



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 21, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

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

Rev. Charles W. Sheerin, D. D., rector of the Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Heavenly Father, guide, we beseech Thee, this body in its deliberations and work. In these days of confusion and doubt, we pray Thee that, as we seek for truth, we may find that the search leads us to Thyself. Give us courage to speak honestly and reverence to speak humbly; and when our minds are perplexed and we cannot find Thee, give us patience to go on with our daily duties.

Thou hast taught us that Thou wilt require much from those to whom much is given; grant that we in this country, whom Thou hast called to so goodly a heritage, may extend more abundantly that which we so richly enjoy in learning to serve our fellow men, and thus may we know the glory of serving Thee. May men everywhere learn that with mutual forbearance and good will Thy paths may be discovered. When we are weary, comfort us with the remembrance that we have not shirked. When we are ill rewarded, save us from bitterness and give us sympathy with all who suffer wrong. Lead us ever more deeply into the knowledge of Thy life and ours, and make us faithful interpreters of life to our fellow men and an example to all who love liberty in government and the welfare of mankind.

We ask this through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 20, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House

XCIII—351

had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 193. An act to amend section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437; 30 U. S. C., sec. 191), as amended;

H. R. 1584. An act authorizing the erection and operation of a memorial museum and shop on the Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho; and

H. R. 2123. An act to amend the Locomotive Inspection Act of February 17, 1911, as amended.

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

H. R. 261. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, Yuba County, Calif.;

H. R. 408. An act for the relief of Lawson Ashby; Mrs. Ora Ashby; and Lawson Ashby, the legal guardian of Betty Mae Ashby, a minor; Darrel Ashby, a minor; Kenneth Ashby, a minor; and Vernon Ashby, a minor;

H. R. 436. An act for the relief of Roger Edgar Lapiere;

H. R. 651. An act for the relief of the estate of Rubert W. Alexander;

H. R. 836. An act for the relief of Mrs. Augusta McCall;

H. R. 888. An act for the relief of certain owners of land who suffered loss by fire in Lake Landing Township, Hyde County, N. C.;

H. R. 893. An act for the relief of Myron R. Leard;

H. R. 984. An act for the relief of A. J. Crozat, Jr.;

H. R. 989. An act for the relief of the estate of Mathew C. Cowley, deceased, and the estate of Louisa Cowley, deceased;

H. R. 1408. An act for the relief of August W. Dietz;

H. R. 1513. An act for the relief of John C. Garrett;

H. R. 1523. An act for the relief of the estate of Marion S. Griggs, deceased;

H. R. 1585. An act for the relief of Adolph Pfannenstiehl;

H. R. 1586. An act for the relief of Mrs. Leslie Price, Philip C. Price, Mrs. Louise Keyton, Annie Curry, and James Curry;

H. R. 2915. An act for the relief of Mrs. Frederick Faber Wesche (formerly Ann Maureen Bell); and

H. R. 3493. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they

were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 193. An act to amend section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437; 30 U. S. C., sec. 191), as amended;

H. R. 1584. An act authorizing the erection and operation of a memorial museum and shop on the Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho; and

H. R. 2123. An act to amend the Locomotive Inspection Act of February 17, 1911, as amended.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MILLIKIN obtained the floor.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield for that purpose.

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:

Alken	Hawkes	O'Connor
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Daniel
Ball	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Barkley	Hill	Reed
Brewster	Hoey	Revercomb
Bricker	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Jenner	Russell
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Byrd	Kem	Sparkman
Cain	Kilgore	Stewart
Capehart	Knowland	Taft
Capper	Lodge	Taylor
Chavez	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	McCarthy	Thye
Cooper	McClellan	Tobey
Cordon	McFarland	Tydings
Donnell	McGrath	Umstead
Downey	McKellar	Vandenberg
Dworshak	McMahon	Wagner
Ecton	Magnuson	Watkins
Ellender	Malone	Wherry
Ferguson	Martin	White
Flanders	Maybank	Wiley
Fulbright	Millikin	Williams
George	Moore	Wilson
Green	Morse	Young
Gurney	Murray	
Hatch	Myers	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is necessarily absent, and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is necessarily absent.

5561

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] has the floor.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine and other business was transacted:

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Resolution 6

"Joint resolution memorializing and petitioning the President and Congress of the United States to pass appropriate legislation to enable veterans who obtained guaranteed loans prior to December 28, 1945, to come within provisions of Public Law 268

"Whereas the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States passed Public Law 346 cited as Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, a section of which enabled veterans to obtain loans for the purchase of homes, farms and business property, which loans were guaranteed up to 50 percent by the Veterans' Administration provided the aggregate amounts did not exceed \$2,000, with an interest rate not exceeding 4 percent per annum, as provided in title III, chapter V, of said law; and

"Whereas the Seventy-ninth Congress passed Public Law 268, an amendment to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, which among other amendments, provided the guaranty up to 50 percent by the Government on veterans' loans for homes, farms, and business, provided that the aggregate amount guaranteed shall not exceed \$2,000 in case of non-real-estate loans, nor \$4,000 in case of real-estate loans; or a prorated portion on loans of both types or combinations thereof, with an interest rate not exceeding 4 percent per annum, as provided in title III, chapter V, of said law; and

"Whereas no provision was made for veterans who obtained such loans prior to the aforesaid amendment to take advantage of the increased Government guaranty and more liberal interest rate: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the President and the Congress of the United States are hereby respectfully memorialized and requested to take such steps as may be necessary by legislation or otherwise, to enable all veterans to have the opportunity of coming within the provisions of the aforesaid amendment; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate prepare and transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"Senate Joint Resolution 17

"Joint resolution relative to the development of deposits of mineral ores in the United States

"Whereas the discovery and development of mineral ores has been a major factor in the industrial growth of the western portion of the United States; and

"Whereas although many surveys and other works have been accomplished by men of

ability and integrity in the United States Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines, it remains a fact that the mineral resources of this country have been discovered and developed largely by the adventurous resident population of these Western States, their efforts having been spurred on under our traditional mining laws by the knowledge that discovery of ore deposits on the public domain could lead to ownership and development of the deposit by the discoverer; and

"Whereas in recent years the policy of the Department of the Interior has been to modify this traditional right to enter upon the public domain for the purpose of search for and discovery of ore deposits, and to restrict the right of development by the discoverer to a mere leasehold from the Government; and

"Whereas this policy is inimical to the development of the Western States in that it robs the individual mining man of his incentive to undergo the hardships and privations incident to discovery and development of the ore deposits which under private ownership create new wealth and develop the community, and instead builds up in the Government of the United States an absentee landlordism in powerful bureaucratic authority contrary to democratic government and the American way of life; and

"Whereas depletion of known ore deposits progressed rapidly during the unprecedented production of the war years, and it is now imperative that new ore deposits be discovered and developed immediately: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior are hereby memorialized to abandon the policy of prohibiting entry upon large areas of the public domain, and to abandon also the policy of restricting to leasing right only the development of ore deposits discovered on the public domain, and to follow the intent of Congress as expressed in the traditional mining laws of the United States, by encouraging entry upon the public domain for the purpose of searching for ore deposits, and giving assurance that the discoverer of such ore deposits may acquire title and develop such deposits under private ownership; all to the end that the greatest possible impetus may be given to the search for new ore deposits and the most rapid development of such properties, in order that needed deposits may early be made available for industrial use throughout the United States and that throughout the western United States new and stable communities may continue to grow up in the course of development of such properties, to the greater development of California and the other Western States, to the strengthening of our democratic way of life, and to the enrichment of the whole United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of California in the Congress of the United States."

A petition of the members of the Tampa (Fla.) Townsend Club, No. 3, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition signed by 423 citizens of San Juan, Puerto Rico, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

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

S. 1230. A bill to amend sections 2 (a) and 603 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 195).

INCREASE IN EXPENDITURES OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I report favorably from the Committee on Rules and Administration Senate Resolution 114, submitted on May 19 by me. The resolution is reported unanimously by the committee, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures authorized under Senate Resolution 54, Eightieth Congress, agreed to January 17, 1947 (authorizing the expenditure of funds and the employment of assistants by the Committee on Rules and Administration in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by subsection (c) (1) (D) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate), is hereby increased by \$85,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BARKLEY. Reserving the right to object, may I ask the Senator whether the report from the Committee on Rules and Administration is unanimous?

Mr. BROOKS. It is unanimous.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I understand, it provides additional funds in connection with some duties in regard to contested elections?

Mr. BROOKS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no objection. There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

CROP INSURANCE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, submitted a report (No. 196) and recommendations on the audit report of the Comptroller General of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1323. A bill to exclude certain lands from becoming a part of the Colville Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1324. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to make such act applicable to the officers and employees of the National Library for the Blind; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1325. A bill to encourage employment of veterans with pensionable or compensable service-connected disabilities through Fed-

eral reimbursement to any employer, insurer, or fund, of amounts of workmen's compensation paid on account of disability or death arising out of such employment; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. McCLELLAN):

S. 1326. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1327. A bill to provide automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1328. A bill to increase the number of copies of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD furnished to the Vice President and each Senator; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself and Mr. LONGE):

S. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the constitution of the International Labor Organization instrument of amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 261. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, Yuba County, Calif.;

H. R. 408. An act for the relief of Lawson Ashby; Mrs. Ora Ashby; and Lawson Ashby, the legal guardian of Betty Mae Ashby, a minor; Darrel Ashby, a minor; Kenneth Ashby, a minor; and Vernon Ashby, a minor;

H. R. 436. An act for the relief of Roger Edgar Lapiere;

H. R. 651. An act for the relief of the estate of Rubert W. Alexander;

H. R. 836. An act for the relief of Mrs. Augusta McCall;

H. R. 888. An act for the relief of certain owners of land who suffered loss by fire in Lake Landing Township, Hyde County, N. C.;

H. R. 893. An act for the relief of Myron R. Leard;

H. R. 984. An act for the relief of A. J. Crozat, Jr.;

H. R. 989. An act for the relief of the estate of Mathew C. Cowley, deceased, and the estate of Louisa Cowley, deceased;

H. R. 1408. An act for the relief of August W. Dietz;

H. R. 1513. An act for the relief of John C. Garrett;

H. R. 1523. An act for the relief of the estate of Marion S. Griggs, deceased;

H. R. 1585. An act for the relief of Adolph Pfannenstiel;

H. R. 1586. An act for the relief of Mrs. Leslie Price, Philip C. Price, Mrs. Louise Keyton, Annie Curry, and James Curry; and

H. R. 2915. An act for the relief of Mrs. Frederick Faber Wesche (formerly Ann Maureen Bell); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3493. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting

sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT OF ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY HEARINGS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a week from today, May 28, in the Senate Office Building caucus room, a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, consisting of Senators SMITH, HICKENLOOPER, THOMAS of Utah, and HATCH, and myself as chairman, will open hearings on the St. Lawrence seaway project, Senate Joint Resolution 11, which was introduced by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] on behalf of himself and 15 other Senators, including myself.

Prior hearings on this very subject before the Foreign Relations Committee were held in 1933 and 1946. In the latter years they covered 1,400 printed pages of testimony. In 1941 the House Rivers and Harbors Committee held hearings on this subject, and they covered 2,400 pages of testimony. The issues of the seaway project have been long and widely debated in public forums and the press.

In view of this extensive consideration of the matter, I feel that it is unnecessary and inadvisable to rehash the issues already discussed, to go over ground that has already been covered, and to waste thereby the precious time of legislators and of witnesses, as well as to expend the money of taxpayers.

PHASES NOW TO BE CONSIDERED

I have, therefore, indicated that the hearings will be confined largely, until the subcommittee determines otherwise, to two phases of the legislation:

- (a) The self-liquidation phase; and
- (b) The national defense phase.

Under (a) there will be considered that entirely new provision of the bill which provides for placing the project on a self-sustaining basis by tolls on vessels using it, which are to defray the costs of operation, maintenance, repairs, and interest, so that the project will not be a burden on the taxpayer. The subcommittee will secure the most accurate statistics and estimates available from the finest type of engineering personnel and other qualified experts as to the currently expected cost of the project, the expected traffic, and related matters.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Under (b), the national defense part, I expect testimony to develop, for instance, for the affirmative, which will demonstrate that this project is necessary, in this atomic age, as a means of national security. Included in this matter is the question of the ore and power facilities that will be vital in this age to furnish matériel for our armed forces, as well as our private needs.

IMPARTIAL TREATMENT OF BILL

Mr. President, I am a cosponsor of the bill, but I want to make it absolutely clear that the subcommittee is going to seek light on this matter with complete impartiality, and with complete equality of opportunity afforded to both sides of the controversy.

I feel that it is necessary, however, that we take as short a time as possible in evaluating this legislation, and that we

then report it to the full committee, and I trust soon thereafter to the full Senate, in order that, if it is at all possible, the Senate may take action on it one way or another at this session.

The Senate of the Eightieth Congress I believe is confronted, in this issue, with a challenge to show how speedily and adequately it can handle a long-standing, much-debated problem.

INVITATION OF WITNESSES

I, therefore, invite all those of my colleagues and others who may be interested in testifying on this subject, and specifically on the two phases which I have mentioned above, to communicate with this subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee. The testimony will, as I have indicated, however, be strictly limited in time—15 minutes, usually, at the most—and limited in nature. All witnesses will be asked to confine their remarks to concise, factual presentations, with as few generalities as possible, and as much statistical support as possible.

We expect to hear orally from very prominent witnesses from Federal, State, and local governments, as well as from private life.

I am issuing invitations to many of those who cannot be heard in the hearings, but who have previously indicated an interest in this subject, to convey to me briefly in writing their current views on the project, particularly on the two phases of it that I have specified above. I regret that all the well-qualified individuals who are deeply interested in this legislation will not have the opportunity to be heard because of the time limitation we are placing on the hearings, but I am sure that they will understand the reasons therefor in the public interest.

Mr. WHITE subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to say a very brief word in response to what the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has said in the way of notice to Members of the Senate. I can only gather from his statement that it is the purpose of the majority of a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to make short shrift in the hearings of any opposition there may be. We have been told in effect that we are to be limited in time, and we are told in effect that we are to be limited in our interrogations of those who may be in favor of this new proposal and as to the substance of testimony which may be offered by those opposed to this waterway project.

I want this to be a matter of protest from me as to any such proceeding. I think a Senator of the United States on a question of this importance has a right to have something to say about the testimony that shall be taken before a committee. I think a Senator of the United States has a right to express his views before a committee. We should not in this arbitrary manner and in advance of any meeting where the matter has been discussed by the full committee be advised of the proposed limitations. I think there is no possible justification for the notice which has just been given to the Senate and to those of us who hold contrary views about this hearing.

PRESENTATION OF AWARD TO J. EDGAR HOOVER

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, Mr. G. A. Richards, president of radio stations WJR, Detroit; WGAR, Cleveland; and KMPC, of Los Angeles, yesterday announced the presentation in Washington of the G. A. Richards 1946 WJR good will award for the outstanding speech on Americanism broadcast on the radio, to Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI.

In conferring this award on Mr. Hoover in Washington, Mr. Richards observed that the address delivered by Mr. Hoover at the annual convention of the American Legion in San Francisco on September 30, 1946, struck the keynote of the day in building the defenses of Americanism against the insidious advances of communism which have penetrated our shores.

Mr. Hoover, in accepting the award, commended Mr. Richards for his civic consciousness and his desire to focus widespread public attention upon the theme of Americanism and the responsibilities of citizenship.

I think Mr. Richards is to be commended for establishing the G. A. Richards award, to be conferred annually on the American citizen who makes the outstanding radio speech on the subject of Americanism and the preservation of our constitutional form of government, to which principles, of course, he and his stations are dedicated. In addition to the award for the outstanding speech on Americanism, he advises us that in the future awards will be made for speeches selected by a board of judges which will be announced later, to receive second, third, fourth, and fifth recognition. Besides the plaques, the awards in the future will consist of cash prizes.

Mr. President, I know that all Members of the Senate have read the two addresses delivered by Mr. Hoover. I certainly hope that every citizen, and particularly those of school age and in our colleges will read these outstanding speeches on Americanism as Mr. Hoover sees it. I agree with what Mr. Hoover stated in them.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY TODAY— ADDRESS BY SENATOR GREEN

[Mr. McGRATH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "The Republican Party Today—A Reply to the Chairman of the Republican National Committee," delivered by Senator GREEN at Providence, R. I., on May 19, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY THE CHIEF JUSTICE AT PRESENTATION OF INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN AWARD TO JAMES F. BYRNES

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the Chief Justice of the United States on the occasion of the presentation to former Secretary of State Byrnes of the Variety Club International's humanitarian award, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT LABOR WANTS—ARTICLE FROM THE AMERICAN LEGION MAGAZINE BY DAVE BECK

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "What Labor Wants," by Dave Beck, appearing in the American Legion Magazine

for May 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE WEST IN REVOLT—EDITORIAL FROM THE RALEIGH (N. C.) NEWS AND OBSERVER

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The West in Revolt," published in the May 10, 1947, issue of the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE HOUSE AND SENATE LABOR BILLS—ARTICLE BY DONALD R. RICHBERG

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The House and Senate Labor Bills," by Donald R. Richberg, published in the May 15, 1947, issue of the Washington Daily News, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOOD PRICES—EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON POST

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why Food Stays High," published in the Boston Post, which appears in the Appendix.]

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY: ITS CAUSE AND CURE—ADDRESS BY HERBERT GARRETT, JR.

[Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Juvenile Delinquency: Its Cause and Cure," delivered by Herbert Garrett, Jr., of Woodruff, S. C., in the South Carolina speech contest of the Knights of Pythias, which appears in the Appendix.]

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE COAST GUARD ACADEMY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, under authority of the standing rules of the Senate, some days ago I appointed, acting as chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, two Senators as a Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy at New London. Because of the pendency of the present tax bill and its importance and its interest to all Members of the Senate, the Senators designated by me find it impossible to go at the time originally contemplated. I am giving notice that by arrangement with those two Senators, they will visit the Coast Guard Academy, in their capacity as a Board of Visitors, at a later time, to be arranged.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—MAGNUSON-FULBRIGHT AMENDMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I desire, for the information of the Senate, to submit a brief statement regarding a matter that took place yesterday. At that time, I submitted an amendment to the bill passed yesterday by the Senate, the amendment relating to the appointment of the so-called Director of the National Science Foundation. The amendment contained a provision that the Director might be removed by the President or the Foundation.

The amendment was originally submitted in that manner, but, before its actual presentation, I went to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey and said that I was first going to attempt to submit the amendment with the words "or the Foundation" stricken from the amendment. That meant that the Director would be removable by the President. There were two copies of

the amendment at the desk, one a carbon copy and the other an original, which included the three words "or the Foundation." I took the carbon copy and submitted that. That was the copy that was read by the clerk, and that was the copy obviously that today's RECORD shows was voted on by the Senate.

About 5 minutes later, while I was busy, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] asked that the amendment be read again, but I did not hear his request. Inadvertently, the clerk read the original copy, which included the words "or the Foundation." The Senator from West Virginia changed his vote upon finding those words to be in the amendment; and I am sure that but for the confusion which existed in the Senate at that time, during the vote, probably the Senator from New Jersey himself would have voted against the amendment.

I regret what happened, but I intended to submit the original amendment, omitting the three words. The amendment in that form was submitted, and that is what was voted on by the Senate. I merely wanted to make this explanation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has called the attention of the Senate to a situation which arose yesterday during consideration of and voting on the National Science Foundation bill. As stated by him, the vote which concerns the situation I now speak of had to do with the method of appointing the Director. The amendment as originally drawn and offered by the Senator from Washington provided that the Director could be removed by the President or the Foundation. The Senator from Washington struck out the words "or the Foundation," leaving the removal of the Director solely within the discretion and power of the President. I am informed there were two copies of the amendment at the desk, one copy not containing the deletion of the words "or the Foundation." When the amendment was read the second time and prior to the vote, through a mistake it was read containing the words "or the Foundation." The President pro tempore will recall that I changed my vote. I voted in favor of that amendment at first because I believed that when I voted it contained the power in the Foundation to remove the Director. Before the vote was announced I was advised of the change that had been made in the amendment, and I changed my vote.

I make this statement, Mr. President, because I feel that other Senators—in fact one so stated to me this morning—voted on the amendment under the misapprehension that the words "or the Foundation" were still in the amendment. I think the RECORD ought to be clear upon the subject. For that reason, I make the statement at this time.

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Has the Senator considered a motion to reconsider first the bill, and then the vote by which the amendment was agreed to?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have considered it, and desire to take up the question later, if it is proper to do so.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the bill require that a motion for reconsideration be made the following day?

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is a question about which I wish to inquire.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. What is the time limit within which a motion to reconsider may be filed in the ordinary course?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion may be made today or tomorrow, under the rule.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, following up what the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has said, I should like to state that I have talked with several Members of the Senate this morning. I myself was laboring under a misapprehension as to the words in controversy yesterday. Had I known that the words "or the Foundation" were definitely out of the amendment I would have voted differently than I did. Had it not been for the fact that my vote as a sponsor of the bill was determinative of that question I would not raise the point now; but it is a fact that if I had been informed, as I should have been, I would have voted differently. I am not trying to evade any responsibility. I should have known what I was voting on. However, the fact remains that without the discretion in the Foundation I would not have voted for the amendment. Therefore, I shall move that the vote be reconsidered. I am advised that I must first move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered and then move to reconsider the vote on this particular amendment. I ask the parliamentary question whether the motion is in order. If so, as a proponent of the bill, I am glad to make both motions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is privileged and is in order. The Senator can enter the motion and call it up later or he can pursue the subject now.

Mr. SMITH. I prefer to enter the motion now and call it up later, because I do not wish to interfere with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] in the matter which he is to present to the Senate today. I wish to enter the motion and call it up later.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion will be entered.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. What is the motion?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is to reconsider the vote on the passage of the National Science Foundation bill for the purpose, as the Chair understands, of subsequently moving to reconsider the vote by which the so-called Magnuson-Fulbright amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LUCAS. Was not a motion made to reconsider the vote on the very amendment we are discussing, and was not a

motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider agreed to? I make the inquiry whether, in connection with a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed, it is in order to move to reconsider the vote on an amendment with respect to which a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is unable to answer the Senator's question until he consults the RECORD to see precisely what happened.

Mr. LUCAS. As I recall, I made a motion to reconsider the vote as the result of a division, with respect to this very amendment. Then there was a ye-and-nay vote on the amendment, and it was agreed to. I made a motion to reconsider that vote, and that motion was laid on the table. After that the bill was passed, and no motion was made to reconsider it after it was passed. I think I am correct. If so, I make a point of order against the reconsideration of any amendment with respect to which a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that the Senator from New Jersey is not pursuing the matter at the present time. He is merely entering the motion. The Chair wishes to consult the RECORD at first hand before passing upon the question raised by the Senator from Illinois. The Chair will do so, and rule later.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HILL. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from New Jersey has entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which the National Science Foundation bill was passed?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore subsequently said: The Chair is now prepared to rule on the point of order raised by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. The Chair has examined the RECORD, and finds that no motion to table occurred in connection with the treatment of the Magnuson-Fulbright amendment. The history of the situation is as follows:

The Magnuson-Fulbright amendment was disagreed to by the Senate on a division. The Senator from Illinois moved to reconsider the vote, which motion was agreed to by a vote of 40 to 39. The question then recurred on agreement to the amendment, and the Senate agreed to the Magnuson-Fulbright amendment by a vote of 42 to 41. That is the end of the RECORD with respect to that amendment. Therefore there was no motion to lay on the table involved in the record of the Magnuson-Fulbright amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the able Presiding Officer is correct. I have consulted the RECORD. My motion to lay on the table was in connection with the vote on a division. It was not made following the ye-and-nay vote. The Chair is quite correct.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MCFARLAND. How many times can the Senate reconsider a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Only once.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Has not this question been reconsidered once?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Not this amendment.

Mr. MCFARLAND. As I understand, the amendment was reconsidered. It was lost on a division.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The vote which was reconsidered was the vote by which the amendment was rejected. The vote by which the amendment was agreed to has never been reconsidered.

REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX PAYMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce individual income tax payments.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the bill, House bill 1, showing the Senate committee amendments, followed by the report of the Senate Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the bill and report (No. 173) were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Individual Income Tax Reduction Act of 1947."

SEC. 2. Reduction in normal tax and surtax on individuals.

(a) Reduction in normal tax on individuals: Section 11 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the normal tax on individuals) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 11. Normal tax on individuals.

"There shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the net income of every individual a normal tax determined by computing a tentative normal tax of 3 percent of the amount of the net income in excess of the credits against net income provided in section 25, and by reducing such tentative normal tax as provided in section 12 (g). For alternative tax which may be elected if adjusted gross income is less than \$5,000, see Supplement T."

(b) Reduction in surtax on individuals: Section 12 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the rate of surtax on individuals) is hereby amended by striking out "by 5 percent thereof" and inserting in lieu thereof "as provided in subsection (g) of this section."

(c) Reduction of tentative normal tax and tentative surtax: Section 12 (g) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(g) Reduction of tentative normal tax and tentative surtax.—

"(1) In the case of taxable years beginning after December 31, 1947, the combined normal tax and surtax under section 11 and subsection (b) of this section shall be the aggregate of the tentative normal tax and tentative surtax, reduced as follows:

	The reduction shall be:
If the aggregate is:	Not over \$200..... 33½ percent of the aggregate.
Over \$200 but not over \$279.17.....	\$67.
Over \$279.17 but not over \$50,000.....	24 percent of the aggregate.
Over \$50,000 but not over \$250,000.....	\$12,000, plus 19¼ percent of excess over \$50,000.
Over \$250,000.....	\$50,500, plus 15 percent of excess over \$250,000.

In no event shall the combined normal tax and surtax exceed 76½ percent of the net income of the taxpayer for the taxable year.

"Taxable years beginning in 1947

If adjusted gross income is—		And the number of exemptions is—				If adjusted gross income is—		And the number of exemptions is—								
At least	But less than	1	2	3	4 or more	At least	But less than	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more
		The tax shall be—						The tax shall be—								
\$0	\$550	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,225	\$2,250	\$250	\$164	\$83	\$2	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
550	575	1	0	0	0	2,250	2,275	263	169	87	6	0	0	0	0	0
575	600	5	0	0	0	2,275	2,300	267	173	90	9	0	0	0	0	0
600	625	8	0	0	0	2,300	2,325	270	178	94	13	0	0	0	0	0
625	650	12	0	0	0	2,325	2,350	274	182	98	17	0	0	0	0	0
650	675	16	0	0	0	2,350	2,375	278	187	101	20	0	0	0	0	0
675	700	19	0	0	0	2,375	2,400	282	191	105	24	0	0	0	0	0
700	725	23	0	0	0	2,400	2,425	286	196	108	28	0	0	0	0	0
725	750	26	0	0	0	2,425	2,450	290	200	112	31	0	0	0	0	0
750	775	30	0	0	0	2,450	2,475	293	205	116	35	0	0	0	0	0
775	800	34	0	0	0	2,475	2,500	297	209	119	39	0	0	0	0	0
800	825	37	0	0	0	2,500	2,525	301	214	123	42	0	0	0	0	0
825	850	41	0	0	0	2,525	2,550	305	218	127	46	0	0	0	0	0
850	875	45	0	0	0	2,550	2,575	309	223	130	49	0	0	0	0	0
875	900	48	0	0	0	2,575	2,600	313	227	134	53	0	0	0	0	0
900	925	52	0	0	0	2,600	2,625	317	231	137	57	0	0	0	0	0
925	950	56	0	0	0	2,625	2,650	320	235	141	60	0	0	0	0	0
950	975	59	0	0	0	2,650	2,675	324	239	145	64	0	0	0	0	0
975	1,000	63	0	0	0	2,675	2,700	328	243	148	68	0	0	0	0	0
1,000	1,025	66	0	0	0	2,700	2,725	332	246	152	71	0	0	0	0	0
1,025	1,050	70	0	0	0	2,725	2,750	336	250	156	75	0	0	0	0	0
1,050	1,075	74	0	0	0	2,750	2,775	340	254	159	79	0	0	0	0	0
1,075	1,100	77	0	0	0	2,775	2,800	344	258	163	82	1	0	0	0	0
1,100	1,125	81	0	0	0	2,800	2,825	348	262	168	86	5	0	0	0	0
1,125	1,150	85	4	0	0	2,825	2,850	352	266	172	89	9	0	0	0	0
1,150	1,175	88	7	0	0	2,850	2,875	356	270	177	93	12	0	0	0	0
1,175	1,200	92	11	0	0	2,875	2,900	361	273	181	97	16	0	0	0	0
1,200	1,225	95	15	0	0	2,900	2,925	365	277	186	100	20	0	0	0	0
1,225	1,250	99	18	0	0	2,925	2,950	369	281	190	104	23	0	0	0	0
1,250	1,275	103	22	0	0	2,950	2,975	373	285	195	108	27	0	0	0	0
1,275	1,300	106	26	0	0	2,975	3,000	378	289	199	111	30	0	0	0	0
1,300	1,325	110	29	0	0	3,000	3,050	384	295	206	117	36	0	0	0	0
1,325	1,350	114	33	0	0	3,050	3,100	392	302	215	124	43	0	0	0	0
1,350	1,375	117	37	0	0	3,100	3,150	401	310	224	131	50	0	0	0	0
1,375	1,400	121	40	0	0	3,150	3,200	409	318	232	138	58	0	0	0	0
1,400	1,425	125	44	0	0	3,200	3,250	418	325	240	146	65	0	0	0	0
1,425	1,450	128	47	0	0	3,250	3,300	426	333	248	153	72	0	0	0	0
1,450	1,475	132	51	0	0	3,300	3,350	435	341	255	160	80	0	0	0	0
1,475	1,500	135	55	0	0	3,350	3,400	443	349	263	169	87	6	0	0	0
1,500	1,525	139	58	0	0	3,400	3,450	452	358	271	178	94	13	0	0	0
1,525	1,550	143	62	0	0	3,450	3,500	460	366	278	187	101	21	0	0	0
1,550	1,575	146	66	0	0	3,500	3,550	468	374	286	196	109	28	0	0	0
1,575	1,600	150	69	0	0	3,550	3,600	477	383	294	205	116	35	0	0	0
1,600	1,625	154	73	0	0	3,600	3,650	485	391	301	214	123	42	0	0	0
1,625	1,650	157	77	0	0	3,650	3,700	494	400	309	223	130	50	0	0	0
1,650	1,675	161	80	0	0	3,700	3,750	502	408	317	231	138	57	0	0	0
1,675	1,700	165	84	3	0	3,750	3,800	511	417	324	239	145	64	0	0	0
1,700	1,725	170	87	7	0	3,800	3,850	519	425	332	247	152	71	0	0	0
1,725	1,750	174	91	10	0	3,850	3,900	528	434	340	254	159	79	0	0	0
1,750	1,775	179	95	14	0	3,900	3,950	536	442	348	262	168	86	5	0	0
1,775	1,800	183	98	18	0	3,950	4,000	545	451	357	270	177	93	13	0	0
1,800	1,825	188	102	21	0	4,000	4,050	553	459	365	277	186	101	20	0	0
1,825	1,850	192	106	25	0	4,050	4,100	562	468	374	285	195	108	27	0	0
1,850	1,875	197	109	28	0	4,100	4,150	570	476	382	293	204	115	34	0	0
1,875	1,900	201	113	32	0	4,150	4,200	579	484	390	301	213	122	42	0	0
1,900	1,925	206	116	36	0	4,200	4,250	587	493	399	308	222	130	49	0	0
1,925	1,950	210	120	39	0	4,250	4,300	595	501	407	316	230	137	56	0	0
1,950	1,975	215	124	43	0	4,300	4,350	604	510	416	324	238	144	63	0	0
1,975	2,000	219	127	47	0	4,350	4,400	612	518	424	331	246	151	71	0	0
2,000	2,025	224	131	50	0	4,400	4,450	621	527	433	339	254	159	78	6	0
2,025	2,050	228	135	54	0	4,450	4,500	629	535	441	347	261	167	85	4	0
2,050	2,075	232	138	58	0	4,500	4,550	638	544	450	356	269	176	92	12	0
2,075	2,100	236	142	61	0	4,550	4,600	646	552	458	364	277	185	100	19	0
2,100	2,125	240	146	65	0	4,600	4,650	655	561	467	373	284	194	107	26	0
2,125	2,150	243	149	68	0	4,650	4,700	663	569	475	381	292	203	114	34	0
2,150	2,175	247	153	72	0	4,700	4,750	672	578	484	389	300	212	122	41	0
2,175	2,200	251	156	76	0	4,750	4,800	680	586	492	398	307	221	129	48	0
2,200	2,225	255	160	79	0	4,800	4,850	689	595	500	406	315	230	136	55	0
						4,850	4,900	697	603	509	415	323	237	143	63	0
						4,900	4,950	706	611	517	423	330	245	151	70	0
						4,950	5,000	714	620	526	432	338	253	158	77	0

(b) Taxable years to which applicable: The amendment made by this section shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1946. For treatment of taxable years beginning in 1946 and ending in 1947, or beginning in 1947 and ending in 1948, see section 6.

Sec. 4. Additional credit against net income for normal tax and surtax.

(a) Exemption for age: Section 25 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to credits against net income for normal tax and surtax) is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and by adding after subparagraph (C) the following:

"(D) an additional exemption of \$500 for the taxpayer if he has attained the age of 65 on or before the last day of his taxable year;

"(E) an additional exemption of \$500 for the spouse of the taxpayer if—

"(1) a joint return is made by the taxpayer and his spouse under section 51 and the spouse has attained the age of 65 on or before such last day, in which case the aggregate exemption of the spouses under subparagraph (D) and this subparagraph shall not exceed \$500 with respect to each spouse who has attained the age of 65 on or before such last day; or

"(ii) a separate return is made by the taxpayer, and his spouse has attained the age of 65 on or before such last day and has no gross income for the calendar year in which the taxable year of the taxpayer begins and is not the dependent of another taxpayer."

(b) Technical amendments.—

(1) Section 58 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to requirement of declaration of estimated tax) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) His gross income from wages (as defined in section 1621) can reasonably be expected to exceed the sum of \$4,500, plus \$500

with respect to each exemption provided in section 25 (b); or"

(2) Section 1622 (h) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to withholding exemptions) is hereby amended by striking out subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(A) An exemption for himself, and an additional exemption for himself if he has attained the age of 65 or will attain such age before the expiration of the taxable year under chapter 1 in respect of which amounts deducted and withheld under this subchapter in the calendar year in which such day falls are allowed as a credit.

"(B) If the employee is married, any exemption to which his spouse is entitled under subparagraph (A), but only if such spouse does not have in effect a withholding exemption certificate claiming such exemption."

(3) In the case of an individual entitled to an additional withholding exemption under

section 1622 (h) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code by reason of the amendment made thereto by paragraph (2) of this subsection, the term "status determination date" as used in section 1622 (h) (3) (B) of such Code includes also the ninetieth day after the date of the enactment of this act.

(4) Section 23 (x) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deduction of medical, etc., expenses) is hereby amended by striking out the second and third sentences thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The maximum deduction for the taxable year shall be \$1,250, except that if more than one exemption is allowed under section 25 (b) for the taxable year (exclusive of an exemption under section 25 (b) (1) (D)) the maximum deduction for the taxable year shall be \$2,500."

(c) Taxable years to which applicable: The amendments made by this section shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1946. For treatment of taxable years beginning in 1946 and ending in 1947, see section 6.

Sec. 5. Reduction in withholding of tax at source on wages.

(a) Percentage method: Section 1622 (a) and section 1622 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to percentage method of withholding) are hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) Requirement of Withholding.—Every employer making payment of wages shall deduct and withhold upon such wages a tax equal to the sum of the following:

"(1) 12 percent of whichever of the following is the lesser:

"(A) the amount by which the wages exceed the number of withholding exemptions claimed, multiplied by the amount of one such exemption as shown in the table in subsection (b) (1); or

"(B) the amount shown in the second column in the table in subsection (b) (1);

"(2) 18 percent of whichever of the following is the lesser:

"(A) the amount by which the wages exceed the sum of—

"(i) the number of withholding exemptions claimed, multiplied by the amount of one such exemption as shown in the table in subsection (b) (1); plus

"(ii) the amount shown in the second column in the table in subsection (b) (1); or

"(B) the amount shown in the third column in the table in subsection (b) (1);

"(3) 14 percent of the amount by which the wages exceed the sum of—

"(A) the number of withholding exemptions claimed, multiplied by the amount of one such exemption as shown in the table in subsection (b) (1); plus

"(B) the sum of the amounts shown in the second and third columns in the table in subsection (b) (1).

"(b) (1) The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

"Percentage method withholding table

"Pay-roll period	1	2	3
	Amount of one withholding exemption	Maximum amount subject to 12 percent rate	Maximum amount subject to 18 percent rate
Weekly.....	\$11.00	\$21.00	\$9.00
Biweekly.....	22.00	43.00	17.00
Semimonthly.....	23.00	46.00	19.00
Monthly.....	46.00	93.00	36.00
Quarterly.....	139.00	278.00	110.00
Semiannual.....	278.00	556.00	219.00
Annual.....	556.00	1,111.00	440.00
Daily or miscellaneous (per day of such period).....	1.50	3.00	1.00"

(b) Wage bracket withholding: The tables contained in section 1622 (c) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to wage bracket withholding) are hereby amended to read as follows:

"If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is weekly—

And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least	But less than	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
The amount of tax to be withheld shall be—												
\$0	\$11	12% of wages	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
\$0	\$11	\$1.40	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$11	\$12	1.50	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$12	\$13	1.60	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$13	\$14	1.70	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$14	\$15	1.80	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$15	\$16	1.90	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$16	\$17	2.00	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$17	\$18	2.10	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$18	\$19	2.20	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$19	\$20	2.30	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$20	\$21	2.40	1.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$21	\$22	2.50	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$22	\$23	2.60	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$23	\$24	2.70	1.40	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$24	\$25	2.80	1.50	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$25	\$26	2.90	1.60	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$26	\$27	3.00	1.70	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$27	\$28	3.10	1.80	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$28	\$29	3.20	1.90	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$29	\$30	3.30	2.00	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$30	\$31	3.40	2.10	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$31	\$32	3.50	2.20	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$32	\$33	3.60	2.30	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$33	\$34	3.70	2.40	1.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$34	\$35	3.80	2.50	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$35	\$36	3.90	2.60	1.30	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$36	\$37	4.00	2.70	1.40	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$37	\$38	4.10	2.80	1.50	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$38	\$39	4.20	2.90	1.60	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$39	\$40	4.30	3.00	1.70	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$40	\$41	4.40	3.10	1.80	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$41	\$42	4.50	3.20	1.90	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$42	\$43	4.60	3.30	2.00	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$43	\$44	4.70	3.40	2.10	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$44	\$45	4.80	3.50	2.20	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$45	\$46	4.90	3.60	2.30	1.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$46	\$47	5.00	3.70	2.40	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$47	\$48	5.10	3.80	2.50	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$48	\$49	5.20	3.90	2.60	1.40	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$49	\$50	5.30	4.00	2.70	1.50	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$50	\$51	5.40	4.10	2.80	1.60	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$51	\$52	5.50	4.20	2.90	1.70	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$52	\$53	5.60	4.30	3.00	1.80	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$53	\$54	5.70	4.40	3.10	1.90	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$54	\$55	5.80	4.50	3.20	2.00	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$55	\$56	5.90	4.60	3.30	2.10	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$56	\$57	6.00	4.70	3.40	2.20	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$57	\$58	6.10	4.80	3.50	2.30	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$58	\$59	6.20	4.90	3.60	2.40	1.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$59	\$60	6.30	5.00	3.70	2.50	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$60	\$61	6.40	5.10	3.80	2.60	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$61	\$62	6.50	5.20	3.90	2.70	1.40	.10	0	0	0	0	0
\$62	\$63	6.60	5.30	4.00	2.80	1.50	.20	0	0	0	0	0
\$63	\$64	6.70	5.40	4.10	2.90	1.60	.30	0	0	0	0	0
\$64	\$65	6.80	5.50	4.20	3.00	1.70	.40	0	0	0	0	0
\$65	\$66	6.90	5.60	4.30	3.10	1.80	.50	0	0	0	0	0
\$66	\$67	7.00	5.70	4.40	3.20	1.90	.60	0	0	0	0	0
\$67	\$68	7.10	5.80	4.50	3.30	2.00	.70	0	0	0	0	0
\$68	\$69	7.20	5.90	4.60	3.40	2.10	.80	0	0	0	0	0
\$69	\$70	7.30	6.00	4.70	3.50	2.20	.90	0	0	0	0	0
\$70	\$71	7.40	6.10	4.80	3.60	2.30	1.00	0	0	0	0	0
\$71	\$72	7.50	6.20	4.90	3.70	2.40	1.10	0	0	0	0	0
\$72	\$73	7.60	6.30	5.00	3.80	2.50	1.20	0	0	0	0	0
\$73	\$74	7.70	6.40	5.10	3.90	2.60	1.30	0	0	0	0	0
\$74	\$75	7.80	6.50	5.20	4.00	2.70	1.40	.10	0	0	0	0
\$75	\$76	7.90	6.60	5.30	4.10	2.80	1.50	.20	0	0	0	0
\$76	\$77	8.00	6.70	5.40	4.20	2.90	1.60	.30	0	0	0	0
\$77	\$78	8.10	6.80	5.50	4.30	3.00	1.70	.40	0	0	0	0
\$78	\$79	8.20	6.90	5.60	4.40	3.10	1.80	.50	0	0	0	0
\$79	\$80	8.30	7.00	5.70	4.50	3.20	1.90	.60	0	0	0	0
\$80	\$82	11.10	9.60	8.20	6.70	5.20	3.70	2.00	.70	0	0	0

"If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is weekly—Continued

And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least	But less than	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of tax to be withheld shall be—										
\$82	\$84	\$11.40	\$9.90	\$8.40	\$7.00	\$5.50	\$4.00	\$2.30	\$1.00	\$0	\$0	\$0
\$84	\$86	11.60	10.20	8.70	7.20	5.80	4.30	2.50	1.20	0	0	0
\$86	\$88	11.90	10.40	9.00	7.50	6.10	4.60	2.80	1.50	.20	0	0
\$88	\$90	12.20	10.70	9.30	7.80	6.30	4.90	3.20	1.70	.40	0	0
\$90	\$92	12.40	11.00	9.50	8.10	6.60	5.10	3.60	1.90	.70	0	0
\$92	\$94	12.70	11.30	9.80	8.30	6.90	5.40	3.90	2.20	.90	0	0
\$94	\$96	13.00	11.50	10.10	8.60	7.10	5.70	4.20	2.40	1.10	0	0
\$96	\$98	13.30	11.80	10.30	8.90	7.40	6.00	4.50	2.70	1.40	.10	0
\$98	\$100	13.50	12.10	10.60	9.20	7.70	6.20	4.80	3.10	1.60	.30	0
\$100	\$105	14.00	12.60	11.10	9.60	8.20	6.70	5.30	3.70	2.00	.80	0
\$105	\$110	14.70	13.20	11.80	10.30	8.90	7.40	5.90	4.50	2.70	1.40	.10
\$110	\$115	15.40	13.90	12.50	11.00	9.50	8.10	6.60	5.20	3.60	2.00	.70
\$115	\$120	16.10	14.60	13.20	11.70	10.20	8.80	7.30	5.80	4.40	2.60	1.30
\$120	\$125	16.80	15.30	13.80	12.40	10.90	9.50	8.00	6.50	5.10	3.50	1.90
\$125	\$130	17.40	16.00	14.50	13.10	11.60	10.10	8.70	7.20	5.70	4.30	2.50
\$130	\$135	18.10	16.70	15.20	13.70	12.30	10.80	9.40	7.90	6.40	5.00	3.30
\$135	\$140	18.80	17.40	15.90	14.40	13.00	11.50	10.00	8.60	7.10	5.70	4.20
\$140	\$145	19.50	18.00	16.60	15.10	13.60	12.20	10.70	9.30	7.80	6.30	4.90
\$145	\$150	20.20	18.70	17.30	15.80	14.30	12.90	11.40	9.90	8.50	7.00	5.60
\$150	\$160	21.90	19.70	18.30	16.80	15.40	13.90	12.40	11.00	9.50	8.10	6.60
\$160	\$170	22.60	21.10	19.60	18.20	16.70	15.30	13.80	12.30	10.90	9.40	8.00
\$170	\$180	23.90	22.50	21.00	19.60	18.10	16.60	15.20	13.70	12.20	10.80	9.30
\$180	\$190	25.30	23.80	22.40	20.90	19.50	18.00	16.50	15.10	13.60	12.20	10.70
\$190	\$200	26.70	25.20	23.80	22.30	20.80	19.40	17.90	16.40	15.00	13.50	12.10
		14 percent of the excess over \$200 plus										
\$200 and over		27.40	25.90	24.40	23.00	21.50	20.10	18.60	17.10	15.70	14.20	12.70

"If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is biweekly—

And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least	But less than	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of tax to be withheld shall be—										
\$0	\$20	12% of wages	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
\$20	\$22	\$2.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$22	\$24	.20	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$24	\$26	3.00	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$26	\$28	3.20	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$28	\$30	3.50	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$30	\$32	3.75	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$32	\$34	4.00	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$34	\$36	4.20	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$36	\$38	4.40	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$38	\$40	4.70	2.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$40	\$42	4.90	2.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$42	\$44	5.20	2.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$44	\$46	5.50	2.80	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$46	\$48	5.90	3.10	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$48	\$50	6.20	3.30	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$50	\$52	6.60	3.50	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$52	\$54	7.00	3.80	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$54	\$56	7.30	4.00	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$56	\$58	7.70	4.30	1.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$58	\$60	8.00	4.50	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$60	\$62	8.30	4.70	2.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$62	\$64	8.60	5.00	2.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$64	\$66	8.90	5.30	2.70	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$66	\$68	9.20	5.60	2.90	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$68	\$70	9.40	6.00	3.10	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$70	\$72	9.70	6.40	3.40	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$72	\$74	10.00	6.70	3.60	1.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$74	\$76	10.30	7.10	3.90	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$76	\$78	10.50	7.40	4.10	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$78	\$80	10.80	7.80	4.30	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$80	\$82	11.10	8.20	4.60	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$82	\$84	11.40	8.40	4.80	2.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$84	\$86	11.60	8.70	5.10	2.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$86	\$88	11.90	9.00	5.40	2.70	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$88	\$90	12.20	9.30	5.80	3.00	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$90	\$92	12.40	9.50	6.10	3.20	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$92	\$94	12.70	9.80	6.50	3.50	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$94	\$96	13.00	10.10	6.80	3.70	1.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$96	\$98	13.30	10.30	7.20	3.90	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$98	\$100	13.50	10.60	7.60	4.20	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$100	\$102	13.80	10.90	7.90	4.40	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$102	\$104	14.10	11.20	8.20	4.70	2.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$104	\$106	14.40	11.40	8.50	4.90	2.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$106	\$108	14.60	11.70	8.80	5.10	2.60	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$108	\$110	14.90	12.00	9.10	5.50	2.80	.30	0	0	0	0	0
\$110	\$112	15.20	12.30	9.30	5.90	3.10	.50	0	0	0	0	0
\$112	\$114	15.50	12.50	9.60	6.20	3.30	.70	0	0	0	0	0
\$114	\$116	15.70	12.80	9.90	6.60	3.60	1.00	0	0	0	0	0
\$116	\$118	16.00	13.10	10.20	6.90	3.80	1.20	0	0	0	0	0
\$118	\$120	16.30	13.40	10.40	7.30	4.00	1.50	0	0	0	0	0
\$120	\$124	16.70	13.80	10.80	7.80	4.40	1.80	0	0	0	0	0
\$124	\$128	17.20	14.30	11.40	8.50	4.90	2.30	0	0	0	0	0
\$128	\$132	17.80	14.90	11.90	9.00	5.40	2.80	.20	0	0	0	0
\$132	\$136	18.30	15.40	12.50	9.60	6.20	3.30	.70	0	0	0	0
\$136	\$140	18.90	16.00	13.00	10.10	6.90	3.70	1.20	0	0	0	0

"If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is biweekly—Continued

And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least	But less than	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of tax to be withheld shall be—										
\$140	\$144	\$19.40	\$16.50	\$13.60	\$10.70	\$7.60	\$4.20	\$1.70	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
\$144	\$148	20.00	17.00	14.10	11.20	8.30	4.70	2.10	0	0	0	0
\$148	\$152	20.50	17.60	14.70	11.80	8.80	5.20	2.60	.10	0	0	0
\$152	\$156	21.10	18.10	15.20	12.30	9.40	5.90	3.10	.50	0	0	0
\$156	\$160	21.60	18.70	15.80	12.80	9.90	6.60	3.60	1.00	0	0	0
\$160	\$164	22.20	19.20	16.30	13.40	10.50	7.40	4.00	1.50	0	0	0
\$164	\$168	22.70	19.80	16.90	13.90	11.00	8.10	4.50	2.00	0	0	0
\$168	\$172	23.30	20.30	17.40	14.50	11.60	8.60	5.00	2.40	0	0	0
\$172	\$176	23.80	20.90	18.00	15.00	12.10	9.20	5.50	2.90	.40	0	0
\$176	\$180	24.40	21.40	18.50	15.60	12.70	9.70	6.40	3.40	.80	0	0
\$180	\$184	24.90	22.00	19.10	16.10	13.20	10.30	7.10	3.90	1.30	0	0
\$184	\$188	25.40	22.50	19.60	16.70	13.80	10.80	7.80	4.40	1.80	0	0
\$188	\$192	26.00	23.10	20.10	17.20	14.30	11.40	8.50	4.80	2.30	0	0
\$192	\$196	26.50	23.60	20.70	17.80	14.80	11.90	9.00	5.40	2.80	.20	0
\$196	\$200	27.10	24.20	21.20	18.30	15.40	12.50	9.50	6.10	3.20	.70	0
\$200	\$210	28.00	25.10	22.20	19.30	16.40	13.40	10.50	7.40	4.10	1.50	0
\$210	\$220	29.40	26.50	23.60	20.60	17.10	14.80	11.90	9.00	5.40	2.70	.20
\$220	\$230	30.80	27.90	24.90	22.00	19.10	16.20	13.20	10.30	7.20	3.90	1.40
\$230	\$240	32.10	29.20	26.30	23.40	20.50	17.50	14.60	11.70	8.80	5.10	2.60
\$240	\$250	33.50	30.60	27.70	24.70	21.80	18.90	16.00	13.10	10.10	6.90	3.70
\$250	\$260	34.90	32.00	29.00	26.10	23.20	20.30	17.30	14.40	11.50	8.60	4.90
\$260	\$270	36.30	33.30	30.40	27.50	24.60	21.60	18.70	15.80	12.90	9.90	6.70
\$270	\$280	37.60	34.70	31.80	28.90	25.90	23.00	20.10	17.20	14.20	11.30	8.40
\$280	\$290	39.00	36.10	33.10	30.20	27.30	24.40	21.40	18.50	15.60	12.70	9.80
\$290	\$300	40.40	37.40	34.50	31.60	28.70	25.70	22.80	19.90	17.00	14.00	11.10
\$300	\$320	42.40	39.50	36.60	33.60	30.70	27.80	24.90	21.90	19.00	16.10	13.20
\$320	\$340	45.10	42.20	39.30	36.40	33.50	30.50	27.60	24.70	21.80	18.80	15.90
\$340	\$360	47.90	45.00	42.00	39.10	36.20	33.30	30.30	27.40	24.50	21.60	18.60
\$360	\$380	50.60	47.70	44.80	41.80	38.90	36.00	33.10	30.20	27.20	24.30	21.40
\$380	\$400	53.40	50.40	47.50	44.60	41.70	38.70	35.80	32.90	30.00	27.00	24.10
		14 percent of the excess over \$400 plus—										
\$400 and over		54.70	51.80	48.90	46.00	43.00	40.10	37.20	34.30	31.30	28.40	25.50

"If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is semimonthly—

And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least	But less than	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of tax to be withheld shall be—										
\$0	\$22	12% of wages	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
\$22	\$24	\$2.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$24	\$26	3.00	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$26	\$28	3.20	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$28	\$30	3.50	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$30	\$32	3.70	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$32	\$34	4.00	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$34	\$36	4.20	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$36	\$38	4.40	1.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$38	\$40	4.70	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$40	\$42	4.90	2.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$42	\$44	5.10	2.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$44	\$46	5.40	2.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$46	\$48	5.70	2.90	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$48	\$50	6.00	3.10	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$50	\$52	6.40	3.30	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$52	\$54	6.70	3.60	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$54	\$56	7.10	3.80	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$56	\$58	7.50	4.10	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$58	\$60	7.80	4.30	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$60	\$62	8.20	4.50	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$62	\$64	8.50	4.80	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$64	\$66	8.90	5.00	2.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$66	\$68	9.20	5.20	2.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$68	\$70	9.40	5.50	2.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$70	\$72	9.70	5.80	3.00	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$72	\$74	10.00	6.20	3.20	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$74	\$76	10.30	6.50	3.40	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$76	\$78	10.50	6.90	3.70	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$78	\$80	10.80	7.30	3.90	1.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$80	\$82	11.10	7.60	4.20	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$82	\$84	11.40	8.00	4.40	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$84	\$86	11.60	8.30	4.60	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$86	\$88	11.90	8.70	4.90	2.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$88	\$90	12.20	9.00	5.10	2.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$90	\$92	12.40	9.30	5.40	2.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$92	\$94	12.70	9.60	5.60	2.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$94	\$96	13.00	9.80	6.00	3.10	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$96	\$98	13.30	10.10	6.30	3.30	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$98	\$100	13.50	10.40	6.70	3.50	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$100	\$102	13.80	10.70	7.10	3.80	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$102	\$104	14.10	10.90	7.40	4.00	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$104	\$106	14.40	11.20	7.80	4.30	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$106	\$108	14.60	11.50	8.10	4.50	1.70	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$108	\$110	14.90	11.70	8.50	4.70	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$110	\$112	15.20	12.00	8.90	5.00	2.20	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$112	\$114	15.50	12.30	9.10	5.20	2.40	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$114	\$116	15.70	12.60	9.40	5.50	2.70	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$116	\$118	16.00	12.80	9.70	5.80	2.90	.20	0	0	0	0	0
\$118	\$120	16.30	13.10	9.90	6.10	3.20	.40	0	0	0	0	0
\$120	\$124	16.70	13.50	10.40	6.70	3.50	.70	0	0	0	0	0
\$124	\$128	17.20	14.10	10.90	7.40	4.00	1.20	0	0	0	0	0
\$128	\$132	17.80	14.60	11.50	8.10	4.50	1.70	0	0	0	0	0

