension they become a part of the great Federal bureaucracy. The Congress should be free and have no taint of becoming a part of a Federal pension system so liberal that it would not be fair to others.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I am not in favor of the retirement provisions from this bill. I have always opposed retirement benefits for Members of Congress. Only a few weeks ago, I vigorously opposed similar legislation that was defeated on the floor of this House. This legislation should be stricken from the bill. If it is not stricken, then I shall vote against the bill.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman from Oklahoma, to strike out all of the provisions of the bill with reference to retirement benefits or, as it is commonly called throughout the country, pensions for Congressmen. As I suggested in my remarks this morning, I do not believe that Members of the legislative branch of the Government who must necessarily pass upon the retirement benefits and social security for civil-service employees and all other people in that category should include themselves in the same category and become pensioners of the Federal Government and themselves try to pass upon the claims of these other people that must come before them.

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

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I compliment the gentleman for offering his amendment. I concur in its arguments. There is a difference between Congressmen who are elected and who have to pass on the claims of employees and the employees themselves. We should hold ourselves independent by not pertaining to this for ourselves.

Mr. RIZLEY. I thank the gentleman. Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman will also agree with me that those of us who have consistently voted against pensions for Congressmen should not be put in position of having to vote "yea" or "no" on a bill for the streamlining of Congress which is used as a vehicle to provide pensions for Congressmen. There is no connection between the provisions for Congressmen and those who make service in the Federal service a life career.

Mr. RIZLEY. I thank the gentleman and agree with him fully.

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

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I compliment the gentleman for offering this amendment, which I support. His amendment, if passed, takes out of this bill part of the stuffifying part of the bill. I wanted to vote for the many fine reorganization features of the bill but I cannot vote for this section nor the tax-exempt salary increase part of the bill. I shall vote "no" on final passage of the bill.

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

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. I am in complete agreement with the gentleman's position on this section. I think it is a proper amendment. I certainly think the Members of Congress are in a different category from that of the civil-service employees and the employees. Mr. Pickett. I am in complete agreement with the gentleman's views and intend to support the amendment.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment in nowise conflicts with the claims of the committee who purportedly are trying to streamline legislative procedure. I am perfectly willing to streamline the Congress but not to pension it. Members of Congress come here and at the end of 6 years, under this bill, they can have the Federal Government join in a plan and contribute to their retirement—of course they join in the plan too, as the gentleman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] stated a while ago—we then become a part of the Government bureaucracy. We all know that when the executive branch of this Government makes a provision for a pension at the beginning of the year, every person working for the Federal Government, who is under civil service and who expects retirement, immediately becomes an ardent advocate for the program recommended by the executive branch of the Government. I will not vote for this bill with the pension benefits in it.

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. MONROE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Mr. MONROE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. MONROE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section close in 15 minutes.

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the gentleman and agree with him fully.

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

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I compliment the gentleman for offering this amendment, which I opposed. His amendment, if passed, takes out of this bill the stuffifying part of the bill. I wanted to vote for the many fine reorganization features of the bill but I cannot vote for this section nor the tax-exempt salary increase part of the bill. I shall vote "no" on final passage of the bill.

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

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. I am in complete agreement with the gentleman's position on this section. I think it is a proper amendment. I certainly think the Members of Congress are in a different category from that of the civil-service employees and the employees. I shall support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman's amendment for the reasons heretofore stated by him.

Mr. SPRINGER. I wish to congratulate the gentleman upon his offering of this amendment. I intend to support the amendment.

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

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. BRYSON. I am to testify with the gentleman's views and intend to support the amendment.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment in nowise conflicts with the claims of the committee who purportedly are trying to streamline legislative procedure. I am perfectly willing to streamline the Congress but not to pension it. Members of Congress come here and at the end of 6 years, under this bill, they can have the Federal Government join in a plan and contribute to their retirement—of course they join in the plan too, as the gentleman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] stated a while ago—we then become a part of the Government bureaucracy. We all know that when the executive branch of this Government makes a provision for a pension at the beginning of the year, every person working for the Federal Government, who is under civil service and who expects retirement, immediately becomes an ardent advocate for the program recommended by the executive branch of the Government. I will not vote for this bill with the pension benefits in it.
expectancy, would draw a total net amount of approximately $90,000.

All these cases are predicated on the assumption that the full amount of back contributions would be paid in.

We have seen where a less amount is paid in, covering 5 years of back contributions instead of 8 years, but I shall not discuss that phase of the problem.

Mr. Chairman, this is the fourth time this question has been considered by this body. We all recall the unpleasant, and in my opinion unfortunate, experience we underwent several years ago when having passed a bill providing pensions for Congressmen, this body was forced by an adverse public opinion to reverse its position and repeal the act which set up that program. I recall that much was said at that time and has been uttered since to the effect the public did not understand the measure granting Congressmen pensions which had been passed; that if it had understood it would not have taken the position it did. When that bill was passed I followed its progress closely, and I must repeat what I have said on previous occasions—that the public was not misinformed in respect to the provisions of that bill. It did understand, and, in my opinion, it was justified in taking the position it did.

Only a few months ago this same question was before this body and was voted down overwhelmingly.

Now we are at it again, seeking for ourselves a pension. And what is the argument for it? Everybody else is getting a pension, why should we not. That is one of the compelling reasons why the National Legislative should not vote pensions for its Members. How, possibly, can this body unbiasedly treat the big problem of pensions in general if it itself becomes a participant in this program? How can it possibly be expected that the Legislature could equitably represent the many and varied personal and individual Members have an interest in this field?

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, now that the committee has voted to retain the income section of the pension provision for Congressmen in the bill, I will be obliged to vote against the bill and hope we may have a recorded vote thereon. I do this with reluctance as I am in favor of the reorganization of the Congress to provide greater efficiency in our work.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONKSY].

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I can only tell you what this will do for me. I will be 62 years old this week sometime. If I retire at the end of this term paying in $4,000, or a little more than that, and if I lived the normal expectancy, I would draw a net pension from this bill amounting to $26,000.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. With this provision in the bill you would have more old, broken-down politicians trying to run for Congress so they can get this pension.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Others, of course, will receive in proportion.

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

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VRUSSELL] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. VRUSSELL. I am glad to note a few minutes ago that the amendment to provide an assistant to each Congressman by $1,000 a year. Such extra help is not necessary and in most instances would be a waste of that amount of money.

I am opposed to the modification of the bill to increase the salary of the Congressmen by $2,500 a year. This amendment will be followed by a section in the bill which will provide retirement benefits for a Congressman after he has served 5 years upon his paying in a certain percent of his salary. Some will refer to this provision as a pension for Congressmen.

It is true that it is a retirement benefit which requires the Congressmen to pay more for such retirement than any other Federal employee pays to secure retirement. It is concerned should not support over 100 Federal Judges are provided with retirement after a certain length of service without paying anything into the Federal Government.

I am opposed at this time to the increase of the salary for Congressmen and I am unalterably opposed to the retirement provision for Congressmen after they have left the service.

I am opposed to the increase in salary because I believe that one who aspires to come to Washington to represent the people of his district in the greatest legislative body of the world should be willing to make some financial sacrifice for the honor and opportunity of serving his country in this great body. I believe you will maintain here a higher type of men if you leave the salary at a level that will cause one to be willing to make some financial sacrifice in his public service. If you make the salary too attractive, you will encourage men who have not been successful in their own business to make a greater effort to be elected to Congress because they would be able to make more money in Congress than they could in their own private business.

I am opposed to the retirement or pension section of this bill largely on the ground that the Members to represent the people in this Congress should by his ability be able to take care of his own financial conditions before, when, and after his services are concluded here. The Members of Congress, the board of directors so to speak, who managed the affairs of the business of this country so far as the Federal Government is concerned should not support a bill to provide Government retirement when they have concluded such services, even though they pay in a sufficient amount to such retirement fund as will make the financial load on the Government not of too great consequence.

