

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 50-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. FERGUSON. 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.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate until next Wednesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave is granted.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. 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 28 minutes p. m.), the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, 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 Rodney, of Delaware, to be United States district judge for the district of Delaware. (New position.)

GOVERNOR OF PUERTO RICO

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

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

The following-named persons to be members of the 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 Advisory Board, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion:

PUBLIC MEMBER

George W. Taylor, of Pennsylvania, vice O. Max Gardner.

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 \$7,581 per annum.)

IN THE ARMY

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

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERAL

Maj. Gen. Robert Sprague Beightler, National Guard of the United States.

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 TO THE SECOND PART OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Warren R. Austin, United States Senator from the State of Vermont.

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. Eaton, a Member of the United States House of Representatives from the State of New Jersey.

Helen Gahagan Douglas, a Member of the United States House of Representatives from the State of California.

John Foster Dulles, of New York.

Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois.

FOREIGN SERVICE

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

James Clement 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

Edward B. Bergman	John J. Ingersoll
Mrs. Katherine W. Bracken	David K. Marvin
Jack E. Conner	Vincent T. McKenna
Bruce R. Crooks	Joseph P. Nagoski
Thomas A. Donovan	Albert V. Nyren
Charles T. Dougherty	James F. O'Connor, Jr.
Thomas J. Duffield, Jr.	John Newton Smith
George M. Finch	Thomas B. Stauffer
William Dale Fisher	Richard H. Stephens
Tibor A. Galambos	Robin E. Steussy
Meyer L. Goldman	Robert W. Stookey
Deane R. Hinton	J. Charles Thompson
	Parker D. Wyman

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

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

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

Harry E. Kolodner, 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 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 errs and the overruling Father 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 slum, blighted, 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 such 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 (S. 1253) 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 votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WHEELER, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. TUNNELL, Mr. REED, and Mr. MOORE to be the conferees 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 of the Senate 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," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. HILL, Mr. GUNNEY, and Mr. REVERCOMB to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER 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.
2. Government Printing Office.
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. 783) for the relief of Karl E. Bond, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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 conferees—Messrs. FERNANDEZ, HEDRICK, and JENNINGS.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two newspaper items.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD 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.]

REPUBLICAN 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. A Republican controlled House 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 vast 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 turned from the Democratic Party to the Republicans. The Republicans dismantled the war government, balanced the budget, reduced taxes three times, and had surpluses 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 the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

COAST GUARD ENLISTMENTS FOR DUTY AT LIFEBOAT STATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6219) 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. 6609) 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. 6890) 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 in connection with the operation of Indian Service irrigation projects, and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That on and after July 1, following approval of this act, collections made from water users on each Indian irrigation project on account of assessments levied to meet the cost of operating and maintaining such project shall be deposited into the Treasury for credit to a trust-fund account pursuant to section 20 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934 (48 Stat. 1233), and shall be available for expenditure in carrying out the purposes for which collected.

SEC. 2. There shall be credited to each trust-fund account so established the excess, if any, of (1) the unexpended balance of any repealed special fund appropriation to which operation and maintenance collections were credited prior to July 1, 1935, and (2) the amount of receipts covered into the Treasury pursuant to section 4 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934 (48 Stat. 1227), over expenditures from appropriations provided for the operation and maintenance of the irrigation project from which such unexpended balance or receipts were derived, and the amount so credited shall be subject to expenditure as prescribed in section 1 hereof.

SEC. 3. Revenues hereafter collected from power operations on each Indian irrigation project and deposited into the Treasury for credit to miscellaneous receipts pursuant to section 4 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934 (48 Stat. 1227), or pursuant to other provisions of law, are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, in specific or in indefinite amounts, equal to the collections so credited, for the following purposes in connection with the respective projects from which such revenues are derived: (1) Payment of the expenses of operating and maintaining the power system; (2) creation and maintenance of reserve funds to be available for making repairs and replacements to, defraying emergency expenses for, and insuring continuous operation of the power system, the fund for each project to be maintained at such level, within limits set by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, as may from time to time be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior; (3) amortization, in accordance with the repayment provisions of the applicable statutes or contracts, of construction costs allocated to be returned from power revenues; and (4) payment of other expenses and obligations chargeable to power revenues to the extent required or permitted by law.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out the words "and after July 1, following."

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.

USE OF FUNDS OF INDIAN TRIBES FOR INSURANCE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1235) to authorize the use of the funds of any tribe of Indians for insurance premiums.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act authorizing the use of the funds of any tribe of Indians for payments of insurance premiums for protection of the property of the tribe against fire, theft, tornado, and hail," approved April 13, 1926 (44 Stat. 242), is amended to read as follows:

"That hereafter the funds of any tribe of Indians under the control of the United States may be used for payments of insurance premiums for protection of the property of the tribe against fire, theft, tornado, hall, earthquake, or other elements and forces of nature, 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 laid on the table.

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, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes," approved December 2, 1942 (42 U. S. C. 1701), 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 23, 1943 (57 Stat. 626), upon changing the final period to a semicolon, the following: "and in such cases benefits for detention shall accrue from January 1, 1942, unless the beginning of absence occurred upon a later date in which event benefits shall accrue from such later date, and for the period of such absence shall be 100 percent of the average weekly wages, determined as herein provided: *And provided further,* That compensation for disability under this title (except under allowance for scheduled losses of members or functions of the body, within the purview of section 102 (a)) shall not be paid in any case in respect to any period of time during which benefits for detention may accrue under this title in the same case, and should a person entitled to benefits for detention also be entitled to workmen's compensation or similar benefits under any other law, agreement, or plan (except allowances for scheduled losses of members or functions of the body), where such other benefits are paid or to be paid directly or indirectly by the United States, the amount thereof accruing as to the period of absence

shall be taken into account and the benefits credited to the account of the detained person reduced accordingly: *And provided further,* That where through mistake of fact, absence of proof of death, or error through lack of adequate information or otherwise, payments as for detention have in any case been erroneously made or credited, any resulting overpayment of detention benefits (the recovery of which is not waived as otherwise provided for in this section) shall be recouped by the Commission in such manner as it shall determine from any unpaid accruals to the account of the detained person, and if such accruals are insufficient for such purpose, then from any allowance of compensation for injury or death in the same case (whether under this title or under any other law, agreement, or plan, if the United States pays, or is obligated to pay, such benefits, directly or indirectly), but only to the extent of the amount of such compensation benefits payable for the particular period of such overpayment, and in cases of erroneous payments of compensation for injury or death, made through mistake of fact, whether under this title or under any other law, agreement, or plan (if the United States is obligated to pay such compensation, directly or indirectly), the Commission is authorized to recoup from any unpaid benefits for detention, the amount of any overpayment thus arising; and any amounts recovered under this section shall be covered into such compensation fund, and for the foregoing purposes the Commission shall have a right of lien, intervention, and recovery in any claim or proceeding for compensation."

Sec. 2. The provisions of section 1 of this act shall apply in all cases coming within the purview of section 101 (b) of such act of December 2, 1942, and shall be applied retroactively to January 1, 1942; and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is authorized to review any case affected by such provisions, and to make the adjustment of benefits which they require. In cases in which claims for benefits under such section 101 (b) have been adjudicated, and the detained person has died since such adjudication, any amounts found to be due upon such review shall be paid to his legal representative.

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.

DISPOSAL AGENCY FOR SURPLUS PROPERTY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1636) to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to designate the Department of State as 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 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.

UNITED STATES CAPITOL GROUNDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6968) to define the area of 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. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 2405, 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, reservations, streets, roadways, walks, and other areas as defined on a map entitled "Map showing areas comprising United States Capitol Grounds," dated June 25, 1946, approved by the Architect of the Capitol and recorded in the Office of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia in book 127, 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 those streets and roadways in said United States Capitol Grounds shown on said map as being under the jurisdiction and control of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall continue under such jurisdiction and control, and said Commissioners shall be responsible for the maintenance and improvement thereof: *Provided further,* That the Commissioners of 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 altering, any utility service of the District of Columbia government.

Sec. 2. Public travel in and occupancy of said United States Capitol Grounds shall be restricted to the roads, walks, and places prepared for that purpose by flagging, paving, or otherwise.

Sec. 3. It is forbidden to occupy the roads in said United States Capitol Grounds in such manner as to obstruct or hinder their proper use, or to use the roads in the area of said United States Capitol Grounds, south of Constitution Avenue and B Street and north of Independence Avenue and B Street, for the conveyance of goods or merchandise, except to or from the Capitol on Government service.

Sec. 4. It is forbidden to offer or expose any article for sale in said United States Capitol Grounds; to display any sign, placard, or other form of advertisement therein; to solicit fares, alms, subscriptions, or contributions therein.

Sec. 5. It is forbidden to step or climb upon, remove, or in any way injure any statue, seat, wall, fountain, or other erection or architectural feature, or any tree, shrub, plant, or turf in said United States Capitol Grounds.

Sec. 6. It is forbidden to discharge any firearm, firearm or explosive, set fire to any combustible, make any harangue or oration, or utter loud, threatening, or abusive language in said United States Capitol Grounds.

Sec. 7. It is forbidden to parade, stand, or move in processions or assemblages in said United States Capitol Grounds, or to display therein any flag, banner, or device designed or adapted to bring into public notice any party, organization, or movement, except as hereinafter provided in sections 11 and 12 of this act.

Sec. 8. Offenses against sections 2 to 7, both inclusive, of this act shall be punishable by a fine not exceeding \$100, or imprisonment not exceeding 60 days, or by both such fine and imprisonment, prosecution for such offenses to be had in The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, upon information by the United States attorney or any of his

assistants: *Provided*, That in cases where public property is damaged in an amount exceeding \$100, the offense shall be punishable by imprisonment for not more than 5 years.

Sec. 9. The Capitol Police shall police the United States Capitol Buildings and Grounds under the direction of the Capitol Police Board, consisting of the Sergeant at Arms of the United States Senate, the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, and the Architect of the Capitol, and shall have the power to enforce the provisions of this act and regulations promulgated under section 14 thereof, and to make arrests within the United States Capitol Buildings and Grounds for any violations of any law of the United States or of any State, or any regulation promulgated pursuant thereto: *Provided*, That the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to make arrests within the United States Capitol Buildings and Grounds for any violations of any such laws or regulations, but such authority shall not be construed as authorizing the Metropolitan Police force, except with the consent or upon the request of the Capitol Police Board, to enter such buildings to make arrests in response to complaints or to serve warrants or to patrol the United States Capitol Buildings and Grounds, with the exception of the streets and roadways shown on the map referred to in section 1 of this act as being under the jurisdiction and control of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. For the purpose of this section, the word "grounds" shall include the House Office Building parking area.

Sec. 10. It shall be the duty of all persons employed in the service of the Government in the Capitol or in the United States Capitol Grounds to prevent, as far as may be in their power, offenses against this act, and to aid the police, by information or otherwise, in securing the arrest and conviction of offenders.

Sec. 11. In order to admit of the due observance within the United States Capitol Grounds of occasions of national interest becoming the cognizance and entertainment of Congress, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, acting concurrently, are hereby authorized to suspend for such proper occasions so much of the prohibitions contained in sections 2 to 7, both inclusive, of this act as would prevent the use of the roads and walks of the said grounds by processions or assemblages, and the use upon them of suitable decorations, music, addresses, and ceremonies: *Provided*, That responsible officers shall have been appointed, and arrangements determined which are adequate, in the judgment of said President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, for the maintenance of suitable order and decorum in the proceedings, and for guarding the Capitol and its grounds from injury.

Sec. 12. In the absence from Washington of either of the officers designated in section 11, the authority therein given to suspend certain prohibitions of this act shall devolve upon the other, and in the absence from Washington of both it shall devolve upon the Capitol Police Board: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the provisions of sections 7 and 11 of this act, the Capitol Police Board is hereby authorized to grant the Commissioners of the District of Columbia authority to permit the use of Louisiana Avenue for any of the purposes prohibited by said section 7.

Sec. 13. Nothing in the foregoing sections shall be construed to prohibit the giving of concerts in the United States Capitol Grounds, at such times as will not interfere with the Congress, by any band in the service of the United States, when and as authorized by the Architect of the Capitol.

Sec. 14. (a) The Capitol Police Board, consisting of the Sergeant at Arms of the United

States Senate, the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, and the Architect of the Capitol, shall have exclusive charge and control of the regulation and movement of all vehicular and other traffic; including the parking and impounding of vehicles and limiting the speed thereof, within the United States Capitol Grounds, except on those streets and roadways shown on the map referred to in section 1 of this act as being under the jurisdiction and control of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia; and said Board is hereby authorized and empowered to make and enforce all necessary regulations therefor and to prescribe penalties for violation of such regulations, such penalties not to exceed a fine of \$300 or imprisonment for not more than 90 days. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section those provisions of the District of Columbia Traffic Act of 1925, as amended, for the violation of which specific penalties are provided in said act, as amended, shall be applicable to the United States Capitol Grounds. Prosecutions for violation of such regulations shall be in the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, upon information by the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia or any of his assistants.

(b) Regulations authorized to be promulgated under this section shall be promulgated by the Capitol Police Board within 6 months after approval of this act: *Provided*, That until such regulations are promulgated and become effective, the traffic regulations of the District of Columbia shall be applicable to the United States Capitol Grounds.

(c) All regulations promulgated under the authority of this section shall, when adopted by the Capitol Police Board, be printed in one or more of the daily newspapers published in the District of Columbia, and shall not become effective until the expiration of 10 days after the date of such publication.

(d) It shall be the duty of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or any officer or employee of the government of the District of Columbia designated by said Commissioners, upon request of the Capitol Police Board, to cooperate with the Board in the preparation of the regulations authorized to be promulgated under this section, and any future amendments thereof.

Sec. 15. The act entitled "An act to regulate the use of the Capitol Grounds," approved July 1, 1882 (22 Stat. 126), the second sentence of the first paragraph under the heading "Capitol Police," contained in section 1 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes," approved May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 143; U. S. C., title 40, sec. 213), the proviso in the paragraph "Lighting the Capitol and Grounds," contained in an act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 613; U. S. C., title 40, sec. 205), and sections 881 to 890, both inclusive, of the act entitled, "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1333, 1334), are hereby repealed: *Provided, however*, That any violation of any of the provisions of said acts hereby repealed, occurring before the date of this repeal, may be prosecuted to the same extent as if this act had not been enacted.

Sec. 16. (a) The provisions of the foregoing sections of this act, except section 9, shall not be construed to extend inside the Capitol Buildings; and the words "Capitol Buildings" as used in this act, shall be construed to include the United States Capitol, Senate Office Building, House Office Buildings, Capitol Power Plant, and Legislative Garage.

(b) Nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal, amend, alter, or supersede (1) section 1820 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 40, sec. 193); (2) an act entitled "An

act to protect the public property, turf, and grass of the Capitol Grounds from injury," approved April 29, 1876 (19 Stat. 41; U. S. C., title 40, sec. 214); (3) except as provided in section 9 of this act, section 15 of an act entitled "An act for the preservation of the public peace and the protection of property within the District of Columbia," approved July 29, 1892 (27 Stat. 325; U. S. C., title 40, sec. 101); (4) the second proviso in the item "Capitol garages" under the caption "Capitol Buildings and Grounds" contained in an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 382, 391; U. S. C., title 40, sec. 185a); or (5) an act entitled "An act to authorize the use of part of the United States Capitol Grounds east of the Union Station for the parking of motor vehicles," approved July 8, 1943 (57 Stat. 390).

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. 6968) 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.

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 to corporations or associations whose charter or articles of agreement denies them the right to operate for profit. The transfer agreement for the disposition of any vessel shall include a stipulation that the transferee shall maintain the vessel in a condition satisfactory to the Navy Department and that no expense shall result to the United States as a consequence of such transfer or as a consequence of such terms and conditions prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 34 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 765; 50 U. S. C. 1611) shall apply to this act.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized, in his discretion, to loan or give 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, Soldiers' Monument Associations, posts of the Grand Army of the Republic, posts of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, posts of the American Legion, and other recognized war veteran associations, State museums, libraries, historical societies, and museums operated and maintained for educational purposes only, whose charter denies them the right to operate for profit, and posts of the Sons of Veterans Reserve, educational institutions whose graduates or students fought in World War I or World War II, captured, condemned, or obsolete ordnance, guns, projectiles, books, manuscripts, works of art, drawings, plans,

models, and other condemned or obsolete material, trophies, and flags, and other material of historic interest which may not be needed in the service of the Navy Department.

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 small article of a negligible or sentimental value, from that ship or vessel, and any person, State, group, or organization named in section 2 of this act who donated any article, material, or equipment including donations of silver service, may receive such articles, equipment, or material 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 Government 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 is authorized 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 States Navy in order that such binoculars might be used in the naval service during World War II and to whom the binoculars given 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 transfer, loan, or gift authorized by section 1 or 2 of this act shall take effect until information of the proposal to make such transfer, loan, or gift has been 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 such sixty-day period, there has not been passed by the two Houses a concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress does not favor the proposed transfer. The loans and gifts authorized by section 2 of this act shall take effect upon the expiration of the first period of thirty calendar days of continuous session of the Congress following the date on which information of the proposal to make such loan or gift is transmitted to the Congress; but only if, between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such thirty-day period, there 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.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELLIOTT: Amend section 2 by adding in line 4, page 3, after the word "Department" a semicolon and the following language: "Provided, That the material authorized by this section to be loaned or given by the Secretary of the Navy shall not include any records of the Federal Government as defined in the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380, U. S. C. 366)."

Mr. DREWRY. The committee accepts the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

XCH—631

passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERTAIN CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES CAUSED BY THE NAVAL SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2247) to permit the Secretary of the Navy to delegate the authority to compromise and settle claims against the United States caused by vessels of the Navy or in the naval service, or for towage or salvage services to such vessels, and for other purposes.

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 the act of July 3, 1944 (58 Stat. 726), be amended by adding another section thereto as follows:

"Sec. 9. When the net amount paid in settlement does not exceed \$1,000, the authority of the Secretary of the Navy as set forth in section 7, 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.

ACTING ASSISTANT SURGEONS IN THE NAVY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6992) to amend the act of May 4, 1898 (30 Stat. 369), as amended, to authorize the President to appoint 250 acting assistant surgeons for temporary service.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection 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 AND 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 16, 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. MADDEN. 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; 34 U. S. C. 1073-1073e), 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 Post-

graduate School, United States Naval Academy," as amended by the act of November 23, 1943 (57 Stat. 594), is hereby further amended by inserting therein two new sections Nos. 4B and 4C, reading as follows:

"Sec. 4B. Any civilian member of the teaching staffs to whom this act applies who shall have served for a total period of not less than 5 years, and who, before becoming eligible for retirement under the conditions defined in the preceding sections hereof, becomes totally disabled for useful and efficient service in his position, by reason of disease or injury not due to vicious habits, intemperance, or willful misconduct on the part of the civilian member of the teaching staffs, shall upon his own application or upon the request or order of the Secretary of the Navy be retired on an annuity computed in accordance with provisions of section 4A of this act. The annuity which the Government pays to a civilian teacher who is forced to retire under this section shall be the difference between his total annuity as computed under section 4A of this act and the immediate life annuity to which he is entitled at the time of such retirement under the annuity policy provided by the act. Every annuitant retired under the provisions of this section, unless the disability for which he was retired be permanent in character, shall at the expiration of 1 year from the date of such retirement and annually thereafter, until reaching retirement age as defined in section 3 hereof, be examined by a board of medical officers appointed by the Superintendent of the Naval Academy. If the annuitant is found to be sufficiently recovered for useful and efficient service in his position and if he is offered reemployment by the Superintendent of the Naval Academy, the annuity being paid him by the Government shall cease immediately. If an annuitant who has been retired under the provisions of this section is subsequently reemployed by the Government, the annuity being paid to him by the Government shall be terminated. If the annuitant is reemployed as a civilian teacher at the Naval Academy, the annuity which the Government will pay him at the time of subsequent retirement shall be the difference between the total annuity, computed under section 4A of this act, and the immediate life annuity which the total premiums, paid on his annuity contracts provided by this act, would purchase. No person shall be entitled to receive an annuity under the provisions of this act, and compensation under the provisions of the act of September 7, 1916, entitled 'An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes,' covering the same period of time; but this provision shall not bar the right of any claimant to the greater benefit conferred by either act for any part of the same period.

"Sec. 4C. Any civilian member of the teaching staffs retiring under the provisions of this act, as amended, may at the time of his retirement elect to receive in lieu of the life annuity to be paid by the Secretary of the Navy under the provisions of this act a reduced annuity payable to him during his life, and an annuity after his death payable to his beneficiary, duly designated in writing and filed with the Secretary of the Navy at the time of retirement, during the life of such beneficiary (a) equal to or (b) 50 percent of such reduced annuity and upon the death of such surviving beneficiary all payments shall cease and no further annuities shall be due or payable. The amounts of these two annuities shall be such that their combined actuarial value on the date of retirement as determined under the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act shall be the same as the actuarial value of the single life annuity provided by this act."

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 permit the Secretary 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 section 1 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 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 section 304 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

Insert the following new proviso immediately before the final proviso of the said section: "Provided further, That any member of the Naval Reserve performing active duty with or without pay for periods of 30 days or less, training duty with or without pay, drills, equivalent instruction or duty, appropriate duty, or prescribed duty, or while performing authorized travel to or from such duties, prior to the official termination of World War II, shall be entitled to all the benefits provided by this section to 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 third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ATOMIC ENERGY CONFEREES

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS]

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 North Carolina [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 within 60 days after 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 in each case by the head of the 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 amount 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 for the Government 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 (41 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 by any other department or agency under this act. Wherever a department or agency considering a claim under this act finds that losses under any such contract or subcontract affected the computation of the amount of excessive profits determined in a renegotiation agreement or order, and to the extent that the department or agency finds such amount was thereby reduced, claims for such losses shall not be allowed under this act.

(b) Every claimant under this act shall furnish to the department or agency con-

cerned any evidence within the possession of such claimant bearing upon the matters referred to in subsection (a) of this section.

Sec. 3. Claims for losses shall not be considered unless filed with the department or agency concerned within 6 months after the date of approval of this act, and shall be limited to losses with respect to which a written request for relief was filed with such department or agency on or before August 14, 1945, but a previous settlement under the First War Powers Act, 1941, or the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 shall not operate to preclude further relief otherwise allowable under this act.

Sec. 4. Appropriations or funds available for work, supplies, or services of the character involved in the respective claims at the time of settlement thereof shall be available for payment of the settlements: *Provided*, That where no such appropriations are available, appropriations for payment of such settlements are hereby authorized.

Sec. 5. Each department and agency shall report to the Congress quarterly the name of each claimant to whom relief has been granted under this act, together with the amount of such relief and a brief statement of the facts and the administrative decision.

Sec. 6. Whenever any claimant under this act is dissatisfied with the action of a department or agency of the Government in either granting or denying his claim, such claimant shall have the right within 6 months to file a petition with any Federal district court of competent jurisdiction, asking a determination by the court of the equities involved in such claim, and upon the filing of such a petition, the court, sitting as a court of equity, shall have jurisdiction 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 the 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 flee from one State to another for the purpose of avoiding prosecution or the giving of testimony in certain cases", approved May 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 782; 18 U. S. C. 408e), be, and it hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"That 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, kidnapping, burglary, robbery, mayhem, rape, assault with a dangerous weapon, or extortion accompanied by threats of violence, or attempt to commit any of the foregoing, under the laws of the place from which he flees; or (2) to avoid giving testimony in any criminal proceed-

ings in such place in which the commission of a felony is charged. Any person who violates the provision of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than \$5,000 or by imprisonment for not longer than five years, or by both such fine and imprisonment. Violations of this Act may be prosecuted only in the Federal judicial district in which the original crime was alleged to have been committed or in which the person was held in custody or confinement."

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.

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:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Land Management, shall, as soon as possible, advertise for sale all of the lands presently leased under section 15 of the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1275), as amended (49 Stat. 1978; 43 U. S. C., sec. 315m), which the Secretary finds are 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 subsequent time upon the application of any person. The word "person" as used in this act includes corporations, partnerships, and associations.

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 is lower, shall be given: First, to the person who is then the grazing lessee of the offered tract or tracts and who is also the owner of lands contiguous to or near said tract or tracts; and second, to the owners of contiguous land who do not qualify for a first preference. Where two or more persons apply to exercise the highest 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 sales 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 shall determine that the land to be offered for sale under this act in and by itself forms an economic unit, it shall be first offered for sale only to persons who have served in the military or naval forces of the United States for a period of at least 90 days during World War II and who have been honorably discharged. The land shall be sold to the highest bidder among such persons, but at not less than its appraised value as determined by the Secretary of the Interior. In addition to the sales price, the purchaser shall pay to the United States the cost of advertising for sale the tract or tracts purchased by him. The preferences stated in section 2 of this act shall not apply to sales under this section. If land offered for sale

under this section is not sold, it shall thereafter be subject to sale under sections 1 and 2 of this act.

SEC. 4. Sales under this act may be made upon such terms of deferred payment as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, and upon completion of payment the Secretary shall cause a patent to issue for the land sold.

SEC. 5. Any sale under this act shall be made subject to leases, easements, or other rights existing in or to the land at the date the land is offered for sale, but any rentals or other charges except those relating to the mineral rights retained by the United States, accruing after the patent has been issued, 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 of the United States and at the end of each fiscal year 90 percent of all such moneys except the amounts paid to cover the cost of advertising 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; also insert the following language: "and who will personally use the land or will use it to establish and maintain their own grazing 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 2, line 9, after the comma, insert the words "at not more than \$1.50 per acre"; page 2, line 17, strike out the word "white"; and page 2, line 17, 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. As used 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 level."

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 reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPILATION OF PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION, SURVEY AND REVIEW REPORTS OF THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS

The Clerk called House Resolution 716, directing that the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors prepare a revised edition of a compilation of all preliminary examination and survey and review reports transmitted to Congress prior to July 31, 1946.

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

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, according to the report it has been customary to make a survey every 15 years. Under this bill it is to be made 10 years from the last report. I should like to know from some member of the committee why they want a change from the usual practice.

Mr. RANKIN. What bill is that?

Mr. KEAN. For the compilation of a preliminary examination, survey, and review reports for the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from New Jersey that the letter from the War Department, which is in the report, explains the situation fairly well. General Wheeler states in that letter the following:

Since this compilation was published, a considerable number of additional reports has been transmitted to Congress, and, therefore, the listing in this document is now largely incomplete.

The publication of an up-to-date compilation of all such reports similar in general form to that printed on pages 1-369 of the above-mentioned document would be valuable for reference purposes and convenient for Members of Congress and others concerned with studies of rivers and harbors for navigation and flood control as authorized by Congress. Accordingly, it is recommended that an up-to-date listing of all preliminary examination and survey and review reports be printed as a House document at this time.

Mr. KEAN. In the past it has been done only every 15 years. Why do they want to change the practice to 10 years?

Mr. RANKIN. Simply because a great deal of this activity has been carried on in the last 10 years.

Mr. KEAN. Does the gentleman mean that the Army engineers have been so busy during the war that they have done more work of this sort than they did before the war?

Mr. RANKIN. We did not get into the war until 1941.

Mr. KEAN. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. That was 5 years after the last report was made, and during that time a large number of these investigations were authorized and carried on. A great many of them are being carried on at the present time. I believe the gentleman from New Jersey will find that General Wheeler is right in asking for this compilation at this time, and I hope he will not object.

Mr. KEAN. Does the gentleman know approximately how much it will cost the Government to make this compilation? Is it a large sum of money?

Mr. RANKIN. I doubt if it costs very much.

Mr. KEAN. Does the gentleman think it would be establishing a precedent to provide for the publication every 10 years instead of 15?

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. KEAN. It certainly would be a convenience to the Members of Congress; there is 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, be, and is hereby, requested to prepare a revised edition of pages 1 to 369 of House Document No. 106, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, being a compilation of 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, etc., 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 of the Naval Establishment may attend meetings of technical, professional, scientific, and other similar organizations and may be reimbursed for 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 discretions for the contingencies of such offices: Director of Naval Intelligence, \$2,000; President of Naval War College, \$1,000; Superintendent of Naval Academy, \$5,200; Commandant of Midshipment at the Naval Academy, \$800; Head of the Postgraduate School at the Naval Academy, \$400.

Sec. 4. Under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, there may be allowed and paid out of naval appropriations the cost of installation and use (other than for personal long distance calls) of extension telephones connecting public quarters occupied by naval personnel with the switchboards of their official stations.

Sec. 5. The third paragraph under the head "Navy Department" in the act of March 18, 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 is authorized to provide for all emergencies and extraordinary expenses arising in the Naval Establishment, but impossible to be anticipated or classified, and when so specified in an appropriation such funds may be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Navy and for such purposes as he may deem proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government, and he may make a certificate of the amount of such expenditures as he may think it 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 so employed shall be paid out of naval appropriations such compensation as he may prescribe.

(b) The first paragraph under the head "Naval Academy" in the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 607), as amended (34 U. S. C. 1071), and section 1528, Revised Statutes (34 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 components thereof whether or not on active duty), for excellence in accomplishments related to naval service, to incur such expenses as may be required to enter such personnel in competitions, and to provide badges or buttons in recognition of special service, good conduct, and discharge under conditions other than dishonorable.

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 enlisted 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 drawing a pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay (other than as members of the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve or as members on the honorably retired list of such Reserve forces) from the Government of the United States.

Sec. 11. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to provide for the maintenance and operation of the Naval Home including the transportation, admission, entertainment, support, and care of beneficiaries, hospitalization of beneficiaries in naval hospitals, transportation and subsistence of attendants of beneficiaries where required, and the burial and care of graves of deceased beneficiaries.

Sec. 12. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to provide for the maintenance and operation of naval prisons and prison farms and for the subsistence, welfare, recreation, and education of all naval prisoners.

Sec. 13. The Secretary of the Navy may, when authorized in an appropriation, contribute to the support of schools in localities where naval activities are located if he finds that the schools, if any, available in the locality are not adequate for the welfare of dependents of personnel of the Naval Establishment stationed at the activity, and may provide for the transportation of such dependents between the schools and the activities when such schools are not accessible to such dependents by regular means of transportation.

Sec. 14. Under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, enlisted naval personnel may receive additional compensation at the rate of \$5 per month while assigned to duty as messmen.

Sec. 15. (a) Within such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, naval personnel, including members of the Nurse Corps, may be furnished public quarters, including heat, light, water, and refrigeration.

(b) Where sufficient quarters are not possessed by the United States, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to provide lodging accommodations for naval personnel, including naval personnel on sea duty at such times as they may be deprived of their quarters on board ship due to repairs or other conditions which may render them uninhabitable: *Provided*, That such accommodations shall not be occupied by the dependents of naval personnel.

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 messes temporarily set up on shore for bachelor officers and officers attached to seagoing or district defense vessels, to aviation units based on seagoing vessels, to the fleet air bases, to the submarine bases, or to landing forces and expeditions.

(b) Enlisted naval personnel may be assigned to duty in a service capacity in officers' messes and public quarters, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, where the Secretary finds 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 a retired enlisted person or a transferred member of the Fleet Reserve without additional expense to the Government.

(c) The sale of meals by general messes afloat and ashore is authorized under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe.

Sec. 17. (a) All enlisted naval personnel while on active duty or on authorized leave or furlough therefrom, midshipmen and cadets shall be allowed a ration, or commutation thereof in money, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe. Such regulations shall establish rates at which rations shall be commuted in money. Members of the Nurse Corps may be subsisted in kind, but, if so subsisted, there shall be deducted from the allowances which they are otherwise entitled to receive, one subsistence allowance.

(b) The proviso in the first paragraph under the head "Bureau of Provisions and Clothing" in the act of January 30, 1885 (23 Stat. 291; 34 U. S. C. 901); the proviso in the first paragraph under the head "Maintenance, Quartermaster's Department, Marine Corps" in the act of July 11, 1919 (41 Stat. 154; 34 U. S. C. 976); and section 1585 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (34 U. S. C. 907) are hereby repealed.

Sec. 18. During the existence of war or national emergency as declared by the President, there may be transported and subsisted on naval vessels at Government expense such persons as the Secretary of the Navy may authorize by regulation.

Sec. 19. Until September 1, 1946, enlisted men of the Navy and the Marine Corps and the Reserve components thereof, if otherwise eligible, shall be eligible for appointment to the Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy if they will have completed 9 months' active service on the date of entrance.

Sec. 20. (a) Candidates for appointment as midshipmen at the Naval Academy or as cadets at the Coast Guard Academy shall receive a mileage allowance at the rate of 5 cents per mile for travel performed while proceeding from their homes or duty stations to the Naval Academy or the Coast Guard Academy for examination and appointment.

(b) Midshipmen and cadets discharged or dismissed from the Naval Academy or the Coast Guard Academy shall be furnished transportation in kind and subsistence from the place of discharge to their homes.

Sec. 21. Section 126 of the act of June 3, 1916, as amended (10 U. S. C. 752; 34 U. S. C. 895), 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, or relief from active duty, shall, under such regulations as the head of the department concerned may prescribe for personnel under his jurisdiction, receive a money 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 shall be allowed."

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

Sec. 23. Naval appropriations chargeable 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. 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, and other materials necessary thereto, and naval appropriations available for the activities in which such personnel are engaged shall be available for the foregoing purposes.

Sec. 25. Without deposit to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States and withdrawal on money requisitions, receipts of public moneys from sales or other sources by officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard on disbursing duty and charged in their official accounts may be used by them as required for current expenditures, all necessary bookkeeping adjustments of appropriations, funds, and accounts to be made in the settlement of their disbursing accounts.

Sec. 26. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to expend out of naval appropriations available for construction or maintenance such amounts as may be required for minor construction (except living quarters), extensions to existing structures, and improvements at naval activities, but the cost of any project authorized under this section which is not otherwise authorized shall not exceed \$20,000.

Sec. 27. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to furnish materials for the manufacture or production by patients of products incident to the convalescence and rehabilitation of such patients in naval hospitals and other naval medical facilities, and ownership thereof shall be vested in the patients manufacturing or producing such products, except that the ownership of items manufactured or produced specifically for the use of a naval hospital or other naval medical facility shall be vested in the Government

and such items shall be accounted for and disposed of accordingly.

Sec. 28. The annual appropriations for the pay of the Marine Corps shall be available for the payment of post exchange indebtedness of deserters and personnel discharged or sentenced to terms of imprisonment while in debt to the United States, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe.

Sec. 29. Proceeds from the sale by the Coast Guard of rations, supplies, uniforms, and other clothing shall be credited to the current appropriations from which purchase of these articles are authorized.

Sec. 30. When personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard are ordered to make any permanent change of station motor vehicles owned by them may be transported to their new posts of duty on Government-owned vessels.

Sec. 31. The first sentence of section 10 (a) of the act of June 6, 1940 (54 Stat. 248; 14 U. S. C. 135), is hereby amended by inserted in the first line thereof the words "working parties in the field," after 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 maintained by the Coast Guard.

Sec. 33. Existing limitations on the number of enlisted personnel of the Coast Guard who may be detailed for duty in the District of Columbia or at Coast Guard headquarters shall not apply 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. (a) The Secretary of the Navy is authorized, in his discretion and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to pay cash rewards to civilian personnel of the Naval Establishment or other persons in civil life when, due to a suggestion or series of suggestions by them, there results an improvement or economy in manufacturing process or plant or naval material, or in efficiency or economy in the operation or administration of the Navy Department or the Naval Establishment. Such sums as may be awarded to employees in accordance with this section shall be paid them out of naval appropriations in addition to their usual compensation. No employee or other person in civil life shall be paid a reward under this section until he has properly executed an agreement to the effect that the use by the United States of the suggestion or series of suggestions made by him shall not form the basis of a further claim of any nature against the United States by him, his heirs, or assigns.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (a) hereof, civilian personnel of the Naval Establishment shall not be paid any premium or bonus or cash reward in addition to their regular salaries.

(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. 36. The Secretary of the Navy, in requesting competitive bids for the construction of naval vessels, shall require each bidder to file with its bid the estimates on which the bid is based.

Sec. 37. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized in time of war to exceed the statutory limit on repairs and alterations of vessels, whenever he deems it necessary.

Sec. 38. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized, out of any naval appropriation made therefor, to provide for (1) the administra-

tion by the Navy of liberated and occupied areas; (2) expenses for special compensation and for travel and subsistence of officers and students of Latin-American countries, and other expenses deemed necessary by the Secretary for Latin-American cooperation; and (3) payment of rewards, not to exceed \$500 in any one instance, for information leading to the discovery of missing naval property or the recovery thereof.

Sec. 39. The authority conferred upon the Secretary of the Navy in this act or in the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as now or hereafter amended, except the authority to prescribe regulations, may be delegated by him to such persons in the Naval Establishment and to such extent as he may deem proper, with or without authority to make successive redelegations.

Sec. 40. As used in this act (a) the term "Naval Establishment" includes the Navy Department, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard while operating as a part of the Navy; (b) the term "naval personnel" includes all personnel of the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard while operating as a part of the Navy, including personnel of the Reserve components while on active duty, and personnel of the Coast and Geodetic Survey when serving with the Navy; (c) the term "personnel of the Naval Establishment" includes both civilian (departmental and field) and naval personnel; and (d) the term "Naval appropriations" includes all appropriations for the Naval Establishment, including those made for departmental purposes.

Sec. 41. The President, in his discretion, is authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, graduates of reputable schools of osteopathy as commissioned medical officers in the Navy, in such numbers as the President should determine to be necessary to meet the needs of the naval service for officers trained and qualified in osteopathy.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, in line 10, strike out "\$2,000" and substitute therefor "\$5,200."

On page 5, in lines 5 and 6, strike out the words "when authorized in an appropriation" and substitute therefor the words "out of funds specifically appropriated for that purpose."

On page 7, in lines 7 to 10, inclusive, strike out the words "members of the Nurse Corps may be subsisted in kind but, if so subsisted, there shall be deducted from the allowances which they are otherwise entitled to receive, one subsistence allowance," and substitute therefor the words: "active duty enlisted personnel, active and inactive retired enlisted personnel and members of the Fleet Reserve when sick in hospitals, and enlisted personnel on duty in hospitals may be subsisted in kind in hospital messes and, when so subsisted, the appropriation chargeable with the maintenance of the hospital mess shall be credited, when applicable, at such rate as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy as the value of the hospital ration. Members of the Nurse Corps may be subsisted in hospital messes under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, and nurses so subsisted shall pay therefor at rates to be fixed by such regulations: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall deprive such nurses of allowances for subsistence now or hereafter provided by law."

On page 9, in lines 16 and 17, strike out the words "paid in connection with such transportation or travel".

On page 11, in line 21, after the word "them" insert the words "for their personal use, not to exceed one vehicle per person,".

On page 13, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

"(d) The provisions of section 12 of title 22, United States Code, together with the

provisions of regulations prescribed thereunder, are hereby made applicable to civilian 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 following: ", and until 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:

"Enlisted men entitled to receive allowances for quarters or subsistence shall continue, while their permanent stations remain unchanged, to receive such allowances while sick in hospital or absent from their permanent-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. Enlisted personnel not receiving allowances for subsistence shall be entitled to commutation in lieu of rations while on furlough or authorized leave or when authorized to mess separately, under such regulations and at such rates as may be prescribed by the head of the executive department concerned."

"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 (37 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 members of the Reserve components thereof and the National Guard, while on active duty in the Federal service, when traveling under competent orders without troops, including travel from home to first station in connection with their appointment or call to active duty and from last station to home in connection with relief from active duty or discharge not the result of their own misconduct, shall receive a mileage allowance at the rate of 8 cents per mile, distance to be computed by the shortest usually traveled route and existing laws providing for the issue of transportation requests to officers of the Army traveling under competent orders, and for deduction to be made from mileage accounts when transportation is furnished by the United States, are hereby made applicable to all the services mentioned in the title of this act: *Provided*, That the head of the executive department concerned may, in his discretion, direct that, in lieu of mileage, actual and necessary expenses shall be allowed to officers traveling on official business and away from their designated posts of duty, without regard to the length of time away from such posts. Actual expenses only shall be paid for travel under orders in Alaska and outside the limits of the United States in North America."