"If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is semimonthly—Continued

And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least	But less than	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of tax to be withheld shall be—										
\$132	\$136	\$18.30	\$15.20	\$12.00	\$8.80	\$5.00	\$2.20	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
\$136	\$140	18.90	15.70	12.50	9.40	5.40	2.70	0	0	0	0	0
\$140	\$144	19.40	16.30	13.10	9.90	6.10	3.10	.40	0	0	0	0
\$144	\$148	20.00	16.80	13.60	10.50	6.80	3.60	.90	0	0	0	0
\$148	\$152	20.50	17.40	14.20	11.00	7.50	4.10	1.30	0	0	0	0
\$152	\$156	21.10	17.90	14.70	11.60	8.30	4.60	1.80	0	0	0	0
\$156	\$160	21.60	18.40	15.30	12.10	8.90	5.10	2.30	0	0	0	0
\$160	\$164	22.20	19.00	15.80	12.70	9.50	5.50	2.80	0	0	0	0
\$164	\$168	22.70	19.50	16.40	13.20	10.00	6.30	3.20	.50	0	0	0
\$168	\$172	23.30	20.10	16.90	13.80	10.60	7.00	3.70	1.00	0	0	0
\$172	\$176	23.80	20.60	17.50	14.30	11.10	7.70	4.20	1.40	0	0	0
\$176	\$180	24.40	21.20	18.00	14.90	11.70	8.40	4.70	1.90	0	0	0
\$180	\$184	24.90	21.70	18.60	15.40	12.20	9.10	5.20	2.40	0	0	0
\$184	\$188	25.40	22.30	19.10	15.90	12.80	9.60	5.70	2.90	.10	0	0
\$188	\$192	26.00	22.80	19.70	16.50	13.30	10.20	6.40	3.30	.60	0	0
\$192	\$196	26.50	23.40	20.20	17.00	13.90	10.70	7.10	3.80	1.10	0	0
\$196	\$200	27.10	23.90	20.80	17.60	14.40	11.30	7.80	4.30	1.50	0	0
\$200	\$210	28.00	24.90	21.70	18.50	15.40	12.20	8.70	5.10	2.40	0	0
\$210	\$220	29.40	26.20	23.10	19.90	16.70	13.60	10.40	6.70	3.60	.80	0
\$220	\$230	30.80	27.60	24.40	21.30	18.10	15.00	11.80	8.50	4.80	2.00	0
\$230	\$240	32.10	29.00	25.80	22.60	19.50	16.30	13.10	10.00	6.20	3.20	0
\$240	\$250	33.50	30.30	27.20	24.00	20.80	17.70	14.50	11.30	8.00	4.40	1.60
\$250	\$260	34.90	31.70	28.60	25.40	22.20	19.10	15.90	12.70	9.60	5.60	2.80
\$260	\$270	36.30	33.10	29.90	26.80	23.60	20.40	17.30	14.10	10.90	7.40	4.00
\$270	\$280	37.60	34.50	31.20	28.10	25.00	21.80	18.60	15.50	12.30	9.10	5.20
\$280	\$290	39.00	35.80	32.70	29.50	26.30	23.20	20.00	16.80	13.70	10.50	6.80
\$290	\$300	40.40	37.20	34.00	30.90	27.70	24.50	21.40	18.20	15.00	11.90	8.60
\$300	\$320	42.40	39.20	36.10	32.90	29.70	26.60	23.40	20.20	17.10	13.90	10.70
\$320	\$340	45.10	42.00	38.80	35.60	32.50	29.50	26.10	23.00	19.80	16.60	13.50
\$340	\$360	47.90	44.70	41.50	38.40	35.20	32.00	28.90	25.70	22.50	19.40	16.20
\$360	\$380	50.60	47.40	44.30	41.10	37.90	34.80	31.60	28.40	25.30	22.10	18.90
\$380	\$400	53.40	50.20	47.00	43.90	40.70	37.50	34.40	31.20	28.00	24.90	21.70
\$400	\$420	56.10	52.90	49.80	46.60	43.40	40.30	37.10	33.90	30.80	27.60	24.40
\$420	\$440	58.80	55.70	52.50	49.40	46.20	43.00	39.80	36.70	33.50	30.30	27.20
\$440	\$460	61.60	58.40	55.20	52.10	48.90	45.70	42.60	39.40	36.20	33.10	29.90
\$460	\$480	64.30	61.10	58.00	54.80	51.60	48.50	45.30	42.10	39.00	35.80	32.60
\$480	\$500	67.00	63.90	60.70	57.50	54.40	51.20	48.00	44.90	41.70	38.50	35.40
		14 percent of the excess over \$500 plus										
\$500 and over		68.40	65.20	62.10	58.90	55.70	52.60	49.40	46.20	43.10	39.90	36.70

"If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is monthly—

And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least	But less than	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of tax to be withheld shall be—										
\$0	\$44	12% of wages	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
\$44	\$48	\$5.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$48	\$52	6.00	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$52	\$56	6.50	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$56	\$60	7.00	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$60	\$64	7.40	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$64	\$68	7.90	2.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$68	\$72	8.40	2.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$72	\$76	8.90	3.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$76	\$80	9.30	3.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$80	\$84	9.80	4.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$84	\$88	10.30	4.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$88	\$92	10.80	5.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$92	\$96	11.30	5.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$96	\$100	11.80	6.20	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$100	\$104	12.30	6.70	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$104	\$108	12.80	7.20	1.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$108	\$112	13.30	7.70	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$112	\$116	13.80	8.20	2.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$116	\$120	14.30	8.70	2.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$120	\$124	14.80	9.20	3.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$124	\$128	15.30	9.70	3.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$128	\$132	15.80	10.20	4.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$132	\$136	16.30	10.70	4.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$136	\$140	16.80	11.20	5.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$140	\$144	17.30	11.70	5.60	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$144	\$148	17.80	12.20	6.10	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$148	\$152	18.30	12.70	6.60	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$152	\$156	18.80	13.20	7.10	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$156	\$160	19.30	13.70	7.60	2.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$160	\$164	19.80	14.20	8.10	2.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$164	\$168	20.30	14.70	8.60	3.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$168	\$172	20.80	15.20	9.10	3.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$172	\$176	21.30	15.70	9.60	4.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$176	\$180	21.80	16.20	10.10	4.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$180	\$184	22.30	16.70	10.60	5.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$184	\$188	22.80	17.20	11.10	5.70	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$188	\$192	23.30	17.70	11.60	6.20	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$192	\$196	23.80	18.20	12.10	6.70	1.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$196	\$200	24.30	18.70	12.60	7.20	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$200	\$204	24.80	19.20	13.10	7.70	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$204	\$208	25.30	19.70	13.60	8.20	2.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$208	\$212	25.80	20.20	14.10	8.70	3.00	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$212	\$216	26.30	20.70	14.60	9.20	3.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$216	\$220	26.80	21.20	15.10	9.70	4.00	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$220	\$224	27.30	21.70	15.60	10.20	4.50	0	0	0	0	0	0

"If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is monthly—Continued

And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least	But less than	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of tax to be withheld shall be—										
\$224	\$228	\$30.90	\$24.60	\$18.30	\$10.40	\$4.90	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
\$228	\$232	31.50	25.10	18.80	10.90	5.40	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$232	\$236	32.00	25.70	19.30	11.50	5.80	.30	0	0	0	0	0
\$236	\$240	32.60	26.20	19.90	12.30	6.30	.80	0	0	0	0	0
\$240	\$248	33.40	27.00	20.70	13.30	7.00	1.50	0	0	0	0	0
\$248	\$256	34.50	28.10	21.80	14.30	8.00	2.50	0	0	0	0	0
\$256	\$264	35.60	29.20	22.90	15.20	9.00	3.40	0	0	0	0	0
\$264	\$272	36.70	30.30	24.00	16.20	9.90	4.40	0	0	0	0	0
\$272	\$280	37.80	31.40	25.10	17.20	10.90	5.30	0	0	0	0	0
\$280	\$288	38.90	32.50	26.20	18.20	11.80	6.30	.70	0	0	0	0
\$288	\$296	39.90	33.60	27.30	19.20	12.70	7.20	1.70	0	0	0	0
\$296	\$304	41.00	34.70	28.40	20.20	13.60	8.20	2.70	0	0	0	0
\$304	\$312	42.10	35.80	29.50	21.10	14.50	9.20	3.60	0	0	0	0
\$312	\$320	43.20	36.90	30.60	22.10	15.40	10.10	4.60	0	0	0	0
\$320	\$328	44.30	38.00	31.70	23.10	16.30	11.10	5.50	0	0	0	0
\$328	\$336	45.40	39.10	32.80	24.10	17.20	12.10	6.50	.90	0	0	0
\$336	\$344	46.50	40.20	33.80	25.10	18.10	13.10	7.40	1.90	0	0	0
\$344	\$352	47.60	41.30	34.90	26.10	19.00	14.00	8.40	2.90	0	0	0
\$352	\$360	48.70	42.40	36.00	27.10	20.00	15.00	9.40	3.80	0	0	0
\$360	\$368	49.80	43.50	37.10	28.10	21.00	16.00	10.30	4.80	0	0	0
\$368	\$376	50.90	44.60	38.20	29.10	22.00	17.00	11.30	5.70	.20	0	0
\$376	\$384	52.00	45.70	39.30	30.10	23.00	18.00	12.20	6.70	1.20	0	0
\$384	\$392	53.10	46.70	40.40	31.10	24.00	19.00	13.20	7.70	2.10	0	0
\$392	\$400	54.20	47.80	41.50	32.10	25.00	20.00	14.20	8.60	3.10	0	0
\$400	\$420	56.10	49.80	43.40	33.10	26.00	21.00	15.20	9.60	4.10	0	0
\$420	\$440	58.80	52.50	46.20	35.80	27.20	22.20	16.40	10.30	5.20	1.60	0
\$440	\$460	61.60	55.20	48.90	38.60	28.40	23.40	17.60	11.50	6.40	3.00	0
\$460	\$480	64.30	58.00	51.60	41.40	29.60	24.60	18.80	12.70	7.60	4.20	0
\$480	\$500	67.00	60.70	54.40	44.20	30.80	25.80	20.00	14.00	8.80	5.40	3.20
\$500	\$520	69.80	63.40	57.10	47.00	32.00	27.00	21.20	15.20	10.00	6.60	5.60
\$520	\$540	72.50	66.20	59.80	49.80	33.20	28.20	22.40	16.40	11.20	7.80	8.00
\$540	\$560	75.20	68.90	62.60	52.60	34.40	29.40	23.60	17.60	12.40	9.00	10.40
\$560	\$580	78.00	71.60	65.30	55.40	35.60	30.60	24.80	18.80	13.60	10.20	13.70
\$580	\$600	80.70	74.40	68.00	58.20	36.80	31.80	26.00	20.00	14.80	11.40	17.30
\$600	\$640	84.80	78.50	72.10	62.30	38.90	33.90	27.10	21.10	15.90	12.50	21.50
\$640	\$680	90.30	84.00	77.60	71.30	41.00	36.00	29.20	23.20	17.00	13.60	27.00
\$680	\$720	95.80	89.40	83.10	76.80	43.10	38.10	31.30	25.30	18.10	14.70	32.40
\$720	\$760	101.20	94.80	88.60	82.20	45.20	40.20	33.40	27.40	19.20	15.80	37.90
\$760	\$800	106.70	100.40	94.00	87.70	47.30	42.30	35.50	29.50	20.30	16.90	43.40
\$800	\$840	112.20	105.80	99.50	93.20	49.40	44.40	37.60	31.60	21.40	18.00	48.80
\$840	\$880	117.60	111.30	105.00	98.60	51.50	46.50	39.70	33.70	22.50	19.10	54.30
\$880	\$920	123.10	116.80	110.50	104.10	53.60	48.60	41.80	35.80	23.60	20.20	59.80
\$920	\$960	128.60	122.30	115.90	109.60	55.70	50.70	43.90	37.90	24.70	21.30	65.30
\$960	\$1,000	134.10	127.70	121.40	115.10	57.80	52.80	46.00	40.00	25.80	22.40	70.70
14 percent of the excess over \$1,000 plus												
\$1,000 and over		136.80	130.50	124.10	117.80	111.50	105.10	98.80	92.50	86.10	79.80	73.50

"If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is a daily pay-roll period or a miscellaneous pay-roll period—

And the wages divided by the number of days in such periods are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least	But less than	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of tax to be withheld shall be the following amount multiplied by the number of days in such period										
\$0	\$1.50	12% of wages	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
\$1.50	\$1.75	\$0.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$1.75	\$2.00	.20	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$2.00	\$2.25	.25	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$2.25	\$2.50	.30	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$2.50	\$2.75	.30	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$2.75	\$3.00	.35	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$3.00	\$3.25	.40	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$3.25	\$3.50	.40	.20	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$3.50	\$3.75	.45	.25	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$3.75	\$4.00	.45	.25	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$4.00	\$4.25	.55	.30	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$4.25	\$4.50	.60	.35	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$4.50	\$4.75	.65	.35	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$4.75	\$5.00	.65	.40	.20	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$5.00	\$5.25	.70	.45	.25	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$5.25	\$5.50	.75	.50	.30	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$5.50	\$5.75	.75	.55	.30	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$5.75	\$6.00	.80	.60	.35	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$6.00	\$6.25	.85	.65	.35	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$6.25	\$6.50	.85	.65	.40	.20	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$6.50	\$6.75	.90	.70	.45	.25	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$6.75	\$7.00	.95	.75	.50	.30	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$7.00	\$7.25	.95	.75	.55	.30	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$7.25	\$7.50	1.00	.80	.60	.35	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$7.50	\$7.75	1.05	.85	.65	.35	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$7.75	\$8.00	1.10	.85	.65	.40	.20	.05	0	0	0	0	0
\$8.00	\$8.25	1.10	.90	.70	.45	.25	.05	0	0	0	0	0
\$8.25	\$8.50	1.15	.95	.75	.50	.25	.10	0	0	0	0	0
\$8.50	\$8.75	1.20	.95	.75	.55	.30	.10	0	0	0	0	0
\$8.75	\$9.00	1.20	1.00	.80	.60	.35	.15	0	0	0	0	0
\$9.00	\$9.25	1.25	1.05	.85	.60	.35	.20	0	0	0	0	0
\$9.25	\$9.50	1.30	1.05	.85	.65	.40	.20	.05	0	0	0	0
\$9.50	\$9.75	1.30	1.10	.90	.70	.45	.25	.05	0	0	0	0
\$9.75	\$10.00	1.35	1.15	.95	.75	.50	.25	.10	0	0	0	0
\$10.00	\$10.50	1.40	1.20	1.00	.80	.55	.30	.15	0	0	0	0
\$10.50	\$11.00	1.45	1.25	1.05	.85	.65	.40	.20	0	0	0	0

"If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is a daily pay-roll period or a miscellaneous pay-roll period—Continued

And the wages divided by the number of days in such periods are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
At least	But less than	The amount of tax to be withheld shall be the following amount multiplied by the number of days in such period										
\$11.00	\$11.50	\$1.55	\$1.35	\$1.10	\$0.90	\$0.70	\$0.45	\$0.25	\$0.05	\$0	\$0	\$0
\$11.50	\$12.00	1.60	1.40	1.20	1.00	.75	.55	.30	.15	0	0	0
\$12.00	\$12.50	1.70	1.45	1.25	1.05	.85	.65	.40	.20	0	0	0
\$12.50	\$13.00	1.75	1.55	1.35	1.10	.90	.70	.45	.25	.05	0	0
\$13.00	\$13.50	1.80	1.60	1.40	1.20	1.00	.75	.55	.30	.15	0	0
\$13.50	\$14.00	1.90	1.65	1.45	1.25	1.05	.85	.65	.35	.20	0	0
\$14.00	\$14.50	1.95	1.75	1.55	1.30	1.10	.90	.70	.45	.25	.05	0
\$14.50	\$15.00	2.00	1.80	1.60	1.40	1.20	1.00	.75	.55	.30	.15	0
\$15.00	\$15.50	2.10	1.90	1.65	1.45	1.25	1.05	.85	.65	.35	.20	0
\$15.50	\$16.00	2.15	1.95	1.75	1.55	1.30	1.10	.90	.70	.45	.25	.05
\$16.00	\$16.50	2.20	2.00	1.80	1.60	1.40	1.20	.95	.75	.55	.30	.10
\$16.50	\$17.00	2.30	2.10	1.85	1.65	1.45	1.25	1.05	.85	.65	.35	.20
\$17.00	\$17.50	2.35	2.15	1.95	1.75	1.55	1.30	1.10	.90	.70	.45	.25
\$17.50	\$18.00	2.45	2.20	2.00	1.80	1.60	1.40	1.20	.95	.75	.50	.30
\$18.00	\$18.50	2.50	2.30	2.10	1.85	1.65	1.45	1.25	1.05	.85	.60	.35
\$18.50	\$19.00	2.55	2.35	2.15	1.95	1.75	1.50	1.30	1.10	.90	.70	.45
\$19.00	\$19.50	2.65	2.45	2.20	2.00	1.80	1.60	1.40	1.20	.95	.75	.55
\$19.50	\$20.00	2.70	2.50	2.30	2.10	1.85	1.65	1.45	1.25	1.05	.85	.60
\$20.00	\$20.50	2.80	2.60	2.40	2.20	1.95	1.75	1.55	1.35	1.15	.95	.70
\$20.50	\$21.00	2.95	2.75	2.50	2.30	2.10	1.90	1.70	1.50	1.30	1.05	.85
\$21.00	\$21.50	3.10	2.85	2.65	2.45	2.25	2.05	1.85	1.60	1.40	1.20	1.00
\$21.50	\$22.00	3.20	3.00	2.80	2.60	2.40	2.15	1.95	1.75	1.55	1.35	1.15
\$22.00	\$22.50	3.35	3.15	2.95	2.75	2.50	2.30	2.10	1.90	1.70	1.50	1.25
\$22.50	\$23.00	3.50	3.30	3.05	2.85	2.65	2.45	2.25	2.05	1.80	1.60	1.40
\$23.00	\$23.50	3.65	3.40	3.20	3.00	2.80	2.60	2.40	2.15	1.95	1.75	1.55
\$23.50	\$24.00	3.75	3.55	3.35	3.15	2.95	2.70	2.50	2.30	2.10	1.90	1.70
\$24.00	\$24.50	3.90	3.70	3.50	3.25	3.05	2.85	2.65	2.45	2.25	2.00	1.80
\$24.50	\$25.00	4.05	3.85	3.60	3.40	3.20	3.00	2.80	2.60	2.35	2.15	1.95
14% of the excess over \$30 plus												
\$30.00 and over		4.10	3.90	3.70	3.50	3.25	3.05	2.85	2.65	2.45	2.25	2.00

(c) Effective date: The amendments made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to wages paid on or after July 1, 1947.

SEC. 6. Fiscal year taxpayers. Section 108 of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by striking out "(d)" at the beginning of subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof "(f)", and by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

"(d) Taxable years of individuals beginning in 1946 and ending in 1947: In the case of a taxable year of an individual beginning in 1946 and ending in 1947, the tax imposed by sections 11, 12, and 400 shall be an amount equal to the sum of—

"(1) that portion of a tentative tax, computed as if the law applicable to taxable years beginning on January 1, 1946, were applicable to such taxable year, which the number of days in such taxable year prior to January 1, 1947, bears to the total number of days in such taxable year, plus

"(2) that portion of a tentative tax, computed as if the law applicable to such taxable years beginning on January 1, 1947, were applicable to such taxable year, which the number of days in such taxable year after December 31, 1946, bears to the total number of days in such taxable year.

"(e) Taxable years of individuals beginning in 1947 and ending in 1948: In the case of a taxable year of an individual beginning in 1947 and ending in 1948, the tax imposed by sections 11, 12, and 400 shall be an amount equal to the sum of—

"(1) that portion of a tentative tax, computed as if the law applicable to taxable years beginning on January 1, 1947, were applicable to such taxable year, which the number of days in such taxable year prior to January 1, 1948, bears to the total number of days in such taxable year, plus

"(2) that portion of a tentative tax, computed as if the law applicable to taxable years beginning on January 1, 1948, were applicable to such taxable year, which the number of days in such taxable year after December 31, 1947, bears to the total number of days in such taxable year."

REPORT No. 173

The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce individ-

ual income-tax payments, having had the same under consideration, report favorably thereon, with amendments, and, as amended, recommend that the bill do pass.

I. GENERAL STATEMENT

This bill provides an immediate reduction in individual income taxes. The heavy rates now in effect constitute a serious restriction on consumer expenditures, retard new investment, and inhibit managerial initiative. A general reduction of these rates at the present time would contribute to the maintenance of the existing high levels of employment and output.

The amount of tax reduction possible at this time is limited by the present high level of expenditures and by the need for a reduction in the Federal debt of \$258,000,000,000. With the Senate expenditure ceiling of \$33,000,000,000 for the fiscal year 1948, and estimated receipts of \$41,400,000,000, \$8,400,000,000 will be available for tax reduction and debt retirement. The tax reduction recommended by your committee amounts to \$3,200,000,000 in the fiscal year 1948, leaving \$5,200,000,000 for debt retirement and contingencies.

H. R. 1 as it passed the House provided a reduction which, with income payments of \$170,000,000,000, would amount to \$4,900,000,000 in the fiscal year 1948. Your committee believes that a more conservative reduction should be made at this time. For that reason the bill as amended by your committee provides that only approximately one-half the eventual reduction will be made for the calendar year 1947. The full reduction will be effective in 1948.

All income taxpayers will receive relief under this bill. The largest percentage reduction will be received by taxpayers having incomes of \$1,000 or less, and the smallest relief will be received by persons with incomes of \$302,000 or more. A special exemption of \$500 is given to persons 65 and over who as a group have suffered with unusual severity as a result of the rise in the cost of living and the changes in the tax system since the beginning of the war.

II. SUMMARY OF CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

A comparison of the effective individual income-tax rates under present law, under H. R. 1 as it passed the House, and under

H. R. 1 as amended by your committee is shown in table I. The rates proposed by your committee are shown both for the calendar year 1947 and for the calendar year 1948 and subsequent years.

Table II shows in summary fashion the reductions in taxes under the bill as passed by the House and as amended by your committee.

TABLE I.—A comparison of the effective individual income-tax rates under present law, under H. R. 1 as passed by the House, and under the Senate Finance Committee bill

Net income before personal exemptions	Single persons, no dependents				Married persons, no dependents			
	Present law		Finance Committee bill for—		Present law		Finance Committee bill for—	
	1947	1948 and subsequent years	1947	1948 and subsequent years	1947	1948 and subsequent years	1947	1948 and subsequent years
\$500	3.17	2.22	2.69	2.22	3.17	2.22	2.69	2.22
\$600	5.43	3.80	4.61	3.80	5.43	3.80	4.61	3.80
\$700	6.33	4.43	5.38	4.43	6.33	4.43	5.38	4.43
\$800	7.12	4.99	6.06	4.99	7.12	4.99	6.06	4.99
\$900	8.44	5.91	7.18	5.91	8.44	5.91	7.18	5.91
\$1,000	9.50	6.65	8.08	6.65	9.50	6.65	8.08	6.65
\$1,200	11.08	7.76	9.42	7.76	11.08	7.76	9.42	7.76
\$1,500	12.67	8.87	10.77	8.87	12.67	8.87	10.77	8.87
\$1,600	13.06	9.56	11.34	9.56	13.06	9.56	11.34	9.56
\$1,700	13.41	10.18	11.85	10.18	13.41	10.18	11.85	10.18
\$1,800	13.72	10.72	12.31	10.72	13.72	10.72	12.31	10.72
\$1,900	14.00	11.20	12.60	11.20	14.00	11.20	12.60	11.20
\$2,000	14.25	11.40	12.83	11.40	14.25	11.40	12.83	11.40
\$2,100	14.48	11.58	13.03	11.55	14.48	11.55	13.03	11.55
\$2,200	14.68	11.75	13.21	11.75	14.68	11.75	13.21	11.75
\$2,300	14.87	11.90	13.38	11.90	14.87	11.90	13.38	11.90
\$2,400	15.04	12.03	13.54	12.03	15.04	12.03	13.54	12.03
\$2,500	15.20	12.16	13.68	12.16	15.20	12.16	13.68	12.16
\$3,000	16.15	12.92	14.54	12.92	16.15	12.92	14.54	12.92
\$4,000	17.34	13.87	15.60	13.87	17.34	13.87	15.60	13.87
\$5,000	18.43	14.74	16.59	14.74	18.43	14.74	16.59	14.74
\$6,000	19.47	15.68	17.53	15.58	19.47	15.58	17.42	15.48
\$7,000	20.49	16.59	18.44	16.39	20.49	16.39	18.44	16.39
\$8,000	21.49	17.20	19.34	17.20	21.49	17.20	19.34	17.20
\$9,000	22.48	17.99	20.24	17.99	22.48	17.99	20.24	17.99
\$10,000	23.47	18.77	21.12	18.77	23.47	18.77	21.12	18.77
\$11,000	24.44	19.55	22.00	19.55	24.44	19.55	22.00	19.55
\$12,000	25.41	20.33	22.87	20.33	25.41	20.33	22.87	20.33

TABLE I.—A comparison of the effective individual income-tax rates under present law, under H. R. 1 as passed by the House, and under the Senate Finance Committee bill—Continued

Net income before personal exemptions	Single person, no dependents				Married person, no dependents			
	Present law		Finance Committee bill for—		Present law		Finance Committee bill for—	
	H. R. 1 as passed by House		1948 and subsequent years		Present law		Finance Committee bill for—	
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
\$13,000	26.42	21.13	23.78	21.13	24.85	19.88	22.36	19.88
\$14,000	27.45	21.96	24.70	21.96	25.99	20.79	23.39	20.79
\$15,000	28.47	22.77	25.62	22.77	26.98	21.58	24.28	21.58
\$20,000	33.23	26.58	29.90	26.58	31.97	25.57	28.77	25.57
\$25,000	37.45	29.96	33.70	29.96	35.33	29.06	32.70	29.06
\$30,000	40.88	32.71	36.79	32.71	39.90	31.92	35.91	31.92
\$40,000	46.06	36.85	41.46	36.85	45.26	36.40	42.36	36.40
\$50,000	50.27	40.22	45.25	40.22	49.59	39.67	46.63	39.67
\$60,000	53.75	43.00	48.37	43.00	53.15	42.52	49.84	42.52

TABLE I.—A comparison of the effective individual income-tax rates under present law, under H. R. 1 as passed by the House, and under the Senate Finance Committee bill—Continued

Net income before personal exemptions	Single person, no dependents				Married person, no dependents			
	Present law		Finance Committee bill for—		Present law		Finance Committee bill for—	
	H. R. 1 as passed by House		1947		Present law		Finance Committee bill for—	
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
\$70,000	56.63	45.31	50.97	45.31	56.10	44.88	50.47	44.88
\$80,000	59.16	47.32	53.24	47.32	58.67	46.94	52.81	46.94
\$90,000	61.43	49.15	55.52	49.15	60.99	48.79	55.11	48.79
\$100,000	63.54	50.83	57.61	50.83	63.13	50.57	57.23	50.57
\$150,000	70.54	56.43	64.51	56.43	70.26	56.26	64.25	56.26
\$200,000	74.28	59.42	68.18	59.42	74.06	59.25	68.98	59.25
\$250,000	76.71	61.37	70.56	61.37	76.54	61.23	70.40	61.23
\$300,000	78.33	62.67	72.14	62.67	78.19	62.55	72.01	62.55
\$400,000	80.36	66.28	74.57	66.28	80.25	66.18	74.67	66.18

TABLE I.—A comparison of the effective individual income-tax rates under present law, under H. R. 1 as passed by the House, and under the Senate Finance Committee bill—Continued

Net income before personal exemptions	Single person, no dependents				Married person, no dependents			
	Present law		Finance Committee bill for—		Present law		Finance Committee bill for—	
	H. R. 1 as passed by House		1947		Present law		Finance Committee bill for—	
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
\$500,000	81.58	68.49	76.04	68.49	81.49	68.41	75.95	70.31
\$750,000	83.20	71.44	77.99	71.44	83.15	71.39	77.94	72.66
\$1,000,000	84.01	72.92	78.96	72.92	83.97	72.88	78.93	73.83
\$2,000,000	85.23	75.14	80.43	75.14	85.21	75.12	80.41	75.59
\$5,000,000	85.50	76.46	81.00	76.46	85.50	76.46	81.00	76.50

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

TABLE II.—A comparison of the reduction in individual income taxes provided by H. R. 1 as it passed the House and as amended by the Senate Finance Committee

Persons with surtax net income of—	Reduction in tax under H. R. 1	
	As passed by House, calendar years 1947 and 1948	As amended by the Senate Finance Committee
		Calendar year 1947
\$0 to \$1,000	30 percent	15 percent
\$1,000 to \$1,400 ¹	30 percent to 20 percent	15 percent to 10 percent
\$1,400 ¹ to \$79,700 ²	20 percent	10 percent
\$79,700 ² to \$302,400 ³	20 percent	7.5 percent ³ above \$79,700 ²
\$302,400 ³ and over	10.5 percent ⁴ above \$302,400 ³	5.3 percent ⁴ above \$302,400 ³

¹ The exact breaking point in surtax net income under the House bill and as provided by your committee for 1948 is \$1,395.83 and for 1947 under the bill as amended by your committee it is \$1,327.60.
² The exact breaking point in surtax net income under the bill as amended by your committee is \$79,728.40.
³ The exact breaking point in surtax net income under both the House bill and the bill as amended by your committee is \$302,395.60.
⁴ The exact percentage is between 10.52 percent and 10.53 percent.
⁵ The exact percentage is between 7.36 percent and 7.37 percent.
⁶ The exact percentage is between 5.26 percent and 5.27 percent.
 Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

The changes in existing individual income-tax law provided by H. R. 1 as amended by your committee are listed below. A somewhat more detailed description can be found in part VI of this report.

A. The present tax burdens of individuals are reduced as shown below. The great mass of wage earners will experience the benefit of the full reduction during the whole of the second half of the calendar year 1947, since under your committee bill withholding from wages at rates reflecting the full reduction starts on July 1, 1947. The committee bill will thus obviate the necessity for making refunds on that part of the 1947 tax which was collected or will be collected during the first 6 months of the calendar year 1947. However, since it is impracticable to split an income-tax year, the reductions actually computed under the bill for the full calendar year 1947 are approximately one-half those of subsequent years.

1. The tax on surtax net incomes of \$1,000 or less is reduced in the calendar year 1947 by 15 percent and in the calendar year 1948 by 30 percent. The reduction provided by the House amounted to 30 percent for both 1947 and 1948.

2. The tax on surtax net incomes of \$1,000 to about \$1,400 is reduced for the calendar year 1947 by an amount varying from 15 percent to 10 percent and for the calendar year 1948 by an amount varying from 30 percent to 20 percent. The reduction provided by the House varied from 30 percent to 20 percent for both 1947 and 1948.

3. The tax on surtax net incomes of about \$1,400 to about \$80,000 is reduced for the calendar year 1947 by 10 percent and for the calendar year 1948 by 20 percent. The reduction provided by the House amounted to 20 percent for both 1947 and 1948.

4. The tax on surtax net incomes of about \$80,000 to about \$302,000 is reduced for the calendar year 1947 by 10 percent on approximately the first \$80,000 for surtax net income and by about 7.5 percent on the remainder; for the calendar year 1948 by 20 percent on approximately the first \$80,000 of surtax net income and by 15 percent on the remainder. The reduction provided by the House amounted to 20 percent for both 1947 and 1948, the same reduction as that provided for persons with incomes between \$1,400 and \$80,000.

5. The tax on surtax net incomes of about \$302,000 and over is reduced for the calendar year 1947 by 10 percent on approximately the first \$80,000 of surtax net income, by about 7.5 percent on approximately the next \$223,000 of surtax net income, and by about 5.25 percent on the remainder; for the calendar year 1948 by 20 percent on approximately the first \$80,000 of surtax net income, by 15 percent on approximately the next \$223,000 of surtax net income, and by about 10.5 percent on the remainder. The reduction provided by the House for both 1947 and 1948 amounted to 20 percent on about the first \$302,000 of surtax net income and about 10.5 percent on the remainder.

B. Persons of 65 or over are given an additional exemption of \$500 beginning in 1947. The House bill provided a similar exemption for taxpayers 65 and over but required individuals who qualified for it to include in their gross income the first \$500 of any pensions, annuities, or officers' retirement pay which otherwise would not have been subject to tax under existing law. The latter requirement was omitted from the Senate bill.

III. THE FISCAL OUTLOOK FOR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN 1947 AND 1948

1. Fiscal year 1947

The fiscal outlook of the Federal Government for the year ending June 30, 1947, has undergone considerable change since the President submitted his budget message on January 3. That message contained a forecast of receipts for the fiscal year 1947 of \$40,230,000,000, expenditures of \$42,523,000,000, and a deficit of \$2,293,000,000. However, subsequent collection and expenditure experience made it clear that in the budget message revenues had been underestimated and expenditures overestimated. This was confirmed by the President in a press release on April 19, 1947, containing the prediction that there would be a surplus of \$1,250,000,000. In going from a deficit of \$2,293,000,000 to a surplus of \$1,250,000,000, the President revised his revenue estimates upward by \$2,270,000,000 to \$12,500,000,000 and his expenditures downward by \$1,273,000,000 to

\$41,250,000,000. The committee requested the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to make an independent estimate of collections in the fiscal year 1947. The results indicated that even the revised Treasury estimate of receipts is probably about \$1,000,000,000 too low and that the surplus for the fiscal year 1947 is likely to be about \$2,300,000,000.

The surplus in 1947 is significant for at least two reasons. First, it has been argued that tax reduction should be postponed until it is possible to balance the budget and make some payment on the debt. The estimated surplus for 1947 indicates that these conditions will be met even before the fiscal year 1948 begins.

Second, the conditions which produced the high level of receipts for fiscal 1947 will favorably affect collections in the fiscal year 1948. The administration has indicated that a record high level of income payments in the latter part of the calendar year 1946 and forepart of calendar 1947 was a major reason for the unanticipated increase in receipts in the fiscal year 1947. Since a substantial portion of the receipts from the individual income tax and a still larger portion of those from the corporate income tax for any given year are based on the tax liabilities of the prior year, it is clear that even if income levels in the fiscal year 1948 are no higher than estimated by the Treasury, receipts in the fiscal year 1948 are certain to be above the Treasury's estimate as submitted in the budget message. That estimate was based upon the assumption that income payments for the calendar year 1947 were \$166,000,000,000. As a matter of fact the official estimate of income payments for the first quarter of the calendar year 1947 is \$176,900,000,000. This does not take into account the wage adjustments which are now being made. It therefore appears unlikely that the April, May, and June levels will be much lower. Hence the Treasury forecast of \$166,000,000,000 for the calendar year 1947 appears to be considerably too low.

This bill as amended will have no significant effect on tax collections in the fiscal year 1947.

2. Fiscal year 1948

Table III shows the effects of H. R. 1 as passed by the House and as amended by your committee upon the budget of the Federal Government in the fiscal year 1948, under two different assumptions concerning income payments:

TABLE III.—The effect of H. R. 1 on the budget of the Federal Government in the fiscal year 1948

	[In billions of dollars]	
	\$165 billion ¹	\$170 billion ¹
1. Net receipts.....	40.3	41.4
2. Expenditures under Senate ceiling.....	33.0	33.0
3. Estimated surplus (No. 1 minus No. 2).....	7.3	8.4
4. Effect of H. R. 1 as passed by the House.....	4.8	4.9
5. Estimated surplus after effect of House bill (No. 3 minus No. 4).....	2.5	3.5
6. Effect of Senate Finance Committee bill.....	3.1	3.2
7. Estimated surplus after effect of Senate Finance Committee bill (No. 3 minus No. 6).....	4.2	5.2

¹ Income payments in the first 6 months of calendar 1947 are assumed to be \$176,000,000,000.

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

For purposes of the legislative budget the Senate expenditure ceiling for the fiscal year 1948 is \$33,000,000,000. With income payments at \$170,000,000,000, receipts under present law are estimated at \$41,400,000,000. This leaves a surplus of \$8,400,000,000. With income payments of \$170,000,000,000, H. R. 1 as amended by your committee will reduce revenues by \$3,200,000,000, leaving \$5,200,000,000 for debt retirement and contingencies. H. R. 1 as passed by the House would leave \$3,500,000,000 for these purposes.

With the expenditure ceiling of \$33,000,000,000 fixed by the Senate, substantial debt retirement and the tax reduction provided by your committee would be possible even if income payments in the fiscal year 1948 should be as low as \$165,000,000,000. At this level of income payments, receipts under present law would be \$40,300,000,000. The loss under H. R. 1 as amended would be \$3,100,000,000, leaving \$4,200,000,000 for debt retirement and contingencies. On this same basis H. R. 1 as it passed the House would leave \$2,500,000,000 for these purposes.

By unanimous action the Senate has endorsed a debt reduction of \$2,600,000,000 for the fiscal year 1948. Your committee believes that H. R. 1 as amended will give more adequate assurance that the debt reduction of \$2,600,000,000 will be realized. The bill is fashioned to meet the Senate view on debt and expenditure reduction.

Your committee believes that the estimate of the receipts for the fiscal year 1948 should be based upon a level of income payments of \$170,000,000,000. This represents a decrease of about \$7,000,000,000 from the current level. The estimate of \$170,000,000,000 represents a conservative position. Allowances are made for some downturn in business, moderate price reductions, and some reduction in employment.

This forecast of \$170,000,000,000 for income payments in the fiscal year 1948 can be compared with an estimate of \$168,000,000,000 used by the Treasury Department in the preparation of its revenue estimates for this year. However, there is a great difference between your committee's judgment of what \$170,000,000,000 would mean in terms of business conditions and the Treasury's interpretation of its \$168,000,000,000 figure. The Treasury believes the latter represents full employment in an absolute sense. This is indicated by the Secretary's statement that there will be no room for expansion in the volume of output of goods and services during the fiscal year 1948.

As noted above, income payments during the first quarter of the calendar year 1947 were \$176,900,000,000. When confronted with the question as to why a continuance of the present levels of employment and output would not produce income payments in the fiscal year 1948 of at least \$176,000,000,000, the Secretary replied that price reductions were anticipated. This reduction in selling prices, combined with the Secretary's assumption that no expansion in volume of output was possible, enabled him to conclude that a level of income payments of \$168,000,000,000 was consistent with a forecast of full employment and maximum production.

Other statements inserted in the testimony of Dr. Haas, Director of the Division of Research and Statistics of the Treasury Department, imply that the price cuts which the Secretary has in mind will take place before the end of the present fiscal year. On page 58 of the hearings the following statement appears:

"The income level in June 1948 was assumed to reach an annual rate of \$169,000,000,000, rising gradually through the fiscal year."

If income payments are to reach an annual rate in June 1948 of \$169,000,000,000, and

average \$168,000,000,000 for the period July 1947 to June 1948, and "rise gradually" during this same period, it is inevitable that the level in July 1947 must be \$167,000,000,000. This means that the level of income payments must drop by about \$10,000,000,000 between May 1947 and July 1947. The Secretary's testimony indicates that this will take place as a result of price cuts and that there will be no untoward repercussions in employment or the volume of business activity.¹

In the opinion of your committee the Secretary's forecast has certain weaknesses. The economy is not as fully employed as the Secretary seems to believe. Unemployment as reported by the Department of Commerce is running now at about 2,400,000 persons. This compares with 650,000 persons during the autumn of 1944, when it can reasonably be said that the economy was fully employed in a fairly absolute sense. Moreover, since the fall of 1944, the average weekly hours of workers in manufacturing industry have dropped from 45 to 40. In the opinion of your committee there is more room for expansion in the volume of output than the Secretary seems to believe.

The Secretary's assumption that substantial cuts in prices will take place in the immediate future is open to question on several grounds. First the price-cut program is a voluntary one which to date at least has not been generally accepted. Therefore its future effectiveness certainly is not assured. Second, the Secretary seems to believe that the price-cutting program can be realized in spite of the wage increases which are now being made. The validity of this assumption is by no means obvious. Third, the Secretary's belief that a general price reduction can occur without raising the level of production is based on what your committee considers an unsound premise; namely, that we have reached an absolute maximum volume of output. Fourth, if general price reduction should be accomplished without increasing the volume of output, it appears likely that the additional funds in the hands of the consumers, would result in prices being bid up again. The committee is unwilling to rely exclusively on price cutting in trying to prevent deflation.

If your committee believed it advisable to base its estimates for the fiscal year 1948 on the continuance of the present levels of employment and output, as the Secretary of the

¹ Your committee has difficulty reconciling the Secretary's opinion that this price adjustment can take place without a recession with certain other implications of his testimony. The Secretary forecast a level of income payments of \$166,000,000,000 for the calendar year 1947. Income payments during the first quarter of this calendar year were about \$177,000,000,000 at an annual rate. Therefore the remaining three quarters must average \$162,000,000,000. Dr. Haas' statement cited above implies that the income payments during the last half of this calendar year must average between \$167,000,000,000 and \$168,000,000,000. This leaves only the second quarter of the year unaccounted for. To arrive at the average of \$166,000,000,000 for the full year, it is necessary to have an average level of income payments during the second quarter of about \$153,000,000,000. Since the quarter will begin at a level around \$177,000,000,000, an average for the quarter of \$153,000,000,000 requires a low point during the quarter of between \$120,000,000,000 and \$130,000,000,000. The drop from \$177,000,000,000 to \$120,000,000,000, or \$130,000,000,000 within the space of 1 or 2 months is clearly inconsistent with the Secretary's notion that the only readjustment called for is in selling prices.

Treasury has done, it would forecast income payment estimates for the fiscal year 1948 of between \$175,000,000,000 and \$180,000,000,000.

IV. SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED REVENUE EFFECT OF TAX REDUCTION

With an income payment level of \$170,000,000,000, individual income tax liabilities under your committee's bill are estimated at about \$13,700,000,000 on the basis of the full-rate reduction, or \$15,600,000,000 with half of the full-rate reduction.² The "half" reduction is effective for calendar year 1947 and the "full" reduction for 1948 and subsequent calendar years. This represents a liability reduction from present law of about \$2,100,000,000 in the case of the "half" reduction and \$4,000,000,000 with the "full" reduction.³ On the basis of income payments of \$170,000,000,000, H. R. 1 as it passed the House would reduce the liabilities under present law by about \$4,000,000,000. Table IV shows the changes in liabilities resulting from the House and Finance Committee bills with income payments of \$170,000,000,000 and \$165,000,000,000. Tables showing the distribution of liabilities among different income groups are shown in part VII of this report.

TABLE IV.—Estimated individual income-tax liability under present law, H. R. 1 as it passed the House, and the Senate Finance Committee bill

[In billions of dollars]

Level of income payments assumed ¹	Estimated liability under—				Reduction in liability under—			
	Present law		Senate Finance Committee bill		Present law		Senate Finance Committee bill	
	H. R. 1 as passed by the House ²	Half-rate reduction ³	Full-rate reduction ⁴	H. R. 1 as passed by the House	Half-rate reduction ³	Full-rate reduction ⁴	H. R. 1 as passed by the House	Full-rate reduction ⁴
\$165.....	\$16.9	\$13.0	\$14.9	\$3.8	\$2.0	\$3.8	\$2.0	\$3.8
\$170.....	17.8	13.7	15.6	4.0	2.1	4.0	2.1	4.0

¹ The liability estimates are shown uniformly on income payment levels of \$165,000,000,000 and \$170,000,000,000 for comparative purposes only. They do not represent forecasts for the periods involved.

² Effective in 1947 and subsequent years.

³ About one-half of the rate reduction and all of the increase in exemptions is made effective in the calendar year 1947.

⁴ The full reduction in rates is effective in calendar year 1948 and subsequent years. This reduction is somewhat smaller than that provided under H. R. 1 as passed by the House, but when the data are rounded the differences disappear.

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

The proposed tax reduction expressed on a liability basis indicates the decrease in the obligations incurred by taxpayers during the year. The reduction expressed on a collection basis indicates the actual loss in the receipts of the Government during that year. The former is useful in illustrating the ultimate effect of the reduction. The latter is necessary to determine the immediate effect of the reduction on the Federal Budget.

Table V presents the effects of the tax reduction proposed by the House and by your committee on a collection basis for the fiscal year 1948 under different assumptions of income payments. For the purposes of this

² Both figures are shown on an income payment level of \$170,000,000 for comparative purposes.

³ Although the rate reduction is halved in 1947, the additional exemption is not. Thus the reduction in liabilities in 1948 is not quite twice the reduction in 1947.

report it is assumed that the level of income payments in the first half of the calendar year 1947 will be \$176,000,000,000, and in the fiscal year 1948, \$170,000,000,000. On this basis, it is estimated that your committee's bill will reduce collections in the fiscal year 1948 by \$3,200,000,000. The bill as passed by the House would reduce collections (or increase refunds) by \$4,900,000,000.

TABLE V.—Comparison of the effect of H. R. 1 as it passed the House with the Senate Finance Committee bill on fiscal year 1948 collections

[In billions of dollars]

Level of income payments in billions of dollars in—	Reduction in collections and increase in refunds in the fiscal year 1948 under—		Excess of budgetary loss under H. R. 1 as it passed the House over loss under Senate Finance Committee bill
	H. R. 1 as it passed the House	Senate Finance Committee bill	
The first half of calendar 1947			
Fiscal year 1948			
\$165.....	\$165.....	\$4.6	\$2.9
\$176.....	\$165.....	4.8	3.1
\$176.....	\$170.....	4.9	3.2

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation

The chief reason for the greater reduction in collections (or increase in refunds) under the House bill is the fact that it makes the full reduction effective for the entire calendar year 1947. Your committee's bill has approximately the same effect as providing the reduction for only the last half of the calendar year 1947.

With minor exceptions, the collections made in the fiscal year 1948 are composed of part of the liabilities incurred in the fiscal year 1947, and part of the liabilities incurred in the fiscal year 1948. Similarly, part of the reduction in the fiscal year 1947 liabilities, and part of the reduction in the fiscal year 1948 liabilities, are reflected in lower collections in the fiscal year 1948. On the other hand, part of the reduction in liability in the fiscal year 1947 is reflected in lower collections in the fiscal year 1947, and part of the reduction in the fiscal year 1948 liabilities is reflected in lower collections in the fiscal year 1949.

The estimates presented above do not take into consideration the stimulating effect which this bill will have upon the economy. As a result, it appears likely that the revenue losses involved have been overstated.

V. GENERAL DISCUSSION OF RECOMMENDED INDIVIDUAL INCOME-TAX REDUCTIONS

1. Why a tax reduction is needed now

Much of the discussion in your committee's hearings was concerned with the problem of whether a tax reduction is appropriate at the present time. This discussion was concerned with the economic effects of a tax reduction and its implications with respect to debt retirement.

A tax reduction at the present time should appear particularly desirable to those who hold the view that a down-turn in business conditions is likely during the fiscal year 1948.

There is a good deal of uncertainty among those holding this view as to whether the downturn will begin shortly or whether some time will elapse before the turning point is reached. In any case a tax reduction will be a hedge against recession and cumulative deflation, and should be enacted now. A tax reduction cannot become fully effective until some time after the legislation is enacted. In the hearings before the House Ways and

Means Committee, the Secretary of the Treasury suggested that it takes 12 months for the full economic effects of a tax reduction to be realized. It should be noted that this lag in the economic effectiveness of a tax reduction means that even if inflationary factors, due to temporary shortages of materials and manpower, should continue to be important in the next few months, they would not be aggravated by a tax reduction now.

Moreover, those who predict some recession should keep in mind that Congress might not be in session if the downturn in business conditions occurred or action by Congress might of necessity be delayed. This, combined with the lag in the economic effectiveness of a tax reduction, suggests that its postponement might well mean that no counteractive tax measures could be taken until a drastic deflation was well under way.

It is argued by some that no matter how large the surplus in the fiscal year 1948 turns out to be, all of it should be used for debt-retirement purposes. Your committee attempted vainly to obtain an expression of opinion from the Secretary of the Treasury on this issue. While debt retirement is highly desirable from the point of view of maintaining the credit status of the Government, it must not be forgotten that one short-run effect of this action is to reduce consumer purchasing power. When the economy appears to be in danger of receding from a high level of operation, a very large debt retirement carried out during a short period of time may well be a major factor in precipitating a recession. For this reason it appears desirable to make a contribution to the credit status of the Government by carrying out a substantial amount of debt retirement in the fiscal year 1948, and also to provide against a recession in business conditions by a concurrent tax reduction. The latter will not only offset the loss of consumer purchasing power inherent in the debt-retirement process, but also stimulate the investment and managerial efforts of the business community which are essential to the continuance of the present levels of production and employment.

2. Why the reduction should be made in the industrial income tax

Your committee agrees with the House Ways and Means Committee that it is desirable to concentrate any reduction which can be made at this time in the individual income tax. Only through the individual income tax is it possible to give relief to all persons bearing heavy tax burdens.

Furthermore, a reduction in the individual income tax is the only way in which a reduction can be made in a single tax which will both increase consumer purchasing power and stimulate investment and managerial initiative.

3. Why the type of reduction provided in this bill was selected

The reduction in the individual income tax should be made in a fashion which is economically desirable. It should be effective in increasing purchasing power and stimulating venture capital and managerial initiative.

The additional income placed in the hands of the consumers by this bill will act as a check on any recession that may be forecast for the fiscal year 1948, and will tend to offset the reduction in consumer purchasing power which is involved in the debt-retirement operation. The importance of the effect of this bill on consumer purchasing power is shown in table VI, which indicates that 64 percent of the reduction will be given to persons with incomes of \$5,000 or less, the primary source of consumer purchasing power.

TABLE VI.—Estimated percentage distribution of the individual income-tax liability and taxpayers under present law, and of total tax reduction under the House bill, and your committee's bill with a full year's reduction in tax (with assumed income payments of \$170,000,000,000)

Net income class	Percentage distribution of—			
	Total taxpayers	Total tax paid under present law	Total reduction under—	
			House bill	Finance Committee bill
\$0 to \$2,000.....	52.7	17.5	24.0	24.5
\$2,000 to \$5,000.....	43.4	39.3	38.5	39.5
\$5,000 to \$10,000.....	2.6	8.2	7.5	7.6
\$10,000 to \$25,000.....	1.1	12.0	10.6	10.7
\$25,000 and over.....	.2	23.0	19.4	17.7
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

Your committee also is impressed with the long-run need for a stimulus to investment and managerial initiative. The extent of the stimulus provided by H. R. 1 as amended can best be seen by examining the proposed reduction in marginal tax rates; i. e., the rates on the top dollar of income received. In deciding whether or not to make a new investment or to take on added managerial responsibilities, it is these marginal rates with which the investor or manager will be concerned. They determine the additional tax he will have to pay on any additional income which he receives.

Table VII shows that the marginal tax rates are substantially lower under the bill than under existing law. For example, in 1948 an individual already having surtax net income of \$18,000 will be taxed at 40 percent on additional income under the bill, rather than 50 percent as under present law. It is believed that this will make him less hesitant in assuming the risks of new investment. Similarly, an individual with a surtax net income of \$100,000 will be more likely to make an investment if the additional return is taxed at 72 percent rather than at the 85 percent provided by existing law. It is believed that the reduced marginal rates also will have the effect of encouraging business managers to take on added responsibilities and work harder to make their businesses a success.

The amount of spendable income remaining after paying taxes is another measure of the effect of taxes on investment and managerial incentives. Table XI in part VII shows the spendable income left after taxes at various levels and the percent this is of income before taxes under both present law and your committee's bill. For example, a single individual with a net income of \$20,000 under present law retains about 67 percent of this income after paying taxes, and in 1948 under your committee's bill about 73 percent. A single individual with a net income of \$70,000 under present law has about 43 percent of his income left after paying his taxes, and in 1948 under your committee's bill 55 percent. The small percentage of net income left after taxes under existing law so reduces the advantage of making risky new investments or exercising managerial initiative as to serve as a strong deterrent to the maintenance of a high level of business activity. Under your committee's bill the taxpayer retains a larger portion of his income after taxes. This constitutes the first major step toward the removal of the deterrents to investment and initiative in present law.

TABLE VII.—Comparison between the marginal rates of the individual income tax under present law, the House bill, and the Senate Finance Committee bill

Surtax net income		Marginal rates			
From—	To—	Present law	House bill	Finance Committee bill	
				1947	1948 and subsequent years
\$0.....	\$1,000.....	19.0	13.3	16.1	13.3
\$1,000.....	\$1,400 ¹	19.0	(3)	(3)	(3)
\$1,400 ¹	\$2,000.....	19.0	15.2	17.1	15.2
\$2,000.....	\$4,000.....	20.9	16.7	18.8	16.7
\$4,000.....	\$6,000.....	24.7	19.8	22.2	19.8
\$6,000.....	\$8,000.....	28.5	22.8	25.6	22.8
\$8,000.....	\$10,000.....	32.3	25.8	29.1	25.8
\$10,000.....	\$12,000.....	36.1	28.9	32.5	28.9
\$12,000.....	\$14,000.....	40.9	32.7	36.8	32.7
\$14,000.....	\$16,000.....	44.7	35.8	40.2	35.7
\$16,000.....	\$18,000.....	47.5	38.0	42.8	38.0
\$18,000.....	\$20,000.....	50.4	40.3	45.3	40.3
\$20,000.....	\$22,000.....	53.2	42.6	47.9	42.6
\$22,000.....	\$26,000.....	56.1	44.8	50.4	44.8
\$26,000.....	\$32,000.....	58.9	47.1	53.0	47.1
\$32,000.....	\$38,000.....	61.8	49.4	55.6	49.4
\$38,000.....	\$44,000.....	65.6	52.5	59.0	52.4
\$44,000.....	\$50,000.....	68.4	54.7	61.6	54.7
\$50,000.....	\$60,000.....	71.3	57.0	64.1	57.0
\$60,000.....	\$70,000.....	74.1	59.3	66.7	59.3
\$70,000.....	\$79,700 ⁴	77.0	61.6	69.3	61.6
\$79,700 ⁴	\$80,000.....	77.0	61.6	71.3	65.4
\$80,000.....	\$90,000.....	79.8	63.8	73.9	67.8
\$90,000.....	\$100,000.....	82.7	66.2	76.6	70.3
\$100,000.....	\$150,000.....	84.6	67.7	78.3	71.9
\$150,000.....	\$200,000.....	85.5	68.4	79.2	72.7
\$200,000.....	\$302,400 ⁵	86.5	69.2	80.1	73.5
\$302,400 ⁵ and over ⁶		86.5	77.3	81.9	77.3

¹ The exact breaking point in surtax net income under the House bill and as provided by your committee for 1948 is \$1,395.83. Under the bill as amended by your committee the breaking point for 1947 is \$1,327.60.

² Incomes in this bracket receive a flat reduction of 167 from the tentative tax.

³ Incomes in this bracket receive a flat reduction of \$38.50 from the tentative tax.

⁴ The exact breaking point in surtax net income under the bill as amended by your committee is \$79,728.40.

⁵ The exact breaking point in surtax net income under both the House bill and the bill as amended by your committee is \$302,395.60.

⁶ It should be borne in mind that the tax is subject to a ceiling of 81.5 percent of surtax net income under existing law, 76.5 percent under the House bill and under the Finance Committee's bill in 1948 and subsequent years, and 81 percent in 1947 under the Finance Committee bill.

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

The need for stimulating managerial incentives and the investment of venture capital is a major reason for the proposed reduction in the taxes of individuals in the middle and upper brackets. The decisions of the executives who receive relative large salaries are of greatest importance with reference to the development of industrial production. The savings of the middle and upper-bracket-income recipients are the principal sources of the venture capital for business expansion.

A study by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for the year 1941⁴ brings out the fact that the great bulk of the relatively speculative business investments are made by individuals with incomes of \$10,000 and over. Individuals with such incomes accounted for no less than 89 percent of the investments in stocks, bonds, and unincorporated business made by the entire group covered in the study. Persons with smaller incomes not only save relatively little,⁵ but are apt to keep what they do save in cash, Government bonds, insurance policies, savings accounts, etc. They cannot

⁴ U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics bulletin No. 822, Family Spending and Saving in Wartime.

⁵ The BLS study indicated that 74 percent of the total saving was done by persons with incomes of \$10,000 and over.

afford to assume the additional risks which speculative investments entail.

4. Why the full reduction was not allowed for the calendar year 1947

H. R. 1 as it passed the House provided for a retroactive tax reduction effective January 1, 1947. Your committee has amended the bill in a manner which roughly has the same effect as making the reduction on July 1, 1947. Stated more accurately your committee amended the bill to provide a reduction for the entire calendar year 1947 which is one-half as large as the reduction provided for the calendar year 1948. It is provided that the withholding tables set up in the House version of this bill shall go into effect July 1, 1947.

The principal reason for this amendment to the House bill is that it reduces the budgetary effect of H. R. 1 in the fiscal year 1948. Under the House version of the bill the revenue loss, in the form of reduced collections and increased refunds, would amount to \$4,900,000,000 with income payments at \$170,000,000,000. Under the bill as amended by your committee, the reduction for the fiscal year 1948 with the same income payments, will amount to \$3,200,000,000.