I hope the House votes down both of these propositions, and on the final passage of the bill I hope that we may have a roll call so that those who are opposed to these two provisions of the bill may be able to register their vote expressing their opposition on the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I urge the Members to defeat both of these propositions.
The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Chairman, you remember the old adage "Slice it as thin as you please, it is still baloney." We congratulate the authors of this bill for it is, in most part, good. However, those skillful artisans of semantics, who on the floor and in print so grossly disregard to the latter sections of this bill, cannot make an annuity of those sections simply by calling it an annuity. As long as the taxpayers pay their part in that much is still a pension and to call it an annuity is a subterfuge. [Page Stuart Chase.] It has been stated by one of our most distinguished Members that a former Member of the House at one time spoke of a certain bug. Yes, it is a time spoken of a certain bug. Yes, it is a bug here and a bug there. Colleagues, do not shout "Vote, Vote" and then blindly pass the whole bill through but let us cast on this bill section by section and stand up and be counted.

Some have stated that the judicial raise was passed like lightning; the raising of the rail was passed like lighting. That was not proper. We should streamline Congress and, above all, no bill should pass under suspension of rules. No legislation should be enacted every Representative of the people has the opportunity to stand up and be counted.

Originally, a pension was an allowance made by a government to retired public officers, clergy, soldiers, and a few of soldiers in the service. Recently, by reason of the complexity of our Government and by further reason of the fact that citizens through long unemployment are as a rule for making ends and sustenance during their declining years, a benevolent Government has accorded to those who have supported their country by taxation throughout their years pensions. Is it right to pension those who have had opportunities and forget those who have not been able by reason of unemployment, illness, and otherwise to provide for those said declining years? Should we grant an allowance, call it by whatever name you please, to those who are able to provide for themselves and refuse it to those who are not? Just yesterday, the Ways and Means Committee succeeded in placing a gag rule before the House, thus preventing pension allowances for those who needed it the most. I grant, however, that the gag would match the State in the amount the State allotted this body, who are no bill should pass. Mr. Burton, of New Hampshire, Beardsley Ruml, and many other business and professional leaders of the country who realize that what has been beneficial in commerce and industry will be beneficial to the procedures and Members of the Congress of the United States.

I concur in the judgment of those who have stated that Members of Congress are pensioned. Yes, the salary provided for members of every profession and every activity in those institutions. Would not the more honorable thing to do be to grant an allowance to each and every citizen in the order for a living as a poorhouse, that no longer would words of Will Carleton, "The Hills to the Poorhouse," be known in this country, and when the peace of the world is wrought out if it is unknown in any country. There is enough in God's great world for everybody. Let us share, and, if there be pensions—call it what you will—those pensions allotted to each and all of the masses instead of just to classes.

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

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Rinzler] to strike out the pension provisions in this legislation which would provide pensions for Congressmen, as they are commonly called or the retirement provisions of this legislation, Congressmen prefer to designate them. By either name, however, I am opposed to them. I have always voted against pensions for Congressmen and I shall vote against them again today.

During one of my first years in Congress, Mr. Chairman, I spoke and voted against pensions for Congressmen. So I am only being consistent in again urging the defeat of these pensions today. I also voted to support the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Buckley] to strike out the salary increases, because I am opposed to the raising of congressional salaries at this time. Until we are able to balance the Federal Budget and until the present inflationary pressures have been effectively curbed, Mr. Chairman, I think it is a mistake to propose legislation to increase congressional salaries although under normal conditions I realize such salaries should be increased. Further, I believe the juncture in our national economic existence, I believe it is a mistake to either vote pensions for Congressmen or congressional salary increases. I hope we defeat these when this legislation gets in the House. I hope you will join me in defeating the provisions of this bill which provide pensions for Congressmen.

Mr. Chairman, I was one of the early advocates and ones to introduce, to streamline and modernize Congress. I am in hearty accord with most of the provisions of the present bill. I think it will tend to increase the efficiency of Congress. However, it is a mistake to mix pensions for Congress and salary increases with a bill primarily designed to remodel and modernize Congress. I do not believe I would refuse to be maneuvered into a position whereby my zeal for modernizing Congress must require me to vote for pension and salary provisions which I feel are both undesirable and unjustly.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am reluctantly compelled to announce that unless the pension and salary provisions are removed from this legislation, I shall have to vote against it, despite my approval of most of the reform provisions of the bill. Earlier today the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Hull] rather ably summarized my reasons for my decision.

Since there may not be a roll call on final passage of this bill—although I among those standing up to ask for one—I take this means of announcing for the Recorn that I shall vote "no" on final passage if the salary increases and pension provisions remain in this bill. If they are not part of this bill, I shall vote "aye."

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that pensions for Congressmen are in a different class from pensions for civil-service employees, Army officers, or judges. We are in a very real sense the board of directors of the world's largest business institution. The country depends upon our collective judgment for its liberty and security. If we have economic sense enough to manage the finances of the Government, we should have economic ability enough to manage our individual finances without benefit of a Government pension system. We can purchase private annuities and pension plans from commercial insurance companies. We can plan for our own retirement. We can show confidence in the private-enterprise institutions which our great Government is designed to preserve. Let us defeat this pension proposal and thus reaffirm our faith in the private-enterprise system which has made America great.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, during the hearings on this legislation testimony in favor of optional retirement for Members of Congress was vigorously advocated by former Senator, now Justice Burton, of Ohio, Senator White, the minority leader of the Senate of the United States, Senator Bridges, of New Hampshire, Bridges, and many other business and professional leaders of the country who realize that what has been beneficial in commerce and industry will be beneficial to the procedures and Members of the Congress of the United States.
Senator Shields stated: I think just as other Government officials have the benefit of retirement provisions, that we of the Congress should have them.

Dr. Meyer Jacobstein, staff member, Brookings Institution, said: A retirement plan plus a more liberal salary would go far toward giving Representatives and Senators the feeling of financial security which they deserve.

The then Senator Burton had this to say: I think it is a good thing to have a pension for all kinds of Government service, but upon the basis of a contribution.

Mr. Rum it indicated that unlike most activities in life, being a Member of Congress does not lead to something else. There is no other Congress that you can get a job in for example. There is no way you can be promoted to chairman of the board of directors. I mean it has a peculiarly hazardous nature; it is a hazardous occupation from that point of view unlike the career of a conscientious man, or some one who is building up something from experience, if it is meritorious, a future for himself.

I direct attention to the words of Senator White: I personally have been very strongly in favor of a retirement system, a retirement system to which the beneficiary must make his contribution. I think a retirement system would make a contribution to independence of thought and independence of action, to a courageous attitude on the part of the Representative toward problems which are constantly confronting him.

Dean W. Reed West, of George Washington University had the following to say: Retirement pay for Members based on age and long service would be a means of overcoming this almost inevitable tendency of individuals to weaken in their independence of the Executive.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss Sumner].

Miss Sumner of Illinois, Mr. Chairman, will be headlining in every newspaper tomorrow morning saying that the Congress worked overtime voting itself a pension. How are the people going to like that? They are not going to mind the fact that you handed yourselves $15,000 for 6 months work. They will believe that perhaps they will be able to get good men to come here to represent them; but when they find out that you have voted yourself a pension so that after they fire you they have to go on paying you separate salaries, they will not like that.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten].

Mr. Whitten. Mr. Chairman, I suppose the amendment believing adequate pay is now provided for the Congress. True we must live within our income. Who does not? After all, work, hard work, is the pleasure of the individual American citizen, who lived within his means, set aside for his insurance and to take care of his own security is what has made American great. Today when we complain rightly, that everyone seems to be looking to the Federal Government for grants, for allocations, when we hear on this floor the complaints about the States wanting Federal grants at a time when the various States are in a much better financial condition than the Federal Government. It would be a mistake to provide a pension for Members of Congress. Of course, you argue that the Member pays into such a fund just as he would for an insurance annuity. Why not take the same money and buy such insurance annuity then? If Members of Congress are not stable enough, if they do not have foresight enough to look after their own means and provide for their own security, who can the Congress expect to work, and provide for their own welfare?