"Sec. 203. The second paragraph of section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 is amended to read as follows:

"Unless otherwise expressly provided by law, no officer of the services mentioned in the title of this act shall be allowed or paid any sum in excess of expenses actually incurred for subsistence while traveling on duty away from his designated post of duty, nor any sum for such expenses actually incurred in excess of \$8 per day. The heads of the executive departments concerned are authorized to prescribe per diem rates of allowance, not exceeding \$7, in lieu of subsistence to officers traveling on official business and away from their designated posts of duty without regard to the length of time away from such posts. Officers, midshipmen, and cadets of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard when absent from a vessel or designated post of duty while assigned to shore-patrol duty may be paid their actual

expenses, and naval personnel on duty with or under training for the Naval Air Transport Service and away from their permanent stations may be paid their actual expenses, or per diem in lieu thereof, at rates not exceeding those prescribed for naval officers in a travel status, without in either case the issuance of orders for specific travel: *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 Nurse Corps) of the services mentioned in the title of this act, and of the legally constituted Reserves of said services while on active duty, and of the National Guard while in Federal service, or while participating in exercises, or performing duties under sections 92, 94, 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 traveling 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 President, the heads of the departments concerned may authorize the payment to members of the services mentioned in the title of this act on duty outside continental United States or in Alaska, whether or not in a travel status, of actual and necessary expenses or per diem in lieu thereof, considering all elements of cost of living, including cost of quarters, subsistence, and other necessary incidental expenses."

"Sec. 204. Section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 is amended by inserting between the fourth and fifth 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 may be paid, in advance or otherwise, a money allowance of 3 cents per mile in lieu of transportation, regardless of the mode of travel; (2) applicants for enlistment (including rejected applicants) in such services may be furnished or reimbursed for transportation and subsistence incident to recruitment of such personnel; and (3) insane patients may be furnished transportation and subsistence from military hospitals to other hospitals or their homes."

"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, drayage, temporary storage, and unpacking) of baggage and household goods and effects, or reimbursement therefor, as authorized by regulations prescribed by the heads of the department concerned, which shall be uniform for the services mentioned and shall be approved by 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 the personnel of all the services mentioned in the title of this act shall have the benefit of all existing laws applying to the Army and Marine Corps 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.

ACCEPTANCE BY THE TREASURY OF DEPOSITS OF PUBLIC MONEYS FROM THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2348) authorizing the continuance of the acceptance by the Treasury of deposits of public moneys from the Philippine Islands.

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

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I see no justification for the United States to continue indefinitely acting as depository for a foreign government; therefore I object.

RETURN OF CERTAIN SECURITIES TO THE PHILIPPINE COMMONWEALTH GOVERNMENT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2210) providing for the return of certain securities to the Philippine Commonwealth Government.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to return to the Philippine Commonwealth Government certain securities in the principal amount of \$6,269,750, which securities were deposited with the Government of the United States and now in the custody of the Treasurer of the United States, in accordance with Commonwealth Act No. 282, approved June 3, 1938, as security to the United States against the loss, damage, or destruction of military supplies and equipment made available by the United States for the use of the armed forces of the Philippine Commonwealth Government.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "return" and insert "transfer and deliver", and strike out "Philippine Commonwealth Government" and insert "Republic of the Philippines."

Page 1, line 8, after the word "States", insert "by the Philippine Commonwealth Government."

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, reserving the right to object, only to point out that the committee report does not comply with the rules of the House by showing wherein this bill amends existing law. It is only because of the urgency of the law and the imminence of adjournment that we waive the requirement that they comply with the rules, and I bring this up now so that the committee staff may take notice of it and realize their oversight.

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 the Senate 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 Senate bill, as follows:

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

"(c) All of the provisions of this title shall be subject to the requirement that, to the fullest extent practicable, the Commission shall require that the lost or damaged property be rebuilt, replaced, or repaired before payments of money are actually made to claimants under this title: *Provided*, That if the Commission determines it is impossible for any reason beyond the control of the claimant, or is impractical to rebuild, replace, or repair the lost or damaged property, the Commission may make payment to the claimant without making said requirement: *Provided, however*, That as a condition to the making of such payment, the Commission shall require that the whole of such payment shall be reinvested in such manner as will further the rehabilitation or economic development of the Philippines: *And provided further*, That nothing in this subsection shall preclude the partial payment of claims as the rebuilding, replacing, or repairing of the property progresses."

Sec. 2. Section 105 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 105. Not later than 6 months after its organization, and every 6 months thereafter, the Commission shall make a report to the Congress concerning operations under this title."

Sec. 3. Section 201 of such act is amended on page 8, lines 12 and 17, after the word "Philippines", by addition of the following "(Republic of the Philippines)".

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, Mont., 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 proposed 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 repetition 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 organized and existing under the laws

of the State of Montana, the following tracts of public lands, to wit:

Thirty-seven and twenty-six one hundredths acres of land, to be used for industrial and recreational purposes, said land being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the north right-of-way line of United States Highway Nos. 10 and 12, said point being north forty-two degrees forty-four minutes west a distance of nine hundred and seventy-one and one-tenth feet from the section corner of sections 4 and 5, township 7 north, range 47 east, and sections 32 and 33, township 8 north, range 47 east; thence north sixty degrees fifteen minutes west a distance of one thousand five hundred and sixty-six and twelve one-hundredths feet more or less to the south right-of-way line of the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad station 3209 plus 88.5; thence north forty-seven degrees sixteen minutes east five hundred and eighty-eight and five-tenths feet along the south right-of-way line; thence north forty-two degrees forty-four minutes west a distance of one hundred and fifty feet along the right-of-way jog at station 3204 plus 00; thence north forty-seven degrees sixteen minutes east along the south right-of-way line a distance of six hundred feet to station 3198 plus 00; thence south forty-two degrees forty-four minutes east a distance of fifty feet; thence north forty-seven degrees sixteen minutes east along the south right-of-way line a distance of one thousand one hundred and five and eight one-hundredths feet more or less to the intersection of the south right-of-way line and the line between A P No. 1 and A P No. 2 south thirty-two; thence south twenty degrees thirty minutes east a distance of one hundred and thirty-six and twenty-seven one-hundredths feet more or less to A P No. 1 south thirty-two; thence south fifty-three degrees forty minutes east a distance of seventy-five and twenty-two one-hundredths feet more or less to a point three hundred and fifty feet at right angles to the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad; thence south forty-seven degrees sixteen minutes west a distance of one thousand and sixty-seven and seventy-nine one-hundredths feet; thence south forty-two degrees forty-four minutes east a distance of one thousand one hundred and twenty-four and six-tenths feet more or less to a point on the north right-of-way of United States Highway Nos. 10 and 12; thence along the arc of a circular curve (radius one thousand nine hundred and seventy feet through an angle of ten degrees fifty-one and five-tenths minutes) a distance of three hundred and seventy-three and four-tenths feet, more or less, to the point of curve (highway station 207 plus 73.2); thence south twenty-four degrees fifty minutes west a distance of three hundred and ninety-one and eight-tenths feet, more or less, to the point of beginning: *Provided*, That a strip of land fifty feet in width will remain open and be used as a road, the center line of said road being Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad station 3198 plus 25 and bearing south forty-two degrees forty-four minutes east to United States Highway Nos. 10 and 12.

Twenty-five and three-tenths acres of land, to be used as a museum site, said land being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the south side of the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad, said point being three hundred and fifty feet from the center line of the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad measured at right angles to the tract at Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad station 3198 plus 00; thence south forty-two degrees forty-four minutes east a distance of one thousand one hundred and twenty-four and six-tenths feet, more or less, to the north right-of-way line

of United States Highway Nos. 10 and 12; thence along the arc of a circular curve of radius one thousand nine hundred and seventy feet through an angle of ten degrees forty-six minutes to a point on the west boundary of tract C and the north right-of-way line of United States Highway Nos. 10 and 12; thence north sixteen degrees fifty minutes east along the west line of tract C a distance of seven hundred and ninety-seven and seven-tenths feet, more or less, to A P No. 5 of tract C; thence north sixty-eight degrees east a distance of three hundred and thirty-nine and nine-tenths to A P No. 6; thence south thirty-five degrees fifty-five minutes east along the boundary of tract C a distance of three hundred and sixty-four and two-tenths feet, more or less, to the north right-of-way line of United States Highway Nos. 10 and 12; thence north sixty-five degrees eight one-hundredths minute east along said right-of-way line a distance of one hundred and fifty-five and one-tenth feet, more or less, to the west boundary of tract B; thence north thirty-six degrees twenty-two minutes west along the boundary of tract B a distance of three hundred and forty-one and seven-tenths feet, more or less, to the northwest corner of tract B; thence north eighty degrees west a distance of one hundred and fifty-three and forty-four one-hundredths feet to A P No. 5 south thirty-three F. K. M. R.; thence north sixty degrees west a distance of four hundred and thirty-five and six-tenths feet; thence north fifty-three degrees forty minutes west a distance of three hundred and fifty-nine and six one-hundredths feet; thence south forty-seven degrees sixteen minutes west a distance of one thousand and sixty-seven and seventy-nine one-hundredths feet, more or less, to the point of beginning.

Said patent shall be issued upon the express condition that the city of Miles City shall use said tracts of land for industrial and recreational purposes and as a museum site, respectively, for the benefit of the citizens of that city: *Provided*, That whenever said lands shall cease to be used by said city for the purposes aforesaid or their sale or conveyance is attempted, then, and in that event, title to such lands and the whole thereof shall revert to the United States: *Provided further*, That such patent shall contain a reservation to the United States of all gas, oil, coal, and other mineral deposits as may be found in such lands and the right to the use of the lands for extracting and removing the same.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 5, line 5, delete the words "one-hundredths minute" and insert "minutes."

Page 5, line 22, after the word "use", insert "or cause to be used."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read the following committee amendment:

Page 6, line 2, after the word "used", insert "or cause to be used."

The committee amendment was rejected.

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.

EAST ST. LOUIS, ILL., TOLL BRIDGE

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6953) 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 Delmar Boulevard and Cole Avenue in the city of St. Louis, Mo., and a point opposite thereto in the city of East St. Louis, Ill.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is the first time I knew that this bill was to be brought up. I suggest that the gentleman withdraw it for the present until I have a chance to look it over.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I withdraw it for the present, Mr. Speaker.

COMPENSATION FOR INJURY, DEATH, OR DETENTION OF EMPLOYEES OF CONTRACTORS WITH THE UNITED STATES OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1561) 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, a similar House bill having just passed on the Consent Calendar.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes," approved December 2, 1942 (42 U. S. C. 1701), 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 23, 1943 (57 Stat. 626), upon changing the final period to a semicolon, the following: "and in such cases benefits for detention shall accrue from January 1, 1942, unless the beginning of absence occurred upon a later date in which event benefits shall accrue from such later date, and for the period of such absence shall be 100 percent of the average weekly wages, determined as herein provided: *And provided further,* That compensation for disability under this title (except under allowance for scheduled losses of members or functions of the body, within the purview of section 102 (a) shall not be paid in any case in respect to any period of time during which benefits for detention may accrue under this title in the same case, and should a person entitled to benefits for detention also be entitled to workmen's compensation or similar benefits under any other law, agreement, or plan (except allowances for scheduled losses of members or functions of the body), where such other benefits are paid or to be paid directly or indirectly by the United States, the amount thereof accruing as to the period of absence shall be taken into account and the benefits credited to the account of the detained person reduced accordingly: *And provided further,* That where through mistake of fact, absence of proof of death, or error through lack of adequate information or otherwise, payments as for detention have in any case been erroneously made or credited, any resulting overpayment of detention benefits (the recovery of which is not waived as otherwise provided for in this section) shall be recouped by the Commission in such

manner as it shall determine from any unpaid accruals to the account of the detained person, and if such accruals are insufficient for such purpose, then from any allowance of compensation for injury or death in the same case (whether under this title or under any other law, agreement, or plan, if the United States pays, or is obligated to pay, such benefits, directly or indirectly), but only to the extent of the amount of such compensation benefits payable for the particular period of such overpayment, and in cases of erroneous payments of compensation for injury or death, made through mistake of fact, whether under this title or under any other law, agreement, or plan (if the United States is obligated to pay such compensation, directly or indirectly), the Commission is authorized to recoup from any unpaid benefits for detention, the amount of any overpayment thus arising; and any amounts recovered under this section shall be covered into such compensation fund, and for the foregoing purposes the Commission shall have a right of lien, intervention, and recovery in any claim or proceeding for compensation."

SEC. 2. The provisions of section 1 of this act shall apply in all cases coming within the purview of section 101 (b) of such act of December 2, 1942, and shall be applied retrospectively to January 1, 1942; and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is authorized to review any case affected by such provisions, and to make the adjustment of benefits which they require. In cases in which claims for benefits under such section 101 (b) have been adjudicated, and the detained person has died since such adjudication, any amounts found to be due upon such review shall be paid to his legal representative.

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.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings by which the bill H. R. 6997 was passed were vacated and the bill was laid on the table.

CASTLE CLINTON NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5125) to establish the Castle Clinton National Monument, in the city of New York, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice in the report of the Attorney General that he disagrees with some parts of the bill. Has that been corrected?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes; that was corrected by an amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is the gentleman going to offer that amendment?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes. Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

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 is authorized to accept, on behalf of the United States, title to the site, comprising approximately 1 acre and situated in Battery Park, New York City, of the

historic structure known as Castle Clinton, together with such structure and any other improvement on or appurtenant to such site. The title to land, interests in land, and structures to be acquired pursuant to this act shall be acquired subject to the approval of the Secretary. When title to such property is vested in the United States, it shall constitute the Castle Clinton National Monument.

SEC. 2. The administration, protection, and development of the Castle Clinton National Monument shall be under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, subject to the provisions of the act entitled "An act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1916, as amended.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after the period, strike out the balance of the line down to and including all of line 1 on page 2.

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.

ALLEGHENY RIVER TOLL BRIDGE

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7030) granting the consent of Congress to 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 Burrel Township in Westmoreland County in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Allegheny River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near the Borough of Tarentum, and in the county of Allegheny, and a point near the boundary of the city of New Kensington and Lower Burrel 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 23, 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 under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of the bridge and its approaches, 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 completion thereof. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls. An accurate record of the costs of the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall

be available for the information of all persons interested.

Sec. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

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.

LAWRENCEBURG (IND.) TOLL BRIDGE

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6899) to authorize the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge, or a free bridge, across the Ohio River at or near Lawrenceburg, Dearborn County, Ind.

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 in order to promote interstate commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for the military and other purposes, the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Ohio River at a point suitable to the interest of navigation at or near Lawrenceburg, Dearborn County, Ind., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

Sec. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission all such rights and powers to enter upon land and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, maintenance, and operation 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 according to the laws of such State and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

Sec. 3. The Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission is hereby authorized to fix and charge toll for transit over such bridge, and the rate of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

Sec. 4. In fixing the rates of toll to be charged for the use of such bridge, the same shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of such bridge and its approaches, including interest at a rate of not to exceed 5 percent per annum and reasonable financing cost, as soon as possible, under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 30 years from the completion thereof. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of toll. An accurate record of the cost of the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

Sec. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

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.

EAST ST. LOUIS, ILL., TOLL BRIDGE

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6953) 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 Delmar Boulevard and Cole Avenue in the city of St. Louis, Mo., and a point opposite thereto in the city of East St. Louis, Ill.

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

There being 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 city of East St. Louis, Ill., its successors and assigns, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near a point between Delmar Boulevard and Cole Avenue in the city of St. Louis, Mo., and a point opposite thereto in the city of East St. Louis, Ill., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

Sec. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the city of East St. Louis, Ill., its successors and assigns, all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, maintenance, and operation 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 according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

Sec. 3. The said city of East St. Louis, Ill., its successors and assigns, is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

Sec. 4. In fixing the rates of toll to be charged for the use of such bridge the same shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of such bridge and its approaches, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible, under reasonable charges, but within a period not to exceed 30 years from the completion thereof. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operation of the bridge and its approaches under economical management. An accurate record of the cost of the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected

shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

Sec. 5. 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 14, strike out the comma, insert a period, and strike out the balance of the line down to and including the word "management" 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 Delmar 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 the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State of Rhode Island to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Sakonnet River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, between the towns of Tiverton and Portsmouth in Newport County, R. I., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

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.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBSION 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 and include an editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune headed "Republican Program."

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 Eliot, 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 commencement address delivered by Alexander Brin, of Boston. I am informed by the Public Printer that it will cost \$135, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

RALEIGH B. DIAMOND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2132) for the relief of Raleigh B. Diamond.

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.

QUALITY ELECTRIC CO., LTD.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4592) for the relief of the Quality Electric Co., Ltd.

Mr. MCGREGOR. 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.

DIXIE MARGARINE CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5279) for the relief of the Dixie Margarine Co., a Tennessee company, of Memphis, Tenn.

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.

BAXTER CAMPBELL AND GLESTIE CAMPBELL JONES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1268) for the relief of Baxter Campbell and Glestie Campbell Jones.

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 Iowa? There was no objection.

MARIE VALIDA ANTONIA MICHAUD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1063) for the relief of Marie Valida Antonia Michaud.

Mr. MCGREGOR. 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 NORWOOD

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. 6321) 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 OLSEN, 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 to pay the sum of \$3,000 to the legal guardian of Robert Olsen, a minor, of Brooklyn, N. Y., for personal injury by reason of the negligent driving of an Army truck which resulted in certain injuries: *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 amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "\$3,000" and insert "\$140."

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.

MR. AND MRS. J. W. WILLIAMS, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1459) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. W. Williams, Jr.

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 \$5,000 to Mr. and Mrs. 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 \$98.05. 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 the result of an accident in Alexandria, La., on September 20, 1941, 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. 3210) 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:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$246.64" and insert "\$218.60."

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.

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 be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harry D. Koons, of York, Pa., 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, 1943: *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 "\$1,433" and insert "\$646.18."

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.

MARTIN A. TUCKER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3855) for the relief of Martin A. Tucker and Emma M. Tucker.

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 Martin A. Tucker, Kernersville, N. C., the sum of \$4,700, and to Emma M. Tucker, Kernersville, N. C., wife of the said Martin A. Tucker, the sum of \$2,500. Such sums represent damages sustained and expenses incurred by the said Martin A. Tucker and Emma M. Tucker as a result of the partial destruction of their home and injuries to the said Emma M. Tucker, on August 2, 1944, when a vehicle owned by the Army of the United States and operated by one Pvt. Harold M. Murphy crashed into the front of the home of the said Martin A. Tucker and Emma M. Tucker at Kernersville, N. 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.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause of said bill and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"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 Martin A. Tucker and Emma M. Tucker, wife of the said Martin A. Tucker, both of Kernersville, N. C., the sum of \$7,200, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage sustained by said Martin A. Tucker and Emma M. Tucker and for personal injuries sustained by Emma M. Tucker and for medical and hospital expenses incurred by reason thereof, all resulting from an accident which occurred on August 2, 1944, when an Army vehicle operated by one Pvt. Harold M. Murphy crashed into the front of the home of the said Martin A. Tucker and Emma M. Tucker at Kernersville, N. 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 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.

PITTSBURGH DUBOIS CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4815) for the relief of Pittsburgh DuBois Co.

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 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 and Transport Co. against the United States, with interest, as described and in the manner set out in section 2 hereof, which claims arise out of the construction by it of the naval fuel oil station and storage facilities at Pearl Harbor, T. of H., and the fuel oil and other petroleum products furnished by it to the United States of America.

Sec. 2. The Court of Claims is hereby directed to determine and render judgment for

the actual cost to the said Pan American Petroleum and Transport Co. of constructing of the storage facilities at Pearl Harbor and the actual cost to it of the 1,453,275 barrels of fuel oil furnished and placed in such storage, for which said work and for which said fuel oil and petroleum products it has not been paid, but of which the Government has received the use and benefit, all pursuant to contracts dated April 25 and December 11, 1922, between it and the United States of America, and which said work was duly performed and said fuel oil furnished pursuant to the terms and conditions of the contracts aforesaid.

Sec. 3. Any suit brought under the provision of this act shall be instituted within 1 year from the date of the approval hereof, and the court shall consider as evidence in such suit for the purpose of determining the actual cost to the Pan American Petroleum and 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 heretofore taken by either party in the case of United States of America against the Pan American Petroleum et al., in the District Court for the Southern District of California, and the findings of fact and conclusions of law and the decree of the court in said case entered July 11, 1925.

Sec. 4. From any decision or judgment rendered in any suit presented under the authority of this act, a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the United States may be applied for by either party thereto as is provided by law in other cases.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, after the name "States", strike out "with interest."

Page 2, line 17, after the word "aforesaid", strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof: "*Provided, however,* That in determining the amount of any such judgment, the Court of Claims is authorized and directed to deduct from the costs found to have been actually incurred by the claimant herein any amounts which have been repaid to the claimant by any individual by reason of any contract or otherwise."

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, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MATERIALS HANDLING MACHINERY CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4860) 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, the sum of \$3,326.10 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-2789-tc-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 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. CECILE W. MCAFEE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5287) for the relief of Mrs. Cecile W. McAfee, Sarah McAfee, and Haven H. McAfee.

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 \$5,000 to Mrs. Cecile W. McAfee; to Sarah McAfee, \$1,000; and to Haven H. McAfee, the sum of \$5,000, in full settlement of all claims of each of said named persons against the United States for damages sustained by them on May 11, 1944, while the said Haven H. McAfee, accompanied by his wife, the said Mrs. Cecile W. McAfee, and his daughter, the said Sarah McAfee, was driving his 1937 Ford DeLuxe Tudor sedan in which his wife and said daughter were riding with him, west on United States Highway No. 70, North, approximately 14 miles east of Lebanon, Tenn., when his Ford automobile was run into by a United States Army truck which was operated carelessly, negligently, and unlawfully and at a high and dangerous rate of speed by a United States soldier in line of his duty on, over, and from a narrow side road which ran into the paved, heavily traveled United States Highway No. 70, North, from the south and which said Army truck while thus negligently and unlawfully operated was run into and against the left side of the automobile of the said Haven H. McAfee with such force and violence that a large steel hook fastened to the front bumper of the said Army truck was rammed through the left side of the McAfee car and it was dragged for a distance of 75 feet down Highway No. 70 toward Lebanon, until the Ford car in which the McAfees were riding was rammed into the curbing of a bridge, when said hook was jerked from said automobile and the Army truck ran on 50 feet farther, as a result of which said collision Mrs. Cecile W. McAfee and Sarah McAfee were thrown with great violence from said Ford automobile to the pavement of the highway and the humerus of Mrs. McAfee's left arm was shattered, crushed, and broken, and she was otherwise cut, bruised, and wounded throughout her entire head, body, legs, and arms; Sarah McAfee was hurt, bruised, cut, and wounded throughout her entire head, body, legs, and arms; Haven H. McAfee was cut, bruised, and wounded in the head, legs, body, and arms; and his Ford automobile totally destroyed; and he was forced to and did pay out the sum of \$657.30 for the treatment and hospitalization of his said wife and daughter and sustained a loss of \$1,119.70 on account of the damage to his automobile and the loss of the use of said automobile and was and will hereafter be deprived of the aid of his said wife: *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 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, after the words "sum of", strike out the remainder of the bill down to the colon in line 12, page 3. Insert in lieu

thereof: "\$3,500 to Mrs. Cecil W. McAfee; to pay the sum of \$1,200 to Haven H. McAfee, and to pay the sum of \$200 to the legal guardian of Sarah McAfee, a minor, all of Sevierville, Tenn., in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of damages sustained by them as a result of a collision which occurred on May 11, 1944, on United States Highway No. 70-N, near Rome, Tenn., when the automobile in which they were riding was struck by an Army truck."

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.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cecile W. McAfee, the legal guardian of Sarah McAfee, a minor, and Haven H. McAfee."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WATSON AIRFOTOS, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5847) for the relief of Watson Airfotos, Inc.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That Watson Airfotos, Inc., of Long Beach, Calif., is relieved of all liability to the United States in the principal sum of \$4,007.06, plus any accrued interest. Such sum represents an indebtedness claimed by the United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, against the said Watson Airfotos, Inc., by reason of the latter's default in 1941 in the performance of a contract with the United States dated June 8, 1940, for an aerial survey of certain areas in the State of California. The indebtedness includes an item of \$815.21, which represents the excess cost over the original contract price of procuring performance of such contract by other parties, and an item of \$3,191.85, which represents liquidated damages claimed for delay in performance of such contracts. The breach of contract was caused by the inability of Watson Airfotos Inc., to obtain qualified pilots for the work under imminent war conditions and by the absence of the president of Watson Airfotos, Inc., Col. Harry B. Watson, on military leave for service in the United States Army. Any surety company acting as surety on a performance bond given to secure such contract is also relieved of liability to the United States to the same extent as Watson Airfotos, Inc.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$4,007.06" and insert "\$3,690."

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. MILLICENT MOORE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5848) for the relief of Mrs. Millicent Moore.

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. Millicent Moore, of Hollywood, Calif., the sum of \$2,464.60. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Millicent Moore against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by her, on April 14, 1942, when an automobile in which she was a passenger

was struck by a United States Army vehicle at the intersection of Paramount Boulevard and Imperial Highway, Downey, Calif. 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. FUKU KUROKAWA THURN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6376) for the relief of Mrs. Fuku Kurokawa Thurn.

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 arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond, if any, in the case of Mrs. Fuku Kurokawa Thurn, and is directed not to issue any further such warrants or orders in her case insofar as any further warrants or orders are based upon the same grounds as the warrants or orders required by this act to be canceled. For the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the said Mrs. Fuku Kurokawa Thurn shall be considered to have been lawfully admitted at the time of her last entry.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That notwithstanding section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 1140; 8 U. S. C. 703, 57 Stat. 600), and section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 161-162; 50 Stat. 165; 46 Stat. 581; 8 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, 1937, 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, 1920 Dillingham Boulevard, Honolulu 12, T. H., the sum of \$1,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries suffered by his son, Rudolph K. Bartels, Jr., a minor, who was seriously burned when two bombers of the United States Army crashed in the Kalihi kai district of the city and county of Honolulu, T. H., on June 8, 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:

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, T. H., the sum of \$500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by the said Rudolph K. Bartels, Jr., a minor, as a result of the crash of an Army airplane in the Kalihi-Kai district of the city and county of Honolulu, T. H., 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.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Rudolph K. Bartels, Jr., a minor."

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 is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Joseph A. Brown, 138 North First Street, Pleasantville, N. J., the sum of \$5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Joseph A. Brown against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained 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 the balance of line 6, all of lines 7, 8, 9, and 10, and on page 2, strike out lines 1 and 2, and all of line 3, down to and including the word "New Jersey" and insert "\$5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for 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 25, 1945, when he was struck by an Army vehicle: *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.

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 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, 2334 Waiomao Street, the sum of \$650, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of property damage caused by the United States engineers on April 23, 1943, while blasting in a quarry adjacent to this property: *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.

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 payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injury sustained by the said Raphael Elder, on April 15, 1943, when the automobile in which he was a passenger was in collision with an Army vehicle in the city of Avon Park, 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 amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$3,000."

Page 1, line 8, strike out the word "injury" and all of lines 9 and 10, down to and including the word "passenger" and insert "injuries and loss of earnings sustained and medical and hospital expenses incurred by the said Raphael Elder as the result of an accident which occurred on April 15, 1943, when the automobile operated by him."

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.

WARREN M. MILLER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5288) for the relief of Warren M. Miller.

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 to the United States amounts 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 compensation from funds appropriated for the Coast and Geodetic Survey. Any amounts heretofore credited to him or refunded to the United States by him on account of such unauthorized payment to him shall be repaid to him out of any money available for the payment of salaries of employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any disbursing officer of the United States the payment of such amounts for such 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 death of Mrs. Hiram H. Wilson, who died February 10, 1945, and personal injury sustained by the said Hiram H. Wilson, on February 10, 1945, when the automobile in which they were passengers 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 "\$5,200."

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 Bobbie Glenn Beddingfield in the enlisted men's swimming pool at Pyote Army air base, and to compensate them properly for funeral expense.

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 1 on page 2 down to and including the word "expense" and insert "\$2,400, in full settlement of all claims against the United States

for damages sustained by them as a result of the death by drowning of their minor son, Bobbie Glenn Beddingfield, in the enlisted men's swimming pool at the Pyote Army Air Base, Pyote, Tex., on December 23, 1945, and for the expenses incurred in connection with the burial of said minor: *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.

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:

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 L. Brett, the sum of \$2,500 in monthly installments of \$100 per month commencing on the first day of the calendar month subsequent to the enactment of this act and in addition the sum of \$86.75 to cover medical and hospital expenses incurred. Such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained on May 14, 1943, when a United States Army truck struck and knocked down Thomas L. Brett at the intersection of Fourth Street and Exchange Avenue, in Santa Rosa, Sonoma County, Calif.: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated by this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, 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, strike out all of lines 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, and on page 2, lines 1, 2, 3, 4, and down to and including the word "California" in line 5, and insert "of Santa Rosa, Calif., the sum of \$2,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by him on May 14, 1943, when he was struck by a United States Army truck at the intersection of Fourth Street and Exchange Avenue, Santa Rosa, Sonoma County, Calif."

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.

CAESAR HENRY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6399) for the relief of Caesar Henry.

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 Caesar Henry, of Crowley, La., the sum of \$10,000. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Caesar Henry against the United States for personal injuries, pain and suffering, and loss of present, past, and future earnings sustained as the result of a collision on January 26, 1944, on United States Highway No. 165, near Kinder, La., involving the truck in which he was a passenger and a United States Army 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.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out "Caesar" and insert in lieu thereof "Caesar."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$2,000."

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LARCADE to the committee amendment: Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$2,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,000."

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, this bill was originally for \$20,000. The claim results from personal injury arising through the negligence of an Army truck driver. The man was totally and permanently disabled. Congress has established the precedent of awarding \$5,000 in cases of this kind. The War Department admits liability. I hope the House will follow its usual custom in allowing \$5,000 in similar cases.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was 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 for the relief of Caesar Henry."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THADDEUS C. KNIGHT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 528) for the relief of Thaddeus C. Knight.

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

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

There was no objection.

ACQUISITION BY UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1640) to provide for the acquisition by the United States of certain real property in the District of Columbia.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to acquire on behalf of the United States, by purchase or otherwise, the tract of land consisting of parcels 251/42 and 251/64 in the District of Columbia, together with the improvements thereon, such tract fronting on Chesapeake Street, Second Street, and Nichols Avenue SW., and the premises being known as 199 Chesapeake Street SW., in order to eliminate hazards to life and property resulting from frequent flights directly over the dwelling house upon such property by aircraft taking off from and landing at Bolling Field. Any appropriation available to the War Department for the acquisition of real property shall be available for carrying out the provisions of this act.

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.

JESSE A. LOTT

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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:

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 Raymond Crosby, of Roachdale, Ind., the sum of \$411.79, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for payment to the postmaster at Roachdale, Ind., by said Raymond Crosby for the purchase of War Savings stamps in 1918, which said amount was embezzled by the said postmaster, and said War Savings stamps were never delivered to said Raymond Crosby: *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.

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:

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 Walter S. Faulkner, of Lebanon, Tenn., the sum of \$1,576, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for (1) compensation for personal injuries and property damage sustained by him when his personally owned automobile which he was driving was struck by a United States Army truck near Martha, Tenn., on September 13, 1943, and (2) for reimbursement of medical and other ex-

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 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.

CROSBY YACHT BUILDING & STORAGE CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1880) 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 \$2,238.27, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for compensation for work performed by it in the removal of certain boats from temporary shelters and in the removal of such shelters, pursuant to an agreement entered into by such company with the Engineer Amphibian Command, Camp Edwards, Mass., on or about July 2, 1942: *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 sustained, and the loss of his wife, as a result of a collision on or about the 4th of February 1944, in which the car driven by Edward A. Mason collided with a United States Army truck on United States Highway 99, near Grants Pass, Ore.: *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, after the dollar sign strike out the bill down to the colon in line 1,

page 2. Insert in lieu thereof "12,563.27, in full settlement 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 incident to her burial, all resulting from an accident involving an Army vehicle which occurred on February 4, 1944, on United States Highway No. 99, near Grants Pass, Ore."

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 is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Minnie P. Shorey, Tampa, Fla., 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 at Drew Field Tampa, Fla., 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 3, 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.

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, 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 on Route No. 5, 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 con-

trary 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 permanent physical injuries, medical expenses, and working time lost as a result of a collision on May 31, 1943, when the car in which they were riding was struck by an 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.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "of", 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 Islip, Suffolk County, N. Y., the sum of \$10,000 in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained as a result of an accident involving an Army vehicle, occurring on March 18, 1944, on North King Street, in Honolulu, T. H.: *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 amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$6,299.25."

Page 1, line 8, after the word "injuries", insert "and loss of earnings."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "1944" and insert "1945."

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, and a motion to reconsider 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. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Grace A. Phillips against the United States on account of the death, on February 7, 1943, of her husband, Arthur D. Phillips, as the result of injuries sustained by him, February 6, 1943, on Pennington Avenue (also known as Henry Ford Avenue), Los Angeles, 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 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 "\$15,000" and insert "\$3,310.48."

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.

SECOND LT. FRANCIS W. ANDERSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5851) for the relief of Second Lt. Francis W. Anderson.

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 Second Lt. Francis W. Anderson, United States Army, the sum of \$3E.66. Such sum represents the amount which the Office of Price Administration determined that the said Second Lt. Francis W. Anderson had been overcharged for rent of room 13A of building 13, Davis Court, Pemberton, N. J., during the period from March 24, 1945, to May 18, 1945. When such determination was made, the said Second Lt. Francis W. Anderson had departed for parts unknown and, efforts to locate him having failed, the amount of such overcharge was paid, pursuant to regulations governing such cases, by the landlord to the Treasurer of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 6, after the words "United States", insert "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.

LIPPERT BROS.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6012) for the relief of Lippert Bros.

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 Lippert Bros., general contractors, Oklahoma City, Okla., the sum of \$15,456.75. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Lippert Bros. against the United States arising out of the construction of Federal Works Agency project No. La 16-102-N: *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 "\$15,456.75" and insert "\$12,000."

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.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF SAMUEL ROSCOE THOMPSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6161) for the relief of the legal guardian of Samuel Roscoe 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, to the legal guardian of Samuel Roscoe Thompson, a minor, of Leesville, La., the sum of \$5,000, the said sum to be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by Samuel Roscoe Thompson on January 25, 1944, at which time the minor was struck down and run over by the lead truck of an Army convoy as he alighted from a school bus, in the neighborhood of the Camp Polk, La., Army Reservation: *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 agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount ap-

propriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, 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, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$597."

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.

ALBERT WHILDEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5093) 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 towing 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 if suit is instituted within 1 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.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "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 \$4,500 to Albert Whilden, of Millville, N. J., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages sustained by him as the result of an accident which occurred on the southeast corner of High and Main Streets, in Millville, N. J., on June 27, 1945, when he was struck by a piece of equipment which had fallen from an Army airplane: *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.

MRS. IVAN B. HOFMAN

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

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 \$114, to Mrs. Ivan B. Hofman, of Gulfport, Miss., in full settlement of all claims against the United States, as reimbursement for the said sum for money lost through burglary at the Gulfport, Miss., office of Internal Revenue, for which she was held accountable, on April 19, 1946: *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.

FORWARD COLUMBUS FUND

The Clerk called the bill (S. 357) for the relief of the Forward Columbus Fund, of Columbus, Nebr.

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.

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 or claims of William S. Brown, of Greenville, S. C., for any losses sustained under contracts W-38-040Q (SC IV)-4, W-38-040Q (SC IV)-10, W-38-040Q (SC IV)-14, W-38-040Q (SC IV)-29, W-2416Q (SC IV)-34, W-38-040Q (SC IV)-3, W-38-040Q (SC IV)-9, W-38-040Q (SC IV)-13, and W-38-040Q (SC IV)-30: *Provided,* That such action may be brought in the Court of Claims within 1 year of the date of the approval of this act, with right of appellate review as in other cases.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MADDEN: Page 1, line 3, after the word "the", strike out the words "Court of Claims" and insert in lieu thereof the words "United States District Court for the Western District of South Carolina."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of South Carolina to hear, determine and render judgment upon the claim of William S. Brown."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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 is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Duane N. Thompson, a minor, of Berkeley, Calif., the sum of \$3,753.70 in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by the said Duane N. Thompson, and for medical expenses incurred as a result of an accident which occurred when he was struck by a United States Government vehicle, at the intersection of Ninth Street and University Avenue, in Berkeley, Calif., on December 28, 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.

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 reimbursement of hospital, medical, and other expenses incurred by him and for any and all property damage sustained by him, as a result of an accident which occurred when the automobile which he was driving was struck by a United States Navy vehicle, at 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.

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 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: *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.

LESTER A. DESSEZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1731) 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, colonel, United States Marine Corps, the sum of \$808.95. Such sum is to be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for emergency travel of dependents (less a payment of \$47.03 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, 1941, to September 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, (1) to Desmark Wright, of Little Rock, Ark., the sum of \$2,325.09; to the estate of Alberta Wright, deceased, the sum of \$5,000; to the estate of Desmark Wright, Jr., deceased, the sum of \$2,000; to the estate of Harold Evans, deceased, the sum of \$2,000; to the legal guardian of Bobby Dennis Wright, a minor, the sum of \$500; and to the legal guardian of Irvin Lee Wright, a minor, the sum of \$750, in full settlement of all claims of each of the said named persons and estates against the United States on account of damages sustained by them as the result of the crash of an Army airplane near Adams Field, Little

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 8, 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 naval forces who was acting as an armed guard on a naval vessel, at the Willemette 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 any money in 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.

ROY M. DAVIDSON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2260) for the relief of Roy M. Davidson.

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 Roy M. Davidson, of Atlanta, Ga., who was suspended from active duty as an investigator for the Office of Price Administration, Atlanta regional office, during the period beginning on August 24, 1944, and ending on October 16, 1944, in contravention of the provisions of section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, a sum equal to the amount of compensation he would have received had he not been suspended, less the amount of any compensation which he may have received from the United States for any part of such period: *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.

Sec. 2. The Price Administrator of the Office of Price Administration is authorized and directed to restore to the credit of the said Roy M. Davidson the total amount of annual leave with which we was charged during the period of the above-described suspension.

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.

COL. S. V. CONSTANT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2369) for the relief of Col. S. V. Constant, General Staff Corps.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Col. S. V. Constant, General Staff Corps, the sum of \$1,179.27, public funds for which he is accountable, and which represent payments made under the act of March 26, 1934 (48 Stat. 466), which have been disallowed by the Comptroller General: *Provided*, That the payees thereunder shall not be held pecuniarily liable.

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 Yellow Cab Transit Co., of Oklahoma City, Okla., 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, Charles Marion Overcash, driver of claimant's vehicle, which occurred in a collision with a United States Army truck on United States Highway 66, near Hazlegreen, 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 his outstanding pioneer service and foresight in the field of American military aviation. The President may present such Medal of Honor to Mrs. Martin Fladoes, of Milwaukee, Wis., sister of the said William Lendrum Mitchell.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all 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 inscriptions, to be presented to 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 shall transmit the same to Mrs. Martin Fladoes, 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 \$3,228 to cover pension which would have been paid to her had her name not been dropped from the 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.

ACCEPTANCE OF CERTAIN FOREIGN DECORATIONS

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 387) granting permission to Thomas Parran, 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:

Resolved, etc., That Thomas Parran, Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, is authorized to accept and wear the decoration and diploma of the Ordre de la Sante Publique, bestowed by the Government of France; the Decoration of the Order of Carlos Finlay, bestowed by the Government of Cuba; and the Dr. Eduardo Liceaga Medal, bestowed by the Government of Mexico; and to accept the title of knight commander of the Orden al Merito, bestowed by the Government of Chile, and wear the decoration therefor; that Rolla E. Dyer, Assistant Surgeon General, Public Health Service, is authorized to accept and wear the decoration of the Order of Carlos Finlay, bestowed by the Government of Cuba; that Howard F. Smith, Assistant Surgeon General, Public Health Service, is authorized to accept and wear the Cross of Officer of the Order of a Million Elephants, bestowed by His Excellency the Governor General of French Indochina, and His Majesty the King of Luang-Prabang; that Herbert A. Spencer, medical director, Public Health Service, is authorized to accept the title of commander of the Order of the White Rose of Finland, bestowed by the President of the Republic of Finland, and wear the decoration therefor; that Vance B. Murray, medical director, Public Health Service, is authorized to accept the title of knight, first-class, of the Order of the White Rose of Finland, bestowed by the President of the Republic of Finland, and wear the decoration therefor; that Gilbert L. Dunnahoo, medical director, Public Health Service, be authorized to accept and wear the decoration of the Order of Carlos Finlay, bestowed by the Government of Cuba; the foregoing decorations and titles having been bestowed upon these officers by the respective governments in recognition of assistance rendered by them in matters relating to sanitation and health. The Department of State is hereby authorized to deliver to Thomas Parran, Rolla E. Dyer, Howard F. Smith, Herbert A. Spencer, Vance B. Murray, and Gilbert L. Dunnahoo, respectively, the above-mentioned decorations which have been bestowed on them.

The joint 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.

NICHOLAS SEVALJEVICK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1471) for the relief of Nicholas Sevaljevick, now known as Nicholas Hornacky.