This amendment will also eliminate the necessity for most of the tax refunds which would have occurred in the fiscal year 1948 as a result of the enactment of the House bill. A reduction which is retroactive to January 1, 1947, results in an overpayment of the tax due during the time intervening between January 1 and the date when the new withholding tables used in collecting the tax go into effect. It has been estimated that the resulting additional refunds would amount to \$450,000,000. The method of reduction recommended by your committee would practically eliminate such refunds.

The stimulus to business which this bill brings results from the additional incentive to managerial initiative and the investment of venture capital. This stimulus consists primarily of the knowledge that from now on the net return allowed on a successful venture and the net reward paid for outstanding managerial achievement is going to be substantially greater than in the past. While the refunds provided by the retroactive feature are considerable, they occur only once and hence offer no continuing stimulus to plans for future investment or managerial action.

5. Why an exemption is needed for persons aged 65 and over

Your committee's bill introduces an additional exemption of \$500 for each person who attained the age of 65 before the end of the taxable year. The exemption will benefit 3,700,000 taxpayers and will remove 1,400,000 persons from the rolls. The heavy concentration of small incomes among such persons reflects the fact that as a group they are handicapped in an economic if not in a physical sense. They have suffered with unusual severity as a result of the 54-percent rise in the cost of living and the changes in the tax system which have occurred since the beginning of the war. Unlike younger persons, the bulk of those who have attained the age of 65 were unable to compensate for price and tax changes during recent years by accepting full-time jobs at prevailing high rates of wages. For these reasons your committee believes that special relief is warranted at this time for persons who have attained the age of 65.

At the hearings on this bill the Secretary of the Treasury did not oppose the giving of special relief to persons aged 65 or over but argued that the appropriate method of doing so would be action under the Social Security Act. It is worth noting that the coverage of the social-security legislation is by no means universal. Relief under it would not

extend to a great number of the people over 65 who now find themselves in an unusually straitened condition.

The Treasury has taken exception to the special exemption for persons aged 65 or over on the ground that it constitutes class legislation. It is difficult to see how the Treasury can take this view after having indicated it is studying the following types of class legislation: individual income tax exemptions, the treatment of family incomes, the taxation of pensions and annuities, the earned income credit, the special taxation of capital gains and losses, the taxation of small business, the double taxation of dividends, the taxation of American corporations doing business abroad, the taxation of co-operatives and other tax-exempt organizations, the 2-percent tax on consolidated returns, and the 85-percent credit for inter-corporate dividends received.

The \$500 exemption for all persons in this age group appears to be a more appropriate method of bringing relief than an extension of the system of exclusions for the benefit of particular types of income used under existing law. Certain persons who have attained the age of 65 are already benefiting by these exclusions. For instance, the annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act and the pay of Army and Navy officers retired by reason of medical survey have been excluded from gross income in full by statutory enactment. Benefits under the old-age and survivors' insurance system or the Social Security Act have been excluded by a Treasury decision. The presence of exclusions of this type has brought an insistent demand for the exten-

sion of similar treatment to other types of retirement income, such as the pensions and annuities received by former employees of State and local governments, retired school teachers, and beneficiaries under the civil-service retirement fund of the Federal Government. Your committee recognizes that existing exclusions work a discrimination against persons having attained the age of 65 who are receiving other types of income, but, believes that a general exemption of \$500 for all taxpayers in this group is preferable to the piecemeal extension of exclusions for the benefit of particular types of income.

H. R. 1 as passed by the House contained a provision which in effect was intended to keep persons receiving more than \$500 of certain types of excludable income from obtaining the benefits of the new \$500 exemption. The House bill required a taxpayer who qualified for the new \$500 exemption to include in his gross income an amount up to \$500 received during the taxable year from certain pensions, annuities, or retirement pay which, but for this bill, would have been excluded in full from gross income. Your committee is in complete accord with the general objective of this provision.

However, due to the difficulty of determining the types of exempt income covered by this provision and the administrative difficulties raised by the Treasury, it was deemed advisable to defer action on this problem to a later bill. The committee is of the opinion that some remedy for the dis-

crimination now existing between recipients of various types of retirement income must be found, and will consider this matter fully in connection with the next general revenue bill. The allowance of the additional \$500 exemption for persons over 65 may well constitute a sufficient basis for removing the exclusions provided under existing law and Treasury rulings.

H. R. 1, as it passed the House, provided that the special exemption for persons aged 65 or over was to be allowed only with respect to persons whose gross income was \$500 or more. This feature of the House bill involves substantial inequity. This can be shown most clearly by comparing two couples where both husband and wife are over 65 but where one wife has gross income in excess of \$500 while the other wife's income is slightly less than \$500. The House bill would bring the first couple an extra exemption of \$1,000, the second couple one of \$500. This would occur, even though the joint incomes of the two couples were the same.

To eliminate this inequity your committee has amended the House bill so as to allow the \$500 deduction with respect to all persons 65 years of age or more regardless of the amount of their gross income.

VI. CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

Table VII compares the reduction in tentative tax and in actual tax payable under present law with that under H. R. 1 as amended by your committee. The changes in present individual income-tax law provided under H. R. 1 are discussed below.

TABLE VIII.—The reductions in tentative taxes and actual taxes under H. R. 1, as amended by the Senate Finance Committee

Surtax net income	Tentative tax	Reduction in tentative tax under present law	Reduction in tentative tax under H. R. 1 as amended by Senate Finance Committee		Actual tax reduction under H. R. 1 as amended by Senate Finance Committee	
			Calendar year 1947	Calendar year 1948	Calendar year 1947	Calendar year 1948
\$0 to \$1,000	\$0 to \$200	5	19.25 percent	33.5 percent	15 percent	30 percent
\$1,000 to \$1,400 ¹	\$200 to \$265.52 or \$279.17 ²	5	\$38.50	\$67	15 percent to 10 percent	30 percent to 20 percent
\$1,400 ¹ to \$79,700 ³	\$279.17 to \$50,000	5	14.5 percent	24 percent	10 percent	20 percent
\$79,700 ³ to \$302,400 ⁴	\$50,000 to \$250,000	5	14.5 percent on first \$50,000 and 12 percent on remainder.	24 percent on first \$50,000 and 19.25 percent on remainder.	10 percent on first \$79,700 ³ of income, and 7.5 percent ⁵ on remainder.	20 percent on first \$79,700 ³ of income and 15 percent on remainder.
\$302,400 ⁴ and over	\$250,000 and over	5	14.5 percent on first \$50,000, 12 percent on next \$200,000, and 10 percent on remainder.	24 percent on first \$50,000, 19.25 percent on next \$200,000, and 15 percent on remainder.	10 percent on first \$79,700 ³ of income, 7.4 percent ⁶ on the next \$223,000 ⁷ and about 5.3 percent ⁷ on remainder.	20 percent on first \$79,700 ³ of income, 15 percent on the next \$223,000 and 10.5 percent ⁸ on remainder.

¹ The exact breaking point in surtax net income under the House bill and as provided by your committee for 1948 is \$1,395.83 and for 1947 under the bill as amended by your committee is \$1,327.60.

² The maximum tentative tax in the "notch" is \$265.52 in calendar year 1947 and \$279.17 in calendar year 1948.

³ The exact breaking point in surtax net income under the bill as amended by your committee is \$79,728.40.

⁴ The exact breaking point in surtax net income under both the House bill and the bill as amended by your committee is \$302,395.60.

1. A reduction in 1947 of 15 percent and in 1948 of 30 percent of the tax for individuals with surtax net income of \$1,000 or less

Under the bill the combined tentative normal tax and surtax of individuals having a tentative tax of \$200 or less is reduced by 19.25 percent for the calendar year 1947, and 33.5 percent for the calendar year 1948 and subsequent years. These reductions are in lieu of the 5-percent reduction provided by present law. They, in effect, reduce the tax burden for individuals with \$1,000 of surtax net income or less by 15 percent in 1947, and by 30 percent in 1948. The tax on \$1,000 of surtax net income under the bill would be \$161.50 in 1947 and \$133 in 1948 and subsequent years, in place of the present tax of \$190. Thus the maximum reduction for any individual as a result of the 15-percent cut in 1947 is \$28.50, and in the case of the 30-percent cut in 1948 and subsequent years, \$57.

For example, a single person with no dependents having a net income of \$1,200 would compute his tax as follows, if he were one of the few required to compute his own tax:

	1947	1948 and subsequent years
1. Net income	\$1,200.00	\$1,200.00
2. Personal exemption	500.00	500.00
3. Surtax net income (No. 1-No. 2)	700.00	700.00
4. Tentative tax (20 percent of No. 3)	140.00	140.00
5. Reduction in tentative tax under bill (19.25 percent in 1947 and 33.5 percent in 1948)	26.95	46.90
6. Tax under bill (No. 4-No. 5)	113.05	93.10

The reduction for surtax net incomes of \$1,000 or less provided by your committee for 1948 and subsequent years is the same as

that provided in H. R. 1 as it passed the House. However, the reduction provided in your committee's bill for 1947 is one-half the reduction provided for 1947 in H. R. 1 as it passed the House.

2. A reduction in 1947 varying from 15 percent to 10 percent and in 1948 varying from 30 percent to 20 percent of the tax on surtax net income between \$1,000 and about \$1,400

Under the bill if the combined tentative normal tax and surtax of an individual in the calendar year 1947 is between \$200 and \$265.53, his tentative tax is reduced by \$38.50. In the calendar year 1948 and subsequent years if his combined normal tax and surtax is between \$200 and \$279.18, his tentative tax is reduced by \$67. These decreases in tax reduction, as income increases, arise from the fact that flat reductions are given in lieu of the 5-percent reduction in tax. In effect, tax reductions are given to

⁵ The exact amount of tax reduction on surtax net income between \$79,728.40 and \$302,395.61 for the calendar year 1947 is between 7.36 and 7.37 percent.

⁶ The exact amount is \$222,667.20, the difference between \$302,395.60 and \$79,728.40.

⁷ The exact percentage reduction in 1947 on surtax net income in excess of \$302,395.60 is between 5.26 and 5.27 percent.

⁸ The exact percentage reduction in 1948 and subsequent years on surtax net income in excess of \$302,395.60 is between 10.52 and 10.53 percent.

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

individuals which in 1947 range from 15 percent for those with surtax net incomes of \$1,000 to 10 percent for those with surtax net incomes of \$1,327.60, and in 1948 range from 30 percent for those with surtax net incomes of \$1,000 to 20 percent for those with surtax net incomes of \$1,395.83. For example, a married person with no dependents having a net income of \$2,200 would compute his tax as follows, if he is one of the few required to compute his own tax:

	1947	1948 and subsequent years
1. Net income.....	\$2,200.00	\$2,200.00
2. Personal exemptions.....	1,000.00	1,000.00
3. Surtax net income (No. 1—No. 2).....	1,200.00	1,200.00
4. Tentative tax (20 percent of No. 3).....	240.00	240.00
5. Reduction in tentative tax under bill.....	38.50	67.00
6. Tax under bill (No. 4—No. 5).....	201.50	173.00

The reduction for surtax net incomes between \$1,000 and \$1,395.84 provided by your committee for 1948 and subsequent years is the same as that provided in H. R. 1 as it passed the House. However, the reduction provided in your committee's bill for 1947 for similar surtax net incomes is about one-half the reduction provided for 1947 in H. R. 1 as it passed the House.

3. A reduction in 1947 of 10 percent and in 1948 of 20 percent for individuals with surtax net incomes between about \$1,400 and about \$80,000

Under the bill in the calendar year 1947 an individual with a combined tentative normal tax and surtax between \$265.52 and \$50,000 receives a 14.5-percent reduction in his tentative tax. In the calendar year 1948 and subsequent years an individual with a combined tentative normal tax and surtax between \$279.17 and \$50,000 receives a 24-percent reduction in his tentative tax. These reductions are in lieu of the 5-percent reduction allowed under present law. Individuals with surtax net incomes in 1947 between \$1,327.60 and \$79,728.41 receive a 10-percent reduction in their tax burden. In 1948, if their surtax net incomes are between \$1,395.83 and \$79,728.41, they receive a 20-percent reduction in their tax burden.

For example, a married person with no dependents having a net income of \$4,000 would compute his tax as follows, if he were one of the few required to compute his own tax:

	1947	1948 and subsequent years
1. Net income.....	\$4,000.00	\$4,000.00
2. Personal exemption.....	1,000.00	1,000.00
3. Surtax net income.....	3,000.00	3,000.00
4. Tentative tax (\$2,000 of surtax net income at 20 percent and \$1,000 at 22 percent).....	620.00	620.00
5. Reduction in tentative tax under bill (14.5 percent in 1947 and 24 percent in 1948).....	89.90	148.80
6. Tax under bill (No. 4—No. 5).....	530.10	471.20

The reduction for surtax net incomes between \$1,395.83 and \$79,728.41 provided by your committee for 1948 and subsequent years is the same as that provided in H. R. 1 as it passed the House, although the House bill continued the 20-percent reduction on up to surtax net incomes of \$302,395.60. The reduction provided in your committee's bill for 1947 is one-half the reduction provided for 1947 in H. R. 1 as it passed the House.

4. A reduction in 1947 of about 7.5 percent and in 1948 of 15 percent of the tax on that portion of the surtax net income which is between about \$80,000 and about \$302,000

In the calendar year 1947, in addition to the reduction of 14.5 percent in the tenta-

tive tax on the first \$79,728.40 of surtax net income, individuals with surtax net incomes between \$79,728.40 and \$302,395.61 receive a 12-percent reduction on that portion of their tentative tax which is between \$50,000 and \$250,000. In the calendar year 1948 and subsequent years in addition to the reduction of 24 percent in the tentative tax on the first \$79,728.40 of surtax net income, individuals with surtax net income between \$79,728.40 and \$302,395.61 receive a 19.25-percent reduction in that portion of their tentative tax which is between \$50,000 and \$250,000. These reductions are in lieu of the 5-percent reduction in tentative tax allowed under present law. Thus an individual with surtax net income of between \$79,728.40 and \$302,395.61 in 1947 receives a reduction of 10 percent in the tax on his first \$79,728.40 of surtax net income and about a 7.4-percent reduction in the tax on his remaining income.⁶ In 1948 he receives a reduction of 20 percent in the tax on the first \$79,728.40 of surtax net income, and a 15-percent reduction in the tax on the remaining income.

The tax reduction for surtax net incomes between \$79,728.40 and \$302,395.61 provided by your committee is smaller than that provided in H. R. 1 as it passed the House. The latter provided a 20-percent reduction in the tax on such incomes in both 1947 and subsequent years.

5. A reduction in 1947 of about 5.25 percent and in 1948 of about 10.5 percent of the tax on that portion of the surtax net income which is in excess of about \$302,000

In addition to the reductions on the tax attributable to the first \$302,395.60 of surtax net income or \$250,000 of tentative tax, individuals with surtax net incomes or tentative taxes in excess of this amount receive a 10-percent reduction in 1947 and a 15-percent reduction in 1948, in lieu of the present 5-percent reduction, on that portion of the tentative tax which exceeds \$250,000. Thus in 1947 an individual with surtax net income of more than \$302,395.60 receives a 10-percent reduction in the tax on the first \$79,728.40 of surtax net income, about a 7.4-percent reduction in the tax on surtax net income between \$79,728.40 and \$302,395.61, and about a 5.26-percent⁷ reduction in the tax on any remaining surtax net income. In 1948 and subsequent years an individual with surtax net income of more than \$302,395.60 receives a 20-percent reduction in the tax on the first \$79,728.40 of surtax net income, a 15-percent reduction in the tax on surtax net income between \$79,728.40 and \$302,395.61 and about a 10½-percent⁸ reduction in the tax on any remaining surtax net income.

The effective tax reduction in the calendar year 1948 and subsequently for individuals with surtax net incomes in excess of \$302,395.60 provided by your committee's bill is smaller than that in H. R. 1 as it passed the House because of the smaller reduction provided for that proportion of the surtax net incomes between \$79,728.40 and \$302,395.61. H. R. 1 as it passed the House provided a reduction of 20 percent in the tax for that portion of the surtax net incomes under \$302,395.61 and a reduction of about 10.5 percent in the tax on that portion of surtax net incomes in excess of that amount. Your committee's bill provides a reduction of 20 percent in the tax on the first \$79,728.40 of surtax net income, a reduction of 15 percent in the tax on surtax net incomes between \$79,728.40 and \$302,395.61, and a reduction of

⁶ The exact amount of tax reduction on surtax net income between \$79,728.40 and \$302,395.61 for the calendar year 1947 is between 7.36 percent and 7.37 percent.

⁷ The exact percentage reduction in 1947 on surtax net income in excess of \$302,395.60 is between 5.26 percent and 5.27 percent.

⁸ The exact percentage reduction in 1948 and subsequent years on surtax net income in excess of \$302,395.60 is between 10.52 percent and 10.53 percent.

about 10.5 percent in the tax on surtax net income in excess of \$302,395.60.

H. R. 1 as it passed the House made the same provision for the calendar year 1947 as for 1948 and subsequent years. The bill as amended by your committee provides reductions in 1947 of about one-half those applying to subsequent years.

6. An additional exemption for individuals 65 years of age or over

An additional exemption of \$500 is granted to individuals who have attained the age of 65 by the end of the taxable year. This feature of the bill is effective January 1, 1947. Your committee's bill allows the exemption to both a husband and a wife who have attained the age of 65 irrespective of the amount of the gross income received by either spouse. The House bill would have denied the exemption with respect to a spouse whose gross income was less than \$500. Your committee's bill also differs from the House measure in that it does not include a provision which would have offset against the new \$500 exemption the first \$500 received on the account of certain pensions, annuities,⁹ or officers' retirement pay excluded in full from taxable income under existing law.

VII. STATISTICAL DATA SHOWING TAX BURDENS, SPENDABLE INCOME AFTER TAX, AND TAX LIABILITY BY INCOME CLASSES UNDER PRESENT LAW, HOUSE BILL AND COMMITTEE BILL

Table IX shows for various net-income levels (after deductions but before exemptions), the amount of tax payable under present law, under the House bill, and under your committee's bill; and the amount and the percentage of the reduction and the effective (or average over-all) rates under the House bill and your committee's bill. For each of the above types of information the effects of your committee's bill in the calendar years 1947 and 1948 and subsequent calendar years are shown separately. Part A of table IX relates to a single person with no dependents; part B, to a married person with no dependents; and part C, to a married person with two dependents.

Since individuals of age 65 and over receive not only the rate reductions but also an additional \$500 exemption, their tax burden cannot be derived from table IX. Table X shows for such persons the same type of information shown in table IX for persons under age 65. Again, part A relates to a single person with no dependents, part B to a married couple both over 65 but having no dependents; and part C to a married couple both over 65 and having two dependents.

Table XI shows the amount of spendable income remaining after tax and the percent such income is of net income (after deductions but before exemptions). This is given for present law, the House bill, and your committee's bill in both 1947 and 1948. Part A presents this information for a single person with no dependents, and part B, for a married person with no dependents.

Table XII shows the estimated distributions among various income classes of taxable returns; net income; tax liability under present law, the House bill, and your committee's bill; and the decrease in tax liability under the House bill and your committee's bill. Since your committee's bill grants in the calendar year 1947 only half the reduction in tax provided for 1948 and subsequent calendar years, it is necessary to have two separate distributions of the above information. Part A shows the above information for the year in which the half reduction is effective, and part B, for the years in which the full reduction is effective. An assumed level of income payments of \$170,000,000,000 is used for both parts to make comparisons possible although estimates of income payments for the periods involved differ somewhat.

⁹ Such as those paid under the Railroad Retirement Act or the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System of the Social Security Act.

TABLE IX—A.—Comparison of individual income tax under present law, House bill, and Finance Committee bill

SINGLE PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Amount of tax				Amount of tax reduction				Percent tax reduction			Effective rates			
	Present law	House bill	Finance Committee bill		House bill	Finance Committee bill		House bill	Finance Committee bill		Present law	House bill	Finance Committee bill		
			For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years		For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years		For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years			For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years	
								Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	
\$500															
\$600	\$19.00	\$13.30	\$16.15	\$13.30	\$5.70	\$2.85	\$5.70	30.00	15.00	30.00	3.17	2.22	2.69	2.22	
\$700	38.00	26.60	32.30	26.60	11.40	5.70	11.40	30.00	15.00	30.00	5.43	3.80	4.61	3.80	
\$750	47.50	33.25	40.37	33.25	14.25	7.13	14.25	30.00	15.00	30.00	6.33	4.43	5.38	4.43	
\$800	57.00	39.90	48.45	39.90	17.10	8.55	17.10	30.00	15.00	30.00	7.12	4.99	6.06	4.99	
\$900	76.00	53.20	64.60	53.20	22.80	11.40	22.80	30.00	15.00	30.00	8.44	5.91	7.18	5.91	
\$1,000	95.00	66.50	80.75	66.50	28.50	14.25	28.50	30.00	15.00	30.00	9.50	6.65	8.08	6.65	
\$1,200	133.00	93.10	113.05	93.10	39.90	19.95	39.90	30.00	15.00	30.00	11.08	7.76	9.42	7.76	
\$1,500	190.00	133.00	161.50	133.00	57.00	28.50	57.00	30.00	15.00	30.00	12.67	8.87	10.77	8.87	
\$1,600	209.00	153.00	181.50	153.00	66.00	27.50	66.00	26.79	13.16	26.79	13.06	9.56	11.34	9.56	
\$1,700	228.00	173.00	201.50	173.00	55.00	26.50	55.00	24.12	11.62	24.12	13.41	10.18	11.85	10.18	
\$1,800	247.00	193.00	221.50	193.00	54.00	25.50	54.00	21.86	10.32	21.86	13.72	10.72	12.31	10.72	
\$1,900	266.00	212.80	239.40	212.80	53.20	26.60	53.20	20.00	10.00	20.00	14.00	11.20	12.60	11.20	
\$2,000	285.00	228.00	256.50	228.00	57.00	28.50	57.00	20.00	10.00	20.00	14.25	11.40	12.83	11.40	
\$2,500	380.00	304.00	342.00	304.00	76.00	38.00	76.00	20.00	10.00	20.00	15.20	12.16	13.68	12.16	
\$3,000	484.50	387.60	436.05	387.60	96.90	48.45	96.90	20.00	10.00	20.00	16.15	12.92	14.54	12.92	
\$4,000	693.50	554.80	621.15	554.80	138.70	69.35	138.70	20.00	10.00	20.00	17.34	13.87	15.60	13.87	
\$5,000	921.50	737.20	829.35	737.20	184.30	92.15	184.30	20.00	10.00	20.00	18.43	14.74	16.59	14.74	
\$6,000	1,168.50	934.80	1,051.65	934.80	233.70	116.85	233.70	20.00	10.00	20.00	19.47	15.58	17.53	15.58	
\$7,000	1,434.50	1,147.60	1,291.05	1,147.60	286.90	143.45	286.90	20.00	10.00	20.00	20.49	16.39	18.44	16.39	
\$8,000	1,719.50	1,375.60	1,547.55	1,375.60	343.90	171.95	343.90	20.00	10.00	20.00	21.49	17.20	19.34	17.20	
\$9,000	2,023.50	1,618.80	1,821.15	1,618.80	404.70	202.35	404.70	20.00	10.00	20.00	22.48	17.99	20.24	17.99	
\$10,000	2,346.50	1,877.20	2,131.85	1,877.20	469.30	234.65	469.30	20.00	10.00	20.00	23.47	18.77	21.12	18.77	
\$11,000	2,688.50	2,150.80	2,419.65	2,150.80	537.70	268.85	537.70	20.00	10.00	20.00	24.44	19.55	22.00	19.55	
\$12,000	3,049.50	2,439.60	2,744.55	2,439.60	609.90	304.95	609.90	20.00	10.00	20.00	25.41	20.33	22.87	20.33	
\$13,000	3,434.25	2,747.40	3,090.83	2,747.40	686.85	343.42	686.85	20.00	10.00	20.00	26.42	21.13	23.70	21.13	
\$14,000	3,842.75	3,074.20	3,458.48	3,074.20	768.55	384.27	768.55	20.00	10.00	20.00	27.45	21.96	24.70	21.96	
\$15,000	4,270.25	3,416.20	3,843.23	3,416.20	854.05	427.02	854.05	20.00	10.00	20.00	28.47	22.77	25.62	22.77	
\$20,000	6,645.25	5,316.20	5,980.73	5,316.20	1,329.05	664.52	1,329.05	20.00	10.00	20.00	33.23	26.58	29.90	26.58	
\$25,000	9,362.25	7,489.80	8,426.03	7,489.80	1,872.45	936.22	1,872.45	20.00	10.00	20.00	37.45	29.96	33.70	29.96	
\$30,000	12,264.50	9,811.60	11,038.05	9,811.60	2,452.90	1,226.45	2,452.90	20.00	10.00	20.00	40.88	32.71	36.79	32.71	
\$40,000	18,425.25	14,740.20	16,582.73	14,740.20	3,685.95	1,842.97	3,685.95	20.00	10.00	20.00	46.06	36.85	41.46	36.85	
\$50,000	25,137.00	20,109.60	22,623.30	20,109.60	5,027.40	2,513.70	5,027.40	20.00	10.00	20.00	50.27	42.22	45.25	42.22	
\$60,000	32,247.75	25,798.20	29,022.98	25,798.20	6,449.55	3,224.77	6,449.55	20.00	10.00	20.00	53.75	43.00	48.37	43.00	
\$70,000	39,643.50	31,714.80	35,679.15	31,714.80	7,928.70	3,964.35	7,928.70	20.00	10.00	20.00	56.63	45.31	50.97	45.31	
\$80,000	47,324.25	37,859.40	42,591.83	37,859.40	9,464.85	4,732.42	9,464.85	20.00	10.00	20.00	59.16	47.32	53.24	47.32	
\$90,000	55,290.00	44,232.00	49,966.00	44,232.00	11,058.00	5,529.00	11,058.00	20.00	10.00	20.00	61.43	49.15	55.62	49.15	
\$100,000	63,540.75	50,832.60	57,608.80	50,832.60	12,708.15	6,354.07	12,708.15	20.00	10.00	20.00	63.54	50.83	57.61	50.83	
\$150,000	105,806.25	84,645.00	96,709.00	84,645.00	21,161.25	10,580.62	21,161.25	20.00	10.00	20.00	75.14	56.43	64.81	56.43	
\$200,000	148,551.50	118,841.20	136,355.60	118,841.20	29,710.30	14,855.15	29,710.30	20.00	10.00	20.00	74.28	59.42	68.18	59.42	
\$250,000	191,771.75	153,417.40	176,391.20	153,417.40	38,354.35	19,177.17	38,354.35	20.00	10.00	20.00	8.02	16.24	17.71	16.24	
\$300,000	234,996.75	187,997.40	216,431.20	187,997.40	46,999.35	23,499.67	46,999.35	20.00	10.00	20.00	7.90	16.01	17.33	16.01	
\$400,000	321,446.75	265,110.25	298,278.50	265,110.25	65,336.50	32,668.25	65,336.50	17.53	8.76	17.53	6.21	14.57	16.06	14.57	
\$500,000	407,896.75	342,600.25	380,178.50	342,600.25	85,436.50	42,718.25	85,436.50	16.04	8.02	16.04	5.81	13.71	15.08	13.71	
\$750,000	624,021.75	535,835.25	584,928.50	535,835.25	188,186.50	94,093.25	188,186.50	14.13	7.06	14.13	4.62	12.61	13.80	12.61	
\$1,000,000	840,146.75	729,210.25	789,678.50	729,210.25	250,936.50	125,468.25	250,936.50	13.20	6.60	13.20	4.01	12.07	13.04	12.07	
\$2,000,000	1,704,646.75	1,502,710.25	1,608,678.50	1,502,710.25	501,873.00	250,936.50	501,873.00	11.85	5.93	11.85	3.51	11.29	12.28	11.29	
\$5,000,000	4,275,000.00	3,823,210.25	4,050,000.00	3,823,210.25	1,212,790.00	606,395.00	1,212,790.00	10.57	5.28	10.57	3.06	10.53	11.40	10.53	

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

TABLE IX—B.—Comparison of individual income tax under present law, House bill, and Finance Committee bill

MARRIED PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Amount of tax				Amount of tax reduction				Percent tax reduction			Effective rates			
	Present law	House bill	Finance Committee bill		House bill	Finance Committee bill		House bill	Finance Committee bill		Present law	House bill	Finance Committee bill		
			For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years		For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years		For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years			For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years	
								Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	
\$1,000															
\$1,200	\$38.00	\$26.60	\$32.30	\$26.60	\$11.40	\$5.70	\$11.40	30.00	15.00	30.00	3.17	2.22	2.69	2.22	
\$1,500	95.00	66.50	80.75	66.50	28.50	14.25	28.50	30.00	15.00	30.00	6.33	4.43	5.38	4.43	
\$1,800	152.00	106.40	129.20	106.40	45.60	22.80	45.60	30.00	15.00	30.00	8.44	5.91	7.18	5.91	
\$2,000	190.00	133.00	161.50	133.00	57.00	28.50	57.00	30.00	15.00	30.00	9.50	6.65	8.08	6.65	
\$2,100	209.00	153.00	181.50	153.00	56.00	27.50	56.00	26.79	13.16	26.79	9.95	7.29	8.64	7.29	
\$2,200	228.00	173.00	201.50	173.00	55.00	26.50	55.00	24.12	11.62	24.12	10.36	7.86	9.16	7.86	
\$2,300	247.00	193.00	221.50	193.00	54.00	25.50	54.00	21.86	10.32	21.86	10.74	8.39	9.63	8.39	
\$2,400	266.00	212.80	239.40	212.80	53.20	26.60	53.20	20.00	10.00	20.00	11.08	8.87	9.98	8.87	
\$2,500	285.00	228.00	256.50	228.00	57.00	28.50	57.00	20.00	10.00	20.00	11.40	9.12	10.26	9.12	
\$3,000	380.00	304.00	342.00	304.00	76.00	38.00	76.00	20.00	10.00	20.00	12.67	10.13	11.40	10.13	
\$4,000	589.00	471.20	530.10	471.20	117.80	58.90	117.80	20.00	10.00	20.00	14.72	11.78	13.25	11.78	
\$5,000	798.00	638.40	718.20	638.40	159.60	79.80	159.60	20.00	10.00	20.00	15.96	12.77	14.36	12.77	
\$6,000	1,045.00	836.00	940.50	836.00	209.00	104.50	209.00	20.00	10.00	20.00	17.42	13.93	15.68	13.93	
\$7,000	1,292.00	1,033.60	1,162.80	1,033.60	258.40	129.20	258.40	20.00	10.00	20.00	18.46	14.77	16.61	14.77	
\$8,000	1,577.00	1,261.60	1,419.30	1,261.60	315.40	157.70	315.40	20.00	10.00	20.00	19.71	15.77	17.74	15.77	
\$9,000	1,862.00	1,489.60	1,675.80	1,489.60	372.40	186.20	372.40	20.00	10.00	20.00	20.69	16.55	18.62	16.55	
\$10,000	2,185.00	1,748.00	1,966.50	1,748.00	437.00	218.50	437.00	20.00	10.00	20.00	21.85	17.48	19.67	17.48	
\$11,000	2,508.00	2,006.40	2,257.20	2,006.40	501.60	250.80	501.60	20.00	10.00	20.00	22.80	18.24	20.52	18.24	
\$12,000	2,809.00														

TABLE IX-B.—Comparison of individual income tax under present law, House bill, and Finance Committee bill—Continued

MARRIED PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS—continued

Net income before personal exemption	Amount of tax				Amount of tax reduction			Percent tax reduction			Effective rates			
	Present law	House bill	Finance Committee bill		House bill	Finance Committee bill		House bill	Finance Committee bill		Present law	House bill	Finance Committee bill	
			For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years		For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years		For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years			For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years
\$30,000.....	\$11,970.00	\$9,576.00	\$10,773.00	\$9,576.00	\$2,394.00	\$1,197.00	\$2,394.00	20.00	10.00	20.00	39.90	31.92	35.91	31.92
\$40,000.....	18,067.50	14,478.00	16,287.75	14,478.00	3,619.50	1,809.75	3,619.50	20.00	10.00	20.00	45.24	36.20	40.72	36.20
\$50,000.....	24,795.00	19,836.00	22,315.50	19,836.00	4,959.00	2,479.50	4,959.00	20.00	10.00	20.00	49.59	39.67	44.63	39.67
\$60,000.....	31,891.50	25,513.20	28,702.35	25,513.20	6,378.30	3,189.15	6,378.30	20.00	10.00	20.00	53.15	42.52	47.84	42.52
\$70,000.....	39,273.00	31,418.40	35,345.70	31,418.40	7,854.60	3,927.30	7,854.60	20.00	10.00	20.00	56.10	44.88	50.49	44.88
\$80,000.....	46,939.50	37,551.60	42,245.55	37,551.60	9,387.90	4,693.95	9,387.90	20.00	10.00	20.00	58.67	46.94	52.81	46.94
\$90,000.....	54,891.00	43,912.80	49,596.40	44,282.35	10,978.20	5,489.10	10,978.20	20.00	9.65	19.33	60.99	48.79	55.11	49.20
\$100,000.....	63,127.50	50,502.00	57,226.00	51,280.38	12,625.50	6,312.75	12,625.50	20.00	9.35	18.76	63.13	50.50	57.23	51.28
\$150,000.....	105,383.50	84,306.80	96,368.40	87,200.98	21,076.70	10,538.35	21,076.70	20.00	8.55	17.25	70.26	56.20	64.25	58.13
\$200,000.....	148,124.00	118,499.20	135,959.60	123,530.40	29,624.80	14,812.40	29,624.80	20.00	8.21	16.60	74.06	59.25	67.98	61.77
\$250,000.....	191,339.50	153,071.60	175,990.80	160,263.58	38,267.90	19,133.95	38,267.90	20.00	8.02	16.24	76.54	61.23	70.40	64.11
\$300,000.....	234,564.50	187,651.60	216,030.80	197,004.83	46,912.90	23,456.45	46,912.90	20.00	7.90	16.01	78.19	62.55	72.01	65.67
\$400,000.....	321,014.50	264,723.50	297,869.00	274,223.50	56,291.00	28,145.50	56,291.00	17.54	7.21	14.58	80.25	66.18	74.47	68.56
\$500,000.....	407,464.50	342,073.50	379,769.00	351,573.50	65,391.00	32,695.50	65,391.00	16.05	6.80	13.72	81.49	68.41	75.95	70.31
\$750,000.....	623,589.50	535,448.50	584,519.00	544,948.50	88,141.00	44,070.50	88,141.00	14.13	6.27	12.61	83.15	71.39	77.94	72.66
\$1,000,000.....	839,714.50	728,823.50	789,269.00	738,323.50	110,891.00	55,445.50	110,891.00	13.21	6.01	12.07	83.97	72.88	78.93	73.83
\$2,000,000.....	1,704,214.50	1,502,323.50	1,608,269.00	1,511,823.50	201,891.00	100,945.50	201,891.00	11.85	5.63	11.29	86.21	75.12	80.41	75.59
\$5,000,000.....	4,275,000.00	3,822,823.50	4,050,000.00	3,825,000.00	452,176.50	225,000.00	450,000.00	10.58	5.26	10.53	85.50	76.46	81.00	76.50

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

TABLE IX-C.—Comparison of individual income tax under present law, House bill, and Finance Committee bill

MARRIED PERSON—2 DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Amount of tax				Amount of tax reduction			Percent tax reduction			Effective rates				
	Present law	House bill	Finance Committee bill		House bill	Finance Committee bill		House bill	Finance Committee bill		Present law	House bill	Finance Committee bill		
			For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years		For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years		For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years			For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years	
\$2,000.....															
\$2,500.....	\$95.00	\$96.50	\$80.75	\$86.50	\$28.50	\$14.25	\$28.50	30.00	15.00	30.00	3.80	2.66	3.23	2.66	
\$3,000.....	190.00	193.00	161.50	132.00	57.00	28.50	57.00	30.00	15.00	30.00	6.33	4.43	5.38	4.43	
\$3,500.....	209.00	193.00	181.50	153.00	56.00	27.50	56.00	26.79	13.16	26.79	6.74	4.94	5.85	4.94	
\$4,000.....	228.00	173.00	201.50	173.00	55.00	26.50	55.00	24.12	11.62	24.12	7.13	5.41	6.30	5.41	
\$4,500.....	247.00	193.00	221.50	193.00	54.00	25.50	54.00	21.86	10.32	21.86	7.48	5.85	6.71	5.85	
\$5,000.....	266.00	212.80	239.40	212.80	53.20	26.60	53.20	20.00	10.00	20.00	7.82	6.26	7.04	6.26	
\$5,500.....	285.00	228.00	256.50	228.00	57.00	28.50	57.00	20.00	10.00	20.00	8.14	6.51	7.33	6.51	
\$6,000.....	380.00	304.00	342.00	304.00	76.00	38.00	76.00	20.00	10.00	20.00	9.50	7.60	8.55	7.60	
\$6,500.....	589.00	471.20	530.10	471.20	117.80	58.90	117.80	20.00	10.00	20.00	11.78	9.42	10.60	9.42	
\$7,000.....	798.00	638.40	718.20	638.40	159.60	79.80	159.60	20.00	10.00	20.00	13.30	10.64	11.97	10.64	
\$7,500.....	1,045.00	836.00	940.50	836.00	209.00	104.50	209.00	20.00	10.00	20.00	14.93	11.94	13.44	11.94	
\$8,000.....	1,292.00	1,033.60	1,162.80	1,033.60	258.40	129.20	258.40	20.00	10.00	20.00	16.15	12.92	14.54	12.92	
\$8,500.....	1,577.00	1,261.60	1,419.30	1,261.60	315.40	157.70	315.40	20.00	10.00	20.00	17.52	14.02	15.77	14.02	
\$9,000.....	1,862.00	1,489.60	1,675.80	1,489.60	372.40	186.20	372.40	20.00	10.00	20.00	18.62	14.90	16.76	14.90	
\$10,000.....	2,185.00	1,748.00	1,936.50	1,748.00	437.00	218.50	437.00	20.00	10.00	20.00	19.86	15.89	17.88	15.89	
\$11,000.....	2,508.00	2,006.40	2,257.20	2,006.40	501.60	250.80	501.60	20.00	10.00	20.00	20.90	16.72	18.81	16.72	
\$12,000.....	2,869.00	2,295.20	2,582.10	2,295.20	573.80	286.90	573.80	20.00	10.00	20.00	22.07	17.06	19.86	17.06	
\$13,000.....	3,230.00	2,584.00	2,907.00	2,584.00	646.00	323.00	646.00	20.00	10.00	20.00	23.07	18.46	20.76	18.46	
\$14,000.....	3,638.50	2,910.80	3,274.65	2,910.80	727.70	363.85	727.70	20.00	10.00	20.00	24.26	19.41	21.83	19.41	
\$15,000.....	5,890.00	4,712.00	5,301.00	4,712.00	1,178.00	589.00	1,178.00	20.00	10.00	20.00	29.45	23.56	26.51	23.56	
\$20,000.....	8,521.50	6,817.20	7,669.35	6,817.20	1,704.30	852.15	1,704.30	20.00	10.00	20.00	34.09	27.27	30.68	27.27	
\$30,000.....	11,381.00	9,104.80	10,242.90	9,104.80	2,276.20	1,138.10	2,276.20	20.00	10.00	20.00	37.94	30.35	34.14	30.35	
\$40,000.....	17,442.00	13,953.60	15,697.80	13,953.60	3,488.40	1,744.20	3,488.40	20.00	10.00	20.00	43.60	34.88	39.24	34.88	
\$50,000.....	24,111.00	19,288.80	21,699.90	19,288.80	4,822.20	2,411.10	4,822.20	20.00	10.00	20.00	48.22	38.58	43.40	38.58	
\$60,000.....	31,179.00	24,943.20	28,061.10	24,943.20	6,235.80	3,117.90	6,235.80	20.00	10.00	20.00	51.96	41.57	46.77	41.57	
\$70,000.....	38,532.00	30,825.60	34,678.80	30,825.60	7,706.40	3,853.20	7,706.40	20.00	10.00	20.00	55.05	44.04	49.54	44.04	
\$80,000.....	46,170.00	36,936.00	41,535.00	36,936.00	9,234.00	4,617.00	9,234.00	20.00	10.00	20.00	57.71	46.17	51.94	46.17	
\$90,000.....	54,093.00	43,274.40	48,537.20	43,274.40	10,818.60	5,409.30	10,818.60	20.00	9.68	19.39	60.10	48.08	54.29	48.08	
\$100,000.....	62,301.00	49,840.80	56,460.40	49,840.80	12,460.20	6,230.10	12,460.20	20.00	9.37	18.81	62.30	49.84	56.46	49.84	
\$150,000.....	104,538.00	83,630.40	95,885.20	83,630.40	20,907.60	10,453.80	20,907.60	20.00	8.56	17.27	69.69	55.75	63.72	55.75	
\$200,000.....	147,269.00	117,815.20	135,167.60	117,815.20	29,453.80	14,726.90	29,453.80	20.00	8.22	16.61	73.63	58.91	67.58	58.91	
\$250,000.....	190,475.00	152,380.00	175,190.00	152,380.00	38,095.00	19,047.50	38,095.00	20.00	8.02	16.25	76.19	60.95	70.08	60.95	
\$300,000.....	233,700.00	186,960.00	215,230.00	186,960.00	46,740.00	23,370.00	46,740.00	20.00	7.90	16.02	77.90	62.32	71.74	62.32	
\$400,000.....	320,150.00	263,950.00	297,050.00	263,950.00	56,200.00	28,100.00	56,200.00	17.55	7.24	14.59	80.04	65.99	74.26	65.99	
\$500,000.....	406,600.00	341,300.00	378,950.00	341,300.00	65,300.00	32,650.00	65,300.00	16.06	6.80	13.72	81.32	68.26	75.79	70.16	
\$750,000.....	622,725.00	534,675.00	583,700.00	534,675.00	88,050.00	44,025.00	88,050.00	14.14	6.27	12.61	83.03	71.29	77.83	72.56	
\$1,000,000.....	838,850.00	728,050.00	788,450.00	728,050.00	110,800.00	55,400.00	110,800.00	13.21	6.10	12.07	83.88	72.81	78.85	73.76	
\$2,000,000.....	1,703,350.00	1,501,550.00	1,607,450.00	1,501,550.00	201,800.00	100,900.00	201,800.00	11.85	5.63	11.29	85.17	75.08	80.37	75.55	
\$5,000,000.....	4,275,000.00	3,822,823.50	4,050,000.00	3,825,000.00	452,950.00	225,000.00	450,000.00	10.60	5.26	10.53	85.50	76.46	81.00	76.50	

TABLE X-A.—Comparison of individual income tax under present law, under the House bill, and Finance Committee bill for persons 65 years of age and over

SINGLE PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Amount of tax				Amount of tax reduction			Percent tax reduction			Effective rates			
	Present law	House bill	Finance Committee bill		House bill	Finance Committee bill		House bill	Finance Committee bill		Present law	House bill	Finance Committee bill	
			For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years		For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years		For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years			For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years
								Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
\$500														
\$600	\$19.00				\$19.00	\$19.00	\$19.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	83.17			
\$700	38.00				38.00	38.00	38.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	5.43			
\$750	47.50				47.50	47.50	47.50	100.00	100.00	100.00	6.33			
\$800	57.00				57.00	57.00	57.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	7.13			
\$900	76.00				76.00	76.00	76.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	8.44			
\$1,000	95.00				95.00	95.00	95.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	9.50			
\$1,200	133.00	\$26.60	\$32.30	\$26.60	106.40	100.70	106.40	80.00	75.71	80.00	11.08	\$2.22	\$2.69	\$2.22
\$1,500	190.00	66.50	80.75	66.50	123.50	109.25	123.50	65.00	57.50	65.00	12.67	4.43	5.38	4.43
\$1,800	247.00	106.40	129.20	106.40	140.60	117.80	140.60	56.92	47.69	56.92	13.72	5.91	7.18	5.91
\$2,000	285.00	133.00	161.50	133.00	152.00	123.00	152.00	53.33	43.33	53.33	14.25	6.65	8.08	6.65
\$2,500	380.00	228.00	256.50	228.00	152.00	123.50	152.00	40.00	32.50	40.00	15.20	9.12	10.26	9.12
\$3,000	484.50	304.00	342.00	304.00	180.50	142.50	180.50	37.25	29.41	37.25	16.15	10.13	11.40	10.13
\$4,000	693.50	471.20	530.10	471.20	222.30	163.40	222.30	32.05	23.56	32.05	17.34	11.78	13.25	11.78
\$5,000	921.50	638.40	718.20	638.40	283.10	203.30	283.10	30.72	22.06	30.72	18.43	12.77	14.36	12.77
\$6,000	1,168.50	836.00	940.50	836.00	332.50	228.00	332.50	28.46	19.51	28.46	19.48	13.93	15.68	13.93
\$7,000	1,434.50	1,033.60	1,162.80	1,033.60	400.90	271.70	400.90	27.95	18.94	27.95	20.49	14.77	16.61	14.77
\$8,000	1,719.50	1,261.60	1,419.30	1,261.60	457.90	300.20	457.90	26.63	17.46	26.63	21.49	15.77	17.74	15.77
\$9,000	2,023.50	1,489.60	1,675.80	1,489.60	533.90	347.70	533.90	26.38	17.18	26.38	22.48	16.55	18.62	16.55
\$10,000	2,346.50	1,748.00	1,966.50	1,748.00	598.50	380.00	598.50	25.51	16.19	25.51	23.47	17.48	19.67	17.48
\$11,000	2,688.50	2,006.40	2,257.20	2,006.40	682.10	431.30	682.10	25.37	16.04	25.37	24.44	18.24	20.52	18.24
\$12,000	3,049.50	2,295.20	2,582.10	2,295.20	754.30	467.40	754.30	24.74	15.33	24.74	25.41	19.13	21.52	19.13
\$13,000	3,434.25	2,584.00	2,907.00	2,584.00	850.25	527.25	850.25	24.76	15.35	24.76	26.42	19.88	22.36	19.88
\$14,000	3,842.75	2,910.80	3,274.65	2,910.80	931.95	588.10	931.95	24.25	14.78	24.25	27.45	20.79	23.39	20.79
\$15,000	4,270.25	3,237.60	3,642.30	3,237.60	1,032.65	627.95	1,032.65	24.18	14.71	24.18	28.47	21.58	24.28	21.58
\$20,000	6,645.25	5,114.80	5,754.15	5,114.80	1,530.45	891.10	1,530.45	23.03	13.41	23.03	33.23	25.57	28.77	25.57
\$25,000	9,362.25	7,265.60	8,173.80	7,265.60	2,096.65	1,188.45	2,096.65	22.39	12.69	22.39	37.45	29.06	32.70	29.06
\$30,000	12,264.50	9,576.00	10,773.00	9,576.00	2,688.50	1,491.50	2,688.50	21.92	12.16	21.92	40.88	31.92	35.91	31.92
\$40,000	18,425.25	14,478.00	16,287.75	14,478.00	3,947.25	2,137.50	3,947.25	21.42	11.60	21.42	46.06	36.20	40.72	36.20
\$50,000	25,137.00	19,836.00	22,315.50	19,836.00	5,301.00	2,821.50	5,301.00	21.09	11.22	21.09	50.27	39.67	44.63	39.67
\$60,000	32,247.25	25,513.20	28,702.35	25,513.20	6,734.05	3,544.90	6,734.05	20.88	10.99	20.88	53.75	42.52	47.84	42.52
\$70,000	39,643.50	31,418.40	35,345.70	31,418.40	8,225.10	4,277.80	8,225.10	20.75	10.84	20.75	56.63	44.88	50.49	44.88
\$80,000	47,324.25	37,551.60	42,245.55	37,551.60	9,772.65	5,078.70	9,772.65	20.65	10.73	20.65	59.16	46.94	52.81	46.94
\$90,000	55,290.00	43,912.80	49,596.40	43,912.80	11,377.20	5,693.60	11,377.20	20.58	10.30	20.58	61.43	48.79	55.11	48.79
\$100,000	63,540.75	50,502.00	57,226.00	51,283.38	13,038.75	6,314.75	12,257.37	20.52	9.94	19.29	63.54	50.50	57.23	51.28
\$150,000	105,806.25	84,306.80	96,368.40	87,200.98	21,499.45	9,437.85	18,605.27	20.32	8.92	17.58	70.54	56.20	64.25	58.13
\$200,000	148,551.50	118,499.20	135,959.60	123,530.40	30,052.30	12,591.90	25,021.10	20.23	8.48	16.84	74.28	59.25	67.98	61.77
\$250,000	191,771.75	153,071.60	175,990.80	160,263.58	38,700.15	15,780.75	31,508.17	20.18	8.23	16.43	76.71	61.23	70.40	64.11
\$300,000	234,996.75	187,651.60	216,030.80	197,004.83	47,345.15	18,965.95	37,991.92	20.15	8.07	16.17	78.33	62.55	72.01	65.67
\$400,000	321,446.75	264,723.50	297,869.00	274,223.50	56,723.25	23,577.75	47,223.25	17.65	7.33	14.09	80.36	68.41	74.47	68.56
\$500,000	407,896.75	342,073.50	379,709.00	351,573.50	65,823.25	28,127.75	56,323.25	16.14	6.90	13.81	81.58	68.18	75.95	70.31
\$750,000	624,021.75	535,448.50	584,519.00	544,948.50	88,573.25	39,502.75	79,073.25	14.19	6.33	12.67	83.20	71.39	77.94	72.66
\$1,000,000	840,146.75	728,823.50	789,269.00	738,323.50	111,323.25	50,877.75	101,823.25	13.25	6.06	12.12	84.01	72.88	78.93	73.83
\$2,000,000	1,704,646.75	1,502,323.50	1,608,269.00	1,511,823.50	202,323.25	96,377.75	192,823.25	11.87	5.65	11.31	85.23	75.12	80.41	75.39
\$5,000,000	4,275,000.00	3,822,823.50	4,050,000.00	3,825,000.00	452,176.50	225,000.00	450,000.00	10.58	5.26	10.53	85.80	76.46	81.00	76.50

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

TABLE X-B.—Comparison of individual income tax under present law, under the House bill, and Finance Committee bill for persons 65 years of age and over

MARRIED PERSONS (BOTH OVER 65)—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Amount of tax				Amount of tax reduction			Percent tax reduction			Effective rates			
	Present law	House bill	Finance Committee bill		House bill	Finance Committee bill		House bill	Finance Committee bill		Present law	House bill	Finance Committee bill	
			For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years		For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years		For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years			For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years
								Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
\$1,000														
\$1,200	\$38.00				\$38.00	\$38.00	\$38.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	3.17			
\$1,500	95.00				95.00	95.00	95.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	6.33			
\$1,800	152.00				152.00	152.00	152.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	8.44			
\$2,000	190.00				190.00	190.00	190.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	9.50			
\$2,500	285.00	\$66.50	\$80.75	\$66.50	218.50	204.25	218.50	76.67	71.67	76.67	11.40	2.66	3.23	2.66
\$3,000	380.00	133.00	161.50	133.00	247.00	218.50	247.00	65.00	57.50	65.00	12.67	4.43	5.38	4.43
\$4,000	589.00	304.00	342.00	304.00	285.00	247.00	285.00	48.39	41.94	48.39	14.73	7.60	8.55	7.60
\$5,000	798.00	471.20	530.10	471.20	326.80	267.90	326.80	40.95	33.57	40.95	15.96	9.42	10.60	9.42
\$6,000	1,045.00	638.40	718.20	638.40	406.60	326.80	406.60	38.91	31.27	38.91	17.42	10.64	11.97	10.64
\$7,000	1,292.00	836.00	940.50	836.00	456.00	351.50	456.00	35.29	27.21	35.29	18.46	11.94	13.44	11.94
\$8,000	1,577.00	1,033.60	1,162.80	1,033.60	543.40	444.20	543.40	34.46	26.27	34.46	19.71	12.92	14.54	12.92
\$9,000	1,862.00	1,261.60	1,419.30	1,261.60	600.40	412.70	600.40	32.24	23.78	32.24	20.69	14.02	15.77	14.02
\$10,000	2,185.00	1,489.60	1,675.80	1,489.60	695.40	509.20	695.40	31.83	23.30	31.83	21.85	14.90	16.76	14.90
\$11,000	2,508.00	1,748.00	1,966.50	1,748.00	760.00	541.50	760.00	30.30	21.59	30.30	22.80	15.89	17.88	15.89
\$12,000	2,869.00	2,006.40	2,257.20	2,006.40	802.60	611.80	802.60	30.07	21.32	30.07	23.91	16.72	18.81	16.72
\$13,000	3,230.00	2,295.20	2,582.10	2,295.20	834.80	647.90	834.80	28.94	20.06	28.94	24.85	17.66	19.86	17.66
\$14,000	3,638.50	2,584.00	2,907.00	2,584.00	1,054.50	731.50	1,054.50	28.98	20.10	28.98	25.99	18.46	20.76	18.46
\$15,000	4,047.00	2,910.80	3,274.65	2,910.80	1,136.20	772.35	1,136.20	28.08	19.08	28.08	26.98	19.41	21.83	19.41
\$20,000	6,353.50	4,712.00	5,301.00	4,712.00	1,681.60	1,092.60	1,681.60	26.30	17.09	26.30	31.97	23.50	26.51	23.50
\$25,000	9,082.00	6,817.20	7,669.35	6,817.20	2,204.80	1,412.65	2,204.80	24.94	15.55	24.94	35.33	27.27	30.68	27.27
\$30,000	11,970.00	9,104.80	10,242.90	9,104.80	2,805.20	1,727.10	2,805.20	23.64	14.43	23.64	39.30	30.35	34.14	30.35
\$40,000	18,097.50	13,953.60	15,697.80	13,953.60	4,143.90	2,599.70	4,143.90	22.90	13.26	22.90	45.24	34.88	39.24	

TABLE X-B.—Comparison of individual income tax under present law, under the House bill, and Finance Committee bill for persons 65 years of age and over—Continued

MARRIED PERSONS (BOTH OVER 65)—NO DEPENDENTS—continued

Net income before personal exemption	Amount of tax				Amount of tax reduction			Percent tax reduction			Effective rates			
	Present law	House bill	Finance Committee bill		House bill	Finance Committee bill		House bill	Finance Committee bill		Present law	House bill	Finance Committee bill	
			For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years		For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years		For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years				
	Percent	Percent			Percent			Percent			Percent	Percent		
\$60,000	31,891.50	24,943.20	\$28,061.10	\$24,943.20	\$6,948.30	\$6,948.30	\$6,948.30	21.79	12.01	21.79	53.15	41.57	46.77	41.57
\$70,000	39,273.00	30,825.60	34,678.80	30,825.60	8,447.40	8,447.40	8,447.40	21.51	11.70	21.51	56.10	44.04	49.54	44.04
\$80,000	46,939.50	36,936.00	41,553.00	36,936.00	10,003.50	10,003.50	10,003.50	21.31	11.48	21.31	58.67	46.17	51.94	46.17
\$90,000	54,891.00	43,274.40	48,857.20	43,604.05	11,616.60	11,616.60	11,616.60	21.16	10.99	21.16	60.99	48.08	54.29	48.45
\$100,000	63,127.50	49,840.80	56,460.40	50,580.85	13,286.70	13,286.70	13,286.70	21.05	10.56	21.05	63.13	49.84	56.46	50.58
\$150,000	105,383.50	83,630.40	95,585.20	86,482.30	21,753.10	21,753.10	21,753.10	20.64	9.30	20.64	70.26	55.75	61.40	57.65
\$200,000	148,124.00	117,815.20	135,167.60	122,803.65	30,308.80	30,308.80	30,308.80	20.46	8.75	20.46	74.06	58.91	67.58	61.40
\$250,000	191,339.50	152,386.00	175,190.00	159,528.75	38,959.50	38,959.50	38,959.50	20.36	8.44	20.36	76.54	60.95	70.08	63.81
\$300,000	234,564.10	186,060.00	215,230.00	196,270.00	47,604.50	47,604.50	47,604.50	20.29	8.24	20.29	78.19	62.32	71.74	65.42
\$400,000	321,014.50	263,950.00	297,050.00	273,450.00	57,064.50	57,064.50	57,064.50	17.78	7.47	17.78	80.25	65.99	74.26	68.36
\$500,000	407,464.10	341,300.00	378,950.00	350,800.00	66,164.70	66,164.70	66,164.70	16.24	7.00	16.24	81.49	68.26	75.79	70.16
\$750,000	623,589.50	534,675.00	583,700.00	544,175.00	88,914.50	88,914.50	88,914.50	14.26	6.40	14.26	83.15	71.29	77.83	72.56
\$1,000,000	839,714.50	728,050.00	788,450.00	737,550.00	111,064.50	111,064.50	111,064.50	13.30	6.10	13.30	83.97	72.81	78.85	73.76
\$2,000,000	1,704,214.50	1,501,550.00	1,607,450.00	1,511,050.00	202,664.50	202,664.50	202,664.50	11.89	5.68	11.89	85.21	75.08	80.37	75.55
\$5,000,000	4,275,000.00	3,822,050.00	4,050,000.00	3,825,000.00	452,950.00	452,950.00	452,950.00	10.60	5.26	10.53	85.50	76.44	81.00	76.50