Mr. Chairman, by all means this amendment should be adopted, and provisions of this bill providing for a pension, stricken out of the bill. If the bill is passed without this amendment what difference would it be to the millions who came asking security at the hands of the Government without effort on their part. You will have speeded the process of paralyzing individual enterprise, with individual attention to a man's own security, you say to everyone, "Look to the Government. The old, the incapacitated have a right to look for assistance. You invite all others to quit trying and to look to the Government. You say to them there is no need for you to be saving, there is no need for you to work within your means, there is no need for you to work, the Federal Government will look after you." There is too much of that attitude already. After all the Government is the people, and if all quit and look to the Government, there will be no one to pay taxes and the promise of the Government will not be worth the paper it is written on.

This House should adopt this amendment, and strike out the pension features of this bill. Keep this Congress where it can say "No" to those who want the Government for everything. Keep a sound Government, and a sound Congress, an independent Congress if you please.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. White].

Mr. White. Mr. Chairman, there are a great many influences that flew around the individual Members of Congress—influence of departments and from other sources that we all know about. If there is one thing that the individual Congressman needs more than anything else, and that the people of the United States need, is those who represent them in Congress, it is stamina.

We pension our judges to keep them from temptation. Why should we not give security to Congressmen so that they might have a little independence to stand up and protect the interest of the American people; in considering and passing legislation?

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Abernethy].

Mr. Abernethy. Mr. Chairman, I favor the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Rizley]. It is difficult to understand how Members of this body, men and women who have established themselves as successful in one field or another else they would not be honored as they are today, as members of the Federal Government. Certainly, Congress could not pass fair judgment on similar bills if the law provides such pensions for its Members, even though the Member does pay toward such pension funds.

The principal object of this bill is to streamline the Congress. It is intended to eliminate bottlenecks, to promote efficiency and speed. That is the Congress that we might do a better job for our constituency and the country. What place or what part does a congressional pension feature play in such worthy objectives? It would contribute not one iota to the good causes for which this bill is intended.

The pension feature should be considered as one of its own merits. The bill applies to salary increases for Members, which I opposed by voting for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Borden].

I shall vote for the pending amendment. If it should not prevail, I shall vote against the bill, on which I hope we will have a roll-call vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Winstead].

Mr. Winstead. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this so-called pension for Members and I voted against this amendment for many reasons. Many sound reasons have been offered by other Members here this afternoon. I also supported the Buck amendment to prevent the increase in salary for Congressmen.

It would be a mistake to provide for a congressional pension even though, as has been argued, taken from the salaries of the Members just as they are from the salaries of the rural carriers, postmasters, and other Federal workers. Different from them, the Congress must sit as judges and pass on the requests of others and by bringing the Members of Congress into such a program, you almost make them interested parties. The aged and the infirm have a right to look to society to assist them, but I still believe that an able-bodied American citizen should look after himself, and provide for his own security. The retirement provisions of the Civil Service Act whereby the worker builds up the funds for his own retirement I believe are sound. But, Mr. Speaker, we must keep in mind that Congress is saving for congressional pensions that the Nation will be weakened and the American people will be further led along the road of not working, but looking to the Federal Government for everything.

I hope this amendment will be adopted and the pension provisions stricken out of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Rayburn].

Mr. Rayburn. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to indulge in debate on this amendment offered by the gentleman...
from Oklahoma. I take the floor at this time to express the hope that when we get into the House the so-called Herter amendment will be defeated. That amendment says each standing committee of the Senate and of the House shall set aside time each month. I fear that if 20 out of the 435 Members in the House as a bill in the committee far down the line ahead of them they might introduce 20 bills and take up the time of the committee. I have faith and confidence in the chairmen of committees. Some of them may be a little autocratic, of course, but most of them respond to Members of Congress when they ask to be heard on a bill that is introduced by them. I can see implications in this that I think may be very harmful. I know that the gentleman from Massachusetts does not have that in mind, but having served many years on committees and 6 years as chairman of one committee, I do not think that amendment is necessary. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Rizley).

The question was taken; and on a division demanded by Mr. Rizley there were—aye 63, noes 166.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee substitute to the Senate bill.

The committee substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The amendment is on the third reading of the bill.

The committee substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee substitute for the Senate bill.
a system of nurseries and nursery schools for ages five and under, and nursery-school children, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6837. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

On July 17, 1946:

H. R. 4924. An act to permit renewal of certain trade-mark registrations after expiry thereof, and for other purposes.

On July 23, 1946:

H. R. 6086. An act 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 for the construction and repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

On July 24, 1946:

H. R. 6086. An act to authorize revisions in the boundary of the Hopewell Village National Historic Site, Pennsylvania, and for other purposes.

H. R. 3821. An act to amend sections 4 and 8 of the act of September 3, 1937, as amended; and

H. R. 3982. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to sell and convey to the Southern Pacific Railroad Co. a right-of-way and easement for railroad purposes across a portion of Camp Beale Military Reservation, Calif.

H. R. 4180. An act to amend the law relating to bankruptcy in interstate or foreign commerce.

H. R. 4484. An act relating to the construction and maintenance of building and improvements for banking purposes on the Fort Ord Military Reservation, Calif.

H. R. 4651. An act to amend section 6 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1936, as amended.

H. R. 4701. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Bear River and its tributaries.

H. R. 4917. An act for the relief of the Railroad Retirement Board. on the death of Mrs. Roosevelt, Ind.;

H. R. 4940. An act for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Bookwalter, Ind., and for other purposes.

H. R. 5007. An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes.

H. R. 6689. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Louis River between the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and for other purposes;

H. R. 336. Joint resolution relating to cotton marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 364. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of an international animal quarantine station on Swan Island, to permit the entry therein of animals from any country and the subsequent importation of such animals into other parts of the United States, and for other purposes.

On July 25, 1946:

H. R. 247. An act for the relief of R. D. Williams;

H. R. 271. An act for the relief of Eleanor McCloskey, also known as Evely Mary Miklaucic, a minor;


H. R. 1331. An act for the relief of the Hatheway Patterson Corp.;

H. R. 1845. An act for the relief of David M. Matteson;

H. R. 1797. An act for the relief of Arcadio Saldana Agosto;

H. R. 1957. An act for the relief of the Ohio Valley General Hospital, Wheeling Clinic, Rosetta Snyder, Virginia Barron, Dr. Paul Cope, and Dr. J. E. Ricketts;

H. R. 2289. An act for the relief of Dr. William A. Schumacher and Magdalene M. Schumacher;

H. R. 2287. An act for the relief of Susan W. Leman;

H. R. 2311. An act for the relief of J. B. Shropshire;

H. R. 2349. An act for the relief of Gaylon Dwayne Duhne;

H. R. 2962. An act for the relief of Justin P. Hopkins;

H. R. 3145. An act for the relief of A. C. MeMeans;

H. R. 3341. An act for the relief of J. E. and Minerva Mitchell, and Rosie Monroe;

H. R. 3360. An act for the relief of Mrs. W. H. (Agnes) Holmes;

H. R. 3397. An act for the relief of Claude S. Crouse;

H. R. 3827. An act for the relief of Fred W. Grant;

H. R. 3844. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Johnnie Pollock, a minor;


H. R. 4090. An act for the relief of Roy Hesselmeier;

H. R. 4215. An act for the relief of Jane O'Malley;

H. R. 4247. An act for the relief of Jesus Lassado and Mrs. America Bowl of Edyutto, an Eskimo;

H. R. 4387. An act for the relief of the estate of the late Alberto Lopen Ramos;

H. R. 4498. An act for the relief of Charles Marvin Smith;

H. R. 4577. An act for the relief of Mrs. Minnie Jenkins Ward;

H. R. 4834. An act for relief of the estates of Katherine Doreen Booth and Agnes Jane True;

H. R. 4862. An act for the relief of Walter E. Newcomb, Sr., Corbin A. Newcomb, and Walter E. Newcomb, Jr.;

H. R. 4919. An act for the relief of Archibald J. Alcorn;

H. R. 5050. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of John Esther Hedin, a minor;

H. R. 5026. An act for the relief of the estate of Dorothy Jordan;

H. R. 6050. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lim Shee Chang;

H. R. 6078. An act for the relief of Mrs. Antonette McClung;

H. R. 5328. An act for the relief of Stephen Libby;

H. R. 5531. An act for the relief of Charles Booker;

H. R. 3322. An act for the relief of Joseph Lopezo;

H. R. 5510. An act for the relief of Newton William Lowery;

H. R. 5538. An act for the relief of Mae Maxim Stinson;

H. R. 5619. An act for the relief of Andrew M. Halvorsen;

H. R. 5641. An act for the relief of F. B. Sweet;

H. R. 5722. An act for the relief of Charles L. Cannon;

H. R. 5739. An act for the relief of Frances Fitzgerald;

H. R. 5806. An act for the relief of Etta Yockton;

H. R. 5872. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Walter Reesman;

H. R. 5976. An act for the relief of Edie Emphorst;

H. R. 5984. An act for the relief of Frances Kuykendall;

H. R. 6213. An act for the relief of Bre'nt Frist, T. Margaret Utinsky;

H. R. 6169. An act to extend the period within which the Secretary of Agriculture may carry out the purposes of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by making payments to agricultural producers;