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.

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:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers Chet Walker, who was a member of Company A, Eighth Regiment United States Infantry, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as a member of that organization on the 9th day of December 1941: *Provided,* That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of 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.

GEORGE N. COX, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2622) for the relief of George N. Cox, Jr.

Mr. MCGREGOR. 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.

AGRICULTURAL INSURANCE CO., AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6683) for the relief of Agricultural Insurance Co., and others.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, we have had no copy of this bill or the report on it. 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.

PETROL CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6112) for the relief of Petrol Corp.

Mr. MCGREGOR. 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.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 237]

Adams	Bates, Mass.	Bunker
Almond	Beckworth	Camp
Anderson, Calif.	Bell	Cannon, Fla.
Andrews, N. Y.	Bennet, N. Y.	Chenoweth
Baldwin, Md.	Boren	Clason
Barden	Boykin	Clements
Barrett, Pa.	Bradley, Mich.	Cochran
Barrett, Wyo.	Brooks	Coffee
Barry	Buckley	Cole, Kans.
Bates, Ky.	Buffett	Combs

Cooper	Hollifield	Peterson, Ga.
Courtney	Holmes, Mass.	Pfeifer
Cox	Hook	Ploeser
Cravens	Horan	Powell
Crawford	Izac	Priest
Curley	Johnson, Okla.	Reece, Tenn.
Daughton, Va.	Johnson, Tex.	Rizley
Davis	Kefauver	Robinson, Utah
Dawson	Kelly, Ill.	Robison, Ky.
Delaney	Kerr	Rockwell
John J.	Kilburn	Roe, N. Y.
D'Ewart	Kilday	Russell
Dingell	Kirwan	Sheridan
Domengeaux	LaFollette	Short
Dondero	Landis	Slaughter
Durham	LeCompte	Somers, N. Y.
Earthman	Luce	Sparkman
Engel, Mich.	Ludlow	Starkey
Ervin	McGehee	Stewart
Fallon	McKenzie	Stigler
Fellows	McMillan, S. C.	Stockman
Fernandez	Mahon	Sumner, Ill.
Gary	Maloney	Thomas, N. J.
Gathings	Mankin	Tolan
Geelan	Mansfield	Torrens
Gibson	Mont.	Traynor
Gillespie	Mansfield, Tex.	Vinson
Gossett	Marcantonio	Voorhis, Calif.
Granger	May	Wasielewski
Hall	Morrow	Welch
Edwin Arthur	Miller, Calif.	West
Halleck	Morrison	White
Hare	Norton	Wickersham
Harless, Ariz.	O'Konski	Winter
Hart	O'Toole	Wolfenden, Pa.
Hébert	Patrick	Wood
Hendricks	Paterson	
Hill	Peterson, Fla.	

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 to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. MONROE, and the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. MICHENER, 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 20, 1946, and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 19, 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 adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to commit.

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 arduously on this subject. It waives points of order.

We had to have a rather unusual 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 House to obtain a separate vote 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 to consume much time 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 dispose of this 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 anybody, 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 special 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 committee to especially apply to the House of Representatives. The committee has eliminated, for instance, the provision that each House Member shall be furnished 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 if 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 congressional 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 \$3,000 per annum to assist each legislator in defraying 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 fixes the annual salary \$12,000 instead of \$15,000, and makes absolutely legal, without question, the authority needed for the payment of \$3,000 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 take care 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 that when the \$2,500 expense item was enacted into law some Members were apprehensive about public reaction. There has been no public reaction about it except a favorable reaction.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I say to the gentleman, of course, my amendment eliminates that \$2,500 expense payment and substitutes a \$3,000 payment, or \$250 a month, to take care of our official expenses. If you pass the bill with a \$15,000 salary provision and no expense allowance, in actuality you will be receiving no more money than you are now. But the people will believe, that is, the average citizen will believe, you are getting a huge increase in salary, and that you are also receiving your expenses. They know it is the usual thing for all workers, including public officials, to be reimbursed for official expenses, and would rightfully presume Members of Congress were being reimbursed for their expenses.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MASON. In fact, if you have a little outside income in addition to your salary, you would be getting less than you are getting now.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes. If you figure out the amounts one would have to pay under our tax laws, you will find that is true.

This amendment I suggest will eliminate all question as to the legality of such an expense account. I believe the American people generally appreciate that any person employed in any business or public position is entitled to receive his expenses before there is any talk about what salary he shall be paid. That is just common sense. However, if this bill becomes law as introduced I know my constituents will think I am increasing my own salary by 50 percent, while increasing the pay of others only 20 percent, when, in fact, we will not actually be increasing our salary at all. However, we will receive all the blame for doing so, just the same.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman plans to offer 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. HARNESSE of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HARNESSE 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. HARNESSE 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 recompensed 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 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.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House

on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 2177, with Mr. SMITH of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, this bill comes to the House of Representatives as the end result of more than 18 months' work of the joint committee of the House and the Senate on the reorganization 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 Reorganization of the Congress could acquire in more than 5 months of hearings in which over 102 witnesses were heard.

SIXTY MEMBERS TESTIFIED

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 system and things which needed improvement.

Senate bill 2177 is being amended by substitution of a committee print agreed to by the House Members of the Committee on the Reorganization of Congress.

There is only one primary purpose considered in this bill. It is nonpolitical in its approach. It deals not with any ideologies or anything except the functional reorganization of the Congress.

ONE TEST ALONE

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

Every Member 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 billions 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 problems of how to handle a \$265,000,000,000 public debt and keep this Nation afloat with that debt load, the greatest any nation has ever carried.

MUST EQUIP OURSELVES

I believe anyone will say that we simply cannot struggle along under this type of work load unless we equip ourselves to answer the challenge that the Constitution 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 Congresses in those past years had three important bills before them. Usually they would meet and decide which cities and towns needed new post offices, which rivers and harbors had to be deepened and improved, and then if the Republicans were in power they might tinker with the tariff a little bit. That in general was much of the work load of the Congresses that once sat in this Hall.

TOOLS HOPELESSLY OBSOLETE

Today we are confronted and confounded 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 possibly do with our present equipment and organization.

Yes; reform is long overdue, it is overdue 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 to try to work on the problems that confront the Congress today with the obsolete tools we have to work with.

Mr. Chairman, we are sitting before this country today serving as the board of directors of the world's largest enterprise. It is a hundred times larger than General Motors, Ford Motor Co., A. T. & T., the Pennsylvania 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 organization, we simply cannot handle the work load that the country expects us to carry.

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

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

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman think that a reactionary 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 April and would not allow the Appropriations Committee to function is a forward-moving step or is it one that really should be thrown out? I am wondering 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 gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the first place, the gentleman from New York is entirely mistaken in his dates; secondly, it can come within the flexibility of the provisions 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, Dr. Fairchild of Yale University, fiscal adviser to the United States Chamber of Commerce, and a great many others. I would not say that it is reactionary or that it is particularly difficult or insuperable.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for that contribution.

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, with the exception of England, the parliamentary system of representative government has disintegrated and disappeared. If we fail here, we fail the world which looks to us to make democracy work.

The framers of our Constitution intended 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 increasing our facilities, to rely only on the judgment that the Members of the Congress had themselves, without research or without data and careful investigation and analysis, to largely answer 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 the Congress is virile, strong enough and well equipped enough 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 3,000,000 men scattered throughout the executive department. 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 gentleman 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 Committee on War Claims are abolished and provision is made that all claims accruing after January 1, 1945, may be settled by the administrative agencies if they are less than \$1,000 or may be the subject of court action if they are more than \$1,000. My question is, What happens to those claims accruing before January 1, 1945, under this procedure?

Mr. MONRONEY. Under this procedure those bills would still be admissible in the Congress. There is provision in the Senate bill which will be adjusted in conference, making it possible to consider bills only for permitting court action on arising from 1939 to 1945.

That is a difference we will have to adjust; but in this claims section every time we have closed the door of admittance of a claim on the floor of Congress 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 before the Congress or they can go into the courts.

Mr. HOPE. Well, under the legislation 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. But suppose 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' fees.

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.

COMMITTEE SYSTEM IMPORTANT

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 law passes the Congress 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 on which the keystone of reorganization rests. If you are not willing to reorganize this overlapping crazyquilt pattern of committee structure, then just do not try to do any reorganizing, because it is the basis and the keystone of this reorganization bill.

You cannot continue to operate in the year 1945 with committees that just grew like Topsy from the beginning of this Nation. We have got to reorganize their functions and realine them, so that the members of the committee 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 major committees that are of great importance in handling the major part of the legislation.

REDUCES FROM 48 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 the gentleman point out what advantages there are in 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 full 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 very important reason for this consolidation is that we intend in this bill to provide for legislative surveys of the Government departments which operate

under these reorganized committees. We want to try to keep them in line with the intent of Congress, to keep a continuing review, if you please, of these departments and agencies downtown over which the reorganized committees have jurisdiction.

We think that only half the job of a standing committee is finished when it passes the legislation. We feel that the other half should be in seeing how that legislation is carried out and seeing if the agencies are living up to the mandates of the Congress and living within the restrictions which we provide.

STAFFS FOR NEW COMMITTEES

I want to hurry on to touch on two or three other points. You could not possibly justify the staffing of all of our 48 committees with expert staffs for each.

We propose in this bill to provide for all of the 19 reorganized major committees to have 4 experts to be paid up to \$8,000 a year. If the committees were not reorganized the cost of providing 4 experts each for 48 standing committees would be tremendous.

We provide for reducing these to 19 standing committees. We feel you will save more money for the country by properly staffing these reorganized committees, particularly the Subcommittees on Appropriations, with experts than by almost anything else in the bill.

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

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

Mr. SPENCE. The Constitution provides that each House will make its own rules of procedure. I wonder if there is any question as to the constitutionality of this legislation.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is a very important question. It was raised in the Senate, may I say to my distinguished chairman. The provisions of the Constitution are that each House shall be the judge of its own rules. It does not prohibit us from acting in concert with the Senate in the exercise of our rule-making powers. We are not touching the Senate rules, we are changing our rules. The Senate changes its rules at the same time.

At points where the two rules come together we must provide by joint legislation for their assimilation. The most distinguished lawyers on the other side proved conclusively in the debate that this is well within the constitutional limitation on the two Houses as to changing the rules. When we meet in January the House can wipe out everything we are doing today if it so desires.

Mr. SPENCE. In other words, you do not derogate any power from the House? The House still has the power to change its rules?

Mr. MONRONEY. The House has the power to change at any minute the authority it has.

LEGISLATIVE BUDGET PROVISIONS

Another subject of tremendous importance is the legislative budget provision. 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 and apart from any relationship one with the other. You simply cannot have adequate budgetary control by such an inadequate procedure.

This section provides 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 to the Congress on a legislative budget. 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 in the red or in the black. Surely it is not asking too much to consider these two important things, income and outgo, together.

I am certain if the Congress adopts this budget section 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 expenses to the Government. While it is a considerable amount of money, I am certain that it will save many hundred 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 of Congress, 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 might add, the entire cost for the increase in Members salary at \$15,000 a year as well as the full annual contribution of the Government to the congressional retirement plan.

A total of \$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 \$29,100,591. 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 country will feel we were wise in 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. We must make it work and make it work well. Around the world the lights of democracy have gone out. They burn here alone, bright enough to rekindle the fires of freedom and democracy. If we fail, we fail the world which looks to us for leadership in this perilous hour.

Remember, gentlemen, that in other countries overseas, where dictators have taken over, they took over when the legislative branches of those nations disintegrated and failed. Then, when their representative system proved incapable of properly handling the problems which faced them, the road to total power was easy.

The representative system is the best guardian of the people's liberty in the world. It can only be able to guard liberty where it is strong enough and well organized enough to carry the load that present day problems place upon them.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY], a member of the joint committee.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, the joint special committee of which I have the honor to be a member, which was created by your act has discharged its duty under your command and has brought to you a report now in the nature of a substitute bill. I think it should be understood by the Members that each and every member of this joint special committee does not necessarily endorse every recommendation which is included in the report or incorporated in this bill.

We have had a difficult task to perform. We worked over a year before we submitted our report. I suppose there were at least 50 Members of Congress who came before the committee with 50 different ideas as to what ought to be done. We sifted and we sorted and we finally got into the picture a composite of such ideas and recommendation as we thought under your command we should submit to you.

That is what is now before you in the nature of a bill. It is in your lap. It is your responsibility from now on. Congress should act. The time for talking has passed.

There is one thing which has been suggested which is so very true that we should bear it in mind. If we are going to make progress we must go ahead. Nothing we do is irreparable. It is true all progress is change, but not all change is progress. Everything we may do today is subject to change next January. We should not feel that the end of the world is coming when we adjourn. We should take our responsibilities seriously.

There are necessary changes to be made in order to enable the Congress of the United States to function properly,

wisely, and expeditiously. Some of the methods which should be employed are incorporated in this bill.

The responsibility of handling the bill on the floor has been delegated by the House membership of the joint special committee to Representatives MONRONEY and DIRKSEN, who are well advised and competent to assume the responsibility we have placed upon them. Let me say as I conclude, for time is the essence today, it was made very clear to us throughout the tedious and lengthy hearings held that there are defects which should be corrected in order to organize Congress to meet modern situations and to equip it to perform adequately its main functions. This substitute bill for the one which passed the Senate meets some objections made to the Senate bill, and, generally speaking, it satisfies the leadership on both sides of the aisle.

It may be that when the bill becomes a law some of its features will work out to be impracticable and unworkable, nevertheless it certainly is a chart we may well follow till we strike any hidden reefs which do not appear thereon.

We certainly should have the courage of our convictions and pass this bill. The people demand it. The Congress should assume and discharge its responsibility.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to ask for any time to speak on the pending bill but recent events in connection with an extremely important phase of our legislative process—the codification of the laws—have impelled me to seek this opportunity to inform the Members about a serious aspect of those functions. When, as chairman of the Committee on Revision of the Laws, I appeared before the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress, I said that I was not there to plead for the continuation of that committee as a separate standing committee so long as the reorganization would insure the carrying on of the important functions of revision of the laws.

During the 8 years that I have been chairman of the Committee on the Revision of the Laws we have engaged in the preparation of two editions of the United States Code, one edition of the District of Columbia Code and a total of 12 cumulative supplements to those codes. As the Members well know those codes contain all the general and permanent laws enacted by Congress and constitute prima facie evidence of the law. Without them the public would be at a complete loss readily to determine the present status of any of our laws. It has been our policy that making the laws understandable is as important as making the laws, and I feel very strongly that the Federal laws should attain the standard set by the majority of the 48 States and that we should have a code which would be legal evidence of the laws. It is not to the credit of the greatest law-making body in the world that it is far behind every State in the Union in this regard.

With this in mind we have prepared seven separate bills and are still engaged

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 (H. R. 2200) revising the criminal 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 matters to give adequate consideration to these bills. I intend no reflection on either the ability or the industry of the members of that committee. They are just too busy with their regular assignments to permit them to consider these bills, and I can understand and sympathize with their situation.

However, the fact that five codification bills, which were reported from the House Committee on the Revision of the Laws and which passed 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 complete and conclusive proof that our present system of this phase of our functions 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 kept up to date and 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 necessary to take the time of the Members now in explaining the great need for codification of our laws. That is a well-established fact. We have made some progress, but there is still much to be decided, and it is my sincere hope that some provision will be made for continuing the work in the most efficient manner possible.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I cannot pretend to possess the knowledge of these intricate problems that is possessed by the members of the special com-

mittee 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 few words about that.

Cold machinery does not necessarily work efficiently. We might set up something that is apparently agreeable in the way of organizing 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. It is from the human standpoint—perhaps I may use that expression—that I have approached this question of the consolidation of committees.

It so happens I have served on the Committee on Committees of the Republican minority for some time. I came into contact with the ambitions and desires of individual Members with respect to assignments to committees. I noticed especially how difficult it is, under the committee system as we now have it, to take a new Member who is anxious to serve and who is equipped with intelligence, and give him a job that is worthwhile. In a large number of instances, we are compelled, under the present set-up, to put that Member upon a committee which seldom meets, or perhaps on two or three committees, no one of which meets frequently, in an endeavor to make it appear to outsiders that he is being accorded recognition. As a matter of fact, for many years I have had a deep sympathy with newly elected Members of the House on both sides of the aisle, in that it takes so long for them to reach a committee which appeals to them, holds their attention, and gives them a chance to serve the country to the best advantage.

Therefore, I was very much in favor of the rearrangement or consolidation of the committees of the House in such fashion that every committee of the House shall be important, and that every Member of the House, be he a newcomer or an oldster, shall be on an important committee. With this provision as proposed by the special committee, we are to have 19 committees instead of 48, and, as I understand it, the members of the special committee have made distribution of the membership to those 19 committees in such fashion that every Member of the House will be on one important committee, whose work will hold his attention, and the performance of which will give him satisfaction and pride. I think there is a morale program here and I have thought so for years. A newcomer should be given a better chance than he is given today under this curious old conglomeration of 48 committees.

You will note that 3 of the committees out of the 19 as proposed by the special committee are not regarded as "exclusive." They are the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Un-American Activities, and the Committee on House Administration. It is specifically provided that a Member assigned to one of those committees, which are obviously of less importance than the other 16, may serve on one of the others. That is so that every Member of the House in accordance with the numerical distribution committee by

committee will have a chance to serve to the best of his ability; and I think that will do more for the spirit and morale of this House than any other change that could occur.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I fully agree with what the gentleman is saying but I should like to have his suggestions and interpretation of how the theory is to be applied to the present standing committees of the House on which men are now serving who next year we might not think were peculiarly fitted for service on that particular committee. Will their seniority prevail and they stay there, or will there be a new deal all the way around?

Mr. WADSWORTH. A new Congress will be elected this coming autumn and that Congress will organize itself. We have got to trust the next Congress to put this machinery to work. I cannot stand here at this time and say exactly what is going to happen to every Member of this Congress when he comes back upon being reelected to the next Congress. We will all be treated alike, at least.

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I believe we all know it to be a fact that oftentimes a man on an important committee, one of our exclusive committees, under the present set-up will find some man running against him and allege that John Jones over here is a member of five committees or seven committees and for that reason this man is not rendering any service to Congress and ought to be defeated; and many have been defeated on that very argument.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Quite frequently the public misunderstands the committee system here and the method by which Members of the House are placed on committees.

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Is not this proposal that the House shall elect the chairman of the standing committees the same as the present procedure? Is there any change over present procedure?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It would be no change at all because the House today elects all the chairmen.

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. JARMAN. I imagine the gentleman had in mind exactly what I had in mind when he propounded that question. According to the press, there was a sentiment on the part of this committee in its inception to change the method of selecting committee chairmanships from the old-established seniority rule, and in that, as the gentleman just said a moment ago, we have to trust the next Congress. But I am wondering if the gentleman knows whether there is any disposition on the part of this committee at this time to change the method of selecting committee chairmen.

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 to go into that party machinery 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 respect to what I believe will be increased efficiency of the legislative body as a whole. It must be admitted that we scatter out amongst too many committees the work of legislation. 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. MICHENER. 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 study the whole question of military pensions and benefits and be in position to bring to us better conceived programs. Then, too, the Federal Government in recent years 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.

There is 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 screened these public works, measured their effect down into the future, not only upon the progress of the country but upon the fiscal position of the Federal Government, and be in a position to present to the House an over-all view of the public works program of the United States? That, in

my opinion, would be a more effective way of doing it for the long view than having it done by three or four separate committees, no two of which consult each other.

Very much the same thing can be said with respect to the support of the military forces. I have myself encountered instances in which one particular committee, we will say the Committee on Military Affairs, reports a recommendation to the House as to the size of the Army and its composition, including the Air Corps, yet no member of the Military Affairs Committee has ever heard what the Navy is proposing. And vice versa. May I cite one instance on the floor here. When the Naval Affairs Committee, exercising its functions perfectly correctly under our custom, under our system, brought in a resolution fixing the size of the Navy—that was only last year—at so many ships, I think 1,079 and 550,000 enlisted men, at an estimated cost of so many billion dollars, I asked the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee on the floor whether or not his committee had any knowledge of what the War Department was going to propose with respect to the size of the Army, its composition, and its cost. The answer was in the negative. I pursued the inquiry further. I went to the War Department and asked the officers of the General Staff whether or not the War Department or the General Staff had ever been consulted by the Navy as to the size of the Navy. No. Now, the same thing will happen in the opposite direction. The Military Affairs Committee of the House may bring in a bill fixing the size of the peacetime Army. We have only an interim Army now. If it does so, under the present system there will be no consultation between the members of the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs with respect to an over-all military policy. My hope has been for years dating back to the time when I was chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate, that the Congress would seize control of the military policy of the United States, and my belief is that it can do so by having the admirals and the generals come before the same committee in the presence of each other to tell their stories.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, although it has not been my privilege to become as familiar with these matters as the distinguished gentleman who just preceded me, and as many Members of this committee, I cannot refrain from confessing my inability to agree with the pessimism which seems to prevail about Congress. I do not agree, for instance, with this sentence on the first page of the report accompanying this bill. After referring to legislative machinery and procedure, the report says:

They must be modernized if we are to avoid an imminent break-down of the legislative branch of the National Government.

My colleagues, I cannot bring myself to agree with that. I do not believe that the legislative branch of this Government is going to break down if this bill does not pass as it is written, or if it does not pass at all, and I am not sure that we are performing any great service either to ourselves—witness Georgia and Oklahoma in the past week—to this Congress, or to this country in publicizing statements of that kind. Some reorganization, of course, is justified and necessary.

However, I am not at all sure that I can get my consent to vote for this bill as introduced. There are several provisions of which I am doubtful. I am not at all sure that time will be saved and business expedited by requiring the actual presence of a majority of a committee to report a bill. I am equally doubtful about the requirement that the testimony of witnesses before committees be in writing. Nor do I think that a majority vote of a committee should be necessary to an executive session except those for marking up bills or voting. On the other hand, I think that the chairman of a committee who wishes to call an executive session for the purpose of securing confidential testimony, for instance during war, should be authorized to do so without any vote by the members of the committee. 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 \$15,000 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 actual increase occurs. This results 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 references made a while ago 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 publicized—it was stated 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 prerogative 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. MONRONEY. I would like to assure the gentleman from Alabama that under the rule by which the committee was established, our committee was denied the right to recommend any 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 go into the matter of seniority, 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, as this new committee goes into gear after the first of the year, the established practice regarding the assignment of Members to committees and the positions on the committees upon which they sit, and the time-honored custom of the Congress that the chairman of the committees shall be elected by the House. I am able to say to the gentleman that we did not change the rule in any regard concerning the election of committees by the House. We did feel that we had no jurisdiction or right, for instance, to recommend any changes regarding committees on the Republican side, who must assign Members to committees and determine their positions on the committees, and I assure the gentleman, with my respect for the strength of the Committee on Ways and Means and its influence in the House, that we did not intend to say to the Committee on Ways and Means what they should do in this instance.

So as the House meets the first of next year the machinery of the House will be exactly the same regarding the assignment of Members to committees and their positions thereon.

Mr. JARMAN. I thank the gentleman very much. In view of the remark a while ago of the gentleman from New York about trusting the next Congress, and in view of the publicity which occurred, I was naturally interested.

One more question: There appears on page 33 of the bill, line 13, a provision which I am certain the gentleman does not mean, and if it has not been corrected I propose to offer an amendment to correct it. That is the provision that the Committee on House Administration shall have jurisdiction over the employment of persons by the House, including clerks for Members and committees.

Mr. MONRONEY. That has nothing to do with the appointment of clerks of Members. However, the Accounts Committee is charged with determining the allocation of the \$9,500 clerical hire and seeing that it does not run over that. This has no relationship whatever to the employment of the clerks, but they do have to administer the appropriations which are made for clerk hire.

Mr. JARMAN. It has nothing to do with the selection of the personnel?

Mr. MONRONEY. No, indeed.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I regret I cannot go along with what appears to be a majority of the House in support of this bill described as a meas-

ure "to provide increased efficiency in government." Of course I am for efficiency. I have legislation pending to do that very thing. I have spoken on that subject many times. There are some provisions in this bill I should be glad to support. There are others to which I am opposed.

I am opposed to the increase of \$5,000 to Members of Congress, in this bill. This is 50 percent. No one knows better than I 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 system similar to that afforded civil-service employees. They are a different group. They are appointed career people. We are elected and serve at the will of the electors. If 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 said, if he drew according to his contribution, it would not be quite so inequitable. This 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. MICHENER. 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. Those 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 been balanced, we are still going into debt, and in view of my opposition to excessive spending in other fields, I cannot support this proposal.

Mr. MONRONEY. 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 product, that is, wise legislation, by improvement in congressional organization. I hope we will not lay so much stress upon organization that we overlook the need for the better product, wise legislation. I was impressed with

the suggestion made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FROWN] that he intended 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. On the other hand, I have no difficulty whatever bringing myself to approve a sane retirement provision for Members of Congress. In fact I heartily approve—not of pensions 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 employees generally throughout the country." 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 38, 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. MONRONEY. 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 the 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 I shall want to 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-ship—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 functions of the present committee to be impaired or to be reduced if it should be merged with another committee.

The Bureau of Reclamation was established in 1902. It has built about a billion dollars worth of projects, adding

greatly to the new wealth of the Nation. Yet, I feel its task is only beginning. We must center in any future committee the full authority and functions now exercised by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. That is the point that I have in mind which prompts me to ask the question. Unless I can be positively assured of the sufficiency of this authority, I shall want to offer an amendment at the end of line 22, page 38, when we read the bill for amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, as we consider the structure of the Congress of the United States and the practices and procedures of our national legislature, we find there are many questions involved as we read carefully, as I am sure most of the Members have, the provisions presented in S. 2177. Perhaps it would be interesting and informative to the committee for me to discuss, although presumably it will be developed by Mr. DIRKSEN and others, the retirement plan which is contemplated if this legislation becomes law. I do so on the premise that the House Committee on Civil Service gave many weeks of study to this problem. As you recall, we attempted to report a retirement measure to the floor for action. I recall at that time the very able gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] said to me in private conversation off the floor of the House—and I think he said it publicly at the time the rule was considered—that he believed we should hold all of these reorganization features together in the legislation and bring them here in one comprehensive legislative proposal for action of our colleagues.

I differed with him at that time. I thought we were presented with a proper challenge; yet I have come to feel that perhaps he was correct. For that reason I made no serious attempt at that time to impress on my colleagues the necessity for voting on the retirement subject matter.

Mr. Chairman, I now discuss and analyze the retirement provisions contained in the measure.

Subsection (a) of section 602: This subsection excludes from retirement the elective officers who are "in the executive branch of the Government" and thus permits retirement coverage for elective officers in the legislative branch of the Government under conditions mentioned in the next subsection. The President and Vice President are accordingly excluded from retirement coverage.

Subsection (b) of section 602—new provisions: This entire subsection adds a new section to the Civil Service Retirement Act, setting up special provisions relating to retirement obligations of and benefits for Members of Congress.

Paragraph (1)—coverage: Provides that the Retirement Act shall not apply to any Member of Congress until he exercises an option to come within the purview thereof and gives notice in writing to the disbursing officer by whom paid of his desire to make contributions to the retirement fund and otherwise participate as a member of that fund.

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 each Member who elects to come within the retirement law shall contribute 6 percent of his basic compensation for all service after the effective date of the pending bill.

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 to the retirement law, 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 as such and have reached 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), must contribute for at least 5 years for annuity benefit: 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 $2\frac{1}{2}$ percent of a 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 annuity purchasable with the deposit not made.

See chart of comparative rates of annuity payable as proposed to Members of Congress and to those under the regular provisions of the Retirement Act.

When regular annuity begins: If a Member of Congress is age 62 or over when he leaves office, his annuity would begin to accrue on the 1st of the month following the month in which he separates.

If the Member separates prior to attaining age 62 his annuity would become effective on the 1st day of the month following the month in which he attains age 62.

Interest on deposits between separation and date of annuity: In the case last mentioned above, his contributions would draw interest from the date of separation, to beginning date of annuity, at the rate of 3 percent compounded annually.

Types of annuity: A Member of Congress could elect any one of three kinds of annuity as follows:

Life annuity with return of any unexpended balance in case of death;

Increased life annuity with forfeiture of any unexpended balance in case of death;

Joint and survivor annuity by which the Member may share his annuity with a survivor either in an equal amount or one-half of the Member's annuity. Most persons name the spouse under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Paragraph (6), refunds: A Member who elects to contribute to the retirement fund and is separated before becoming eligible for annuity would be entitled to the return of his credited contributions with interest at the rate of 4 percent compounded annually.

No Member who receives a refund as provided above may subsequently become eligible for annuity as such Member, unless he redeposits the refund with interest, but no interest would be required during any period of separation from the service.

Paragraph (7), reelected Member drawing annuity: If a retired Member of Congress, drawing annuity is again elected to Congress he may either (a) have his annuity suspended during his subsequent service and resume the same annuity when subsequently separated, or (b) elect to become again a member of the retirement fund and contribute 6 percent of base pay, during his subsequent service so that his annuity would be recomputed, with the inclusion of the additional service upon subsequent separation—annuity to be suspended.

Paragraph (8) certain congressional service under pending bill not creditable toward annuity for service in the executive branch: This section is designed primarily to prevent a continuance of existing practice under which a Member of Congress after separation as such may receive appointment in the executive branch of the Government and be accorded credit toward annuity for all his service as a Member of Congress.

Under S. 2177 a Member of Congress who has served for at least 6 years, any part of which occurs after the enactment of the bill, may not have credit for

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 a 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."

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 when both the Member and the Government contribute their shares of the cost currently.

The deficiency cost, or accrued liability, would total \$3,000,000. If this cost be amortized over a period of 52 years—following the procedure of the Civil Service Retirement Act—there would be an annual cost of about \$136,000 until the liability be 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.

If we take into consideration that a Member of Congress may now, upon failure of reelection, secure an appointment in the executive service, and upon retirement therefrom secure credit for his congressional service, the figures given are an overstatement because the practice would not obtain under S. 2177.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has again expired.

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 provisions as contained in this bill so that the material appears in order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I have long felt the need for a reorganization of the committees of Congress, as well as the procedure of the House. Streamlining of Congress is long past due. I feel that the provisions providing for congressional reorganization, as provided in the committee amendment 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 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 proposed salary increase 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 proposal fully 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 the number of years of 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 reorganization 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, with the realization that we are the official representatives selected by them to protect the economy of our country and safeguard their interests.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, no informed person presently contends 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 duties of the legislative branch of the Government in the year 1946. They provided for changes in the Constitution and in the law of the land. They expected coming generations to keep abreast of the times. Their plans have worked well. Needed changes to the Constitution have been made; however, the Congress has been derelict about improving its own procedure. We are naturally conservative people, and it is well that we are that way. Any changes made should be of a progressive nature, inspired by necessity and not the result of emotional or radical appeal on the part of that minority which feels that our form of government has outlived its usefulness, and which is sympathetic to foreign ideologies.

The bill which we bring you today had its genesis in study on the part of students of government, political scientists,

efficiency engineers, and Members of Congress. It is not a hasty conclusion inspired by any particular pressure group of our people. It reflects the considerate thought and almost unanimous approval of all of these groups.

I do not agree with those sincere and enthusiastic pessimists who believe that Congress must be modernized if we are to avoid an imminent break-down of the legislative branch of the National Government. It is not as bad as that. Present laws, rules, and regulations governing the Congress are the result of trial and error. The rules and the regulations of the first Congress are not at all like those of today. Congress after Congress, appreciating the experiences of the past, has yielded to progress but has made only such changes as were imperative.

There is a difference between that which is essential to function and that which is advisable in order that functioning may be more effective. Congress has stumbled along during the last few years when the shackles of outworn precedents should have been removed. The purpose of this proposed legislation is to remove these shackles and not only to make it easy but to make it possible for the Congress to fulfill the duties for which it was created. During the last 10 years the legislative picture has become extremely involved. The Federal Government is participating in an alarming extent in State, local, and community affairs. The present committee system is a glaring example of the horse-and-buggy days brought up to date, but still using the horse and buggy. There are three times as many committees as there were a few years ago. Additional committees are added, while useless committees are continued. We all know the primary reasons for the continuance of these unnecessary committees. I think the people are beginning to understand the facts and, when they are fully advised, will insist upon doing away with this inefficiency. The fact that it does reflect glory on needless committee chairmen and on the membership of outworn standing committees does not warrant its perpetuation.

Every committee in a way is a miniature legislature where policies are considered, determined, and the pros and cons of legislation evaluated. If this is true, then these committees should be active, representative, and as large as possible in keeping with accomplishment. This bill envisions such a condition. Who can justify the present jurisdictional committee set-up where four House committees deal with public works, six deal with public land problems, and three with veterans' affairs, and so on down the list. None of these committees dealing with like subject matter has any contact with or knowledge of similar matters being worked upon by the other committees. This is not only committee inefficiency but, as a rule, militates against the best interests of the groups primarily affected.

It is hoped by the proponents of the bill to correlate the legislative activities of the House and the Senate to avoid duplication, conserve time of the Members, as well as the time of innumerable

executive and agency representatives, who spend weeks appearing before different House and Senate committees dealing with the same subject, and are compelled to tell their stories and make their cases over and over again. Mr. Speaker, all of this just does not make sense. This bill will not cure all of the evils, but it will help. Neither the Senate bill nor the House bill were hastily prepared. For more than a year the joint congressional committee, assigned the task of making this study and reporting to the Congress, has worked at that job. As a member of that committee I know whereof I speak. The committee has had the very able and enthusiastic assistance of Dr. George Galloway, the committee counsel, who has pioneered in this field for a number of years. The legislative counsel of the House and the Senate has given generously of its time and knowledge, and is entitled to much credit for the form in which the committee's views are brought to you.

Time for general debate is limited, and I can render no better service in explaining the bill than by adopting as a part of my remarks an excerpt of the committee report, which reads as follows:

At present the combined membership of all the standing committees in the House is 908 and of the 10 exclusive committees is 291. In addition, there are 6 special committees of the House, with a total membership of 62. Altogether the 439 Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners of the Seventy-ninth Congress occupy 970 seats on its standing and special committees, an average of 2.2 seats per Member. Under the bill, Representatives would serve on one standing committee each and no more, with the exception of the District and Un-American Activities Committees, whose members would serve on two committees each, and of the Expenditures and Administration Committees, whose majority members would serve on two standing committees each.

The bill would also define the jurisdiction of each reorganized committee so as to avoid jurisdictional disputes between them. It would expand the present meager staff facilities of our standing committees, which are the real workshops of Congress; permit each committee to appoint four experts in its field; and strengthen the legislative reference and legislative counsel services which are our own unbiased research and legal arms.

As further steps toward improving the policy-determining machinery of Congress, the bill would regularize committee procedure as regards hearings, meetings, and records. It would expedite the reporting of bills. Committee powers are defined, and permission to sit while the Senate is in session is restricted. The bill also seeks to confine conference committees to the consideration of matters in disagreement between the two Houses and outlaw legislative riders on appropriation bills.

In the last analysis, Congress is the center of political gravity under our form of government because it reflects and expresses the popular will in the making of national policy. Too often, however, the true attitude of public opinion is distorted and obscured by the pressures of special-interest groups. Beseated by swarms of lobbyists seeking to protect this or that small segment of the economy or to advance this or that narrow interest, legislators find it difficult to discover the real majority will and to legislate in the public interest. As Government control of economic life and its use as an instrument of popular welfare have increased, the activities of these powerful groups have multiplied. As the lawmaking, money-raising, and appro-

propriating agency in the Federal Government, the acts of Congress affect the vital interests of these organized groups, many of which maintain legislative agents on or near Capitol Hill. These agents seek to transform the aims and programs of their groups into public policy by having them embodied in general legislation, by changing the tax laws to suit their own purposes, by using their influence to reduce or eliminate the appropriations for agencies they dislike and to increase the appropriations of agencies they favor, and by pressing for the ratification or rejection of treaties. Presidential nominations, and constitutional amendments. A pressure-group economy gives rise to government by whirlpools of special-interest groups in which the national welfare is often neglected. The pulling and hauling of powerful pressure groups create delays and distortions which imperil 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 to influence legislation. It also requires them to file detailed quarterly accounts of their receipts and expenditures. Full information regarding the membership, source of contributions, and expenditures of such organized groups would prove helpful to Congress in evaluating their representations and weighing their worth. Publicity is a mild step forward in protecting Government under pressure and in promoting the democratization of pressure groups.

IMPROVED FISCAL PROCEDURES

A second set of provisions is designed to strengthen Congress in the performance of its appropriating function for the administrative establishment. Hitherto the efforts of Congress to compel compliance with the laws making specific appropriations have been too often frustrated. Congress has permitted transfers between appropriations, authorized the unlimited use of departmental receipts, and set up credit corporations with separate budgets. The executive has mingled appropriations, brought forward and backward unexpended and anticipated balances, incurred coercive deficiencies, and otherwise escaped the rigors of congressional control.

To correct these conditions, at least in part, the substitute provides for several improvements in the legislative phase of the budget process. It would provide for open hearings on appropriation bills and require all such bills to be fully and carefully considered by the entire Appropriations Committees of both Houses. It would allow Members time to study the committee hearings and reports on appropriation bills before their floor consideration. It would provide each appropriation subcommittee with a staff of not more than four qualified specialists in its particular expenditure province with a view to making a more thorough scrutiny of departmental estimates and to serve both the majority and minority members. The substitute would also forbid the reappropriation of unobligated balances except for continuing public works, which were estimated at \$12,300,000,000 for the fiscal year 1946; and take steps toward limiting permanent appropriations which amounted to \$5,600,000,000 in the fiscal year 1946.

Although Congress is charged by the Constitution with the power of the purse, there now is no correlation between income and outgo. Control of the spending power is divided between the Senate and the House of Representatives, and within each House between its revenue and appropriating committees. Taxes are levied and appropriations made by many separate committees.

The right hand does not know what the left hand is doing.

To strengthen budget control, S. 2177, as it passed the Senate, provided for the adoption of annual Federal Budget totals by joint action of the revenue and appropriating committees of both Houses. If total estimated expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year exceed the total estimated Federal receipts, Congress would be required by record vote to authorize the creation of additional Federal debt in the amount of the excess. If it appeared midway in the fiscal year that the total appropriations would exceed the total approved Budget figure, the President was directed by proclamation to reduce such appropriations by such amounts (to be fixed by him) so as to bring total expenditures within the limit previously set. These limitations would not apply in time of war or during a national emergency.

The substitute strikes out the provisions contained in the Senate bill explained above and inserts a provision requiring the same committees to meet jointly at the beginning of each Congress and after study and consultation report to their respective Houses a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year. Such budget will include the estimated overall Federal receipts and expenditures for such year and will contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year. Within such maximum amount it is contemplated that the committees will reserve a sufficient amount for subsequent deficiency appropriations as the need becomes apparent. It is realized that such amounts that may be reserved for deficiency will, of necessity for a few years, be on the trial and error method; however, it is believed that with a few years' experience such amount will be susceptible of definite determination in advance under ordinary circumstances. If said committees estimate that the receipts will exceed expenditures, the report will contain a recommendation for a reduction in the public debt. A concurrent resolution will accompany such report and will contain language adopting such budget and fixing the maximum allowance to be appropriated for expenditure in such year. In addition, if an estimated deficit will result, the concurrent resolution will also include a section stating that it is the sense of Congress that the public debt shall be increased in an amount equal to such deficit.

OVERSIGHT OF ADMINISTRATIVE PERFORMANCE

A third group of provisions in the substitute is designed to strengthen congressional surveillance of the execution of the laws by the executive branch. Congress has long lacked 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 administrative rules 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 standing committees of both Houses to exercise continuous surveillance of the execution of the laws by the administrative agencies within their jurisdiction. Staffed with qualified specialists in their respective provinces of public affairs, these committees would conduct a continuous review of the activities of the agencies administering laws originally reported by the legislative committees. The reconstructed standing committees will, it is hoped, roughly parallel the reorganized administrative structure of the executive branch of the Government and will be utilized as vehicles of consultation and collaboration between Con-

gress and the corresponding administrative agencies within their respective jurisdictions.

As a further check upon the financial operations of the Government and its care in handling public funds, the substitute authorizes and directs 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 economy and efficiency of administrative management. Reports on such analyses would be submitted by the Comptroller General to the Expenditures, Appropriations, and appropriate legislative committees of the two Houses.

SAVING CONGRESSIONAL TIME

Congress is overburdened 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 bans the introduction in either House of private claims and pension bills, bridge bills, and other local and private legislation. Title IV provides for the administrative and judicial adjustment of tort claims against the United States which Congress is poorly equipped to settle. Title V grants the consent of Congress to the construction of 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—a reform long overdue and a step toward reducing the legislative work load—is separately provided for in legislation introduced by Senator McCARRAN and pending on the Senate Calendar.