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

TABLE X-C.—Comparison of individual income tax under present law, under the House bill, and Finance Committee bill for persons 65 years of age and over

MARRIED PERSONS (BOTH OVER 65)—2 DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Amount of tax				Amount of tax reduction			Percent tax reduction			Effective rates				
	Present law	House bill	Finance Committee bill		House bill	Finance Committee bill		House bill	Finance Committee bill		Present law	House bill	Finance Committee bill		
			For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years		For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years		For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years					
	Percent	Percent			Percent			Percent			Percent	Percent			
\$2,000															
\$2,500	\$95.00				\$95.00	\$95.00	\$95.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	3.80				
\$3,000	190.00				190.00	190.00	190.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	6.33				
\$4,000	380.00	\$133.00	\$161.50	\$133.00	247.00	218.50	247.00	65.00	57.50	65.00	9.50	3.33	4.04	3.33	
\$5,000	589.00	304.00	342.00	304.00	285.00	247.00	285.00	48.39	41.94	48.39	11.78	6.08	6.84	6.08	
\$6,000	798.00	471.20	530.10	471.20	326.80	267.90	326.80	40.95	33.57	40.95	13.30	7.85	8.84	7.85	
\$7,000	1,045.00	638.40	718.20	638.40	406.60	326.80	406.60	38.91	31.27	38.91	14.93	9.12	10.26	9.12	
\$8,000	1,292.00	836.00	940.50	836.00	456.00	351.50	456.00	35.29	27.21	35.29	16.15	10.45	11.76	10.45	
\$9,000	1,577.00	1,033.00	1,162.80	1,033.00	543.40	414.20	543.40	34.46	26.27	34.46	17.52	11.48	12.92	11.48	
\$10,000	1,862.00	1,261.60	1,419.30	1,261.60	600.40	442.70	600.40	32.24	23.78	32.24	18.62	12.62	14.19	12.62	
\$11,000	2,185.00	1,489.60	1,675.80	1,489.60	695.00	509.20	695.00	31.83	23.30	31.83	19.86	13.54	15.23	13.54	
\$12,000	2,508.00	1,748.00	1,966.50	1,748.00	760.60	541.50	760.60	30.30	21.59	30.30	20.90	14.57	16.39	14.57	
\$13,000	2,869.00	2,006.40	2,257.20	2,006.40	862.60	611.80	862.60	30.07	21.32	30.07	22.07	15.43	17.36	15.43	
\$14,000	3,230.00	2,295.20	2,582.10	2,295.20	934.80	647.90	934.80	28.94	20.06	28.94	23.07	16.39	18.44	16.39	
\$15,000	3,638.00	2,584.00	2,907.00	2,584.00	1,054.50	731.50	1,054.50	28.98	20.10	28.98	24.26	17.23	19.38	17.23	
\$20,000	5,990.00	4,332.00	4,873.50	4,332.00	1,558.00	1,016.50	1,558.00	26.45	17.26	26.45	29.45	21.66	24.37	21.66	
\$25,000	8,521.00	6,368.80	7,164.90	6,368.80	2,152.70	1,356.60	2,152.70	25.26	15.92	25.26	34.09	25.48	28.66	25.48	
\$30,000	11,381.00	8,633.60	9,712.80	8,633.60	2,747.40	1,668.20	2,747.40	24.14	14.66	24.14	37.94	28.78	32.38	28.78	
\$40,000	17,442.00	13,459.60	15,142.05	13,459.60	3,982.40	2,299.95	3,982.40	22.83	13.19	22.83	43.61	33.65	37.86	33.65	
\$50,000	24,111.00	18,741.60	21,084.30	18,741.60	5,369.40	3,026.70	5,369.40	22.27	12.55	22.27	48.22	37.48	42.17	37.48	
\$60,000	31,179.00	24,373.20	27,419.85	24,373.20	6,805.80	3,759.15	6,805.80	21.83	12.06	21.83	51.97	40.62	45.70	40.62	
\$70,000	38,532.00	30,232.80	34,011.60	30,232.80	8,299.20	4,520.10	8,299.20	21.54	11.73	21.54	55.05	43.19	48.59	43.19	
\$80,000	46,170.00	36,320.40	40,860.45	36,320.40	9,849.60	5,309.55	9,849.60	21.33	11.50	21.33	57.71	45.40	51.08	45.40	
\$90,000	54,093.00	42,636.00	48,118.00	42,636.00	11,457.00	6,075.00	11,457.00	21.18	11.05	21.18	60.10	47.37	53.46	47.37	
\$100,000	62,301.00	49,179.60	55,694.80	49,179.60	13,121.40	6,606.20	13,121.40	21.06	10.60	21.06	62.30	49.18	55.69	49.18	
\$150,000	104,538.00	82,954.00	94,802.00	82,954.00	21,584.00	9,736.00	21,584.00	20.65	9.31	20.65	71.96	55.30	63.20	55.30	
\$200,000	147,269.00	117,131.20	134,375.60	117,131.20	28,793.93	12,893.40	28,793.93	20.46	8.75	20.46	75.63	58.57	67.19	61.04	
\$250,000	190,475.00	151,688.40	174,389.20	151,688.40	38,786.60	16,085.80	38,786.60	20.36	8.45	20.36	78.19	60.68	69.76	63.52	
\$300,000	233,700.00	186,268.40	214,429.20	186,268.40	47,431.60	19,270.80	47,431.60	20.30	8.25	20.30	80.04	62.09	71.48	65.18	
\$400,000	320,150.00	263,176.50	296,231.00	263,176.50	56,973.50	23,019.00	56,973.50	17.80	7.47	17.80	81.32	65.79	74.06	68.17	
\$500,000	406,600.00	340,526.50	378,131.00	340,526.50	66,073.50	28,469.00	66,073.50	16.25	7.00	16.25	81.32	68.11	75.63	70.01	
\$750,000	622,725.00	533,901.50	582,881.00	533,901.50	88,823.50	39,844.00	88,823.50	14.26	6.40	14.26	82.03	71.19	77.72	72.45	
\$1,000,000	838,850.00	727,276.50	787,631.00	727,276.50	111,573.50	51,219.00	111,573.50	13.30	6.11	13.30	83.89	72.73	78.76	73.68	
\$2,000,000	1,705,350.00	1,500,776.50	1,606,631.00	1,500,776.50	202,573.50	96,719.00	202,573.50	11.89	5.68	11.89	85.17	75.04	80.33	75.51	
\$5,000,000	4,275,000.00	3,821,276.50	4,050,000.00	3,825,000.00	453,723.50	225,000.00	453,723.50	10.61	5.26	10.53	85.50	76.43	81.00	76.50	

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

TABLE XI-A.—Comparison of spendable income under present law, House bill, and Finance Committee bill

SINGLE PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Spendable income after tax				Percent of spendable income after tax to net income before personal exemption			
	Present law	House bill	Finance Committee bill		Present law	House bill	Finance Committee bill	
			For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years			For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years
					Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
\$500	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$500.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
\$600	581.00	586.70	583.85	586.70	96.83	97.78	97.31	97.78
\$700	662.00	643.40	607.70	643.40	94.57	96.20	95.39	96.20
\$750	702.50	716.75	709.63	716.75	93.67	95.57	94.62	95.57
\$800	743.00	76.010	751.55	760.10	92.88	95.01	93.94	95.01
\$900	824.00	846.80	835.40	846.80	91.76	94.09	92.82	94.09
\$1,000	905.00	933.50	919.25	933.50	90.50	93.35	91.93	93.35
\$1,200	1,067.00	1,106.90	1,086.95	1,106.90	88.92	92.24	90.58	92.24
\$1,500	1,310.00	1,367.00	1,338.50	1,367.00	87.33	91.13	89.23	91.13
\$1,800	1,533.00	1,607.00	1,578.50	1,607.00	86.28	89.28	87.69	89.28
\$2,000	1,715.00	1,772.00	1,743.50	1,772.00	85.75	88.60	87.18	88.60
\$2,500	2,130.00	2,196.00	2,158.00	2,196.00	84.80	87.84	86.32	87.84
\$3,000	2,515.50	2,612.40	2,563.95	2,612.40	83.85	87.08	85.47	87.08
\$4,000	3,306.50	3,445.20	3,375.85	3,445.20	82.66	86.13	84.40	86.13
\$5,000	4,078.50	4,262.80	4,170.65	4,262.80	81.57	85.26	83.41	85.26
\$6,000	4,831.50	5,065.20	4,948.35	5,065.20	80.53	84.42	82.47	84.42
\$7,000	5,565.50	5,852.40	5,708.95	5,852.40	79.51	83.61	81.56	83.61
\$8,000	6,280.50	6,624.40	6,452.45	6,624.40	78.51	82.81	80.66	82.81
\$9,000	6,976.50	7,381.20	7,178.85	7,381.20	77.52	82.01	79.77	82.01
\$10,000	7,653.50	8,122.80	7,888.15	8,122.80	76.54	81.23	78.88	81.23
\$11,000	8,311.50	8,849.20	8,580.35	8,849.20	75.56	80.45	78.00	80.45
\$12,000	8,950.50	9,560.40	9,255.45	9,560.40	74.59	79.67	77.13	79.67
\$13,000	9,565.75	10,252.60	9,909.17	10,252.60	73.58	78.87	76.22	78.87
\$14,000	10,157.25	10,925.80	10,541.52	10,925.80	72.55	78.04	75.30	78.04
\$15,000	10,729.75	11,583.80	11,166.77	11,583.80	71.53	77.23	74.38	77.23
\$20,000	13,354.75	14,683.80	14,019.27	14,683.80	66.77	73.42	70.10	73.42
\$25,000	15,637.75	17,510.20	16,573.97	17,510.20	62.55	70.04	66.30	70.04
\$30,000	17,735.50	20,188.40	18,961.95	20,188.40	59.12	67.29	63.21	67.29
\$40,000	21,574.75	25,259.80	23,417.27	25,259.80	53.94	63.15	58.54	63.15
\$50,000	24,863.00	29,890.40	27,376.70	29,890.40	49.73	59.78	54.75	59.78
\$60,000	27,732.25	34,201.80	30,977.02	34,201.80	46.25	57.00	51.63	57.00
\$70,000	30,356.50	38,285.20	34,320.85	38,285.20	43.37	54.69	49.03	54.69
\$80,000	32,675.75	42,140.60	37,408.17	42,140.60	40.84	52.68	46.76	52.68
\$90,000	34,710.00	45,768.00	40,034.00	45,768.00	38.57	50.85	44.48	50.85
\$100,000	36,459.25	49,167.40	42,391.20	49,167.40	36.46	49.17	42.39	49.17
\$150,000	44,193.75	65,355.00	58,240.00	65,355.00	29.46	43.57	35.49	43.57
\$200,000	51,448.50	81,158.80	63,644.40	81,158.80	25.72	40.58	31.82	40.58
\$250,000	58,228.25	96,582.60	73,608.80	96,582.60	23.29	38.63	29.44	38.63
\$300,000	65,003.25	112,002.60	83,568.80	112,002.60	21.67	37.33	27.86	37.33
\$400,000	78,553.25	134,880.75	101,721.50	134,880.75	19.64	33.72	25.43	33.72
\$500,000	92,103.25	157,539.75	119,821.50	157,539.75	18.42	31.51	23.96	31.51
\$750,000	125,978.25	214,164.75	165,071.50	214,164.75	16.80	28.56	22.01	28.56
\$1,000,000	159,853.25	270,789.75	210,321.50	270,789.75	15.99	27.08	21.03	27.08
\$2,000,000	295,353.25	497,289.75	391,321.50	497,289.75	14.77	24.86	19.57	24.86
\$5,000,000	725,000.00	1,176,789.75	950,000.00	1,176,789.75	14.50	23.54	19.00	23.54

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

TABLE XI-B.—Comparison of spendable income under present law, House bill, and Finance Committee bill

MARRIED PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Spendable income after tax				Percent of spendable income after tax to net income before personal exemption			
	Present law	House bill	Finance Committee bill		Present law	House bill	Finance Committee bill	
			For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years			For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent year
					Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
\$1,000	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
\$1,200	1,162.00	1,173.40	1,167.70	1,173.40	96.83	97.78	97.31	97.78
\$1,500	1,405.00	1,433.50	1,419.25	1,433.50	93.67	95.57	94.62	95.57
\$1,800	1,648.00	1,693.50	1,670.80	1,693.50	91.56	94.08	92.82	94.08
\$2,000	1,810.00	1,867.00	1,838.50	1,867.00	90.50	93.35	91.93	93.35
\$2,500	2,215.00	2,272.00	2,243.50	2,272.00	88.60	90.88	89.74	90.88
\$3,000	2,620.00	2,696.00	2,658.00	2,696.00	87.33	89.87	88.60	89.87
\$4,000	3,411.00	3,528.80	3,469.90	3,528.80	85.28	88.22	86.75	88.22
\$5,000	4,202.00	4,361.60	4,281.80	4,361.60	84.04	87.23	85.64	87.23
\$6,000	4,955.00	5,164.00	5,059.50	5,164.00	82.58	86.07	84.33	86.07
\$7,000	5,708.00	5,966.40	5,837.20	5,966.40	81.54	85.23	83.39	85.23
\$8,000	6,420.00	6,738.40	6,580.70	6,738.40	80.29	84.23	82.26	84.23
\$9,000	7,138.00	7,510.40	7,324.20	7,510.40	79.31	83.45	81.38	83.45
\$10,000	7,815.00	8,252.00	8,033.50	8,252.00	78.15	82.52	80.34	82.52
\$11,000	8,492.00	8,993.60	8,742.80	8,993.60	77.20	81.76	79.48	81.76
\$12,000	9,131.00	9,704.80	9,417.90	9,704.80	76.09	80.87	78.48	80.87
\$13,000	9,770.00	10,416.00	10,093.00	10,416.00	75.15	80.12	77.64	80.12
\$14,000	10,361.50	11,089.20	10,725.35	11,089.20	74.01	79.21	76.61	79.21
\$15,000	10,953.00	11,762.40	11,357.70	11,762.40	73.02	78.42	75.72	78.42
\$20,000	13,606.50	14,885.20	14,245.85	14,885.20	68.03	74.43	71.23	74.43
\$25,000	15,918.00	17,734.00	16,826.20	17,734.00	63.67	70.94	67.30	70.94
\$30,000	18,030.00	20,424.00	19,227.00	20,424.00	60.10	68.08	64.09	68.08
\$40,000	21,902.50	25,322.00	23,712.25	25,322.00	54.76	63.81	59.28	63.81
\$50,000	25,205.00	30,164.00	27,684.50	30,164.00	50.41	60.33	55.37	60.33
\$60,000	28,108.50	34,486.80	31,297.63	34,486.80	46.85	57.48	52.16	57.48

TABLE XI-B.—Comparison of spendable income under present law, House bill, and Finance Committee bill—Continued

MARRIED PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS—CONTINUED

Net income before personal exemption	Spendable income after tax				Percent of spendable income after tax to net income before personal exemption			
	Present law	House bill	Finance Committee bill		Present law	House bill	Finance Committee bill	
			For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years			For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years
\$70,000.....	\$30,727.00	\$38,581.60	\$34,654.30	\$38,581.60	Percent 43.90	Percent 55.12	Percent 49.51	Percent 55.12
\$80,000.....	33,060.50	42,448.40	37,754.45	42,448.40	41.33	53.06	47.19	53.06
\$90,000.....	35,109.00	46,087.20	40,403.60	45,717.65	39.01	51.21	44.80	50.80
\$100,000.....	36,872.50	49,498.00	42,774.00	48,716.62	36.87	49.50	42.77	48.72
\$150,000.....	44,616.50	55,093.20	53,631.60	62,799.02	29.74	43.80	35.75	41.87
\$200,000.....	51,876.00	81,500.80	64,040.40	76,469.60	25.94	40.75	32.02	38.23
\$250,000.....	58,660.50	96,928.40	74,009.20	89,736.42	23.46	38.77	29.60	35.89
\$300,000.....	65,435.50	112,348.40	83,969.20	102,995.17	21.81	37.45	27.99	34.33
\$400,000.....	78,985.50	135,276.50	102,131.00	125,776.50	19.75	33.82	25.53	31.44
\$500,000.....	92,535.50	157,926.50	120,231.00	148,426.50	18.51	31.59	24.05	29.69
\$750,000.....	126,410.50	214,551.50	165,481.00	205,051.50	16.85	28.61	22.06	27.34
\$1,000,000.....	160,285.50	271,176.50	210,731.00	261,676.50	16.03	27.12	21.07	26.17
\$2,000,000.....	295,785.50	497,676.50	391,731.00	488,176.50	14.79	24.88	19.59	24.41
\$5,000,000.....	725,000.00	1,177,176.50	950,000.00	1,175,000.00	14.50	23.54	19.00	23.05

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

TABLE XII-A.—The estimated individual income-tax liability under present law, H. R. 1 as passed by the House, and the Senate Finance Committee bill with the half reduction in tax¹ (with assumed income payments of \$170,000,000,000²)

[Money amounts in millions]

Net income classes (in thousands)	Taxable returns		Net income		Tax liability under ³						Decrease in tax over present law							
	Number	Percent distribution	Amount	Percent distribution	Present law		H. R. 1 as passed by the House		Senate Finance Committee bill		H. R. 1 as passed by the House		Senate Finance Committee bill		H. R. 1 as passed by the House		Senate Finance Committee bill	
					Amount	Percent distribution	Amount	Percent distribution	Amount	Percent distribution	Simple distribution	Cumulated from smallest income class	Simple distribution	Cumulated from smallest income class	Simple distribution	Cumulated from smallest income class	Simple distribution	Cumulated from smallest income class
\$0 to \$1.....	6,989,303	14.07	\$5,417	4.47	\$365	2.05	\$252	1.84	\$303	1.94	\$113	\$113	\$62	\$62	2.79	2.79	2.94	2.94
\$1 to \$2.....	19,201,704	38.66	28,731	23.71	2,746	15.47	1,889	13.78	2,287	14.62	856	969	459	521	21.17	23.96	21.72	24.66
\$2 to \$3.....	13,519,423	27.22	33,479	27.63	3,368	18.97	2,565	18.71	2,939	18.79	803	1,772	429	950	19.86	43.82	20.29	44.95
\$3 to \$4.....	6,108,173	12.29	20,843	17.20	2,384	13.43	1,867	13.62	2,089	13.36	517	2,289	295	1,245	12.78	56.60	13.95	58.90
\$4 to \$5.....	1,909,500	3.84	8,440	6.97	1,136	6.40	898	6.55	1,007	6.44	238	2,527	129	1,374	5.89	62.49	6.10	65.00
Total under 5.....	47,723,103	96.08	96,900	79.98	9,999	56.32	7,472	54.50	8,625	55.15	2,527	-----	1,374	-----	62.49	-----	65.00	-----
\$5 to \$10.....	1,265,839	2.55	8,450	6.98	1,453	8.18	1,151	8.39	1,291	8.25	302	2,829	162	1,536	7.47	69.96	7.66	72.66
\$10 to \$25.....	530,578	1.07	7,850	6.48	2,125	11.97	1,698	12.38	1,907	12.19	427	3,256	218	1,754	10.55	80.51	10.31	82.97
\$25 to \$50.....	105,950	.21	3,580	2.96	1,501	8.45	1,205	8.79	1,350	8.63	296	3,552	151	1,905	7.32	87.83	7.14	90.11
\$50 to \$100.....	36,593	.07	2,537	2.09	1,385	7.80	1,116	8.14	1,272	8.13	269	3,821	113	2,018	6.65	94.48	5.35	95.46
\$100 to \$300.....	8,158	.02	1,260	1.04	857	4.83	695	5.07	787	5.03	162	3,983	70	2,088	4.01	98.49	3.31	98.77
\$300 to \$500.....	570	(4)	216	.18	161	.91	133	.97	150	.96	28	4,011	11	2,099	.69	99.18	.52	99.29
\$500 to \$1,000.....	290	(4)	197	.16	145	.82	126	.92	137	.88	19	4,030	8	2,107	.47	99.65	.38	99.67
\$1,000 and over.....	82	(4)	163	.13	129	.72	115	.84	122	.78	14	4,044	7	2,114	.35	100.00	.33	100.00
Total over 5.....	1,948,060	3.92	24,253	20.02	7,756	43.68	6,239	45.50	7,016	44.85	1,517	-----	740	-----	37.51	-----	35.00	-----
Grand total.....	49,671,163	100.00	121,153	100.00	17,755	100.00	13,711	100.00	15,641	100.00	4,044	-----	2,114	-----	100.00	-----	100.00	-----

¹ The half reduction in tax is effective under the Finance Committee bill in the calendar year 1947 only.

² This and the following table are for comparative purposes presented on the basis of income payments of \$170 billion. This does not represent a forecast for the calendar year 1947.

³ Normal tax, surtax, and alternative tax on capital gains.

⁴ Less than 0.01.

NOTE.—Figures do not necessarily add to totals because of rounding.

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

TABLE XII-B.—The estimated individual income tax liability under present law, H. R. 1 as passed by the House, and the Senate Finance Committee bill with the full reduction in tax¹ (with assumed income payments of \$170,000,000,000²)

[Money amounts in millions]

Net income classes (in thousands)	Taxable returns		Net income		Tax liability under ^{3—}						Decrease in tax over present law							
	Number	Percent distribution	Amount	Percent distribution	Present law		H. R. 1 as passed by the House		Senate Finance Committee bill		H. R. 1 as passed by the House		Senate Finance Committee bill		H. R. 1 as passed by the House		Senate Finance Committee bill	
					Amount	Percent distribution	Amount	Percent distribution	Amount	Percent distribution	Amount		Percentage distribution					
											Simple distribution	Cumulated from smallest income class	Simple distribution	Cumulated from smallest income class				
\$0 to \$1.....	6,989,303	14.07	\$5,417	4.47	\$365	2.05	\$252	1.84	\$251	1.83	\$113	\$113	\$114	\$114	2.79	2.79	2.84	2.84
\$1 to \$2.....	19,201,704	38.66	28,731	23.71	2,746	15.47	1,880	13.78	1,877	13.66	856	699	869	983	21.17	23.96	21.62	24.46
\$2 to \$3.....	13,519,423	27.22	33,479	27.63	3,368	18.97	2,565	18.71	2,552	18.58	803	1,772	816	1,799	19.86	43.82	20.30	44.76
\$3 to \$4.....	6,103,173	12.29	20,843	17.20	2,384	13.43	1,867	13.62	1,853	13.49	517	2,289	531	2,330	12.78	56.60	13.21	57.97
\$4 to \$5.....	1,909,500	3.84	8,440	6.97	1,136	6.40	898	6.55	894	6.51	238	2,527	242	2,572	5.89	62.49	6.03	64.00
Total under 5.....	47,723,163	96.08	96,900	79.98	9,999	56.32	7,472	54.50	7,427	54.07	2,527	2,572	2,572	2,572	62.49	64.00	64.00	64.00
\$5 to \$10.....	1,265,839	2.55	8,450	6.98	1,453	8.18	1,151	8.39	1,147	8.35	302	2,829	306	2,878	7.47	69.96	7.61	71.61
\$10 to \$25.....	530,578	1.07	7,850	6.48	2,125	11.97	1,698	12.38	1,697	12.35	427	3,552	428	3,306	10.55	80.51	10.65	82.26
\$25 to \$50.....	105,950	.21	3,580	2.96	1,501	8.45	1,205	8.79	1,204	8.77	296	3,552	297	3,603	7.32	87.83	7.39	89.65
\$50 to \$100.....	36,593	.07	2,537	2.09	1,385	7.80	1,116	8.14	1,162	8.46	269	3,821	223	3,826	6.65	94.48	5.55	95.20
\$100 to \$300.....	8,158	.02	1,260	1.04	857	4.83	695	5.07	716	5.21	162	3,983	141	3,967	4.01	98.49	3.51	98.71
\$300 to \$500.....	570	(1)	216	.18	161	.91	133	.97	138	1.01	28	4,011	23	3,990	.69	99.18	.57	99.28
\$500 to \$1,000.....	290	(1)	197	.16	145	.82	126	.92	129	.94	19	4,030	16	4,006	.47	99.65	.40	99.68
\$1,000 and over.....	82	(1)	163	.13	129	.72	115	.84	116	.84	14	4,044	13	4,019	.35	100.00	.32	100.00
Total over 5.....	1,948,060	3.92	24,253	20.02	7,756	43.68	6,239	45.50	6,309	45.93	1,517	1,447	1,447	1,447	37.51	36.00	36.00	36.00
Grand total.....	49,671,163	100.00	121,153	100.00	17,755	100.00	13,711	100.00	13,736	100.00	4,044	4,019	4,019	4,019	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

¹ The full reduction in tax is effective under the Finance Committee bill in 1948 and subsequent calendar years.
² This and the prior table are for comparative purposes presented on the basis of income payments of \$170 billion. This does not represent a forecast for the calendar year 1948.
³ Normal tax, surtax, and alternative tax on capital gains.
⁴ Less than 0.01.

NOTE.—Figures do not necessarily add to totals because of rounding.
 Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

DETAILED DISCUSSION OF THE TECHNICAL PROVISIONS OF THE BILL
 SECTION I. SHORT TITLE

Section 1 provides that the act may be cited as the "Individual Income Tax Reduction Act of 1947."

SECTION 2. REDUCTION OF NORMAL TAX AND SURTAX ON INDIVIDUALS

Under existing law the income tax on individuals is determined by first computing tentative taxes at the rates specified in sections 11 and 12 of the code and then reducing the tentative taxes by 5 percent thereof. Section 2 of the House bill provided reductions in the normal tax and surtax on individuals by substituting a larger percentage reduction than 5 percent of the tentative taxes.

With respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1946, the House bill reduced the aggregate of the tentative normal tax and the tentative surtax, as follows:

1. If the aggregate of the tentative taxes is \$200 or less, such aggregate is reduced by 33½ percent thereof, a reduction of 30 percent of the tax under existing law;
2. If the aggregate of the tentative taxes is over \$200 but not over \$279.17, such aggregate is reduced by \$67, a reduction varying from 30 percent to 20 percent of the tax under existing law;
3. If the aggregate of the tentative taxes is over \$279.17 but not over \$250,000, such aggregate is reduced by 24 percent thereof, a reduction of 20 percent of the tax under existing law;
4. If the aggregate of the tentative taxes is in excess of \$250,000, the first \$250,000 thereof is reduced by 24 percent (a 20-percent reduction of such portion of the aggregate of tentative taxes after its 5-percent reduction under existing law), and the amount of such aggregate in excess of \$250,000 is reduced by 15 percent, a reduction of approximately 10.5 percent of such portion after its 5-percent reduction under existing law.

Your committee recommends the adoption of the reductions of the House bill for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1947 (with the exception of the introduction of a new bracket covering the aggregate of tentative normal tax and tentative surtax over \$50,000 and not over \$250,000), but recommends that for taxable years beginning in 1947 the reduction should be approximately one-half the reductions recommended for future taxable years.

With respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1947, the committee amendment—

- (a) retains the reductions provided in the House bill stated in paragraphs 1 and 2 above;
- (b) in cases where the aggregate of tentative taxes is over \$279.17 but not over \$50,000 retains the rule of paragraph 3 above;
- (c) in cases where the aggregate of tentative taxes is in excess of \$50,000 but not in excess of \$250,000, retains the rule of paragraph 3 above as to the first \$50,000, but provides a reduction with respect to such excess over \$50,000 of 19¼ percent (instead of 24 percent as provided in the House bill), equivalent to a reduction of 15 percent of such portion of the aggregate of tentative taxes after its 5 percent reduction under existing law, as opposed to a comparable reduction of 20 percent under the House bill;
- (d) in cases where the aggregate of tentative taxes is in excess of \$250,000, while still retaining the rule of paragraph 3 above as to the first \$50,000—
 - (1) provides, with respect to the portion in excess of \$50,000 and not in excess of \$250,000, the rule stated in paragraph (c), and
 - (2) adopts as to the portion of such aggregate of tentative taxes over \$250,000 the same rule as under the House bill (stated in paragraph 4 above) namely: a reduction of 15 percent, equivalent to a reduction of approximately 10.5 percent of such portion of the aggregate of tentative taxes after its 5 percent reduction under existing law.

With respect to taxable years beginning in 1947, your committee amendment provides a

reduction in tax equivalent to approximately half the reduction which your committee would provide in the case of taxable years beginning after 1947. Under the committee amendment—

- (a) if the aggregate of the tentative normal tax and tentative surtax is \$200 or less, such aggregate is reduced by 19¼ percent thereof, a reduction of 15 percent of the tax under existing law;
- (b) if the aggregate of the tentative taxes is over \$200 but not over \$265.52, such aggregate is reduced by \$38.50, a reduction varying from 15 percent to 10 percent of the tax under existing law;
- (c) if the aggregate of the tentative taxes is over \$265.52 but not over \$50,000, such aggregate is reduced by 14.5 percent thereof, a reduction of 10 percent of the tax under existing law;
- (d) if the aggregate of the tentative taxes exceeds \$50,000 but does not exceed \$250,000, the aggregate is reduced by \$7,250 plus 12 percent of the excess of such aggregate over \$50,000. This reduction, with respect to the portion of the aggregate of tentative taxes not over \$50,000, is equivalent to a reduction of 10 percent of such portion after its 5-percent reduction under existing law. With respect to the portion of such aggregate in excess of \$50,000, this reduction is equivalent to a reduction of approximately 7.5 percent of such portion after its 5-percent reduction under existing law;
- (e) if the aggregate of such tentative taxes exceeds \$250,000, the aggregate is reduced by \$31,250 plus 10 percent of the excess of such aggregate over \$250,000. This reduction, with respect to the portion of such aggregate of tentative taxes not in excess of \$50,000, is a reduction of 10 percent of such portion after its 5-percent reduction under existing law. With respect to the portion of such aggregate of tentative taxes in excess of \$50,000 but not in excess of \$250,000, the reduction is equivalent to a reduction of approximately 7.5 percent of such portion after its 5-percent reduction under existing law. With respect to the portion of such aggregate of tentative

taxes in excess of \$250,000, the reduction is equivalent to a reduction of approximately 5.3 percent of such portion after its 5-percent reduction under existing law.

Section 12 (g) of the code provides, as an over-all limitation upon the combined normal tax and surtax in the case of individuals, that such combined tax shall not exceed 85½ percent of the next income of the taxpayer. The House bill substituted for this percentage figure 76½ percent to be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1946. The committee amendment retains the House figure, but limits its application to taxable years beginning after 1947. With respect to taxable years beginning in 1947, your committee, in order to conform with the revised reductions for 1947, provides that the over-all limitation shall be 81 percent.

For purposes of clarity your committee has combined the various percentage reductions in the tentative taxes into two tables, one applicable for taxable years beginning in 1947 and the other applicable for taxable years beginning after 1947. Section 2 (c) of your committee bill incorporates these tables in section 12 (g) of the code. Sections 11 and 12 of the code are amended by sections 2 (a) and 2 (b), respectively, of your committee bill to provide that the tentative normal tax and tentative surtax computed under such sections shall be reduced as provided in the tables under section 12 (g) of the code as amended by your committee.

The tables provided under the committee amendment to section 12 (g) of the code are designed to apply to the aggregate of the tentative normal tax and tentative surtax, and to provide for a reduction in the combined normal tax and surtax. In view of the fact that there are certain provisions of the code, such as sections 105 and 106, which make it necessary to determine the surtax separately from the normal tax, your committee has provided in section 12 (g) a special rule for making such computations. Under this rule, the surtax shall be an amount which is the same proportion of the combined normal tax and surtax as the tentative surtax is of the aggregate of the tentative normal tax and tentative surtax.

Special provision is made in section 6 of the bill for taxable years beginning in 1946 and ending in 1947, or beginning in 1947 and ending in 1948.

SECTION 3. INDIVIDUALS WITH ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME OF LESS THAN \$5,000

Section 3 of the House bill amended the tax table contained in section 400 of the code, relating to the optional tax on individuals with adjusted gross incomes of less than \$5,000. The bill as reported by your committee limits the application of the tax table in the House bill to taxable years beginning after 1947, and provides an additional tax table to be applicable to taxable years beginning in 1947 to reflect the reductions provided by your committee in section 2 of the bill with respect to taxable years beginning in 1947. Special provision is made in section 6 of the bill for taxable years beginning in 1946 and ending in 1947, or beginning in 1947 and ending in 1948.

SECTION 4. ADDITIONAL CREDIT AGAINST NET INCOME FOR NORMAL TAX AND SURTAX

Section 25 (b) (1) of the code now provides certain exemptions which are allowable as credits against net income in computing the normal tax and surtax. Section 4 of the House bill amended section 25 (b) (1) of the code by introducing an additional exemption of \$500 for a taxpayer who attains the age of 65 before the end of the taxable year. The House bill provided that in the case of a joint return the additional exemption of \$500 is allowed each spouse who has attained the age of 65 and whose gross income for the taxable year is \$500 or more. The bill as reported by your committee re-

tains the provision of the House bill respecting the additional exemption of \$500 for a taxpayer who has attained the age of 65 and the additional exemption of \$500 for the taxpayer's spouse who has attained the age of 65, but removes the requirement that the spouse must have gross income for the taxable year of \$500 or more. Where a joint return is filed and both the husband and wife have attained the age of 65, the additional exemption for old age will be \$500 for each such taxpayer.

The additional exemptions provided by section 4 of your committee bill, as in the corresponding provision of the House bill, do not apply to a nonresident alien who is not a resident of a contiguous country, to a citizen of the United States who is entitled to the benefits of section 251 of the code, relating to income from sources within possessions of the United States, or to a citizen of a possession of the United States (other than the Virgin Islands) not otherwise a citizen of the United States and not a resident of the United States.

Subsection (b) of section 4 of the House bill amended section 25 (b) (2) of the code to provide that for the purposes of the additional exemption for old age the determination of whether or not an individual has attained the age of 65 shall be made as of the last day of the taxable year. Your committee bill amends section 25 (b) (1) of the code to incorporate this provision, and subsection (b) of section 4 of the House bill has, therefore, been eliminated. In determining the age of an individual for the purposes of the exemption for old age the last day of the taxable year of the taxpayer is the controlling date. Thus, in the event of a separate return by a husband no additional exemption for old age may be claimed for his spouse unless such spouse has attained the age of 65 on or before the last day of the taxable year of the husband. Nor will the husband filing a separate return be entitled to such exemption for said spouse if during the calendar year in which his taxable year begins, he received over half of her support from another taxpayer. In no event shall the additional exemption for old age be allowed with respect to a spouse who dies before attaining the age of 65, even though such spouse would have attained the age of 65 before the close of the taxpayer's taxable year. For the purposes of the old-age exemption, an individual attains the age of 65 on the first moment of the day preceding his sixty-fifth birthday. Accordingly, an individual whose sixty-fifth birthday falls on January 1 in a given year attains the age of 65 on the last day of the calendar year immediately preceding.

Your committee has eliminated subsection (c) of section 4 of the House bill. This subsection amended section 22 of the code (relating to gross income) by adding a new subsection (o) to require an individual entitled to the old-age exemption to include in gross income for the taxable year the first \$500 of certain tax-exempt pensions, annuities, etc. Subsection (d) of section 4 of the House bill which made a technical amendment to section 22 (b) (5) of the code has likewise been eliminated in view of the removal of the provision which originally necessitated its inclusion.

Subsection (b) of section 4 of the bill as reported by your committee contains four technical amendments, not found in the House bill, necessitated by the insertion in the code of the old-age exemption.

Paragraph (1) of section 4 (b) amends section 58 (a) (1) of the code. Existing law requires a declaration of estimated tax if the taxpayers' gross income from wages subject to withholding may be expected to exceed \$5,000 plus \$500 for each exemption to which he is entitled except his own exemption. Your committee amends section 58 (a) (1) to give effect to the old age exemption provided in the bill. Under the amendment a

declaration will be required if the anticipated wage exceeds \$4,500 plus \$500 for each exemption to which the taxpayer is entitled, including his own exemption. Under existing law a single person who has no dependents and is under 65 years of age and who derives his income solely from wages subject to withholding is required to file a declaration if his anticipated wages for the calendar year exceed \$5,000. Under the committee amendment the same result will follow (\$4,500 plus \$500 for his own exemption). Under the committee amendment if the same individual is over the age of 65 the declaration would not be required unless his anticipated wages for the calendar year exceeded \$5,500 (\$4,500 plus \$500 for his own exemption plus \$500 for his old-age exemption). Similarly under existing law, a single person under the age of 65 who has one dependent is not required to file a declaration unless his anticipated wages exceed \$5,500 (\$5,000 plus \$500 for the dependent). The same result would follow under the committee amendment (\$4,500 plus \$500 for his own exemption plus \$500 for his dependent).

The House bill does not make available for withholding purposes the additional exemption allowed to individuals who have attained the age of 65. Paragraph (2) of section 4 (b) would amend section 1622 (h) (1) of the code to authorize the allowance of the old-age exemption for withholding purposes. Paragraph (3) would require employers to give effect to the additional exemption with respect to the first payment of wages made on or after the ninetieth day after the date of the enactment of the bill, if a withholding exemption certificate is filed at least 30 days before such ninetieth day. This will allow employees approximately 60 days from the date of enactment within which to furnish new exemption certificates and will allow employers a minimum of 30 days to give effect to such certificates.

Paragraph (4) of section 4 (b) amends section 23 (x) of the code relating to deduction of medical, etc., expenses. Under the House bill the amendment providing for the additional exemption for old age had the effect of increasing from \$1,250 to \$2,500 the maximum deduction provided for medical expenses by section 23 (x) of the code in the case of a single individual over 65 years of age having no dependents. Under the committee amendment the maximum deduction provided for medical expenses by section 23 (x) of the code will not be increased by the additional exemption provided for old age.

Subsection (c) of this section of your committee bill is identical with subsection (e) of section 4 as passed by the House, and provides that the amendments made by this section shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1946. Special provision is made in section 6 of the bill for taxable years beginning in 1946 and ending in 1947.

SECTION 5. REDUCTION IN WITHHOLDING OF TAX AT SOURCE ON WAGES

Section 5 (a) of the House bill amended section 1622 (a) of the code, relating to the percentage method of withholding, to reflect the reductions in tax provided in section 2 of that bill. The House bill required the application of four rates in computing the amount to be withheld under the percentage method instead of the two rates provided in existing law. Your committee amendment simplifies the computation under the percentage method of withholding by substituting three rates for the four provided in the House bill. The wage bracket withholding tables contained in section 5 (b) of the House bill are also adjusted to conform to the above change.

Under your committee amendment section 5 of the bill is made applicable with respect to wages paid on or after July 1, 1947, instead of June 1, 1947, as provided in the House bill.

SECTION 6. FISCAL YEAR TAXPAYERS

The bill as reported by your committee retains the provision of the House bill respecting the computation of the tax for fiscal years beginning in 1946 and ending in 1947, and adds a new subsection to section 108 to provide for the computation of the tax imposed by sections 11, 12, and 400 for taxable years beginning in 1947 and ending in 1948. This new subsection is necessitated by your committee amendments providing tax reductions for 1947 different from those provided for subsequent years.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the Senate has before it House bill 1, which is cited as the Individual Income Tax Reduction Act of 1947. This bill was reported by the Senate committee with amendments after 9 days of open hearings. Representatives of labor, management, and other groups were heard. The testimony covers 582 printed pages. The record and the report of the committee are on the desks of Senators.

When viewed most conservatively, the present outlook indicates that revenues for the fiscal year 1948 will run well ahead of the budget estimate made last December. This is shown by the increased receipts in the March 1947 returns, and by the fact that income payments in January, February, and March were higher than anticipated. The income level of \$177,000,000,000 during these months is all the more impressive because it does not reflect the wage increases now being made. Because of these wage changes it is likely that the income payments in April, May, and June will be at least as high as those earlier in the year.

The tax collections in the fiscal year 1948 depend to a considerable extent upon the economic conditions prevailing in the earlier years. In taxation, as in other fields, collections lag behind obligations. For this reason the Treasury's estimate of receipts for the fiscal year 1948 is too low. This estimate was submitted on January 3 on the basis of calculations made in December 1946. The level of income payments for the calendar year 1947 used in that estimate was about \$10,000,000,000 less than the level experienced to date in the calendar year 1947.

The Treasury's underestimate of income payments during the first 6 months of the calendar year 1947 means that its estimate of 1948 collections is too low, even though the level of income payments assumed by the Treasury for the fiscal year 1948 itself should turn out to be correct.

An independent estimate prepared recently by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation indicates that receipts in 1948 will be substantially larger than those shown in the Budget message. The extent of the difference between the staff and Treasury estimates depends on the level of income payments assumed for the fiscal year 1948. At the levels which are most likely to appear, an ample surplus will remain to provide for debt retirement and contingencies even after making due allowance for the loss of revenue; if this should develop, resulting from the enactment of H. R. 1. I will discuss this point in detail later.

If we are going to maintain our production and employment at their present

high levels, a tax reduction at this time is most important. This bill is designed primarily to relieve our individual taxpayers from the oppressive tax rates which constitute so great an obstacle to the efficient operation of our peacetime economy. This tax reduction will increase the incentives upon which our system of free private enterprise depends. It will help to stimulate managerial effort. It will encourage the release of venture capital needed to finance the expansion of business and employment basic to the maintenance of our present high level of economic activity.

Because it brings relief to all individual income taxpayers, this bill will be effective in increasing consumer purchasing power. This also will contribute to the maintenance of the existing high levels of income and employment.

Let us examine H. R. 1 and see exactly what it does. While this bill gives all of the 49,500,000 taxpayers filing returns a reduction in taxes, the largest part of the relief goes to those with surtax net incomes of \$1,000 or less. This group includes single persons making up to \$1,667 per year, married couples making up to \$2,222 per year, and married couples with two dependents making up to \$3,333 per year.

These taxpayers will receive a 30-percent reduction in their tax liability in 1948 and subsequent years. In 1947, the reduction will be 15 percent on a full-year basis. However, since new withholding rates with the full 30-percent reduction will be put into operation July 1, 1947, the great mass of these taxpayers will begin to feel the 30-percent reduction immediately after July 1. This group comprises over 26,000,000 taxpayers, or 53 percent of the total number filing returns.

The group receiving the next largest reduction consists of taxpayers with surtax net incomes between \$1,000 and approximately \$1,400. This group numbers around 7,000,000 taxpayers. The bill will reduce their tax by a flat amount of \$67 in 1948 and subsequent years. This \$67 includes the 5-percent reduction allowed under existing law. For 1947 the reduction is \$38.50. This also takes into account the existing 5-percent reduction. However, the full reduction of \$67 has been incorporated in the withholding tables which go into operation July 1, 1947.

The third group consists of taxpayers whose surtax net incomes are between \$1,400 and \$80,000. There are sixteen and one-half million taxpayers in this group, or about one-third of the total. H. R. 1 will reduce their tax by 20 percent in 1948 and subsequent years and by 10 percent in 1947.

The fourth group consists of taxpayers with surtax net incomes between \$80,000 and \$302,000. Approximately 15,000 taxpayers are in this group. This is about three-tenths of 1 percent of the total number of taxpayers. For 1948 and subsequent years this group is given a 15-percent reduction on that part of the tax attributable to income in excess of \$80,000 and 20 percent on that part of the tax attributable to the income below \$80,000. The House bill allowed this group a full 20-percent reduction on their

entire tax. For 1947 this group receives a reduction which is approximately one-half that allowed in 1948.

Those with surtax net incomes above \$302,000 comprise the final group. There are only 577 taxpayers in this group. These receive the same reduction as the previous group on that part of the tax attributable to their surtax net income up to about \$302,000. On that part of the tax attributable to the income in excess of that amount the committee retains the House reduction of 10½ percent for 1948 and subsequent years. For 1947 the reduction on that part of the tax applicable to the income above \$302,000 is approximately 5 percent.

The Treasury has estimated that out of 48,000,000 taxpayers 22,000,000 will not have to compute their tax at all. Their tax will be computed by the collector.

About sixteen and one-half million will use the tax table in which their tax is automatically computed for them. Only about 10,000,000 will compute their tax on Form 1040.

Of these 10,000,000, half will compute their tax exactly as they do under existing law, except that for 1947 they will reduce their tax by 19¼ percent instead of 5 percent, and for 1948 by 33½ percent instead of the present 5 percent. I cannot help feeling that in view of the tax reduction which they receive they will be very happy to do this.

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

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

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has been discussing House bill 1. I am not sure that I understand fully whether he is discussing the bill which has been reported to the Senate by the Committee on Finance, or whether he is discussing the bill (H. R. 1) which came to the Senate Committee on Finance from the House of Representatives.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am discussing the Senate version of the bill as amended by the committee.

Mr. President, 1,666,000 taxpayers will reduce their tax by \$38.50 for 1947 and a flat \$67 for 1948. The procedure for these taxpayers will be much simpler than under existing law. Instead of reducing their tax by 5 percent, they will reduce it by the flat amount referred to above.

Approximately 3,300,000 taxpayers remain. The procedure which they will follow will also be simple. Most of these taxpayers will reduce their tax by 14½ percent for 1947 and 24 percent for 1948 instead of the present 5 percent. This group will find it just as simple to use the reduction in this bill as the present 5-percent reduction.

One way of seeing how the tax reductions provided by this bill operate is to see what happens to spendable income.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a table which shows the relation between the spendable income of a married person with no dependents, under existing law, and under the bill as reported by the Committee on Finance.

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

TABLE I.—Comparison of spendable income under present law and Finance Committee bill

MARRIED PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Spendable income after tax			Percent of spendable income after tax to net income before personal exemption		
	Present law	Finance Committee bill		Present law	Finance Committee bill	
		For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years		For 1947	For 1948 and subsequent years
\$1,000	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
\$1,200	1,162.00	1,167.70	1,173.40	96.83	97.31	97.78
\$1,500	1,405.00	1,419.25	1,433.50	93.67	94.62	95.57
\$1,800	1,648.00	1,670.80	1,693.60	91.56	92.82	94.08
\$2,000	1,810.00	1,838.50	1,867.00	90.50	91.93	93.35
\$2,500	2,215.00	2,243.50	2,272.00	88.60	89.74	90.88
\$3,000	2,620.00	2,658.00	2,696.00	87.33	88.60	89.87
\$4,000	3,411.00	3,460.90	3,528.80	85.28	86.75	88.22
\$5,000	4,202.00	4,281.00	4,361.00	84.04	85.64	87.23
\$6,000	4,955.00	5,059.50	5,164.00	82.58	84.33	86.07
\$7,000	5,708.00	5,837.20	5,966.40	81.54	83.39	85.23
\$8,000	6,420.00	6,580.70	6,738.40	80.29	82.26	84.23
\$9,000	7,138.00	7,324.20	7,510.40	79.31	81.88	83.45
\$10,000	7,815.00	8,033.50	8,252.00	78.15	80.34	82.52
\$11,000	8,492.00	8,742.80	8,993.60	77.20	79.48	81.76
\$12,000	9,131.00	9,417.90	9,704.80	76.09	78.48	80.87
\$13,000	9,770.00	10,093.00	10,416.00	75.15	77.64	80.12
\$14,000	10,361.50	10,725.35	11,089.20	74.01	76.61	79.21
\$15,000	10,953.00	11,357.70	11,762.40	73.02	75.72	78.42
\$20,000	13,606.50	14,243.85	14,885.20	68.03	71.23	74.43
\$25,000	15,918.00	16,526.20	17,734.00	63.67	67.30	70.94
\$30,000	18,030.00	19,227.00	20,424.00	60.10	64.09	68.08
\$40,000	21,992.50	23,712.25	25,622.00	54.76	59.28	63.81
\$50,000	25,205.00	27,684.60	30,164.00	50.41	55.37	60.33
\$60,000	28,108.50	31,297.65	34,486.80	46.85	52.16	57.48
\$70,000	30,727.00	34,654.30	38,581.60	43.90	49.51	55.12
\$80,000	33,060.50	37,754.45	42,448.40	41.33	47.19	53.06
\$90,000	35,109.00	40,403.60	45,717.65	39.01	44.89	50.80
\$100,000	36,872.50	42,774.00	48,716.62	36.87	42.77	48.72
\$150,000	44,616.50	53,631.60	62,799.02	29.74	35.75	41.87
\$200,000	51,876.00	64,040.40	76,469.60	25.94	32.02	38.23
\$250,000	58,660.50	74,009.20	89,736.42	23.46	29.60	35.89
\$300,000	65,435.50	83,969.20	102,995.17	21.81	27.99	34.33
\$400,000	78,985.50	102,131.00	125,776.50	19.75	25.53	31.44
\$500,000	92,535.50	120,231.00	148,426.50	18.51	24.05	29.69
\$750,000	126,410.50	165,481.00	205,051.50	16.85	22.06	27.34
\$1,000,000	160,285.50	210,731.00	261,676.50	16.03	21.07	26.17
\$2,000,000	295,785.50	391,731.00	488,176.50	14.79	19.59	24.41
\$5,000,000	725,000.00	950,000.00	1,175,000.00	14.50	19.00	23.05

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It will be seen from this table that under existing law a married person with a \$1,200 income has 96.8 percent of his total income left after tax and about 98 percent left under the bill. However, as the income increases the percentage retained becomes smaller and smaller. For example, the \$12,000 man has only 76 percent left under existing law, and about 81 percent left under the bill; the \$25,000 man has 64 percent left under existing law, and 71 percent under the bill; the \$100,000 man has 37 percent left under existing law, and 49 percent under the bill; and the \$1,000,000 man has 16 percent left under existing law, and 26 percent under the bill.

One of the chief differences between your committee's bill and that which passed the House is the fact that the latter provided for a retroactive tax reduction to January 1, 1947. Your committee's bill has roughly the effect of making the reduction on July 1.

The principal reason for this amendment of the House bill was the effect of the latter on the budget for the fiscal year 1948. The revenue loss resulting from the House version would be \$4,900,000,000, with income payments at \$170,000,000,000. Under the bill as amended by your committee, the reduction for the fiscal year 1948, with the same income payments, will be \$3,200,000,000. Your committee believes that

its bill gives greater assurance that the desired volume of debt retirement will take place, and that adequate provision will be made for such contingencies as might arise.

This amendment to the House bill will also eliminate most of the tax refunds which would have occurred in the fiscal year 1948 under the House bill.

Your committee believes that the refunds resulting from the retroactive feature of the House bill would be of little value from the point of view of stimulating managerial incentive and investment.

The bill provides a special exemption for all persons 65 or over. This group is particularly in need of relief at the present time. It includes a great many retired school teachers, policemen, municipal workers, and persons who have retired from private industry, whose sole source of livelihood is the small amount which they receive as a pension or annuity or as retirement pay.

The concentration of small incomes among persons 65 or over is unusually great. A study by the Bureau of Labor Statistics relating to the year 1944, showed that 45 percent of single males aged 60 or over had incomes below \$1,000, as compared with only 13.6 percent of the single males between 30 and 60. The same study showed that 27 percent of the families of two, with a male head, fell in this income class—namely, the

group having incomes of less than \$1,000—when the head of the family was 60 or over, while less than 3 percent did so when the age of the head of the family was between 30 and 60. Similar results appear in another Bureau of Labor Statistics investigation relating to 1941. The recent national survey of liquid-asset holdings, spending, and saving, conducted by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, bears out the heavy concentration of small incomes among persons aged 60 or more.

Available statistical data also show that persons aged 65 or more suffered unusually as a result of the increases in cost of living and taxes during recent years. Their incomes did not increase in proportion to the rise in prices and the increase in taxes. Unlike younger persons, most of those now over 65 were unable to supplement their regular incomes by engaging in a gainful occupation at prevailing high rates of wages. Hence, their economic position deteriorated, relative to that of the rest of the community.

The special exemption for all persons aged 65 or over will benefit 3,700,000 taxpayers and will remove 1,400,000 from the tax rolls.

Certain persons 65 and over are already benefiting by a system of exclusions of particular types of income which is a part of existing law. For instance, recipients of annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act and retirement pay of Army or Navy officers discharged by reason of medical survey are excluded in full from gross income by statutory enactment. Annuities under the old-age and survivors insurance system of the Social Security Act have been excluded by Treasury decision.

Of course, these exclusions work a discrimination against recipients of other types of income. The result has been an insistent demand for the extension of similar treatment to other types of retirement income, such as the pensions and annuities paid to former employees of State and local governments, retired school teachers, and former civil-service employees in the Federal Government. The general exemption for all taxpayers 65 and over seems to be a more satisfactory answer to this problem rather than an extension of the system of exclusions of particular types of income.

The House bill contained a provision intended to keep persons who were receiving the fully excluded types of retirement income from obtaining the full benefit of the new \$500 exemption for persons aged 65 and over. That was done by requiring a taxpayer who qualified for the new exemption to include in his gross income the first \$500 received on the account of pensions, annuities, or retirement pay which, but for this bill, would have been excluded in full from gross income.

The principle upon which this provision is based is sound. However, representatives of the Treasury Department have pointed out that this particular section of the House bill involves unusual difficulties of interpretation and administration. Hence it seemed advisable to delete the provision in question from

House bill 1 in order to permit a thorough study of the problem at hand to be made.

Your committee is of the opinion that some remedy for the existing discrimination between various types of retirement income must be found. This problem will be dealt with in connection with the next general tax bill. Meanwhile it should be pointed out that the additional \$500 exemption for persons 65 and over, allowed under House bill 1, may constitute sufficient basis for removing entirely the exclusions of particular types of retirement incomes enjoyed under existing law and Treasury rulings.

One further amendment was made in the portion of the House bill which dealt with this special \$500 exemption. As passed by the House, this exemption was limited to persons aged 65 or over who received gross income of \$500 or more. When the tax is calculated on the basis of a joint return of husband and wife, both of whom are in the appropriate age group, this feature of the House bill involves a substantial inequity. If the wife had, let us say, only \$499 of gross income, under the House bill the couple would receive an additional exemption of \$500. If she had a gross income of \$501, the couple would receive an additional exemption of \$1,000. This difference would appear, even though the total income of the couple remained the same.

To eliminate this inequity the committee amended the House bill so as to allow the \$500 deduction with respect to all persons 65 years of age or over.

As heretofore stated, the bulk of the tax reduction provided by the bill will go to persons with income of \$5,000 or less. I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a table showing the percentage of reductions which go to persons in specific income brackets.

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

Estimated percentage distribution of the individual income-tax liability and taxpayers under present law, and of total tax reduction under your committee's bill with a full year's reduction in tax (with assumed income payments of \$170,000,000,000)

Net income class	Percentage distribution of—		
	Total taxpayers	Total tax paid under present law	Total reduction under Senate Finance Committee bill
\$0 to \$2,000.....	52.7	17.5	24.5
\$2,000 to \$5,000.....	43.4	39.3	39.5
Total below \$5,000.....	96.1	56.8	64.0
\$5,000 to \$10,000.....	2.6	8.2	7.6
\$10,000 to \$25,000.....	1.1	12.0	16.7
\$25,000 and over.....	.2	23.0	17.7
Total over \$5,000.....	3.9	43.2	36.0
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, this table shows that nearly 65 percent of the benefits of the full rate reduction provided by the bill will go to individuals having net incomes of \$5,000 or less. These individuals pay 56.8 percent of the total taxes levied under existing law.