H. R. 6472. An act for the relief of John E. Peterson, James M. Hiller, Vivian Langemo, Floy Sibley, and Ross Lee Brown; and


EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGLINCHY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Rec mond.

Mr. GREEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Recomb in two instances, in one to include a speech and in the other to include a speech made by John Stelle, commander of the American Legion.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Recomb.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Recomb and include a speech he made on
June 1, and in another instance to insert a radio speech he made last week.

MINERAL LEASING ACT

Mr. FERNANDEZ submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1236) to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended, in order to promote the development of oil and gas on the public domain, and for other purposes:

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRANAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an article from the National Legionnaire.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. HOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and insert an address made by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. TRAYNOR).

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and insert a resolution.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a major article. I am informed by the Public Printer that the extension will cost $80. Notwithstanding the cost, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

REORGANIZATION OF RAILROADS

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1253) to enable debtor railroad corporations expeditiously to effectuate reorganizations of their financial structures, to alter or modify their financial obligations, and for other purposes, with House amendments and House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferences: Messrs. SUMNERS of Texas, HOBBS, GORSKI, Reed of Illinois, and GWYNNE of Iowa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a resolution entitled "15,000,000 Will Die," which appears in Roger Babson's report for the 4th of March 1948. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a poem entitled "A Ballade of the Peace," by Robert Pernar, of West Virginia.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an article from the Chicago Tribune.

COSTS OF LIVING MUST BE ACCURATELY TABULATED—BILL IS PRESENTED TO ACCOMPLISH THIS NECESSARY SERVICE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States today signed the bill to continue the Office of Price Administration for another year. Of great importance to American citizens is the knowledge of the facts relative to economic data with reference to food, rents, and many other items.

Unquestionably the most efficient organization in keeping the country informed on this subject is the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the United States Department of Labor. This Bureau has received many, many commendations on the accuracy of its reports to the Nation. It can certainly be relied on to point out true facts in relation to our economy. There are regular indexes published as a basis of cost and the wholesale prices weekly, but its service has been necessarily limited to some degree under its powers. Never has there been a time when information such as is published by this great Bureau of Labor Statistics is more needed.

It will be, Mr. Speaker, perhaps 4 months before any other rent surveys, for example, can be made. It is important that we have reports on the rents charged the American public as well as many other items.

I am today introducing a joint resolution authorizing the Bureau of Labor Statistics to carry forward the studies necessary for the emergency or reversion period.

This joint resolution provides that for the purpose of furnishing information and reports to Congress, various Federal agencies, and private groups and individuals, the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor is authorized and directed to collect information and report on the prices of foodstuffs, rents, and other living essentials more frequently and in a larger number of cities than now covered in the Bureau's program to the extent necessary to describe the course of prices and living essentials and of rents in principal localities and on a nationwide basis.

The legislation is as follows:

Joint resolution to authorize the Bureau of Labor Statistics to collect and report information in additional cities and at more frequent intervals

Resolved etc., That for the purpose of furnishing information to the Congress, various Federal agencies, and private groups and individuals during the price emergency, the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor is hereby authorized and directed to collect information and report on the prices of foodstuffs, rents, and other living essentials more frequently and in a larger number of cities than now covered in the Bureau's program to the extent necessary to describe the course of prices of living essentials and of rents in principal localities and on a nationwide basis.

For the purpose of making these studies, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of $250,000 to be available until expended.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the legislative business and any other special order, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a statement by Col. G. H. Ramey, United States Army, retired, upon the need for rehabilitation of those afflicted with Hansen's disease.

Mr. CORBETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in three instances and to include certain excerpts.

Mr. SHAPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances, in one to include a letter.

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Record in two instances and to include two newspaper editorials.

Mr. GWINN of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a speech by Virgin Jordan of the Industrial Conference Board.

Mr. CARLSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a statement by the Republican Postwar Tax Study Committee.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the Washington Star.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the Washington Star.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include two bills that I understand were sent to the Speaker today—one a bill for a permanent corps for the Army nurses and another for a permanent corps for the Wacs. I am delighted the Army appreciates the work of the Wacs and will continue them as a part of the Army.

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

There was no objection.
Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend the remarks on the reorganization bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Congressional Record and include an editorial.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Congressional Record in two instances and include therewith certain articles.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would like to inform the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished majority leader, the program for tomorrow.

Mr. MCCORMACK. The first order of business will be the atomic energy conference report.

Then there will be several suspensions. S. 191, the hospital construction bill.

H. R. 6517, providing for site acquisitions and design of Federal buildings.

S. 1636 designating the State Department as disposal agency of surplus property abroad.

S. 2085, a bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to provide needed educational facilities other than housing, in relation to veterans.

A companion bill has passed the Senate and already an appropriation of $75,000,000 has been provided for. The passage of this bill is necessary to allow that appropriation to operate.

Then the bill H. R. 4502, the cancer control legislation, reported out of the Committee on Merchant Marine Affairs.

S. 619, which I understand the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. Barbour) conferred with the gentleman from Massachusetts regarding. It is the Vocational Educational Act of 1946. If it is not passed by unanimous consent.

There is also a bill amending the War Powers Act, I think the first one, which relates to the Alien Property Custodian’s Office. Unanimous consent for its consideration will be asked. I understand there is some objection to section 33 of an organic act which is the first section of the bill, but that has been stricken out by the Senate committee and I understood the request will be to pass what would be the Senate bill as amended eliminating those objectionable features of the bill as reported out of the House committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is it quite probable all that will not be done tomorrow, in which event the rest will be taken up on Saturday?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

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

Mr. MCCORMACK. I yield. Mr. JUDD. Will the Philippine aid bill come up for consideration in the next day or two? Does the gentleman know whether a rule has been granted on it yet?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks in all probability some of those bills may be handled by consent. We are all very anxious to pass the Philippine bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is the Philippine loan bill reported out today and there is a bill extending the RFC. Whether or not they can be considered by unanimous consent I am unable to state, but every effort will be made to bring them up.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Massachusetts will permit, the Chair will also say that the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SUMMERS) to ask consent to take up the so-called tidelands bill tomorrow and continue the Senate amendment.

SUSPENSIONS IN ORDER TOMORROW, JULY 26, 1946

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order tomorrow for the Speaker to recognize for the purpose of suspending the rules.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW 12 O'CLOCK

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I also want to announce that we will meet tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BIEHILLER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BIEHILLER. Did I understand the Chair correctly to say that consent would be asked to consider the tidelands bill?

The SPEAKER. Yes; consent will be asked to consider the Senate amendment to the House bill. It is a bill that passed the House several months ago.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—PRICE CONTROL

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and together with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I have today signed House Joint Resolution 371 amending the price-control laws and extending them for another year. I have signed this measure with reluctance.