These time-saving devices will not only make for a more efficient use of congressional time, they will also enable the Congress, which has been in almost continuous session since 1940, to take a regular annual recess. 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 Members to their constituents for that refreshment of contact and exchange of opinion and experience so essential to responsive representative government.

The substitute also provides the Senate 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 the age of 62 years. This feature 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 the 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. Suffice it to say, that there is no apparent

reason why Members of Congress should not be permitted to purchase annuities when they retire, the same as are now 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 limitations are placed on amendments. 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 hoped that the membership will forget any prejudices or personal interests and in 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 some amendments and shall then vote for the bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

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 consolidation generally as provided in the pending bill will make for efficiency and will promote morale and better service in my judgment in the discharge of our official duties.

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 Little Steel formula, but, inasmuch as wages and salaries have been increased about 30 percent, I now feel salaries 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 residences 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 a straight-out 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 duplicate home expenses in Washington.

Another matter—it is rather minor—is the so-called stenographic pool. There are a number of details in the bill about which I am in doubt. I speak, therefore, 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 stenographic assistance that is not accorded 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.

Personally, I oppose retirement benefits for elected public officials, whether those officials be the President or Vice President of the United States, Senators and Representatives of the United States, or senators and representatives in the State legislatures. I advocate eliminating the retirement section, which is 602, from the bill.

Under the terms of the proposed bill there will be congressional retirement benefits. It is said they are optional, but that is no answer. We merely put ourselves in the same category that our clerical help is now in with respect to the optional feature. Favoring as I do the principle of retirement in business and in the Government services where there are careers, I cannot bring myself to believe that that principle could be applicable with respect to elected public officials. Members of the Senate and Members of the House must pass upon all 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 from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] 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. DIRKSEN. 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 lobbyists.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. Chairman, open confession is good for the soul and I do not mind indicating to the House that the particular measure before you today has been of extremely high interest to me for a great many years. I have never felt, and I came here nearly 14 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 it was good enough for those who antedated me in service; that if there was some improvement we could make in efficiency and economy, if there is some little thing we can do to retrieve the esteem in which this body ought to be regarded by the people in a constitutional, representative democracy, I felt I should lend what feeble talent and zeal I might have to that cause. I have been at it now for about 6 years. The fruition of that feeble effort and even more so the undiminished efforts of the gentleman from Oklahoma, MIKE MONRONEY, who early and late has carried water and done chores to help bring this about, is before you today.

The joint committee had long hearings and heard many witnesses. Finally a bill was drawn. It received thorough discussion on the floor of the United States Senate for 4 days, and was concluded on the 10th day of June 1946.

When the roll was called the vote was 45 to 16, meaning that, by a vote of 3 to 1 of the Senators who voted, this measure was adopted. Well, of course, our hopes were high and we looked forward to the day when action might be gotten on this measure before the curtain of the Seventy-ninth Congress might be pulled down.

Here and now I want to pay testimony to the beloved Speaker of the House of Representatives. We have had some conferences with SAM RAYBURN—and I call him SAM affectionately—and sitting in those conferences were the majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the minority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the Parliamentarian, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] and myself. I shall be everlastingly grateful to SAM RAYBURN for the great interest that he has manifested in this matter for a long period of time and for his anxious desire to see that action was taken thereon before this Congress expires. So, Mr. Chairman, speaking as a member of the joint committee, and speaking as one who has been so vitally interested in this matter, I accord you my personal gratitude, and I think the House and the Senate of the United States also owe you a debt of gratitude for the splendid and fine way in which you have looked upon these efforts.

It was with a sense of distress that I read an editorial in one of the newspapers this week that so indefensibly and so unwarrantably attacked the Speaker of this House on the theory that he was the one who occasioned the deletion of one portion of this bill.

That is an unconscionable distortion of the facts, for when we were sitting in quiet fellowship in the Speaker's office we explored every item in the bill. We wanted to get a bill that we thought would be given consideration and receive favorable action by the House. So, what was finally contrived was contrived out of a rare and understanding fellowship. So, I salute the gentleman from Texas, SAM RAYBURN, 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 Solomons, 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 tried 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 and echoed and re-echoed 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 responsible legislative job. I 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 full of legislation to your hotel 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 discordant note in your reflections 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 2,500 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, where money 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 not more than \$1,000 is 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, notwithstanding the old doctrine 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 hear these suits, 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 tort claims title carried in the pending bill, and it may come on for action before the present session is over. All that is in the interest of time and economy, to get rid of some of these private bills.

Secondly, there is the bridge title. I have introduced bills to secure authority to build bridges over navigable streams, and in a sense of confusion and bewilderment I have often wondered what it was all about. When a bill like that is introduced, what happens to it? It has to go to the War Department. Having 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? Does it run at right angles with the stream or does it run diagonally? Is it a traffic hazard? Is the clearance sufficient to take care of the stacks of the inland steamers 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 not 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 from 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 have them done with dispatch by the staff of your committee and to give you more time. The staffing provisions have the same thing in mind.

Then in addition to the time element we were thinking 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 there in undigested form. What good does it do, unless we have senior experts to digest it when legislation is before the committees? That is what the people expect, and that is the use we should make 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 through my secretary 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. Ernest Griffith, 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 lap. I think the RECORD will show 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 diligence, 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 specialists in every branch of economic endeavor, which is so essential if they are going to be able to advise the Members and committees of this House. What I am trying to spell out for you is the general approach to this thing, to develop more time to reflect upon our work, and to produce a greater efficiency in the structure of the Congress and a greater economy, particularly in the matter of time.

There are some other things that we seek to do for ourselves. There is the

increase in pay. I do not know what disposition the House will make of that. I am only going to make this comment on that item. When this bill was in the Senate it carried the same item of \$15,000 per year. But there was a provision written in when it went to the Senate which provided for the deductibility of the expenditures under the Internal Revenue Code. That was defeated in the Senate and for a very good reason—not that the Senate objected to it, but on the ground that it was a revenue provision. When you examine that very fresh and virile Constitution of the United States you will find that all revenue proposals must originate in the House of Representatives. That is the only reason it was taken out. So if the increase in salary was interpreted along with that deductibility provision, then it would make a perfect picture, do not you know—so it ought to be restored. I think I am free to say that the majority leader of the House of Representatives has the language and will offer that deductibility clause when we read the bill under the 5-minute rule.

Just a word in reference to the retirement system. I know there are many people in the country who feel we ought to make no provision for the retirement of elective officers. I see no reason why we should not. I see no reason why we should not enjoy the same security provisions that are extended by the civil-service retirement system and the social-security system to almost every person in the country. It is a good system. On one occasion several years ago when we inherited all these bundles for Congress, and I got my share—they did not bother me any—we brought in a retirement proposal here which was really no retirement proposal at all. It was enough on which to starve to death and I did not care for anything like that. Now, we bring you a real retirement system, and you will find the annuities spelled out in the report that accompanies this bill. You make a 6-percent contribution and then at age 62 if you pay in the entire amount you get 2½ percent of your basic salary times the number of years that you served.

If you pay back only \$2,500, which we accept arbitrarily for the purpose of letting this pay out in the 22-year period, there also you get a reasonably substantial annuity.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Is it true that with this 6-percent contribution it will make this fund self-sufficient in a period of 20 years?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right; either 20 or 32 years.

I want to add one little thing on this question of salaries and retirement. I want to read to you, with the indulgence of the House, and I hope you will not think I am transgressing when I read what Senator BARKLEY said on the last day this was under consideration in the Senate. I want to read this to you because I think it is priceless. I quote:

I remember when I was in the House of Representatives, when the last increase in salaries occurred for Members of Congress.

The salaries were increased from \$7,500 to \$10,000 a year. I voted against that salary increase. I voted against it in part, at least, because 2 or 3 weeks before that I had voted against a general increase in the salaries of Government employees, and I was not willing to vote myself an increase when I had voted against increases for others. The newspapers in my congressional district mentioned rather favorably the fact that I had voted against that increase in salary. Some of them had editorials after this fashion: "Old BARKLEY stood by the people; he did not engage in this raid on the Treasury," and so forth.

Congress adjourned shortly after that, and I expected to be patted on the back by everyone I saw when I got home because I had voted against the increase in the salaries of Members of Congress. I was at home for a week. I went up and down Broadway in my home city and into the stores to see my friends and visit with them. I spent an entire week there, and no one mentioned the subject. No one said a word about it. Finally an old farmer friend of mine, much older than I was, but a very dear friend who always came to town when he heard that Congress had adjourned, heard that I had returned home, and he wanted to talk about what was going on. He was a well-informed man. We stood in the shade of a brick wall for about an hour and talked about what had happened in Congress. Finally he said, "I see that you fellows in Congress increased your salaries." I replied, "Yes, Uncle Jack. They did, but I voted against it." He looked straight into my eyes for about 5 minutes, and finally he said, "You are just a damn fool."

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the minority whip is present I am going to say this, with his indulgence. Yes. He is here.

You remember when we had this last bill on retirement under consideration. The issue was raised out in his district in Illinois. He is my beloved friend and he is my congressional neighbor. He called up one day and he said, "I wish you would come over here, if you can spare the time."

I went over there. They had a party meeting. They had a great dinner. A very charming and capable lady, fortified with plenty of money, who was an opponent of his in the primary, was there, on my special invitation. She was the one who had advertised in the newspapers in great flaming headlines that the Congressman from that district had voted himself \$348 a month pension. And then, in fine type that you could see only through bifocals, was the rest of the explanation. That gracious lady was sitting there in a company of 500 other members of my party at that dinner. I went particularly that night to discuss that very thing, in the Masonic Temple in Bloomington, Ill. When it was all over and finished the whole issue had been dispelled.

It is time that we on our own responsibility go back home and, without cringing, without showing some kind of public and legislative cowardice, we say to our people, "Sure, I did it, and here is the reason why." We have been running around, too often, and they do not understand our positions. Perhaps that is one of the reasons why the prestige of Congress has gone down in public esteem. Let us not do it. Let us say and do the things that we believe contribute to the better discharge of our responsi-

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 Fort Wayne, Ind., over in South Bend, over in Youngstown, Ohio, recently 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 or controversial it may be, is to give 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 procedure 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 under the probability that I may be guilty of violating a confidence, just reach 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 the OPA people came before 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 matter 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. Was there somebody who could examine into the techniques and the office procedure, into the investigational 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. 50 several years ago under which we have a staff. But it was not investigated, and that is one reason why these committees must be equipped with investigators who do not go down there for a week or 10 days at a time.

They must go and live in the structure of Government and find the weaknesses and then they must sit at the elbows of the Members of Congress as they are assembled in committees and say: "Ask him this question; ask him that question; ask him how he justifies this expense or that procedure." That is the only way you are finally going to get economy in this country. So we gave them \$106,000,000 for 9 months. It went across the floor of the House and was approved and sent to the other body. When it got to the Senate they did not have a single member of the OPA before a Senate committee and when the bill went across the Senate floor and finally got to conference it had been cut from \$106,000,000 to \$56,000,000; and I do not know why. Then we went to conference and we ragged around. Some said: "Oh, give them \$106,000,000; do not penalize them." Some said: "They should not have that much." One conferee said: "Let's give them only \$25,000,000." Then I reached up into thin air and pulled out a figure. I said: "Mr. Chairman, I suggest we give them \$75,000,000." And that

is the figure that went up to the White House in the bill. Is that intelligent appropriating? I say to you we do not get to the vitals of the thing we do in the subcommittee. If we do not, how are we going to balance the budget at a time when the public debt is \$275,000,000,000? There is a way, and that way is written into this bill. It is to have subcommittees of Ways and Means and Appropriations of the House and a subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, five or seven men from each—and we are going to amend the language here so that it does not require the full committee—we provide that members from the two committees which wrestle with the question of revenue income that is sweated out of the people and filters into the Public Treasury shall work together with the spending committees of the House and Senate in contriving an over-all fiscal policy.

Here is another group from the two committees charged with the responsibility of appropriating money out of the Federal Treasury. In all the days I have been in Congress, there never has been a meeting of the Ways and Means Committee and the Appropriations Committee, not one. If I am wrong, let any Member stand in his place and challenge that statement. Is that not an amazing thing?

What do the taxpayers think about it? They are the people who are in interest, after all. Here in the files are telegrams from taxpayers associations in Connecticut, Illinois, Ohio, and elsewhere, insisting that the provision to set up a legislative over-all budget be preserved in this bill. An effort will be made to knock it out. I hope you will rise, be patient and see that it is preserved. It requires this group of people from these four committees to get together and examine the President's budget that comes here the first of the year, then to spell out an over-all ceiling. We can kick it over if we want to. But think of the moral effect on the tax structure of our country to be able to say that men skilled in finance and in expenditures have contrived a revenue structure, an over-all appropriation structure, that will result in a balanced budget and we can look down the corridors to the year's end, 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, 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 prin-

ciple before the joint committee, and said:

In the financial operation of Congress, on the other hand, there is no fiscal pattern, and appropriations are made in a vacuum.

You never knew how right you really were unless 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 new fiscal 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 could meet each session as 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 total 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 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 gentlemen 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 can be 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 streamlining the Congress, staged a meeting of the 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 chairman moved 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 chairman did not move to strike it out. The chairman made no motion at all.

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

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; but who brought the resolution to us. Who was the moving spirit that brought in 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 answer to 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 section 138 should be stricken from the bill. It was decided to submit it to the entire membership of the Committee on Appropriations and get their reaction. I had supposed 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 the gentleman refers. I had never seen it before. 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 lying 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 out 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. He wants to carry on in the dim dark past, and if you are going to stand for that sort of thing, then we might just as well have no bill. Let it never be said of us by the American people that we are going to reach out for extraordinary benefits, with increased pay, and not give the taxpayer a little show for his money. I admonish you with all the

fever that I can bring to you, if you strike that out, the last hope of a balanced budget may go glimmering. Have we become so accustomed to deficits and deficit spending that we will leave a single stone unturned, a single method unexplored to get back to a budget that will infuse confidence in our people. It is indeed astonishing that Members argue that lack of time, or lack of facilities, or some other equally unsubstantial reason makes this impracticable.

Let me point out to you that this proposal was well considered in the Senate. When the final vote came, 10 members of the Senate Appropriations Committee voted for the bill and only 3 voted against it. Is it to be presumed that members of the Senate Appropriations Committee are so untalented in the fiscal field that they were unable to spell out the meaning and intent of this proposal for a legislative budget. I think not.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Admitting, as I personally do, the very great desirability of achieving some coordination between the possible revenues of the Government in a given year and the probable appropriations, I am wondering if paragraph (b) of the proposed bill really gets us anywhere. In the first place, a concurrent resolution would have no effect whatsoever upon the reduction of the public debt; it would not be a law. In the second place, there can be no guarantee that the Congress would adopt it, and even if it would adopt it, a bill might be proposed the next day that would accomplish something else in violation of it, and the subsequent action of Congress would be controlling.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That can be done. The House, having passed a bill, in my judgment would be pretty reluctant to kick over that which it had done the day before, unless you made a pretty persuasive case. Besides that, would you not hear from the people back home who have to pay these taxes that we appropriate?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If you really want to make it effective, when you adopt a budget based upon your anticipated revenues, should you not provide that upon the passage of such legislation no bill should be passed in cases of that kind unless it were done by two-thirds?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wrote a provision like that that I placed before the Committee on Ways and Means in 1943. In fact, we also had language in this bill that we acted upon. However, we did not want to be too inflexible with that sort of thing and then delete some of the provisions passed by the Senate. Our disposition was entirely correct in the matter, but we thought if we went too far it might yet work out properly. We left it with certain flexibility, and after we have a year or two experience under it, we can then approach this question again and analyze this whole technique. We did not do this overnight.

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 slightest explanation of how it would work or whether or not it could work.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I should like to see this thing explored on the floor. I do not care what somebody says about it 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 apportion 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 was possible to cut things down by proceeding with people who were not interested in special projects. I hope the thing will be explored before we get through so people will understand what you are shooting 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 an over-all budget finally escapes us. The thing to do is to see it on broad 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.

As to the exploration, if you want some interesting reading sometime, get down the old volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when the Budget and Accounting Act was debated in 1921. It is marvelous. 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 relations in government where 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.

Let it not be said that we are so selfish that we take staff aid—we take clerical help—we take retirement—we take increases in salary—we take deductibil-

ity from income—and then not have something constructive and useful to give to the 140,000,000 people who pay the money that is expended and appropriated by this body.

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The original bill in the Senate had a provision for an administrative assistant. I believe that is not contained in the House version.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is taken out.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I wish to inquire whether with the consolidation of the committees does the gentleman feel the individual member will have more work placed upon his shoulders and that he might therefore be in need of an administrative assistant?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am hoping that he will have less. As a member of the committee that has one or more senior specialists attached to it, he can do more work and perhaps have a little time for leisure.

Members of the House, we have brought you an integrated bill. 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 concerned and the staffing of these committees—that has been integrated and worked out. If you kick out one of these things without good and persuasive reasons, then, of course, you are going to break up the definite and precise procedures 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 encouraging. It was compelling. It was extraordinary. I refer to the outstanding single fact observed by the Special Committee on the Organization of Congress 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 outstanding single fact observed by the committee was the virtual accord of criticism and suggestion proposed by the numerous and expert observers who appeared before us. Here in Congress where the urgent interests of the Nation meet and toss turbulently before being channeled into legislative direction, we rarely meet 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 expression here. 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 study to this vital question. It heard a great variety of testimony from Members of Congress, political scientists, students of government, and so forth. Yet despite the significant and fundamental 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 thoughtful and thorough, their criticisms reasoned and penetrating, 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 Members. 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. When such attacks have been bitter, harsh, unjust, and mean, as they often have been, we have had either to ignore them, which is dignified but not rebuking, or protest them, which is to expose one to degrading controversy. But when there has been a measure of truth in such attacks 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 criticisms more insistent, 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 has been limited, our legislative prerogative greatly deferred to the executive branch, our power of policy making disorganized, our oversight of administrative performance 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 labor."

And small wonder too that there has been a tremendous surge in recent years in and out of Congress for reorganization, a surge which we hope will gain the highest level. 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 methods 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 Legislature is strong and effective. Recent history is too full of pointed warnings of the consequence of the default of legislatures. The decay of national vigor or the surrender of all power to the dictator have been the product of the impotence 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 the defects in our present machinery and to enable Congress to perform adequately its main functions of determining policy, authorizing administrative organization and appropriations to carry out policy, and supervising execution of the resultant program. The term "streamlining Congress" is frequently heard in reference to these proposals. Such a term ignores the structural and basic element of reorganization incorporated. We are equipping ourselves with a modern and more efficient engine which eliminates waste, restores power, utilizes energy to the fullest, and assures continued performance.

Mr. Chairman, I refer to the proposed changes as basic and structural, designed to improve the machinery and method of both Houses and of the Congress 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 a constructive plan whose design is reorganization. In the select committee I affirmed for the RECORD 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, and declare that if it remains as part of the bill, I must object to its passage.

My endorsement and unstinting support of the reorganization bill is a matter of record and I reiterate that endorsement 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 so doing I am most anxious to assert, since the issue might be regarded as a delicate one, that this difference of opinion reflects no discredit on either party to opinion.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has proposed to correct the practice of attaching riders to appropriation bills, a proposal we should all endorse since such riders 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 own merits, but despite them, for often they are provisions which would not otherwise receive the approval of Congress. 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 in including a salary proposal 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 alien to the proper intent of the bill. We would condone, and, it might be noted, to our own advantage, an abuse of legislative purpose which at the same time we propose to eliminate. This is a weakening inconsistency. Let the question of salary pass or fail on its own merits, debated and voted under open scrutiny.

But it is argued that such a proposal is at one 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. Men are elected to Congress on the support of the voters of the Nation because their record of public service has been meritorious or their qualifications are outstanding. Men seek election to Congress because they are devoted to or fascinated by public service, enjoy its responsibilities, desire the prestige and accolades that accompany it, are resolved to participate in forming the policy of the Nation and for similar reasons. It is significant in this respect to note that most Members seek reelection year after year, that comparatively few resign, except in wartime, to work elsewhere in public service, and salary is rarely the decisive factor. No, membership in Congress appeals to most of us quite apart from the salary, which obviously does not enrich us, and membership in Congress is determined by a popular vote which imposes a challenging demand on candidates. I am quite sure that a readjustment in our salary would scarcely affect the calibre of Congress. The opposite assertion is gratuitous.

Charles A. Beard, the eminent historian, has been one, and among the most astute, who has pointed out that our deficiencies lie in the system, not the men. He, while making cogent observations on present structural limitations pertinent to our study, has rebuked the oft-expressed opinion that the calibre of Congress has seriously declined. He says:

It is possible to pick out of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the past 10 years addresses (not orations) which for breadth of knowledge, technical skill, analytical argument, close reasoning, and dignified presentation compare favorably with similar utterances made in the preceding century by the so-called great orators.

The improvements proposed by the reorganization bill in the structure of Congress are not only long overdue but they are so thorough and far-reaching that they will modernize Congress. They are not only urgently needed but they promise extremely beneficial results. The study which produced them was thorough. The spirit that proposed them was ambitious. The consensus of opinion that aided in formulating them

was of the highest order. They are an integrated series, with the single exception of this salary proposal. While I believe that it would be a mistake to retain this extraneous provision, I will strongly protest against any attempt to reduce the essential body of proposals to segments. It is unfortunate that the salary question has been included; it does not belong. But all else is integral to the purpose and plan, vital to its intent, essential for its efficacy.

The committee has proposed changes which would seek to secure a firm follow-through between legislative decision and executive action, which would not only determine broad policies clearly and decisively but would also review the effectiveness of the policy and the subsequent administration of the policy. Most important of these is a simplified system of standing committees corresponding with the major areas of public policy and public administration. First, the correlation of the committee systems of the two Chambers with each other would facilitate joint action on specific measures by means of joint hearings. And the coordination of the congressional committee system with the pattern of the administrative branch of the National Government would, as the report states:

Improve the performance by Congress of its legislative and supervisory functions, provide direct channels of communication between the two branches, promote more harmonious and unified action in the development of public policies, and go a long way to bridge the gap between the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

The proposed committee realignment would certainly increase committee efficiency, of prime importance since committee work is the center and nucleus of our system. It is provided, for example, that the Appropriations and Ways and Means Committees of the House shall confer and by such conference guarantee a balance between money obtained in revenue and money expended. The right and left hands of our monetary policy would not only know what the other was doing, but would work together. And working together the committees could exercise more effective insight into administrative policy, as is variously provided. No longer will the tremendous sums of money we appropriate vanish into the great morass of Federal agencies and Government corporations to be freely employed and easily interchanged. We will now appropriate funds knowing what the Federal income will be, and instructing all agencies specifically in the expenditure of those sums. And the committee has further provided against supplemental appropriations by requiring the President to take specific steps to assure that allotted funds are not exceeded.

Of great interest to all of us is the reduction in the number of standing committees and the elimination of special committees. We have all had the experience of being members of separate committees which were meeting at the same time. One of the chief difficulties of the special committee was this very conflict of demands on our time. Not infrequently I was unable to hear the testimony of authorities of special note be-

cause of the meetings of the Judiciary Committee of which I serve. The reduction in the number of committees, the specific assignments of committee responsibility and province, and the provision for joint hearings of both the Senate and the House on important matters are all designed to speed up and strengthen our system while minimizing wasted time and confusion, overlapping, and conflict of claim.

Mr. Chairman, as regularly as the clock strikes the hour, and enforced by that striking, every Member is reminded every day of two facts, as closely allied as the hands of the clock. The first is that the demands on his time are incessant and even oppressive, and that his sources of information and assistance inadequate. In the Seventy-seventh Congress a total of 10,793 bills were introduced and 541 joint resolutions. Out of this flood Congress passed 1,078 House bills and 476 Senate bills. Again in the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress 953 bills and resolutions were passed, of which only 86 were subject to any real discussion. The other 867 were passed by voice vote or without objection. But it is not only in this flood of legislation that we are overwhelmed. I have mentioned the demands of committee work; yet we know too well that this is only part of the demand. The tremendous detail of office work, which we are unwilling to stint, the public appearances, the special investigations, the trips to or consultations with officers of the Federal agencies, meeting constituents, radio appearances, and so forth—the fact is, as we know well, that we are trying to do a great deal too many things which we regard as our responsibility without being able to do any of them as well as we would like or are able to do.

Furthermore we have hard-working, but greatly overburdened, assistants whose extraordinary efforts cannot keep pace with the demands placed on them. We have five legal counsels trying to assist in drafting legislation not only for 435 Members but for the House committees as well. The committees are forced to do their work with staffs that are but a fraction of corresponding staffs in the executive branch. We must rely on the very representatives of the Federal agencies for information when we are trying to exercise our supervision of their carrying out of the policy we have prescribed. These and many more inadequacies in our modus operandi have been cited insistently as draw-backs to our efficient operation.

So comprehensive are the many changes proposed, so significant is each to our policy and procedure, and so worthy is each of special note that it is impossible here to attend to all. A quick review will, however, show us an impressive array, revolutionary yet fitting. Witness. Improved fiscal procedure. Private bill banned; the claims deferred to the courts. Definite adjournment provided annually. Improved committee procedure. Special committees banned, and committee jurisdiction better defined. Conference rules are defined to prevent the introduction of provisions not approved by either House. Standing committees will exercise con-

tinuous surveillance of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of laws within the jurisdiction of respective committees. Committee hearings will be preserved. More adequate provision made for information on the legislative day. Transfer of appropriations is prohibited to executive departments and units therein, and administrative management analysis are called for from the Comptroller General on efficient and economic administration and expenditure of public funds. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to be improved. Committees on the Library and Printing reorganized. Lobbying regulated. This requires a word without curtailing 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, lobbying will be regulated by provisions which include detailed account of contributions, filed statements and registration with specific penalties for violations.

Here are a few of the numerous wise and progressive provisions that make the reorganization 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 investigating every conceivable 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 standing and 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 heighten our accomplishments. We can restore our prestige and effectiveness. We can free our hands then to be able to grip the great issues of these crucial days. We can refute the thesis of the managerial revolution and maintain the 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 overripe for reform. They all 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. Administration is an adaptation of the ways of business to the state. And in a world in which the national economy is made up of huge corporate estates, the pressures toward Presidential rule are relentless. But lest the historical trend write its own ticket in an irresponsible Executive or an oligarchy of pluralistic agencies, the American system should be accorded another chance. So, let us restore to Congress, the institution tied up most closely with the liberties of the people, its vital role in the conduct of public affairs. For we are inventive; new techniques must serve ancient ends, and even if

administration is here to stay, we need not sacrifice representative government.

I feel that I would be neglecting what almost constitutes a duty if I were to fail to speak my praise of the great efforts and accomplishments of Senator LA FOLLETTE and Congressman MONRONEY, chairman and vice chairman, respectively, of the joint committee to whose creative initiative, patient perseverance, and deep understanding we are indebted for these historic proposals. And we all must feel indebted to Mr. George B. Galloway, chairman of the Committee on Congress of the American Political Science Association, who served with remarkable vigilance and admirable devotion as staff director of the committee. From his profound knowledge of the National Legislature and the National Government and his penetrating, analytical insight came not only many of the concrete proposals, but the moving and sustaining spirit of our study.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time, 7 minutes, to the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND].

Mr. OUTLAND. 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 Oklahoma [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] made a splendid presentation of the more important phases of that 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 had in the past. I am proud of the fact that I am a member of the great 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 on the part of any particular committee is not the main issue; the point is better over-all congressional functioning.

I may say in passing that it just might have been that if our committee had not had so many jobs on our hands this year, we could have turned out a report on the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill and gotten it through and obtained a vote on it at this session. But the tremendous load of work this particular committee has been carrying unfortunately has delayed hearings on this vital housing measure. If the other committees had not had so much on their hands they might have turned out legislation that is very important. So I think in the long run this consolidation of committees is an excellent thing.

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

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HAYS. I want to join my colleague from California in emphasizing this matter of surrendering committee functions. He would agree, would he not, that it is incumbent upon us to think not solely of one committee and its functions if we are to make this tremendously forward step in efficiency? I would call attention to the fact that under this set-up the Committee on Banking, of which both of us are members, loses some of its jurisdiction over foreign loans and agricultural loans. That we would surrender to the Agriculture Committee and the other to the Foreign Affairs Committee functions which we have been jealous of heretofore.

Mr. OUTLAND. I agree with the gentleman completely.

Mr. Chairman, there are two or three additional things I want to mention. One 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 do its full duty to the American people it should make every individual who represents an outside organization state his income and his outgo. It is a worth-while 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 might not be considered under present rules?

Mr. OUTLAND. 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

points first. I will try and get to the gentleman's point before I conclude.

I said a few moments ago that in my judgment this bill did not go far enough. I would like to see restored on the floor of the House the provision for an administrative assistant for each Member of Congress. Why should there not be one? Are Members afraid to vote themselves that additional help if they need it to properly perform their duties? I was going to introduce such an amendment but I now understand that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. WOODHOUSE] is going to introduce the amendment. I shall support it here on the floor.

May I say too that I hope joint committees of the House and Senate will be set up to expedite committee hearings; that measures will be taken to take out of the hands of congressional patronage appointment of men to both service academies. I can see no reason why it should be a congressional prerogative to appoint the future Army and Navy officers. It should be on a civil-service basis, on the basis of merit, alone, and upon no other basis.

I think also the appointment of post-masters should be based on merit and should not be retained in the hands of Congress.

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

Mr. OUTLAND. In just a moment. I have only a few minutes and I still have several points to bring out, if the gentleman will pardon me.

I would like to see eventually the provision reinstated in a measure of this nature which will provide for more joint sessions of the two Houses of Congress and for joint committees of the two Houses. One way in which we are going to expedite our work even more than is provided for in this measure is by seeing that committees which are considering the same legislation do not call the same man back to give exactly the same testimony before each one of them. It has come to my attention that in one instance a very important governmental official, one high in the ranks of government, had to come up here eight different times to give exactly the same testimony on the same subject matter before eight different committees. If we make some provision in our reorganization plans to correct that kind of situation I think we will be doing a great service to the country.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this bill is passed by a tremendous majority. I trust also that the splendid work begun by this joint committee this session will be continued in the Eightieth Congress. Only as we criticize and improve our own procedure will we be able to make the legislative branch of our Government achieve its full and rightful place in the American system of government.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

SHORT TITLE

That (a) this act, divided into titles and sections according to the following table of

contents, may be cited as the "Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946":

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 (a) 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. Standing committees 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 Public Lands.

Committee on Public Works.

Committee on Rules and Administration.

Sec. 103. Appropriations.

Part 2—Rules of the House of Representatives

Sec. 121. Standing committees 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. 122. Delegates and Resident Commissioner.

Sec. 123. Reference of private claims bills.

Part 3—Provisions applicable to both Houses

Sec. 131. Private bills banned.

Sec. 132. Congressional adjournment.

Sec. 133. Committee procedure.

Sec. 134. Committee powers.

Sec. 135. Conference rules on amendments in nature of substitute.

Sec. 136. Legislative oversight by standing committees.

Sec. 137. Decisions on questions of committee jurisdiction.

Sec. 138. Legislative Budget.

Sec. 139. Hearings and reports by Appropriations Committees.

Sec. 140. Records of Congress.

Sec. 141. Preservation of committee hearings.

Sec. 142. Effective date.

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS

Part 1—Statutory provisions relating to Congressional personnel

Sec. 201. Stenographic pool.

Sec. 202. Increase in compensation for certain congressional officers.

Sec. 203. Committee staffs.

Sec. 204. Legislative Reference Service.

Sec. 205. Office of the Legislative Counsel.

Sec. 206. Studies by Comptroller General.

Sec. 207. Expenditure analyses by Comptroller General.

Sec. 208. Correction of Military and Naval Records.

Part 2—Statutory provisions relating to committees of Congress

Sec. 221. Improvement of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sec. 222. Joint Committee on Printing.

Sec. 223. Joint Committee on the Library.

Sec. 224. Transfer of functions.

Sec. 225. Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

Sec. 226. Economic Report of the President.

Part 3—Provisions relating to Capitol and pages

Sec. 241. Remodeling of caucus rooms and restaurants.

Sec. 242. Assignment of Capitol space.

Sec. 243. Senate and House pages.

Sec. 244. Effective date.

TITLE III—REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

Sec. 301. Short title.

Sec. 302. Definitions.

Sec. 303. Detailed accounts of contributions.

Sec. 304. Receipts for contributions.

Sec. 305. Statements to be filed with Clerk of House.

Sec. 306. Statement preserved for 2 years.

Sec. 307. Persons to whom applicable.

Sec. 308. Registration with Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House.

Sec. 309. Reports and statements to be made under oath.

Sec. 310. Penalties.

Sec. 311. Exemption.

TITLE IV—FEDERAL TORT CLAIMS ACT

Part 1—Short title and definitions

Sec. 401. Short title.

Sec. 402. Definitions.

Part 2—Administrative adjustment of tort claims against the United States

Sec. 403. Claims of \$1,000 or less.

Sec. 404. Reports.

Part 3—Suits on tort claims against the United States

Sec. 410. Jurisdiction.

Sec. 411. Procedure.

Sec. 412. Review.

Sec. 413. Compromise.

Part 4—Provisions common to part 2 and part 3

Sec. 420. One year statute of limitations.

Sec. 421. Exceptions.

Sec. 422. Attorneys' fees.

Sec. 423. Exclusiveness of remedy.

Sec. 424. Certain statutes inapplicable.

TITLE V—GENERAL BRIDGE ACT

Sec. 501. Short title.

Sec. 502. Consent of Congress.

Sec. 503. Tolls.

Sec. 504. Acquisition by public agencies.

Sec. 505. Statements of cost.

Sec. 506. Sinking fund.

Sec. 507. Applicability of title.

Sec. 508. International bridges.

Sec. 509. Eminent domain.

Sec. 510. Penalties.

Sec. 511. Rights reserved.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT PAY
OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Sec. 601. Compensation of Members of Congress.

Sec. 602. Retirement pay of Members of Congress.

Mr. MONRONEY (interrupting reading of amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask that the reading of the substitute over to line 1, page 4, be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.
The Clerk read as follows:

SEPARABILITY CLAUSE

(b) If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to say that this substitute is now being read as an original bill subject to amendment. It will be read section by section.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who advocate and who believe that there are many things that need to be done for the purpose of improving congressional procedure and I want to congratulate the committee on the very effective and constructive work it has done on this bill. I am in full accord with all of the provisions of the bill insofar as they affect legislative procedures in the House. Of course, I accord to every Member of this Committee the same privilege and prerogatives that I hope they accord me.

I am against the retirement provision for elective officials not only for Members of Congress but of any other legislative body. I think it is wrong in principle. I do not believe it was ever contemplated that the legislative branches of government which must pass upon retirement laws and retirement benefits for ordinary civil-service employees and many others should ever be placed in the same category or should ever place themselves in the same category as those appointed officials or appointed employees who become a part of the working system of the Federal Government. It was intended by the founding fathers when they so wisely set up this system of government that the Congress itself would not be a professional Congress, if you please, but a citizens' Congress of independent individuals, not pensioners of the taxpayers, and if this Congress goes that far I believe that we destroy some of the very things we are attempting to cure.

I am one of those who believe that the Members of Congress should be paid an adequate salary and should be paid an adequate expense account for their actual necessary and legitimate expenses. There is no sound argument or reason why Members of Congress should be required to pay legitimate expenses incurred in conducting official business out of their salaries.

I know that very fine and sympathetic arguments can be made with respect to retirement benefits. I know there are

many cases that come to our attention of Members of Congress of splendid citizens, who have given the best part of their lives in faithful and long service here in the House who are insecure in their declining years, but at the same time I do not think that because of those few cases we can afford, as Members of Congress, to place the Congress of the United States in the category of pensioners. It is not a matter, as I see it, of whether we have the courage to do something for ourselves. I voted for the expense account because I thought the Members of Congress were entitled to it. That is not the question in this bill, but it is a question whether or not the principles of retirement shall be applied to Members of Congress. That is the way I feel about it.

Certainly, we do not cripple the things that my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] talked about by striking from the bill the retirement feature. I think he made a splendid argument in connection with the need for an improved fiscal policy for this Government, and the coordination that must be had between the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Ways and Means. We certainly do not weaken that provision or any other provision of the so-called streamlining of Congress by striking from this bill the provisions for retirement benefits. At the proper time I shall offer an amendment to strike out that language.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask two questions of the vice chairman of the Committee on Reorganization, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. First, I ask this question: There is enumerated the jurisdiction of the various committees. For example, take the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, as enumerated on page 36. I find that there are not mentioned certain subject matters over which the Committee on the Judiciary has always had jurisdiction; for instance, war powers, salary increases of Congressmen, Alien Property Custodian, prohibition, flags. What will be the rule if those subject matters are not specifically mentioned in this bill?

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the gentleman for a very, very good question. It was the feeling of the Committee on Reorganization that it was a physical impossibility to spell out in complete detail every single possible jurisdictional matter that would be before a committee. We tried to erect this as a guidepost from the House precedents.

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 prerogatives 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 those committees 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 cannot say. We do not change or interfere in any degree with existing practices in the House regarding committee assignments or the places which are assigned by the Committee on Ways and Means on our side and the Committee on Committees on the Republican side.

That is still left a matter for the two major parties to determine. The only place that that actually comes before the House is the existing House rule that the chairman of committees of the House shall be elected by the House, which is the existing rule of the House.

Mr. CELLER. It is not the gentleman's recommendation, then, that the seniority rule that now prevails should not be changed?

Mr. MONRONEY. We do nothing whatsoever about the seniority rule or try to regulate the places on the committees.

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 that 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 go into the details through subcommittees or otherwise of 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 joint 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 any good 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. What earthly use would the Bureau of the Budget's recommendations be if they did not over a period of 4

or 5 months before the Budget is presented to the 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. If the legislative budget is to be 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? There is nothing said here as to whether 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 connection with it. 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 committees until then.

I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE 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 idea they have in mind. I could get a little 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? Is it going to be an omnibus appropriation bill where logrolling can be done? It was the idea of Martin Madden in charge of the Appropriations Committee very shortly after 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 of this operation to get an omnibus appropriation bill and have it put through by special interests as a result of logrolling is the question involved. All of these recommendations of the Budget must be considered by this 104-man committee and decided in that way. Is it going to be that kind of a budget or it is going to be a budget gotten up by members of the committee who do not represent special interests? I am interested in finding out something about it—as to what is proposed and how it could work. We have had nothing but generalities. If we are going to be delayed until the 1st of March

or the middle of March or the 1st of April before we can start Appropriations Committee hearings—and that is the way it looks—I do not see how it is going to be possible ever to get these bills out and have them considered in time to be enacted into law before the end of the fiscal year and in time for them to take effect. I would like to see what these people have in mind. Of course, if it is nothing but a pious gesture and if it is to be done in a slipshod way with ideas that these people have in their heads—ideas taken out of the air—that is one thing. But if we are going to have a thorough attempt to go through our Budget estimates which are sent down to us by the President, we must work on them just as soon as the Congress is organized, and that work must be done intensively or otherwise we are not going to accomplish any results. I am projecting these thoughts because I want to see the right thing done. I want to see it done because it is the right thing and not because a lot of people have been putting out propaganda or because people who do not understand it have suggested it.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Can the gentleman tell me how it is possible for any group to meet along about the 15th of February or the 1st of March and place a ceiling on appropriations without hearings having been held previously to determine what is necessary?

Mr. TABER. If you are going to have the job done intelligently, you must have hearings as a basis for it. If not, your work will be utterly useless.

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 think it is. 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 that they have in here. Suppose you put on a budget ceiling, and without having that ceiling allocated to different appropriation bills and different departments the Appropriations Committee should attempt to bring in bills. The first 8 or 10 bills that were brought in might be under the ceiling or they might wipe out the ceiling without getting anywhere at all.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Does not the gentleman realize the position in which the tax committee is placed if it

proceeds on the assumption that you will have a budget of \$25,000,000,000 and then make a tax cut, and then we find later on the appropriation bills have amounted to \$45,000,000,000?

Mr. TABER. That is a terrible thing. I appreciate the necessity for a balanced budget. I have worked for that ever since I have been here. A great many times it was not effective. On the other hand, at times it has been effective.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think if this committee met approximately the 15th of June and went over the work of the various subcommittees and all the discussions which had been held upon the floor, and then perhaps that committee could 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 be using a little common 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 3 or 4 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 strike out the last four words.

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 is 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 here, I would like at least to suggest that we translate this into simple language. Perhaps we can understand it better.