Those with incomes of \$2,000 or less will receive about 25 percent of the total tax reduction provided by the bill. These people now pay 17.5 percent of the tax levied under existing law.

Persons with incomes of \$10,000 and over will receive about 28 percent of the tax reduction. These people are paying 35 percent of the taxes imposed by existing law. These facts reveal the fallacy of any complaint that H. R. 1 brings inadequate relief to the recipients of smaller incomes.

Some critics of the bill allege that the percentage of the relief given to those in the lower brackets should be even greater. Usually this conclusion is reached by pointing out that the percentage reductions provided under H. R. 1 as amended are not the same as the percentage increases which took place in the individual income tax burdens between 1939 and 1945. It is alleged that tax rates should go down in the same manner as they went up during the war.

Behind this argument lurks the assumption that the rate structure of 1939 was an ideal one. This is highly questionable. The rates applied to upper bracket incomes in 1939 were extremely high. They represented the end product of a determined effort to convert the individual income-tax into a device for the redistribution of wealth. In their desire to attain this objective, the proponents of the rate structure developed during the 1930's tended to pay far too little attention to the problem of maintaining managerial initiative and an adequate flow of venture capital. For this reason it is not supportable to use the 1939 rate structure as a basis for comparison.

The real factor limiting the amount of the reduction which can be granted to lower-bracket incomes in the pending bill is the present size of the budget, and the large amount of the total revenue which comes from the lower brackets. Out of an estimated total taxable income of \$121,000,000,000 in 1947, no less than \$97,000,000,000, or 80 percent, is received by persons with net income of \$5,000 or less; \$68,000,000,000, or 56 percent, is received by persons with incomes of \$3,000 or less. Because of this concentration of incomes in the lower brackets, rate reductions in that area are very expensive. To provide a materially greater reduction in these brackets at this time would require a considerable additional reduction in the Federal budget. We could adopt the extremely high tax rates and confiscate all the incomes of these persons, and the result would not be a drop in our revenue bucket.

A bill which concentrated relief exclusively among incomes of \$5,000 or less would do nothing to alleviate the very heavy burdens now imposed upon the people who make the key decisions in our industrial organization. It would do nothing to encourage the persons who are expected to assume the risks of developing the new products and the new enterprises upon which a continued advance in the standard of life of the Nation so largely depends.

A great many people are unaware of the extent of the burdens now imposed. Many do not appreciate the discouragement

to effort, enterprise and risk-taking which results from the existing rate schedule.

The easiest way to show what I mean is to refer to the so-called marginal rates used under the present law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert a table on the subject at this point in the RECORD.

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

TABLE III.—Comparison between the marginal rates of the individual income tax under present law and the Senate Finance Committee bill

Surtax net income		Marginal rates	
From—	To—	Present law	Finance Committee bill
			1947 and subsequent years
\$0	\$1,000	18.8	18.1
\$1,000	\$1,400 ¹	19.0	(²)
\$1,400	\$2,000	19.0	17.1
\$2,000	\$4,000	20.9	18.8
\$4,000	\$6,000	24.7	22.2
\$6,000	\$8,000	28.5	25.6
\$8,000	\$10,000	32.3	29.1
\$10,000	\$12,000	36.1	32.5
\$12,000	\$14,000	40.9	36.8
\$14,000	\$16,000	44.7	40.2
\$16,000	\$18,000	47.5	42.8
\$18,000	\$20,000	50.4	45.3
\$20,000	\$22,000	53.2	47.9
\$22,000	\$26,000	56.1	50.4
\$26,000	\$32,000	58.9	53.0
\$32,000	\$38,000	61.8	55.6
\$38,000	\$44,000	65.6	59.0
\$44,000	\$50,000	68.4	61.6
\$50,000	\$60,000	71.3	64.1
\$60,000	\$70,000	74.1	66.7
\$70,000	\$79,700 ⁴	77.0	69.3
\$79,700	\$80,000	77.0	71.3
\$80,000	\$90,000	79.8	73.5
\$90,000	\$100,000	82.7	76.6
\$100,000	\$150,000	84.6	78.3
\$150,000	\$200,000	85.5	79.2
\$200,000	\$302,400 ⁵	86.5	80.1
\$302,400 ⁶ and over		86.5	81.9

¹ The exact breaking point in surtax net income under the House bill and as provided by your committee for 1948 is \$1,395.83. Under the bill as amended by your committee the breaking point for 1947 is \$1,327.00.

² Incomes in this bracket receive a flat reduction of 87 from the tentative tax.

³ Incomes in this bracket receive a flat reduction of 38.50 from the tentative tax.

⁴ The exact breaking point in surtax net income under the bill as amended by your committee is \$79,728.40.

⁵ The exact breaking point in surtax net income under both the House bill and the bill as amended by your committee is \$302,395.00.

⁶ It should be borne in mind that the tax is subject to a ceiling of 81.5 percent of surtax net income under existing law, 76.5 percent under the House bill and under the Finance Committee's bill in 1948 and subsequent years, and 81 percent in 1947 under the Finance Committee bill.

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, a person receiving a surtax net income of \$10,000, who obtains an additional income of a thousand dollars, must pay 36 percent of it to the Government. In other words, so far as that bracket is concerned, such a person works more than 2 days a week for the Federal Government alone on his new income. A person whose surtax net income is \$25,000 and who earns an additional \$1,000, must pay the Government 56 percent, or \$560. A person whose surtax net income is \$50,000, who earns an additional \$1,000, must pay 71.3 percent of it, or \$713, to the Government.

The willingness of individuals to put forth additional managerial effort and to take additional business risks depends very largely

upon the portion of their additional earnings which they will be permitted to retain as their own. When 36, or 56, or 71 percent of this additional income is taken from them by the income tax, it is only too obvious that their initiative to exert additional efforts and take additional risks is blunted.

The situation is serious, not merely from the point of view of the individuals involved, but from the point of view of the economy as a whole. So long as our economic system is primarily of a capitalistic character, the material progress which is possible under it depends upon the intelligent and aggressive development of individual business enterprises. If the managers and the owners relax, and fail to put forth their best efforts, the rate of progress in the economy will, at the very least, slow down. If the efforts of the persons who are in control of the private enterprises of our country are inadequate, volume of output will tend to fall, and unemployment will result. If the investors of the country are unwilling to take the risks of developing new enterprises and of bringing new products into the market place, the tempo of business will decline, to the detriment of all the persons who make up our society.

The bill which is now before the Senate would reduce the rates imposed upon the middle and upper as well as the lower bracket incomes.

I wish now to make a few observations on the relation of the pending income-tax reduction bill to the provisions of section 138 (a) of the reorganization Act of 1946 for a legislative budget.

It will be recalled that this act was passed in the closing days of the last session of the preceding Congress and was approved by the President on August 2, 1946.

It calls for the creation of a Joint Congressional Budget Committee which is to meet at the beginning of each regular session of Congress and by the succeeding February 15 is to make budget recommendations in the form of a report to the respective Houses for the ensuing fiscal year including estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for such fiscal year.

The report is to be accompanied by a covering resolution.

The shortness of the time elements involved posed obvious difficulties during the first year of the operation of these provisions for a legislative budget. There was no legislative budget staff and there were no provisions for one. Opportunity was lacking for long and thorough preparatory ground work in the agencies of the Federal Government. In this connection I would remind Senators that the staff of the executive budget numbers about 600 persons and works on a full-time basis.

Nevertheless, following the convening of the Congress on January 3 of this year the joint committee was organized and its budget report was made by February 15. It was accompanied by a covering concurrent resolution.

This resolution was introduced in the Senate on February 15 as Senate Concurrent Resolution 7 and in the House on the same day as House Concurrent Resolution 20. It is brief, and it would

be well to bring it back to mind. It reads:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the judgment of the Congress, based upon presently available information, that revenues during the period of the fiscal year 1948 will approximate \$39,100,000,000 and that expenditures during such fiscal year should not exceed \$33,000,000,000, of which latter amount not more than \$25,100,000,000 would be in consequence of appropriations hereafter made available for obligation in such fiscal year. It is the further judgment of the Congress that sound fiscal policy requires that not less than \$2,600,000,000 of the excess of revenues over expenditures be applied toward reduction of the public debt during said fiscal year.

I am now reading from the Senate policy on the budget.

It is further declared to be the judgment of the Congress that all proceeds from the transfer or disposition of property under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, which are covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts should be applied toward reduction of the public debt.

Those are the Senate's budget running orders.

On February 19, the Senate concurrent resolution came up for action. On March 3, 1947, it was adopted as amended, by the Senate, by a vote of 64 to 20.

The amendment setting the maximum goal of expenditure for the fiscal year of \$33,000,000,000 was carried by a vote of 51 to 33. The amendment providing for debt reduction of not less than \$2,600,000,000 during the same fiscal year was unanimously adopted.

The amended version of the Senate's concurrent resolution went to conference, and the conferees have been unable to agree.

The Senate version was not reached in cavalier fashion. The expenditure-reduction goal of not less than \$4,500,000,000, the debt-reduction goal of \$2,600,000,000 and the other features of the resolution, as amended, were adopted after lengthy debate on February 19, 21, 24, 26, 28, and on March 3, 1947.

A strong majority of the Senators were of the opinion that an expenditure reduction of \$6,000,000,000 at this time might require excessive curtailment of essential governmental activities.

In my opinion, the conferees could have agreed had the representatives of the Senate been willing to split the difference in the conflicting figures of the two Houses. In other words, I believe that had we been willing to commit ourselves to a debt-reduction goal of \$1,300,000,000 instead of two and six-tenths billions, and an expenditure-reduction goal of five and twenty-five one-hundredths billions instead of the Senate's goal of four and five-tenths billions, we could have gotten an agreement.

Speaking for myself, I have been unwilling as a conferee to come back here with that kind of result. It seemed to me that it would have been an affront to my colleagues had we returned with a debt-reduction objective of one-half of that unanimously desired by Members of the Senate. It seems to me it would have been an affront to the Senate, had we come back with a compromise on

debt reduction against our own figure on debt reduction, which has been, in my opinion, becoming more warranted by the passing of time, and, in my opinion, has also become more achievable; indeed, it is now, I think, certain through the operation of H. R. 1, as amended, which is before the Senate.

Moreover, a revenue estimate of thirty-nine and one-tenth billions made in February, when national income payments were estimated for the fiscal year 1948 on the basis of one hundred and sixty-five billions, could not stand as valid against the unfolding facts which now make conservative the present estimate of revenue for fiscal 1948 adopted by the Senate Committee on Finance of forty-one and four-tenths billions.

With the passing weeks, the Senate's four and five-tenths billions expenditure-reduction goal seemed more realistic, as I have said, than the six-billion goal of the House. I could see no point in yielding on this in any substantial respect while our own view of it was gaining strength by experience.

I think it may fairly be said that had we agreed upon a compromise along the lines which might have been available, that is, to have cut the debt-reduction proposal in half and to have raised the expenditure reduction to \$5,250,000,000, every Senator, so far as the consideration of this bill is concerned, would have known it for what it was and would have continued to follow the Senate version or his independent judgment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point in his remarks?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Certainly.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand, from the statement made by the distinguished Senator, that there is now no possibility whatever of reaching an agreement with the House conferees on the legislative budget proposal?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not say that at all. I am stating the reasons, so far as I am concerned, why we have not come back to the Senate with the compromise.

Mr. LUCAS. What is the opinion of the Senator with respect to the possibility of the conferees reaching an agreement? In other words, the Senator has made a very dynamic statement of his own position with respect to the legislative proposal, and I was wondering whether, from the conferences he has attended, the Senator has any opinion relating to whether or not it is possible for the conferees to get together, and to submit to the Senate any kind of conference report upon the important legislative budget?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am not without hope on that subject.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator still has hope—

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have hope.

Mr. LUCAS. But little faith, I take it?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have hope. I am trying to explain to the Senator why I have not agreed, and perhaps why others have not agreed to a compromise, which they might think would be unrealistic, and which could not be brought back to the Senate.

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

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator agree that that ought to be done, that an agreement of some kind between the House and the Senate should be reached upon what is directly laid down for us to do in the Legislative Reorganization Act?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am coming to that in a moment.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sorry if I interrupted the continuity of the Senator's remarks.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Moreover, since the conferees must come from the Budget Committee, I doubt whether another team taken from the same committee would have achieved any more acceptable results.

Does it take the action of the House to give validity to our own viewpoints when we are working as the Senate? Does not the action of the Senate in setting a four and one-half billion reduction goal bind our consciences just as much as though the same figure had been reached by both Houses?

Can it be said that our Senate Appropriations Committee is not impressed with the Senate viewpoint of the reduction goal set out in the Senate's amended resolution but that it would be impressed if we brought back a phony compromise?

When the Senate Appropriations Committee processes these appropriation bills and brings them before the Senate for our decision will our individual consciences gain any acquittal from duty because our Senate goal has not been approved by the House?

I should add that because of a technical parliamentary situation in the House, the conferees would not be able to bring back a higher estimate of revenue than the new unrealistic one contained in the resolutions before the conference. This comes about through a rule of the House which would subject such a raise in estimate to a point of order. I have been so advised by our parliamentarian who has conferred on the subject with the House parliamentarian.

Will anyone say that we here in the Senate in the process of making a tax bill where estimated revenues are just as important as estimated expenditures, should govern our action by a figure which has become unreal and which cannot be revised because of a parliamentary rule of the House?

I wish that we could have agreed prior to bringing this bill before the Senate. I wish that we could have brought back something reasonably close to the Senate's viewpoints. Let me remind the Senate that consideration of this tax bill was delayed in an effort to reach such an agreement and hoping for such an agreement.

I must disagree, however, with anyone who may contend that we could help the consideration of the matter before us by formal adherence to a compromise which in our hearts we would regard as a sham.

The amount of money that is to remain in the citizen's pocketbook as a re-

sult of our action here, is a very real matter to him, and he is not apt to be interested in mirage diversions.

There will be an effort to delay consideration of the bill until June 10 on the ground that we do not have sufficient information on which to proceed at this time.

This argument will receive more extensive attention after it has been made. At this time, I merely wish to bring it into the perspective afforded by our actions and our fiscal policies in connection with the last tax reduction bill.

This was the Revenue Act of 1945. By that law, we took about 12,000,000 people off of the tax rolls; we abolished excess-profits taxes; we made a flat 5-percent tax reduction.

The then estimated cost of that bill to the revenues was about \$6,000,000,000. At the present rate of national individual income payments a similar bill would carry a cost estimate of about \$9,000,000,000.

The Revenue Act of 1945 came before the Senate for consideration on October 24, 1945. What was the state of the budget at that time? The budget deficit estimated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945—we passed the bill in October of that year—was \$53,941,000,000. The budget deficit estimated for the fiscal year June 30, 1946, was \$20,976,000,000.

We were reducing taxes \$6,000,000,000 with an estimated \$53,000,000,000 deficit for the preceding fiscal year staring us in the face and a \$20,000,000,000 estimated deficit ahead of us. From certain conventional standpoints this was the ultimate in fiscal irresponsibility.

Well, surely, there must have been many days of debate; the RECORD must have been full of anguished soul-searching.

How much debate was there? The bill came before the Senate for consideration on October 24, 1945, and was passed on the same day without even a roll-call vote.

The bill went to conference, came back to the Senate on November 1, 1945, and on the same day the conference report was agreed to without a roll-call vote.

But we were not acting irresponsibly. We passed that bill in 1945 because we were anxious to stimulate by tax reduction the transition of our economy from war to peace and we adopted a remedy suited to the purpose. The bill before us is in aid of the same general objective.

Now to contrast the situations. We are not proposing a \$6,000,000,000 tax reduction. The bill before us contemplates \$3,200,000,000 of reduction. We are not offering our bill under the cloud of a \$53,000,000,000 deficit. Under all of the estimates before us, including those of the administration, we will have balanced budgets with surpluses in the fiscal years 1947 and 1948.

We who sponsor this bill accept the estimates of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation that the income payments for the fiscal year 1948 will be \$170,000,000,000; that this will yield net receipts of \$41,400,000,000. From this we subtract the Senate's estimate of expenditures for the fiscal year of thirty-three billions. This leaves an estimated surplus for the fiscal year of

\$8,400,000,000. We subtract from this the effect on the revenue if any should develop—of the bill before us, to wit, \$3,200,000,000, which leaves an estimated surplus for debt reduction and contingencies of \$5,200,000,000.

The conservative nature of the \$170,000,000,000 estimate of national-income payments from which follows the estimate of receipts of \$41,400,000,000 is appreciated when we recall that under information released a few days ago by the Department of Commerce, the national-income payments for the first quarter of this year were running at the annual rate of \$176,700,000,000. Not overlooking price reductions which may occur, it is reasonable to believe that these income payments are not apt to decline very much for some time to come in view of the expanding pattern of increased wages over the United States and large corporate profits not yet reflected.

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

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. In estimating the income of \$41,400,000,000, does the Senator make allowance for any possible income from Government corporations or public-debt accounts or special accounts of trust funds? Has the Senator been able to secure any information as to the possible income from those sources?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The estimate of \$41,400,000,000 proceeds from the estimate of \$170,000,000,000 in national income. I should say that some of those factors enter into the calculation of national income, and I shall be glad to try to secure the exact figures.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think the figures used for the purposes of this agreement are the same as those which are calculated in the President's budget. They were included in the \$39,100,000,000 figure.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes. Let me repeat that the Department of Commerce has just told us that the national income for the second quarter of this year is running at an annual rate of \$176,700,000,000. Remember that we are basing our estimates on \$170,000,000,000. Let me suggest again that any tendency to lag, if there should be one, will be held up for some time to come by increased wages the pattern of which is spreading over the country, and by corporate profits which have not yet been fully reflected.

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

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. Does the Senator remember the month represented by the figure 176.7?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think it was in the month of March.

Mr. HAWKES. I wish to say to the Senator that I have heard that at the present time the national income is running on an even higher basis than that.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should not be at all surprised, for the reasons just mentioned, namely, wage increases and unreflected corporate profits.

Mr. HAWKES. I think this might be a good place to interrupt the Senator—

Mr. MILLIKIN. National income, as distinguished from national income payments, is in excess of \$180,000,000,000.

Mr. HAWKES. That was the point. I wished to bring out at this place in the Senator's remarks the fact that the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Snyder, when asked a number of times on the witness stand if he saw any recession from the present rate of national income, left the definite impression, as I recall, that he saw no recession in sight. Am I correct?

Mr. MILLIKIN. He made it very clear that there is no serious recession in the contemplation of the Treasury's estimates.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If I may supplement my answer to the Senator, the Department of Commerce gives total income payments, adjusted seasonally at the annual rate, for January of \$177,100,000,000; for February, one hundred and seventy-seven billion, and for March, one hundred and seventy-six billion seven hundred million which is the figure I used.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Those who do not believe that an expenditure reduction of \$4,500,000,000 can be made, or that national income payments for the fiscal year 1948 will not average \$170,000,000,000 can cut a billion dollars off at both ends, or \$2,000,000,000 at either end, and there will be sufficient left to meet the Senate's plan of \$2,600,000,000 of debt reduction.

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

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I observe at page 70 of the hearings the following colloquy between the chairman and Secretary Snyder:

The CHAIRMAN. In your statement yesterday on page 1, you said, "Nor do I believe that a tax reduction is necessary at this time to assure a continued high level of production."

We had quite a few questions and answers yesterday with the objective of probing your opinion as to whether we were in for a recession, and as I got the burden of your remarks, you are not predicting a recession for fiscal year 1948; am I correct in that?

Secretary SNYDER. That is correct.

I take it that at least in part the Senator bases his comment on Secretary Snyder's utterances in the testimony which I have just quoted.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes. I may say to the distinguished Senator that the same thought was reiterated at a number of points in the testimony.

These points will be expanded in due course. I only wish to remind Senators, in aid of a further preliminary perspective, that the proposed income-tax reduction may not result in any revenue reduction. Our past history indicates that in an economy similar to that now existing, income-tax reduction may go hand-in-hand with increased revenue. This was well stated during the consideration in the Senate of the Revenue Act of 1945. I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 9, part 8, page 9948:

The rate of tax does not determine what comes into the Treasury. The bill, so far as it affects corporations, is properly a tax

rate-reducing bill. It will not necessarily reduce the amount of revenue coming in. Indeed, if it has the effect which it is hoped it will have, it will so stimulate the expansion of business as to bring in a greater total revenue. I think if one will look back to World War I, he will understand precisely what I am now trying to say.

Mr. President, while it is somewhat aside, I shall pause in the presentation of my prepared statement to emphasize this fact: The Revenue Act of 1918 was approved February 24, 1919, some months after the actual cessation of hostilities. In a sense, that act was both a war-tax act and an immediate post-war tax rate-reduction act, since it provided one schedule of rates for 1918 and a somewhat lower schedule for 1919, 1920, and 1921. The act of November 23, 1921, made more substantial reductions in rates. The recovery of the country from a state of depression in 1920 and 1921 was rapid. The Revenue Acts of 1924 and 1926 made still further tax reductions, but the income from tax revenues of the Government increased through all of that period.

Those were the remarks of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the distinguished ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Finance, and then its superb chairman.

Is it possible that, confronted with a balanced budget and surpluses—a consummation for which we have looked with anxious yearning for all these years—we shall dissipate our thoroughly supportable resolution to reduce individual income taxes and yield instead to indecision and delay, so that we may have a further period within which to flagellate ourselves, on the assumption—which should be completely unacceptable and which should be indignantly rejected—that this is necessary to hold us to Senate policies to which we already have committed ourselves?

I hope that we have not been steeped in deficits and despair so long that we simply cannot believe good news, and must meet it with dolorous misgivings. I hope that on further reflection Members of the minority will join us in this effort to restore without delay to 49,000,000 income taxpayers \$3,200,000,000 of their own money.

Mr. President, I have agreed to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

Mr. GEORGE obtained the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. 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:

Alken	Capper	George
Baldwin	Chavez	Green
Ball	Connally	Gurney
Barkley	Cooper	Hatch
Brewster	Cordon	Hawkes
Bricker	Donnell	Hayden
Bridges	Downey	Hickenlooper
Brooks	Dworshak	Hill
Bushfield	Ecton	Hoyer
Butler	Ellender	Holland
Eyrd	Ferguson	Ives
Cain	Flanders	Jenner
Capehart	Fulbright	Johnson, Colo.

Johnston, S. C.	Moore	Taylor
Kem	Morse	Thomas, Okla.
Kilgore	Murray	Thye
Knowland	Myers	Tobey
Lodge	O'Connor	Tydings
Lucas	O'Daniel	Umstead
McCarthy	Pepper	Vandenberg
McClellan	Reed	Wagner
McFarland	Revercomb	Watkins
McGrath	Robertson, Va.	Wherry
McKellar	Robertson, Wyo.	White
McMahon	Russell	Wiley
Magnuson	Saltonstall	Williams
Malone	Smith	Wilson
Martin	Sparkman	Young
Maybank	Stewart	
Millikin	Taft	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate at any great length in connection with this matter. Before I take my seat I wish to lodge a motion, not to postpone indefinitely, but to postpone to a day certain, the consideration of the bill. My remarks will necessarily be brief.

I wish to say at the outset that I am not in disagreement with the distinguished chairman of the Senate Finance Committee as to the desirability of reducing individual income-tax rates. I am not in disagreement with the distinguished Senator or with the majority members of the committee respecting the method of reduction adopted in the bill. As a tax-reduction bill, it seems to me that it is a fairly good approach. The same result might be reached by other methods, but that seems to me to be immaterial, because I am, and have been for a long time, thoroughly committed to a reduction of our wartime taxes. Only the initial step is being taken at this time. If we are eventually to sustain our economy, tax rates must be very greatly reduced, beyond the reduction which will be made effective by the approval of either the House or the Senate bill or of some compromise between them.

With that statement, Mr. President, I wish also to give assurance that I have no desire to postpone the decision upon this bill to a date too late for the setting up of the necessary machinery to put the bill into operation if it shall pass and become law.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I could understand and I might be inclined to agree with the remarks of the able Senator from Georgia, the former chairman of the Finance Committee, relative to postponement to June 10, if I felt that we would know any more on June 10 than we know at this time. But I wish respectfully to call to the attention of my colleague from Georgia the fact that last year the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill did not finally become law until June 22, the District of Columbia appropriation bill until July 9, the Interior Department appropriation bill until July 1, the Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill until July 26, the legislative appropriation bill until July 1, the War Department appropriation bill until July 16, the Navy Department appropriation bill until July 8, and

the State-Justice-Commerce appropriation bill until approximately July 1. So it seems to me that we shall not have the final figures or shall not know what the final figures will be in respect to the appropriation bills until they have run the gamut of both Houses of Congress, the conference committees, and have actually gone to the President.

Based on past experience—and last year was not an unusual year—the fact remains, in my opinion, that on June 10 we shall not be any better able to judge what the final figures will be than we are at the present time. For that reason, it seems to me that the fundamental question we have to decide here is whether we shall pass any tax legislation at all which will be effective as of July 1. Certainly if I did not feel that we were going to make a substantial reduction in the Federal debt—a reduction of at least \$2,600,000,000—I would not have supported and would not support the motion of the Senator from Colorado. But the figures seem to indicate that not only can the tax reduction of \$3,200,000,000 be made, but also a considerably greater amount than the debt reduction of \$2,600,000,000.

Since those figures seem to be borne out on the record, and inasmuch as we shall not know any more on June 10 than we know today, I question very much the advisability of postponing action until June 10.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator from California for his observations. I confess that on June 10 we shall not have absolute knowledge of what the final appropriations will be; but I shall come to that point in the course of my discussion, if I may be permitted to proceed for a few minutes.

Mr. President, in addition to the preliminary remarks which I have already made, I should like to say why I now think we should postpone the consideration of this bill until at least June 10. I am speaking on the basis of the best information which I have been able to obtain—I say to the Senator from California, although it seems he is about to leave the Chamber—and I say that all the major appropriation bills probably will be reported to the House of Representatives by June 12. I have that information upon authority which I regard as authentic. Even in advance of the actual reporting of the appropriation bills, we shall know substantially the pattern set by the House Appropriations Committee. It is true that the House may not agree to the recommendations of its Appropriations Committee, and will not entirely do so. It is also true that the appropriations may be changed by the Senate; undoubtedly that will prove to be true. Finally, in the conference some amounts different from the amounts actually recommended by the House of Representatives Appropriations Committee will no doubt be agreed upon. But when the major appropriation bills clear the House Appropriations Committee, we can begin to get a picture of the expenditures for the fiscal year 1948.

Mr. President, I am very much in agreement with the Senator from Colorado in respect to the legislative budget; I do not think the legislative budget in

and of itself would be very helpful to me. Other Senators take a different view of that matter.

What I am primarily concerned about is the appropriations which finally will be made by this Congress. The acid test of what the Congress is going to do is to be found in the appropriation bills themselves, not in the covering resolution in regard to the over-all legislative budget, which now is quietly asleep, or at rest, I should say, in the conference committee of the House and the Senate.

I invite the Senate simply to look at the facts as they stand today. One or two of the appropriation bills have passed both Houses of Congress. Some have only been reported by the House committee and have passed the House of Representatives. The actual reductions made in the Interior Department appropriation bill are, in round figures, in the amount of \$134,000,000. The appropriations carried in the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill have been actually reduced by \$103,415,000. I give only the round numbers. The Navy Department appropriation bill, which passed the House of Representatives yesterday, makes cuts under the budget estimates by \$377,519,000. The items in the State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary appropriation bill reduce the budget estimates by \$159,650,000, in round numbers. The Treasury-Post Office Departments appropriation bill reduces the budget estimates by \$897,072,000. All those reductions constitute a total reduction, as thus far made, of only \$1,671,665,267—to give the exact figure.

Included in that figure is an item of \$800,000,000 for tax refunds. The \$800,000,000 for tax refunds is a very doubtful or dubious cut under the budget estimates. At best, we must pay whatever refunds are finally approved by the taxing authorities or by the courts or by both. Those refunds may not run as high as they have been estimated in the budget, or they may run as high as they have been estimated in the budget. I submit that the reduction made in the Treasury Department appropriation bill by this item of \$800,000,000 is almost a figure out of the air; it has very little to commend itself. If that is taken from the actual reductions already made, we have reductions, as thus far accomplished, amounting to a little more than \$871,000,000.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As a matter of fact, even assuming that the tax refund item is a debatable one, as the Senator has quite correctly stated that it is, is not that more than offset by the action taken by the Senate 2 days ago in including in the deficiency appropriation bill an amount to make up the losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation on subsidies, which was set up in the President's budget for next year, and amounted to \$830,000,000? The losses themselves only amount, as I recall, to approximately \$600,000,000, but the saving in the budget for 1948, under the budget figure, will be \$830,000,000. So by paying that this year, that will reduce the necessity of having such an item

in the 1948 budget; and that action has already been taken by the Senate.

Mr. GEORGE. That was in the 1948 budget, I may say to the Senator, and we are dealing now with the 1948 budget, so far as the expenditure budget is concerned.

Mr. President, I have some information which would lead me to believe that the House Committee on Appropriations will include some further, and perhaps severe, cuts in the expenditure budget. The best information I have been able to obtain thus far—by June 10 we should be able to secure more accurate information—is that the agricultural appropriations will be reduced by around \$300,000,000. That is a cut which may not stand in both the House and the Senate. It is not likely that the recommendations of the committee will stand insofar as the agricultural appropriation bill is concerned.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I presume the Senator has this information with respect to the cut in the agricultural appropriation, only through some individual Member of the House. It is only a guess, is it not?

Mr. GEORGE. That is true, and I am so saying. I am merely estimating what would happen if there were a cut of that amount.

Mr. LUCAS. The question I wish to ask is whether or not the Senator knows the break-down in connection with the suggested \$300,000,000 cut in agricultural appropriations.

Mr. GEORGE. Not fully. A great many of the provisions relate to soil conservation and certain types of subsidies, but I do not know that the information I have received is correct. I do know, however, that of the estimated savings, as best I can gather information as to them, there may be a report at least from the Committee on Appropriations of the House of a saving of \$350,000,000 in the agricultural appropriation bill.

The War Department appropriation, of course, constitutes a considerable item in the President's budget. I should think that if a cut of \$900,000,000 were made in that item that would be about all the Congress would sustain.

When we come to the Veterans' Administration and independent offices bill it is almost anybody's guess as to what may be cut in that appropriation; but it would be a miracle if the House and Senate sustained a cut of as much as \$700,000,000 in all the items carried in that bill.

Mr. President, we would have an actual cut, as matters now stand, and as I estimate, of not more than \$2,786,000,000.

There will be a Treasury surplus at the end of this fiscal year, on July 1, as admitted by the Treasury, of \$1,250,000,000. That, added to what it now looks as though we may be able to cut the budget, would total a little better than \$4,000,000,000. If the cost of the tax bill is taken off, it seems to me that our surplus will be reduced to about \$800,000,000.

Mr. President, I hop I am wrong in these figures, but I wish to see at least what the House Committee on Appro-

provisions intends to do with the important supply bills which are still before it. There is no Member of this body more willing than I to go along with tax reduction, if the indicated reduction in the expenditure budget seems to justify it.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator the source of his information that there will be a surplus in the Treasury on July 1 of approximately a billion dollars. I understood the Senator to say that was his estimate.

Mr. GEORGE. The Secretary of the Treasury himself estimated that at the beginning of the fiscal year 1948, that is, July 1, 1947, there would be a surplus of \$1,200,000,000. I believe I am correct in that statement.

Mr. AIKEN. My reason for asking was that certain information I had received led me to believe that there would be a surplus of about \$3,000,000,000.

Mr. GEORGE. I am speaking of the Treasury estimate, and we are so near the end of the fiscal year that it should not be too much of a guess. So I am figuring on a surplus at the beginning of the fiscal year 1948 of \$1,250,000,000. What the surplus would be at the end of the fiscal year 1948, if any, with the present tax rates in effect, would depend entirely on the level of business activity, the national income, and so forth. I do not care to guess about that, because I am not able to guess, and I should be the last one to suggest that we are going into a depression; but I do call attention to one fact, namely, that at this time the deterioration of the economy of the whole world, outside the United States, and possibly Canada and some of the South American countries, is definitely marked.

I also wish to call attention to the fact that we cannot remedy the repercussion of a rapid deterioration of the economy of the whole of Europe and of all Asia. I recall very vividly, as I think every other Senator will recall, that the stock market went into a tailspin in October 1929, and there was a tremendous collapse. We might have pulled out of that, I think we would have pulled out of it, but in 1931 the Rothschild Bank of Austria failed, the repercussions of that failure were felt all over Europe, and it was utterly impossible to escape the long depression period which ensued. Our economy is affected, and always will be affected, and especially at this time, by what happens abroad.

I hope we will not be called upon to make further appropriations to aid and assist the European economy, but I do not know what we may have to do to arrest the deterioration in the economy of Europe. If we have to meet an issue of that kind, whether we like it or not, we will be compelled to do so.

I have not given any consideration whatever to the Greek loan, or to other loans we have recently made, in connection with this statement.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I gather, then, from the Senator's statement regarding the 1929-1931 episode, that he does not subscribe to what was a rather widespread theory that the conditions then were due entirely to our domestic policies.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no, I do not; but I do not want to go back and rehash those old political issues.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, the Senator is objecting to guessing what the revenue will be; but do we not always have to guess what it will be? Are the revenues not always uncertain, and can we base our guess on anything better than what we are basing it on today?

Mr. GEORGE. I think we can.

Mr. TAFT. We are conservative—

Mr. GEORGE. If the Senator will bear with me a moment, I will tell him why I think we can.

Mr. TAFT. In the last analysis, of course, the estimate of revenues for the next 18 months, or next 15 months—

Mr. GEORGE. Thirteen months.

Mr. TAFT. Is bound to be a guess. It cannot be anything but a guess. We may have a depression, we may have a boom, certain things may happen in Europe, they may not happen in Europe. It seems to me there cannot be an objection to taking a figure on the ground that it is based on a guess, because every estimate of revenue is based on a guess.

Mr. GEORGE. It is based on an estimate; though I concede, of course, that an estimate is more or less of a guess. I do not want the Senator from Ohio to misinterpret what I am saying. I am speaking of conditions that now exist. If there is any man alive who can look at the economy of all Europe and say that it is good, then I should like to see him. I know that it is going to make our task a bit more difficult. I do not say that it necessarily controls us in making our revenue laws; but I do say, and I repeat, that if by June 10 or 12, through the House Appropriation Committee, we can have an actual pattern of what cuts in the expenditure budget will be made, we can proceed with a great deal more confidence and certainly with the consideration of the tax bill.

Mr. President, I know very well that even when the tax bills are passed, both House and Senate, we may be confronted in January or in February with emergency bills to make up a deficit here and there; I understand that; but at the same time I think it is necessary to take certain chances, and I am perfectly willing to concede that it is necessary to take certain chances. At this time, we are looking at conditions as they exist. At the moment, they seem very promising in our own country, and I do not want to say anything that would have even the slightest tendency to undercut whatever business activity or degree of prosperity we hope may grow through 1948; but, on that point, I want to make the observation that the tax cut that is being made will continue beyond 1948. If we

were guessing on that one year only; I should be willing to guess at this moment and not wait until the House committee acts. But the cut that is being made in individual income tax rates is going to remain permanently in our revenue laws; at least those cuts will continue through the fiscal year 1948, the fiscal year 1950, and right on. I grant that they are not too great; they are not so great as I think they must ultimately be made; but that brings me back to our present condition, and to the facts that we actually know to exist at this time.

What is the state of our business, Mr. President? How would any Member of the Senate, in a comparable position, act with reference to the reduction of his revenue, before he had ascertained to what extent his expenditures could be cut? As of the first day of this month, the Treasury had outstanding 90-day bills amounting to \$16,600,000,000. Bear that figure in mind. It had outstanding other maturities, due or callable by June 30, 1948, the end of the next fiscal year, of \$37,600,000,000, or a total of more than \$54,000,000,000. Of course, the Treasury has other maturities, in addition to the 90-day bills and in addition to those due or callable by June 30, 1948, due and callable by June 30, 1952, totaling an additional \$42,500,000,000, making a total of debt maturing or callable between now and June 30, 1952, of \$96,700,000,000. Of course, we also had, over and above these short-terms, obligations which include Treasury notes and Treasury bills and certificates, both the special and the general type, an additional indebtedness of \$161,000,000,000. Bear this in mind—it is important—that included in the \$161,000,000,000 is \$50,000,000,000 of E, F, and G bonds. E bonds are demand notes upon the Treasury, and so are F, and so are G bonds, practically demand notes upon the Treasury.

Therefore, sitting in the place of the Secretary of the Treasury, or sitting in the place of the owner of one's own business, if there existed a situation such as I have described, would not a person in that position want to wait before actually cutting his income, especially when he is asked now, by my motion, to wait only about 20 or 25 days, to see what the picture of his expenditures will actually be, by action of the House Committee on Appropriations, a committee that carries a great deal of weight with respect to expenditures. I want to compliment the House committee. I am anxious for the House committee to cut our expenditure budget. I think, on the whole, they have done a very good job. I do not say that they can reach, as my distinguished friend from Colorado, the chairman of the committee, has assumed, \$4,500,000,000. If the expenditure budget is cut \$4,500,000,000, or even somewhat less than that, then a tax reduction can be made, and the national debt can also be reduced by the amount of the \$2,600,000,000 that was ordered in the Senate.

But, Mr. President, there are the short-term 90-day notes falling due within the next 3 months, in the sum of \$16,600,000,000; there are falling due other obligations within the fiscal year 1948 of \$37,600,000,000. There are E, F, and G bonds of \$50,000,000,000, included in the

\$161,000,000,000; which may, almost overnight, become a charge on the Treasury.

I am speaking of a condition. I do not know what will happen in the fiscal year 1948. As the distinguished Senator from Ohio says, it is, of course, anybody's guess as to what may happen. I concede that. But I am speaking of the conditions that now exist. I am also speaking of the condition that exists throughout the world, which we now know. We know that it is not going to improve materially within the immediate future. That seems to me to make it imperative to wait until June 10, before finally completing the bill.

The distinguished Senator from Colorado has pointed out that the cut in individual income taxes may not actually result in a decline or a reduction in revenue. That is ordinarily true, but I do not believe that a cut of \$3,200,000,000 in individual income taxes will have very great effect upon our revenue income, as a stimulant. I cannot see how it can. It might check or tend to check a decline in revenue, but it is altogether too little, as I see it, to suggest that it could increase very greatly our revenue.

In 1945, when the war ended, I favored tax reduction. I favored it very strongly. Although there are a great many people in the country, some Members of the Senate, who have protested against the cuts that were then made in taxes, I am as confident as I am of anything that if we had retained the excess-profits tax, the capital-stock tax, and the high corporate normal and surtax rates, we would not have passed through the transition period without a crash. I have never been afraid to assume my responsibility for that cut. At that time we entirely relieved 12,000,000 taxpayers in the lowest brackets, and we also relieved all taxpayers by a 5-percent cut, which was not, of course, very substantial. I then hoped, and I now hope, that we might be able now or in the very near future to make a further tax cut in the individual income rates.

I agree as thoroughly as does anyone with what the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee has said, which the majority has often repeated, that it is necessary to reduce individual tax rates. I personally do not quarrel with the method applied in the reduction of these rates in the pending bill if we are to have a reduction of \$3,200,000,000. There are other Senators who think that the reduction should come by way of increasing the exemptions and relieving a great many people in the lower income brackets.

The defect, the hardship, the weakness in our present revenue law, as I see it, lies, so far as individual rates are concerned, in the high surtaxes, from the lowest bracket to the topmost bracket, and, therefore, I have not quarreled and do not intend to quarrel with the method employed in making the cuts.

There is one thing I believe would be advisable, but failure to adopt it will not restrain me from voting for and supporting a tax cut, if when the House has acted on appropriations we can see how we can make the cut, and that is that I believe it would be advisable to put into

effect, whatever reductions are made, the 1st day of January 1948, rather than July 1, 1947. But that point I do not regard as controlling. The question is whether we can safely now proceed, without the knowledge which can come to us within 20 or 25 days which, although when it comes to us will be subject to certain modifications and some changes, will nevertheless give us a very clear picture of what the cut in the expenditures is going to be.

Mr. President, I lay down as a sound principle that we cannot, in our present circumstances, afford to cut taxes based upon the prospect of an increased income; that we cannot, in present circumstances, predicate a sound tax bill upon what we think—projecting ourselves into the future—is going to be the economic condition of this country and our national income. The only sound basis is to reduce the expenditure budget, and the moment the cut in the expenditure budget goes down even to \$3,000,000,000 then I could, with some degree of confidence, say that we could proceed with a tax-reduction bill, because we could be assured that the surplus already accumulated, and which will be realized, of course, on July 1, just ahead of us, would enable us to make some payments upon our debt.

Mr. President, let me say—and I do not speak as a partisan on tax matters at all—that I think the Congress of the United States could make no greater mistake now than to cut taxes, knowing that it will not be able to restore them to the old level whatever happens. No greater calamity could befall the American economy than to have a balanced budget as of now, and, then perhaps in fiscal 1949, or in fiscal 1950, find ourselves with an unbalanced budget and another period of deficit spending. That would take the heart out of American business; it would take the life out of the American taxpayers. Although the payment of taxes is always hard, so long as the income remains at its present high level we can somehow at least struggle along if we were to defer the tax cut until January 1 next.

The motion which I now make, Mr. President, is for the postponement of the consideration of the bill to a day certain, and I designate that day as June 10, because I believe that will give us an opportunity to obtain the pattern of the appropriations which will be made for the fiscal year 1948.

Mr. President, this is all I have to say at the present time. With respect to the reduction of taxes generally and with respect to the general principle of taxation, I myself am not out of step with what is desired by the chairman of the Finance Committee in the pending bill. I simply believe that it would be the part of wisdom and would enable us to proceed more intelligently if we could postpone the consideration of the bill until June 10.

Mr. President, of course, there are other Senators who wish to discuss the matter, but so far as I am concerned, I have no further remarks to make on the question. I have no desire to delay unduly consideration of the bill. I say that to the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] to postpone further consideration of H. R. 1 until June 10.

THE ALTERNATIVES TO INTERNATIONAL CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, for many months I have been asserting that the overshadowing problem of making a lasting peace rests in the conclusion of a successful control of the murderous use of atomic energy.

Harry Truman, Clement Attlee, and Mackenzie King comprehended this when they declared to the world on November 15, 1945, their determination to share the peaceful and fruitful products of the energy with all mankind and their determination to seek effective prohibitions against its deadly use.

The United States has taken the lead in the formulation of an international program to implement this policy. I take considerable satisfaction that I in a small way contributed to the formulation of that policy. On September 6, 1945, I said on the floor of the Senate that the national and international control of this force must be brought about. On December 5, 1945, I stated my belief that an international authority, internationally owned and inspected, was the medium of such control.

It was because I firmly believed this that I welcomed with a peculiar satisfaction the Acheson-Lillenthal report and the Baruch program. I have, Mr. President, honestly endeavored to test for objective truth and fairness those proposals. I am not ashamed to confess that I have examined and reexamined them in the early hours of the dawn on many occasions. This is a problem which at all hazards must be avoided by insomniacs. But examine them as I would, in consultation and reexamination the answer was the same. Our proposals stand the acid test of logic and conscience and good ethics. I am more than ever convinced that in their acceptance lies the hope of peace.

Some of us make the mistake of believing that the world's peoples know what the United States has proposed. Mr. President, I dare say that they do not know. In a trip I made abroad last fall, I ascertained that what we had proposed was scarcely known in Europe, and the few who pretended to some knowledge on the subject were in error as to what we had proposed. Mr. President, what is our plan? What have we proposed? If our plan is not righteous—if we have not proposed a sound moral and ethical solution of this problem, we shall stand indicted before God and man.

In the American Proposals for International Control of Atomic Energy we have proposed that—

When an adequate system for control of atomic energy including the renunciation of the bomb as a weapon has been agreed upon and put into effective operation and condign punishments set up for violations of the rules of control which are to be stigmatized as international crimes, we propose that (1) manufacture of atomic bombs shall stop; (2) existing bombs shall be disposed of pursuant to the terms of the treaty, and (3) the (International Development) Au-

thority shall be in possession of full information as to the know-how for the production of atomic energy.

In other words, Mr. President, we who possess the most effective military weapon created by man have voluntarily offered to do away with its use if other nations will also refrain from using it. We who possess the secret of the world's most powerful force for the betterment of man's conditions of living voluntarily offer to share that secret with the peoples of the earth, regardless of creed, color, or cash, provided only they agree—and implement that agreement in action—to use it for good and not for evil. On Monday night last, Mr. Gromyko challenged the justice and generosity of that offer. A careful reading of his address indicates that his country has not essentially altered its position on any major point since he announced 11 months ago that our plan was "unacceptable in whole or in part." Mr. Gromyko in his latest speech has strongly reiterated his criticism of the American plan.

He said that the plan envisioned by the American proposals would interfere with the sovereignty and economy of independent states, secure America's atomic monopoly, and impede the development of international confidence and friendship. He reiterated his previous position that the prohibition of atomic weapons must be the first step in any control system, that the elimination of such weapons must begin immediately upon the conclusion of a convention, and that the prohibition of atomic arms should be a concurrent part of a general disarmament.

Mr. President, what is wrong with this position? Do we declare it to be unacceptable simply because we wish to be arbitrary, domineering, and uncooperative? No, Mr. President, we regretfully find the Russian plan unacceptable for the very sufficient reason that it will not give the world the kind of safety and complete security which the world desperately needs in this atomic age.

Let us examine the Russian position in greater detail. In essence, what they propose is an immediate convention outlawing atomic weapons without waiting for agreement on measures of control and punishment; that punishment be left to the Security Council, where there is to be no curbing of the right of veto; and that the International Agency have very limited powers of inspection and no proprietary right of operation.

Under the Russian proposals America would be forced to disarm unilaterally. Limited inspection would give no security against secret violations and national rather than international production and control of atomic energy would increase, rather than diminish, national rivalry and antagonism. It could not promise the peoples of the world freedom from atomic warfare. It would withhold the abundant blessings inherent in atomic energy.

Mr. Gromyko says that the American plan would mean interference with national sovereignty. Certainly that is correct. But will not the United States, with its vast atomic development, be giv-

ing up more and enduring greater interference to its sovereignty than will any other nation?

It is strange the way nations, as well as individuals, cling to definitions and to terms that modern science and invention have made meaningless. Gromyko emphasizes sovereignty, and thereby confesses that he does not have sufficient comprehension of the force of atomic energy. He talks about sovereignty in outworn and obsolete terms. It will do us no good to worship a 1944 definition of sovereignty if in doing so we find ourselves despoiled upon its altar. It is precisely because Gromyko does not realize that his concept of sovereignty has been destroyed as surely as Hiroshima and Nagasaki were destroyed, that he falls into error.

Mr. Gromyko says that the American plan seeks to preserve our atomic monopoly. Mr. President, our purpose, made plain for all to see, is diametrically the opposite. It was made plain in the Truman-King-Attlee declaration which, under American initiative declared:

We are prepared to share, on a reciprocal basis with others of the United Nations, detailed information concerning the practical industrial application of atomic energy just as soon as effective enforceable safeguards against its use for destructive purposes can be devised.

It was made plain again in our domestic act which, after providing for the common defense and security, provides in section 10 (a) (2)—

That the dissemination of scientific and technical information relating to atomic energy should be permitted and encouraged so as to provide that free interchange of ideas and criticisms which is so essential to scientific progress.

This, after effective safeguards have been secured.

It was again made plain in the Acheson-Lilienthal plan and the Baruch proposals by the provisions for the establishment of an internationally controlled Atomic Development Authority.

What kind of monopoly is this, Mr. President, which stretches forth the hand, not to take, but to give? What kind of monopoly is this which would reach into the far and undeveloped places of the earth not to exploit and enslave, but to bring freedom from fear and freedom from want? And let there be no mistake. There is inherent in atomic energy the means to the highway of freedom from want. Byproducts of atomic energy used in the study of plant life may eventually reveal nature's secret of photosynthesis and soil fertility and lead to the improvement and the replenishing of the world's food supply. This is something not for the far distant future but for our own times. It is because we want to bring these things to mankind everywhere as well as because we want to remove fear that we have made our proposals.

Yet, Mr. President, Mr. Gromyko finds in this generosity only selfishness; and the American plan he finds entirely unacceptable.

I think it should be stated firmly and quickly that the Russian plan cannot be considered by us, not because we wish to

be arbitrary or uncooperative, but simply because the plan does not furnish the world with the kind of security that is so desperately needed in the age of atomic weapons.

There are many of us, Mr. President, who have given much thought and study to the terrible situation that would arise in the event that no agreement could be reached for the successful control of atomic energy. To anyone who has reflected upon the facts of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, consideration of the alternatives is productive of a state of profound sorrow. God knows the world needs peace. God knows the world wants peace, and yet we must somehow convince the peoples of the world that war, however unnecessary and however unwanted, is not beyond the realm of possibility in the event of failure to agree on a system for controlling atomic energy.

Mr. President, God forbid we should finally fail in our endeavors; but suppose we do. Suppose we are finally driven to admit that it has become impossible to achieve agreement, what then? What are the conditions which will then confront the world? What are the alternative courses of action from which we shall then be forced to choose? Mr. President, to assume the worst is not to exercise it into being. To consider the alternatives is not to prefer them. In the light of the realities of world conditions is it not the better part of wisdom to prepare for the worst while continuing to hope for the best?

Mr. President, on that awesome day, should it come to pass, when the negotiations break down and the negotiators hurry back to their homelands to warn their people, I would not want my country to be taken by surprise. I would not want my people to be left stunned and unprepared for the kind of world we shall then find ourselves living in.

On that day, Mr. President, the destiny of civilization will hang in the balance. Men will look upon the raw and evil face of death and destruction and fear to breathe lest the scales be tipped. When all is hushed the trembling of a leaf may echo like the roar of cannon and a single word may send the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse charging over the earth like the whirlwind of doom. How shall we then face up to the future? What shall we then be able to do?

Mr. President, when the world can agree only on disagreement, we will, in my considered opinion, have left to us only four alternatives; none satisfactory and all fraught with danger.

First, we could then frankly, openly, and fearfully launch ourselves upon an atomic arms race against Russia; seeking to make even bigger and better atomic bombs and other weapons; striving to keep ahead; hoping to be able to retaliate in case of attack but living from moment to moment under the ministry of fear because of the impossibility of knowing when or where an attack might hit us. It is true we might disperse our cities and relocate our industries, but to be effective such dispersal and relocation

would cost approximately \$300,000,000,000 which is more than half the estimated value of every man-made improvement in the United States.

The cost of such a program added to the financial burden of our present debt would certainly disrupt our entire social and economic system and could result in a Fascist type of rule by edict.

Of all the nations of the earth we are the most vulnerable to atomic attack, because our concentrated industries and crowded cities make excellent targets. Because we are not a police state, it would be impossible for us to evacuate our cities and relocate our industries secretly.

Behind the iron curtain Russia could move her industries and her people as she did in the last war, without the rest of the world knowing a thing about it. Because of the vast untenanted lands to the east, because of the still rich cities to the west in Europe, she could afford to consider a few of her own cities expendable. It has been said that an aggressor would not use atomic bombs because destroyed cities constitute poor booty. But the sacrifice of American cities, or even of the whole country, might be considered none too high a price for the conquest of the rest of the world.

It would not even be necessary for an enemy to destroy our cities in order to destroy us. By the use of radioactive particles, or death dust, as it has been called, in combination with disease germs, every living thing in our cities could be annihilated and the cities themselves left standing and empty of resistance to an invader. With America out of the way, who would be left to stop an aggressor intent on world domination?

Some of my friends take comfort in the thought that since gas was prohibited in the last war and was not used, a simple convention or treaty outlawing the use of the atomic bomb will protect us in the next war. This fallacy is based on the belief that the gang that wiped out Lidice and operated the human furnaces at Buchenwald were restrained in the use of poison gas because of their plighted word. They were restrained from the use of gas because they realized that gas was not the controlling weapon, that there was a defense against it, and that it could be turned against them more successfully than they could use it offensively. But the atomic bomb is the controlling weapon of war. If used in sufficient quantities and without notice all counter strokes of significance can be discounted and written off. Dictators have never in the course of human history been restrained by a treaty. Certainly a nation which relied on one for its defense against atomic attack would erect a Maginot line of paper that would have more fatal and catastrophic effects than the steel one for which it could be named.

No, a unilateral arms race with Russia will bring neither safety nor peace. It is no satisfactory alternative to an international agreement.

A second alternative is to let Russia go her own way if she prefers that and to proceed without her. But an international control plan without Russia would give us no control where we most need it. It would leave unaccomplished that

thing which most needs accomplishment. It would make it easier and quicker for Russian espionage to discover the secrets of bomb production without any restraints, by way of inspection and control over her own activities. No, a control system which does not control Russia in this field will bring neither safety nor peace. It is no satisfactory alternative to a world-wide control system.

Another alternative which has been suggested is based on this type of reasoning: If an atomic war is inevitable, and there is no adequate defense against the atomic attack, since the first assault may be the last, then the best defense is offense. I have long contended that the necessity for atomic control has made obsolete our old definitions of aggression. I assert that for the first time in human history the failure to agree to a sane, effective, and righteous control of a weapon of war constitutes in and of itself an act of aggression. The holding of such an instrument of death over the heads of mankind is a species of assault far more productive of a state of fear and its paralyzing consequences than actual battery itself. The more imaginative, the more creative, the more cultured and sensitive a person is, the more horrible would be his perception of an impending oblivion. Away would go all the values that make life in a democracy worth the candle.

The last thing in the world we want to have happen is to be forced to throw the first atomic bomb in a war of total destruction. I correct myself; it is the last thing but one we want to have happen. The last thing we want to have happen is to have someone else throw such a bomb at us.

Mr. President, we thank God that we would shrink from imposing an atomic Pearl Harbor. It is not our way of doing things. Once launched on such a course, we would have to rule the world to maintain our safety, and we might have to sacrifice our democratic form of government in the attempt. It is certainly not a satisfactory alternative to an international agreement.

The last alternative, and the fourth, which suggests itself is this: Let the nations of the world, in convention assembled, vote on a resolution making the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission proposals the world plan. Invite all peace-loving nations to adhere to the plan and to declare that any nation which refuses by a specified date to accept a plan which has been democratically approved by the majority of the nations of the world is thereby denominated an aggressor. By such action the nations would be seeking only to assure the peace of the world in a most dangerous situation. Failure by even one nation to give such assurance forces the whole world to remain postured for war, when the overwhelming universal desire of all mankind is that the world be postured for peace.

No overt act is necessary to commit aggression when it comes to atomic energy. If I but have a dangerous dog and I fail to keep him in restraint, my neighbors can hale me into court and the law will punish me. To argue that atomic energy is inherently dangerous to

the peace of the world is to belabor the obvious. Failure to show evidence of peaceful intentions with regard to it, is of itself evidence of aggressive intentions. The peace and safety of the world demand that aggression be stopped before it becomes overt and before it is too late.

The moral consciousness of the world, the war-weary bodies and the peace-loving hearts of the peoples of the world, cry out for an end to covert, as well as overt, acts of aggression. To refuse to cooperate with the rest of the world in the search for universal peace, denies to the world the possibility of living and working free from the fear of war. A colossus striding across the international scene with a chip on his shoulder menaces the peace and security of every home and every hut throughout the world. There can be no escape from the contagion of fear; it threatens us, one and all.

At this point I can do no better than to quote the immortal words of Franklin Roosevelt:

When an epidemic of physical disease starts to spread, the community approves and joins in a quarantine of the patients in order to protect the health of the community against the spread of the disease.