I had hoped for a bill under which the Government could with full confidence assure the people that prices would remain generally stable in those last few critical months of the transition to a free economy. This bill falls far short of that hope. I am advised, however, that in the best bill the Congress will now pass. It is clear, moreover, that it is a better bill than the one I was forced to veto on June 29. If that bill had become law, inflation would have been inevitable. While the present measure by no means guarantees that inflation can be avoided, it offers a sufficient prospect of success to warrant the making of this great and necessary effort. Its success, and the economy on an even keel until a flood of goods makes further controls unnecessary.

The behavior of prices and rents in the last 4 weeks has given the country a frightening foretaste of what would happen to the cost of living without price and rent control. Even though many factors were operating to restrain prices during this period, prices have nevertheless risen steadily and ominously.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics index of 28 basic commodities in the primary markets has shown an increase of 24.8 percent in the 26 weeks ending June 28, 1946, as against an increase of only 13.1 percent in the 3 years and 42 days between the signing of the hold-the-line order on May 17, 1943, and June 28, 1946. This increase, of course, can be attributed to the removal of subsidies. These, it must be remembered, were prewholesale figures. The impact of the increases has not yet been fully felt by consumers. Retailers have for the most part held to their OPA prices so long as their old inventories lasted.

These increases have occurred in spite of the restraining influences at work to keep prices down. I had requested that the price line be held while the Congress considered the enactment of a workable law. Businessmen hesitated to build up inventories at high prices and thus risk serious loss if prices were rolled back to the June 30 levels. This risk was heightened by the prompt passage in the House of Representatives of a bill which would restore the June 30 prices and rents. In addition, consumer resistance to increased prices developed immediately.

In view of the alarming rise in prices which took place under these conditions, it is not difficult to predict what would happen if a free market were operating without restraint.

These facts demonstrate that the continuance of effective price control is a vital necessity to our people. There are millions of families for whom a sharp rise in living costs means immediate suffering. There are others who can get along well enough for a while, but ultimately inflation exacts its toll from all. The present legislation makes the task of staving off inflation even more difficult than it has been in the past. Clothing prices in particular will be difficult to hold at reasonable levels, and there are some other things that consumers will have to go without, or pay higher ceiling prices for them than they should. It is particularly unfortunate that many of these increases result from concessions to financial pressures, rather than from the adoption of principles designed
to expand production within a stable price structure.

The present bill, despite its inadequacies, is an improvement in many respects over the bill which I vetoed. In my veto message, I emphasized the disadvantages which would flow from the Taft amendment and its companion the Wherry amendment. These provisions are fundamentally changed in the present bill. A comparison of the two bills demonstrates this fact.

Although its professed object was to increase production, the Taft amendment would have permitted prices to be increased for already profitable industries even where no increase in production was possible. While the present bill will require some price increases where there will be no substantial expansion in production, it reduces materially both the number and the size of these increases.

It was mandatory under the Taft amendment to increase prices so that all industries could earn the profits they earned in the year 1941 on every major item they make. This was a year of abnormally large profits. The base price, for measuring profits under the present bill, is the year 1940, in which profits were more nearly representative of normal peacetime conditions. At the same time, the use of 1940 margins of profit offers every incentive for full production because cause 1940 was a highly profitable year.

Another serious deficiency of the Taft amendment is corrected by the present bill. It is obvious that costs go down as volume of production goes up. Yet that amendment would have compelled the Price Administrator to base prices on current costs. Even though it was perfectly clear that in many industries volume would be increasing so rapidly that the use of current costs would result in exorbitant prices. The present bill permits adjustments to be made for increases in volume that can be reasonably anticipated to occur within 3 months. This change in date means that, without further action, there will be no increase in prices in 1941. I regret that the Congress did not do more to bring about these changes.

Another major objection to the Taft amendment was the damage it would have done to compliance and enforcement. OPA has developed uniform dollar-and-cent prices for many important products. This is the most readily understood and easily enforced kind of pricing. Since prices under the Taft amendment were based on each individual manufacturer’s own 1941 price, uniform prices could not have been maintained in the same way. In any case, there were no provisions for enforcement of enforceable dollar-and-cent prices.

The Wherry amendment would have restored to wholesalers and retailers the percentage mark-ups which prevailed on January 1, 1940. The present bill provides that time OPA has not passed on to consumers all the increases granted to manufacturers. Instead, the distributors have been required to absorb some of the increases. This was a fair policy because the sales volume was so high that even with reduced mark-ups distributors were generally far better off than in any recent peacetime year. The present bill gives to distributors the mark-ups which prevailed on March 31, 1946. This change in date means that, without hardship, relative prices are to be decreased. Price increases are to be assured of considerably lower prices than would have been required under the Wherry amendment.

Thus, price increases will be far fewer, and those that occur will be far smaller, under the present bill than under the vetoed measure. The saving will be most significant in the basic industries, like steel. Since price increases in basic materials mean price increases in all the industries using those materials, an alarming upward spiral of costs and prices on a wide front seemed inevitable under the vetoed bill. Now there is a sound basis for the hope that such a spiral can be prevented.

Furthermore, by practically reducing the number of price increases, the present bill minimizes two other dangers inherent in the vetoed bill. First, the administrative burden on the Office of Price Administration, which is already serious, is not impossible, as it was under the vetoed measure. Secondly, the danger of widespread interruptions of production while industry is waiting for price increases is materially lessened. Unless, however, the Congress promptly provides OPA with an adequate appropriation there are bound to be serious delays in the granting of required price adjustments. These delays would in turn mean slow-downs in production. And it is maximum production that will have the day when price control can safely be abandoned.

Finally, the vetoed bill contained a clause which would have destroyed wage stabilization by requiring the inclusion of unapproved wage increases as costs in the price-increase formula. That clause has been omitted from the present bill. The invaluable work of the Wage Stabilization Board can therefore be continued. I regret that it did not comply with my request to refrain from compelling administrative changes that will make our task more difficult. Good government requires that a law be administered consistently in all the fields where it is applicable. Consistency of policy is difficult to achieve when, as in the present bill, the Congress has provided for division of responsibility. I am confident, however, that the Price Administrator and the Secretary of Agriculture will work closely together to maintain unified policies.

I shall proceed promptly to appoint the Price Decontrol Board provided for by this statute. We are all anxious, on the one hand, not to cling to these controls too long and, on the other hand, not to release them too soon. The standards prescribed by the Congress for removing and restoring controls are reasonable standards. As I said in my veto message, I have not been opposed to the creation of an independent board to resolve these difficult questions of timing the removal of controls. In my view the present measure has the advantage over any other of being a substantial amendment to the present legislation, and I have no fear that the Congress will permit the Board members in whose judgment and fairness the Congress and the country will have complete confidence.

Price control is but one of the means of combating inflation. Under the best of circumstances price control alone could not preserve economic stability. Because of the defects in the present legislation and because of the months of delay in its enactment, it is all the more apparent that more extensive use of the power to allocate scarce materials may be required and that stern and positive emergency measures than would otherwise be called for may prove to be necessary.

In order to bring spendable income more closely in balance with the supply of goods, attention must be given to strong anti-inflationary policies such as further reduction of Federal expenditures. If, despite such measures, inflation still threatens, consideration must then be given to the formulation of a more vigorous tax policy. Such a tax program would, I realize, be unpalatable at any time when we are doing our utmost to increase production but if it is the only alternative to the ravages of inflation, we would have no choice.

I pledge the administration to do its full share in this struggle but it must not be forgotten that the battle against inflation is not the Government’s battle alone—it is the people’s battle as well. Consumers must vigorously resist exorbitant prices. Black markets cannot be suppressed solely by enforcement measures. Businessmen must, as controls are progressively removed, exercise self-restraint and forego the opportunity for short-run gain from profiteering in favor of the long-run advantage of stable prices and fair profits.

If it appears that all the efforts of the Government and the people will not be enough under the present legislation, I shall have no alternative but to call the Congress back in special session to strengthen the price control laws and to enact such fiscal and monetary legislation as we need to save us from the threat of economic disaster.

Harry S. Truman.
The White House, July 25, 1946.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. Douglas) is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE HUMAN BUDGET MUST BE BALANCED FOR PEACE

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, now, when we were about to go home to take part in the first peacetime political campaign and election in 4 years, it seems worth while to ask ourselves some searching questions. If we do so, perhaps we will be better able to answer the very searching questions that the voters will put to us between now and November 5. Some of us will survive and be called on to examine critically our democratic test; some of us will flunk out and be replaced.