If you were preparing a household budget for yourself 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. Then you would set up the groups of expenditures into which you expected to put your personal income for that year. You would not worry at the beginning of the year 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 it. So here the proposal is to set up the amount of money the Government may properly spend in its financial situation, and then to realize that the Appropriations Committee and the Ways and Means Committee should work together, first to appropriate economically and within limits 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 our 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 subcommittees in the Committee on Appropriations 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 help 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. 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 is what I do not think it should 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 gone beyond the historic 25 percent set down as a safe limit.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And certainly I think there should be coordination between revenues and expenditures. That part 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 budget estimate and being tremendously interested in the reorganization of Congress, I have had some occasion to review the history of legislation of this character. Everything suggested now 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 handling 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. TABER]. I know of no two men who have done more to help balance the budget or who are more sincerely interested in those things than the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from New York. They have lived with this thing. 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 anyone 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 850 employees of the Bureau of the Budget. They have sat there and are sitting 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 which sit down for months and try 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.

Think of the ridiculousness of the proposition offered here. They are going to call the Ways and Means Committee in to help the Appropriations Committee on the proposition, and we are going over to the Ways and Means Committee and tell them how to do their taxing, what they should put in their revenue bills. Then the Senate is coming over here to tell us about our budget and we are going to tell them about theirs. The result will be confusion because under this bill as it stands today all of this vast and intelligent analysis that is so necessary will have to be done in 30 days under the bill. Mr. Chairman, it is preposterous.

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

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, these estimates are worked on by the Bureau of the Budget with 850 employees, with their experts, trying to do a job, and then the Appropriations Committee works on them, to cut them intelligently; yet all of that is to be superseded by a 30-day study by this super committee made up of Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Appropriations Committee, together with the same two corresponding bodies in the Senate. In that 30 days they will tell you what you should appropriate.

Gentlemen, it is ridiculous, and it will bring nothing toward orderly and better Government.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I am not here to offer any crippling amendments or to make suggestions that would throw monkey wrenches into the works, but when I heard the last speech made by the gentleman who just preceded me, extolling the virtues of the Bureau of the Budget, and how hard they labored to save money for the taxpayers, I could not help thinking about the President's reorganization plans that this House defeated overwhelmingly. The gentleman who was in charge of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Smith, on that occasion, even though this House passed the bill providing for a 25 percent decrease in the cost of government, when asked regarding that decrease, said that it had not ever been considered.

I have great respect for the gentleman from Kentucky, and he is most convincing, and because he is so eloquent and convincing, I felt the need to rise on this occasion to point out the fact 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. MONRONEY], who sponsored this legislation, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] 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 the amendment that we offered, 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 many hard-working men down there who are trying to do their job as sincerely as the gentleman is trying to do his.

Mr. BENDER. Frankly I do give credit to them. I think they are a fine agency and 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 up 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 the gentleman and I vote for.

Mr. BENDER. But the Budget has made many recommendations that we revised downward, and we do it regularly, on every appropriation bill.

There are many pressing and difficult issues before the Nation today which demand our keenest thinking. Virtually every one of these problems requires legislative analysis and action. Yet Con-

gress finds itself in the position of seeking to battle a multitude of complex economic, social, and political difficulties with archaic legislative weapons. Our procedure has proven itself painfully slow, cumbersome, and expensive.

A Congress which is forever prodding the Executive to cut down on unnecessary expenditures cannot itself sanction the wastefulness of duplicating committees, hearings, and functions. Nor is there any justification in these days for the expensive double employment of experts by the executive branch of our Government and by special congressional committees.

Congress will do well to take action at once on the proposal now pending to modernize its functions.

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 a staff of full-time experts 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 Senate and House to assure effective cooperation would be set up. Another joint committee representing the majority and minority parties in Congress would 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 the 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, is something I have been wishing would come before the House of Representatives for a long, long, long time. I tried many times to get the Appropriations Committee and the Ways and Means Committee to get together 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 hew to the line of a balanced budget.

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

Mr. RICH. I yield 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 money, 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

that they know just exactly what they can spend in that home. If they spend more than they take in, when they have to go 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 make additions or improvements" and they figure the cost. They know it will cost so much money. But before they determine that they are going to spend that money they know exactly where they are going to get every dollar of it. They do not obligate themselves for hundreds of thousands of dollars when they do not know where it is coming from. They make arrangements with the banks or somebody else to finance them, and then they know how much they have to make from day to day to pay that debt off.

For 14 years I have been very much dissatisfied with the way we have been squandering, unintelligently, the money of the taxpayers of this country, and I say we have been squandering it, and I say it advisedly. Look at our financial statement and it will reveal its terribly terrible condition to you. We have not used business procedure or business methods in Congress in our financing the Federal Government. If we now adopt section 138 and carry out its provisions, as I hope will be the case, I believe we will be able to do something that will eventually cause us to have a Budget we can balance. If we do not do that, our Government is hopelessly lost, because our indebtedness of \$268,000,000,000 now certainly is an amount that ought to make every one of you shudder. Each one of you owes \$2,000 of that debt, and every man, woman, and child in your district owes the sum of \$2,000. A family of five owes \$10,000 of that debt of this country, and they have to pay it. It is for this reason if for no other reason that we ought to adopt section 138. Also we should not vote any increased salaries to Members at this time, the country is not in condition to accept the increase and they cannot afford to pay it. You must cut down the expenses of government and show the taxpayers that the majority party are worthy of their hire. The stockholders of a corporation would not elect directors that would wreck the corporation and put it into bankruptcy if they knew it. Do you think they would? No; they would vote them out. I say to you, watch out if your stockholders do not do likewise.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have been privileged to be a member of the Committee on Appropriations 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 myself four-square with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has today given to the House of Representatives a challenge. So far as I

am concerned as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I endorse what he has said 100 percent. I know the House of Representatives is not going to turn its back upon the provisions in this bill which the sponsors of the bill say, and the distinguished Senator from my own State of Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] says, are the very guts of this bill. Now, let us see what they are arguing about. 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 Appropriations of the Senate in a joint meeting to take a look at this budget which the President submits at the beginning of each session." Why not? I ask you. Why should they not take a look? Why should they not examine that budget? Why should they not raise the question as to whether or not it is possible to adopt a legislative budget—a legislative mark, if you please—that the committees of Congress may shoot at in an attempt to balance the budget? The budget that the President will submit 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 not they have the up-to-the-minute figures of these departments submitted so that we can have an up-to-the-minute legislative budget? Perhaps it may interfere somewhat with this Subcommittee on Deficiency Appropriations that has already reported out 3 deficiency bills involving billions of dollars which never were considered by any of the subcommittees of Congress charged with appropriating for the items contained in those 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 Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] I have not heard one sound argument adduced which to me is a compelling argument against the adoption of the provisions of this reorganization bill which will give this joint committee an opportunity to go over the Presidential budget to try to 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 ceiling that the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations can shoot at.

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

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in this proposal that stops 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 situation of appropriating money, as I have experienced 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 having 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 conviction in that regard that I, as one member 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 ably and magnificently expressed by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

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

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close 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, there are many features of this bill which I think are important. 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 reorganizing the activities of Congress. Practically 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 controversial features should be introduced at this time. In other words, features which might not be adopted if they independently came before the House.

It was only a few months ago that this House had the privilege of voting directly on the question of pensions for Congressmen. The bill was sent back to committee. The House refused to take any action whatsoever regarding it. Previously that question has been before the Congress and has been discussed and turned down. Yet, because this is an important bill and because it is a step in the right direction, even though it is not complete in all particulars, again we have this question of congressional pensions inserted. I happened to be among those who opposed congressional pensions during many Congresses and I continue to oppose them.

Another is the provision for the increase of salaries of Senators and Representatives. There is a way of increasing 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 legislative committee, let it receive favorable consideration in the Committee of the Whole, and then a vote by the House, on a ye and nay vote. That is the way to increase salaries and do it fairly and squarely. There is no reason why that particular salary provision should be put into this bill. There is nothing in the procedures of Congress that depends upon the salaries that Members receive. 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 additional \$640,000 per year as 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 for them will probably amount to not to exceed \$20 per year for every pensioner on the lists. Certainly if there is any reason why salaries should be increased in Congress, or why there should be a wage increase everywhere 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 congressional 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 purposes of the 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 Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, or of that House to which they specifically apply; and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(b) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the portions of the bill from line 12, page 5, to line 13, page 24, be considered as read and printed in the RECORD. That portion of the bill deals exclusively with the rules of the Senate over which the House exercises no real jurisdiction, and it would

expedite consideration of the bill to treat it in this manner.

The 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 1—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 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.
- "9. Dairy industry.
- "10. Entomology and plant quarantine.
- "11. Human nutrition and home economics.
- "12. Plant industry, soils, and agricultural engineering.
- "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.

"(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.
- "(c) Committee on Armed Services, 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. Common defense generally.
- "2. The War Department and the Military Establishment generally.
- "3. The Navy Department and the Naval Establishment generally.
- "4. Soldiers' and sailors' homes.
- "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.
- "9. Ammunition depots.
- "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 under this rule.
- "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 Federal 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 ocean mail and pneumatic-tube 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, 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 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. Adulteration of food and drugs.
- "5. Taxes and tax sales.
- "6. Insurance, executors, administrators, wills, and divorce.
- "7. Municipal and juvenile courts.
- "8. Incorporation and organization of societies.
- "9. Municipal code and amendments to the criminal and corporation laws.

"(g) (1) 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:

- "(A) Budget and accounting measures, other than appropriations.
- "(B) Reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government.
- "(2) Such committee shall have the duty of—

"(A) receiving and examining reports of the Comptroller General of the United States and of submitting such recommendations to the Senate 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.

"(h) Committee on Finance, 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 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. Tariffs and import quotas, and matters related thereto.
- "9. National social security.
- "10. Veterans' measures generally.
- "11. Pensions of all the wars of the United States, general and special.
- "12. Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the armed forces.
- "13. Compensation of veterans.

"(i) Committee on Foreign Relations, 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. Relations of the United States with foreign nations generally.
- "2. Treaties.
- "3. Establishment of boundary lines between the United States and foreign nations.
- "4. Protection of American citizens abroad and expatriation.
- "5. Neutrality.
- "6. International conferences and congresses.
- "7. The American National Red Cross.
- "8. Intervention abroad and declarations of war.
- "9. Measures relating to the diplomatic service.
- "10. Acquisition of land and buildings for embassies and legations in foreign countries.
- "11. Measures to foster commercial intercourse with foreign nations and to safeguard American business interests abroad.
- "12. United Nations Organization and international financial and monetary organizations.
- "13. Foreign loans.

"(j) 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, busses, 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.
- "9. Merchant marine officers and seamen.
- "10. Measures relating to the regulation of common 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 service, lighthouses, lightships, and ocean derelicts.
- "13. The United States Coast Guard and Merchant Marine Academies.
- "14. Weather Bureau.
- "15. Except as provided in paragraph (c), the Panama Canal and interoceanic canals generally.
- "16. 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. Judicial proceedings, civil and criminal, generally.

"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.

"6. National penitentiaries.

"7. Protection of trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies.

"8. Holidays and celebrations.

"9. Bankruptcy, mutiny, espionage, and counterfeiting.

"10. State and Territorial boundary lines.

"11. Meetings of Congress, attendance of Members, and their acceptance of incompatible offices.

"12. Civil liberties.

"13. Patents, copyrights, and trade-marks.

"14. Patent Office.

"15. Immigration and naturalization.

"16. Apportionment of Representatives.

"17. Measures relating to claims against the United States.

"18. Interstate compacts generally.

"(l) Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, 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. Measures relating to education, labor, or public welfare 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.

"6. Child labor.

"7. Labor statistics.

"8. Labor standards.

"9. School-lunch program.

"10. Vocational rehabilitation.

"11. Railroad labor and railroad retirement and unemployment, except revenue measures relating thereto.

"12. United States Employees Compensation Commission.

"13. Columbia Institution for the Deaf, Dumb, and Blind; Howard University; Freedman's Hospital; and Saint Elizabeths Hospital.

"14. Public health and quarantine.

"15. Welfare of miners.

"16. Vocational rehabilitation and education of veterans.

"17. Veterans' hospitals, medical care and treatment of veterans.

"18. Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief.

"19. Readjustment of servicemen to civil life.

"(m) Committee on Public Lands, 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. Public lands generally, including entry, easements, and grazing thereon.

"2. Mineral resources of the public lands.

"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. Military parks and battlefields, and national cemeteries.

"6. Preservation of prehistoric ruins and objects of interest on the public domain.

"7. Measures relating generally to Hawaii, Alaska, and the insular possessions of the United States, except those affecting their revenue and appropriations.

"8. Irrigation and reclamation, including water supply for reclamation projects, and easements of public lands for irrigation projects.

"9. Interstate compacts relating to apportionment of waters for irrigation purposes.

"10. Mining interests generally.

"11. Mineral land laws and claims and entries thereunder.

"12. Geological survey.

"13. Mining schools and experimental stations.

"14. Petroleum conservation and conservation of the radium supply in the United States.

"15. Relations of the United States with the Indians and the Indian tribes.

"16. 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.

"6. Measures relating to the purchase of sites and construction of post offices, custom-houses, Federal courthouses, and Government buildings within the District of Columbia.

"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 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.

"(o) (1) Committee on Rules and Administration, 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:

"(A) Matters relating to the payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate or creating a charge upon the same; except that any resolution relating to substantive matter within the jurisdiction of any other standing committee of the Senate shall be first referred to such committee.

"(B) Except as provided in paragraph (n) 8, matters relating to the Library of Congress and the Senate Library; statuary and pictures; acceptance or purchase of works of art for the Capitol; the Botanic Gardens; management of the Library of Congress; purchase of books and manuscripts; erection of monuments to the memory of individuals.

"(C) Except as provided in paragraph (n) 8, matters relating to the Smithsonian Institution and the incorporation of similar institutions.

"(D) Matters relating to the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress; corrupt practices; contested elections; credentials and qualifications; Federal elections generally; Presidential succession.

"(E) Matters relating to parliamentary rules; floor and gallery rules; Senate Restaurant; administration of the Senate Office Building and of the Senate wing of the Capitol; assignment of office space; and services to the Senate.

"(F) Matters relating to printing and correction of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

"(2) Such committee shall also have the duty of examining all bills, amendments, and joint resolutions after passage by the Senate; and in cooperation with the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, of examining all bills and joint resolutions which shall have passed both Houses, to see that the same 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 Senate, to the President of the United States in person, and report the fact and date of such presentation to the Senate. Such committee shall also have the duty of assigning office space in the Senate wing of the Capitol and in the Senate Office Building.

"(2) Each standing committee shall continue and have the power to act until their successors are appointed.

"(3) Each standing committee is authorized to fix the number of its members (but not less than one-third of its entire membership) who shall constitute a quorum thereof for the transaction of such business as may be considered by said committee, subject to the provisions of section 133 (d) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

"(4) Each Senator shall serve on two standing committees and no more; except that Senators of the majority party who are members of 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."

Appropriations

SEC. 103. Rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"RULE XVI

"Amendments to appropriation bills

"1. All general appropriation bills shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and no amendments shall be received to any general appropriation bill the effect of which will be to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add a new item of appropriation, unless it be made to carry out the provisions of some existing law, or treaty stipulation, or act, or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session; or unless the same be moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, or proposed in pursuance of an estimate submitted in accordance with law.

"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 if such restriction is to take effect or cease to be effective upon the happening of a contingency, and if an appropriation bill is reported to the Senate containing amendments proposing new or general legislation or any such restriction, a point of order may be made against the bill, and if the point is sustained, the bill shall be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

"3. All amendments to general appropriation bills moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, proposing to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add new items of appropriation, shall, at least 1 day before they are considered, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and when actually proposed to the bill no amendment proposing to increase the amount stated in such amendment shall

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 shall be received to any general appropriation bill, nor shall any amendment not germane or relevant to the subject matter contained in the bill be received; nor shall any amendment to any item or clause of such bill be received which does not directly relate thereto; nor shall any restriction on the expenditure of the funds appropriated which proposes a limitation not authorized by law be received if such restriction is to take effect or cease to be effective upon the happening of a contingency; and all questions of relevancy of amendments under this rule, when raised, shall be submitted to the Senate and be decided without debate; and any such amendment or restriction to a general appropriation bill may be laid on the table without prejudice to 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 be cited on the face 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:

Name of committee	Purpose of appropriation
Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.	For the Department of Agriculture.
Committee on Civil Service.	For the Post Office Department.
Committee on Armed Services.	For the Department of War; for the Department of the Navy.
Committee on the District of Columbia.	For the District of Columbia.
Committee on Public Works.	For rivers and harbors.
Committee on Foreign Relations.	For the diplomatic and consular service.

"(b) At least one member of each committee enumerated in subparagraph (a), to be selected by his or their respective committees, shall be a member of any conference 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 their 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, the rule shall be construed strictly and, in case of doubt, in favor of the point of order."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be by the titles of the sections, each section to be open for amendment when the title has been read.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I want to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma a question: Would we by the provisions embodied in this bill have the right to change the rules of the next 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 section?

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. PATMAN. 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 advised?

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 section 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 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Standing committees of the House of Representatives

SEC. 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 by the House, at the commencement of each Congress, the following standing committees:

"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 33 Members.

"4. Committee on Banking and Currency, to consist of 27 Members.

"5. Committee on Civil Service, to consist of 25 Members.

"6. Committee on the District of Columbia, to consist of 25 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 27 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 order named 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 serve on one standing committee and no more; except that Members who are elected

to serve on the Committee on the District of Columbia or on the Committee on Un-American Activities may be elected to serve on two standing committees and no more, and Members of the majority party who are 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. Adulteration 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.

"9. Dairy industry.

"10. Entomology and plant quarantine.

"11. Human nutrition and home economics.

"12. Plant industry, soils, and agricultural engineering.

"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.

"(c) 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. Soldiers' and sailors' homes.

"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.

"9. Ammunition depots.

"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.

"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 under this rule.

"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.

"1. The Federal 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 ocean mail and pneumatic-tube 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. Adulteration of food and drugs.

"5. Taxes and tax sales.

"6. Insurance, executors, administrators, wills, and divorce.

"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.

"6. Child labor.

"7. Labor statistics.

"8. Labor standards.

"9. School-lunch program.

"10. Vocational rehabilitation.

"11. United States Employees' Compensation Commission.

"12. Columbia Institution for the Deaf, Dumb, and Blind; Howard University; Freedmen's Hospital; and St. Elizabeths Hospital.

"13. Welfare of miners.

"(h) (1) Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

"(A) Budget and accounting measures, other than appropriations.

"(B) Reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government.

"(2) Such committee shall 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.

"3. Protection of American citizens abroad and expatriation.

"4. Neutrality.

"5. International conferences and congresses.

"6. The American National Red Cross.

"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.

"10. Measures to foster commercial intercourse with foreign nations and to safeguard American business interests abroad.

"11. United Nations Organization and international financial and monetary organizations.

"12. Foreign loans.

"(j) (1) Committee on House Administration.

"(A) Employment of persons by the House, including clerks for Members and committees, and reporters of debates.

"(B) Expenditure of the contingent fund of the House.

"(C) The auditing and settling of all accounts which may be charged to the contingent fund.

"(D) Measures relating to accounts of the House generally.

"(E) Appropriations from the contingent fund.

"(F) Measures relating to services to the House, including the House Restaurant 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.

"(I) 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; statutory and pictures; acceptance or purchase of works of art for the Capitol; the Botanic Gardens; management of the Library of Congress; purchase of books and manuscripts; erection of monuments to the memory of individuals.

"(K) Except as provided in paragraph (o) 8, matters 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.

"(2) Such committee shall also have the duty of—

"(A) examining all bills, amendments, and joint resolutions after passage by the House; and, in cooperation with 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 the proceedings thereof.

"(k) Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

"1. Interstate and foreign commerce generally.

"2. Regulation of interstate railroads, busses, trucks, and pipe lines.

"3. Communication by telephone, telegraph, radio, and television.

"4. Civil aeronautics.

- "5. Weather Bureau.
 "6. Interstate oil compacts.
 "7. Railroad labor 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.
 "1. Judicial proceedings, civil and criminal, generally.
 "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.
 "6. National penitentiaries.
 "7. Protection of trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies.
 "8. Holidays and celebrations.
 "9. Bankruptcy, mutiny, espionage, and counterfeiting.
 "10. State and Territorial boundary lines.
 "11. Meetings of Congress, attendance of Members, and their acceptance of incompatible offices.
 "12. Civil liberties.
 "13. Patents, copyrights, and trade-marks.
 "14. Patent Office.
 "15. Immigration and naturalization.
 "16. Apportionment of Representatives.
 "17. Measures relating to claims against the United States.
 "18. Interstate compacts generally.
 "19. Presidential succession.
 "(m) 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 pilotage.
 "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.
 "10. Except as provided in paragraph (c), the Panama Canal and interoceanic canals generally.
 "11. Fisheries and wildlife, including research, restoration, refuges, and conservation.
 "(n) Committee on Public Lands.
 "1. Public lands generally, including entry, easements, and grazing thereon.
 "2. Mineral resources of the public lands.
 "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. Military parks and battlefields, and national cemeteries.
 "6. Preservation of prehistoric ruins and objects of interest on the public domain.
 "7. Measures relating generally to Hawaii, Alaska, and the insular possessions of the United States, except those affecting the revenue and appropriations.
 "8. Irrigation and reclamation, including water supply for reclamation projects, and easements of public lands for irrigation projects.
 "9. Interstate compacts relating to apportionment of waters for irrigation purposes.
 "10. Mining interests generally.
 "11. Mineral land laws and claims and entries thereunder.
 "12. Geological survey.

- "13. Mining schools and experimental stations.
 "14. Petroleum conservation and conservation of the radium supply in the United States.
 "15. Relations of the United States with the Indians and the Indian tribes.
 "16. 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.
 "(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.
 "6. Measures relating to the purchase of sites and construction of post offices, custom-houses, Federal courthouses, and Government buildings within the District of Columbia.
 "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 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 therefor; but it shall not be in order for any bill providing general legislation in relation to roads 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.
 "1. The rules, joint rules, and order of business of the House.
 "2. Recesses and final adjournments of Congress.
 "(q) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.
 "(A) Un-American activities.
 "(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) 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 the House is 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 subcommittee 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 such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by

- any person designated by any such chairman or member.
 "(r) Committee on Veterans' Affairs.
 "1. Veterans' measures generally.
 "2. Pensions of all the wars 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.
 "(2) (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 referred to it of printing for the use of the House or the two Houses, and on all matters of expenditure of the contingent fund of 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 grants to railroad and other corporations, 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 it is presented to the House, unless so determined by a vote of not less than two-thirds of the Members voting, but this provision shall not apply during the last 3 days of the session), and, pending the consideration thereof, the Speaker may entertain one motion that 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 shall provide that business under paragraph 7 of rule XXIV shall be set aside by a vote of less than two-thirds of the Members present; nor shall it report any rule or order which shall operate to prevent the motion to recommit being made as provided in paragraph 4 of rule XVI.
 "(c) The Committee on Rules shall present to the House reports concerning rules, joint rules, and order of business, within three legislative days 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 called up by the Member making the report within seven legislative days thereafter, any member of the Rules Committee may call it up as a question of privilege and the Speaker shall recognize any member of the Rules Committee seeking recognition for that purpose. If the Committee on Rules 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-

olution, on days when it shall be in order to call up motions to discharge committees it shall be in order for any Member of the House to call up for consideration by the House any such adverse report, and it shall be in order to move the adoption by the House of said resolution adversely reported notwithstanding the adverse report of the Committee on Rules, and the Speaker shall recognize the Member seeking recognition for that purpose as a question of the highest privilege.

"(d) The Committee on House Administration shall make final report to the House in all contested-election cases not later than 6 months from the first day of the first regular session of the Congress to which the contestee is elected except in a contest from the Territory of Alaska, in which case the time shall not exceed 9 months.

"(e) A standing committee of the House shall meet to consider any bill or resolution pending before it (A) on all regular meeting days selected by the committee; (B) upon the call of the chairman of the committee; (C) if the chairman of the committee, after 3 days consideration, refuses or fails, upon the request of at least three members of the committee, to call a special meeting of the committee within seven calendar days from the date of said request, then, upon the filing with the clerk of the committee of the written and signed request of a majority of the committee for a called special meeting of the committee, the committee shall meet on the day and hour specified in said written request. It shall be the duty of the clerk of the committee to notify all members of the committee in the usual way of such called special meeting.

"(f) The rules of the House are hereby made the rules of its standing committees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is hereby made a motion of high privilege in said committees."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer several committee amendments which are on the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONRONEY: Page 25, line 15, after the word "of", strike out "25" and insert "27."

On page 26, line 11, strike out "27" and insert "25."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, this is simply a clarifying amendment changing the number of members on the Ways and Means Committee from 27, which the committee had provided back to 25. Or, I should say, taking it back to its historic number.

The committee did not know it, but the Ways and Means Committee has always been a 25-man committee. The division within the committee has been 15 and 10 between majority and minority. We did not wish to disturb that historical relationship. We add to the 25 members of the Foreign Affairs Committee 2, making that 27 so as to preserve the numerical balance for the committee.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman tell us why the Committee on the Judiciary was reduced from 27 to 25 members in view of the fact that that committee absorbs under this bill the jurisdiction of four other committees? Why should it not be 27 instead of 25?

Mr. MONRONEY. The difference between 25 and 27 was largely to see that the mathematical balance of the House was preserved. If the gentleman wishes, he can offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONRONEY: Page 27, line 16, after the word "respectively", insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That unless otherwise provided herein any matter within the jurisdiction of a standing committee prior to January 2, 1947, shall remain subject to 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: On page 29, strike out lines 5 to 7, inclusive; and on page 38, strike out lines 1 and 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"10. The Panama Canal and the maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including the administration, sanitation, and government of the Canal Zone; and interoceanic canals generally."

The 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 36 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. Interstate oil compacts; and petroleum and natural gas, except on the public lands.

"7. Securities and exchanges.

"8. Regulation of interstate transmission of power, except the installation of connections between Government water-power projects.

"9. Railroad labor and railroad retirement and unemployment, except revenue measures relating thereto.

"10. Public health and quarantine.

"11. Inland waterways.

"12. Bureau of Standards, standardization of weights and measures, and the metric system."

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 will 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 CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONRONEY: Page 37, line 17, after the word "water", insert "(except matters subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONRONEY: Page 38, line 22, after the word "projects", strike out the period and insert a comma, and the words "and acquisition of private lands when necessary to complete irrigation projects."

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 "25" and insert "27."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, there is reduced by this bill the number of Members on the Committee on the Judiciary from 27 to 25, despite the fact that a great deal 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 their work, because a tremendous 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 on Claims. Over 2,000 claims bills were filed in this very session of Congress. The Federal tort claims bill, which will be passed by the passage of this bill, might reduce the number of claims bills filed, perhaps cut it in half, to 1,000 claims bills, but there will have to be a separate subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary to handle those additional claims bills.

It will be essential to set up a separate subcommittee to consider bills involving patents, copyrights, and trade-marks.

We also have 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 about 3 months to revise and codify the criminal 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 those

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 changing the membership of the Committee on the Judiciary from 25 to 27, and reducing the membership of the Committee on Foreign Affairs from 27 to 25, so we will keep our numerical balance?

Mr. CELLER. That is agreeable.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer that amendment to the gentleman's amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONRONEY to the amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: On page 25, line 21, strike out "twenty-five" and insert "twenty-seven" and in line 15 on that page strike out "twenty-seven" and insert "twenty-five."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: On page 45, line 12, after the word "House", insert "other than the Committee on Appropriations."

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 purposes. It would be impracticable to call this committee of 42 members together at a stated time when there could be no business for the consideration of the committee. I therefore have offered this amendment to except the Committee on Appropriations from this requirement.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WADSWORTH: On page 29, line 11, after the period, insert: "13. Scientific research and development in support of the armed services."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the special committee, of course, will understand that that is a perfectly simple amendment. Certainly the committee on the armed services should have jurisdiction over legislation

relating to scientific research and development in support of the armed services.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I think that is an entirely logical amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LYLE: On page 25, after line 24, insert:

"14. Committee on Post Office and Post Roads to consist of 25 members."

On page 30, strike out lines 4 through 7.

On page 38, after line 4, insert:

"(n) Committee on Post Office and Post Roads: All legislation relating to the post office and post roads."

On page 40, line 11, strike out the words "and post roads."

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, old soldiers die very hard, and the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads is one of the oldest and best soldiers that has ever served this Congress. Perhaps no other committee in Congress is so intimately associated with the lives and happiness and sometimes the sorrow of the people as is the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads. I know that many of you Members started in that committee, and have worked on it as I have during the long, long "years" of the Seventy-ninth Congress. We have a deep affection for that committee and for its work. We have a great admiration for it and for the things it has done, especially during this Congress. We feel it deserves more recognition and consideration than it is receiving in this measure. As the Post Office Department is represented by a member in the President's Cabinet, much of the work of the Civil Service Committee to which the Post Office and Post Roads Committee has been assigned under this bill deals with personnel.

Much of the work of our committee deals with the laws and problems of the Post Office Department and does not deal with personnel. We feel it has an important place in the work of Congress. Of course, there is not anything exciting about it. We do not report any OPA bills to you. We do not report any national-service legislation or draft legislation, but we never get you in trouble when we do report out bills to you because they are generally popular. We would like to continue to serve as a committee of this House. We feel it is important to the welfare of the country and to the Congress. We feel we can well earn the position that we are asking for. Perhaps there will be some confusion, Mr. Chairman, with reference to the number on the committee, but I believe that can be worked out quite easily in conference if the amendment is adopted.

Mr. MONRONEY. I believe it would be very difficult.

Mr. LYLE. I would be glad to help you. I think it could be worked out.

Mr. MONRONEY. I must say to the gentleman from Texas that we are forced to oppose the gentleman's amendment because we think this is a very, very important part of this whole matter of committee reorganization. If we knock a

hole in it now for the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, then we will have to knock a hole in it for the Committee on Disposal of Executive Papers and many others. Then, as a result, the whole overlapping committee structure will grow back up again. I would certainly have to oppose the amendment vigorously because it throws the whole set-up out of gear and destroys the plan which the committee has so laboriously attempted to work out.

Mr. LYLE. When I was in the Texas Legislature, every year just as soon as they could, they used to try to do away with some of the district courts down there. There was an old judge who had had his court for a long time. This situation reminds me of this story, and I am going to tell it.

One of the Senators called on him and said, "Judge, we are going to do away with your court."

He said, "My goodness, who is doing that?"

The Senator said, "Well, there is an old lawyer from Dallas who came down and testified against your court."

He said, "He came down to testify against your Honor." The judge said, "I knew he would." He said, "I have known him for 30 years and he has hated me ever since I beat him for county attorney. He is no good." He said, "Who else is down there?" He named another lawyer. He said, "He don't like me either. I caught him stealing money from a widow one time and he has never liked me since." The Senator said, "Wait a minute. Nobody is down here to try to tear up your court." And the old judge said, "Senator, you have made me say awful things, awful things, about two of the best friends I ever had."

I thought the gentleman handling this measure was going to agree to this amendment, so he has made me say some nice things about one of the worst enemies the Post Office Committee has ever had.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will turn down this amendment by a very resounding vote. Let it be remembered that this bill passed the Senate on the 10th day of June. That is 6 weeks ago. In the Senate they joined up the Post Office Committee and the Civil Service Committee, precisely as we are doing in the House. We have heard no single complaint or protest in all that time. It was not until this morning that I understand a few telegrams filtered in to Members of Congress, probably inspired right down town, telegrams about which that earnest and diligent mail carrier who carries the mail in the cities out home or the man who plods down the country road delivering mail never heard anything.

It can work out very effectively this way. If you are going to disturb this committee structure now, then it will be like pushing over a little tin soldier in a whole row of soldiers, you start pushing them all over.

I am heartbroken over the entreaty expressed by the distinguished gentleman

from Texas [Mr. LYLE], but I do hope you will roll back this amendment by a very substantial vote.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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 been 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 us a provision abolishing the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads of the House of Representatives. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] would continue the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads in this House. That is the issue presently before the House.

In the hearings held by this select committee on this resolution to investigate and report there is not a scintilla of evidence, there is not the record of any person with knowledge of postal matters testifying before that committee in behalf of this change. There is a statement by one Member of Congress in the hearings which the committee had published to the effect that the personnel of the Post Office Department being under civil service, therefore the legislative committee dealing with the Post Office Department should be the Committee on the Civil Service. It is my understanding that the entire civilian personnel of the Government is under civil service, so with equal logic one might say that the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Labor, the Committee on Ways and Means, and practically every other committee of the House should be abolished and all should be absorbed into the Civil Service Committee. Obviously, the fact that the personnel of the Post Office Department, like the personnel of every other department of the Government is under civil service is not a just reason for inferring that all the body of the law relating to the Post Office Department should be referred to the Civil Service Committee. Now, what is that body of law? Let anybody who wishes to inquire, and especially members of this select committee who made no inquiry into the subject whatsoever, as is revealed by the printed testimony—let them step into the library off the floor of this House and ask for the United States Code and see the body of law relating to postal matters. The Post Office Department is the largest single—what shall we say,

business, utility, or enterprise?—not in the United States only but in the world. Its functions circle the globe; its functions relate to much more than personnel, but even in the matter of personnel it has always been the judgment of those who were aware of postal matters that such legislation should be separate and apart from general civil service legislation. But apart from personnel matters, the committee functions deal with legislation concerning the policy and operation of the Post Office Department. The functioning of this enterprise, the Post Office Department, is a business whose annual revenues approximate \$1,600,000,000. It is a business enterprise or utility, whatever you call it, which is governed in its operations by laws of the Congress. To say that all the functions of that large enterprise, international in character, far more than personnel, involving finance, involving air mail, involving postage rates, involving foreign mail, should be referred to a committee that has to do with reports from the Civil Service Commission is ridiculous.

I think I can make the statement with absolute accuracy that no one connected with the postal service whether as employee, supervisor, Postmaster General, or anyone else in this far-flung enterprise has advised this committee 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 his statement. I wish to read 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 22 chapters dealing entirely with the Postal Service. These chapters cover laws involving all postal-service problems such as classification of post offices, city-delivery service, rural-delivery service, establishment of post offices, money-order service, postal-savings service, air-mail service, rural-delivery service, foreign service, as well as rates and accounts and revenues of the postal service. It would, therefore, appear to me that there should be some distinction between postal legislation and purely civil service or employee 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 which have little or nothing to do with the employee civil-service problems.

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.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I am in full accord with the objectives of the special committee in the streamlining of Congress, at least I am in full accord with the objectives that they announce on this floor. One was increased efficiency in the legislative department, another effectiveness, another the saving of time, and so forth. In order to bring that about they propose to telescope 48 committees of the House into 19 committees, doing away with 29 committees. I have no objection to that if it will accomplish the objectives that they say they want to accomplish. But I call the attention of the committee to the fact that 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 postal 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 complicated rates and the complicated schedules of the Post Office Department. I know something about tariff rates and I know something about tax rates, and these postal rates are as complicated as the tariff rates and tax rates which the Ways and Means Committee handle. When you telescope that major committee, which is a board of directors for a corporation handling a billion dollars a year—it takes in a billion dollars and spends a billion dollars—into the Civil Service Committee that has had nothing to do with rates, are you bringing about efficiency or 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, the largest in the Nation, yet 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 effectiveness, I do not think that is bringing about efficiency; 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 of Missouri. 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 changed with each 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 members of 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 objection to the proposal as made in the committee bill.

We have changed the name of the committee from the Civil Service Committee to 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 mastery of all the 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 Civil Service 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 who will go 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 are placed 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 recommendation? I have read the testimony 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 1956 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. LYLE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COLE of Missouri) there were—ayes 46, noes 92.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BIEMILLER: On page 26, strike out all of lines 6 and 7.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, when the Seventy-ninth Congress convened an amendment to the rules of the House was passed. That amendment created the Committee on Un-American Activities as a permanent committee of the House. Previously that committee had been a special committee. You will recall that when that amendment was adopted there was a sharp division of opinion among the Members. It was not adopted by a large majority. Those who voted against it were of the opinion that the creation of such a committee would not add anything of value to the work of the House.

I am offering this amendment today so that Members who were dissatisfied on the opening day of the session and do not believe that there should be such a permanent committee will have an opportunity to voice their opinion.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I do not yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. When this committee was adopted as a permanent committee of the House, as I recall, there were only 81 votes cast against it.

Mr. BIEMILLER. I think the gentleman is in error. He will find there were in excess of 180 votes cast against it.

Mr. MASON. There were only 81. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, I will not yield further at this time.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I do not yield on that point.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield to clarify that?

Mr. BIEMILLER. Yes; surely.

Mr. MASON. I looked the matter up yesterday in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 17 this year and just 81 votes were cast against it.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, let us keep the record straight. I suggest that when gentlemen try to correct a Member who has the floor they make sure they know what the Member was talking about. I stated that the Un-American Activities Committee was created in January of 1945 and there were over 180 votes cast against the adoption of the committee at that time. The exact figure is 186.

Since that committee has been functioning certain things have happened that many of us have not liked. I am going to refer only briefly to one of those things to illustrate my point as to why I do not believe this committee should be in existence.

You will recall that an employee of this committee, a certain Mr. Adamson, has written threatening and insulting letters to several people in the United States

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 House are aware of the fact, for example, that in the ritual of initiation 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 believe we need the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 4 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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 a century and a half. We went 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 issue ourselves, 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 "crazy quilt" is something of which I do not approve. 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 others of which I do approve. I know members of the special committee have worked hard and conscientiously and they feel that they have brought forth something constructive 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 are now undertaking.

I happen to have opposed the establishment of the Committee on Un-American Activities when it was before the House for consideration, but we have vigorously tried to keep out of this bill everything except that which deals with the functional reorganization of Congress.

There are no political considerations or ideological considerations involved in this. I do hope the committee will allow us to go ahead so that we can provide ourselves with better-running machinery which we so badly need in this day and age.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] to abolish the Un-American Activities Committee. In my opinion this committee is serving a definite and necessary function to the Congress and the Nation in revealing subversive and un-American activities which are detrimental to the best interests of national security.

In spite of the criticism that has been leveled at this committee as to its functions it nevertheless must be continued and the dignity of the House and its power to subpoena witnesses in order to reveal subversive activities must be protected.

There are underground forces operating in this Nation which must be continually watched, there are forces operating under the guise of democracy that have no other purposes than to weaken or if possible overthrow this Government. These forces operate under the privilege of freedom of speech and freedom of the press who would, if they succeeded in gaining power, abolish the freedom of speech and freedom of the press which they now use to gain their objective. Due to the nefarious and subtle manner in which these forces operate they have succeeded in enlisting many influential citizens in their cause. They have succeeded in obtaining large sums of money for propaganda purposes. They have succeeded in electing to public office many candidates that espouse their causes in legislative bodies throughout the Nation.

We need this committee to unearth these activities. We need this committee to put these forces on notice that we as a Nation will not stand for these activities. If we want to change our form of government we can do it by constitutional processes provided for in our Constitution. We do not need the demoralizing activities of these foreign and communistic influences usually found in these subversive groups that try to introduce foreign ideas and ideals into our body politic.

I have consistently supported the Un-American Activities Committee since it was established. When it was estab-

lished I would have preferred to have seen it set up as a special committee with equal representation of both major parties on its personnel. My position in that regard was misunderstood as meaning that I was opposed to investigation of subversive and un-American activities. Nothing could be further from the truth. I shall always oppose any un-American or subversive force or group that attempts to weaken or demoralize the Government of the United States, the greatest government in the world for the benefit of all of the people all of 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:

"RULE XII

"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 additional members 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 XXI 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 shall be referred, except by unanimous consent, to any other than the following committees, namely: To the Committee on Foreign Affairs and to the Committee on the Judiciary."

PART 3—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 a provision of law or treaty stipulation); (2) the construction of a bridge across a 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 title V.

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 not later than the last day (Sundays 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 the House of Representatives shall fix regular weekly, biweekly, or monthly meeting days for the transaction of business before the committee, 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 House of Representatives, as the case may be, any measure approved by his committee and to take or cause to be taken 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, so 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 use of committee members.

(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:

"(g) Each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall set aside a regular period during each month to afford opportunity to Members who have introduced any bill or resolution to appear before the committee to explain the measure and outline the nature and character of the considerations which in their judgment support its passage."

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is phrased in the exact language of the provision carried in the bill originally reported by the select committee and passed by the Senate. Apparently it was left out in the drafting of the bill that is now before us, for reasons with which I am not familiar.

It is a very simple amendment which, to my mind, carries out in part the argument used by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], in regard to the morale of Members of the House, and likewise performs a really useful service. Today a great many Members of the House, particularly the younger Members, are humiliated by having to go back to their districts and tell the people in their districts that a certain bill which they filed with the House of Representatives had not only never been acted upon, but that the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill had never even allowed the Member 5 minutes before the

committee in which to explain the purposes of the bill.