In 1937, when President Roosevelt uttered those far-sighted words, the Hitler aggression might have been stopped by a world quarantine. That costly lesson must profit the world should any nation refuse to adhere to the agreed plan by the specified date.

While this alternative may prove to be the best way to deal with such a desperately dangerous situation, it would of course be indeed preferable for all the nations of the earth to reach agreement.

May God grant it will never be necessary to us to choose among the alternatives. May He make it possible for the nations of the world to come to agreement, so that they may stand, not arm against arm, but eye to eye, looking to a world of peace, of prosperity, and of freedom. God willing and man striving, that can be possible for us all.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BREWSTER obtained the floor.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, it is my intention at this time to report to the Senate certain nominations which have been approved by the Committee on Armed Services. It is urged that these nominations be confirmed promptly, for the reason that in the list of nominations are those of cadets at the West Point Military Academy and midshipmen at Annapolis. Graduation time is approaching, and in order to provide time for the printing of diplomas, and so forth, it will be necessary to have the nominations confirmed by the Senate immediately.

Let me say further that the committee has also approved and has authorized me to report to the Senate certain other nominations involving promotions and transfers, all of which are routine. A large number of them relate to the Naval Reserve, such as appointments in the

Regular Navy, as ensigns, of Naval Reserve midshipmen.

There are also some transfers in the Regular Army, without promotion. I further call the attention of the Senate to the fact that included in the list is the nomination of a new Surgeon General, Brig. Gen. Raymond W. Bliss, to be Surgeon General of the Army, and the nomination of his assistant, Colonel Armstrong. Also there is the matter of placing one vice admiral on the retired list, as a vice admiral.

Now, Mr. President, with this brief explanation, and with the further statement that the nominations were ordered reported from the Committee on Armed Services, I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session for this purpose only, the Senate receive these nominations, and consider them en bloc, and I move that they be confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request submitted by the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. LUCAS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I did not quite understand the urgency of the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. GURNEY. The urgency is that included in all these nominations—and they were considered en bloc by the committee—they are this year's graduates of West Point and Annapolis. June week is approaching, certain papers must be ready, and the authorities would like to have time to have the diplomas printed and to have the necessary preliminary work done in connection with the graduations at the two Academies.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand the Senator's remarks, what is requested is absolutely necessary before the students at Annapolis and West Point can get their diplomas.

Mr. GURNEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. LUCAS. And it is urgent to that extent?

Mr. GURNEY. I think so.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall not object, but a great number of postmaster nominations have been sent to the Senate, some 800, which have been held up from the time they were received.

Mr. GURNEY. I understand that, but my unanimous-consent request is that, because of the conditions regarding the cadets at West Point and the midshipmen at Annapolis, the Senate, as in executive session, consider only their nominations.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to suggest to my colleague from Illinois, in

whose effort regarding the post-office nominations I joined a few days ago, that as a member of the Committee on the Armed Services, of which the distinguished Senator from South Dakota is the chairman, I know these nominations were reported unanimously by the committee with the distinct understanding that the chairman would as soon as possible make the request he has submitted, because unless the matter is disposed of very quickly, the men in the Academies will not be graduated in the regular legal and routine way. So I shall ask the Senator from Illinois if he will not let these nominations go through without further objection, although I share the sentiments he has expressed. However, I believe that in view of the circumstances as outlined by the Senator from South Dakota, a special case is made out, and we do not want to penalize some other nominees while trying to get justice for some in whose behalf I know the Senator from Illinois has worked diligently.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not going to enter a formal objection to the present consideration of the nominations, but I hope that, at the proper time, the Senator from South Dakota will join the Senator from Illinois and others in seeing that action is had on the postmaster nominations which have been sent to the Senate by the President of the United States, and who are now standing by awaiting action on the part of the Senate. I appreciate that the young men graduating from the Naval Academy and the Academy at West Point are entitled to consideration by the Senate, but, at the same time, a great number of disabled veterans, who went forth and fought for their country in World War I and World War II, are standing by at this moment, at the crossroads in every State in the Union, waiting for the Senate to take the same generous action the Senator from South Dakota is asking it to take on behalf the cadets and midshipmen, in order that these veterans, too, may have an opportunity to make a livelihood in their own communities, and in order that they may get the recognition to which they are justly entitled under the laws of the land, and under what should be every senatorial privilege and courtesy.

Mr. GURNEY. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there is no objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota, the nominations in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps reported favorably from the Committee on Armed Services by the Senator from South Dakota will be

considered en bloc, and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed, and the President will be notified immediately.

REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX PAYMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce individual income tax payments.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly about the proposed delay in the consideration of the revenue bill. As a member of the committee which considered the bill, it is my hope that what I understand to be the pending question, namely, a motion to delay consideration of the bill to June 10, shall not be favorably acted upon, since if there is to be tax reduction effective July 1, I think all are agreed that we must proceed forthwith to the consideration of the bill.

I am somewhat puzzled by the logic of the Senator from Georgia in view of what has hitherto taken place, since in the Senate committee, when this matter was being considered, there was, as I recall—and I want to do the Senator full justice—a motion by the Senator from Georgia to fix the date of the tax reduction as of January 1, 1948. How it is possible to pass upon the fiscal state of the Treasury on January 1, 1948, and yet have very serious doubt as to the fiscal state of the Treasury on July 1, 1947, is one of the questions I have been unable to resolve.

It seems to me that if we are able to forecast our situation for 7 months, we certainly should be able to forecast it for the intervening month, which is the only difference between us, so far as the period involved is concerned, in the proposal presented by the bill as reported by the Senate committee.

In order to have before us clearly the precedents in this matter, I have had compiled a history of the major tax legislation covering the period of the last 20 years, and I shall ask that there be included in the RECORD at this point a transcript of this analysis, showing that in 9 out of 19 cases of revenue legislation, the bills have been passed far earlier in the session of Congress than is now contemplated, so that in every one of those instances the Congress must not only have been proceeding upon estimates, but upon estimates far in advance of the conditions which we are now able seriously to consider.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine?

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

Major tax legislation 1926-46 (inclusive)

Bill No.	Congress	Title of act	Date passed House	Date passed Senate	Date became law	Public law or public resolution number	Session and date
H. R. 1	69th	Revenue Act, 1926	Dec. 18, 1925	Feb. 12, 1926	Feb. 26, 1926	Public Law 20	69th Cong., 1st sess., Dec. 7, 1925, to July 3, 1926.
H. R. 1	70th	Revenue Act, 1928	Dec. 15, 1927	May 21, 1928	May 29, 1928	Public Law 532	70th Cong., 1st sess., Dec. 5, 1927, to May 29, 1928.
H. J. Res. 133	71st	Tax Reduction	Dec. 5, 1929	Dec. 14, 1929	Dec. 16, 1929	Public Resolution 23	71st Cong., 2d sess., Dec. 2, 1929, to July 3, 1930.
H. R. 10236	72d	Revenue Revision 1932	Apr. 1, 1932	June 1, 1932	June 6, 1932	Public Law 154	72d Cong., 1st sess., Dec. 7, 1931, to July 16, 1932.
H. R. 7835	73d	Revenue Act, 1934	Feb. 21, 1934	Apr. 17, 1934	May 10, 1934	Public Law 216	73d Cong., 2d sess., Jan. 3, 1934, to June 18, 1934.
H. J. Res. 324	74th	Revenue	June 17, 1935	June 26, 1935	June 28, 1935	Public Resolution 36	74th Cong., 1st sess., Jan. 3, 1935, to Aug. 26, 1935.

Major tax legislation 1926-46 (inclusive)—Continued

Bill No.	Congress	Title of act	Date passed House	Date passed Senate	Date became law	Public law or public resolution number	Session and date
H. R. 8974.....	74th.....	Revenue Act of 1935.....	Aug. 5, 1935	Aug. 15, 1935	Aug. 30, 1935	Public Law 407....	74th Cong., 1st sess., Jan. 3, 1935, to Aug. 26, 1935.
H. R. 12395.....	74th.....	Revenue Act of 1936.....	Apr. 29, 1936	June 6, 1936	June 22, 1936	Public Law 740....	74th Cong., 2d sess., Jan. 3, 1936, to June 20, 1936.
H. R. 9682.....	75th.....	Revenue Act of 1938.....	Mar. 11, 1938	Apr. 9, 1938	May 28, 1938	Public Law 554....	75th Cong., 3d sess., Jan. 3, 1938, to June 16, 1938.
H. R. 6851.....	76th.....	Revenue bill, taxation.....	June 19, 1939	June 22, 1939	June 29, 1939	Public Law 155....	76th Cong., 1st sess., Jan. 3, 1939, to Aug. 5, 1939.
H. R. 10039.....	76th.....	Taxation.....	June 11, 1940	June 19, 1940	June 25, 1940	Public Law 656....	76th Cong., 3d sess., Jan. 3, 1940, to Jan. 3, 1941.
H. R. 10413.....	76th.....	Taxation, national defense.....	Aug. 29, 1940	Sept. 19, 1940	Oct. 8, 1940	Public Law 801....	Do.
H. R. 3531.....	77th.....	Taxation, excess-profits tax.....	Feb. 25, 1941	Mar. 3, 1941	Mar. 7, 1941	Public Law 10.....	77th Cong., 1st sess., Jan. 3, 1941, to Jan. 2, 1942.
H. R. 5417.....	77th.....	Taxation, Revenue Act of 1941.....	Aug. 4, 1941	Sept. 2, 1941	Sept. 20, 1941	Public Law 250....	Do.
H. R. 7378.....	77th.....	Taxation, Revenue Act of 1942.....	July 20, 1942	Oct. 10, 1942	Oct. 21, 1942	Public Law 753....	77th Cong., 2d sess., Jan. 5, 1942, to Dec. 16, 1942.
H. R. 2750.....	78th.....	Taxation, collection method.....	May 4, 1943	May 14, 1943	June 9, 1943	Public Law 68.....	78th Cong., 1st sess., Jan. 6, 1943, to Dec. 21, 1943.
H. R. 3687.....	78th.....	Taxation, revenue.....	Nov. 24, 1943	Jan. 21, 1944	Feb. 25, 1944	Public Law 235....	78th Cong., 2d sess., Jan. 10, 1944, to Dec. 19, 1944.
H. R. 4646.....	78th.....	Taxation, simplification.....	May 5, 1944	May 20, 1944	May 29, 1944	Public Law 315....	Do.
H. R. 4309.....	79th.....	Taxation, reduce.....	Oct. 11, 1945	Oct. 24, 1945	Nov. 8, 1945	Public Law 214....	79th Cong., 1st sess., Jan. 3, 1945, to Dec. 21, 1945.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, this exhibit shows the approximate date, during the session of the Congress when the tax bills were passed, under three categories—early in the session, the middle of the session, and late in the session—and I think it will be very useful in the consideration of the motion made by the Senator from Georgia, for whose views in fiscal matters I continue to entertain the very highest regard.

I wish to call attention to the history of this period, beginning in 1926, to show that at all times, under all administrations, in both Houses, it has always been recognized that Congress, in passing revenue legislation, must proceed upon estimates. I understand the Senator from Georgia recognizes this practice, but prefers that certain of the clouds in the sky shall be dissolved before we proceed further.

The result, however, must be that any possible reduction on July 1, 1947, would be rendered illusory by such action, and it is for that reason I feel very strongly, and in full accord with the many members of the committee and of the Senate and of the House, that we should proceed with this matter forthwith.

I cite from the RECORD for December 10, 1925, when the revenue legislation of that year was being considered in the House of Representatives, a comment on the situation by Mr. Collier, of Mississippi, a Democratic Member. I trust Senators will notice that throughout this history there runs the constant conflict between Treasury estimates and congressional estimates, that the current issue with which we are concerned here, and which the Senator from Colorado has so ably presented, is nothing at all new, that it was not discovered in this session, that perhaps the Treasury experts are too conservative or too optimistic, that the House and Senate have always found it necessary to exercise a certain degree of independent judgment, and that the results in many instances have completely vindicated their conclusions. And so I quote Mr. Collier, Democrat, from Mississippi, to the following effect:

Now, why do I make the statement that I am willing to vote for the repeal of special taxes which will cost nearly \$150,000,000—

In those days, I may interpolate, they were discussing comparatively moderate sums—

When we have heard from the chairman of the committee that the advice from the Treasury is that \$325,000,000 is as far as we could go without danger. I make it for two reasons—one may be political and the other a common-sense mathematical one. One is because I have no confidence in these estimates.

We all remember that the 1924 bill was in the hands of the President some time before it was finally signed, and there were many vague rumors that it might meet with a veto because the Treasury experts, headed by Mr. McCoy, their chief expert and statistician, had told us that the bill would not only give no substantial relief, but the repeal of certain special taxes together with the unscientific lowering of the surtax rates would result in an annual deficit of nearly \$300,000,000. But Congress had heard the prophecies of these experts before and insisted on the 40 percent rate.

I do not wish to make a reflection on Mr. McCoy. I believe he is an able and conscientious statistician, but he made an awful poor guess in 1924. He made an even poorer guess in 1922.

In January 1922, the Treasury Department through its actuaries came before the Committee on Ways and Means and told us that there would be a deficit of \$279,000,000 for the year 1923. Instead of a deficit there was a surplus of over \$300,000,000. These actuaries' opinions were estimated only on the current year, when they had full information of the condition of business before them.

When prophets make prophecies and I find they turn out so differently from what they said, then I lose confidence. Did the 1924 bill give relief? Under the heavy surtaxes of 1924, paid under the 1921 act, we presented to the American people * * * a rebate of 25 percent. That was some relief. At the same time, instead of that deficit of over \$200,000,000 as stated by Mr. McCoy and \$320,000,000 as stated by Mr. Mills, there was a surplus of \$290,000,000. When we are confronted with a mistake of \$400,000,000, when less than \$2,000,000,000 were intended to be collected, I think we can safely say that we may regard with some doubt future statements coming from the same source. Again, that is not all. I do not believe I am divulging any of the executive sessions of the committee when I say that it is the belief of all of us on the committee * * * that practically every estimate of expenditures from the Department was an overestimate and every estimate for collection of taxes was an underestimate. I do not criticize

the Treasury Department for being careful, but they are overcautious.

That quotation from the remarks of Mr. Collier is found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 67, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, pages 644 and 645. I may point out that this was in the period following the close of World War I; somewhat later than the present period, but in the same period of reconstruction.

We now come to a statement on December 8, 1925, by Mr. Green, of Iowa, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, introducing on the floor of the House the revenue bill which later became law in 1926, 6 months before the end of the session and 5 months before the estimates went into effect. In introducing this bill, Mr. Green said:

Last spring, during the Sixty-eighth Congress, it became evident that the revenues which would be received under the act of 1924 would be far larger than were necessary to carry on the proper functions of the Government. The Treasury then estimated, as I recollect, that \$250,000,000 surplus would be produced for the fiscal year 1925, although the original estimate has been only \$67,884,000 and a surplus of about \$250,000,000 for the fiscal year 1926.

That is cited, again, from the same CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 67, page 519.

In the debate in the Senate on the revenue bill of 1926, the late Senator Harrison of Mississippi expressed his doubt as to the accuracy of Treasury estimates of Government income and expenditures in the past. I think we all recall the position which Senator Harrison occupied in the consideration of fiscal matters throughout his distinguished public career. He said:

The Secretary of the Treasury said at that time (when the revenue bill of 1924 was being considered) that the Treasury would stand for only a reduction of \$325,000,000. The Democrats contended that it would stand a still greater reduction.

It is interesting to note that here we have the other side of the aisle contending for the very principle which they oppose today.

Events have proved that the minority was correct. Even in 1924 we gave to the country a \$400,000,000 reduction instead of \$325,-

000,000 over the protest of the present Secretary of the Treasury.

The Secretary of the Treasury having been wrong both times previously when he made an estimate and asked for the passage of a tax reduction bill, and having been mistaken anywhere from \$200,000,000 to \$300,000,000 it is reasonable to assume that he is wrong this time. He is merely guessing now, as he guessed twice before. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 67, 69th Cong., 1st sess., p. 2882.)

So that it is not new for a Secretary of the Treasury apparently not to possess infallibility in his estimates. We have seen the variance in the estimates under the present Secretary of the Treasury, by billions of dollars in the developments of recent months.

Coming down to the later date of 1932, we have a distinguished sponsor of a distinctly different ideological point of view in Representative Fiorello LaGuardia. I think it may be of some significance, because I think certain of Mr. LaGuardia's comrades have been most critical of any attempts at tax reduction at this time.

Speaking on March 18, 1932, in the House debate regarding the revenue bill of 1932, Mr. LaGuardia said:

There seems to have been a rather deliberate attempt to confuse the membership on anticipated revenues for the year 1931. Of course the revenue from income of 1931 at its best can be only an estimate. Whether or not these estimates were officially considered by the Committee on Ways and Means, of course I do not know, but I do know that a very conservative estimate has been made—

I think that certainly applies to the figures of the very conservative chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Colorado, today—

and that the information was known and available to the membership of the committee. They are based on a most drastic reduction from the last available returns after proper comparisons were made. The estimate is most conservative.

There followed a comparison of income in 1930, based on returns filed August 31, 1931, and estimates for 1932. Representative LaGuardia then continued:

Surely all must admit that sufficient allowance has been made for reduced incomes.

That is from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 18, 1932, volume 75, part 6, page 6468, the Seventy-second Congress, first session.

I come down to 1935; and again I call to the witness stand the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee at that time, the Honorable Pat Harrison, of Mississippi, who, in reporting the Revenue Act of 1935, explained the changes made in the House version of the bill. Throughout his explanation runs the admission that the amounts reported are based on estimates by Treasury experts and committee experts. He spoke as follows:

It is quite interesting to note that according to the estimates of both the Treasury experts and the committee experts, by virtue of the increase in surtaxes in the Finance Committee proposal only \$4,000,000 will be derived from those very great increases. That answers some of the questions

as to how much money we can get for the Government by drastic increase of rates on incomes in the higher brackets.

The excess-profits-tax provisions of the House bill, it is estimated, should provide \$100,000,000; but in the Senate committee bill we made the tax milder and more liberal, so that we propose to raise only \$10,000,000 of increased revenue from excess profits.

In lieu of the inheritance tax the Committee on Finance has recommended an increase of the rates in the present estate-tax structure. From that source there should be derived approximately the same amount which it is estimated would be obtained from the inheritance tax carried by the House bill; that is, the Senate committee proposal would raise \$80,000,000 of increased revenue.

From the gift tax, which is a corollary to the increased inheritance tax of the House bill, or to the estate tax in the Senate committee proposal, we should receive \$24,000,000 under the House bill from the increased rates on gift taxes, while under the Senate committee proposal the increase, it is estimated, would be \$21,000,000. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 79, pt. 12, 74th Cong., 1st sess., August 14, 1935, pp. 13041 and 13042.)

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. On the subject of erroneous estimates, may I invite the attention of the distinguished Senator to page 158 of the hearings before the committee. Mr. Lawton was the witness. He was the acting Assistant Director of the Budget. He was asked:

The CHAIRMAN. How much did you miss your budget estimate for the fiscal year 1947?
Mr. LAWTON. From the original?

The CHAIRMAN. Comparing the original with what you now believe will be the results at the end of the year, how much will you have missed your budget estimate?

Mr. LAWTON. The original estimate for the fiscal year 1947 which was contained in the budget document in January 1946 was 31.5. The present estimate is 42.5.

I might say that that estimate had been revised in connection with the budget summation last year, last August, and it was revised in the January budget.

The CHAIRMAN. What will your surplus be at the end of this fiscal year?

Mr. LAWTON. \$1,250,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. \$1,250,000,000?

Mr. LAWTON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And what was your predicted deficit?

Mr. LAWTON. The original estimate was 4.5 billion?

The CHAIRMAN. And the original estimate you predicted a deficit for the fiscal 1947 of 4.5 billion?

Mr. LAWTON. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And you will wind up with a surplus of \$1,250,000,000.

Mr. LAWTON. Yes. Those estimates have been revised twice in the intervening period.

The CHAIRMAN. As of the present time, from the time of your first estimate, you have missed it \$5,750,000,000; is that correct?

Mr. LAWTON. That is the difference between expenditures and receipts; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. A total miss of \$5,750,000,000; is that right?

Mr. LAWTON. Yes.

That throws an interesting perspective, I suggest, on all the quarreling they used to have over a \$300,000,000 miss.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think it is very revealing as indicating the very great difference in our fiscal situation, as they used to be most meticulous over a few million dollars or a hundred million dollars, and now they miss by \$5,000,000,000 and are very complacent about the situation.

Mr. President, the matter of estimates seems to be a source of some perturbation to our friends on the other side of the aisle.

I come now to 1936, and again to a distinguished Democrat, Representative Samuel B. Hill, Democrat, of Washington, who has this to say in discussing tax bill procedures on April 23, 1936:

It has been the practice of the Ways and Means Committee as far back as I know anything of its procedure, first, to get the information through study and through hearings, and then write the bill. I recall in 1932 * * * with hearings on a tax bill before the Ways and Means Committee. * * * The Ways and Means Committee regardless of partisanship, undertook to meet the revenue requirements as outlined by the * * * Secretary of the Treasury. Not only did the Secretary of the Treasury not bring a bill already prepared for the Ways and Means Committee but he came back repeatedly revising his estimates and asking for more money and asking the Committee on Ways and Means to find sources of additional revenue.

In every revenue bill since that time the same procedure has been followed. I am advised that the same procedure was followed prior to that time.

I am not criticizing * * * but simply pointing out this is the practice of the Republican Members when they are in control and it is the practice of the Democratic Members when they are in control, especially when they have been forewarned that the minority Members are opposed to every part of the measure and every part of the proposed legislation.

It is true that we rely upon the (committee) experts, including the drafting service; and we have, I think, as able men in this service as can be found, and we are glad to rely upon them.

This statement is to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 80, part 6, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session, April 23, 1936, at page 3998.

I come now to the statement of Representative Allen T. Treadway, Republican, of Massachusetts, on the same revenue bill:

The Treasury itself has not furnished a definite estimate of what the bill is expected to produce in the way of revenue, and even if it did the estimate would be no more than a guess. The Federal revenue is actually jeopardized by the bill when it abandons an assured collection of \$1,132,000,000 from corporations in favor of a yield which at most is pure conjecture and which will undoubtedly be disappointing in amount. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 80, pt. 6, 74th Cong., 2d sess., April 23, 1936, p. 5990.)

That was when a Republican was questioning the Democratic step in that direction.

Coming to 1936, Senator King, Democrat, of Utah, in presenting the Senate

version of the Revenue Act of 1936, spoke as follows:

I wish to say something about the estimates of the bill. Conservative estimates indicate that the committee bill will yield about \$829,000,000 as compared with the yield of \$803,000,000 claimed under the House bill.

In reaching the conclusions respecting the revenue yield, due consideration was given to the Treasury estimates. The committee also gave consideration to the estimates submitted by its own experts. * * * In the report submitted by the committee the Senators will find a statement based upon the Treasury estimates indicating that they were made in an abundance of caution, and that reasonably we may expect, if the Senate bill shall be enacted into law, that the full amount of at least \$829,000,000 will be raised in addition to the existing revenue.

We now come to the Revenue Act of 1937; and again we find estimates. Representative Thomas E. Jenkins, of Ohio, a Republican, had this to say in discussing the bill:

I expect to vote for this bill because I think it will call a halt on the tendency of a few wealthy people who are not fair and square with the Government and who do not want to assume to pay the taxes which they really should pay under the law. * * * As to the amount of money this bill will produce even the experts who testified before the Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member, were not able to make any definite estimate. The best they could do was to offer a guess. These guesses ran all the way from \$40,000,000 to \$100,000,000 per year. Probably \$60,000,000 or \$70,000,000 would represent a fair average between them and would probably represent the amount that will be saved to the Government by this legislation. This amount of money in these days of terrific spending is well worth going after. I repeat that I expect to vote for this bill for this reason. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 81, pt. 8, 75th Cong., 1st sess., August 16, 1937, p. 9020.)

In connection with the Revenue Act of 1938, Representative CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, in extending his remarks on the total of appropriations, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, declared:

It is impossible to say now with certainty what the situation with respect to Federal expenditures and revenues will be for the next fiscal year. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 83, pt. 11, 75th Cong., 3d sess., June 16, 1938, Appendix, p. 3106.)

I come now to the Senate discussion of the excess-profits tax estimates of 1940. On September 13, 1940, Hon. Pat Harrison, Democrat, of Mississippi, had this to say:

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator, of course, recalls that the chief of our staff, in presenting the estimates for 1941 under the Senate bill, estimated the amount of revenue at \$882,500,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. HARRISON. And the Senator recalls that when the Treasury experts were asked for an estimate they said they did not have the figures, but could only give us those for this year, in which we all know we could not raise much—the amount of \$355,000,000—I believe—but that in that instance Mr. Stam said that he estimated the revenue for 1940 at \$482,000,000. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 86, pt. 11, September 13, 1940, p. 12062.)

Mr. Stam is still the expert of the Finance Committee.

I add that there is a wide difference in the estimates obtained from various sources on the revenue the excess-profits tax would provide. Nevertheless, estimates, and only estimates, were used as the basis for the tax.

Again, in 1940, Senator Harrison, in presenting the excess-profits-tax bill, said:

All estimates are guesses to some extent; but if the Senator will look into the guesses made by the experts of the Treasury and those made by the experts of the joint committee, he will find that our experts have been in some instances more correct than the Treasury experts. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 86, pt. II, September 13, 1940, p. 12062.)

That was the comment of a distinguished and most experienced Democratic Senator in dealing with this very situation in 1940.

The 1942 tax bill which inaugurated pay-as-you-go taxes was the largest single piece of revenue legislation ever undertaken by our Government. Introducing the bill into the House on July 16, 1942, Mr. DOUGHTON, Democrat, of North Carolina, outlined the various estimates used by the Treasury and the Ways and Means Committee in framing the bill. He stated:

Treasury actuaries estimate the bill will produce about \$6,000,000,000 of additional revenue. This estimate from certain studies I have made, is in my opinion too conservative. From many years of experience with tax legislation and observing and comparing the results of estimates with actual tax collections, I am willing to venture an estimate of my own, although, of course, I do not pretend to compare myself with the actuaries of the Treasury Department

There were two revenue acts, as you will remember, in 1940, which were estimated at the time to yield about \$2,000,000,000 of added revenue annually. Then followed the Revenue Act of 1941, estimated then to produce more than \$3,500,000,000 of additional revenue. Thus, while these three bills were estimated at the time of their enactment to produce about \$6,000,000,000 annually, our revenues since 1939 have actually increased by \$11,500,000,000—that is, from \$5,500,000,000 in 1939 to \$17,000,000,000, which the existing law is yielding currently. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 5, July 16, 1942, p. 6262.)

That was a pretty decisive demonstration, within the past 4 years, of how widely the estimates have departed from the results.

I again quote Representative DOUGHTON, who for a long time was chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee who stated, in reporting the revenue bill of 1942:

I feel safe in predicting that this bill, under present business conditions, will yield in excess of \$7,000,000,000 annually. I say "under present business conditions," because no one can tell with certainty what any bill will produce, not knowing what business conditions the future may bring about.

I give the Senate this record of 20 years of tax legislation, demonstrating that without a single exception our tax bills have always been passed upon the basis of estimates by the Treasury, of estimates of experts on business, or,

finally, on conclusions of members of the Senate Committee on Finance and the Members of the Senate as to what it is estimated the future may hold, and that if any tax reduction is to occur on July 1, 1947, it is absolutely imperative, in the light of all the conditions, figures, and estimates which have been accumulated in the studies of the past months and in the light of the business experience of recent months, that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of this matter. I hope that every Member of the Senate will bear in mind that if it be deemed advisable to accomplish this tax reduction at the beginning of the fiscal year 1948—and there is much to be said for our carrying it out within the period of 12 months which is the period of time for which we make the appropriations, as well as the estimates—it is absolutely essential that we proceed forthwith to its consideration, and that in doing so we shall simply be following the course charted by every committee and every Congress throughout the entire history of the Government of the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 153) providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war.

RELIEF ASSISTANCE FOR COUNTRIES DEVASTATED BY WAR—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the House has adopted the conference report on the European relief bill. The bill is in practically the form in which it passed the Senate. The only substantial difference is that out of the \$350,000,000 figure in the Senate bill a portion, running from \$15,000,000 to \$40,000,000, is earmarked for the children's fund in the event the President exercises an option to use it for that purpose.

I think the only other important difference is that the conference bill yields to the House's desire to identify the countries to which the relief is to go, the identification being precisely the same as that which was presented to the Senate in the letter from the Secretary of State.

The conference report is signed by all the Senate conferees, and I think there is no disagreement whatever about it. Under the circumstances, I feel that it is appropriate for me to ask that the conference report be now considered.

I submit the conference report on House Joint Resolution 153 providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELL in the chair). The conference report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint reso-

lution (H. J. Res. 153) providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President not to exceed \$350,000,000 for the provision of relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war, such relief assistance to be limited to the following: Food, medical supplies, processed and unprocessed materials for clothing, fuel, fertilizer, pesticides, and seed: *Provided*, That from the funds authorized under this section the President shall make contributions to the International Children's Emergency Fund of the United Nations for the special care and feeding of children, and such contributions shall not be subject to the limitations and requirements provided in this joint resolution, but after \$15,000,000 has been so contributed, no further contributions shall be made which would cause the aggregate amount so contributed by the United States (1) to constitute more than 57 per centum of the aggregate amount contributed to said fund by all governments not receiving assistance from said fund, including the United States; or (2) to exceed \$40,000,000, whichever is the lesser.

"There shall be established and maintained, out of the funds authorized under this joint resolution, a relief distribution mission for each of the countries receiving aid under this joint resolution. Such missions shall be comprised solely of American citizens who shall have been investigated as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Such missions shall have direct supervision and control, in each country, of relief supplies furnished or otherwise made available under this joint resolution, and, when it is deemed desirable by the field administrator provided for in section 4, such missions shall be empowered to retain possession of such supplies up to the city or local community where such supplies are actually made available to the ultimate consumers.

"Not more than \$15,000,000 of the funds authorized under this joint resolution shall be available for relief in any countries or territories other than Austria, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Trieste, and China. This provision shall not imply any obligation to give relief to any of the countries mentioned.

"Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed, until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to this section, to make advances, not to exceed in the aggregate \$75,000,000, to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution, in such manner and in such amounts as the President shall determine. From appropriations authorized under this section, there shall be repaid to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the advances made by it under the authority contained herein.

"Sec. 2. (a) Under the direction of the President, such relief assistance shall be provided in the form of transfers of supplies, or the establishment in this country of credits subject to the control of the President, in such quantities and on such terms as the President may determine; except that no such transfers of supplies or establishment of credits may be made after June 30, 1948, and except that not more than 6 per centum of the amount herein authorized shall be used for the procurement of supplies outside the United States and its Territories and possessions.

"(b) In carrying out this joint resolution, funds authorized herein may be used to pay necessary expenses related to the providing

of such relief assistance, including expenses of or incident to the procurement, storage, transportation, and shipment of supplies transferred under subsection (a) or of supplies purchased from credits established under subsection (a).

"(c) Funds authorized under this joint resolution may be allocated for any of the purposes of this joint resolution to any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government and such sums shall be available for obligation and expenditure in accordance with the laws governing obligations and expenditures of the department, agency, or independent establishment, or organizational unit thereof concerned, and without regard to, sections 3709 and 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 41, sec. 5, and title 31, sec. 529).

"(d) Such additional civilian employees as may be required by the War Department in connection with the furnishing of procurement, storage, transportation, and shipping services under this joint resolution and which services are paid for from funds herein authorized, shall not be counted as civilian employees within the meaning of section 607 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended by section 14 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946.

"(e) When any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government receives request from the government of any country for which credits have been established under subsection (a) and receives, from credits so established, advances or reimbursements for the cost and necessary expenses, it may furnish, or procure and furnish (if advancements are made), supplies within the category of relief assistance as defined in section 1 and may use sums so received for the purposes set forth in subsection (b) of this section. When any such reimbursement is made it shall be credited, at the option of the department, agency, or independent establishment concerned, either to the appropriation, fund, or account utilized in incurring the obligation, or to an appropriate appropriation, fund, or account which is current at the time of such reimbursement.

"(f) In order to supplement the general relief assistance made available under the terms of section 1 and to effect the economical and expanded use of American voluntary relief contributions, funds authorized under this joint resolution, not to exceed \$5,000,000, may be used to pay necessary expenses related to the ocean transportation of supplies donated to or purchased by American voluntary and nonprofit relief agencies, and in such quantities and kinds and for such purposes as the President may determine to be essential supplements to the supplies provided for such general relief assistance.

"(g) The relief supplies provided under the terms of this joint resolution shall be procured and furnished by the appropriate United States procurement agencies unless the President shall determine otherwise.

"Sec. 3. No relief assistance shall be provided under the authority of this joint resolution to the people of any country unless the government of such country has given assurance satisfactory to the President that

(a) the supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution, as well as similar supplies produced locally or imported from outside sources, will be distributed among the people of such country without discrimination as to race, creed, or political belief; (b) representatives of the Government of the United States and of the press and radio of the United States will be permitted to observe freely and to report fully regarding the distribution and utilization of such supplies; (c) full and continuous publicity will be given within such country as to the purpose, source, character, scope, amounts and progress of the United

States relief program carried on therein pursuant to this joint resolution; (d) if food, medical supplies, fertilizer, or seed is transferred or otherwise made available to such country pursuant to this joint resolution, no articles of the same character will be exported or removed from such country while need therefor for relief purposes continues; (e) such country has taken or is taking, insofar as possible, the economic measures necessary to reduce its relief needs and to provide for its own future reconstruction; (f) upon request of the President, it will furnish promptly information concerning the production, use, distribution, importation, and exportation of any supplies which affect the relief needs of the people of such country; (g) representatives of the Government of the United States will be permitted to supervise the distribution among the people of such country of the supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution; (h) provision will be made for a control system so that all classes of people within such country will receive their fair share of essential supplies; and (i) all supplies transferred pursuant to this joint resolution or acquired through the use of credits established pursuant to this joint resolution and any articles processed from such supplies, or the containers of such supplies or articles, will, to the extent practicable, be marked, stamped, branded, or labeled in a conspicuous place as legibly, indelibly, and permanently as the nature of such supplies, articles, or containers will permit in such manner as to indicate to the ultimate consumer in such country that such supplies or articles have been furnished by the United States of America for relief assistance; or if such supplies, articles, or containers are incapable of being so marked, stamped, branded, or labeled, that all practicable steps will be taken to inform the ultimate consumers thereof that such supplies or articles have been furnished by the United States of America for relief assistance.

"Sec. 4. When supplies are transferred or otherwise made available to any country pursuant to this joint resolution, the President shall cause representatives of the Government of the United States (1) to supervise the distribution of such supplies among the people of such country, (2) to observe and report with respect to the carrying out of the assurances given to the President pursuant to section 3, and (3) to seek arrangements that reparations payable from current production by any such country to any other country by treaty be postponed during the period of such relief.

"With respect to the furnishing of relief assistance pursuant to this joint resolution, the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a field administrator who shall direct the supervision of such relief assistance. Such administrator shall receive compensation at a rate not to exceed \$12,000 per annum, and any necessary expenses, as the President shall determine. He shall act in accordance with the instructions of the President.

"The authority of the President under sections 2 and 3 and under this section may, to the extent the President directs, be exercised by the Secretary of State.

"Sec. 5. (a) The President shall promptly terminate the provision of relief assistance to the people of any country whenever he determines (1) that, by reason of changed conditions, the provision of relief assistance of the character authorized by this joint resolution is no longer necessary, (2) that any of the assurances given pursuant to section 3 are not being carried out, (3) that an excessive amount of any supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution, or of similar supplies produced locally or imported from outside sources, is being used to assist in the maintenance of armed forces in such country, or (4) that supplies transferred or otherwise

made available pursuant to this joint resolution, or similar supplies produced locally or imported from outside sources, are being exported or removed from such country.

"(b) Relief assistance to the people of any country, under this joint resolution, shall, unless sooner terminated by the President, be terminated whenever such termination is directed by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress.

"Sec. 6. To the extent that relief supplies procured with funds authorized under this joint resolution are not furnished on terms of repayment in dollars, they shall be furnished only upon condition that the government of the receiving country agree that when it sells such relief supplies for local currency (a) the amounts of such local currency will be deposited by it in a special account; (b) such account will be used within such country, as a revolving fund, until June 30, 1948, only upon the approval of the duly authorized representative of the United States, for relief and work relief purposes, including local currency expenses of the United States incident to the furnishing of relief; and (c) any unencumbered balance remaining in such account on June 30, 1948, will be disposed of within such country for such purposes as the United States Government, pursuant to Act or joint resolution of the Congress, may determine.

"Sec. 7. The President shall submit to the Congress quarterly reports of expenditures and activities under authority of this joint resolution."

And the Senate agree to the same.

A. H. VANDENBERG,
ALEXANDER WILEY,
H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
TOM CONNALLY,
WALTER F. GEORGE,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CHARLES A. EATON,
KARL E. MUNDT,
SOL BLOOM,
JOHN KEE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the conference report.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I have learned, by rumor only, that the amount of money which is contained in the relief bill is also contained in the President's estimated budget which was sent to Congress. I have also learned that it is not contained in the budget. I wonder whether or not the Senator from Michigan could give me information on that subject.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I hesitate to answer the question. My impression is that it is in the budget, but I am not able to underwrite that statement.

Mr. LUCAS. I thought perhaps the Senator might know.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That question never arose, of course, in connection with our consideration of the matter.

Mr. LUCAS. I had occasion to learn about that, and it seemed to be rather important in view of the subject we are discussing here today. I shall take the time to look it up and consult the proper department.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Are these funds to be administered in conjunction with similar funds contributed from any other countries?

Mr. VANDENBERG. There is a coordinating group in the United Nations set up under order of the General Assembly to coordinate the independent contributions which are made by various countries which are cooperating. But each country, as indicated in great detail in the debate itself, is in control of its own contributions.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. Are we using any of the UNRRA personnel—I am speaking only, of course, of American personnel associated with UNRRA—in the administration of these funds in any of the countries where they are to be distributed?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The organization to administer the new relief bill has not yet been fully developed. Indeed, the Administrator himself has not yet been appointed, because it is only this afternoon that we have been on our way to have the fund available. It is my understanding that there is a new Administrator contemplated, and if the one expected to be chosen shall be actually selected, he will be an administrator of very wide experience in the international administration of Red Cross affairs during the past 20 years.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the administrator in charge of the administration of these funds be a distinct person from the administrator who will be in charge of the administration of the Greek relief?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Oh, entirely and totally distinct. There is no relationship between the two administrations at all, except, of course, that a portion of the relief fund is earmarked for expenditure in Greece.

Mr. PEPPER. That is what I was going to ask. Would the \$50,000,000 that is earmarked in the relief bill for expenditure in Greece be administered by the administrator of the \$300,000,000 provided for Greece under the Greco-Turkish loan measure?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; the two are to be separately administered.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to inquire of the Senator whether the provision that was adopted in the House for investigation of the personnel by the FBI appears in the conference report?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is in the conference report with the verb changed. The House required approval by the FBI. The conference report requires investigation by the FBI and approval by the President and the State Department.

Mr. McMAHON. That is a very important change.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is a very important change.

Mr. McMAHON. I congratulate the Senator on having brought it about.

I should like to ask a further question. In view of the present heavy burden which the FBI has to carry, will the necessity for investigation by the FBI slow up, in the Senator's opinion, the process of getting this relief work under way?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think not, because it is applied only to policy-makers at the top level. That point is specifically explained in the statement of the House and Senate conferees. Clerical help, custodial help, and personal service at the lower levels are not included.

Mr. McMAHON. In other words, it may mean an investigation of from 25 to 50 persons?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not know the number, but the formula is practical.

Mr. McMAHON. The number will be manageable.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I may supplement the reply to the question of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] regarding the allowance in the budget, as I have the budget in my hands. There is an item of \$3,510,000,000 for international affairs and finance. I do not, of course, know the break-down, but that is a great deal of money, and I hope it may include the item to which the Senator has modestly referred.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That was the basis of my response to the Senator from Illinois. I know that there is an overall figure in the President's budget in excess of \$3,000,000,000 covering all these various enterprises.

Mr. BREWSTER. Three billion five hundred and ten million dollars.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I cannot say categorically that this item is included, but I think it is.

REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME-TAX PAYMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1), to reduce individual income-tax payments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] to postpone consideration of the pending bill, House bill No. 1, until June 10, 1947.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Cordon	Hoey
Baldwin	Donnell	Holland
Ball	Downey	Ives
Barkley	Dworshak	Jenner
Brewster	Ecton	Johnson, Colo.
Bricker	Ellender	Johnston, S. C.
Bridges	Ferguson	Kem
Brooks	Flanders	Kilgore
Bushfield	Fulbright	Knowland
Butler	George	Lodge
Byrd	Green	Lucas
Cain	Gurney	McCarthy
Capehart	Hatch	McClellan
Capper	Hawkes	McFarland
Chavez	Hayden	McGrath
Connally	Hickenlooper	McKellar
Cooper	Hill	McMahon

Magnuson	Revercomb	Tydings
Malone	Robertson, Va.	Umstead
Martin	Robertson, Wyo.	Vandenberg
Maybank	Russell	Wagner
Millikin	Saltonstall	Watkins
Moore	Smith	Wherry
Morse	Sparkman	White
Murray	Stewart	Wiley
Myers	Taft	Williams
O'Connor	Taylor	Wilson
O'Daniel	Thomas, Okla.	Young
Pepper	Thye	
Reed	Tobey	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate, I shall detain the Senate for only a short time while I speak in support of the motion which has been made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], namely, to postpone until June 10, further consideration of the tax measure which now is before the Senate.

Before speaking briefly on that subject, I should like to take this opportunity to compliment and to congratulate the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], who is chairman of the Finance Committee for his fairness and impartiality in the hearing which was held for some 2 weeks or more before the Finance Committee. They were no star-chamber sessions, Mr. President, all persons who had something constructive or worth while to say, and even some persons who did not have much to say, were permitted to testify before that committee. The proceedings before that committee were so different from the short hearings in the House of Representatives when House bill 1, known as the Knutson bill, was reported, that I think the Senator from Colorado is entitled to these kind words from a Senator on this side of the aisle.

Mr. President, when we consider the history of H. R. 1 as it was originally conceived by those who were responsible for its introduction in the House of Representatives, we learn that H. R. 1 as first drawn and introduced was a bill which sought the reduction of taxes by 20 percent "straight across the board." That phrase has a pleasing sound, a pleasant ring. But upon a careful analysis of that type of tax reduction one will immediately discover that such a tax bill, if it had been followed out as originally introduced in the House of Representatives, would have placed those in the higher income groups in the United States in approximately the same position in which they found themselves preceding the war while doing little for those in the low-income bracket. So as time went on the bill was amended, and when it came to the Senate as amended it was further amended by the Senate Committee on Finance, and it is now before the Senate as so amended.

Mr. President, the bill in its present form does give relief to taxpayers in every bracket, but I undertake to say that before we write the over-all tax bill which everyone is talking about, since there is a determination to pass some kind of a tax measure in the Eightieth Congress, we should follow the same methods Congress used to increase taxes for war purposes. When we started to

raise revenue for war purposes we decreased the exemptions of those in the lower income brackets, until thousands upon thousands, yes, millions, who never saw an income-tax schedule before 1939 and 1940, were required to pay income taxes to the Government, and they are paying them today.

If we are to do anything in the way of reducing taxes, in the final analysis we should increase exemptions, not to the same extent they were decreased for war purposes, but we should start at least in the inverse order and give to those in the lower income groups what they are rightfully entitled to in the way of tax reduction.

Mr. President, I shall have more to say about that perhaps later, either while we are discussing the pending bill, or if the motion made by the Senator from Georgia should prevail, I shall speak at some length upon a substitute bill I shall offer at the proper time.

I wish to point out distinctly to the Senate and to the country that H. R. 1 as reported by the Committee on Finance, which is now the unfinished business of the Senate, does not take a single taxpayer in the lower brackets off the roll, and today there are 47,700,000 individuals paying income taxes into the Federal Treasury. In other words, what I inveigh against heavily in connection with the bill is the fact that, unless he is over 65 years of age, the taxpayer now paying \$1 will pay the sum of 70 cents under H. R. 1, as amended by the Senate Finance Committee.

Mr. President, I do not think that is right. I am not one of those who believe that we can make a better citizen out of an American simply by compelling him to file an income-tax schedule. I do not believe he is going to have a greater stake in his Government if he is compelled to file an income-tax schedule for a dollar or a dollar and a half or two dollars; and that is exactly what is required under the pending bill.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I am not a member of the committee, but I am interested in what the Senator just said about making a better citizen out of a man who is compelled to file an income tax return and pay from 70 cents to a dollar or a dollar and a half. I am wondering if the taxpayer paying that small sum would not fully realize that, in his making that return, the expense to the Government would be far greater than the amount he pays, and if he might not logically get the idea that he is being compelled to pay a tax from which the Government derives no benefit whatever, and he is simply paying something in the nature of a penalty.

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to the able Senator from New Mexico that the benefit the Government derives is very slight in thousands upon thousands of cases. In fact, in my judgment, in thousands upon thousands of cases it will cost the Government more to collect the small sums paid than will be obtained by the Government through compelling the taxpayers to pay these small amounts.

I submit, with sincerity, that the individual who has to pay the small income tax, instead of being made a better citizen, more or less will lose faith in his Government because of the trouble to which he must go to pay his dollar into the Treasury of the United States. The income tax collectors are rounding him up to see if he has paid his dollar, and sometimes he has to go to a lawyer to ascertain whether he has made out his income tax schedule correctly.

It is said, "The person in the lower income tax groups does not have any trouble with his schedule, because the directions are all written out for him, and all he has to do is to read them and make out his check for 70 cents, or \$1.50, and send it to the collector." The trouble with the individual who makes that kind of a statement is that he fails to understand that the average person at the crossroads throughout America does not understand the implications and the complications of income tax payments. In fact, sometimes when I hear some of the debates which take place in the Senate, I wonder whether the Members of the Senate of the United States understand them.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I know the Senator does not intend to discuss the substitute bill he proposes to offer, and I am quite interested in what the Senator has been saying about the subject to which he is now animadverting and I rise to inquire whether the substitute he proposes to offer later will cover the situation about which he is now talking.

Mr. LUCAS. If and when we reach that point, I shall develop that question to a somewhat greater extent than I have done thus far. I do have a provision in the substitute bill which I propose to offer at the proper time, which will increase the exemptions for dependents and for the married man. I do not wish to discuss it now, but since the Senator raised it, I will say that, for instance, under the bill I propose to offer, I would increase individual exemptions merely from \$500 to \$600, and those of married persons, from \$1,000 to \$1,200. That slight increase in exemptions would cost the Treasury of the United States \$1,500,000,000.

In addition to that, it would take 4,800,000 people off the tax rolls—the small taxpayers I am talking about who are entitled to be taken from the rolls. In other words, while we are doing the tax work by piecemeal at this time—and everybody admits it is only a temporary expedient for tax relief—we should not under any circumstances go across the board 20 percent, 30 percent, or 10 percent, as H. R. 1 does, but we should follow the same pattern for tax legislation followed by the Congress for years. If an over-all tax bill is to be written, that would be another matter. One of the reasons I would like to see the tax bill postponed until January 1 is because the Ways and Means Committee of the House has started hearings to consider at least 50 different phases of the revenue law needing attention at this time, in order

that next year that committee may report a complete tax bill, overhauling the revenue acts as they now stand.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I do not want to divert the Senator entirely from the line of his prepared remarks, but his reference to increasing the exemptions reminds me of something I heard recently about the Senator from Illinois. I was told the Senator is opposed to any tax reduction whatever. What the Senator has said he intends to propose, to increase or enlarge the exemptions, indicates that he is not opposed to tax reductions.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say to the Senator, the bill that I have would take effect on January 1, 1948. I have excellent reasons, that I shall present at the proper time, as to why I think no tax reduction should be made at this time; but I do not want to go into that now.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator, as a lawyer, knows that it costs a certain definite amount of money to mail even a form letter, including the cost of addressing and sealing the envelope. It takes a certain amount of money to handle the answer thereto, when it comes into an office. Has the Senator discussed yet the amount of savings that will be entailed in the cost of operating the Bureau of Internal Revenue, by getting rid of small tax payments which do not justify the cost of sending out bills and receiving reports and doing the bookkeeping entailed in the payment? I think it would effect a saving to the taxpayer, but it would also largely offset the cost to the Government of that work.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct. The majority has been talking about cutting people off the pay rolls; and I am in favor of that. I say that anybody that can be spared from the pay roll without impairing the essential services of the Government, should go. Here is an opportunity to take 4,800,000 people off the tax rolls. There will certainly be an opportunity to take some people off the pay rolls, which I think follows as a matter of common ordinary horse sense; and yet those who are talking loudest about cutting people off the pay rolls are not taking a single individual off the tax rolls; thereby saying, by inference, "We want everybody to remain on the pay rolls, in order to collect from those who are on the tax rolls."

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. My question was impelled by the fact that I well remember, when we lowered the brackets and lowered exemptions, as at the present time, it became necessary to put a tremendous number of people in various district offices—my recollection is it was an increase of something like 35 percent—to handle the vastly increased number of taxpayers, a large number of whom did not pay sufficient taxes to justify the expenditure for clerical help entailed in collection.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not completely familiar with the last conclusion the Senator makes.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. As I listened to the statement of the Senator from Illinois I thought he gave the impression that H. R. 1, as amended, does not take any taxpayers off the rolls. It takes 1,400,000 aged people off.

Mr. LUCAS. They are taken off by the increased exemptions?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. That is, \$500, for those above the age of 65?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is right.

Mr. LUCAS. I am talking primarily about those in the lower income tax brackets. The Senator is correct, so far as those above 65 years of age are concerned.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I did not understand the Senator from Colorado. How many people does the Senator say are to be taken off the roll?

Mr. MILLIKIN. One million four hundred thousand people, 65 years old or older.

Mr. LUCAS. Those are people 65 years of age and over; but since the Senator from Colorado has mentioned that I want to call the attention of the Senate and the country to the fact that the provision which helps people over 65 years of age does one of the most unusual things I have ever heard of since I have been in Congress and have been assisting in writing and in debating tax legislation. Why do I say that? In order to aid those who are administering the law, as the Senator from Colorado said, a \$500 tax exemption is given to every individual over 65 years of age. It does not make any difference who he may be.

Mr. HATCH. Is that regardless of income?

Mr. LUCAS. It is regardless of the income the elderly person may have. If he is 65 years of age, he gets a \$500 exemption. If the wife is over 65 years of age, she gets a \$500 exemption. Under this tax bill, even a man with three children, on a \$2,000 salary, could not get a \$100 flat exemption unless he was over 65.

Regardless of the task in the way of administration, the inequities of that situation are so great that the bill itself becomes unsound and ought to be defeated, if and when a final vote is taken on the floor of the Senate.

To say that a Member of the United States Senate who is 65 years of age—and there are a few of them—is entitled to a \$500 exemption, simply because he is 65, while some employee of the Senate, who is 35 years of age, who has three children, is not entitled to any exemption, to me simply does not make sense; it is inequitable, it is unfair, and it is unsound.

Mr. MILLIKIN and Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HATCH. The Senator has already answered my question by the remarks just made.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to invite the distinguished Senator's attention to the fact that the exemptions under the present law are available to all, whether rich or poor. I think it might be unfortunate to apply the needs test to people, because they are 65 years old or over.

Mr. LUCAS. It is unnecessary to apply the needs test to those above 65 years of age. It is admitted that the provision for a \$500 exemption to all over 65 years of age, regardless of financial condition, was placed in the bill, simply because of administrative difficulties. I say that that is not fair. I say that the individual who is over 65 and who has plenty is not entitled to the \$500 exemption, unless the exemption is given to every taxpayer regardless of age, particularly in the lower-income groups. I do not say that the individual who is on a pension or those who have retired are not entitled to the \$500 exemption. That is not the point I am making. I am in favor of that phase of it, but I submit that it ought to be confined to such persons. We should not run amuck with legislation of this kind, by placing every individual in the United States of America in a certain classification, whether he is worth \$100 or \$10,000,000, and give him the benefit of the \$500 exemption, simply because he is 65 years of age.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I understand the Senator's point thoroughly, but I want the RECORD to be clear that the exemptions already granted by existing law are available to all taxpayers, whether they are rich or whether they are poor. We have not drawn a distinction in granting exemptions on the basis of wealth.

Mr. LUCAS. That is true. Under the present law no distinction is made in exemptions on the basis of wealth. But I say that the Senator's committee is drawing the distinction with respect to persons who are 65 years old. I undertake to say that an individual who has plenty, who does not want for the necessities of life, who files an income tax schedule under which he pays \$15,000 or \$20,000, or perhaps \$10,000, certainly should not be entitled to a \$500 exemption simply because he is 65 years old. If discrimination is to be made in favor of anyone, do not discriminate in favor of those who can pay, because the Nation's tax structure is based upon ability to pay, and everyone knows it. Consequently, if it is proposed to dish out any favors to the American taxpayers, they ought to go to those who are in the lower income tax bracket groups.

Mr. President, I had not intended to debate that point at this time. I want to get back primarily to some of the points which have been raised with re-

spect to the motion made by the able Senator from Georgia. The Senator from Georgia made a statement which should command the respect of every Senator and of the American people as a whole. In the able address which he delivered, he stated that he could think of nothing worse than if, after a tax reduction this year, there should come a recession, resulting in nothing being paid on the national debt, and finally resulting in deficit financing for governmental expenses in 1949 and 1950. He said he could think of nothing worse from the standpoint of impairing a sound national economy.

I subscribe to that doctrine. If that should happen, I undertake to say that the individuals who have bonds which are cashable at that particular time will be going to the banks as fast as they can with their bonds. I can think of nothing which would more quickly destroy confidence and faith in this country than to have the country obliged to indulge in deficit financing in 1949 and 1950. I say it is not beyond possibility that that could happen if we go through with a program of \$3,500,000,000 tax reduction, if we go through with a program of paying \$2,800,000,000 to apply on the national debt, especially in view of present world conditions.

Already we have appropriated outside and beyond what the President of the United States requested in his budget, something like \$800,000,000, and I am assuming that the \$350,000,000 the Senate just voted on today is not included in the President's budget. I do not think it is. Some say it is, but I am not sure about it. If I am correct in my assumption there is something like \$800,000,000 already appropriated by the Congress which is not included in the President's budget—practically the same amount that has been saved so far by the House of Representatives, if we eliminate the \$800,000,000 tax refund, which, of course, is just a bookkeeping transaction—a phony of the worst kind.

Mr. President, H. R. 1 was presented in the beginning in the House of Representatives primarily on the theory of giving to the people of America an incentive to invest money in order to keep business concerns operating.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The able Senator, being a member of the committee, I am sure has given considerable thought to this question. Under present conditions, in view of the first quarterly reports of our corporations, with which I am sure the Senator is familiar, it does not seem to me that the present great need is money for investment with a view of increasing productivity, or that the lack of such money presents a great danger in the next year or so. On the other hand, what should concern us more is the lack of consumptive power, and that therefore, so far as Congress can influence such matters by fiscal policy, the saving of money to those in the higher-tax brackets on order to encourage investment and production should not be the immediate goal, but the immediate goal should be the building up

of ability to consume. That, it seems to me, is the most important thing to be done in the next year. Our tax policy should be sufficiently flexible to meet the conditions of the moment. Conditions might change entirely in a year or 2 years, but under present conditions increase of consumptive power is the important goal to be attained.