I do not propose today to recall in detail the specific legislative issues. On the platforms and in the debates, even on those that by one means or another have been stored away in the deep-freeze...
lock for the new Congress to thaw out and bring to life.

Each one carries home his own record and his own conscience.

I want to state some very basic questions. They are questions which, I believe, are deeply troubling to the people of my State and to the whole American race.

They are questions to which answers must be given. Upon finding the right answers—and in time—depend the survival and further flowering of our American democracy. We are seeking those answers which will depend the survival of civilization itself. To those who have ears to hear, brains to understand, and hearts to care for, the ticking of the atomic bomb is louder and more compelling than the ticking of any clock. Even those who may try to escape the tension by hysterical attempts at humor betray the fact that, as part of the human race, they, too, are involved and concerned about the answers.

Yes, many questions hang over us, too many of them unanswered as we prepare to leave. The answers I shall give may not be the right answers, or not complete answers. But they are answers in which I believe, and I propose to speak and fight and pray until the polls close on election day.

What is the issue in this political campaign? Is it peace, or world organization, or full employment, or free enterprise, or balance the budget?

The issue is peace, not peace at any price, but a peace which for which we are willing to work, and which we are to have at home and in the United Nations. It must be a peace, not of capitulation which is no peace, but of cooperation and accommodation.

With power goes responsibility. We who have the power of the atomic bomb, unmatched today but perhaps surpassed tomorrow as history is counted, have the heaviest responsibility for the making of such a peace.

All the other issues are part of, and effect, the big issue. Today, as we prepare to adjourn for 5 months, we have been too late with too little in preparing for peace. God grant us time to catch up when we come back, those who do come back.

"Peace, it's wonderful." But how do you get it?

There is nothing miraculous nor instantaneous about peace. It does not just happen. It develops, grows, or withers from day to day. We can get it by creating such conditions here at home and helping to create such conditions abroad as will make sure that there will never again be war.

Never?

That is right. This time there is no fooling. I quote from the findings of the Senate Special Committee on Atomic Energy, April 19, 1946, page 5: "It turns out that the real protection against the atomic bomb lies in the prevention of war."

And, at page 6, the final sentence summarizing the testimony of the scientists, military men, Congressmen who had been closely connected with the Manhattan district—atomic bomb—project:

"Since the only real solution to the whole problem (created by the development of atomic energy) is continued world peace, legislation should be directed in specific terms toward that end and should contain a practical expression of our desire for international cooperation."

As an American citizen, I am proud of the report of that committee, of the bill passed by the Senate, of the Lilienthal report and recommendations, of the Bill to Establish the United Nations, all made with the support and approval of President Truman. As a Member of this House, I am not proud of the atomic-weapon committees, suspended, and resumed later. Peace must be continuous from now on. It recommends legislation in specific terms and a "practical expression of our desire for international cooperation."

Who says so? Are these words, "the only real solution," "lies in continuous world peace," the words of the Congresswoman from California? Oh, no. Not at all. They are the words of a Senate committee, summarizing the testimony of the men who split the atom and who know more about the release of atomic energy, which is now going on, can split and destroy our world.

Who are they?

Let me read their names. I read from the Senate report:

Dr. Alexander Sachs, economist, Maj. Gen. L. R. Groves, United States Army, Director, Manhattan engineering district.

Dr. Harold C. Urey, professor of chemistry, University of Chicago.

Dr. Irving Langmuir, associate director of research, General Electric Co.

Dr. Vannevar Bush, Director, Office of Scientific Research and Development.

Dr. J. R. Oppenheimer, professor of physics, California Institute of Technology.

Dr. Hans A. Bethe, professor of physics, Cornell University.

Dr. Philip Morrison, physicist, Los Alamos Laboratory.

Dr. S. A. Goudsmit, professor of physics, University of Michigan.

Dr. Leo Szilard, member, metallurgical laboratory, University of Chicago.

Dr. John A. Simpson, physicist, University of Chicago.

Dr. Clarke Williams, physicist, College of the City of New York.

Dr. Alvin M. Weinberg, physicist, Clinton Laboratories, Oak Ridge.

Dr. Ross Gunn, Naval Research Laboratory.

Commodore W. S. Farsans, Assistant to the Deputy Chief, Naval Operations for Special Weapons.

Vice Admiral W. H. P. Blandy, Deputy Chief, Naval Operations for Special Weapons.


Rear Adm. Lewis L. Straus, Deputy Chairman of the Army-Navy Munitions Board and special assistant to the Secretary of the Navy.

Frank R. Creeden, formerly with Stone & Webster Engineering Corp.

H. E. Thompson, vice president, Carbide & Carbon Chemicals Corp.

H. A. Winne, vice president, General Electric Co.

Rear Adm. H. Brown, vice president, Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.

Mr. Speaker, we are all too apt to make negative, defensive statements about matters that are very important and very dear to us. Instead of saying "peace at any price," or "no more war" or "a warless world."

I prefer to make it positive, to take the offensive, to say a world full of peace is what we must have. As a woman, I know how deep is the instinct and the desire for peace, for the conserving, for the saving and the cherishing and the infinite improvement of human life. In a Nation and a world still too much controlled by fear, it is also true that peace does keep breaking out all over. It is part of the divine optimism of mankind. To those living on a planet that is small and getting smaller, it is literally true that we must have a world full of peace or no world at all. Man's destiny demands it.

"What do you mean, a peaceful world? Why not get down to earth, to brass tacks?"

Bigger profits, higher wages, a new washing machine, two chickens in every pot, lower taxes—are these the conditions of peace? They are all desirable. Yes; and they are all possible in a Nation as rich as ours. We can have bigger profits and higher wages at the same time—if we manage to keep our vast economic and productive machine rolling out goods in capacity volume for ready sale.

We want all these things and we can have them. But is that all we want? Is that our ultimate goal, our deepest concern, our utmost yearning as we bend over our children and think of the years ahead?

No; beyond and beneath and before and after everything else, we want a world, a peace world full of peace—all of us, men and women alike, farmer, wage earner, businessman, big and small, veteran and nonveteran, those who fought and those who stayed home and waited, Democrat and Republican. That is our goal. Peace. Not a cold marble shaft, a remote ideal, honored in the breach more than in the observance, but a lively, active, all-pervasive sense of economic and political and social good health running through all our communities, our Nation, and other nations. To this goal all other issues, which are part and parcel of the big issue, will fall into their proper place.

"How about balancing the Budget?"

But not true that means we stop increasing the national debt, begin living within our income, and start reducing the enormous debt we shall have neither peace nor prosperity, but loss of confidence in our government, and finally a break-down and another war? Why not be practical and start with the budget and taxes?"
strong suggestion is made that the candidate who pledges to work toward that end first, last, and always, putting that goal above all else, is the candidate who alone has the real interest of the people at heart. The budget and all will come out all right." "Balance the budget and put our house in order." "Balance the budget and save ourselves from all the dangers in the catalog of horrors."

Well, let us make this issue hold still a moment while we look at it. (Never mind the political danger of having to support veterans and the political danger of having to make promises to them.)

I mention these minor issues to emphasize the fact that, if we are not to bring our civilization down in ruins, we must fit every act into a pattern that permits of a future. As with nuclear fission, so with politics and economics. Chain reactions are inevitable. They happen all the time. They can be good or bad. Our job, the want to survive, is to make them good, and to relate each of them to the others and to the whole structure and habit of peace.
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Mr. Speaker, that is the issue, the test in the months and years to come. We have won the war. We must prove ourselves worthy of peace.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, Mr. Rees (Kansa) is recognized for 10 minutes.

INVESTIGATION OF LOYALTY IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. Rees of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for permission to speak at this time to make a rather brief statement in supplemental form as a member of the subcommittee of the House Civil Service Committee, appointed, among other things, to investigate the problem of loyalty of employees in Government. I shall also make a few brief observations.