All this amendment would do would be to require committees either in executive session or through subcommittees or in whatever way they might choose to allow Members to come before them at regular times to say in a few words as to why they had faith in a particular bill that had been referred to that committee.

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

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. Does 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 pending 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 where 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, therefore, 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 Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

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 all of lines 1 to 16, 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 on Claims, unless we have reached a point where we want to make a brand new departure in the history and theory of government and reverse the theory that you cannot sue the sovereign. If you do not want to do that then you had better adopt this amendment; otherwise you establish a new principle to the effect that people who have a claim against the Government can sue the Government. Those who may think they have a claim have no redress whatever under this bill if it is passed, except as their case is authorized in the courts.

I hope the House will adopt the amendment and retain the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MONRONEY. 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].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

On page 48, line 1, after the word "Representative", insert "except the Committee on Appropriations."

Page 48, line 18, after the word "each", insert "such."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this section deals with meetings of committees to hear those who have submitted legislation which has been referred to committees. The proposition is not applicable to the Committee on Appropriations for the reason that it originates its own bills. It considers no bills introduced by Members of the House and, as a matter of fact, no bills are referred to the Committee on Appropriations except legislative bills in which may inadvertently be embodied an ap-

propriation clause. Such bills are never considered by the committee.

The hearings of the committee are practically confined to representatives of the various departments of the Government. Their testimony is submitted in justifications which are printed and which are available to the members of the committee before the item involved is taken up.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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 remain separate. I merely inquire about the powers, prerogatives, and the duties formerly held by a committee. Will the jurisdictions be merged as the committees are merged? 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. MONRONEY. 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 be according to the precedents 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 functions, but merely gather them into the new committee organization?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct, but unless the jurisdiction is otherwise specified in here the precedents of the House will apply.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the gentleman for this explanation. As an illustration, I call attention to the fact that the Bureau of Reclamation has for many years under numerous acts of Congress passed since 1902 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 irrigation and reclamation possessed 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 during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to take such testimony and to make such expenditures (not in excess of \$10,000 for each committee during any Congress) as it deems advisable. Each such committee may make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, may report such hearings as may be had by it, and may employ stenographic assistance at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved 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 once every 6 months, and such information shall be published periodically in the Congressional Directory when and as the same is issued and as 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 sit, without special leave, 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, together with the subpoenaing of books, papers, documents, and correspondence, and so forth.

The original bill provided that not only the Senate standing committees but the House standing committees should have the same right. Why are we being treated like stepchildren? Why should the Senate standing committees 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 us. We should have it without being compelled to go to the Rules Committee and then to the House. It is unavailing that we have witnesses appear 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 permission from the House.

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

Mr. Chairman, this was rather carefully considered by the House committee, and our set-up is considerably different from the set-up in the Senate. The Senate is plagued with a great many special committees. It is a rash that has broken out over there which practically destroys the continuity and the power of the standing committees.

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 arm our special or our standing committees with subpoena powers anytime we wish.

An amendment is going to be offered to the appropriation section by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], that is going to arm all of the investigators and clerks of the new Committee on Appropriations with the proper power.

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 subpoenaing records.

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

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. In view of the fact that it is 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, is it not?

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

Mr. CELLER. Would the gentleman be willing to give that power to standing committees without the \$10,000 provision?

Mr. MONRONEY. No; I do not believe so. I think we are either going to have to maintain the integrity of this House bill on the floor or tear up the carefully planned and considerate judgment given it by all.

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 distinguished Speaker and the majority and 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. MONRONEY. 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 stenographically, he shall be entitled to 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 member conducting 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 at his option 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, allege misconduct by, or otherwise comment adversely upon any individual, partnership, association, corporation, or governmental agency or officer or employee thereof, and the committee shall not 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 committee 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 the subject of adverse comment shall have the right to testify in person concerning such adverse comment in a public hearing to be conducted by the committee.

"(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, unless 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 report, whether interim or final, unless and until a meeting of the committee has been called upon proper notice and such report has been approved by 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 publicly released unless and until the committee, upon notice to all of its members, has met and approved such public release.

"NO PRIVATE PROFIT FOR COMMITTEE MEMBERS OR STAFF

"No member of a legislative committee, its counsel, employees, or agents, shall for compensation speak, lecture, or write about such committee, its purposes, 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. 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 asked to be given the very privileges that are set forth 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 gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] 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 currently come to my attention.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONFERENCE RULES ON AMENDMENTS IN NATURE OF SUBSTITUTE

SEC. 135. (a) In any case in which a disagreement to an amendment in the nature of a substitute has been referred to conferees, it shall be in order for the conferees to report a substitute on the same subject matter; but they may not include in the report matter not committed to them by either House. They may, however, include in their report in any such case matter which is a germane modification of subjects in disagreement.

(b) In any case in which the conferees violate subsection (a) the conference report shall be subject to a point of order.

LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT BY STANDING COMMITTEES

SEC. 136. To assist the Congress in appraising the administration of the laws and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary, each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee; and for that purpose shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the Congress by the agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

DECISIONS ON QUESTIONS OF COMMITTEE JURISDICTION

SEC. 137. In any case in which a controversy arises as to the jurisdiction of any standing committee of the Senate with respect to any proposed legislation the question of jurisdiction shall be decided by the presiding officer of the Senate without debate in favor of that committee which has jurisdiction over the subject matter which predominates in such proposed legislation, but such decision shall be subject to an appeal.

LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

SEC. 138. (a) The Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, are authorized and directed to meet jointly at the beginning of each regular session of Congress and after study and consultation, giving due consideration to the Budget recommendations of the President, report to their respective Houses a legislative Budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for such year. Such report shall contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year which shall include such an amount to be reserved for deficiencies as may be deemed necessary by such committees. If the estimated receipts exceed the estimated expenditures, such report shall contain a recommendation for a reduction in the public debt. Such report shall be made by March 1.

(b) The report shall be accompanied by a concurrent resolution adopting such Budget, and fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year. If the estimated expenditures exceed the estimated receipts, the concurrent resolution shall include a section substantially as follows: "That it is the sense of the Congress that the public debt shall be increased in an amount equal to the amount by which the estimated expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year exceed the estimated receipts, such amount being \$ _____."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment proposed by Mr. MONRONEY: On page 51, line 23, after the comma, insert "or duly authorized subcommittee thereof."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman explain the amendment?

Mr. MONRONEY. 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 their large number. It was not intended that subcommittees would not be permitted, in fact it was anticipated that the initial work would be done by them.

The language of the bill is broad enough to permit subcommittee action, but we are specifying in this amendment now that duly authorized subcommittees of the four committees joining in the preparation of this legislative budget will meet to take it up.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MONRONEY: 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. TABER: On page 51, line 19, to page 52, line 20, inclusive, strike out all of section 138.

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 hopeful that the proponents of 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 Committee in the House of Representatives. It will increase spending. It will prevent any kind of orderly procedure by the House. Instead of it 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 that situation. If it is to mean nothing, 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 conducted hearings. Then, what would happen? They would have to establish by resolution what that ceiling might be. If it was to be effective, we would have to break down into 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 upon any of the bills until 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 result in an over-all omnibus appropriation bill, with all kinds of logrolling and all kinds of efforts to destroy any economy in government.

The Appropriations Committee was set up by Martin Madden originally in such 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. There has been no 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 this 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 bureaus 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 through, and I do not like to see it.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section close in 25 minutes.

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. MONRONEY. I will modify my request and make it 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. I may say that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has not talked on the bill, neither have I. Each of us would like 10 minutes. I do not think that is an unreasonable request.

Mr. MONRONEY. I will not insist on closing debate at this time; but, after all, this was discussed for an hour and 20 minutes this morning under the 5-minute rule. I do hope Members will limit themselves to a reasonable time.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 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. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I must object. 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 not objected to anybody having an extension of time. It does seem that on a bill of this importance we should have just a little time to discuss 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 really might be properly 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 of Representatives as the most modern document in the Library of Congress or here in the House of Representatives. For 157 years these rules have grown up under trial and error. A majority of the House 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 from the rules and this proposal 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 of the House to do 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 will meet and will say: "We will 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. Of course, it would be easy to say, "Now, we would like to pay old-age assistance, we would like to pay social security, we would like to appropriate money for highways, flood control, and soil conservation, but we have tied our hands. We gave four committees the power to say how much money we can appropriate this year and they have stated, we have adopted their suggestion, and we cannot exceed it." Of course, if we pass a resolution we could increase the national debt, then we could go ahead and do it. But why not allow an increase in the taxes, if necessary, without increasing the national debt to provide for something that we want?

This puts the House definitely on the spot to the extent that it will say, "Now, we have no money left. We would like to provide all these benefits; they are worth while, like terminal leave, and other things; but we cannot do it. These four all-powerful committees have met." They would meet with logrolling privileges and opportunities. They can swap among themselves. That is contrary to our form of government.

It was always intended that one House should be a balance on the other House. This is consolidating the two Houses, allowing the four most powerful committees to get together, trade among themselves, if they desire, and run the Congress like they want to run it. It is going too far and this amendment should be adopted.

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

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it looks to me as if certain people are trying to make a mountain out of a molehill, to use a homely expression. When the gentleman from Texas speaks about members of the two tax committees and the two appropriations committees getting together and logrolling, I do not think he really meant what he said, because that would be expressing a rather low opinion of four very important committees of the Congress. It so happens that I am a member of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue

Taxation and I know with what benefit to the country and to the taxing structure of the country that committee has functioned and continues to function. If a joint committee having broad supervisory powers over taxation is good for the tax structure, then why would not a joint budget committee be good for the spending program?

We have been going along for years, as the gentleman from New York so ably pointed out this morning, and there has been absolutely no liaison between the taxing committees and the spending committees. The purpose of title III is to coordinate the work of the two committees. The Ways and Means Committee should know what the budget is going to be before it brings in a tax bill and, on the other hand, the Appropriations Committee should know approximately what they are going to have to do with before they start reporting appropriation bills. Of course, I appreciate the fact that the Appropriations Committee views with distaste, if not with general alarm, any attempt on the part of the Congress to place even a small degree of supervision over spending.

We all know that the way we have been going for many years has not worked to the country's advantage. The budget has been out of balance for 12 or 15 years. The national debt continues to grow apace. It has not worked. Now let us try something else.

This need not necessarily be permanent legislation to the extent that it cannot be changed in a few years by a future Congress. We are embarking on something quite new in the way of government financing so we will have to proceed through trial and error. As this thing works out, we will see where it needs strengthening and perhaps where it should be cut down. This country is not going to expire next year, and neither is Congress going out of business next year. Let us try it. I maintain that it certainly cannot be any worse than the present system. To my way of thinking title III is the very heart of the proposal before us.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section close in 25 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. JONES. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall try to be very brief. Of course, I know that all of us want to complete this matter promptly, but let us look at this thing just very honestly and fairly and see how much there is in it and how much logic there is in it. All in the world that the provision in the bill does is to have a group of men, members of these committees, get together, probably on January 15 of each year, and make a decision by February 15 on all matters contained in the Budget. They are going to be in session for a long period of 30 days and are expected to tell us intelligently what we should do. Of course, they cannot. Everyone knows that it will be simply an offhand expression of opinion, because they can no more know all the details of the various appropriations than

they could know about what is going to happen during the next year.

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

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is it not clear in this proposal that this special committee shall be required merely to recommend the maximum amount to be spent and not the details of its expenditures?

Mr. O'NEAL. But that is the whole question. How can they make an intelligent decision? In fact, every year large appropriations are necessary because of legislation passed after February 15.

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

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JONES. The provision in section 138 is meaningless because it does not bind anybody.

Mr. O'NEAL. Certainly not. Furthermore, let me say again that billions of dollars are appropriated after February 15 that they could not possibly know about. Exigencies arise and emergencies occur. They could not possibly tell what it is going to be, and it is the most futile gesture that I could imagine. Just listen to what the present law is. All we have to do is to carry out the present law and we will accomplish whatever we would by the provisions of this bill. The present law says:

1. If the Budget indicates an excess of expenditures (not appropriations) over receipts, the President is required to include in the Budget recommendations for new taxes, loans, or other appropriate action to meet the estimated deficiency.

2. If the estimated receipts exceed the estimated expenditures, the President is required to make such recommendations as in his opinion the public interests require.

3. If deficiency or supplemental estimates alter the regular Budget proposals as regards deficits or excesses, the President is required to submit recommendations as in the case of the regular Budget.

That is the law today. If we have additional appropriations the President is required to make that certification, and all we have to do is to take that and act upon it. But how ridiculous it is to say that any group of men in 30 days' time can examine a thirty-five or forty billion dollar budget, anticipate what is going to be spent after February 15, and tell you then that you must live within it.

Gentlemen, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the ranking member of the committee, two men who have had more experience than anybody in the House with this subject, feel that it would very strongly work against the best interests of the country and the work of the Committee on Appropriations. The committee met and discussed the problem, and all of them are more or less experts on this proposition. My recollection is that the vote was 17 to 3 against this being in the bill. If you want to put something in the bill just to support the Reorganization Committee, all right; otherwise, I think the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri should be supported.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate

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.

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

Mr. JONES. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, may I say to the chairman of the special committee handling this matter that I have two amendments that I wish to offer. I think they are very important. This matter is very important to the Committee on Appropriations. We feel that the bill proposed by the special committee as far as it concerns the Committee on Appropriations is ill-conceived, and we feel very strongly about it. I ask the gentleman to reserve his request for a few moments.

Mr. RAYBURN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, the way our program stands now we must, if humanly possible, complete consideration of this bill today. Even though debate is not closed in a reasonable time, I trust the committee will stay in session until we complete the consideration of this bill today. If we are to do that, we will have to make more progress than we have been making in the last 2 hours.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that I am compelled to ask unanimous consent that all debate close in 40 minutes. Only eight Members are standing at this time, and that will give each Member standing 5 minutes. I further ask that the last 5 minutes be reserved to the committee.

Mr. JONES. Is the request that debate close in 40 minutes on this section or on this amendment?

Mr. MONRONEY. On this section and all amendments thereto.

Mr. JONES. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I am reluctantly compelled to move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this section of the bill because I feel it is unworkable. The reorganization features are mainly very good and certainly the number of the House committees should be cut down. The Members of the House should take into consideration the opinion of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the opinion of the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, as well as the opinion of 17 out of the 20 men on that committee who voted yesterday in our committee against including this particular section in the bill.

I would suggest as I have suggested heretofore that if the proposed joint committee be scheduled to meet June 15 and then go over the work of the Committee on Appropriations up to that date and decide whether or not we had appropriated too much money for the session, then that joint committee could really

be effective in saving money. That joint committee would decide perhaps that Congress has appropriated too much money and it is necessary to have a general percentage cut through the Federal personnel with certain exceptions, such as Veterans' Administration, for example. Then we would really have something to work upon. That 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 balanced. We must have balanced budgets; and personally I have voted to 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. TABER's amendment will be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, at this time let me say that I cannot vote for this bill if the provisions for salary increases to Members and retirement pay for Members 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 all increases 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 we 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 appropriations in the House. I 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 our home legislature, and also as chairman of a committee of the Council of State Governments, working on the same subject.

The proposal the committee has offered is certainly no cure-all. Claiming too much for it would be just as serious as criticizing it too badly. Personally, I wish the committee had gone much farther in what to my mind are the most difficult processes in our appropriations. To begin with, I am convinced that as long as the credit of the United States can be used with the ease with which it is now used, in other words, as long as we can continue borrowing all the money we want to borrow by simple majorities in raising the debt limit, it is an open invitation to spend more money than you have got coming in from current revenue.

In the second place, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] talked a lot about the evils of an omnibus bill. It is only through an omnibus bill that the Members of the House can tell where it is currently going, because when we vote

on each individual appropriation bill we have no idea what is going to follow it, perhaps a week or 2 weeks or a month later. We never have a chance to see the full fiscal picture before us. In other words, each appropriation as it comes along is a temptation to spend more money on the ground that perhaps we can cut it off of a future appropriation bill for some other department later on. We never know from day to day whether the money we are appropriating is coming out of current revenue in accordance with the plans of the Ways and Means Committee, whether it is coming out of the sale of surplus material, the proceeds of which should be reducing our public debt, or whether it is coming out of borrowings.

I remember a short time ago a statement was issued by the White House saying that this year we were going to balance our budget for the reason that we had borrowed last year more money than we actually used. Of all the silly financial statements I have ever heard that is the silliest, and shows how muddled is our financial picture.

The particular provision in this bill is not going to cure the situation, but I think it is helpful. It is helpful because of the psychology that is established. If the committee, call it what you will, made up of joint committees of the two branches that control taxation and control expenditures, gives a financial picture to the House, even if it is no more than their best guess as to where we are going to come out if we appropriate as much money as shown by the budgetary recommendation of the President, then I think psychologically we can more intelligently take the point of view that we are either going to save money, we are going to stop borrowing money, or we are going to cut down progressively all along the line; or perhaps that this year because of the revenues predicated upon tax returns, we can appropriate a little more for public works. At least we will have a little more of the picture. Today we have none as we progress from one appropriation bill to the other.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. We had the same situation in the Postwar Economic and Planning Committee. My impression was when they came before the Banking and Currency Committee that they were forced to add to extravagance rather than detract. The chairman and the ranking member came before our committee and they were specially committed to this extravagance. So psychologically they were for the extravagance.

Mr. HERTER. What the lady says is true almost all along the line.

A moment ago the gentleman from Kentucky made the statement that the Appropriations Committee did not know by February 15 what kind of measures were going to come up in the form of other legislation that would require spending. That to my mind is one of the additional reasons for the section under debate. The most dangerous thing that happens is being uncertain in your mind as to what you can spend within a year,

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 to the amount of the income of the Government. That is the intended general impression: "That somehow this reorganization of Congress will limit appropriations to the amount of income the Government receives." There is nothing in section 138 that will do that. This section makes in order, makes legal, the very thing that the Joint Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has done for the last 5 years. I have seen reams of material from that committee.

One of its most outstanding publicity stunts is an appeal to take one-third of the employees off the Federal pay roll, reduce the number by a million. What happened? Why did Congress not cut a million employees from the Federal pay roll? Because the chairman and some members of that joint committee are never on the floor to fight when individual appropriation items are before their particular body of Congress. They are not on the floor of Congress to cut down the number of employees provided for in those separate appropriation bills. They yell to the public some distance away from the appropriation debate.

The way to cut the appropriations or take people off the pay rolls is not to write magazine articles or get out brochures under the name of the Joint Committee on Federal Expenditures; the only way to do it is to get people in both Houses of Congress who want to cut expenditures to vote against the increases. Then they will be cut, if you can find a majority of Congressmen who want to stop deficit spending. An election, in my opinion, would help.

If you permit this section 138 to remain in the bill you are going to be embarrassed just as you are embarrassed today by having someone in your district say to you: "Why do you not get on the band wagon of the chairman of the Joint Committee on Nonessential Expenditures?" Why! Constituents have even written thus to Doc SMITH, who has voted "No" so many times that he may doubt whether he has ever voted for an appropriation. Constituents have even asked my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVINGER], and me why we did not get on the Byrd bandwagon. CLIFF CLEVINGER, of the Fifth, Doc SMITH, of the Eighth, and I, of the Fourth Districts of Ohio, have voted "No" on appropriations bills so often Chairman BYRD cannot find our band wagon or hear the music. And there is going to be a lot of confusion on the majority side for sponsoring this provision. You are going to be embarrassed. Project yourself into the future under this bill. The President sends to Congress a \$35,000,000,000 budget. It will be examined by

this committee provided by section 138 of 104 members or a subcommittee thereof, representing the Senate Finance Committee, the House Ways and Means Committee, the House Appropriations Committee, and the Senate Appropriations Committee. Thus super committee will get publicity. Headlines will be spread stating how they recommended 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 and we will wake up 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 \$45,000,000,000 and Congress has the same Members, the same administration, New Deal majorities, who want to spend, and spend, and spend; and then you will be embarrassed to the tune of \$20,000,000,000 and the folks back home will think they have a bunch of nit-wits in Congress for not following this "superduper" synthetic ceiling committee. On the other hand your "superduper" committee will have to throw an ax at the \$35,000,000,000 budget, as 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 allowed 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" committee 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 expedient. This section 138 is ill-advised, silly, ridiculous, will make fools out of the Members of Congress unless you adopt an amendment which says that the recommendations 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 section 138 provides, to wit: A 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 expenditures balance income." My amendments will legally make the section 138 "superduper" committee ceilings the legal ceilings on appropriations that Congress or 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].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, what about subsection (b) of section 133? Let me read what that says:

(b) The report shall be accompanied by a concurrent resolution adopting such budget and fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year. If the estimated expenditures exceed the estimated receipts, the concurrent resolution shall include a section substantially as follows: "That it is the sense of the Congress that the public debt shall be increased in an amount equal to the amount by which the estimated expenditures for the ensuing fiscal 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 give sanction 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 nothing in this bill whatsoever 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 Congressmen and I fear there will be left little interest in it. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] 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 it were not being log-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. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read 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 that concurrent resolution no appropriation bill shall be passed appropriating funds in excess of the budget so adopted except by 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 especially to be commended; 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 (b) says:

The report shall be accompanied by a concurrent resolution adopting such budget, and fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such 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 further 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 the Congress will know it by voting affirmatively 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 such and such a date. 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 appropriation figure, and if a deficit is running, to specify that the Congress authorizes the creation 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 (b). 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 on the ground that it ties 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 nothing about it except to require that the 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. If Congress ignores the resolution nothing happens; if Congress adopts the resolution nothing happens except that Congress has said it thinks the national debt should be increased.

In my judgment the section needs something to give effect to the ceiling. So the amendment which I have offered says that if the concurrent resolution is adopted, then an appropriation in excess of that amount may be passed only by a two-thirds vote. That is in harmony with the provision which a great many State legislatures have; that deficiency appropriations may not be made except by a two-thirds vote and that appropriations may not be made immediately available on an emergency basis except by a two-thirds vote.

The language of the bill does not have any teeth in this section. It merely creates a committee and requires it to make recommendations. If the over-all budget idea is to be effective, you have to do something more than that. Nobody guarantees that Congress will adopt this resolution. The bill simply requires a report by a committee by a certain date recommending a ceiling for appropriations. If we really want to do something about joining expenditures and revenues, we must give effect to that ceiling. My amendment says that if Congress exceeds this budget, the excess may be adopted only by a two-thirds vote.

The latter part of (b) is not needed. As a matter of fact, we put Congress in a somewhat ridiculous position to require that the proposed resolution say that the public debt should be increased in advance of any demonstrated need for it. The Treasury does not go out and sell a lot of securities until it has demands for cash to meet maturing obligations. Many times receipts run ahead of the estimates. That has been true in the past and it is true currently, I think. Why then increase the public debt in advance of the time when the cash is needed to meet maturing obligations?

Consequently, I have offered an amendment dropping that language and providing instead that appropriations in excess of the ceiling may be adopted only by a two-thirds vote.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at an appropriate place in the RECORD prior to the vote on the amendment with relation to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, not having spoken on this bill, I want to begin my remarks on this amendment by say-

ing that my good friend and our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has done a monumental work. I want to praise him, although there are some features of the bill with which I disagree. This particular feature of the bill appears to be sound and I think it is a forward step. We have heard the situation described as some Members think it might prove to be under this provision. For instance, I have heard the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, my able friend [Mr. JONES], describe how silly a fiscal policy we might develop under this procedure. I wondered if he was not describing the ridiculous procedure which we have under our present system. Mr. Chairman, let us think a minute. Does the Congress have a fiscal policy? Does it? Let me ask you another question: Is there anything which will loom before the Congress within the next decade more important than fiscal affairs? Under the present system, we have no formal way of developing a fiscal policy, and what is more, we have no way of sensibly following a policy if we had one. Mr. Chairman, much has been said about the workability of this. For 4 years I have been on the Committee on Appropriations. The members of that committee work very hard. But I say to you that appropriations are made by the Congress and by the Committee on Appropriations with less accurate knowledge of the amount that should be appropriated than is healthy for the country.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. Always, to my distinguished and able and lovable friend, the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. Does the gentleman with his sound business experience and the experience he has had on the Committee on Appropriations feel that any group of men could pass on appropriation estimates in 30 days from January 15 to February 15, and do an intelligent job?

Mr. GORE. In specific items, no. If you mean by your question, Can the Congress in 30 days decide how much money they are going to appropriate for every item, this or that project, hither and yon?—no. But if the Congress cannot within 30 days make up its mind on a sensible over-all fiscal policy for the year, then I think Congress is a laggard institution and it is time that we were reorganizing. It is time we bestirred ourselves again and again to improve this institution.

Mr. O'NEAL. Will the gentleman indicate how this provision as recommended by the Committee on Reorganization could possibly accomplish such a result?

Mr. GORE. That is the purpose. I hope it can accomplish that result. I do not think it could be worse than the present helter-skelter procedure. We now have no definite goals for either over-all appropriations or revenue. And while we talk so much about appropriations, remember also that the revenue end of fiscal affairs is to be considered. Perhaps if the national need is sufficient to warrant an increased appropriation,

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 ask for a gag rule on every bill from that committee. This is the very heart of the effort made by this bill to implement the Congress and its methods of procedure to the end that the Congress itself may formulate and at least attempt to follow a sound fiscal policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 5 minutes to close debate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, there have been 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. TABER] said it would be dangerous. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] said it would be absurd and embarrassing to the Congress. The gentleman from Ohio said it would be an urge for deficit spending. Another Member said it restricts Congress and the country too closely. Just make up your minds. But what you see today is the recurring pattern of history. When the Keating-Owen Child Labor Act was introduced in 1916 it was Senator Beveridge who said it would not work. When women's suffrage was first given to the country, omniscient minds stood in this well and said, "It will not work." When the income-tax amendment was first proposed to the Constitution of the United States they said, "It will not work." There are Members sitting in this Chamber this afternoon who, when the General Accounting Act of 1921 was proposed, which first set up an Appropriations Committee with exclusive power to appropriate, said, "It will not work." Yes. That is the inertia of age talking. "It will not work." Have they given you a single persuasive argument why half a dozen Members from four committees of the House and Senate cannot sit down in a comfortable committee room and discuss the over-all aspects of the expenditure of revenue for this great corporation called the United States of America?

What an awful confession has been made here today, and members of my own committee, great committee that it is, have come into this well and confessed their ineptitude, they have confessed the inflexibility of the very committee of which I have the honor to be a member. God save the mark! Oh, let us not be put to one side by the talk that there is no time and that there are restrictive rules. You go out to Portland or Seattle or San Francisco or Cleveland or Milwaukee or elsewhere and tell one of your taxpayers that you would like to put a ceiling on the budget but there were rules obstructing it. They will say, "Rules do not register in my pocketbook."

What I want to do is to exercise a little flexibility of mind and judgment and I want some real, honest-to-God constructive effort to balance the budget of the United States that has been out of balance for 17 long years. We offer you now a simple device, a simple proposal

that has a great deal of moral force in it for the country and a great deal of force to retrieve the esteem for Congress that is ebbing away and leaching away. Be not disillusioned or dismayed or put aside or fooled by all this unsubstantial argument that has been made here. They are the arguments of every generation in the history of the country. But, 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. TABER] 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, let us determine that it can 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 amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

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. TABER].

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 money 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. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 27, noes 101.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES. 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 each executive department and for the several independent establishments including the District of Columbia shall be allocated by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives prior to the consideration of the estimate of appropriations by the several subcommittees thereof."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: On page 52, after line 20, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"(c) No appropriation contained in any appropriation bill which in percentage ratio to the estimate of the Bureau of the Budget for any such appropriation is in excess of the percentage ratio that the total recommended maximum appropriations contained in said legislative budget bears to the total budget estimates of the President as contained in the annual Budget for any such year, shall be considered or received in either House."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

HEARINGS AND REPORTS BY APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEES

Sec. 139. (a) 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.

(b) The Committees on Appropriations of the two Houses are authorized and directed, acting jointly, to develop a standard appropriation classification schedule which will clearly define in concise and uniform accounts the subtotals of appropriations asked for by agencies in the executive branch of the Government. That part of the printed hearings containing each such agency's request for appropriations shall be preceded by such a schedule.

(c) No general appropriation bill or amendment thereto shall be received or considered in either House if it contains a provision reappropriating unexpended balances of appropriations; except that this provision shall not apply to appropriations in continuation of appropriations for public works on which work has commenced.

(d) The Appropriations Committees of both Houses are authorized and directed to make a study of (1) existing permanent appropriations with a view to limiting the number of permanent appropriations and to recommend to their respective Houses what permanent appropriations, if any, should be discontinued; and (2) the disposition of funds resulting from the sale of Government property or services by all departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government with a view to recommending to their respective Houses a uniform system of control with respect to such funds.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 52, after the word "bill", beginning on line 22, strike out the words "other than deficiency appropriation bills."

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 I have offered this amendment, the main reason being 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 to some degree, often 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. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. JUDD. If the amendment of the gentleman is accepted and deficiency appropriation bills also have to be brought in with a report 3 days before they are considered and a real emergency arises, requiring immediate action, all we need to do is to suspend the rules on a two-thirds majority. The Congress 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 floor and the Members have not 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 the same afternoon 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 the House 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 regularly 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, I hope the salary increase and retirement pay section of this bill can be eliminated so I can support the bill on final passage, because in my studied opinion the reorganization of Congress would be beneficial to some degree.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section close in 4 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman; throughout the day I have been considering offering an amendment similar to the one offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]. I decided not to do so upon the advice of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], because I sincerely support the obvious improvement in the organization and operation of Congress in this legislation as submitted by the committee. But I think this amendment would be most constructive. I call your attention to the fact that when this measure passed the other body, this language 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 real 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 and sustained study by the membership at large before the bills are 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. I urge that the amendment be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

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. If we nailed down tightly the proposition for 3 days on all appropriations, those urgent matters would be delayed.

The section that has just been adopted does exactly what the gentleman wants to do in discouraging deficiencies. I am heartily in favor of reducing this practice. The bill provides that all appropriations will have to come in in the regular way, with a 3-day interim, 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 string this language out and then we will know it is taken care of.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not think the 3-day elbow room on deficiencies is going to hurt or help particularly the thing that the gentleman seeks to accomplish.

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 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 that in 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. MONRONEY. The other section of the bill will help a lot by eliminating so many deficiencies, which is important, too.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

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:

Records of Congress

SEC. 140. (a) The Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives are authorized and directed, acting jointly, to obtain at the close of each Congress all of the noncurrent records of the Congress and of each committee thereof and transfer them to the National Archives for preservation, subject to the orders of the Senate or the House, respectively.

(b) The Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to collect all of the noncurrent records of the House of Representatives from the First to the Seventy-sixth Congress, inclusive, and transfer such records to the National Archives for preservation, subject to the orders of the Senate or the House, respectively.

Preservation of committee hearings

SEC. 141. The Librarian of the Library of Congress is authorized and directed to have bound at the end of each session of Congress the printed hearings of testimony taken by each committee of the Congress at the preceding session.

Effective date

SEC. 142. This title shall take effect on January 2, 1947; except that this section and sections 140 and 141 shall take effect on the date of enactment of this act.

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS

PART 1—STATUTORY PROVISIONS RELATING TO CONGRESSIONAL PERSONNEL

Stenographic pool

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives 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 6 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 the Senate and in the House Office Buildings that shall be available to Members of Congress in periods of peak work. My amendment would strike out that section. It is stated that the pool is needed in the Senate. I answer that if we strike it out here it will still be in conference. It is said that stenographic pools are used in the departments of the Government. I answer that if they are, they are used under the general direction of the chief of the department. My thought is that it will not be satisfactory for the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate to be the supervisors

of the offices of 435 Members of the House and 96 Members of the Senate. This bill makes no change in the allowances for clerk hire to each Member of Congress. All are treated exactly alike. If this pool remains in the bill, there will be discrimination that will be irritating and that will lead to worse than confusion and to great dissatisfaction. For that reason, I have offered this amendment to strike out the section. I trust the Committee will adopt the amendment.

Mr. MICHENER. I quite agree with the gentleman.

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

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. How would the stenographers in the pool be compensated?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I understand they would be hired and compensated by appropriations from the Federal Treasury, but I do not know what they would be doing while they were waiting around to be assigned to Members. At all events, I think that all Members of the House should be treated alike.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How would you allocate them? That is what we want to know.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I do not believe they could be allocated to all Members alike. There would be discrimination. I oppose the pool. I urge that the section be eliminated.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section close in 10 minutes, 2 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE).

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POAGE as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON:

On page 55, lines 7 and 8, strike out the words "and clerk of the House of Representatives."

In line 9 strike out the words "each of" and the words "and House."

In line 13, strike out the word "Congress" and insert the word "Senate."

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I had prepared an amendment identical to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi. But on further consideration it seemed to me there was no occasion for the House taking it upon itself to legislate regarding the prerogatives of the other body. The only difference between the substitute and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi is simply that the substitute relates only to the prerogatives of this body and not to any other body.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will not that matter be better promoted by striking out this section, thus allowing the Senate section to remain and the matter could then be adjusted if it is still insisted on in conference?

Mr. POAGE. I do not think so, else I would have accepted the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi. It is my opinion there is no occasion for us to do something that might be considered as an affront or lack of proper courtesy to the other body. I fully concur in the ideas of the gentleman from Mississippi that there is no occasion for this stenographic pool. I think it would be nothing but a source of irritation, annoyance, and trouble.

The proposal to reorganize many of the procedures and activities of the Congress is a worthy one. I am for it. Most of the Members of this House are for it. We want to wipe out useless committees and to make those which remain actually function. We want to provide the committees with adequate help to intelligently perform their duties. I believe this bill does that in a rather acceptable manner. But, important as committee work is, it falls far short of covering all of a Member's work.

Unless a Congressman has an adequate and efficient office staff, it becomes impossible to do any work satisfactorily. No Congressman is going to be able to do any outstanding work with regard to pending legislation if he knows that he is neglecting fifty or a hundred letters about the OPA, housing, or the draft. Nor will he be able to give his best, either in the committee or on the floor, if he realizes that he has done nothing about the requests of dozens of veterans who each day ask for numerous contacts. In short, the work in our own offices is basic. This bill falls far short in caring for the ever-increasing load of individual office work—yet this work, particularly veterans' work—is sure to rapidly increase.

Originally it was suggested that each Member be given an executive assistant. Many Members do not like that name. That provision was stricken out. The only relief offered by this bill for your pressing office work is the creation of a stenographic pool. I do not believe that such a pool will be of any practical value. When one Member has extra work, most other Members are likely to have extra work. If the pool were large enough to provide help for all when it was needed, we might just as well assign extra help directly to each Member. In fact, this is the only way that the extra help will be at all efficient. I, therefore, ask that you adopt the substitute amendment and not offer gratuitous offense to anybody else. I ask you to abandon this stenographic pool.

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. How will the pool be compensated? Will they be paid out of the general fund or will each Member have to pay for the services he gets?

Mr. POAGE. I assume it will be paid out of the general fund.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman that there is no reason for it.

Mr. POAGE. The bill is not clear on it and it seems to me we might as well wipe out that uncertainty.

If I can gain recognition, I shall follow this amendment with another to provide

an extra clerk at \$5,000 per year for each Member. This clerk would in my office, and doubtless in most 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 absolute minimum 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. 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 expenses have gone 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 and salary 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 the provisions 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 serve his people and would, I feel sure, aid in making each Member a better legislator.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

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 know that this is a rather unpopular 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 our legislative 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 recently come before this House. 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 public 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.

This 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 \$25,000 a year for entertainment for each of them. I fought against this measure and voted against it. This House recently passed the British gift or loan which included \$4,000,000,000. I opposed that measure 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 for the same reasons. So I cannot consistently support this measure which will just add millions more toward our annual expenses.

What this Congress 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 and demands are coming 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 also 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 with part of the Members at 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 are sitting almost idly, 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 secretary at \$2,500 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 good use of this. 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. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the gentleman not think there should be some provision in there that 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. HOFFMAN 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 their business, instead of adding to their offices extra clerks that they might not need most of the time.

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

The question is on the perfecting amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

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—ayes 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 officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives (not including the Presiding Officers of the two Houses) shall be increased by 50 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 not be applicable to the compensation of said elected officers.

(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 authorized to be appropriated annually for the "Office of the Speaker" the sum of \$20,025.

(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 offer an amendment to section 202.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POAGE: On page 56, line 8, add a period and a new sentence to read as follows:

"Each Member of the House of Representatives is authorized to employ 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 Poage 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. POAGE] 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 we represent 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 because a great many people did not like the title. If you do 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 work done in our offices 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 you think 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 require a man somewhat learned in that work, you just try turning these cases over to somebody out of a stenographic pool. If you think that you can satisfy the veterans of your district by turning over their cases which mean so much to them to some \$1,800 a year stenographer, just try doing it. I think it is perfectly clear that you must be able to employ somebody with some judgment 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 we represent. In other words, 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 we come to 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 the Rules Committee, has given notice 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 an 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. POAGE].

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 the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico is authorized to employ an administrative assistant whose duty it shall be to assist the Members in carrying out their departmental business and other duties in Washington. Each such administrative assistant shall receive compensation at a rate not to exceed \$6,000 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 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—\$8,000 was 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 Congressman'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 \$8,000 a year to "at a rate not to exceed \$6,000 a year." A basic salary of \$6,000 a year actually means \$8,339.10. If you were to leave it at \$8,000 as in the Senate bill, the individual would get \$10,000, exactly the same salary a Congressman now gets. Eight thousand, three hundred and thirty-nine dollars and ten cents, 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 the 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 save 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 initiative, prepare material for our use, and take responsibility, especially in handling matters with the executive departments, 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 gentleman 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 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 administrative assistant at this time.

They felt that the matter was being tried out in the other body. Being only 56 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 that the House can later adopt it.

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 defeating 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 cooperation 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 time has expired.

The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. POAGE) there were—ayes 32, noes 162.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMITTEE STAFFS

SEC. 203. (a) Each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives (other than the Appropriations Committees) is authorized to appoint by a majority vote of the committee not more than four professional staff members in addition to the clerical staffs on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness 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. Each such committee is further authorized to terminate the services by a majority vote of the committee of any such professional staff member as it may see fit. Professional staff members shall not engage in any work other than com-

mittee business and no other duties may be assigned to them.

(b) The Committee on Appropriations of each House and each subcommittee thereof 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 fitness to perform the duties of the office; and said staff members shall be assigned to the chairman and ranking minority member of each Committee on Appropriations and each subcommittee thereof as the committee or subcommittee may deem advisable. Such committee or subcommittee is further authorized to discharge by a majority vote of the committee or subcommittee 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. In addition to other duties, such professional staff members shall aid the chairmen and ranking minority members in making careful studies of budget requests with a view to eliminating unnecessary expenditures.

(c) The clerical staff of each standing committee, which shall be appointed by a majority vote of the committee, shall consist of not more than six clerks, to be attached to the office of the chairman, to the ranking minority member, and to the professional staff, as the committee may deem advisable; and the position of committee janitor is hereby abolished. The clerical staff shall handle committee correspondence and stenographic work, both for the committee staff and for the chairman and ranking minority member on matters related to committee work.

(d) All committee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the Member serving as chairman of the committee; and such records shall be the property of the Congress and all members of the committee and the respective Houses shall have access to such records. Each committee is authorized to have printed and bound such testimony and other data presented at hearings held by the committee.

(e) The professional staff members of the standing committees shall receive annual compensation, to be fixed by the chairman, ranging from \$6,000 to \$8,000 and the clerical staff shall receive annual compensation ranging from \$2,000 to \$6,000.

(f) No committee shall appoint to its staff any experts or other personnel detailed or assigned from any department or agency of the Government, except with the written permission of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate or the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

(g) No individual who is employed as a professional staff member of any committee as provided in this section shall be eligible for appointment to any office or position in the executive branch of the Government for a period of 1 year after he shall have ceased to be such a member.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

Page 57, 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 clerk thereof and assistants for the minority, as each such committee, by a majority vote, shall determine to be necessary, such personnel, other than the minority assistants, to possess such qualifications as

the committees respectively may prescribe, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House also is authorized to conduct studies and examinations of the organization and 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 January 9, 1945."

Page 58, line 15, strike out "\$6,000" and insert "\$5,000."

Page 58, line 17, strike out "\$6,000" and insert "\$8,000."

Page 58, line 18, after "(f)", insert "Except as otherwise provided in this act."

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. DIRKSEN], to whom they are satisfactory.

The first, offered as a complete substitute for the text of subsection (b), provides for the staffing of the Committees 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 1943, 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 as 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 argument, 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.

The 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: On page 59, after line 3, insert the following new subsection:

"(h) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions—

"(1) The committee employees of the existing Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and of the existing Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives shall be continued on the rolls of the

respective 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 of the Senate or the Clerk of the House, as the case may be.