Mr. LUCAS. In my opinion, the Senator is absolutely correct. There is not a single economic factor existing today which indicates there is any lack of ability on the part of industry to have risk capital invested. Why do I make that statement? Because the profits of corporations are the highest in all history of peacetime America. Individuals were never better off in America than they are at this very moment. I do not contend that taxes should remain high forever. I only make the argument against the theory of reduction in taxes as a necessary incentive to investment in industry at this time. Certainly there is no individual who understands sound economy in America who will undertake seriously to say that when a tax bill is made retroactive to January 1, 1947, that in itself will be an incentive for individuals to invest money. That sort of argument will not hold water. Yet that was one of the big talking points with respect to H. R. 1 when it was introduced in the House and was passed by the House of Representatives. The sponsors of H. R. 1 said that the enactment of the bill would stimulate incentive to build and to buy and to do the things that would necessarily be done with the money that is saved to the taxpayers of America.

Mr. President, I agree with the able Senator from Colorado on that particular point. He does not say that a retroactive tax measure provides a stimulation of that kind at all. But the point I am making is that the argument was made to the American people that a retroactive tax measure would provide incentive capital. It will not do any such thing, Mr. President.

I wish to speak briefly with respect to the budget. The Senator from Georgia has gone over that point very carefully. Some time ago I made a speech on the floor of the Senate upon this subject. The able Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] discussed it today. He candidly admitted the deadlock between the House and the Senate which has existed for some time.

It is most unfortunate that the Legislative Budget Committee was unable to agree upon a figure and report it back to the Senate and House. It seems to me that in view of all the turmoil which was raised over the question of reducing the President's budget \$6,000,000,000 or \$4,500,000,000, some sort of compromise should have been reached. I would not say that it would have been a "phony" compromise, as the Senator from Colorado said today. All legislation is based upon compromise. If the conferees could not agree upon one figure or the other they should have brought back some other figure. That is the important point. The American people were expecting something in the way of a figure on budget reform.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it not pretty clear that the reasons why they cannot agree are the same reasons urged by the Senator from Georgia for deferring action upon this bill? They cannot agree on a figure, because they know they have not enough knowledge even to make an estimate on any reasonable basis. It would be a pure guess. That is why they have not been able to agree.

Mr. LUCAS. That may be partially the reason; but the further we go in the consideration of various appropriation bills, the more we are convinced that they cannot reach an agreement even on a \$4,500,000,000 cut. The more appropriation bills we consider, the less likely they are to reach any kind of agreement, because it cannot be done, considering what has occurred up to date. The Senator from Georgia covered that question.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to remind the distinguished Senator that the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] gave us a very interesting symposium of information with respect to appropriation bills, and especially the appropriation bills of 1946. I notice that in his list are eight great appropriation bills which did not become law until after the 10th of June, some of them running well into July, and one of them running to the end of July. So I am suggesting that we would not know any more on June 10 than we do on May 21 about the matter of expenditures.

Mr. LUCAS. I heard the able Senator from California make that suggestion; but what the able Senator from California overlooks is this: We have a Reorganization Act, which most Members of the majority supported last year. That Reorganization Act makes it mandatory under section 138 that the Legislative Budget Committee report by February 15 on a budget to be used as a yardstick for the Appropriations Committees of both the Senate and House. That is another reason why, in my opinion, they are unable to reach any figure. They cannot reach it, as I have said before. But we know that the appropriations approved are a pretty fair barometer of how much is to be cut from the appropriations. If anything, the Senate will add to them. The House appropriations can be used as a minimum, because when the Senate gets through with the appropriation bills which come from the House, 9 times out of 10 it will add to them. The House Members have to run every 2 years. They cut appropriations indiscriminately. They say, "We will cut off \$100,000,000 here, because it will look good back home," and the Senate will put it back, because Senators have to run only every 6 years.

Mr. MILLIKIN. So far this year the action of the Senate indicates that the Senate will make deeper cuts in expenditures than the House.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senate did so in connection with one bill, the bill for the

Labor Department and the Federal Security Agency. However, if I were a gambling man and wanted to make a little bet with the Senator—say a chocolate soda or something like that—I would be willing to wager that the Senate will definitely override the House on the appropriation bills. The Senator knows that.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Make mine sarsaparilla. [Laughter.]

Mr. LUCAS. It might be strawberry before we get through.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Perhaps the able Senator from Georgia has set the date too soon. Following the suggestion—if I may use that term—of the Senator from Colorado in calling our attention to the lateness of the bills, perhaps it might be better to defer consideration of the pending bill until June 25 or June 28. Then we would have more knowledge about expenditures. Would that suggestion be more acceptable to the Senator than the date of June 10?

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Under the Reorganization Act Congress is supposed to adjourn sine die by the end of July. The Senator's suggestion would very effectively prevent that, and would also prevent passage of an income-tax reduction bill, or any other kind of tax-reduction bill this year.

Mr. LUCAS. It is strange to observe how some Senators like to conform to the Reorganization Act in connection with some questions, but with respect to others they do not pay much attention to it.

The question of adjournment, of which the able Senator from Colorado has spoken, is not so important to the American people. They do not care whether we adjourn or not, but they are very much interested in the budget. They have been interested in whether or not the Legislative Budget Committee would submit a \$4,500,000,000 cut or a \$6,000,000,000 cut.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I admit that the American people are interested in the budget. I hope the Senator is not suggesting that they are not interested in a tax cut.

Mr. LUCAS. I would not say that they are not interested in a tax cut; but I will say to my able friend that there are many who are primarily interested in seeing sound economy in government. If they knew that a tax cut would ultimately result in deficit financing they would not be for tax reduction. I believe, if a Gallup poll were taken submitting that question over the country, it would be found that they would rather pay under the present tax rate than to have deficit financing.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I abhor deficit financing as much as does any other Member of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I know the Senator does; and I admire him for it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. We have had 20 years of deficit financing. In fact, we have become more accustomed to deficit financing than to operating with a surplus. I hope that we shall not return to deficit financing; but if we should do so, it would not be entirely without precedent.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course not. The Senator is absolutely correct. The party to which the Senator belongs has constantly inveighed against deficit financing, and has called for sound financing in government. It has advocated making our bonds safe by balancing the budget. For the past 10 or 12 years I have listened to arguments along that line. But now it seems that the majority party is not so much in fear of red ink as it once was.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I feel very much encouraged and hopeful this evening. I see that at long last we have brought the old sinner down the sawdust trail, and that he now believes in balancing the budget and in surpluses—good old Republican doctrine.

Mr. LUCAS. It may be that I am going along with Republican doctrine from the Senator's viewpoint; but he is about to become a good New Dealer with his tax bill, if it should ultimately prove to be the basis for deficit financing.

Mr. MILLIKIN. God forbid. If my previous remark created that impression, I am sorry I made it. [Laughter.]

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a word or two further with reference to the budget. The House Appropriations Committee recently reported the appropriation bill for the Navy Department. The President requested \$3,513,000,000, and the committee recommended a reduction of \$377,519,200, or approximately 10.7 percent. The percentage of reduction in the appropriations for the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency, as compared with the President's budget, was 4.5 percent; that of the Interior Department, 45.4 percent. I imagine that the able Senator from Colorado will want to change that figure a little when the bill comes to the Senate. The total estimate in the President's budget was \$10,369,578,043. As recommended by the House Appropriations Committee the amount is \$9,519,260,153, or a saving of \$850,317,890 representing a percentage reduction of 8.2 percent. To effect a reduction in the budget of \$6,000,000,000, it would have to be cut an average of 16 percent. To reduce it \$4,500,000,000 it would have to be cut an average of 12½ percent. I undertake to say that there is approximately \$18,000,000,000 in the President's budget which is almost untouchable, representing items in the budget which will not be reduced very much. I have reference to the national debt, our international commitments, the Veterans' Administration item, and tax refunds.

The items which I have mentioned total approximately \$18,000,000,000. There is left approximately \$19,500,000,000 upon which to operate. On that basis, if we want to reach a saving of \$6,000,000,000 we would have to cut ap-

proximately 35 percent. In order to reach a saving of \$4,500,000,000, the cut would have to be approximately 25 percent.

In my judgment, Mr. President, it is impossible to do it; it cannot be done. Before we vote on any tax measure we ought to know exactly what the House Appropriations Committee will do with respect to the Agricultural Department appropriation. We ought to know what it will do regarding the appropriations for the Army. Evidence on the Army appropriation has been taken weeks ago, I am told. Why the committee does not make a report on the Army appropriation bill I do not know, unless it be that they are waiting for a tax bill to be passed. I am told that they recommend cutting \$300,000,000 from the Agricultural appropriation budget. The President requested, I think, \$1,400,000,000 in his budget. They are going to take away the essentials of the rural electrification service which has been so useful to the American farmer, especially in my section of the country. They intend to cut that appropriation to the bone. They are cutting the soil conservation appropriation; they are also applying the meat ax to the support program which Congress passed 2 years ago.

Mr. President, as one who comes from an agricultural section in the midwest, I want to know just what the Appropriations Committee intends to do with the agricultural appropriation bill, and I want to know whether they are using the ax on that bill in order to help put through a tax bill and still balance the budget. I think we will know by June 10. That is one of the primary and major reasons why I shall support the motion made by the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. It certainly will not deter any tax measure at this session of Congress. It would give everyone an opportunity to ascertain between now and that time exactly what the Appropriations Committee of the House has done regarding appropriations; and there can be no harm in this slight delay in order that the Senate of the United States may ascertain exactly what the Appropriations Committee has done and in order that we may intelligently approach the question of tax legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Georgia, to postpone consideration of the pending bill until June 10, 1947.

INVESTIGATION OF FIFTH MISSOURI CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT DEMOCRATIC PRIMARY—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, yesterday the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] submitted Senate Resolution 116, to investigate the nonaction of the Department of Justice in connection with alleged irregularities in the Democratic primary election in the Fifth Missouri Congressional District on August 6, 1946, and it was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. The chairman of that committee, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] desire that the resolution be referred to

the Committee on the Judiciary. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be discharged from the further consideration of the resolution and that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I should like to ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent is granted.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, May 22, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 21 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Edmond M. Hanrahan, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term expiring June 5, 1952. (Reappointment.)

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Ray C. Wakefield, of California, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1947. (Reappointment.)

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

James W. Lauderdale, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years from July 1, 1947. (Reappointment.)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 21 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Brig. Gen. Raymond Whitcomb Bliss, to be the Surgeon General, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from date of appointment, vice Maj. Gen. Norman Thomas Kirk, United States Army, whose term of office expires May 31, 1947.

Col. George Ellis Armstrong, to be Assistant to the Surgeon General, with the rank of brigadier general, for a period of 4 years from date of appointment, vice Brig. Gen. Raymond Whitcomb Bliss, United States Army, nominated for appointment as the Surgeon General.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To Adjutant General's Department

Capt. Joseph Stephen Magrath, Jr.

To Judge Advocate General's Department

Lt. Col. Eugene Mead Caffey

To Quartermaster Corps

Capt. Frank Arthur Bogart

To Corps of Engineers

First Lt. Robert Howard Allan

To Signal Corps

Maj. Frank Glover Trew

To Infantry

Capt. Donald Kenneth Hughes

To Air Corps

Maj. William Frank Steer
Maj. Richard David Wentworth
Capt. George Lovelace Poor
Capt. Jack Emmert Wert
First Lt. John Robert Blunk
First Lt. Nolan Edward Burch
First Lt. Andrew Lacock Cox
First Lt. Roy Arthur Dix
First Lt. Neil James Graham
First Lt. James Porter King
First Lt. Francis Carmel Lozito
First Lt. Henry Bailey McDaniel, Jr.
First Lt. Marvin Leroy Wells Peters
First Lt. James Hiram Phifer, Jr.
First Lt. Charles Ernest Tychsen
First Lt. Arthur Brown Van Buskirk
First Lt. Thomas Renan Waddleton

To Ordnance Department

Col. Ray Maxey Hare

To Coast Artillery Corps

Col. Wharton Girard Ingram

To Air Corps

Col. Henry Lester Barrett
Maj. George Henry Dietz
Maj. Wilson Turner Douglas
Maj. Basil Littleton Riggs
Capt. John Clifford McCawley
First Lt. Roy William Ballard
First Lt. Wesley Skilton Calverley
First Lt. John Jay Easton
First Lt. Robert William Griffin
First Lt. George Mercer Higginson
First Lt. Alden Dale Jacobson
First Lt. John Arthur McDavid
First Lt. Richard Magee Osgood
First Lt. John Rose Richards
First Lt. Lawrence Cutright Sheetz
First Lt. James Wesley Smith
First Lt. Joseph Walter Stephens, Jr.
First Lt. Edward Verner
First Lt. John Robert Wilbraham
First Lt. Edward Patrick Wynne

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named cadets, United States Military Academy, who are scheduled for graduation on June 3, 1947, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 23 and 24e of the National Defense Act, as amended.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS WITH RANK FROM JUNE 3, 1947

Corps of Engineers

Richard Herman Allen
Merlin Willard Anderson
Calvin Leland Bass
Roger Redmond Bate
Arthur Andrew Becker
Ralph Harold Beuhler
Shelton Brant Biles, Jr.
Junius Jay Bleiman
Frank Coulter Boerger
Phillip Thomas Boerger
Jerome Boris Christine
William Carl Clamprone
Paul J. Curry
James Franklin Fraser
Bernard Michael Greenberg
Edwin Borchard Greene
Raymond Richard Hails, Jr.
Kenneth Martin Hatch
George LeRoy Haugen
Carroll Christian Jacobson, Jr.
James Allen Johnson
Peter Karter
James Byron Kennedy
George Levenback
Richard Freeman McAdoo
John Wayne Mastin
Milum Davis Perry, Jr.
Melvin Alfred Rosen
Norman Robert Rosen
Howard Leroy Sargent, Jr.
William Jackson Schuder

Sam David Starobin
Richard Joseph Steinborn
Marvin Henry Stock
Jack Mathew Thompson
Albert Archer Van Petten
Carlton Juan Wellborn, Jr.

Signal Corps

Albert John Geraci
Harold Walter Grossman
Henry William Hill
John Elwood Hoover
Richard Motley Hutchinson, Jr.
Graham Gunther Kent
James Philip Mattern

Cavalry

Joseph John Addison
Robert Jacob Baer
Hugh James Bartley
Theodore Chester Bielicki
Jean Prosper Burner
Donovan Finley Burton
William Fortune Coghill
James Christopher Cosgrove
John Delistraty
Jack Van Dunham
James Eugene Edington
James Betts Egger
John Carter Faith
Herschel Everett Fuson
Robert Miller Garvin
John Love Gerrity
Warren Robert Gossett
William Douglas Grant
Alexander Meigs Haig, Jr.
Roland Valentine Heiser
Dandridge Featherston Hering
Robert James Kennedy
George Anthony Lynn
William Gabriel McGee
Robert James McNeil
Arnold William Mahlum
Robert DeWayne Peckham
John Brooks Reese
John Joseph Sullivan
Frank Leonard Taylor
William Loyd Webb, Jr.
William Irvine West
Meade David Wildrick, Jr.
Richard Lytle Yates

Field Artillery

Thomas Edward Benson
William Donald Brown
Robert Thornton Curtis
Bernard Figueredo de Gil, Jr.
Donald Marvin Dexter, Jr.
Richard Earl Dunlap
Milton Leland Haskin
Wayne Otis Hauck, Jr.
Thomas Francis Hayes
George Duane Heisser
William Sylvester Henry, Jr.
Willis Hickam Knipe
Robert Joshua Koch
Richard Alan Littlestone
Robert Ewing McCord
Charles Stuart Todd Mallett
Robert Miller Montague, Jr.
Wallace Eugene Nickel
John Guilford Paules
Tom Judson Perkins
John Richard Rantz
Kermit Dean Reel
James Russell Robinson, Jr.
Thomas Edmund Rogers
Robert Warren Short
Theodore Solomon Spiker
William Michael Sullivan

Infantry

Bernard William Abrams
Harry Folk Ball
George Earl Bland
Otis Evan Brannon, Jr.
William Albert Carpenter, Jr.
Robert Bernard Coleman
William Edmond Conger, Jr.
William Lambie Cooper
William Bernard Cronin
Stanley Warfield Crosby, Jr.
John Edward Culin
Glenn Woodward Davis

Robert Francis Draper
Gordon James Duquemin
Henry Everett Emerson
Robert Bruce Fahs
Stuart Gregory Force
David Welty Gibson
Robert Haldane
William Donald Hirschfeld
Julius Frederick Ickler
Leon Joseph Jackques, Jr.
Wilber Glenn Jones, Jr.
Robert Adair King
Donald Warren Krause
Wells Brendel Lange
John William Lauterbach, Jr.
Melvin Vernon LeBlanc
Alexander Lemberes
Selby Francis Little, Jr.
Walter Patrick Lukens
John Warwick McCullough, Jr.
Oliver Louis McDougell
Henry Tomlinson MacGill
Robert Anthony Mahowald
LeRoy Emil Majeske
George Aloysius Maloney
Martin Michael Maloney
John More Miller
Charles Augustus Munford, Jr.
John DuBose Nail, Jr.
William Wallace Nairn, 3d
Robert Lynn Ozier
Carl Kamp Russell
Norman Junior Salisbury
James Emerson Smith, Jr.
Gordon Malin Strong
James Bernard Tatum
Harold Stan Tavel
Gerald Ross Toomer
Wallace Francis Veaudry
William Dawes Williams, Jr.

Quartermaster Corps

Thomas Long Flattery
Bernard Jay Gardner
Bennet Norman Hollander
Burton Katz
Robert Peter Lane
Harrison Franklyn Meadows, III

Chemical Corps

Paul Charles Callan

Ordnance Department

James Lee Bushnell
Willis Howell Clark
John Griffin Gaddie
Henry Cantzon Paul
Louis Rachmeler
Hal Clyde Richardson, Jr.
Donald Verner Schnepf
Richard Henry Storzini
William Smith
Ira Warren Snyder, Jr.
Donald Harry Steininger
Joseph John Williams

Air Corps

Anthony Allan Alfano
John Jamison Anderson
Leland George Anderson
Howard Brown Arnold, Jr.
Robert Paul Babbitt
Earle LeRoy Bathurst, Jr.
Robert Allan Beckelman
Milton Bellovin
Ralph Locker Bentley
Buford Bernell Biggs
Felix Anthony Blanchard, Jr.
James Montgomery Breedlove
Herbert Owen Brennan
William Spencer Carpenter, Jr.
Milton Jay Chamberlain
Leland Dale Christensen
Arthur Emmett Coates, Jr.
Egbert Haldane Cofield, Jr.
James Edward Colburn
James Smith Coolbaugh
John Edward Cottongim
John Martin Coyne, Jr.
Albert William Cretella, Jr.
Forest Willard Crowe
George Martin Dell
Gordon Kendrick Dicker

David Michael Dunham
Harold Jacob Eberle
Robert Maxwell Ehrlich
Angelo James Ellis, Jr.
James Walter Enos
Kenneth Howe Farrier, Jr.
Gonzalo Fernandez
John Frost
Cecil Edward Fuchs
Homer Perry Gainey, Jr.
Edson Leonard Garrabrants
Dean Stevens Gausche
Jesse James Gilliam, Jr.
George Joseph Goldsborough, Jr.
Alan Henry Gould
William Wright Gray
Edmund Mortimer Gregorie, Jr.
Robert Blake Griffith
Wallace Hull Griffith
John Thompson Guice
Robert Maurice Haas
Robert Fletcher Halligan
George Fred Harrington
James David Heironimus
Donald Clement Helling
Park Brown Herrick, Jr.
Edwin Connery Hightower, Jr.
Charles William Hill
Robert Earl Hoffman
Andrew Leon Hudgins
Frederick Gray Hudson III
Frederick Walter Jacoby
David Jarvis
Walter Edward Johnson
Joe Dean Johnston
Kermit Clifton Kaericher
Harry Richard Kain
Robert Edward Keck
John Leroy Kennedy, Jr.
Robert Eugene Kettner
Marcos Emmet Kinevan
John Jay Kirby, Jr.
Frederick John Knauss
Frank Joseph Kremser, Jr.
William Thomas Kuykendall
Conrad Norman Lajeunesse
Frank Joseph Lamattina
Kenneth Moore Landis
Hewitt Chemnitz Larsen
Allen Franklin Learmonth
Charles Kennicott Leech
John Kenneth Lerohl
Hubert Horace Lewis
J. Robert Lilley
Donald David Litt
John Joseph Lowry
Einar Glenn Lundy
Richard Alexis McClure
James Crawford McKim
John Stevenson Mallory, Jr.
John Edwin Mock
Thomas Vincent Monahan
Robert Burns Moore
Willard Noble Munroe, Jr.
John James Murphy
Ralph Calvin Murrin
David Newcomb
John Novomesky, Jr.
Patrick Joseph O'Connell
David Anicker Odell
Jack Merrill Palmer
Jack Vernon Pearce
Francis Raymond Perry
John Franklin Piepenbrink
Jack Francis Pierce
Herbert Carson Pinkerton, Jr.
George Barney Poole
Jack Harris Ray
William John Reckmeyer
Clyde Calvin Reynolds
Donald Oren Robb
Edwin Wales Robertson II
James Edward Ryan
Alan David Sapowith
Robert Satten
Lee Geoffrey Schlegel
Winston Ousley Scoville
Brent Scowcroft
William Jennings Sharpe
Charles Edward Shields
King D. Simon
Leonard Anthony Staszak
Leslie Robert Stevens

Charles Carrington Stewart
Daniel Lisle Tate II
Young Arnold Tucker
Stewart Meldred Vockel, Jr.
Douglas Crowther Weaver, Jr.
Robert Wilson White
Gerald Joseph Wojciehoski
William James Woldenberg
Frederick Malcolm Wright
John Mackay Young
Clifford George Zimmer, Jr.

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENT ON THE RETIRED LIST

Vice Adm. Alexander Sharp, United States Navy, retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

The following-named officers for appointment in the United States Navy in the corps, grades, and ranks hereinafter stated:

The following-named officers to the ranks indicated in the line of the Navy:

(*Indicates officers to be designated for EDO and SDO subsequent to acceptance of appointment)

Lieutenants (junior grade)

*Mather, Donald I. Thierault, Harold J.
*Muller, Harry P. *Young, Horace

Ensigns

Acton, William D. Garver, Richard E.
Ambrosio, William Girard, Jean L.
Andrich, Vincent J. Godfrey, Earl F.
Askew, George V. Gohr, Robert B.
Aydelott, William "L." Goodman, Louis R.
Ayers, George "L", Jr. *Graham, Archibald
Balley, Ralston "G", Jr.
Banks, Charles A. *Groom, Ralph A.
Barnes, Jerald D. Gullett, John H.
Beatle, Ralph H. Hall, John C.
*Beck, Preston E. Hanley, Richard J.
Becker, Terrill F. Harper, Horace D.
Beckett, Philip E. Hartman, Richard V.
Benson, William D. Hatheway, Valentine
Burglund, Burton E. J., Jr.
Berry, David P. L. Hedbawny, Edward J.
Beyer, Delbert A. *Henderson, James W.
Blair, James A. Holbrook, Jack G.
Botten, Ralph D. Hook, John C.
Brown, Glenn H., Jr. Hough, William L.
Canto, Joseph V. *Howard, Cornelius S.,
Carter, Frank B. Jr.
Carroll, Charles J., Jr. *Howard, Herbert B.
Clark, Carroll D. Howard, Sam R.
Collins, John J. Hulka, Edward H.
Collins, Wayne D. *Hunsicker, Charles,
Corbett, James F. Jr.
Corey, Richard A. *Hutchinson, Harold
Cover, John H. Huvall, Willard R.
Coyle, Arthur J. *Jacobs, Benjamin P.
Coyne, Philip G. Jermann, Donald R.
Cunningham, Patrick Johnson, Charles E.
F. Johnson, Clarence R.
D'Albora, Duilo Jones, Theodore
Davenport, Herman P. Kauffman, Harry R.
Jr. Kent, Robert B.
David, Floyd J. Kiernan, Francis J.
Davila, Daniel I. Kile, Newton A., Jr.
De Baets, Donald J. Killingbeck, William
Deffenbaugh, Robert E.
M.
Delaney, Henry L. Knudson, Angus J.
Dickey, John L. Koons, Jack L.
Dionne, Robert J. *Kralik, William F.
Dolan, Eugene F. *Krouse, Gale E.
Dorman, Alvin E. *Kurtz, George P.
Dorroh, Ray P. Lake, Jarrett T., Jr.
*Droz, John F. Laughlin, George W.
Eaholtz, Galen M. Leslie, David A.
Edrington, Frank R. Lewis, Frederick E.
Eckman, Charles J. Lindgren, George B.
Egli, Clayton J. Lococo, Salvatore
Eldridge, Richard A. Loranger, Donald
Essert, Antone Lynch, James
Evans, Donald W. Malan, Max E.
Evans, Thomas G., Jr. *Margolf, Edgar L.
*Everett, Clayton F. Marks, Earl J., Jr.
Fenby, Charles C. Martin, William H., Jr.
Finke, Gordon R. Maxwell, Jack A.
Finley, Howard B., Jr. McAdams, Robert B.
*Fisher, Robert E. McConnell, Joseph E.
Forehand, Wendell C. McDaniel, Charles B.
Fritsch, Edward C., Jr. *McKinney, Harold W.

McVay, Kenneth M. Smith, Charles W.
Melton, John B., Jr. Smith, Gordon C.
Menconi, Harry E., Jr. Smith, John
Merritt, John A., 3d Spaulding, John I.
Miles, Bernard L. Stanley, George M.
Miles, Neagle W. Steadley, William A.
Mills, Allan W. Stecker, Kenneth W.
Mix, Robert W. Stephens, Jerrel D.
Moore, Willard H. Stevenson, Norman M.
Moriarty, Norbert L. Stockstill, Peter T.
Morris, Evan D. Storey, Richard E.
Morris, John R. Stowitts, Emory V. P., Jr.
Mottarella, Victor G. Swanson, Hjalmer E.
Murphy, William F. Tefft, William V. 2d
*Nardone, Henry J. Thomas, John
*Neill, Eugene R. *Thompson, James B., Jr.
Neth, Robert L. A. Thomson, Robert G., Jr.
Nicolais, Anthony L. Orton, Robert D.
O'Connell, Thomas A. Parr, Charles W.
Orton, Robert D. Perdue, Uley F.
Parr, Charles W. *Plattner, Francis B.
Perdue, Uley F. Price, Kenneth W.
*Plattner, Francis B. Rapacz, Edwardus
Price, Kenneth W. Ratliff, John "H"
Rapacz, Edwardus *Reed, Richard C.
Ratliff, John "H" *Rich, Charles A.
*Reed, Richard C. Rich, Harold G.
*Rich, Charles A. Rocke, William A.
Rich, Harold G. Rose, Charles J.
Rocke, William A. Schneider, Robert F. J.
Rose, Charles J. Schnopp, Robert W.
Schneider, Robert F. J. Schock, Robert E.
Schnopp, Robert W. Shea, John
Schock, Robert E. Small, Rufus C.
Shea, John *Zimmerman, Chester A.
Small, Rufus C. Smith, Billie E.

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Assistant surgeons with the rank of lieutenants (junior grade)

Bond, Victor P. McCann, Eugene C.
Cleary, James F., Jr. McCarthy, Robert J.
Conley, John L. Meyer, Frederick W., Jr.
Gundelfinger, Benjamin F.
Savage, Charles
Hagelstein, Arthur A. Scheffen, Albert E.

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Assistant paymasters with the rank of ensigns

Arrigo, Anthony J. McMullen, Marvin E.
Bevan, Loren R. Monahan, Edward F.
Bigham, Robert G., Jr. Nunn, Enoch W.
Cohen, John F. Ooyman, John G. 3d
Dellinger, Charley P. Pierce, James M.
Dorlon, William E. Pluto, Raymond J.
Downey, James G. Reeves, James F., Jr.
Duffie, Hubert W. Rocque, Paul F.
Farrell, George 3d Ross, Joel E.
Fitzpatrick, Julius W. Tice, "J" P.
Hauck, Richard H. Tiffin, Jesse R.
Hix, Charles F. Tripp, Charles J.
Hiza, John Walker, Hinton C.
Johnson, Karl A. Wasko, Andrew J.
Keenan, Joseph I. Wilson, Robert W.
Kolinsky, Jaromir J. Zielinski, William E.
Larsen, Russell W. Bentley, William R.
Martin, Donald V. Corley, James O.
McDonald, Raymond Kurek, Edward L.
O., Jr. Toll, David R.
Wallis, Esle D.

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Assistant civil engineer with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade)

Marra, Peter S.

Assistant civil engineers with the rank of ensign

Allen, Max H.
Mallory, Charles W.
Andrews, James D.

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Assistant dental surgeons with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade)

Blackwood, Robert M. Siemer, Harold N.
Gleisten, Howard P. Steinauer, Jerome J.
Harwood, Richard C. Stoopack, Jerome C.
Hudec, Ernest P. Van Damm, Vincent W.
Mitchell, Edward C. Wemple, Clifton "L."
Rumming, Ray C. Williams, Robert M.
Secrest, Robert H.

The following-named officers to the rank of commissioned warrant officers in the Navy in the grades indicated:

Chief boatswains

Banks, Ned V. McMillan, Donald J.
Eddy, Harold B. Proback, Nicholas
Elder, David A. Robinson, Robert
Hambly, Louis C. Schuhmacher, John E.
Hima, Dennis Smith, Forrest E.
Jones, Leslie Trapp, Robert I.

Chief machinists

Banks, Milton W. McGahee, Estli M.
Howell, Gerald U. Ritter, Preston R.

Chief pharmacists

Kibsgaard, Henry
Novak, Louis

The following-named officer to the rank indicated in the line of the Navy, to correct spelling of name as previously nominated and confirmed:

Ensign

Hannah, Glyde B.

The following-named officers to the ranks indicated in the line of the Navy:

Lieutenant

*Awtrey, Hugh R.

Lieutenants (junior grade)

*Hoch, John E.
Leroy, James M.
Murray, Budd M.

Ensigns

Anderson, Albert A. Kimpflen, Joseph F.
Armstrong, Francis L. Knoche, John H.
Beam, Jay K. Langfur, Joshua T.
Brambilla, Marius G., Jr. Kuhns, Paul S.
Branch, Henry S., Jr. Kujawa, Edwin A.
Brown, Barry W. Langfur, Joshua A.
Casler, James B. *Larkin, Muri A.
Cromer, Morris H. Leary, Lauris J.
Deatherage, Benjamin Liebmann, Howard F.
C. Maguire, Paul H.
DeBlanc, Albert C. Matthews, William D.
English, Thomas J. McConnell, James H.
Epps, Charles W. McNeal, Cecil L.
Featherstone, Thomas *Moloney, Ralph T.
A. Newman, Hubert F.
Foltz, Robert L. O'Dougherty, Edwin F., Jr.
*Foster, John P.
Franetovich, Francis L. Plowman, Edwin L.
Gaines, Donald M. Poynter, Drexel E.
Gibbs, James T. Ramsey, William B.
*Gullette, George L. Reardon, Francis P.
Halford, James A., Jr. Richardson, Dean C.
Hall, Ozni D. Rider, Richard G.
Hansen, John B. Robertson, Jack M.
Harris, Donald W. Robertson, John A., Jr.
Hawley, Edward R. Robinson, Marvin K.
*Hazelett, Samuel E. Roe, Charles R.
Howe, Thomas Rumsey, James F.
Huling, Harold E. Sampson, Richard A.
H. Johnson, Arrol, Jr. Savage, Vann E.
Johnson, Carl M. Scoggin, John L.
Johnson, Donald W. *Seifert, Jerry R.
Johnston, Floyd M. Sheridan, Martin J.
Jones, Alfred H. Smith, Richard F.
Juhnke, Lyle A. Snider, Alfred C.
Keenan, Raymond J., Jr. Sorenson, Richard C.
Kennedy, Henry G. Spencer, Erwin J.

Stearns, Theodore H. Tuggle, Charles, M., Jr.
Stern, Eugene "J", Jr. Twaddell, Miles E.
Sutton, James C., Jr. Wasco, Michael F.
Tarpey, John F. Weekley, Eugene K.
Thompson, Harold R. Wheelless, John C.
Jr. Yarbrough, John D.
Tillen, Frank J., Jr. Ziegler, William F.
Tkoch, Walter

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Surgeon with the rank of lieutenant commander

Callaway, Raymond R.

Passed assistant surgeon with the rank of lieutenant

Gard, Perry W.

Assistant surgeons with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade)

Hague, James D.
Losner, Irving
Mattison, William L.

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Assistant paymasters with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade)

Appleby, Charles A.
Cryer, William E.
Ragland, Thomas W.

Assistant paymasters with the rank of ensign

Abrams, Bernard Hoffman, Rex V.
Bateman, Roger I. Keller, Bruce W.
Bollens, Alfred P. Kennedy, Patrick F.
Brown, Lowell E. Kenyon, Floyd O.
Burnham, William W. Kiss, Richard C.
Butchart, Robert L. Kruskow, Max E.
Claussenius, Richard Lux, Donald A.
Hatton, Roy E. McGuire, Henry W.
Healy, Robert N. Sylvester, Nelson J.
Hobkirk, Carl M.

The following-named officers to the grade and rank indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Assistant civil engineers with the rank of ensign

Gazda, Theodore E. Timberlake, Lewis G.
Locke, Harry A. Hobson, Harold E.

The following-named officers to the grade and rank indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Assistant dental surgeons with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade)

Hattendorf, Derwood F.
Sheppard, John R.
Smith, Roland C.

The following-named officers to the rank of commissioned warrant officer in the Navy in the grades indicated:

Chief boatswain

Crocker, Ralph J.

Chief gunners

Harman, Walter E.
Lawrence, Oscar O.

Chief electricians

Aalsey, Howard M. Hackett, Arthur E.
Camp, Jack E. Rosier, Warren "W"
Gaumer, Chester T. Yarbrough, Paschal R.

Chief radio electricians

LeCompte, James W. Myles, Clyde W.
McMullen, Alton R. Phillips, William R.

Chief machinists

Grozler, Gaylord L.
Hesson, James F.
Orcutt, Lyle F.

Chief carpenters

Davis, George S. Hunt, Joe H.
Harley, Douglas M. Judash, Joseph
Howerton, Vance B. Smith, Frank M.

Chief ship's clerks

Daniel, Horace H. McClure, Phillip A.
Eads, Lyle W. Olasky, Charles

Chief pharmacist

Williams, Lindley

Chief pay clerks

Bender, Merle D. Mattila, Martti
Dunning, Gordon Patton, William A.
Lucas, Frank J. Reinhold, Edgar D.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

To be assistant paymaster with rank of ensign from June 6, 1947

Roy S. Nunnally

To be assistant paymasters with the rank of ensign from June 6, 1947, in lieu of appointment as ensigns as previously nominated

James R. Ahern Thomas F. Murphy, Jr.
Bruce A. Benson Gordon W. Phelps, Jr.
William D. Crawford William J. Reynolds
Gall L. Heasley Joseph E. Spalding
Sheldon L. Hirsch Gerald H. Weyrauch
Martin D. Marder Harry I. Zankman

To be ensigns in the Navy from June 6, 1947

George R. Lathan
Neil E. Nelson, Jr.

To be ensigns from June 6, 1947, in lieu of appointment as assistant paymasters in the Navy with the rank of ensign as previously nominated

William E. Ainslie Harold A. McCauley
Robert M. Bonk Thomas O. Nutt, Jr.
Duane D. Borgert Edward A. Short
Raymond E. Jeffery Samuel S. Stephens
John R. Logan

To be ensigns in the Navy from June 6, 1947, in lieu of appointment as assistant civil engineers in the Navy with the rank of ensign as previously nominated

Joseph W. Neudecker, Jr.
James L. Yates

To be assistant paymasters with the rank of ensign from June 6, 1947, in lieu of appointment as ensigns in the Navy as previously nominated

William Blanchard, Jr.
Frank G. Simala

To be assistant paymasters with the rank of ensign

Robert R. Poitras
Donald B. Small

To be assistant civil engineers with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade)

"W" "J" Elevins Bernard J. Isabella
Richard L. Divoll John A. Mitchell
David LaM. Flynn Herbert F.
Robert H. Hartley Zinsmeister, Jr.

To be ensigns in the Navy, from June 6, 1947

Sigmund Abraham, James R. Borge
Jr. Raymond L. Black
Clayton R. Adams Ralph G. Blair
James R. Ahern William P. Blandy
Charles S. Alexander, Lloyd S. Blomeyer
Jr. Charles H. Bloom
Zeb D. Alford Daniel K. Bloomfield
Thomas R. Allen James S. Bloomfield
Lionel E. Ames, Jr. Arthur K. Blough, Jr.
Donald S. Apple Robert O. Bonnell, Jr.
Charles E. Arnold Paul V. Borlaug
Alan Augenblick Frank L. Boushee
Jack F. Ayers Paul H. Bowdre, Jr.
Francis W. Bacon, Jr. John C. Bowers
George F. Ball Ross K. Bramwell
Earl deR. Barondes Benjamin Y. Brewster,
Richard W. Bass, Jr. Jr.
Fred H. Baughman Jack H. Bridges
James M. Beggs Wharton H. Brooks, Jr.
Ralph E. Behrends Charles H. Brown
John H. Bell Robert C. Bryan
Roland M. Bendel Richard E. Byran
Bruce A. Benson Edward G. Buck
Joseph H. Benton Randall O. Buck, Jr.
John J. A. Berggren Donald P. Buhner
Arthur C. Bigley, Jr. Nathaniel W. Bullard
Paul T. Bishop John Bunganich, Jr.

William J. Byrd
William J. Callahan
David W. Cammack
Roger Carlquist
Dale E. Carlson
William L. Carpenter
David C. Carruth
Robert C. Carter
Robert S. Chadima
John L. Chelgren
Russell H. Christian
Karl J. Christoph, Jr.
William E. Clark
Joseph H. Clagens 2d
Harold S. Clay
William H. Clegg
William F. Clifford, Jr.
Phillip LeR. Collins, Jr.
Robert I. Conn
Daniel Connolly
Benjamin J. Conroy
Jr.
William E. Conway
Frank W. Corley, Jr.
Paul T. Corrigan
Walter W. Cort, Jr.
Joseph D. Costello
William D. Crawford
Robert E. Crispin
Robert W. Crouter
Frank L. Crump, Jr.
Edward M. Cummings,
Jr.
Joseph H. Curl
Robert S. Curl
Nello A. Da Rodda
Cabell S. Davis, Jr.
Nicholas E. Davis
Walter A. DeAndrade
Tyler F. Dedman
Harold P. Deeley, Jr.
George E. DeLong
Richard T. Dempsey
Donald P. Dick
Robert W. Dickleson
Warren S. Dodd, Jr.
Walter J. Donovan
Robert C. Doxey
Gene R. Dreher
Peter Duncan
John A. Dunn
Robert H. P. Dunn
James R. Duquette
Robert E. Durfos
John C. Dyer
Paul J. Early
Eurton I. Edelson
Charles S. B. Edmondson, Jr.
Maurice M. Edwards,
Jr.
John E. Ellert
Claude P. Ekas, Jr.
Robert E. Endebrock
Robert F. Ennis
Wesley D. Ennis
Phillip W. Erickson
Roger E. Errington
John B. Fahey
Harlow H. Falevsky
John W. Fallon, Jr.
Robert R. Fargo
Gordon "H" Farmer
Willard L. Felsen
William A. Feltovic
Richard W. Fenn
Richard Ferguson
John B. Ferris, Jr.
John H. Fisher
Robert H. Flood
William H. Flynn, Jr.
Melvin "M" Forman
David G. Foxwell
Edmond W. Freeman
3d
Peter H. Freeman
Cloyd W. French
John C. Fry
Harrison C. Gaftskill
3d
James M. Gammon
Bruce B. Garlinghouse

Alan S. Garner
Irvin L. Gasser
Seth C. Gatchell
Robert K. Geiger
Peter Gengor
Julian Gewin
James H. Gildard 3d
Donald T. Giles, Jr.
Peter J. Goldman
Charles Gonia
Ben Goodman, Jr.
Charles F. Gorder
Robert H. Gormley
Walter Grechanik
Herbert T. Green
Norman K. Green
Roger M. Gregory, Jr.
Robert J. Grimsley
Nicholas Guletsky
Rowland I. Haines 3d
Robert F. Hale
Robert K. Hammann
William D. Harkins
Richard B. Harris
James L. Harrison, Jr.
Donald P. Harvey
Arthur J. Haskell
James W. Hawthorne
Joseph R. Hawvermale
James T. Hayes
Thomas B. Hayward
Gail L. Heasley
Robert A. Hemmes
William E. Henson, Jr.
George A. Herbert
Russell G. Herron
Ivan Himmel
Sheldon L. Hirsch
Arthur J. Hodder, Jr.
Richard A. Hoffman
Bradley D. Hoffmann
Henry A. Hoffmann
Gordon McG. Hogg, Jr.
John P. Holland
Jesse A. Holshouser, Jr.
Wallace C. Holton
James M. Hornbrook
Norman T. Hornsby
Fred E. Horvath
Walter P. Houk
John C. Hufft
Arthur N. Hull
David H. Hunt
"H" Reid Hunter
Ralph J. Jaccodine
Stanley A. Jacobs
William H. Jagoe
William E. Jarvis
Harry P. Jefferson
George G. Jeffries, Jr.
Harold W. Jesse
Joseph "B" Jochum
Harvey J. Johnson
James H. Johnson
Jack D. Jones
Robert S. Jones
William F. Jones
Robert F. Jortberg
William H. Kanzler
Paul C. Keenan, Jr.
Bruce Keener 3d
James P. Kelley
Eugene F. Kelly
Ralph A. Kennedy
John S. Kern
Stephen H. Kessler, Jr.
Donald McL. Kirkpatrick
Wilbur C. Klemm
Franklin C. Knock
Edwin H. Koester
Richard E. Kosiba
Joseph Kovacs
Arthur L. Krasnow
Dale L. Kratzer
Francis X. Kuhn
Frank E. Lally, Jr.
Alphonse G. Lang, Jr.
Judson D. Langston
Humphrey B. Lansden
Jerome E. Larson
Kelvin K. Larson

John R. Lastova, Jr.
Henry B. Latimer
Kent W. Lawson
William H. Layman
John C. Le Douay
Harry B. Lee
George R. Lemmon
Chantee Lewis
William S. Lewis
Robert A. Litke
George L. Little 3d
Raymond DeL. Lochner
John R. Lucas
William McK. Luckie
Melville I. Macquarrie
Francis F. Manganaro
John F. Mangold, Jr.
Martin D. Marder
Lawrence D. Marsolais
James K. Martin
Robert S. Marts
William McG. Mathew
Richard C. Maurer, Jr.
John W. McAdams, Jr.
William J. McCabe
John A. McCamont
William J. McClain
Robert B. McClinton
John A. McCook
Wayne S. McCord
Kyle C. McCormick
Wilson E. McDermut
Carlton A. K. McDonald
David B. McDowell
William B. McGinty,
Jr.
William McKinley
Stewart H. McLean
James D. McNeil
John B. Mencke
Gordon K. Meriwether,
Jr.
Robert P. Metzger
Charles R. Miko
Robert L. Milholland
Robert H. Miller
Ross L. Miller
Robert N. Mitchell, Jr.
William E. Monaghan
Girard W. Moore, Jr.
Richard E. Moran
Clifford L. Morgan
Max K. Morris
Wilbur M. Morrison
Eugene W. Mulligan
3d
Richard E. Munly
Thomas F. Murphy,
Jr.
Perry W. Nelson
Roger M. Netherland
William C. Newell, Jr.
Samuel C. Newman
George A. Nicholas
Oliver LeG. Norman,
Jr.
William E. Nylan
Charles H. Ogilvie
Corwin A. Olds
Lawrence A. O'Leary
James C. Oliver, Jr.
Robert C. Olson
Albert G. Opitz
Neri Osborn 3d
James W. Osmer, Jr.
James A. Ostiller
George R. Parish, Jr.
John S. Park
Harry Partridge, Jr.
Randolph F. Patterson
Samuel S. Pennock 3d
Anson C. Perkins
John R. Pesavento
Reuben W. Peterson,
Jr.
Gordon W. Phelps, Jr.
Kenneth E. Phillips
Edward B. Pickell
Jackson R. Pickens

Frank R. Pirkey
Clarence R. Plank
Reuben P. Prichard, Jr.
Robert E. Pyle
Burton J. Rab
Jerome W. Rabinowitz
John E. Rasmussen
Charles F. Rauch, Jr.
Robert D. Rawlins
Benton E. Reams
William F. W. Reeve
William J. Reynolds
Robert G. Ricker
Baylor G. Riddell
William L. Rigot
Paul A. Riley
William D. Robertson,
Jr.
Charles H. Rockcastle
Abraham Rockman
Ralph C. Rodgers
Duke J. Rose
Meyer H. Rose
Seymour N. Ross
Robert G. Roth
Thomas W. Routledge
Russell A. Rowan, Jr.
James C. Ruehrmund
John K. Ryder
Richard M. Ryder
Hugh A. Sanders
John B. Sangster, Jr.
Bayard T. Sansom
Glenn A. Savage
Robert K. Schenkel
James R. Schmolter
Marvin C. Scoggins, Jr.
Donald M. Shake
John C. Shannon
John W. Sharp
Victor V. Sharpe, Jr.
Daniel F. Shea, Jr.
William L. Shea
Daniel N. Shockey
William J. Shoemaker
William E. Shorr
Kenneth L. Shugart, Jr.
Arnold L. Silverman
Willard E. Simon
Jonathan A. Sisson
James B. Sizer 3d
Harold F. Skelly
Charles R. Skord
Robert W. Slater
Charles P. Smith
Deming W. Smith
Harold A. Smith
Robert P. Smith
Samuel T. Smith, Jr.
Francis M. Snyder
Richard L. Sonne
Joseph E. Spalding
Walter Spangenberg,
Jr.
Spiro Spiron
Warren L. Spry
Henry L. Staples, Jr.
Robert H. Stickel
Troy E. Stone
Arthur E. Strauss
James T. Strong
Willard L. Strong
Jack M. Stufflebeam
Hubert B. Sturtevant,
Jr.
Charles D. Summitt
David "H" Swenson,
Jr.
Dean Taylor, Jr.
Theodore R. Tenczar
Milford S. Terrass
Lee R. Thomas, Jr.
Robert K. Thompson
Sebastian Trusso
Louis T. Urbanczyk, Jr.
Robert L. Van Horn
Raymond W. Vasquez
Frank "J" Vermilya
Jay J. Viehmann
John R. Virtz
Russell A. Vollertsen

John C. Waddell
Dwight Wadsworth
Edgar F. Ward
Donald C. Warren
Jonathan R. Warren
Ronald D. Waugh
Joseph E. Weatherly, Jr.
Albert W. Weems, Jr.
Robert M. Weidman, Jr.
Edward F. Welch, Jr.
Alfred G. Wellons, Jr.
John T. Welsh
William G. Wepfer
Gerald H. Weyrauch
Curtis R. Wick
John G. Wick

John E. Wilkie
Bernard P. Williams, Jr.
Henry H. Wilson
Kenneth E. Wilson, Jr.
Robert E. Wilson
Cornelis Winkler, Jr.
Robert S. Wise
Alan E. Wood
John H. Wray
Andrew J. Yates
William K. Yates
Floyd F. Young
Harry I. Zankman
William L. Zedaker, Jr.
Louis J. Zeleznock
Randolph D. Zelov

Eugene A. Dieckert, Jr.
Joseph E. Dierkes
Donald L. Dondero
Robert M. Ducey
Harry B. Ellis
James E. Empting
David L. English
William Evans
James V. Farley, Jr.
Doc G. Faulkner, Jr.
Robert Fedor
John J. Fickers
Albert O. Floyd
Archie E. Floyd
Isaac N. Franklin, Jr.
John McA. Frye
Peter Galimitakis
Joseph J. Garside
Gene F. Gauthier
Michael Gaydos, Jr.
George W. Gibson
Robert F. Graves
William D. Greene
Galen M. Hallett, Jr.
Charles R. Hannun
Andrew U. Hassman, Jr.

William L. McGonagle
Robert M. McLaughlin
Grover C. Miller
Raymond T. Miller, Jr.
William J. Miller
Donald F. Milligan
Samuel R. Misericordino
Jack L. Morrow
Robert C. Newcomb
George E. Nuber, Jr.
Eugene W. Ostlund
Arthur M. Pastel
Dale S. Perry
Richard Porter
Paul R. Powell
William C. Powell, Jr.
William L. Prange
John F. Pritchard
Robert W. Proctor
Henry P. Quick
Robert L. Quimby
Robert B. Rausch
Davis W. Reed
William E. Reed
Donald H. Reese
Isaac P. Rehkopf
Benjamin T. Richards
Donald W. Richardson
Joseph M. Rideout 3d
David A. Robinson
William B. Robinson
Robert E. Rodes, Jr.
Estel E. Rouch
Clifford LeR. Sayre, Jr.
Walter T. Schulthels
Robert L. Scott
Harold Scudder
Aldo Serafin
Lester L. Shade
Frank G. Simala
Richard S. Slawson
Earl A. Sonnier
Monroe B. Sorge
George A. Souris
Charles J. Stanback
Jason K. Stewart
Joseph V. Sweeney
James Thomson
Paul E. Trejo
Edward "X" Tuttle
John Van Tol
Adelberta M. Von Almen, Jr.

Donald H. Lake
John R. Logan
Donald E. Mackin
Donald S. Macoy
Joseph L. Mahoney, Jr.
William F. Mangan
Noel D. Martin
Alfred S. Maurstad
Harold A. McCauley
Thomas T. McGinnis
David E. Moline
Robert F. Morison
Maurice A. Notch
Thomas O. Nutt, Jr.
Joseph F. Ouellette

Paul J. Pflueger
Charles R. Pitchford
Raymond Ramer
Robert L. Reed
Keith L. Robinett
Edward A. Short
John T. Snyder
Samuel S. Stephens
Jackson B. Strange
Lawrence E. Sutherland, Jr.
Edward J. Tuite
William S. Waldron
Carleton R. Williams

The following-named midshipmen to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, from the 6th day of June, 1947:

Thomas J. Allshouse
Harold R. Andrus, Jr.
Bradley L. Baker
James E. Ballard
William C. Brewer
Charles W. Butler
John A. Chapman 2d
Robert D. Darragh, Jr.
Elliot A. Dewey
Gordon M. Ehrman
Richard M. Evans
Nevin W. George
James I. Gibson
Charles C. Held, Jr.
Marvin S. Hutchison
Walter L. Kraus
Peter N. Kyros
Thomas F. Nealon

Thomas J. O'Connor
William C. Olin
Warren H. Ortland
Thomas J. Pawlowski, Jr.
Stephen W. Plarr
John W. Porter
Eugene M. Portner
Richard L. Rainey
William F. Reed, Jr.
Frank Simpson 3d
Jack C. Smith
Ernest L. Truax, Jr.
Willard H. Walker 3d
David W. Whelan
Thomas J. Wills 2d
William D. Wilson

Millard F. Havener
Kenneth G. Haynes
Richard W. Haupt
Robert L. Heinz
Richard M. Hennigan
William McG. Hepburn, Jr.
Harold M. Hewell
Alvin S. Hibbs
Robert K. Hoffman
Carl L. Hokenson, Jr.
Philip C. Hollano
Wallace J. L. Houde
Lewis McN. Hough
Richard H. Howe
George E. Hubbell
Ira J. Hudson 3d
Bruce M. Jacobs
William E. James
Robert W. Johnson
William N. Johnson
Charles W. Jones
Robert A. Keagy
James D. Kearny
Edward T. Keating
Owen K. King
Joseph M. Kitchen
John L. Kline, Jr.
Robert H. Koehler
Robert P. Kolar
Lee F. Kyle
Eugene Lange
Charles S. Leach
Morris Levin
Linus R. Litsey
James F. Logan, Jr.
Thomas Lorgo
Lawrence R. Lowe
Donald H. Lucas, Jr.
Robert T. Maconie
Patrick J. Madden
Don McC. Martin
Andrew J. Mashaw
Joseph C. McCalley
Raymond K. McDaniel

Robert L. Quimby
Robert B. Rausch
Davis W. Reed
William E. Reed
Donald H. Reese
Isaac P. Rehkopf
Benjamin T. Richards
Donald W. Richardson
Joseph M. Rideout 3d
David A. Robinson
William B. Robinson
Robert E. Rodes, Jr.
Estel E. Rouch
Clifford LeR. Sayre, Jr.
Walter T. Schulthels
Robert L. Scott
Harold Scudder
Aldo Serafin
Lester L. Shade
Frank G. Simala
Richard S. Slawson
Earl A. Sonnier
Monroe B. Sorge
George A. Souris
Charles J. Stanback
Jason K. Stewart
Joseph V. Sweeney
James Thomson
Paul E. Trejo
Edward "X" Tuttle
John Van Tol
Adelberta M. Von Almen, Jr.

The following-named midshipmen, United States Naval Reserve, to be assistant civil engineers in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, from June 6, 1947:

Joseph W. Neudecker, Jr.
Henry F. Peger

Maurice A. Person
Donald R. Williams
James L. Yates

IN THE MARINE CORPS

APPOINTMENTS IN THE MARINE CORPS

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 729, from June 6, 1947:

Peter W. Adams
Ezra H. Arklund
Albert F. Belbusti
Charles A. Cothran
James W. Epley
Jesus R. Flores
Harold D. Fredericks
Cullen O. Henry
Forest J. Hunt
Robert E. Izzo
George C. Kliefoth
Arthur F. Larievy, Jr.
Francis E. McDonald

Otto L. Marx
Anthony V. Messina
Bromley Palamontain
Martin Pearson
Robert H. Rea
Parks H. Simpson
Carl H. Smith, Jr.
Robert E. Steed
Joseph M. Vosmik
David W. Walsh
John J. Walsh

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 21, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou whose all-searching eye beholdeth all things and weigheth the motives of men, be with us and keep us above lower things. Come to us and give us the spirit which makes supreme the deeds of unselfishness and which conquers any forbidding purpose. In our hidden lives may there be found the secret of Thy presence, which brings the wisdom of the divine mind and the fervent desire to walk the highway which Thou hast appointed. Help us to do much that our country will approve, and to do much that our country will hold. Each day inspire us to give Thee our unquestioning loyalty and our impassioned love and hearty obedience. In all our tasks help us to be true and fearless in defense of the right, that genuine goodness may abound in our official circles.

In Thy Holy name. Amen.

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

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The following-named midshipmen to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, from the 6th day of June 1947:

George W. Allen
George A. Bacas
Jack T. Baker
Joseph S. Bartos, Jr.
Bonner R. Bell
Leon C. Bramlett, Jr.
Francis B. Carlon
Richard W. Crowley
Floyd A. Cuff
Thomas E. Dawson
Charles H. Dean, Jr.
George R. Earnest
Thomas H. Galbraith
Robert W. Holding
Edgar A. Hollister
Edward Y. Holt, Jr.
Edmund W. Jaworski

William L. Jesse
James H. Larson
Baldomero Lopez
Robert M. Lucy
Thomas E. Murphree
Robert B. Pohl
William A. Reavis
Charles J. Schneeman, Jr.
Lloyd L. Seaward
Philip D. Shutler
Boyd B. Sibert, Jr.
David A. Strausz
Donald W. Tardif
Thomas E. Vernon
William F. Wagner
Floyd H. Waldrop

William E. James
Robert W. Johnson
William N. Johnson
Charles W. Jones
Robert A. Keagy
James D. Kearny
Edward T. Keating
Owen K. King
Joseph M. Kitchen
John L. Kline, Jr.
Robert H. Koehler
Robert P. Kolar
Lee F. Kyle
Eugene Lange
Charles S. Leach
Morris Levin
Linus R. Litsey
James F. Logan, Jr.
Thomas Lorgo
Lawrence R. Lowe
Donald H. Lucas, Jr.
Robert T. Maconie
Patrick J. Madden
Don McC. Martin
Andrew J. Mashaw
Joseph C. McCalley
Raymond K. McDaniel

Robert L. Quimby
Robert B. Rausch
Davis W. Reed
William E. Reed
Donald H. Reese
Isaac P. Rehkopf
Benjamin T. Richards
Donald W. Richardson
Joseph M. Rideout 3d
David A. Robinson
William B. Robinson
Robert E. Rodes, Jr.
Estel E. Rouch
Clifford LeR. Sayre, Jr.
Walter T. Schulthels
Robert L. Scott
Harold Scudder
Aldo Serafin
Lester L. Shade
Frank G. Simala
Richard S. Slawson
Earl A. Sonnier
Monroe B. Sorge
George A. Souris
Charles J. Stanback
Jason K. Stewart
Joseph V. Sweeney
James Thomson
Paul E. Trejo
Edward "X" Tuttle
John Van Tol
Adelberta M. Von Almen, Jr.