Mr. Speaker, it is of extreme importance to our country at this time that people employed in all departments of Federal service be of the highest integrity and unquestioned loyalty. The people of this country are entitled to that consideration. Employment in Government should be accepted as a high privilege. Very unfortunately, there is no uniform, consistent policy among our agencies with regard to investigating and employing employees who are known to be disloyal. Right now we have employees in Government who have been rejected on loyalty grounds by one agency but who are accepted for employment in another agency.

The Civil Service Commission is responsible for permitting hundreds of employees to remain on the pay rolls, even though their loyalties have been called into question. In dealing with these cases the policy of "reasonable doubt" on questions of loyalty has not been carefully followed. It is given to outside influences, not only in civil service, but in other agencies of Government, in making final decisions with respect to fitness of many employees.

Mr. Speaker, conditions that are excusable with respect to this problem were brought to the attention of the subcommittee, and the policy of this Commission was studied. The investigation was held. These conditions will not be cured entirely by mere changes in technique or issuance of directives. I am informed that the Civil Service Commission is giving consideration to new directives with regard to investigation of applicants for employment. I have no objection to these new directives, but little will be accomplished thereby with respect to those who are already on our pay rolls. We ought to determine who is responsible for permitting thousands of employees to remain in Government and then see to it that such persons, after careful examination, are immediately removed.

Mr. Speaker, after all, this Congress is responsible to the people to see to it that our national security is preserved and the most important place to start up to do it is within the Government itself.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Civil Service wants to do that as a matter of fairness to the hundreds of thousands of loyal, patriotic employees in Government. They are entitled to that protection and consideration. Employment in Government must ever fight the deadening affect of monopoly, recognize it for what it is—a real enemy of free enterprise, and, finally, if allowed to grow, the death of democracy.

A man's spirit and courage expand in the art of human relations. We must hand in hand learn to walk. To achieve our goal, to build a world of peace, the opportunities are limitless if we truly desire peace within our Nation and among nations.

A decent home with enough room where children can grow up normally, happily; where grownups can rest their bodies, relax, restore their strength for the job they have chosen to do, is fundamental to healthy minds and healthy bodies and to a sound spirit. Senior citizens must be provided for adequately in a society that is wise.

Science must be used as an instrument to open the doors of business opportunity for all, not just a special few.

Science must be used to bring about better working conditions, better health and new communities. Science must be used for all the people to develop greater resources.

The opportunities are limitless if we keep the goal in mind, if we remember what we are trying to do.

To achieve our goal, to build a world full of plenty and peace and empty of want and war, we can no longer afford old patterns, old states. We are in a new blind—all of us—so unfeeling, so unknowing when it comes to the science and art of human relations. We must master that science.

We must hand in hand learn to walk and see and feel and work together, each a part of whatever future there will be. We must be vigilant daily of ourselves.

We must measure our own action, search our own hearts, test every proposal, every act, by the question that is the sum of all questions, all issues: Will it help or harm the making of real peace within our Nation and among nations?
solve it if we have the will and the courage to do it.

THE HONORABLE JOHN J. COCHRAN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished and beloved colleague, and my personal friend, Hon. John J. Cochran, after 11 consecutive terms of faithful, efficient service to his country, his State, and his constituency, has decided not to return to the Halls of Congress. The contemplation of the ending of my close relationship with him during all the years of my office as Member of Congress brings a feeling of personal sadness, not merely that our relations have ended, but also that our duties have been so mutually interwoven, as for the personal feeling of loss not being able to look to him for aid and inspiration, and the many important legislative problems which are present and which only those with the knowledge, ability, and power of clear thought possessed by Cochran can properly solve. This present state of the world calls for men in public office who can meet the complex and difficult conditions of daily life with courage and vision. We can ill afford to lose the valued service of John Cochran. We need pause but momentarily to consider the varieties and intricacies of legislative work to be addressed, but convinced that integrity in government demands the effort of men of his first talents.

The future happiness of the world is dependent upon the wisdom, impartiality and independence of all who hold positions of public trust and confidence. John Cochran, throughout his distinguished career as a Member of Congress has ever maintained the honor and dignity of that office. His every thought and action has had one objective—the maintenance of constitutional government and the preservation of the rights of men, wherever resident or domiciled. Tolerance has been his creed. Integrity is his shield. He has ever striven to protect the minority against unjust claims of the majority and to maintain peace and order in our Nation through legislation designed to guarantee the rights of the majority when threatened by the ill-advised aggression of any minority. America is today the greatest and the most powerful Nation in the world. Jack Cochran has contributed immeasurably to this national greatness and power.

Jack Cochran was secretary to Hon. William L. Igoe and Hon. Harry B. Haves who represented St. Louis in Congress for 14 years. He was secretary to Senator William J. Stone, being with the Senator at his death. While secretary to Senator Stone he acted as secretary to the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, elected to the Sixty-ninth and Seventieth Congresses, and Member of the House during each succeeding Congress. During his term of office he has served with distinction on many committees. His sagacity and devotion to duty has perhaps been best exemplified by his outstanding accomplishment in the cause of good government as chairman of the Civil Service Act. His loyalty and fidelity to our late beloved President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, is a matter of common knowledge. His fearless and sympathetic understanding of every problem which concerns the veteran has endeared him to all heroes of World War I and of World War II. The longer men associate with him, the deeper grows affection and admiration. Brilliant, faithful, courageous—he has won for himself the respect and confidence of all his associates. Fortunately he indeed are those who enjoy his friendship.

Ever a valiant warrior for those principles of liberty, equality, and justice which are our most treasured heritage, John Cochran has lived and fought for the attainment of his ideals—the high ideals of honor in government, security and happiness in America, permanent peace in the world. He has been uniting the means to meet the complex and difficult problems of our time. He has lived and fought for the standard of patriotic devotion to God, to country, to man. Wise counselor, patient adviser, keen and astute citizen, we will miss him and his inspirational example of real American. It was once said that a king who is willing to be the man of his people is the greatest king in the world. "Jack" Cochran is truly the man of his people. His absence from our deliberations will leave a vacant chair. His experience, integrity, loyalty to country, and fidelity to God, are attributes of his character which having endeared him to all, increase the sentiments of deep regret that he will no longer be among us.

With him go our heartfelt wishes for the best health possible and, above all, for happiness.

He has ably served his God and country—may he throughout his life enjoy the fruits of his undying service for his fellow men.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a magazine article.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MURPHY, for 1 week on account of official business.

To Mr. HARE, for 3 days.

To Mr. BLYNOLD of New York, for 10 days.

To Mr. BRYSON, for the period ending August 14, on account of official business.

To Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia, for Friday and Saturday this week, on account of official business.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was hereupon signed by the Speaker:


The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1426. An act to provide for the replanning and rebuilding of certain areas in accordance with plans approved by the Secretary of War, and the assembly, by purchase or condemnation, of real property in or near such areas for the sale or lease thereof for the redevelopment of such area in accordance with said plans; and to provide for the organization, procedure for, and the financing of such planning, acquisition, and sale or lease; and for other purposes.

S. 1428. An act authorizing rehabilitation on the island of Guam; and

S. 2246. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to acquire in fee or otherwise certain lands and rights in land on the island of Guam, and for other purposes.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that the committee did so on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:


ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn. The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 26, 1946, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1477. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to create the Medical, Veterinary, and Dental Department of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1478. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to establish the Women's Army Corps in the Regular Army in the Officers Reserve Corps and in the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1479. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to establish the Army Nurse Corps, the Physical Therapist Corps, and the Occupational Therapist Corps in the Medical Department of the Regular Army and in the Officers' Reserve Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1480. A communication from the President of the United States, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $30,000,000 for the payment of claims of employees of the Government for increased overtime, leave, and holiday compensation on the basis of restored rates pursuant to the provisions of the Comptroller General in accordance with the provisions of H. R. 6527, Seventy-seventh Congress (H. J. Res. 371), to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.
1481. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $2,679,450,000 for the cost of the contemplated leave of absence of 90 days for members of the armed forces in accordance with the provisions of H. R. 4001 (79th Congress (H. Doc. No. 717)); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1482. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting one set of the Commission's requests for personnel for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1947; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1483. A letter from the Administrator, National Park Service, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Mr. Stephen S. Paut and Mrs. Edith Anderson; to the Committee on Commerce.