"(3) The appropriations for the compensation of committee employees of standing committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives contained in the Legislative Branch 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 (f)" and insert in lieu thereof "(f), and (h)."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is to continue 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. MONRONEY. 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 of Congress a separate department 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 in the analysis, appraisal, and evaluation 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 serviceable to Congress, and committees and Members thereof, without partisan bias in selection or presentation;

(3) to prepare summaries and digests of public hearings before committees of the Congress, and of bills and resolutions of a public general nature introduced in either House.

(b) (1) A director and assistant director of the Legislative Reference Service and all other necessary personnel, shall be appointed by the Librarian of Congress without regard to the civil-service laws and without reference to political affiliations, solely on the ground of fitness to perform the duties of their office. The compensation of all em-

ployees shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided*, That the grade of senior specialists in each field enumerated in paragraph (2) of this subsection shall not be less than the highest grade in the executive branch of the Government to which research analysts and consultants without supervisory responsibility are currently assigned. All employees of the Legislative Reference Service shall be subject to the provisions of the civil-service retirement laws.

(2) The Librarian of Congress is further authorized to appoint in the Legislative Reference Service senior specialists in the following broad fields: Agriculture; American government and public administration; American public law; conservation; education; engineering and public works; full employment; housing; industrial organization and corporation finance; international affairs; international trade and economic geography; labor; mineral economics; money and banking; price economics; social welfare; taxation and fiscal policy; transportation and communications; and veterans' affairs. Such specialists, together with such other members of the staff as may be necessary, shall be available for special work with the appropriate committees of Congress for any of the purposes set out in section 204 (a) (1).

(c) 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, \$550,000; (2) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, \$650,000; (3) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, \$750,000; and (4) for each fiscal year thereafter such sums as may be necessary to carry on the work of the Service.

OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

Sec. 205. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the work 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, \$250,000;

(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 have no personal interest 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 for 6 months' work, and that 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 get defeated 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 they ought 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. I notice 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 gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As long as the gentlewoman is not coming back, it does not make any difference to her.

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 gentlewoman is, and a very capable one, and I expect to be some time. I only wish she had consented to stand for reelection. 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 lady. 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 a compliment. I think you are all 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, this 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 and the rest of us poor worms have to pay for it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman 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, many 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 wisdom and 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. DOUGHTON]. I think he is worth 100 of the young fry. It ought to be a suspicious circumstance to you that the big drive for this bill has come from the same people and the same magazines and the editors who were for all 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 restrictions placed in general appropriation acts limiting the expenditure of specified appropriations therein, with a view to determining the cost to the Government incident to complying with such restrictions, and to report to the Congress his 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 Committees, and to the legislative committees having jurisdiction over legislation relating to the operations of the respective agencies, of 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, under procedures set up by them, and acting through boards of civilian officers or employees of their respective departments, are authorized to correct any military or naval record where in their judgment such action is necessary to correct an error or to remove an injustice.

PART 2—STATUTORY PROVISIONS RELATING TO COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS

Improvement of Congressional Record

SEC. 221. The Joint Committee on Printing is authorized and directed to provide for printing in the daily RECORD the legislative program for the day, together with a list of congressional committee meetings and hearings, and the place of meeting and subject matter; and to cause a brief résumé of congressional activities for the previous day to be incorporated in the RECORD, together with an index of its contents. Such data shall be prepared under the supervision of the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives, respectively.

Joint Committee on Printing

SEC. 222. Section 1 of the act entitled "An act providing for the public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents," approved January 12, 1895 (28 Stat. 601), is amended to read as follows: "That there shall be a Joint Committee on Printing, consisting of the chairman and two members of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and the chairman and two members of the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, who shall have the powers hereinafter stated."

Joint Committee on the Library

SEC. 223. The Joint Committee of Congress on the Library shall hereafter consist of the chairman and four members of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and the chairman and four members of the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives.

Transfer of functions

SEC. 224. The functions, powers, and duties imposed by statute, resolution, or rule of either House of Congress on the effective date of this section on a standing committee of the Senate or the House of Representatives (or the chairman thereof) are, insofar as

they are consistent with this act, hereby transferred to that standing committee created by this act (or the chairman thereof) to which is transferred the legislative jurisdiction over the subject matter to which such functions, powers, and duties relate; except that the respective chairmen of the Committees on Civil Service of the two Houses created by this act shall be members of the National Archives Council.

Joint Committee on the Economic Report

SEC. 225. Section 5 (b) (3) (relating to the time for filing the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report) of the Employment Act of 1946 is amended by striking out "May 1" and inserting in lieu thereof "February 1."

Economic report of the President

SEC. 226. Section 3 (a) (relating to the time for filing the economic report of the President) of the Employment Act of 1946 is amended by striking out "within 60 days after the beginning of each regular session" and inserting in lieu thereof "at the beginning of each regular session."

PART 3—PROVISIONS RELATING TO CAPITOL AND PAGES

Remodeling of caucus rooms and restaurants

SEC. 241. The Architect of the Capitol is authorized and directed to prepare plans and submit them to Congress at the earliest practicable date for the remodeling (a) of the caucus rooms in the Senate and House Office Buildings to provide improved acoustics and seating facilities and for the presentation of motion picture or other visual displays on matters of national interest; and (b) of the 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 reassignment 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 jointly, are authorized and directed to enter into an arrangement with the Board of Education of the District of Columbia for the education of congressional pages and pages of the Supreme Court in 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 elect to attend a private or parochial school of their own choice; *Provided, however,* That such private or parochial school shall be reimbursed by the Senate and House of Representatives only in the same amount as would be paid if the page or pages were attending a public school under the provisions of paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment on page 67, line 10.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONRONEY: On page 67, line 10, insert:

"SEC. 244. All necessary funds required to carry out the provisions of this act by the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House are hereby authorized to be appropriated, and the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House are hereby further authorized to employ such administrative assistants as may be necessary in order to carry out the provisions of this act, under their respective jurisdictions."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, this simply authorizes the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House to carry out the provisions of this act.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Effective date

SEC. 244. This title shall take effect on the date of its enactment; except that sections 203 (a), (b), (c), (e), and (f), 222, 223, 224, and 243 shall take effect on the day on which the Eightieth Congress convenes.

TITLE III—REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

Short title

SEC. 301. This title may be cited as the "Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act."

Definitions

SEC. 302. When used in this title—

(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 "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 "person" includes an individual, partnership, committee, association, corporation, and any other organization or group of persons.

(d) The term "Clerk" means the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States.

(e) 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.

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; and

(4) the name and address of every person to whom any such expenditure is made and the date thereof.

(b) It shall be the duty of such person to obtain and keep a receipted bill, stating the particulars, for every expenditure of such funds exceeding \$10 in amount, and to preserve all receipted bills and accounts required to be kept by this section for a period of at least 2 years from the date of the filing of the statement containing such items.

Receipts for contributions

SEC. 304. Every individual who receives a contribution of \$500 or more for any of the purposes hereinafter designated shall within 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. 305. (a) Every person receiving any contributions or expending any money for the purposes designated in subparagraph (a), (b), or (c) of section 307 shall file with the Clerk between the first and tenth day of each calendar quarter, 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 not mentioned in the preceding report; 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 an expenditure in one or more items of the aggregate amount or value, within the calendar year, of \$10 or more has been made by or on behalf of such person, 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 where there has been no change in an item reported in a previous statement only the amount need be carried forward.

Statement preserved for 2 years

Sec. 306. 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, a duplicate of such statement shall be promptly filed upon notice by the Clerk of its nonreceipt;

(b) shall be preserved by the Clerk for a period of 2 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. 307. 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 or other persons in any manner whatsoever, 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 passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States.

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 organizations to see whether or not it would be actually restrictive. As a matter of fact, a number of suggestions were made to the committee and those suggestions were carefully considered. Later on, some of the organizations which suggested amendatory language thought it was just as well not to have it included.

The gist of the antilobbying provision is contained in section 307. What this is designed to do 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 their assets and all of their receipts and probably file a very long administrative record with 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. I 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 full report?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That was my own conception of what is intended.

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 committees, you 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 down here and appeared before a 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 he was a lobbyist 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 been stricken out.

What 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 endeavor to 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 an 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 takes place at the present time is not approaching the Congress directly but it is radio appeals that causes thousands 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 order that there may be no 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 do. There 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 three 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 letters and telegrams, 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 collections and the methods in which they are disbursed.

Second. The second class of lobbyists are those who are employed to come to the Capitol under the false impression that they exert some powerful 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. The title in no wise prohibits or curtails their activities. It merely requires that they shall register and disclose the sources and purposes 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 their employers with respect to legislation which concerns them. They will likewise be required to register and state their compensation and the sources of their employment.

Section 301. Short title: This section provides a short title, namely, the "Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act."

Section 302. Definitions: This section contains definitions and for convenience of reference the definitions of "contribution," "expenditure," and "legislation" are included 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 '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 the duty of every person soliciting or receiving contributions (as defined above) to any 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 every person making a contribution 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 required to be kept for at least 2 years from the date of filing of the statement containing such items.

Section 304. Receipts for contributions: This section requires every individual who receives a contribution of \$500 or more 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 making the contribution and the date on which received.

Section 305. Statements to be filed with Clerk of House: This section requires every person receiving any contributions or expending any money for the purposes specified in section 307 (post) to file with 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 \$10 or more has been made within the calendar year by or on behalf of such person and the amount, date, and purpose of such expenditure; the total sum of all expenditures made by or on behalf of such person during the calendar year and not stated under the foregoing requirement, and the total expenditures made by or on behalf of such person during the calendar year. Statements required to be filed hereunder shall be cumulative during the calendar year to which they relate.

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, shall constitute part of the public records of his office, and shall be open to public inspection.

Section 307. Persons to whom applicable: This section defines the application of the title and includes any person who by himself or through any agent or employee or other person in any manner whatsoever, 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 one of the following purposes:

(a) The passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States. It will be noted in this connection that under the definition set forth above "legislation" means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House.

(b) To influence, directly or indirectly, the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress.

Section 308. Registration with Secretary of Senate and Clerk of House: This section requires any person who engages himself for pay or for any consideration, for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of legislation, to register with the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate giving full details of his employment, and to report each calendar quarter details concerning money received and expended by him during the preceding calendar quarter in carrying on his work. There are excepted from the provisions of this section persons who merely appear before committees in support 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 it a misdemeanor to violate any of the provisions of the title and provides punishment by fine of not more than \$5,000 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 any proposed legislation or from appearing before a committee of the Congress in support of or in opposition to proposed legislation; and 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 be 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 title.

It should prove helpful in a determination of those cases and persons to whom the title does not apply and then specifies three broad groups who would be required to comply with its provisions.

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 order that there may be no misunderstanding of the purposes of this title the committee desires to make a statement as to what the title does and what it does not do. There 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 appear openly and frankly before the committees of Congress and engage in no other activities to influence legislation.

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 three 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 letters and telegrams, many of which have been based entirely upon misinformation as to facts. This class of persons 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 collections and the methods in which they are disbursed.

Second. The second class of lobbyists are those who are employed to come to the Capitol under the false impression that they exert some powerful 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, but carefully conceal from Members of Congress whom they happen to contact the purpose of their presence. The title in no wise prohibits or curtails their activities. It merely requires that they shall register and disclose the sources and purposes 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 their employers with respect to legislation which concerns them. They will likewise be required to register and state their compensation and the sources of their employment.

Section 301. Short title: This section provides a short title, namely, the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act.

Section 302. Definitions: This section contains definitions and for convenience of reference the definitions of "contribution," "expenditure," and "legislation" are included 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 '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 the duty of every person soliciting or receiving contributions (as defined above) to any 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 every person making a contribution 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 required to be kept for at least 2 years from the date of filing of the statement containing such items.

Section 304. Receipts for contributions: This section requires every individual who receives a contribution of \$500 or more 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 making 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 expending any money for the purposes specified in section 307 (post) to file with 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 \$10 or more has been made within the calendar year by or on behalf of such person and the amount, date, and purpose of such expenditure; the total sum of all expenditures made by or on behalf of such person during the calendar year and not stated under the foregoing requirement, and the total expenditures made by or on behalf of such person during the calendar year. Statements required to be filed hereunder shall be cumulative during the calendar year to which they relate.

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, shall constitute part of the public records of his office, and shall be open to public inspection.

Section 307. Persons to whom applicable: This section defines the application of the title and includes any person who by him-

self or through any agent or employee or other person in any manner whatsoever, 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 one of the following purposes: (a) The passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States. It will be noted in this connection that under the definition set forth above "legislation" means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House. (b) To influence, directly or indirectly, the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress.

(c) To influence, directly or indirectly, the election or defeat of any candidate for any elective Federal office.

Sec. 308. Registration with Secretary of Senate and Clerk of House: This section requires any person who engages himself for pay or for any consideration, for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of legislation, to register with the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate, giving full details of his employment, and to report each calendar quarter details concerning money received and expended by him during the preceding calendar quarter in carrying on his work. There are excepted from the provisions of this section persons who merely appear before committees in support of or in opposition to legislation but who engage in no further or other activities in connection with the passage or defeat of such 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.

Sec. 309. Reports and statements to be made under oath: This section requires all reports and statements to be made under oath.

Sec. 310. Penalties: This section makes it a misdemeanor to violate any of the provisions of the title and provides punishment by fine of not more than \$5,000 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 any proposed legislation or from appearing before a committee of the Congress in support of or in opposition to proposed legislation; and 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.

Sec. 311. Exemption: This section provides that the title shall not apply to practices or activities regulated by the Federal Corrupt Practices Act nor be construed as repealing any portion of said act.

I believe I can say for members of the committee that we have no desire to restrict in the slightest way the right of a citizen to petition his Government for a redress of grievances by urging the passage or defeat of legislation that might be prejudicial or harmful or adverse to his interests. It is not the desire of the committee to place upon any citizen a brand that is sometimes regarded as sinister. Nor is it the intent of the committee to cause undue inconvenience or hardship for bona fide organizations who must necessarily keep in close touch with all varieties of legislation because of the impact of such legislation upon their legitimate activities. After all, government having moved so deeply into the

whole business, economic, and social field that the many fine organizations which represent various economic interests would be almost remiss in their obligations if they failed to keep abreast of developments in the legislative field.

But where men are engaged and paid for the primary and principal purpose of encompassing the defeat or enactment of legislation it is not asking too much that such persons register and file a statement. Many States have such acts upon the statute books today and these do not appear to have imposed undue hardships on any person, group, or organization.

Note particularly the language in section 308. It says:

Any person who shall engage himself for pay or for any consideration for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation * * *

That I believe is the key to this title.

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

Mr. Chairman, with the centralization of government which has grown up in the past number of years, it is almost necessary for organizations like the Grange and the Farm Bureau Federation to have their representatives here practically all the time to try to keep them apprised as to legislation affecting millions of farmers throughout the Nation.

I am not in favor of corrupt lobbyists, yet at the same time when you bring about a condition where all of the activities controlling the Government of this country and the industry of this country is lodged here in Washington, if you estop the people of this country from being able to come down here in decent form and under the Constitution petition this Congress you are doing a great disservice to this country and you are playing right into the hands of those people who are trying to subvert the better purposes of government, the radio commentators who have been trying to destroy the confidence of the people in representative government by berating the Members of Congress. I do not know what the answer to this is but I do not want to exclude the right of the people to petition, guaranteed to them in the Constitution of this country, and bring about a condition that will deprive them of their constitutional rights.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Registration with Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House

Sec. 308. (a) Any person who shall engage himself for pay or for any consideration for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States shall, before doing anything in furtherance of such object, register with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate and shall give to those officers in writing and under oath, his name and business address, the name and address of the person by whom he is employed, and in whose interest he appears or works, the duration of such employment, how much he is paid and is to receive, by whom he is paid or is to be

paid, how much he is to be paid for expenses, and what expenses are to be included. Each such person so registering shall between the first and tenth day of each calendar quarter, so long as his activity continues, file with the Clerk and Secretary a detailed report under oath of all money received and expended by him during the preceding calendar quarter in carrying on his work; to whom paid; for what purpose; and the names of any papers, periodicals, magazines, or other publications in which he has caused to be published any articles or editorials; and the proposed legislation he is employed to support or oppose. 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; 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 comments, or paid advertisements, which directly or indirectly urge the passage or defeat of legislation, if such newspaper, periodical, or individual, engages in no further 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 such legislation.

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word to make a few comments on the subject of lobbyists.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, we are violating the Constitution. It is directly implied in the Constitution that we have no right to intimidate people or to make any effort to intimidate them so that they cannot petition the Congress. What is this but intimidation? It is the same sort of curb you put on enemy agents during the war. Registration—do you remember? It is the same curb you put on enemy agents during the war.

Mr. Chairman, this is not intended to prevent corruption. It would be very simple to put in here language providing for a heavy fine or a heavy jail sentence for anyone who tried to bribe or who offered a job to a Congressman or indulged in any of the ways that are known as corrupt. If that were the intention it would be the easiest thing in the world to insert language in this section. You can see what this is.

How have the damaging bills that have come through this Congress heretofore been brought up? They have been brought here by a group of financiers in New York who see somebody down here in the bureaucracy and start these things like Bretton Woods, the British loan, and all of these other things that are unconstitutional. The bureaucracy sees all these CIO's, women's clubs, business groups, and so forth, and lines them up; then day after day we are bombarded with letters. We have seen that in the committees. Of course, they do not register because everybody knows they

are around and that they are influencing legislation.

What does this bill do? It says that if the man whose business is going to be taken by the OPA or the Bretton Woods agreement or the British loan or some of the rest of this iniquitous legislation hires a lawyer, the lawyer has to register exactly the same as an enemy agent registered during the war.

Mr. Chairman, the people are going to soon rise up and stop this totalitarian way into which this Government has fallen recently.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman 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, be guilty of a misdemeanor, 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, directly 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 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. DIRKSEN]. There are a good many claims that have been investigated by Government authority and have been approved by the Committee on Claims. We had 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 seems to me that there ought to be some method by which the claims that have at least been favorably acted upon by the committee should not be covered by the provision, having to go back into the court and over the whole thing again and, if there is cost to be added, the Government will have to pay the cost if the claimants succeed in these suits.

What I am getting at is this: It does seem to me that there ought to be an amendment that this provision should not apply to claims or bills that have been filed and favorably acted upon by the Committee on Claims. We have a great many cases now in that situation. Some have been there for a year and a half before the Army ever got around to it, and they spent a good deal of time investigating whether these claims were just or not. They finally made their report to the Claims Committee, and the Claims Committee heard the evidence and approved it, and it passed the House 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 that may be on the calendar or in 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 gentlewoman 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 know 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 no laughing matter, 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 their 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 pledged 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 worked tirelessly 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 is Sergeant Andrew 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 to Walter Reed when, after 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 world were filled with the 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 that be 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, and corporations whose primary function is to act as, and while acting as, instrumentalities or agencies of the United States, whether or not authorized to sue and be sued in their own names: *Provided*, That this shall not be construed to include any contractor with the United States.

(b) "Employee of the Government" includes officers or employees of any Federal agency, members of the military or naval forces of the United States, and persons acting on behalf of a Federal agency in an official capacity, temporarily or permanently in the service of the United States, whether with or without compensation.

(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 head of each Federal agency, or his 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, where the total amount of the claim does not exceed \$1,000, caused by the negligent or wrongful act 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, in accordance with the law of the place where the act or omission occurred.

(b) Subject to the provisions of part 3 of this title, any such award or determination shall be final and conclusive on all officers of the Government, except when procured by means of fraud, notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary.

(c) Any award made to any claimant pursuant to this section, and any award, compromise, or settlement of any claim cognizable under this title made by the Attorney General pursuant to section 413, shall be paid by the head of the Federal agency concerned out of appropriations that may be made

therefor, which appropriations are hereby authorized.

(d) The acceptance by the claimant of any such award, compromise, or settlement shall be final and conclusive on the claimant, and shall constitute a complete release by the claimant of any claim against the United States and against the 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 paid by such Federal agency 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, sitting without a jury, shall have exclusive jurisdiction to hear, determine, and render judgment on 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 caused by the negligent or wrongful act 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 in accordance with the law of the place where the act or omission occurred. Subject to the provisions of this title, the United States shall be liable 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.

(b) The judgment in such an action shall constitute a complete bar to any action by the claimant, by reason of the same subject matter, against the employee of the Government whose act or omission gave rise to the claim. No suit shall be instituted pursuant to this section upon a claim presented to any Federal agency pursuant to part 2 of this title unless such Federal agency has made final disposition of the claim: *Provided*, That the claimant may, upon 15 days' notice given in writing, withdraw the claim from consideration of the Federal agency and commence suit thereon pursuant to this section: *Provided further*, That as to any claim so disposed of or so withdrawn, no suit shall be instituted pursuant to this section for any sum in excess of the amount of the claim presented to the Federal agency, except where the increased amount of the claim is shown to be based upon newly discovered evidence not reasonably discoverable at the time of presentation of the claim to the Federal agency or upon evidence of intervening facts, relating to the amount of the claim. Disposition of any claim made pursuant to part 2 of this title shall not be competent evidence of liability or amount of damages in proceedings on such claim pursuant to this section.

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

Mr. Chairman, before addressing my remarks to this particular section to ask

a question, I think it should be stated in all fairness that I am quite sure in answer to the statement by the gentleman from Massachusetts that not a single one of these disabled American veterans has ever been ridiculed for his attempts to procure legislation by any Member of Congress. I will say further that the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation has been giving this subject a great deal of serious consideration, and that this committee is the best friend the disabled veterans of this country have.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Claims, I for one have no objection whatsoever to this legislation taking away part of its duties. The Members of Congress may be aware of the fact that almost half the bills introduced in this House are private bills. May I ask whether or not any consideration was given to limiting the amount of awards that may be made by the Federal courts in various types of cases?

Mr. MONRONEY. In this bill we are placing jurisdiction in the Federal courts to determine the amount of the awards.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The reason I asked the question is this. As the gentleman well knows, the Committee on Claims has for a number of years followed the practice of limiting the amounts in death cases to \$5,000, and other types of cases are likewise limited. If I read this language correctly, the recovery will be against the Government just exactly as against the private individual. I say frankly that you are opening the doors of the Treasury in all of these suits, and thousands of them will be filed every year. In all fairness to the Nation and to the taxpayers of the Nation there should be some limitation on the amounts to be recovered in these actions, and no one knows that better than the objectors on both sides of the aisle. Without such limitation I cannot support this measure.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana, one of the objectors.

Mr. SPRINGER. The provision is also contained in section 410 that these trials must be had before the district court without a jury. What is the gentleman's thought on that subject?

Mr. SCRIVNER. There are advantages in trial before the court without a jury, namely, that the cases can be much more expeditiously handled than they can in the case of a jury trial. There is another advantage in that quite often, inasmuch as the Government is the defendant and the money comes out of the Treasury, the juries will decide cases with their hearts rather than their heads, just as they do when an insurance company is the defendant, so the awards in jury trials would probably be much larger, in view of the sympathy the jurors might have, than they would be in trials before the court. If these cases are to be tried by the Federal courts, they should be court trials rather than jury trials, in my opinion.

Mr. MONRONEY. 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 inviting such awards rather than limiting them.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Yes; but we have had that limitation in the Committee on Claims on private 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 settlement of Federal tort claims in the district 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 recovery.

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, 1934 (48 Stat. 1064); 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. 505).

Review

Sec. 412. (a) Final judgments in the district courts in cases under this part shall be subject to review by appeal—

(1) in the circuit courts of appeals in the same manner and to the same extent as other judgments of the district courts; or

(2) in the Court of Claims of the United States: *Provided*, That the notice of appeal filed in the district court under rule 73 of the Rules of Civil Procedure shall have affixed thereto the written consent on behalf of all the appellees 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, 1934 (48 Stat. 1064). In such appeals the Court of Claims of the United States shall have the same powers and duties as those conferred on a circuit court of appeals in respect to appeals under section 4 of the act of February 13, 1925 (43 Stat. 939).

(b) Sections 239 and 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended, shall apply to cases under this part 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.

Compromise

Sec. 413. With a view to doing substantial justice, the Attorney 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.

PART 4—PROVISIONS COMMON TO PART 2 AND PART 3

One-year statute of limitations

Sec. 420. Every claim against the United States cognizable under this title shall be forever barred, unless within 1 year after such claim accrued or within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, whichever is later, it is presented in writing to the Federal agency out of whose activities it arises, if such claim is for a sum not exceeding \$1,000; or unless within 1 year after such 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. In the event that a claim for a sum not exceeding \$1,000 is presented to a Federal agency as aforesaid, the time to institute a suit pursuant to part 3 of this title shall be extended for a period of 6 months 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 would otherwise expire before the end of such period.

Exceptions

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, exercising due care, in the execution of a statute or regulation, whether or not such statute or regulation be valid, or based upon the exercise or performance or the failure to exercise or perform a discretionary function or duty on the part of a Federal agency or an employee of the Government, whether or not the discretion involved be abused.

(b) Any claim arising out of the loss, miscarriage, or negligent transmission of letters or postal matter.

(c) Any claim arising in respect of the assessment or collection of any tax or customs duty, or the detention of any goods or merchandise by any officer of customs or excise or any other law-enforcement officer.

(d) Any claim for which a remedy is provided by the act of March 9, 1920 (U. S. C., title 46, secs. 741-752, inclusive), or the act of March 3, 1925 (U. S. C., title 46, secs. 781-790, inclusive), relating to claims or suits in admiralty against the United States.

(e) Any claim arising out of an act or omission of any employee of the Government in administering the provisions of the Trading with the Enemy Act, as amended.

(f) Any claim for damages caused by the imposition or establishment of a quarantine by the United States.

(g) Any claim arising from injury to vessels, or to the cargo, crew, or passengers of vessels, while passing through the locks of the Panama Canal or while in Canal Zone waters.

(h) Any claim arising out of assault, battery, false imprisonment, false arrest, malicious prosecution, abuse of process, libel, slander, misrepresentation, deceit, or interference with contract rights.

(i) Any claim for damages caused by the fiscal operations of the Treasury or by the regulation of the monetary system.

(j) Any claim arising out of the activities of the military or naval forces, or the Coast Guard, during time of war.

(k) Any claim arising in a foreign country.

(l) Any claim arising from the activities of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONRONEY: On page 84, line 1, before the word "activities" insert the word "combatant."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Attorneys' fees

Sec. 422. The court rendering a judgment for the plaintiff pursuant to part 3 of this title, or the head of the Federal agency or his designee making an award pursuant to part 2 of this title, or the Attorney General making a disposition pursuant to section 413 of this title, as the case may be, may, as a part of the judgment, award, or settlement, determine and allow reasonable attorney's fees, which, if the recovery is \$500 or more, shall not exceed 10 percent of the amount recovered under part 2, or 20 percent of the amount recovered under part 3, to be paid out of but not in addition to the amount of judgment, award, or settlement recovered, to the attorneys representing the claimant. Any attorney who charges, demands, receives, or collects for services rendered in connection with such claim any amount in excess of that allowed under this section, if recovery be had, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than \$2,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

Exclusiveness of remedy

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 agency to consider, ascertain, adjust or determine claims on account of damage to or loss of property, or on account of personal injury or death, caused by the negligent or wrongful act or omission of any employee of the Government while acting within the scope of his office or employment, are hereby repealed in respect of claims cognizable under part 2 of this title and accruing on and after January 1, 1945, including, but without limitation, the provisions granting such authorization now contained in the following laws:

Public Law No. 375, Sixty-seventh Congress, approved December 28, 1922 (42 Stat. 1066; U. S. C., title 31, secs. 215-217).

Public Law No. 267, Sixty-sixth Congress, approved June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 1054; U. S. C., title 33, sec. 853).

Public Law No. 481, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved March 20, 1936 (49 Stat. 1184; U. S. C., title 31, sec. 224b).

Public Law No. 112, as amended, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved July 3, 1943 (57 Stat. 372; U. S. C., title 31, secs. 223b, 223c, and 223d).

Public Law No. 182, as amended, Sixty-fifth Congress, approved July 1, 1918 (40 Stat. 705; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 600).

Section 4 of Public Law No. 18, Sixty-seventh Congress, approved June 16, 1921 (42 Stat. 63), as amended by Public Law No. 456, Seventy-third Congress, approved June 22, 1934 (48 Stat. 1207; U. S. C., title 31, sec. 224c).

(b) Nothing contained herein shall be deemed to repeal any provision of law authorizing any Federal agency to consider, ascertain, adjust, settle, determine, or pay any claim on account of damage to or loss of property or on account of personal injury or death, in cases in which such damage, loss,

injury, or death was not caused by any negligent or wrongful act or omission of an employee of the Government while acting within the scope of his office or employment, or any other claim not cognizable under part 2 of this title.

TITLE V—GENERAL BRIDGE ACT

Short title

SEC. 501. This title may be cited as the "General Bridge Act of 1946."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEA: Beginning at the top of page 87, strike all of title 5: General Bridge Act.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment if adopted would be to leave the granting of permits for bridges over navigable streams as the situation stands at present. I would not ask the Committee of the Whole of the House to consider this matter from the standpoint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which has jurisdiction of the subject. If there is any reason why the law should be left as it is, the reason is that Members of Congress may have the benefit of securing bridge permits through the committee of Congress instead of going to the War Department for that purpose. Every Member of Congress realizes there are two distinct lines of work of the Members of the House. One is as to their legislative duties and the other is a very important part of a Congressman's work, and that is contact with the executive departments of the Government. Whether we like it or not, in the last 40 or 50 years there has been an accumulation of Federal activities that frequently bring the Members of Congress in contact with the departments of Government. Whether you adopt the provisions that are in this bill or stay with the existing law, that responsibility will rest upon the Members very much as it is now so far as securing bridge permits for their district is concerned. This year, for instance, there have been over 100 Members of Congress who have come to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to handle these measures. We have found frequently that it has been a great advantage to Members of the House to have this body to which they can apply in securing permits for their districts.

We feel it is probably true that our committee can be of service to the Members of this House, that justifies retaining jurisdiction where it is.

I will be followed by our colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], who for a great many years has had charge of this work as chairman of the subcommittee. I think he will give you substantial reasons why the House might determine it would be to the advantage of the Membership of the House and to the country if this jurisdiction should be maintained in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section close in 10 minutes.

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 was introduced not to preserve the jurisdiction of a committee but to safeguard the proper functions of the Congress.

This is another of the constantly recurring attempts to induce the Congress to abdicate 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 in the form of bills. No action has ever been taken in favor of such a proposal, and no one has ever been found to introduce such a bill.

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 does the Member of Congress from that district. A city, a county, a State—sometimes two cities, counties, or States—desire construction of a bridge. They would rather secure the authority through their Congressman 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 constituency it is the most important bill pending in Congress. The Congressman knows local conditions. He and members of the committee having jurisdiction speak the same language and understand one another's problems. No Member of Congress desiring 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 favorable reports. I wonder if 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 be revived if this title should become law. We have eliminated many privately owned ferries, dangerous bottlenecks to modern highway traffic. We authorize free bridges and publicly owned toll bridges, which, at the expiration of a reasonable amortization period, become free bridges—just as free to traffic as any other 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 than if placed in a bureaucratic strait-jacket.

If this title becomes a law the Member of Congress will have no part in authorizing a bridge in his district; but woe 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 be punishable by a fine not to exceed \$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 legislative processes. 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 has 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 tendency 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 worse than the arrogation of power by the executive department is the abdication 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 obsequiously to the dictates of a bureaucratic clerk.

Unless we stop drifting as we have been drifting, and are drifting now, representative government will be undermined and destroyed, and on its ruins will rise an autocratic, arrogant, paternalistic, centralized bureaucracy. Then constitutional government will be dead. Let us get back to the principles of the fathers, maintain this Government as an "indissoluble Union of indestructible States," as a "government of laws and not of men," preserve the separation of powers under a dual form of government, and restore the equipoise which, as the result of executive usurpation and legislative abdication, 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 enjoy the fellowship 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 aspect of it. 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 a hundred 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. WADSWORTH. 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. WADSWORTH. 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? The gentleman was a member of 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 thereto 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 the location and plans thereof shall also have been submitted to and approved by the highway department or departments of the State or States in which the bridge and its approaches are situated; and where such bridge shall be between two or more States and the highway departments thereof shall be unable to agree upon the location and plans therefor, or if they, or either of them, shall fail or refuse to act upon the location and plans submitted, such location and plans then shall be submitted to the Public Roads Administration and, if approved by the Public Roads Administration, approval by the highway departments shall not be required.

Tolls

SEC. 503. If tolls shall be charged for the transit over any interstate bridge of engines, cars, streetcars, wagons, carriages, vehicles, animals, foot passengers, or other passengers, such tolls shall be reasonable and just, and the Secretary of War may, at any time, and from time to time, prescribe the reasonable rates of toll for such transit over such bridge, and the rates so prescribed shall be the legal rates and shall be the rates demanded and received for such transit.

Acquisition by public agencies

SEC. 504. After 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, within or adjoining which 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 such 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, the amount of damages or compensation to be allowed shall not include good will, going value, or prospective revenues or profits, but shall be limited to the sum of (1) the actual cost of constructing such bridge and its approaches, less a reasonable deduction for actual depreciation in value; (2) the actual costs of acquiring such interests in real property; (3) actual financing and promotion costs, not to exceed 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 necessary 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 within 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 of costs so filed, 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 said individual, firm, or corporation, its successors and assigns, shall make available all of its records in connection with the construction, financing, and promo-

tion thereof. The findings of the Secretary of War as to the reasonable costs of the construction, financing, and promotion of the bridge shall be conclusive for the purposes mentioned in section 504 of this title, subject only to review in 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 or acquired by a State or States or by any municipality or other political subdivision or public agency thereof, under the provisions of this title, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical 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 so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls. An accurate record of the amount paid for acquiring the bridge and its approaches, the actual expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and 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, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151; U. S. C., title 33, sec. 401), and the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters", approved March 23, 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 firm or corporation, its successors or assigns, or any State, political subdivision, or municipality authorized 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 according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor 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 bridges, or who refuses to produce books, papers, or documents in obedience to a subpoena or other lawful requirement under this title, or who otherwise

violates any provisions of this title, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not to exceed \$5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

Rights reserved

SEC. 511. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this title is hereby expressly reserved as to any and all bridges which may be built under authority hereof.

**TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT
PAY OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS**

Compensation of Members of Congress

SEC. 601. (a) Effective on the day on which the Eightieth Congress convenes, the compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of \$15,000 per annum each; and the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Vice President of the United States shall be at the rate of \$20,000 per annum each.

(b) The sentence contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1946, which reads as follows: "There shall be paid to each Representative and Delegate, and to the Resident Commissioner from Puerto 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, 1947, which reads as follows: "There shall be paid to each Senator after January 1, 1946, 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.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an 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 13 on page 94 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Effective on the day on which the Eightieth Congress convenes there shall be paid to each Senator, Representative in Congress, Delegate from the Territories, Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, an expense allowance of \$2,500 per annum to assist in defraying expenses relating to, or resulting from, the discharge of his official duties, for which no tax liability shall incur, or accounting be made. Such sum to be paid in equal monthly installments.

"(c) The sentence contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1946, which reads as follows: "There shall be paid to each Representative and Delegate, and to the Resident Commissioner from Puerto 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.

"(d) The sentence contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947, which reads as follows: "There shall be paid to each Senator after January 1, 1946, 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."

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 \$12,000 and the expense account at \$3,000. Since that time, however, I have had a number of conferences with different 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 of the House and Senate 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 incurring 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. There is no 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 exemption for the money that he actually expends in the conduct of his work, his official work as a Member of Congress, because it has been held in some cases that a Member of Congress is not engaged in a business or a profession, therefore he cannot claim a deduction as a business expense or as a professional expense. So we fixed that very firmly in this amendment.

I want to call attention to one other thing, and I especially would like to get the attention of the Speaker and of the minority leader, that in my amendment I do not reduce in any way the salaries fixed for the Speaker of the House or the Vice President of the United States. I think they are worthy of receiving \$25,000 each, and I am glad that the committee put that provision in the bill.

We have debated this question. I think everyone understands it. I think this is the direct and the honest and the honorable way to do this thing. I do not believe that anyone can contend that a Member of Congress is not entitled to a reasonable expense allowance, just as every other public official in the United States is given a reasonable expense allowance. This money is to be spent, of course, on official business, and there is no Member of Congress worthy of his salt that does not spend more than \$2,500 a year in transacting the affairs of his constituents and the public business of the United States. I think we are being honest not only with the public but with ourselves. The reason I offered this amendment is because the bill provided that you would receive \$15,000 salary, out of which you pay your own expenses on official business, and there is no other public official in the country, and I know of none in private business, that is re-

quired to pay his expenses on official business out of his own pocket.

Therefore, I hope this amendment will be adopted.

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

Members of the Committee, let us understand just exactly what we are doing. We are talking about \$15,000 that will come to every Member of the House and Senate, and whether we should go about it by saying \$15,000 is our salary, or \$12,500 plus \$2,500 for expenses, is a matter for the House to determine, but I believe that every Member of the House and Senate should realize that the board of directors of the Federal Government cannot continue to get men of the ability needed to face the problems that we face today at far below the going rate in business or industry or in other lines. Government service will not keep a man here if he is losing money. I had occasion to investigate the amounts of time that Members of Congress have spent on the job. Since 1925, when the congressional salary was raised from \$7,500 to \$10,000, until 1938, the Congress spent 47.4 percent of the time in those years on the job in Washington. Since 1938 until 1946 we have spent 94 percent of the time on the job in Washington; just almost exactly double the amount of time.

You can also consider with this the cost-of-living increase, which in all of these statistics, considering the much higher Washington living costs, does come up to about the 50-percent increase that we are considering at this time—either in the committee bill or in the amendment.

You can consider the Federal pay increase we have granted almost all other Federal employees, which approaches and almost equals, since 1925, 50 percent.

So I think if you measure it on any index and on the average weekly earnings of workers in industry, it might be interesting, because that has been the yardstick. Since 1925, it has increased 76.9 percent up to the present time.

So I believe if we are honest with the people we will say that it should require the payment of \$15,000 to keep the type of men that Congress must have on the job. I do not mean to say that you cannot get 435 men to sit in the House for \$10,000, or for \$8,000, or for \$5,000, or for \$4,000. But government, like everybody else, is going to get just exactly what it pays for, and year after year you are going to see your top men dropping out, men that we can ill afford to lose, and go into other types of business.

Neither of these provisions, either the committee bill nor the Brown amendment, apply to Members of this Congress. The people themselves will decide in the November elections just who will receive this increased pay. We do have the responsibility of placing the salary on the job which will be held by the people who the people select to represent them.

Congress must make this decision, for there is no other agency which can set the salary of Members of Congress. I wish there could be a separate board or some other means to relieve us of this onerous task.

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 Congress—and attract the 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 hires the Congressman for a definite salary for the year.

I do not like the \$2,500 expense allowance because I think every Member within 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 light to say that it is a \$15,000-a-year job and that we are paying that definite and certain amount.

On the deductibility, I believe the approach that is being made by the committee in an amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is a correct one.

It would put a Member of Congress in exactly the same position as a businessman coming to Washington. It would reverse, by the amendment the gentleman from Massachusetts will offer, an old Tax Court decision that holds for some reason, I know not what, that our place of residence for Federal income-tax purposes is in Washington.

Does any Member think he could come here and serve his district in Washington and not retain a residence in his home district? I am sure you realize that no Member could do that. So this amendment will be offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] to permit income-tax deductibility for one of the duplicating residences that a Congressman must maintain. He can deduct only then up to \$2,500 a year for this. The matter is in your hands. I feel it is a more straightforward step to say it is a \$15,000-a-year job rather than to adopt the Brown amendment.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

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

There was no objection.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUCK: On page 93, line 13, strike out section 601, paragraphs (a) and (b).

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

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. This amendment is word for word the amendment I intended to offer. I shall support the gentleman's amendment, and shall not offer my amendment.

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 has been amended. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York 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, I have continuously advocated 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 must therefore advocate that 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, insofar 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 all trends toward inflation. 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 policy to have elected officials participating in any plans for retirement benefits.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, on various occasions in the past I have spoken and voted 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 to 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 clear in 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 positions of 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 of any country in the history of the world and it is therefore more appropriate that we, as Members of Congress, set the pace by tightening our belts and voting for 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. However, I cannot 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. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the congressional pay was increased in 1925 from \$7,500 to \$10,000. It has remained at this figure until 2 years ago we voted a \$2,500 expense account to each Member. I do feel that increase is sufficient and the additional increase of \$2,500 suggested by the Brown amendment is not needed. Men who come to Congress have great responsibility. It does not seem that with the unbalanced budget that the additional increase is now justified. The increased-pay amendment should be defeated.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, heretofore, when legislation of this character was presented to the House, I spoke against its passage, and I voted against it. I took the position then, as I now take that same position, because our Nation is involved in the greatest debt that any nation has faced; our people are bowed down in debt; this is not a proper time for increases in salaries, and this is not a proper time to think of retirement. I am opposed to it, and I will vote against this measure.

Mr. Chairman, while I am in full accord with streamlining Congress when it can be done properly, yet there are many items in this plan to reorganize Congress with which I cannot agree. Yet, with great care—and with ample

time—a plan of reorganization can be worked out, but I cannot subscribe to this plan. I will cast my vote against this bill. I will vote for the best interest of the people I represent and against any increase of taxes upon the people for this proposed plan.

We must quit spending. We must begin paying our debt. We cannot pay if these programs are continued.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I expect to vote against this bill and I am opposed to the increase in salary provided in this legislation. I am also opposed to the retirement plan commonly known as a congressional pension.

I favor a reorganization of Congress but not in the manner attempted by this legislation.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I cannot vote for an increase in the salary of Members of Congress and the pension program for Congressmen. I realize that our compensation is too low and that our official expenses here in Washington and at home are heavy and take a good part of our salaries. However, I cannot vote to increase my own salary without giving increases to our low-income workers. I also feel we should make adequate provision for our old folks before increasing our own pay. I therefore am voting against increase in pay and pensions for ourselves.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment of the gentleman from New York. With the Federal budget in its present situation this Congress should consider its duty to the taxpayers. I cannot support legislation to raise the salaries of Congress, nor can I support pensions for Congress.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I am in entire agreement with many provisions of this bill. I think the streamlining of the Congress is long overdue. However, I cannot agree with the section under consideration wherein the compensation of the Members is increased. Nor can I agree with the retirement benefits to the legislative branch of the Government. Just yesterday we had under consideration the increase in the Federal contribution for old-age assistance and while I voted for that legislation I felt then and feel now that we did not go far enough. It seems to me that a Member of Congress is in a far different position than an employee in the civil service and for that reason I shall vote against the retirement section. Everyone knows the country faces a tremendous debt and if we are to insist upon economy in others we must practice it ourselves and for that reason I shall vote against the increase in salaries to Members of Congress.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the committee for their excellent work on this bill, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. In it are many needed reforms. 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.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this is no time for Congressmen to vote themselves a salary increase. If there is one organ in our whole social and economic structure rather than any other 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 the public must look to for the adoption of measures to prevent the further progress of inflation. Since the raising of our salary would be in principle definitely inflationary, we would by such act entirely 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 1939 and a great many more whose income has by no means kept pace with rising living costs. Should the Congress now raise the salary of its Members, those groups would be forced to pay, out of 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 its integrity, 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. This alone should deter us. 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 work we do 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 my conscience and answer to 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 this bill. There are 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 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 that would free us more for our primary duties as legislators. I hope that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE] will help, as he suggested, in making this change at a later date.

Probably the most important provisions are 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 heartily support the inclusion of Members of Congress in the retirement allowance system long in effect for other Government employees. It is not a grant. It is a sound annuity system to which a Member contributes 6 percent 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. The retirement allowance does two 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 in his 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 himself. Second, it enables him to quit 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 skill, his clientele, his business are gone. 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 consistently counseled against 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 adequate 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 to consumers, and 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 our salaries just 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 cannot ask others to hold steady a few more months, until we have achieved full production and ended the threat of inflation, and at the same time vote for a salary increase

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. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK]. Let me remind 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. This means 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 their demands? Only yesterday we passed the social-security bill allowing the old-age pensioners an increase of only \$5 per month, which amounts to 20 percent. What are we to say to them if we pass this? How can we ever contend that we are practicing economy and trying to reduce Government spending and balance the budget when we do things like shortening our session by almost half and yet increase salaries by 50 percent? Gentlemen, 75 percent of the people of my district earn less than \$2,500 per year. They are the ones who pay 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. I shall support 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 its final passage even though I favor most of its other provisions.

Mr. SCHWABE 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 rather than 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 will break the country but it is the wrong principle. We should be an example for the whole country. We propose to fight inflation on the one hand with the silly OPA and then turn right 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 and put our stamp of approval 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 purchasing power of our dollar is being slowly but surely destroyed. It is one way of robbing the old-age pensioner, the veteran, and all holders of Government bonds 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, my voting record 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. MONRONEY. 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, 1930, as amended, is amended by inserting 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, to the disbursing officer by whom his salary is paid of his desire to come within the purview of this act. Such notice may be given by a Member of Congress within 6 months after the date of enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 or within 6 months after any date on which he takes an oath of office as a Member of Congress.

"(2) In the case of any Member of Congress who gives notice of his desire to come within the purview of this act, the amount required to be deposited for the purposes of section 9 with respect to services rendered after the date of enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, shall be a sum equal to 6 percent of his basic salary, pay, or compensation for such services, together with interest computed at the rate of 4 percent per annum compounded on December 31 of each year; and the amount to be deducted and withheld from the basic salary, pay, or compensation of each such Member of Congress for the purposes of section 10 shall be a sum equal to 6 percent of such basic salary, pay, or compensation.

"(3) No person shall be entitled to receive an annuity as provided in this section until he shall have become separated from the service after having had at least 6 years of service as a Member of Congress and have attained the age of 62 years, except that any such Member who shall have had at least 5 years of service as a Member of Congress may, subject to the provisions of section 6 and of paragraph (4) of this section, be retired for disability, irrespective of age, and

be paid an annuity computed in accordance with paragraph (5) of this section.

"(4) No Member of Congress shall be entitled to receive an annuity under this act unless there shall have been deducted and withheld from his basic salary, pay, or compensation for the last 5 years of his service as a Member of Congress, or there shall have been deposited under section 9 with respect to such last 5 years of service, the amounts specified in paragraph (2) of this section with respect to so much of such 5 years of service as was performed after the date of enactment of the Legislative Reorganization 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.

"(5) 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 2½ 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.

"(6) In the case of a Member of Congress who becomes separated from the service before he completes an aggregate of 6 years 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 such 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.

"(7) 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.

"(8) Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to prevent any person eligible therefor from simultaneously receiving an annuity computed in accordance with this section 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.

"(9) No provision of this or any other act relating to automatic separation from the service shall be applicable to any Member of Congress.

"(10) 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 of Congress 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

and all of the remaining lines of the paragraph on said page and all of pages 95, 96, 97, and 98.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I suggested to the committee this morning that I would at the proper time offer this amendment. All this amendment does is 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 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 his arguments. There is a vast 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 approving 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 "yes" 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 two. The two issues should not be mixed in this manner.

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 stultifying 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 amendment. 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 judiciary employees. I shall support the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKETT. I expect to 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 also concur 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, but as the gentlewoman 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 presents a program 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.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] has expired.

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

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section close in 15 minutes.

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

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes and that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY]. I agree with him that elected officials are in a different category than those who make service in the Federal service a life career. All of us followed some other career or profession before we came to Congress. When we leave these halls either voluntarily or by action of our constituents we can, and most of us will, return to our former careers. In general I favor this reorganization bill. I think the committee has done a splendid job. I shall, however, vote for the Rizley amendment.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to pensions for Congress and I hope they will be eliminated from the bill.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I am not in favor of any law providing pensions 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 such legislation. However, I do concur in 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 title 6, providing pensions 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. MILLER of 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 in 6 years' service you can participate. This part of the bill should not be retained.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma, to strike 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 entire measure. The motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma should prevail.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, whatever we do here today let us not deceive ourselves or our constituents. This bill provides fat pensions for Congressmen. Make no mistake about that. Take my own case. I will have served 8 years at the close of this term. Suppose this provision is left in the bill and it passes and I should wish to avail myself of benefits provided therein.

I could retire at the end of this year, pay to the Government \$4,030 to make up certain back contributions and receive a pension of \$2,000 per year. If I were to live my normal life of expectancy, 15 years, I would receive a total of pensions amounting to \$30,000, or approximately \$26,000 net. Should I die before receiving an amount equal to the \$4,030 back contributions paid in, the difference plus 4-percent interest would be paid to my widow or estate. I would be risking nothing.

Take the case of a Congressman who has served 10 years and retires at the age of 62. He would pay in back contributions \$5,026 and if he lived to the age of expectancy, according to mortality tables, he would receive a total of \$37,500 or approximately \$32,500 net.

A Congressman who has served 14 years and retires at the age of 62 and lives to the age of expectancy would draw a total net of \$44,700.

A Member who had served 20 years, retired at 62 and lived to the age of expectancy, would receive a total net of more than \$63,000.

A Member having served 30 years and retiring at 62, if he lived to the age of

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.

There is an alternative 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 program now.

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 provisions very 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 not we. That is one of the compelling reasons why the National Legislature 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 pension systems if its Members have an interest in this field?

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, now that the committee has voted to retain the increase of salary and 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 motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I trust the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] will be voted down.

We have had a long day and I think we have accomplished a splendid job in piloting an integrated bill right up to the last section. Let us not spoil that handiwork that has had a lot of time and attention by acceding to this amendment and striking out the retirement provisions of this bill.

It is so easy to characterize this as a pension, but is it? Under the proposed plan we ask you to go into your pockets for 6 percent every year on your base salary. We ask you, before you become eligible, to pay back for all of your service since 1920 or for 5 years. This is nothing other than an insurance annuity. The participation of the Federal Government is nothing more than what it is for every one of the hundreds of thousands of civil-service employees on the rolls today.

We have covered millions of people by social security. There are over 100 Federal district judges in the country today who can retire at a substantial annuity without having contributed one dime while they were on the bench. In the course of World War II, there were probably over 1,800 brigadier generals and probably 450 major generals, and the day will come when they can retire at a very substantial annuity and not have expended a single dime out of their pockets for an annuity that shall be paid out of the Treasury of the United States. They are public servants also. Now we put ourselves in this position, therefore, instead of taking an annuity like a Federal judge without contribution, or a general officer of the Army or Navy without contribution, we require that you pay 6 percent every year during your service. If you have been here for 6 years, then you are eligible for retirement at age 62, but in every case you are buying your retirement annuity which has been carefully worked out with the actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement Board. Every dollar that will be required by them now and in the future will be amortized under this system in a period of about 20 years. It is one of the finest things in this bill, and I hope the House will not succumb to some of the unfounded statements that have been made on this matter. I hope you will complete the good work that has been going on since high noon of today and finally put the capstone on this bill and provide the kind of retirement system every Member of Congress is so richly entitled to by reason of the feverish effort they have made over the years.

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

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I can only tell you what this will do for me. I will be 62 years old this week sometime. I could 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 of Ohio. 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. VURSELL] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. VURSELL. I am glad to note a few minutes ago that the amendment to provide an assistant to each Congressman at \$5,000 a year was defeated. Such extra help is not necessary and in most instances would be a waste of that amount of money.

Now we are considering an amendment 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 will be argued that 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 here than they could in their own private business.

I am opposed to the retirement or pension section of this bill largely on the same grounds. One who aspires 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 still is 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 today have coined phrases in regard 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 it, 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 shame that a bill brought to us in good faith should be wrought out with such eel-like dexterity by allowing bugs to enter it. The good part of the bill tumbles a bug here and tumbles a bug there. Colleagues, do not shout "Vote, Vote" and then blindly pass the whole bill through mob psychology but let us vote on this bill section by section and stand up and be counted.

Some have stated that the judicial raise was passed like lightning; the raise for ambassadors was passed like lightning. That was not proper. We should streamline Congress and, above all, no bill should pass under suspension of rules. No legislation should be enacted unless each and 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, disabled soldiers, and families 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 unable to provide for maintenance and sustenance during their declining years, a benevolent Government has accorded to those who have supported their country by taxation throughout the 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 this committee would match each State in the amount the State allotted by raising the monthly allowance for the blind \$5 and the aged \$5 provided each State should do the same, up to the amount of \$25; that is, if any State should allow \$25, the Government would match it for that much. However, the gag rule prevented the Representatives of the people from being heard at the proper time, of presenting the proper amendments and then allowing each

Representative to stand up and be counted.

I concur in the judgment of those who have stated that Members of Congress many times leave this body in distress and without maintenance and sustenance. I further concur in the view of those who have stated that only those of means can afford to come to Congress and leave their professions. However, it does seem to me that this great body is a position of honor, that the man who seeks to represent the people in this, the most honorable body on the face of the earth, must completely forget himself, not thinking of material things and what his reward is—he has left a good name—what greater reward can there be? Yes, I understand that there are several ex-Members who have served honorably in this body, who are now in poorhouses of the United States. There are several in our State. But there are ex-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 order that there be no such a thing as a poorhouse, that no longer would the words of Will Carleton, "Over the Hills to the Poorhouse," be known in this country, and when the peace of the world is wrought out that it be 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—let there be equal 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.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] to strike the provision from this legislation which would provide pensions for Congressmen, as they are commonly called or the retirement provisions of this legislation as their supporter prefers 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. BUCK] 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 shall continue to oppose legislation to increase congressional salaries although under normal conditions I realize such salaries should be increased. However, at this particular 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 can defeat the salary increases when this legislation gets in the House. I hope you

will now join me in defeating the provisions of this bill which provide pensions for Congressmen.

Mr. Chairman, I was one of the early and active supporters of this move 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, in my mind it is a mistake to mix pensions for Congress and salary increases with a bill primarily designed to remodel and modernize the legislative processes. For one, I 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 untimely.

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 effectively and clearly summarized my reasons for my decision.

Since there may not be a roll call on final passage of this bill—although I shall be among those standing up to ask for one—I take this means of announcing for the RECORD 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 stability and security. Surely, 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, 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 services of the Members of the Congress of the United States.

Senator BRIDGES 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 that 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. Ruml 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 a university president or professional man, or some one who is building from his experience, if it is meritorious, a future for himself.

I direct your 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, there will be headlines 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 maintenance, it will be just too much.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I supported the Buck 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, if you please, 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, certainly it will be a mistake to provide a pension for Members of Congress. Of course, you argue that the Member pays into such 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 live within 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 defense will this Congress have to the millions who came asking security at the hands of the Government without effort on their part. You will have opened the gates and instead of preaching 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 to live 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 work 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 to provide 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 gen-

tleman 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, can vote a pension for Congressmen. Certainly, Congress could not pass fair judgment on similar calls 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, to speed up the business of 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 on its own merits. The same applies to salary increases for Members, which I opposed by voting for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

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 Congressmen and therefore for 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, payments are 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, we must 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 are the judges, and I believe by providing 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 say 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 CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time 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—ayes 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 CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 2177) to provide for increased efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government, pursuant to House Resolution 717, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Herter amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HERTER: Page 49, after line 4, insert a new subsection to read as follows:

"(g) Each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall set aside a regular period during each month to afford opportunity to Members who have introduced any bill or resolution to appear before the committee to explain the measure and outline the nature and character of the considerations which in their judgment support its passage."

The amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee substitute for the Senate bill.

The committee substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee rise?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Does any member of the minority claim the right to offer a motion to recommit?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. KNUTSON. In its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KNUTSON moves that the bill be re-committed.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee) there were—ayes 229, noes 61.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee, Mr. ABERNETHY, and Mr. LECOMTE demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk of the House be authorized and directed in the engrossing of the amendment to the bill (S. 2177) to provide for increased efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government, to make all necessary clerical and technical changes, including changes in section numbers and cross references, and changes in the table of contents.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ATOMIC ENERGY BILL

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the atomic energy bill S. 1717, have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SURPLUS PROPERTY

Mr. MANASCO submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6702) to clarify the rights of former owners of real property to reacquire such property under the Surplus Property Act of 1944.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communi-

cated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On July 3, 1946:

H. R. 32. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934;

H. R. 4512. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research relating to psychiatric disorders and to aid in the development of more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such disorders, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5244. An act to authorize the appointment of additional Foreign Service officers in the classified grades.

On July 5, 1946:

H. R. 1654. An act to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6056. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6516. An act to increase the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia.

On July 8, 1946:

H. R. 6496. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

On July 9, 1946:

H. R. 5990. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

On July 11, 1946:

H. R. 5258. An act granting a renewal of Patent Numbered 113,244 dated February 7, 1939, relating to the flag of the Church of God.

On July 12, 1946:

H. R. 6428. An act making appropriations for the Coast Guard, Treasury Department, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; and

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

On July 13, 1946:

H. R. 6285. An act authorizing the State of Delaware, by and through its State highway department, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Delaware River near Wilmington, Del.

On July 16, 1946:

H. R. 541. An act authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two 4-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5356. An act to provide assistance to the Republic of China in augmenting and maintaining a Naval Establishment, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5641. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the National convention of the United Spanish War Veterans, to be held in Milwaukee, Wis., August 4 to 10, inclusive, 1946;

H. R. 5933. An act to authorize and direct the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia to establish and operate in the public schools and other suitable locations

a system of nurseries and nursery schools for day care of school-age and under-school-age children, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6837. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

On July 17, 1946:

H. R. 3424. An act to permit renewal of certain trade-mark registrations after expiry thereof, and for other purposes.

On July 20, 1946:

H. R. 5452. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6777. An act making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

On July 23, 1946:

H. R. 6885. 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 appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

On July 24, 1946:

H. R. 3533. 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 2, 1937, as amended;

H. R. 3993. 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 Cooke Military Reservation, Calif.;

H. R. 4180. An act to amend the law relating to larceny 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, 1930, 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 Western Union Telegraph Co.;

H. R. 5800. An act to authorize school districts in Alaska to issue bonds for school construction, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5820. An act relating to mail service on Lake Winnepesaukee, N. H.;

H. R. 5831. An act to include the heads of executive departments and independent agencies within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930;

H. R. 6041. An act authorizing the State of Indiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Wabash River at or near Montezuma, Ind.;

H. R. 6065. An act authorizing the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or a free bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind.;

H. R. 6081. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Iowa State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Des Moines River at or near the town of Eddyville, Iowa;

H. R. 6222. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Calcasieu River at or near Lake Charles, La.;

H. R. 6407. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6515. An act to amend the act entitled "An Act authorizing the Nebraska-Iowa Bridge Corp., a Delaware corporation, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River between Washington County, Nebr., and Harrison County, Iowa," approved March 6, 1928;

H. R. 6597. An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6889. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Saint Louis River between the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 336. Joint resolution relating to cotton marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. J. Res. 359. Joint resolution relating to peanut 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, and 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 E. D. Williams;

H. R. 271. An act for the relief of Eleanor McCloskey, also known as Evely Mary Mikalaukas;

H. R. 844. An act for the relief of John P. Hayes, postmaster, and the estate of Edward P. McCormack, former postmaster, at Albany, N. Y.;

H. R. 1331. An act for the relief of the Hatheway Patterson Corp.;

H. R. 1345. 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 H. Cope, and Dr. J. E. Ricketts;

H. R. 2269. An act for the relief of Dr. William A. Schumacher and Magdalen M. Schumacher;

H. R. 2287. An act for the relief of Susan S. Wiseman;

H. R. 2319. An act for the relief of J. B. Shropshire;

H. R. 2489. An act for the relief of Gaylon Dhu;

H. R. 2962. An act for the relief of Justin P. Hopkins;

H. R. 3145. An act for the relief of A. C. McMeans;

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. 3848. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Johnnie Pollock, a minor;

H. R. 3857. An act for the relief of Warren H. Thompson and Madeline Parent;

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 Lassalle and Mrs. America Bonet Medina;

H. R. 4357. An act for the relief of the estate of the late Alberto Lopez Ramos;

H. R. 4492. An act for the relief of Charles Marvin Smith;

H. R. 4577. An act for the relief of Dolores Joyce;

H. R. 4673. An act for the relief of Mrs. Minnie Jenkins Ward;

H. R. 4834. An act for relief of the estates of Katherine Delores Booth and Agnes Jane True;

H. R. 4862. An act for the relief of Walter R. Newcomb, Sr., Corbin A. Newcomb, and Walter R. Newcomb, Jr.;

H. R. 4919. An act for the relief of Archibald J. Alcorn;

H. R. 4996. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Joan Esther Hedlin, a minor;

H. R. 5026. An act for the relief of the estate of Drury Lee Jordan;

H. R. 5030. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lim Shee Chang;

H. R. 5178. An act for the relief of Marian Antoinette McCloud;

H. R. 5228. An act for the relief of Stephen Lisay;

H. R. 5351. An act for the relief of Charles Booker;

H. R. 5352. An act for the relief of Joseph Ippolito;

H. R. 5510. An act for the relief of Newton William Lowery;

H. R. 5538. An act for the relief of Mae Maxine Stone;

H. R. 5539. An act for the relief of Andrew M. Halvorsen;

H. R. 5541. An act for the relief of F. B. Sweat;

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 Yoakam;

H. R. 5872. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Walter Keaton.

H. R. 5878. An act for the relief of Elsie Elmhurst;

H. R. 5884. An act for the relief of Frances Krzys;

H. R. 6213. An act for the relief of Brevet First Lt. Margaret Utinsky;

H. R. 6459. 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. Hiler, Vivian Langemo, Floy Sibrie, and Ross Lee Brown; and

H. R. 6927. An act for the acquisition of buildings and grounds in foreign countries for the use of the Government of the United States of America.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MCGLINCHAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GREEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD 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 RECORD.

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 RECORD 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 include a resolution.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a memorial address. 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 thereto, insist on the 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 conferees: 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 an article entitled "15,000,000 Will Die," which appears in Roger Babson's report for the 4th of March 1946. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "A Ballade of the Peace," by Robert Permar, 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 and value 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 issued of basic commodities 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 reconversion 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 price and rent information in additional cities and at more frequent intervals

Resolved etc., That for the purpose of furnishing information and reports 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 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 orders, 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. Rarey, 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. SHAFER 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 Virgil 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 a radio program in connection with the National Farm Safety Week.

Mr. HORAN 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 article by Gould Lincoln.

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 gentlewoman 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 their 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 RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the 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 inquire of 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. 6917, 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 Foreign Affairs.

S. 619, which I understand the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] 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 that 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 the 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. SUMNERS] to ask consent to take up the so-called tidelands bill tomorrow and concur in 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.

HOURLY 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. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BIEMILLER. 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 these last few critical months of the transition to a

free economy. This bill falls far short of that hope. I am advised, however, that it is 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 a whole-hearted effort to keep our 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 days since 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. Of this increase, only about 2 percent can be attributed to the removal of subsidies. These, it must be remembered, are 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 resolution 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 special interest 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 disastrous consequences 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 objective was to increase production, the Taft amendment would have required 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 high profits. The base for measuring profits under the present bill is the year 1940, in which profits were more nearly representative of normal peacetime operations. At the same time, the use of 1940 margins of profit offers every incentive for full production because 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 will cut down substantially the price increases on consumer goods which were out of production during the war.

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 any case where prices in 1941 varied. The present bill cures this defect. The formula works from the average price for the industry in the base period, and this permits the continuance 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, 1946. In the months since 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 faring far better 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 hardships to distributors, consumers are 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 inescapable under the vetoed bill. Now there is a sound basis for the hope that such a spiral can be prevented.

Furthermore, by drastically reducing the number and size of required price increases, the present bill minimizes two other dangers inherent in the vetoed bill. First, the administrative burden on the Office of Price Administration, while still 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 hasten 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 the Congress 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. I propose to appoint as members of the Board men in whose judgment and fairness the Congress and

the country will have complete confidence.

Price control is but one of the means of combatting 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 sterner fiscal and monetary 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 a 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 part 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 pass that examination, that supremely 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 those the record has been made, even on those that by one means or another have been stored away in the deep-freeze

locker for the new Congress to thaw out and bring to life.

Each one carries home his own record and his own conscience.

I propose 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 people.

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. Upon the answers depend the very survival of civilization itself. To those who have ears to hear, brains to understand, and hearts to care, the whirring 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 for which 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 for which we are willing to work and think and vote here 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 officials, industrialists, and others 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) lies in 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 Lillienthal report and recommendations, of the Baruch proposal to 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-energy bill passed by this body. I hope it will be improved in conference. I hope that the new Congress may further improve its provisions.

Let us look at that final sentence again. If we fail to heed its warning it may become the epitaph of civilization. Note that it says "the only real solution." Is what? "Continued world peace." Note the word continued. That means that peace cannot be broken, suspended, and resumed later. Peace must be continuous from now on.

It recommends legislation in specific terms and finally "a practical expression of our desire for international cooperation."

Who says so? Are these words, "the only real solution * * * lies in continued 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 how 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 laboratory, 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, staff 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. Parsons, 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. William R. Purnell, Assistant Chief of Naval Operations for Matériel.

Rear Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, Deputy Chairman of the Army-Navy Munitions Board and special assistant to the Secretary of the Navy.

Frank R. Creedon, formerly with Stone & Webster Engineering Corp.

H. E. Thompson, vice president, Carbide & Carbon Chemicals Corp.

H. A. Winne, vice president, General Electric Co.

Edwin 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" we say "not war," 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. Today, 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 even 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 inmost 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 warless world, a peaceful world, a world full of peace—all of us, men and women alike, farmer, wage earner, businessman, big and small, veteran and nonveteran, those who went 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. With this goal always in mind all other issues, which are part and parcel of the big issue, will fall into their proper place.

"How about balancing the Budget?" Is it not true that unless 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 money, our Government, and finally a break-down and another war? Why not be practical and start with the budget and taxes?"

With this cry of "balance the budget," especially at campaign time, the very

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. "Balance 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 suggest to homeless veterans that they put their house in order. What house? is likely to be their very apt reply.) Let us talk about taxes. None of us likes to pay taxes. But there are many things we dislike a whole lot more. Death, the loss of dear ones, bloodshed and horror, the slow readjustment to what we call peace for those who have lived years in weeks of war—there is no need to belabor the point. But there is no excuse for forgetting or omitting it.

The fact is that, even if we balance the budget and there is World War III, the balanced budget will bring no happiness, the balanced budget will prove no shield against danger. (France had billions in gold when the Nazis took Paris.) There may not even be anyone around to enjoy or record a balanced budget if there is World War III. A balanced budget, in and of itself, is no guaranty of happiness and no guaranty of future life.

A balanced budget is desirable, of course, but we can go on eating and sleeping, working, loving our dear ones, raising our families, whether we as a Nation add the column on the deficit or the plus side. We can do this as long as we are not afraid of ourselves as a people, a nation, and a race.

Why is this possible? Because we are a rich nation, the richest in the world in money and goods and the equal of any nation in raw materials. Our budget is unbalanced, but we are in debt to no one. We have borrowed from ourselves.

I recall the words of a very prominent Republican, a former Senator, now an employee, I believe, of the Republican National Committee, to the effect that, if you feel you have had your money's worth, the budget can be said to have been balanced. I believe the American people—even those who have paid the highest taxes—think they have had their money's worth in the past 14 years of peace and war. We are free and strong, stronger internally and abroad than in 1932. I do not believe we are afraid, even of bookkeeping. I do not believe we can be scared by bookkeepers' talk that puts dollars first and people second.

If we keep the individual's budget balanced so that every family in America is well-housed, well-clothed, and well-fed, the national budget will take care of itself when the time comes to cast up accounts. We are not keeping books for the sake of keeping books, or of making money, but of saving lives, saving our national strength.

The issue, the great overriding national issue, is Peace, peace within this Nation and among nations. We balance the budget now if we contribute our full share to peace. Nothing less is enough.

If we find that health, Federal aid to equalize education throughout the 48 States, housing, and scientific research are the real foundations of peace here and abroad, we will be balancing the budget by laying those foundations.

If the use of fiscal policy in credit, taxation and expenditures for useful public works and services is helpful in substituting steady and rising employment and incomes for another and more violent boom and bust, then I say, let us use it. Let us keep the national ledger free of the blood and tears that smudged the figures for 1929 to 1933.

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, if we 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.

Every principle, every struggle is senseless from here out if there is to be no future. Therefore, for each of us who sometimes must meet a child's trusting eyes, every act must fit into a pattern that permits of a future.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion it is the human budget that we must balance first. As never before, people must be mobilized, not as slaves or puppets, but as free, healthy, aspiring, working, enjoying and friendly individuals, unafraid of each other, tomorrow or themselves. This is a great country, in those terms. It must be made a better country, more healthy, more optimistic, with more security and opportunity for the individual man and woman and young person. That is the way to mobilize to make peace. The same all-out vigor and determination that we put into the war must be invested in the peace.

From here out, human values must be put first. They must be the test in weighing every issue, budget balancing, taxes, whatever it is.

"But where do human values get us? We cannot run a world WPA," the hard-boiled realists will be saying in the next few months. "Let us shut down on all this relief. Take care of our own first and let the rest pay cash on the barrel head."

Oh, Mr. Speaker, such realism is no realism at all.

We have Bretton Woods, a World Bank, Food and Agriculture Organization, UNESCO, the United Nations, but unless we continue to go to the rescue of a starving world, this year and the next at least, those fine brave plans for a world of peace can go for nothing. Money and trade, learning, culture, and scientific programs will never have a chance to be worked out and used by mankind. We simply cannot build anything lasting as long as 500,000,000 people face starvation. Peace and misery cannot live together.

It is people, remember, with whom we are primarily and ultimately concerned—not governments but people, Russian people, Polish people, Dutch people, French people, English people, Ital-

ian people, Chinese people, hungry, sick, homeless people—people with war-shocked nerves, people suffering for years during German occupation and the disaster of war from malnutrition. It is with these people we must live and work and play and build, not only commerce, trade, air travel, international organizations, but friendship, sympathy, understanding, trust—the essential ingredients of a happy family life—whether it be on main street or the world family along the international highways and airways that lace the earth together in one great neighborhood.

And what of human values at home? There is a lesson to be learned from the war. We had a 15,000,000-man Army. It was a great Army. It helped to win a great victory. It routed the forces of evil, winning freedom and a chance for greater freedom—losing would have meant slavery for all the people of the world—slavery to the Axis nations.

"But what did we win when we won the war?" ask the self-styled realists.

Let no one tell you this war was fought for nothing. We won freedom. Every town in Germany had its slave battalion, made up of the conquered people of Europe. Every town had its stinking concentration camps with their human furnaces heated for the slaves in case they did not perform to suit their masters.

Let no one ever tell you we gained nothing when we won this war.

A 15,000,000-man army it took for us to do the job. But it took more—for war demands courage and a spirit and a will to win. It demands intelligence and a physical hardihood, a capacity of man's body to measure up to his spirit and his intellect. It took the best that we had. We spent our finest manhood.

There is a shameful fact connected with the building of that great 15,000,000-man army which does not at first appear. We discarded because of mental or physical defects almost as many men as we took into the Army.

The shameful story is told in the record of the Selective Service. It is a stark incontrovertible story of unequal educational opportunities, the story of malnutrition here at home, of the ravages of disease and physical defects because of lack of medical attention, the story of low wages in cities, low incomes on farms and insecurity, like a malaria eating into the blood and the bones of our people. It is the story of human erosion, unnecessary and preventable in the richest of all countries. It all showed up in the records of the Selective Service when we had to choose only the sound and healthy to win the war.

This story must not continue if we are to build a sound healthy society, free from the germs of war—healthy enough to give the world leadership that is asked of us. If in war, courage and the will to win must be fortified by intelligence backed up by a healthy sturdy body, I declare that these things are doubly needed now.

Is it too much to ask that all Americans, Democrat or Republican, look at economic and social legislation in this light? A job at a living wage on the farm, in the factory, in the offices of

America with reasonable hours, a fair wage to keep the machinery of our Government going—for the Federal worker and postal employee—are the foundations of a healthy mind and body. They are likewise the insurance to business of enough customers with enough money to buy the plenty our economy can and must produce year in and year out.

Business and agriculture can and must be free from fear of monopoly, free for all, free so that initiative and imagination can flower, so that healthy, normal ambition is something for the many and not for the few—so that there is an ever-widening horizon for all. This does not just happen. Government must make and enforce the rules of the road, of commerce, of fair competition, and give help to small business in its contest with big business.

I think in a government of the people—our Government—we, the elected representatives, must ever fight the deadening hand of monopoly, recognize it for what it is—the real enemy of free enterprise, and, finally, if allowed to grow, the death of democracy itself.

A man's spirit and courage expand in a society where the rules are fair and just, where the same rules apply to all, where the only limit on one's advancement is one's own application and ability.

Health is not the pious dream of welfare workers and Senator MURRAY. Health is the heavy bomber of peace. Doctors, nurses, hospitals—we must not stop until we have the number we need to insure health for all.

Playgrounds, recreation centers, parks contribute to health.

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 secure.

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 prejudices, old hates. We are so 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?

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, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] 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 support of my supplemental report 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 at all times be respected as a high privilege. Very unfortunately, there is no uniform, consistent policy among our agencies with regard to investigating and removing 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 roll, even though their loyalties have been challenged. In dealing with these cases the policy of "reasonable doubt" on questions of loyalty has not been carefully followed. Too much attention and susceptibility 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 inexcusable with respect to this problem were brought to the attention of the subcommittee, even during the few days investigations were being 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 any person with doubtful loyalty 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, we ought 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.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Civil Service ought to continue its investiga-

tions and hearings with respect to this entire question of loyalty. It should not be a witch-hunting proposal, but it should be a careful, firm, and constructive investigation in the various agencies so that we can find out not only who are the people that are being held in Government with questionable loyalties, but also who is responsible for their being in such positions. And, furthermore, see that action is taken by legislation or otherwise to deal with this problem.

My attention has just recently been called to an agency where a number of people have been employed whose loyalty is questioned, but who claim they cannot be released except by going through civil service. The Civil Service Commission claims it is not in position to take any action with respect to an employee after he has once been investigated and placed permanently on the pay roll. This situation should be definitely solved. Let us fix the responsibility and see that that responsibility is carried out.

Of course, the Civil Service Commission is entitled to sufficient funds to make proper investigation, but more important it must have the will to see that those already in service who do not belong there are removed. If the Civil Service cannot remove them, then they ought to recommend removal to the agency where they are employed. We need more definite action and less directives in civil service.

Mr. Speaker, our attention has just been called to a glaring situation of a man named Jacobson, who was employed as a clerk for \$1,200 or \$1,400, and within a short time rose to a position of importance and responsibility so that he receives more than \$9,000 per year. That is a case of sheer neglect on the part of officials in our Government. It was not difficult to find out about this man's record. He had been recommended for disbarment. His record was not good, and yet he was not only approved for employment, but further approved for advancement to which common sense would tell anyone he was not entitled. Somebody is responsible for permitting that thing to happen. Not only should Jacobson have been thrown out of the Government before now, but those who recommended him should be held accountable.

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to deal with this question, we cannot do it by just appointing interdepartmental committees. We have got to take action, and we have got to fix responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed in the lack of many agencies of Government in their lack of interest and support in cooperating with our committee and Congress in dealing with this question. Mr. Speaker, the problem of subversive activities in Government ought to be investigated from top to bottom. A committee of this Congress should make investigation, and in doing so it ought to have the loyal and complete cooperation of every agency and department of Government. If they hesitate to cooperate, we should know the reason why. The problem is too serious and too important to the American people to permit vacillation or "buck passing" on the part of anyone or any agency. We can

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 close and valued 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 been so pleasant and agreeable, or that our duties have been so mutually interwoven, as for the personal feeling of loss in not being able to look to him for aid and assistance in the many important legislative problems which are present and which only those with the knowledge, ability, and power of clear thought possessed by JOHN 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 absolutely 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 his high 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 however situated. Tolerance has been his credo. 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. Hawes who represented St. Louis in Congress for 14 years. He was secretary to Senator William J. Stone, being with the Senator at the time of his death. While secretary to Senator Stone he acted as secretary to the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. Elected to the Sixty-ninth Congress, he has served as 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 best been exemplified by his outstanding accomplishment in the cause of good government as chairman of the Committee on Accounts. 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. Fortunate 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 untiring in his endeavor to bring social security to mankind. Stricken by physical infirmity which would have defeated all but the strong of heart, he has carried high, with unflinching courage, 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 as a 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 man.

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. WASIELEWSKI, for 1 week on account of official business.

To Mr. HARE, for 3 days.

To Mr. BALDWIN 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 thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 371. Joint resolution extending the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended.

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 slum, blighted, 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 such planning, acquisition, and sale or lease; and for other purposes;

S. 1466. 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 that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 371. Joint resolution extending the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended.

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 taken 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 Service Corps in the Medical 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 Dietitian 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, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of \$20,000,000 for the payment of claims by employees and former employees of the Government for increased overtime, leave, and holiday compensation on the basis of night rates pursuant to certain decisions of the Comptroller General in accordance with the provisions of H. R. 6532, Seventy-ninth Congress (H. Doc. No. 716); 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 \$2,679,493,000 for the cost of terminal leave and accumulated leave in excess of 90 days for members of the armed forces in accordance with the provisions of H. R. 4051, Seventy-ninth Congress (H. Doc. No. 717); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1482. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the report of the Federal Trade Commission entitled "Distribution Methods and Costs, Part IX—Cost of Production and Distribution of Fish on the Pacific Coast" (H. Doc. No. 718); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1483. 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.

1484. A letter from the Administrator, National Housing Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Mr. Stephen S. Plaut and Mrs. Edith Anderson; to the Committee on Claims.

1485. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate within the District of Columbia the sale of milk, cream, and ice cream, and for other purposes," approved February 27, 1925; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1486. A letter from the Administrator, National Housing Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of James E. Culbreth; to the Committee on Claims.

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 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.

1489. 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 Western District of Kentucky, as submitted by the Department of Justice through the Treasury Department, and which requires an appropriation of \$218.92, together with an indefinite 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 \$250,000 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 \$26,000,000 for the Office of Price Administration (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 \$750,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission (H. Doc. No. 722); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1493. 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 (H. 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 General Accounting Office, amounting to \$30,591.32 (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 estimates of appropriation submitted by the several executive departments and independent offices to pay claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property, in the sum of \$1,425.57 (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 \$70,738.47 (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 submitted by the Public Roads Administration to pay claims for damage to roads and highways of States or their subdivisions, in the sum of \$21,012.64 (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 estimates of appropriation amounting to \$506,223.53, to cover claims allowed by the General Accounting Office 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 88 (79th Cong., 1st sess.), for the continuation of the Special Committee To Investigate Acts of Executive Agencies Which Exceed Their Authority (Rept. No. 2659). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1198. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce 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. 2660). 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. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania: Committee on Labor. H. R. 3922. A bill to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several 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. 2662). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the 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 the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 6910. A bill relating to the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange sites at Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Fla., for Coast Guard purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2664). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILLIPS: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 7101. A bill to protect American agriculture, horticulture, livestock, and the public health by prohibiting the unauthorized importation into, or the depositing in the territorial 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. 6043. 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; with amendment (Rept. No. 2666). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. Senate Joint Resolution 156. Joint resolution to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; with amendments (Rept. No. 2667). 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. 7140. 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 Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on the Territories.

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 the Civil Service.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 7144. A bill to amend the act of April 14, 1930, to provide increased retired pay for certain members of the former Life Saving Service; to the Committee on the 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. 7146. A bill to amend the act of May 18, 1928, so as to authorize a per capita distribution of certain funds to the Indians of California; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 7147. A bill to repeal certain statutes relating to the war and emergencies; 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 Port 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 International 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. MUNDT:

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, S. 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.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

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 Wahler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

H. R. 7155. A bill for the relief of Dionisio R. Trevino; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 7156. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Antonio Saraco; 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. LEA:

H. R. 7160. A bill for the relief of Walter R. and Kathryn Marshall; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 7161. A bill for the relief of George Ely Vasu; 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.

PETITIONS, 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. 1362; 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—to 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 to which we look except for the assurance that in matters great and small we do not stand in a feigned self-sufficiency, but that supporting in infinite power are the everlasting arms. Make us conscious of Thy presence in that which Thou hast given us to accomplish; and may every fruit of labor find its roots in a wisdom which Thou dost bestow.

Incline Thine ear unto us as the supplications of our hearts ascend in the 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. ALBEN 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. WHITE, 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 clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hayden	Overton
Andrews	Hill	Pepper
Austin	Hoey	Radcliffe
Ball	Huffman	Reed
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Bilbo	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Brewster	Kilgore	Shipstead
Brooks	Knowland	Smith
Buck	La Follette	Stanfill
Burch	Langer	Stewart
Bushfield	Lucas	Swift
Capper	McCarran	Taft
Carville	McClellan	Taylor
Connally	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McMahon	Tobey
Downey	Magnuson	Tunnell
Eastland	Mead	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Millikin	Wagner
Fulbright	Mitchell	Walsh
George	Moore	Wheeler
Gerry	Morse	Wherry
Green	Murdock	White
Guffey	Murray	Wiley
Gurney	Myers	Willis
Hart	O'Daniel	Young
Hawkes	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent because of illness in his family.

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

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] 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. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] 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 busi-