1484. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the purposes of the city of Washington; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1485. A letter from the Administrator, National Park Service, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of James E. Culbret to the Committee on Claims.

1486. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1487. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1488. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a record of judgment rendered against the Government by the District Court of the United States for the District of Kentucky, submitted by the Department of Justice through the Treasury Department, and which requires an indemnity appropriation to pay interest (H. Doc. No. 719); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1490. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $260,000 for the Price Control Board (H. Doc. No. 720); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1491. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $750,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission (H. Doc. No. 721); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1492. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $375,000 for the Council of Economic Advisers (J. Doc. No. 723); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1494. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation under the Treasury Department for payment of certain claims allowed by the Court of Claims, amounting to $80,591.32 (H. Doc. No. 724); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1495. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation under the Treasury Department for the payment of claims by the several executive departments and independent offices to pay claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property, in the amount of $81,720.75 (H. Doc. No. 725); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1496. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting 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 $70,786.47 (H. Doc. No. 726); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1497. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation of the Public Roads Administration to pay claims for damages to roads and highways of States or their subdivisions, in the amount of $41,012.24 (H. Doc. No. 727); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1498. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimate of appropriation amounting to $506,223.83, to the Department of the Interior, Office of the Accounting Officer and for the services of the several departments and independent offices (H. Doc. No. 728); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

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. SMITH of Virginia: Select Committee To Investigate Executive Agencies submits a report pursuant to House Resolution 86 (79th Cong., 1st sess.) of the Special Committee To Investigate Acts of Executive Agencies Which Exceed Their Authority (Rept. No. 3638). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture, S. 1106. A resolution of the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain property in the State of Michigan now occupied by the Weather Bureau and to acquire land in the State of Michigan for the erection of a Weather Bureau station; without amendment (Rept. No. 3650). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania: Committee on Labor, H. R. 3922. A bill to provide for the general welfare by enabling the States to make more adequate provision for the health and welfare of mothers and children and for services to crippled children and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 3662). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, House Report No. 2661. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments (Rept. No. 3663). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MCDONALD: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, H. R. 5892. A bill providing for a medal for service in the merchant marine during the present war; with amendment (Rept. No. 2663). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, H. R. 6910. A bill relating to the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to authorize the Port of Freeport, Broward County, Fla., for Coast Guard purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 3664). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILLIPS: Committee on Agriculture, H. R. 7161. A bill to protect American agriculture, livestock, and the public health by prohibiting the unauthorized importation into, or the depositing in the waters of the United States of garbage derived from products originating outside of the continental United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2665). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FLANNAGAN: Committee on Agriculture, H. R. 6943. A bill to provide support for wool, to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 by including wool as a commodity to which orders under such act are applicable, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to fix wool standards and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2666). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENDER:
H. R. 1140. A bill to provide for the reduction of appropriations to the extent necessary to balance the Budget for the fiscal year 1947; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mrs. NORTON:
H. R. 7141. A bill to promote the general welfare of the people of the United States by establishing a publicly supported labor extension program for wage and salary earners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BARTLETT:
H. R. 7142. A bill to increase the compensation of the Governors of the several States and Territories and the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RANDOLPH (by request):
H. R. 7143. A bill to exempt certain interns, student nurses, and other student employees of hospitals of the Federal Government from the Classification Act and other laws relating to compensation and benefits of Federal employees; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. HAND:
H. R. 7144. A bill to amend the act of April 14, 1930, to provide for the retired pay for certain members of the former Life Saving Service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOOK:
H. R. 7145. A bill to suspend deportation of Indonesians; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PATTERSON:
H. R. 1146. A bill to amend the act of May 18, 1934, so as to authorize a per capita distribution of certain funds to the Indians of California; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HOBBES:
H. R. 7147. A bill to repeal certain statutes relating to the war on terrorism; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. DE LACY:
H. R. 7148. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Washington to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across Fort Washington Narrows between Bremerton, Wash., and Manette, Wash., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina:
H. R. 7149. A bill to amend Public Law No. 291, the Organization Immunities Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINSHAW:
H. R. 7150. A bill to repeal an act granting certain public lands situated in Mono County, in the State of California, to the city of Los Angeles; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LEA:
H. R. 7151. A bill to amend section 12 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, for the purpose of affording protection to investors in certain unregistered securities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOUGHTON of California:
H. R. 7152. A bill providing for the conveyance to the city of Canton, S. Dak., of the Canton Insane Asylum, located in Lincoln County, Dak., to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WEICHEL:
H. R. 7153. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of Thomas Alva Edison; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SPENCE:
H. J. Res. 388. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to render financial aid to the Republic of the Philippines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. J. Res. 389. Joint resolution to authorize the Bureau of Labor Statistics to collect price and rent information in additional cities and at more frequent intervals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:
H. Res. 740. Resolution requesting information from the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:
H. R. 7154. A bill for the relief of Freda Wahringer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DWORSCHAK:
H. R. 7155. A bill for the relief of Dionisio R. Tavera; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KEARNY:
H. R. 7156. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Antonio Saracco; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KLEIN:
H. R. 7157. A bill for the relief of Alex Ball; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KEEFE:
H. R. 7158. A bill for the relief of Neal E. Will; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LESINSKI:
H. R. 7159. A bill for the relief of Georgios Ekaterinis; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KE:

By Mr. SADOWSKI:
H. R. 7161. A bill for the relief of George Ely; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ROWAN:
H. R. 7162. A bill for the relief of Tsuyoshi Matsumoto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

FENTIONS, ETC.

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

2124. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Federal Bar Association of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting Congress to appoint an appropriate committee to investigate all questions of fact, law, and public policy arising out of the public charges made by Mr. Justice Jackson, of the United States Supreme Court, against Mr. Justice Black; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2125. Also, petition of the Common Council of the City of Rome, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their endorsement of adequate price control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2126. Also, petition of Southwest Shippers Advisory Board, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their opposition to railroad retirement bills S. 93 and H. R. 1863; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JULY 26, 1946

(Legislative day of Friday, July 5, 1946)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Ralph C. John, S. T. M., assistant minister, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, most merciful Father, our beginning is with Thee; our continuation—live and to serve—is a gift of Thy providence; and our hope for the near and the far reaches of time is engendered through Thy divine love. We would not accept the challenge of the high tasks given us to accomplish; and may every fruit of labor find its place in Thy presence in that which Thou hast given us to accomplish; and may every gift of the Spirit find its place in Thy presence in that which Thou hast given us to accomplish; and may every gift of the Spirit find its place in Thy presence in that which Thou hast given us to accomplish; and may every fruit of labor find its place in Thy presence in that which Thou hast given us to accomplish; and may every gift of the Spirit find its place in Thy presence in that which Thou hast given us to accomplish; and may every gift of the Spirit find its place in Thy presence in that which Thou hast given us to accomplish; and may every fruit of labor, dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
President pro tempore,
Washington, D. C., July 26, 1946.
To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. Alan W. Barkley, a Senator from the State of Kentucky, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

KENNETH McKELLAR,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BARKLEY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITING, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, July 25, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

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

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

Atten Brooks Byrd Chafee Cordon Downey Ferguson Fife George Kefauver Magee Mansfield McCarthy Newcomb Overton Peake Reed Russell Shipstead Smith Stewart Swift Tanner Thomas, W. D.

Thomas, W. J.

TunneI Walsh Whip Witt Hawes O'Mahoney

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. GSTETT] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MYERS] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BAILES] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent on official 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. ELords] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYRINGS] are absent on official business, having been appointed to the commission on the part of the Senate to participate in the Philippine Independence ceremonies.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BAILES] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is absent on official business, being a member of the commission appointed to attend the Philippine Independence ceremonies.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAREHART] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROPES] are absent by leave of the Senate.

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 Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent on official business.