The following-named midshipmen, United States Naval Reserve, to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 6th day of June 1947:

Robert A. Aiken
Julian L. Alexander, Jr.
James B. Allen
Ray M. Allman
Michelangelo Altieri
Arthur H. Anderson
Frank A. Anderson
Kenneth L. Baker
William E. Bardemeler
Frederick J. Bear, Jr.
Francis J. Beltzer
Roy M. Bell
Charles H. Black
William Blanchard, Jr.
William E. Boisvert, Jr.
Myron E. Bond
Lee H. Boyd
Carl J. Bradley
Charles C. Brisco, Jr.
Elmer C. Broadwell
John R. Brown
Kenmore McM. Brown
Orval W. Buell

Sidney M. Burnett
Ossian R. Butterfield
William A. Buttler
Robert D. Buzzard
Harold P. Cahill, Jr.
Donald D. Campbell
Robert V. Canosa, Jr.
Earle W. Carder, Jr.
Herbert V. Carr
Robert W. Cauchon
Joseph R. Childers
Frederic J. Clawson
Robert J. Cleary
Robert W. Cohan
Thomas A. Connor
Frederick D. Cook
Wayne H. Crawford, Jr.
Harold W. Crozier
John D. Cumalat
John E. Cummings
William E. Cunningham
William S. Currie
Richard J. Dermody
Richard A. Derus

The following-named midshipmen, United States Naval Reserve, to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, from June 6, 1947:

William E. Ainslie
Michael Bat
James M. Baumgardner
Carl I. Bergkvist
Robert M. Bonk
Duane D. Borgert
William H. Brownell
Wright A. Burnham
Ralph A. Buswell
Ervin H. Cooper
Howard R. Cottrell

Paul R. Ebling
Richard B. Euchenhofer
Malcolm E. Graham
Normal A. Henry
James D. Hereford, Jr.
Leif A. Houkom
Raymond E. Jeffery
Carroll R. Keyser
"J" Scott Kirkwood
John W. Kline
Francis A. Kocourek

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may be permitted to meet this afternoon at 3 o'clock while the House is in session.

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

There was no objection.

LABOR BILL SHOULD INCLUDE ANTI-COMMUNIST PROVISIONS

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when the labor bill is finally considered it is my earnest wish that it shall contain anti-Communist provisions similar to those in the House bill. The House bill makes it possible for a union to expel a Communist and contains prohibitions against a Communist being an officer in a labor organization. There are some who believe it inadvisable to so prohibit the activities of Communists in labor unions. They do so largely on the grounds that the Communists are a political party or that it is difficult to prove a person is a Communist. Now the Communists are not an American political party. They are members of an international organization with headquarters in Moscow. As stated by me on this floor several days ago, a leading American Communist, Mr. Sigmund Eisencher, stated in my office in the presence of a newspaper reporter that in the event of a conflict between the United States and Russia, that the American Communists would be on the side of Russia. No American political party could possibly hold such a position. The American Communists are not an American political party—they are a Russian political party.

With regard to the proposition that it is difficult to prove one to be a Communist I should like to state that in our hearings before the Labor Committee, Mr. Russ Nixon, for example, openly stated that they took Communists into their labor union on the same basis as anyone else. In many instances the Communists openly profess their communism in labor-union activities.

Any labor law that this Congress writes should contain a prohibition against the activities of these bold and arrogant agents of a foreign power. It is necessary that our labor laws should so provide because it is the avowed purpose of the American Communists to capture the American labor movement and use it as a tool of treachery and treason.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LANHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial by Ralph McGill appearing in the Atlanta Constitution.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on consumer credit.

Mr. ALMOND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by his colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT].

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

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Chelsea, Mass.

RUSSIAN PROPAGANDA

Mr. LANHAM. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, Why They Behave Like Russians, by John Fisher, should be required reading for every Member of Congress. Over the week end I had the pleasure of reading this book which goes far to explain many things that have been puzzling me about Russia.

Mr. Fisher makes it crystal clear that Russia's frantic efforts to build up a frontier of satellite states in eastern Europe and her failure to cooperate with the United States is due to their fears.

Their fundamental fear grows out of their belief which is an outgrowth of the doctrines of Karl Marx that our free-enterprise system has within itself the seeds of destruction.

The Russians believe that we cannot prevent the vicious cycle of inflation and depression. They believe that within the next 5 years we will be in the midst of the greatest depression in our history. Furthermore, they believe that when this period comes we will come under the domination of a Fascist group and will inevitably turn aggressive and imperialistic. They believe that they must build up their strength to meet the attack they believe is coming from us.

So it is perfectly clear that we must convince Russia of the fallacy of their beliefs and the groundlessness of their fears by preventing the depression in America that they so confidently expect.

ON-THE-JOB TRAINING

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I know that the Members who do not already know it will be very glad to

hear that on tomorrow the Committee on Rules will hear H. R. 246, a bill introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY] to raise the ceilings of on-the-job training. This bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. We hope that a rule will be brought in, because many of the veterans already have had to give up their training because they could not get along on the \$175 ceiling a month for single men and \$200 ceiling for married men. Many of the employers have given up their training program. It is vital that the rule be granted promptly and the bill pass. I hope the Members of the House will join with us in asking the Committee on Rules to grant the rule. I have no doubt but what the rule will be granted, but support and interest will help secure a rule promptly when the bill comes to the House, I believe there will not be a vote against it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the approval of the Voice of America program by the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD concerning Operation Naval Reserve.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by one of his constituents on the 1947 position of agriculture.

ZIONIST ATTACKS ON GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include certain excerpts.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, Great Britain is protesting against the attacks now being made on her by the alleged Zionists in this country. It is about time that somebody in the American Congress let the British people know that this outfit does not represent the American people.

Last week they published a full-page advertisement in the New York Times, and yesterday the New York Times carried on its front page an excerpt from that advertisement. I want to read you just a short portion of that excerpt. Listen to this. It says, now, speaking to these Zionists:

Every time you blow up a British arsenal, or wreck a British jail, or send a British railroad train sky high, or rob a British bank or let go with your guns and bombs at the British betrayers and invaders of your homeland, the Jews of America make a little holiday in their hearts.

Mr. Speaker, that vicious statement does not represent the views of the decent high-class law-abiding Jews of America, as you will find in reading the memoirs of Henry Morgenthau, Sr., concerning this outfit. It does not represent decent Americans of any kind.

It is time we put a stop to these vicious inflammable attacks on Great Britain, a friendly nation.

Hon. Henry A. Morgenthau, Sr., one of the great Jews of America, is quoted as saying in his autobiography:

Zionism is the most stupendous fallacy in Jewish history. I assert that it is wrong in principle and impossible of realization; that it is unsound in its economics, fantastical in its politics, and sterile in its spiritual ideals. Where it is not pathetically visionary, it is a cruel playing with the hopes of a people blindly seeking their way out of age-long miseries. These are bold and sweeping assertions, but in this chapter I shall undertake to make them good.

The very fervor of my feeling for the oppressed of every race and every land, especially for the Jews, those of my own blood and faith, to whom I am bound by every tender tie, impels me to fight with all the greater force against this scheme, which my intelligence tells me can only lead them deeper into the mire of the past, while it professes to be leading them to the heights.

Zionism is a surrender, not a solution. It is retrogression into the blackest error, and not progress toward the light. I will go further, and say that it is a betrayal; it is an eastern European proposal, fathered in this country by American Jews, which, if it were to succeed, would cost the Jews of America most that they have gained of liberty, equality, and fraternity.

Therefore, as I said, this group of radical Zionists do not represent the better element of American Jews. Nor do they represent the sentiments of a vast majority of the American people.

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

SUPPORT FOR WOOL

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 214, Rept. No. 409), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill S. 814, to provide support for wool, and for other purposes, 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 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the amendments recommended by the Committee on Agriculture now printed in the bill; and it shall also be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order as a substitute for the committee amendment beginning in line 14, page 3, and ending on page 6, line 11, the language appearing in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A2379. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. ARENDS. 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. 59]

Bender	Elsaesser	Mitchell
Bennett, Mich.	Flannagan	Morrison
Bland	Fuller	Norrell
Bonner	Gathings	Norton
Bradley, Mich.	Gearhart	Patman
Brown, Ohio	Gifford	Pfeifer
Buckley	Gregory	Poage
Bulwinkle	Gross	Powell
Busbey	Hagen	Price, Fla.
Byrne, N. Y.	Hartley	Sasser
Celler	Heffernan	Scott, Hardie
Chapman	Hoeven	Scott,
Clark	Jarman	Hugh D., Jr.
Clements	Keefe	Shafer
Cole, Kans.	Kilburn	Simpson, III.
Courtney	Klein	Smathers
Cox	Kunkel	Somers
Crow	Lea	Teague
Dawson, Ill.	McGarvey	Thomas, N. J.
D'Ewart	Mansfield, Tex.	Towe
Domengeaux	Meade, Md.	Wood
Doughton	Miller, Nebr.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 367 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

FILING OF REPORT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 3342.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by our distinguished Secretary of State on World Trade Week, and further to extend my remarks and include a similar statement by our equally distinguished Secretary of Commerce on World Trade Week.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BREHM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject Will the Conferees Nullify Labor Legislation?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Lowell Sun of Thursday, May 15, on the question of unification of the armed forces.

Mr. BATTLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he made before the House Committee on Education and Labor on Federal aid to education.

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

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

REFERENCE OF A BILL

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture be discharged from the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2472 and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

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

RELIEF ASSISTANCE TO THE PEOPLE OF COUNTRIES DEVASTATED BY WAR

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 153) providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 153) providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President not to exceed \$350,000,000 for the provision of relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war, such relief assistance to be limited to the following: Food, medical supplies, processed and unprocessed materials for clothing, fuel, fertilizer, pesticides, and seed: *Provided*, That from the funds authorized under this section the President shall make contributions to the International Children's Emergency Fund of the United Nations for the special care and feeding of children, and such contributions shall not be subject to the limitations and requirements provided in this joint resolution, but after \$15,000,000 has been so contributed, no further contributions shall be made which would cause the aggregate amount so contributed by the United States (1) to constitute more than 57 percent of the aggregate amount contributed to said fund by all governments not receiving assistance from said fund, including the United States; or (2) to exceed \$40,000,000, whichever is the lesser.

"There shall be established and maintained, out of the funds authorized under this joint resolution, a relief distribution mission for each of the countries receiving aid under this joint resolution. Such missions shall be comprised solely of American citizens who shall have been investigated as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Such missions shall have direct supervision and control, in each coun-

try, of relief supplies furnished or otherwise made available under this joint resolution, and, when it is deemed desirable by the field administrator provided for in section 4, such missions shall be empowered to retain possession of such supplies up to the city or local community where such supplies are actually made available to the ultimate consumers.

"Not more than \$15,000,000 of the funds authorized under this joint resolution shall be available for relief in any countries or territories other than Austria, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Trieste, and China. This provision shall not imply any obligation to give relief to any of the countries mentioned.

"Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed, until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to this section, to make advances, not to exceed in the aggregate \$75,000,000, to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution, in such manner and in such amounts as the President shall determine. From appropriations authorized under this section, there shall be repaid to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the advances made by it under the authority contained herein.

"Sec. 2. (a) Under the direction of the President, such relief assistance shall be provided in the form of transfers of supplies, or the establishment in this country of credits subject to the control of the President, in such quantities and on such terms as the President may determine; except that no such transfers of supplies or establishment of credits may be made after June 30, 1948, and except that not more than 6 per centum of the amount herein authorized shall be used for the procurement of supplies outside the United States and its Territories and possessions.

"(b) In carrying out this joint resolution, funds authorized herein may be used to pay necessary expenses related to the providing of such relief assistance, including expenses of or incident to the procurement, storage, transportation, and shipment of supplies transferred under subsection (a) or of supplies purchased from credits established under subsection (a).

"(c) Funds authorized under this joint resolution may be allocated for any of the purposes of this joint resolution to any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government and such sums shall be available for obligation and expenditure in accordance with the laws governing obligations and expenditures of the department, agency, or independent establishment, or organizational unit thereof concerned, and without regard to sections 3709 and 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 41, sec. 5, and title 31, sec. 529).

"(d) Such additional civilian employees as may be required by the War Department in connection with the furnishing of procurement, storage, transportation, and shipment services under this joint resolution and which services are paid for from funds herein authorized, shall not be counted as civilian employees within the meaning of section 607 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended by section 14 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946.

"(e) When any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government receives request from the government of any country for which credits have been established under subsection (a) and receives, from credits so established, advancements or reimbursements for the cost and necessary expenses, it may furnish, or procure and furnish (if advancements are made), supplies within the category of relief assistance as defined in section 1 and may use sums so received for the purposes set forth in subsection (b) of this section. When any such reimbursement is made it shall be credited, at the option of the department, agency, or independent establishment concerned, either to the appropriation, fund, or account uti-

lized in incurring the obligation, or to an appropriate appropriation, fund, or account which is current at the time of such reimbursement.

"(f) In order to supplement the general relief assistance made available under the terms of section 1 and to effect the economical and expanded use of American voluntary relief contributions, funds authorized under this joint resolution, not to exceed \$5,000,000, may be used to pay necessary expenses related to the ocean transportation of supplies donated to or purchased by American voluntary and nonprofit relief agencies, and in such quantities and kinds and for such purposes as the President may determine to be essential supplements to the supplies provided for such general relief assistance.

"(g) The relief supplies provided under the terms of this joint resolution shall be procured and furnished by the appropriate United States procurement agencies unless the President shall determine otherwise.

"Sec. 3. No relief assistance shall be provided under the authority of this joint resolution to the people of any country unless the government of such country has given assurance satisfactory to the President that (a) the supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution, as well as similar supplies produced locally or imported from outside sources, will be distributed among the people of such country without discrimination as to race, creed, or political belief; (b) representatives of the Government of the United States and of the press and radio of the United States will be permitted to observe freely and to report fully regarding the distribution and utilization of such supplies; (c) full and continuous publicity will be given within such country as to the purpose, source, character, scope, amounts and progress of the United States relief program carried on therein pursuant to this joint resolution; (d) if food, medical supplies, fertilizer, or seed is transferred or otherwise made available to such country pursuant to this joint resolution, no articles of the same character will be exported or removed from such country while need therefor for relief purposes continues; (e) such country has taken or is taking, insofar as possible, the economic measures necessary to reduce its relief needs and to provide for its own future reconstruction; (f) upon request of the President, it will furnish promptly information concerning the production, use, distribution, importation, and exportation of any supplies which affect the relief needs of the people of such country; (g) representatives of the Government of the United States will be permitted to supervise the distribution among the people of such country of the supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution; (h) provision will be made for a control system so that all classes of people within such country will receive their fair share of essential supplies; and (i) all supplies transferred pursuant to this joint resolution or acquired through the use of credits established pursuant to this joint resolution and any articles processed from such supplies, or the containers of such supplies or articles, will, to the extent practicable, be marked, stamped, branded, or labeled in a conspicuous place as legibly, indelibly, and permanently as the nature of such supplies, articles, or containers will permit in such manner as to indicate to the ultimate consumer in such country that such supplies or articles have been furnished by the United States of America for relief assistance.

"Sec. 4. When supplies are transferred or otherwise made available to any country pursuant to this joint resolution, the President

shall cause representatives of the Government of the United States (1) to supervise the distribution of such supplies among the people of such country, (2) to observe and report with respect to the carrying out of the assurances given to the President pursuant to section 3, and (3) to seek arrangements that reparations payable from current production by any such country to any other country by treaty be postponed during the period of such relief.

"With respect to the furnishing of relief assistance pursuant to this joint resolution, the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a field administrator who shall direct the supervision of such relief assistance. Such administrator shall receive compensation at a rate not to exceed \$12,000 per annum, and any necessary expenses, as the President shall determine. He shall act in accordance with the instructions of the President.

"The authority of the President under sections 2 and 3 and under this section may, to the extent the President directs, be exercised by the Secretary of State.

"Sec. 5. (a) The President shall promptly terminate the provision of relief assistance to the people of any country whenever he determines (1) that, by reason of changed conditions, the provision of relief assistance of the character authorized by this joint resolution is no longer necessary, (2) that any of the assurances given pursuant to section 3 are not being carried out, (3) that an excessive amount of any supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution, or of similar supplies produced locally or imported from outside sources, is being used to assist in the maintenance of armed forces in such country, or (4) that supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution, or similar supplies produced locally or imported from outside sources, are being exported or removed from such country.

"(b) Relief assistance to the people of any country, under this joint resolution, shall, unless sooner terminated by the President, be terminated whenever such termination is directed by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress.

"Sec. 6. To the extent that relief supplies procured with funds authorized under this joint resolution are not furnished on terms of repayment in dollars, they shall be furnished only upon condition that the government of the receiving country agree that when it sells such relief supplies for local currency (a) the amounts of such local currency will be deposited by it in a special account; (b) such account will be used within such country, as a revolving fund, until June 30, 1948, only upon the approval of the duly authorized representative of the United States, for relief and work relief purposes, including local currency expenses of the United States incident to the furnishing of relief; and (c) any unencumbered balance remaining in such account on June 30, 1948, will be disposed of within such country for such purposes as the United States Government, pursuant to Act or joint resolution of the Congress, may determine.

"Sec. 7. The President shall submit to the Congress quarterly reports of expenditures and activities under authority of this joint resolution."

And the Senate agree to the same.

CHARLES A. EATON,
KARL E. MUNDT,
SOL BLOOM,
JOHN KEE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

A. H. VANDENBERG,
ALEXANDER WILEY,
H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
TOM CONNALLY,
WALTER F. GEORGE,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 153) providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Except for clerical and minor clarifying changes, the differences between the joint resolution as passed by the House and the substitute agreed to in conference are explained below.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATION

By the first section of the joint resolution as passed by the House, the appropriation of not more than \$200,000,000 was authorized for relief assistance. This section also provided that from the sums appropriated the President could make contributions to the International Children's Emergency Fund of the United Nations for the special care and feeding of children (contributions for such purpose not to be subject to the limitations and requirements contained in the joint resolution with respect to funds used for relief assistance), and that after \$15,000,000 had been so contributed no further contributions should be made which would cause the aggregate United States contribution (1) to constitute more than 57 percent of the aggregate amount contributed to such fund by all governments, including the United States, or (2) to exceed \$50,000,000, whichever was the lesser.

The Senate amendment authorized an appropriation of \$350,000,000 for the provision of relief assistance and contained no provision with respect to contributions to the Children's Emergency Fund.

The conference substitute authorizes the appropriation of not to exceed \$350,000,000 for relief assistance, and includes a provision with respect to contributions to the Children's Emergency Fund, similar to the House provision, except that for the purpose of making mandatory the contribution of \$15,000,000, the permissive phrase "may make contributions" has been changed to "shall make contributions"; and the clauses prescribing the maximum aggregate United States contribution to the fund have been amended to read as follows: ". . . which would cause the aggregate amount so contributed by the United States (1) to constitute more than 57 per centum of the aggregate amount contributed to said fund by all governments not receiving assistance from said fund, including the United States; or (2) to exceed \$40,000,000, whichever is the lesser."

It is not intended that there be set aside indefinitely amounts sufficient to cover the maximum possible United States contribution to the fund determined on the basis of contributions made by other countries. It is understood that if the President determines, at a reasonable time prior to the termination of the relief assistance program, that there is no reasonable expectation that other governments will make contributions which will result in an increase in the aggregate amount to be contributed by the United States, he may utilize for the relief assistance program the amounts which have not been contributed to the Children's Emergency Fund.

ADVANCES BY RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

There has been included in the first section of the conference substitute a provision, taken from the Senate amendment, authorizing and directing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make advances, not to exceed an aggregate of \$75,000,000, to carry out the provisions of the joint resolution, in

such manner and in such amounts as the President shall determine. Provision is made for repayment to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation when appropriations are made pursuant to the joint resolution.

RELIEF-DISTRIBUTION MISSIONS

The joint resolution as passed by the House contained a provision that none of the funds authorized should be used for relief assistance in those countries whose governments are dominated by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics unless the governments of such countries agreed to a requirement which by the joint resolution was declared to be applicable to every country receiving aid under the provisions of the joint resolution. The requirement referred to, which was incorporated in the joint resolution, was that the State Department should establish and maintain a relief-distribution mission for each country receiving aid. This provision required that each such mission should be comprised solely of American citizens approved as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It further provided that such missions should have direct supervision and control of relief supplies in each country and, when deemed desirable by the American authorities administering the provisions of the joint resolution, such missions should be empowered to retain possession of our relief supplies up to the city or local community where such supplies were actually made available to the ultimate consumers.

The Senate amendment contained no provisions of the character above referred to.

The provision as to the establishment of relief-distribution missions has been included in the conference substitute, with minor modifications, and since it will apply to all countries to which relief assistance is extended, the provision making specific reference to governments dominated by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has not been retained. The principal changes which the conference substitute makes are to eliminate the reference to the State Department, to provide that the members of such missions shall be "investigated" rather than "approved" as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and to change the reference to "American authorities" to "the field administrator provided for by section 4."

The requirements as to American citizenship and investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation are intended to apply to all persons exercising the responsibilities with which each mission is entrusted; but there will be attached to the mission custodial and service personnel, recruited in foreign countries, as to which compliance with these requirements will not be practicable. It is not contemplated that any position of importance or influence will be filled by any person other than an American citizen who has been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

COUNTRIES TO RECEIVE RELIEF ASSISTANCE

The provision in the House joint resolution specifying the countries for which relief assistance may be made available, under the joint resolution, has been modified in the conference substitute. As modified it reads as follows:

"Not more than \$15,000,000 of the funds authorized under this joint resolution shall be available for relief in any countries or territories other than Austria, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Trieste, and China. This provision shall not imply any obligation to give relief to any of the countries mentioned."

The House provision differed from the provision above quoted in that the specification of the countries was stated affirmatively rather than negatively; and Trieste was not included among the countries listed. The last

sentence of the above-quoted provision was not contained in the House joint resolution.

PROCUREMENT OF SUPPLIES OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

The House joint resolution provided that not more than 10 percent of the appropriations authorized should be expended for the procurement of relief supplies in countries other than the United States. A similar provision is included in the conference substitute, taken from the Senate amendment. Under this provision not more than 6 percent of the amount authorized by the joint resolution may be used for the procurement of supplies outside of the United States and its Territories and possessions.

EMPLOYEE CEILING

The conference substitute contains a provision to the effect that additional civilian employees required by the War Department in connection with the furnishing of procurement, storage, transportation, and shipment services paid for from funds authorized by the joint resolution shall not be counted as civilian employees within the meaning of section 607 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended by section 14 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946. This is based on a Senate provision which applied to any department, agency, or independent establishment.

SUPPLIES MADE AVAILABLE BY AMERICAN RELIEF AGENCIES

There is included in section 2 of the conference substitute a provision taken from the Senate amendment, reading as follows:

"(f) In order to supplement the general relief assistance made available under the terms of section 1 and to effect the economical and expanded use of American voluntary relief contributions, funds authorized under this joint resolution, not to exceed \$5,000,000, may be used to pay necessary expenses related to the ocean transportation of supplies donated to or purchased by American voluntary and nonprofit relief agencies, and in such quantities and kinds and for such purposes as the President may determine to be essential supplements to the supplies provided for such general relief assistance."

ASSURANCES GIVEN BY RECIPIENT COUNTRIES

In section 3 of the conference substitute, providing that relief assistance shall not be granted to the people of any country unless its government has given certain assurances satisfactory to the President, two new clauses taken from the Senate amendment have been added.

One of these, clause (h), requires that assurance must be given that provision will be made for a control system so that all classes of people within the recipient country will receive their fair share of essential supplies. The other of these clauses, clause (i), reads as follows:

"(i) all supplies transferred pursuant to this joint resolution or acquired through the use of credits established pursuant to this joint resolution and any articles processed from such supplies, or the containers of such supplies or articles, will, to the extent practicable, be marked, stamped, branded, or labeled in a conspicuous place as legibly, indelibly, and permanently as the nature of such supplies, articles, or containers will permit in such manner as to indicate to the ultimate consumer in such country that such supplies or articles have been furnished by the United States of America for relief assistance; or if such supplies, articles, or containers are incapable of being so marked, stamped, branded, or labeled, that all practicable steps will be taken to inform the ultimate consumers thereof that such supplies or articles have been furnished by the United States of America for relief assistance."

There was included in this section of the House joint resolution a clause (h), requiring assurance that when relief supplies procured with funds authorized by the joint resolution were sold by a receiving government for local currency the amounts of such local currency should be deposited by the recipient government in a special account and should be used only for relief and rehabilitation purposes with the approval of the duly authorized representative of the United States. In the conference substitute this provision has been omitted, but there has been included as section 6 of the conference substitute a similar and more comprehensive provision, taken from the Senate amendment, which reads as follows:

"Sec. 6. To the extent that relief supplies procured with funds authorized under this joint resolution are not furnished on terms of repayment in dollars, they shall be furnished only upon condition that the government of the receiving country agree that when it sells such relief supplies for local currency (a) the amounts of such local currency will be deposited by it in a special account; (b) such account will be used within such country, as a revolving fund, until June 30, 1948, only upon the approval of the duly authorized representative of the United States, for relief and work relief purposes, including local currency expenses of the United States incident to the furnishing of relief; and (c) any unencumbered balance remaining in such account on June 30, 1948, will be disposed of within such country for such purposes as the United States Government, pursuant to Act or joint resolution of the Congress, may determine."

ADMINISTRATION

The House joint resolution provided for the appointment by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, of a relief administrator to perform such functions, relating to the administration of the joint resolution, as the President might prescribe. Such administrator was to receive such salary and have such staff as the President should determine.

A provision in the Senate amendment would have provided for an administrator to direct the supervision of relief assistance only in Europe. This provision provided for a salary of not to exceed \$12,000 per annum, and any necessary expenses, as the President should determine.

The conference substitute, in section 4, provides for a field administrator, who is to direct the supervision of relief assistance under the joint resolution, such field administrator to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. As to salary and expenses this provision follows the Senate amendment. Such administrator is to act in accordance with the instructions of the President.

A provision from the Senate amendment has been included in section 4, providing that the authority of the President under that section and under sections 2 and 3 may, to the extent the President directs, be exercised by the Secretary of State.

PROVISION RELATING TO REPARATIONS

Section 4 of the House joint resolution provided that when supplies were transferred or otherwise made available to any country the President should cause representatives of the Government of the United States, among other things, to "make certain that reparations payable by any such country to any other country by treaty have been postponed during the period of such relief". The Senate amendment contained no similar provision.

In the conference substitute this provision of section 4 has been modified so that, when relief assistance has been so made available, the President is to cause representatives of the Government of the United States "to

seek arrangements that reparations payable from current production by any such country to any other country by treaty be postponed during the period of such relief".

CHARLES A. EATON,
KARL E. MUNDT,
SOL BLOOM,
JOHN KEE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN].

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, when this bill was up for debate in the House, I called attention to the fact that its provisions were intended only for residual relief after termination of UNRRA. UNRRA has now been in existence for nearly 3 years, in which time, of course, Europe has had two crop periods, and is approaching another one. When we passed the first UNRRA authorization, we were told that the purpose of UNRRA and its scope was to bring the war-devastated countries through one crop period. Now, I repeat, we have had two full crop periods, and nearly 3 years of UNRRA, and this bill was intended only as a cleaning up, or mopping up process, in other words, to finish what was nearly done.

For this reason the 1947 budget included \$100,000,000 for this purpose. In the debate on the bill under question, your attention was further called to the fact that President Truman, in his message, said that help would be needed only through 1947; that the United Nations organization recommended help until this year's crops were harvested; that ex-President Herbert Hoover recommended help through this year's crop period; that every representative of the State Department, Under Secretaries Acheson and Clayton, Deputy Under Secretary Tyler Wood, all agreed that no help would be needed in 1948, with the possible exception of some limited help in Austria. In fact, all the authoritative sources were agreed that help was needed only from March 31, 1947, through the crop period of 1947.

Your attention was called to the fact that there was a sense of proportion in the job to be done before the next crop harvest and the \$100,000,000 in the budget with which that job was to be done.

Your attention was further called to the fact that in upping the amount to \$350,000,000, the administration had admitted that this amount was partly based on judgment and partly grabbed out of the air. The evidence, of course, is overwhelming that the extension of the term of relief for 6 months, to June 30, 1948, was also grabbed out of the air. These two changes have all the earmarks of changing residual relief into continuous and permanent relief by bureaucratic boondogglers.

I now want to give you some facts which I think would justify cutting this amount to \$100,000,000, and to prove to you that when we authorize \$200,000,000, it is a very liberal authorization.

I hold in my hand the President's tenth quarterly report to Congress on

the operations of UNRRA. This came to our desks last Saturday, May 17. This tenth quarterly report is not for the first quarter of 1947, although it was received 47 days after the ending of that quarter. Had it been for that quarter, we might have had some useful information to help our judgment on the pending bill. It is in fact a report for the last quarter of 1946, and it was kept confidential and secret, and not to be released until May 15, 1947.

It contains some rather interesting information, but is more intriguing for its lack of information. On page 34 of that report, we find that total contributions to UNRRA, paid or available, were \$3,688,395,736. On pages 24 and 25 we find a double-check statement that total shipments to December 31, 1946, were \$2,311,225,000. According to these figures, there was available on January 1, 1947, \$1,377,170,736.

Now, I do not mean to say that that amount was available the 1st of January, but the accounting does not preclude such an assumption. It does not show what happened to it, or how much of it is available at the present time.

To get any idea of what was available, we can turn to the President's letter of transmittal on page 1, the third paragraph, where he says:

The approximate value of supplies remaining to be shipped on January 1, 1947, was a world total of \$660,000,000.

Where the President gets this figure, I do not know. Perhaps they keep two sets of books. I was unable to find this statement, or any basis for it, in the report itself.

Then on page 38 the report states that the balance available for commitment amounts to \$165,379,746. Now these two items put together, supplies remaining to be shipped and balance available for commitment, amount to \$825,379,746. That was the amount available, apparently, on January 1, 1947, and leaves \$551,790,990 unaccounted for. Perhaps, by a long process of deduction and elimination, one could ascertain that this went for shipping charges and administrative expenses, but the report does not show this. It could just as well represent contributions not yet "paid" but "available."

When we made the second appropriation for UNRRA last year, a balance of \$180,000,000 of the contribution of the United Kingdom was so listed as available. Upon investigation, it was found that it was not really available; that the United Kingdom was unable to furnish supplies for that amount, and had made \$180,000,000 in sterling available until such time as supplies could be bought within the United Kingdom. We know that the United Kingdom has not been in any better position to furnish supplies than it was at that time, and unless they were able to pay it out of the \$3,750,000,000 loan, this might account for the difference of \$550,000,000 unaccounted for.

This is not said in disparagement or criticism of the United Kingdom, for it is a matter of common knowledge that she needs relief, and is probably using

the \$3,750,000,000 to support her own people.

However, we do know, if the President's figures are correct, that the amount of \$825,379,746 was available on January 1, 1947. Now, if we spent \$2,311,225,000 in the first 30 months of UNRRA, that will average about \$77,000,000 per month. So that if they spent at the same rate in 1947 that they did in the preceding 2½ years, they would have sufficient supplies and funds at \$77,000,000 a month to run them for 10¾ months, or into the latter part of November 1947, without \$1 of the \$350,000,000 we are considering at the present time. And remember, this is residual relief in a few countries. We are not pouring it into Bielorussia, the Ukraine, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and other countries, as we did in those 30 months.

We can double check this from another angle. Page 3 of the report, paragraph 3, states:

During the quarter September 30 to December 31, 1946, UNRRA shipped supplies worth \$253,795,000 to the receiving countries.

Now, if we divide \$253,000,000 by three, that will amount to about eighty-four or eighty-five million a month. To be sure, in the next paragraph they immediately apologize for this low amount with the following statement:

Although shipments in October at \$52,000,000, in November valued at \$92,000,000, and in December valued at \$109,000,000, fell below the previous average of \$149,367,000 per month, which had been maintained during the first 8 months of 1946, the drop was largely due to the accumulated effects of shipping and coal strikes.

Here, again, we have an example of the shovel-and-pitchfork method of UNRRA. According to this statement, a year has only 11 months. After giving us the amounts for October, November, and December, they give a higher figure for the first 8 months, which should be 9 months. In other words, they take the balance spent outside of October, November, and December, and divide it by 8, which makes \$149,000,000, when they should divide it by 9, which makes only \$132,000,000 per month. Quite some difference. And these people, who forget that a year has 12 months, give us bills we must pass with hardly the privilege of dotting an "i" or crossing a "t."

When we take into consideration that this average was during 1946 after the first crop period, with many more countries receiving relief, and we are now dealing with the period after the second crop period, with much less countries needing relief, and which is to be only residual relief, and for which they had at least \$825,000,000 at the beginning of the year, we can understand why at first, and in harmony with all the other testimony, only \$100,000,000 was provided in the budget. We can also have some idea as to why this amount would amply take care of the situation. Why, then, was the amount of \$100,000,000 upped to \$350,000,000, and the term of relief extended from, we will say, December 1947 to June 30, 1948?

It seems to me that the fact that Paul Porter went to Greece on January 16, 1947, to make a survey may be an element in the changed picture. It is true that he headed a mission to Greece, but this was before the administration had knowledge that the United Kingdom was pulling out of Greece, and I think the relief bill is part of a pattern.

Now, Paul Porter is one of the triumvirate of Porter, Henderson, and Bowles, who, according to the newspapers, through ADA, last week advised the people of the United States that they must increase wages and cut prices to avoid a depression. In my opinion, there is no swifter or surer way to destroy our free enterprise and economy. I do not know how the Members like that philosophy, but I do not subscribe to it. Paul Porter, as we know, succeeded Chester Bowles as OPA Administrator, and the night that he took that office he made a speech in Washington in which he said:

I want it emphatically understood that OPA is not a receivership; and that I am not a liquidator. OPA is a going concern, composed of loyal men and women who have done much for the country and are going to do much more.

The American people, as we know, thought otherwise.

It seems to me that Paul Porter went over there to perpetuate his going concern. At least it must be admitted that it was about that time that we changed from a residual relief concept to a continued, if not perpetual relief, by extending the term to June 30, 1948, instead of at the end of the next crop harvest, or let us say after the first of the year, and upping the expense to \$350,000,000.

Let us take a paragraph on the report of the American Economic Mission to Greece which is as follows:

The psychology of certain elements in Greece has operated as a serious impediment to recovery. There has been a sense of helplessness, and in some quarters a feeling that because Greece suffered so much during the war, it is now entitled to the care of its richer allies. There is the widely held view that external factors in Greek problems are so large that individual efforts are futile. The lack of confidence among government officials and the people in the ability of Greece to save itself financially and the belief that it must depend on aid from abroad has contributed to an appalling inertia.

I think most of us will agree that this is the psychology in other countries, and that the more of our substance we pour into these countries, the more they will look for help. This was the psychology even in our own country, and most of us remember how difficult it was to get rid of the relief agencies. Having abolished them here, we should not now begin them on an international scale.

The foregoing reasoning, it seems to me, is fortified by the fact that although it is now almost 2 months past March 31, we have heard little complaint of the gap between UNRRA and this proposed relief. And yet, the question may be asked, how did the people in these six countries get along during the period of this gap? Of course, the figures I just gave you on UNRRA supply the answer. Nevertheless, one of the members of the

conference was quoted in the newspapers as saying when the \$150,000,000 cut was restored by the conferees:

Recent reports from Europe helped influence the result. Reports in the last few days indicate relief pressure in Europe was greater than was contemplated when the figure of \$350,000,000 was set. There was a feeling the situation cannot be met with any smaller amount.

Interesting that this report should come in the last few days. The same few days in which the bill was in danger of the \$150,000,000 cut, but never before that.

It has been said on the other end of the Capitol that this is only an authorization, and that the Appropriations Committee can keep the amount down to \$200,000,000. The answer is that on an authorization of this nature, the camel gets its nose under the tent for the whole amount, and it will be most difficult for the Appropriations Committee to cut it down once a foreign relief mission has made commitments, even though they may not be urgently needed.

I believe in the bipartisan foreign policy, and in our precarious situation, a bipartisan domestic policy, for that matter. But it is not a sound bipartisan foreign policy when we agree merely to achieve agreement with the administration on the proposed reckless and unfounded spending policy.

It is my belief that the House should insist on reducing the amount in the bill to \$200,000,000; that this will be ample together with the \$825,000,000 that was available at the beginning of the year, to carry these countries through the next harvest and up to the first of the year, and even considerable beyond that. It seems to me, in the meantime, a thorough investigation should be made as to the real situation in regard to UNRRA funds available, and then in the January session we can review the situation and act with some degree of intelligence, instead of throwing away the taxpayers' money with reckless abandon and without knowledge of the facts.

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

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. JONKMAN. I am now going to say a word about the \$15,000,000, for the children's fund and I think if you will examine you will find that the report is very ambiguous. It is said they are in effect cutting this authorization by \$15,000,000 which is given to the Children's Relief Agency. They say it may amount to \$40,000,000 and may eventually cut this authorization in effect by \$40,000,000. But in my opinion all that they are going to get for the children's fund from us or anybody else is the \$15,000,000 for there will not be any additional contributions to this children's fund until the other countries provide for their 43-percent assessment.

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

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. BLOOM. According to the House bill, the children's fund did not get anything. It was only permissive for the President to give it to them. In this bill, as the gentleman will know if he reads the conference report, it is mandatory to give the children's fund at least \$15,000,000, and then the other 57 percent up to the \$40,000,000 depends upon the amount of money that is received from the other United Nations. Now, the other \$25,000,000 depends upon the proportionate share of what the other United Nations spend. In doing it that way it allows us to try to get the other United Nations to spend their amount of money so that we will get the \$25,000,000, but the \$40,000,000 is given in here, and it was originally provided up to November 30 to earmark that added \$25,000,000.

Mr. JONKMAN. I agree with the gentleman. We absolutely give \$15,000,000, and then the other countries have to make up 43 percent, which amounts to \$11,300,000, and the total will be \$26,300,000, representing 57 percent of our money and 43 percent of their money. But, are you going to ask the other nations to give their contributions all to the children's fund? How much do you expect to get from the other nations?

Mr. BLOOM. I will say this to the gentleman: It allows us to go to the children's fund of the United Nations and get them to appropriate their amount of money so that we can give our amount of money, and it is in our favor to do it this way rather than another way.

Mr. JONKMAN. I am telling the gentleman from New York it will be one of the sore spots when you expect to get \$26,000,000 and you have to work on that 43 percent from the United Nations for their contribution. You will have to ask them to contribute first to the children's fund to get the \$40,000,000. They will have something to say about that, too.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman has reached an erroneous conclusion.

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

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the conference committee in adjusting the differences that existed between both branches, and it is a pleasure to me to not only vote for the conference report but to urge that my colleagues vote for and adopt it.

My purpose in rising on this occasion is to make some suggestions to those who will administer this law on the part of our Government.

I notice in the conference report the establishment of a joint relief mission for each of the countries receiving aid under this joint resolution. I think that is a mighty fine idea. I also note the provision that the members of the mission shall be investigated as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I think that is a wise provision, certainly one that nobody can object to as we consider world conditions today and the purpose for which this money will be used. I also note with

great pleasure that such mission shall have direct supervision and control, in each country, of relief supplies furnished.

I hope the selection of the members of the various missions and other employees will be made with great care. I hope the benefits flowing to the unfortunate people of the countries that will receive the benefits will go to the people, and that the intent of Congress will be carried out by those administering the relief that will flow as a result of the passage of this bill.

While I voted for UNRRA, I state frankly that I never enthusiastically favored the idea, but the relief of human beings was the thing that was uppermost, and to try to propose some other method at that time would have interfered with the call of humanity. I did not like this international agency with its complex personnel and the complicated results that I could visualize would flow therefrom. I felt and always have felt that America's response to the call of humanity should be as direct as possible, and that not only should we do it directly but try to benefit the people who needed it in other countries in such a manner that there would be an appreciation of the fact that the Government of America, the people of America, were their friends.

I have said on the floor of this House repeatedly that in the world of tomorrow we need all the friends we can have, even the people of little Liberia, using that as an illustration. This bill gives an opportunity, with the right kind of administration, to bring about the maximum results as far as relief is concerned, and the maximum results as far as the cementing for countless generations to come of friendship between the people of America and the people of the countries that will benefit, if the relief is administered in the right way and as the Congress intended in the passage of this law.

It is not my purpose to suggest the names of the men who should be selected, but it is within my prerogative to suggest the type of men who should be selected. For example, I think those selections should fit into the people of the nations receiving relief and be persons who understand their problems and their background. In Poland, for instance, Americans of Polish blood should be on the mission, and in Italy Americans of Italian blood, but I think those Americans should have been born here.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Does the gentleman believe the Communist government in Poland should have anything to do with the distribution of this fund?

Mr. McCORMACK. Absolutely not. I am coming to that.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. The language of the bill is, "Such mission shall have direct supervision and control." This means that we should not have it administered in such a manner that a political party would benefit, and in the countries behind the iron curtain there is only one political party permitted to exist. We are making this appropriation

to help unfortunate human beings, and those carrying out this law on the part of America should see that the intent of Congress is faithfully carried out, that those human beings benefit, that the people of those countries are resuscitated as much as possible, and that the political parties in the Communist-controlled governments shall not be permitted to use this relief to strengthen themselves in those countries of which they have temporary control.

The type of persons appointed to administer this program, or employed in connection with it, is of vital importance in carrying out the intent of Congress and in the success of this undertaking.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I am the only conferee who did not sign this report. I regret to find myself in disagreement with my colleagues on this, just as I regret that I disapproved of many provisions of the bill as it was reported from our committee to the House. I proposed or supported eight amendments on the House floor, seven of these were adopted.

In my judgment, the bill as reflected in the report is in many respects a great improvement over the original bill. Of the nine amendments which were incorporated into the bill on the floor of the House, five are now in the bill in substantially the same form, two are in modified form, and two have been omitted.

The difficulty with this relief measure is that it is only a partial proposition. Let us bear in mind that the State Department said that the figure of \$350,000,000 was picked out of the air. No one is contending that the full \$350,000,000 will meet the relief problem in Europe because the State Department contends that \$550,000,000 is the absolute minimum need there. So that, no one contends that this \$350,000,000 will solve the whole relief problem. As President Hoover said, no mortal man knows the relative relief needs in Europe and our ability to supply them this fall until the harvests are made here and in Europe.

Unquestionably, \$200,000,000 is sufficient to carry us up to that time.

I thought the way to handle this uncertainty was to have a joint congressional committee review the needs and our ability to fill them in the fall. The House did not agree with that viewpoint. I was in conference willing to split the difference between the House and the Senate and have the conferees pick a figure out of the air of \$315,000,000, which involved a general relief figure of \$275,000,000 and adding \$40,000,000 for the children's fund. The other conferees felt it was necessary to hold rigidly to this \$350,000,000 figure that had been picked out of the air by the State Department.

We know that the State Department has a survey going on all over the world to find out what the relief and reconstruction needs are so as to measure our ability to meet these needs. It seems to me that we could well act on something less than the full program requested in this bill until we get some such

report back and study it. We know that from now on, since we cannot relieve all of the needs of the world, we have to help our friends and we have to keep our economy in shape so that we can help our friends.

One other provision concerns me, and that was the change made with reference to reparations. The House provided that the President should make certain that reparations payable by any country to another country by treaty be postponed during the period we furnish relief. The conference report merely says the President shall seek arrangements to postpone reparations while we furnish relief. We are looking forward to treaty reparations. The House provision permitted reparations required or demanded by Russia under armistice agreements to go out and relief to go into those countries at the same time, but attempted to stop future treaty reparations which will necessitate relief from us.

The hearings show that \$23,000,000 is required from Hungary in reparations which cause that country to require relief. I am deeply conscious of the position of Hungary and I want to see Hungary given some help, but I do not like to see our country take the position that we are going to approve a treaty which will require reparations which will require relief from us and thus have us paying the reparations. I am opposed to our paying Russian treaty reparations, directly or indirectly. That is exactly what ratification of those treaties will mean, under this bill as the conferees amended it.

This report says the President shall seek arrangements to postpone these treaty reparations after we have approved them? Who do you think the President will contact to seek arrangements like this? Why, Joe Stalin, for the country demanding reparations under such circumstances is Russia. And how much attention will Stalin pay to our plea to postpone reparations in a treaty we have just approved? I think the conferees could have done better with that particular section. I think the conferees could have done better on the amount. It should be more than \$200,000,000. It does not need to be \$350,000,000. While I know that we must have a relief bill, and I know we shall, I think the conferees should try again, and therefore I am not going to support the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vorvys] has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, there are two factors involved in whether or not the House should support its conferees, which I strongly urge upon the House.

The first is a question of principle, the second, a question of figures.

On the question of principle, I think we have made our views very clearly known. Certainly one thing must distinguish the people of this country and the Congress of this country—a sense of responsibility. The Congress by overwhelmingly passing a program for assistance to Greece and Turkey has not

made an idle gesture, but has undertaken a definite responsibility in the world. It is that responsibility which we are, in part, called upon to discharge today. It is quite footless to defend Greece and Turkey against forces or social systems that threaten their national integrity and their national security, and at the same time to let millions of people in other European countries, including Greece, starve. By undertaking the Greek-Turkish assistance program we have agreed with the world that we will pull our oar in the boat; and we have recognized that the security of the United States is not safeguarded along the borders of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans of the continental United States, but is safeguarded in the Pindus Mountains of Greece and on the Black Sea coasts of Turkey. Now we are called upon by this relief bill to say also that it is safeguarded in the hearts and minds and physical and spiritual integrity of the peoples of Italy, Austria, Hungary, Greece, and Poland as well.

The argument was made that a number of those countries are Communist-dominated. That question was thrashed out in the House very thoroughly before. The basic issue is this: If they are Communist-dominated now, do you want to surrender them forever, or do you still want to try to win their adherence to our kind of life by showing that it is the United States and its type of society which has the great heart, and that it is another type of society which does not; or do you just want to give up these peoples and let them go down the drain forever? For these peoples know very well that in a Communist society a man's right to eat depends on his politics. Do we want them to conclude that we, too, have taken this path?

We come now to the question of fact. What are the facts about this situation? A very distinguished member of our committee, takes the report of UNRRA and analyzes it; analyzes a good many bookkeeping figures in order to try to draw certain conclusions. As I have taken notes of what he said, he comes to two conclusions. Either UNRRA was spending \$140,000,000 a month or it was spending \$77,000,000 a month, and therefore it could go on for either 10 months or 5 months. But that makes a very great difference, for either its whole program is finished this month or it is not, and we know that it is finished. The difference, of course, is a very real one, too, because we are not talking just a lot of bookkeeping figures and trying to prove a dialectical case; we are trying to feed people. Words uttered here and analyses made here are not going to feed them if they do not have the food. Former President Hoover, in whom many of the Members of this House have great confidence and who went into this thing in very great detail and studied it thoroughly, said he is for this bill. He is for this bill for \$350,000,000. I am confident he looked into the UNRRA situation as well, and would have drawn attention to any such circumstance as might enable UNRRA to carry on.

Finally, let us look at the record on this question of adequacy of the funds pro-

vided. Is the \$310,000,000, for relief to the countries to be aided, which is now contained in the conference report, necessary, and how is it reconciled with the proposition that the general fund for relief may not get contributions from other nations? The record on that is very clear. I call the attention of the Members to page 107; it says that \$180,000,000 is necessary for grains alone to take care of just 1947 for the six principal countries under consideration.

The remainder, the difference between \$180,000,000 and a total of \$296,000,000 needed for food alone, or \$116,000,000, is needed for fats, meat, pulses, and dairy products—all foods. Therefore, your \$296,000,000 is the minimum food figure. It compares with a base figure of \$290,000,000 provided in the bill. That leaves out medical supplies, materials for clothing, fuel, fertilizer, and other items in this bill. This food to sustain a diet of 2,000 to 2,100 calories per day compares with average United States consumption of 3,400 calories per day.

If the House approves this conference report, therefore, you will be enabling the United States at least to fill out the elementary basic food needs of these peoples.

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

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will adopt the conference report.

I believe that those members of this body who opposed UNRRA have a very good reason for supporting this method of providing relief, because this is what might be called the unilateral method.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN], pointed out that at the beginning of this year there were some \$825,000,000 left in UNRRA. I would say that that was probably known to the United Nations Expert Committee and to the State Department when they requested the amount of \$350,000,000, and that the mere fact that there has been some delay in furnishing relief under UNRRA is no reason for cutting down the relief now. To my knowledge the need still exists.

Furthermore, I am reliably informed that the relief needs of Italy alone between now and the end of the year are \$120,000,000. Italy is suffering tremendously from the ravages of war and is continually on the verge of communistic upheaval.

I would point out also that this relief bill is a part of our foreign policy. It is as much a part of our foreign policy as the Greek-Turkish bill. We upheld the Greek-Turkish bill in this House; we should uphold this conference report now.

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

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, it strikes me that to a certain extent this debate on the amount of the authorization is a little beside the point. During the original debate on the bill I asked the gentleman from New York [Mr.

BLOOM] whether or not this was an appropriation bill or an authorization bill. He said it was merely a customary authorization bill. In other words, the final decision and the time when the House will have a chance to make the real decision on the amount will come when the appropriations are being considered. So, I do not think it is important to limit the authorization at this time because the real decision will come when the appropriations are made.

I want to say one other thing. It is this.

Personally I believe we ought not to approach this relief and rehabilitation matter on a piecemeal basis. We have now pending before the War Department subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee a \$725,000,000 budget estimate for occupied countries. Then there is the \$400,000,000 for Greece and Turkey. There is the \$350,000,000 under this bill for war devastated countries. And another proposal is coming up, we understand, for \$78,000,000 for Korea. Then perhaps some other amounts for the IRO, as successor to UNRRA.

My own belief is that these things should be brought up in one appropriation bill and that the Appropriations Committee should consider them all at one time, taking a look at the amount of available supplies we can export, the amount of material we can devote to rehabilitation, the amount of money that the United States Government can afford to spend in other parts of the world, and present the whole picture to the House at one time.

This piecemeal attack on our overseas commitments is fundamentally wrong.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE].

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, we have heard it repeatedly said upon the floor of the House that the figure of \$350,000,000 has been picked out of the air. That is quite a current expression. You frequently hear it. However, that is not the case in this instance, because the figure was definitely not picked out of the air.

The \$350,000,000 was arrived at from the fact that the United Nations Security Council after a careful and very extensive investigation of the relief needs of the countries for which this relief is intended fixed a figure of \$610,000,000 as being the amount absolutely necessary for the relief of these people during the current year. The \$610,000,000 figure fixed by the Security Council is the amount absolutely necessary in the current calendar year for the relief of these people. The amount allocated to be donated by the United States Government for that purpose is 57 percent or \$350,000,000, which amount was inserted in the bill.

When the bill came before the House for consideration an amendment was offered which allocated and earmarked \$50,000,000 for the children's relief fund. Of that amount \$15,000,000 was to be paid at the instance or discretion of the President at once and the other \$35,000,000 deferred until it was ascertained whether or not the other nations made their contributions to the fund. The

conferees retained that fund in the bill, reducing it however, to \$40,000,000. We made the payment of \$15,000,000 mandatory on the part of the President so that it reduced the fund provided in the measure for relief purposes by \$15,000,000. We leave \$25,000,000 earmarked for the children's relief fund providing the other nations contribute, which they will likely do, and this will further reduce the amount allowed by this bill to \$310,000,000, leaving that amount alone for carrying the burden of \$350,000,000 for relief.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORVY] said a moment ago that we all agree \$350,000,000 will not relieve the situation in Europe. Of course, we all agree with that statement. The statement is verified by the fact that the Security Council after its investigation fixed the amount absolutely necessary at \$610,000,000. Therefore this \$350,000,000, after reducing it approximately \$40,000,000 by the children's fund, will be just a drop in the bucket toward relieving the situation in the countries of Europe for which it is intended, and if we reduce it, as is suggested by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN], to \$200,000,000, you leave only \$160,000,000 to meet a very desperate situation.

Mr. Speaker, during the last meeting of our conference committee, just before we adjourned, we had a telegram from Europe read to us stating that conditions in the countries over there, in Austria and in Italy especially, were growing worse every day; that not only had there been a partial and very heavy crop failure but that there was promised a complete crop failure, and that this relief was needed and needed instantly.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily approve the conference report, and I hope it will be approved by this body.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the statement has been made here that the figure of \$350,000,000 was simply picked out of the air. I rise as a member of the committee to refute that statement. The United Nations has investigated this particular situation in Europe.

The American Government has investigated the situation through the United States embassies. The Department of Agriculture has investigated it as to food requirements. The Department of State has had its own people there looking into the situation. The Food and Agricultural Survey Mission of the United Nations has checked the situation. The United Nations Committee of Experts on the needs for 1947 has investigated. They have said that it would take \$583,000,000 for relief, exclusive of China, and it will be noted that this bill authorizes only \$350,000,000.

Also the data obtained by the subcommittee of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations has entered into this finding of \$350,000,000 as necessary. I would like to point out to this economy-minded Congress that under the United Nations relief we were taking 72 percent of the burden and now we are only going to take 57 percent of

the burden. We have reduced the figure. This relief is not for just giving away of money and materials. It is chiefly for food to prevent starvation. This relief is to raise these people to the absolute minimum beyond which they would starve. Even the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN], admits that this fund is not sufficient to keep them from starving.

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

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JONKMAN. Did the gentleman say I admitted that this fund was not enough to keep them from starving?

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman feels, I take it from his statement, that this fund itself will not keep these people from starving.

Mr. JONKMAN. I, on the contrary, claim to have demonstrated that they cannot spend the fund that they have judiciously. They can spend and they can waste, but a billion dollars is a lot of money to spend.

Mr. FULTON. May I say this, that the gentleman from Michigan did not bring you up to date on the figures; that the last shipment of UNRRA relief which we were to provide has now been sent from these shores. May I point out that Senator VANDENBERG testified, page 5123 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in that respect. So, the gentleman from Michigan is incorrect in his statement that this money, and the goods and the food purchased, are unexpended, because Senator VANDENBERG himself on the Senate floor said categorically that the last shipment has already left our shores.

As long ago as last January Secretary of State Marshall said that this was No. 1 on his list of 27 foreign-affairs measures that we should have for the peace of the world. I believe I will stand with General Marshall and with Senator VANDENBERG.

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

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MATHEWS. There is obviously a discrepancy between the first five lines of the bill and page 1 of the report.

Mr. FULTON. Would the gentleman ask his question directly.

Mr. MATHEWS. Subsection (b) of section 2 on the second page. What I want to ask the gentleman is this: Can we be given assurance that out of the \$350,000,000 authorized to be appropriated will be included the salaries of the missions and the commission and all persons connected with it?

Mr. FULTON. I will assure the gentleman, as a member of the committee, that all expenses for administration, traveling, and expenses of all the missions in each of the countries are included in the authorization of the \$350,000,000 specifically.

Mr. MATHEWS. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. LODGE. I just want to point out something in connection with the change

made in conference in the clause that was in the House bill which provided that reparations payable by treaty by any country receiving relief to any other country must be postponed during the period of such relief. It was my intention, as the author of that amendment, to protect the American taxpayer against having to make payments both for relief and for reparations. It was my intention to protect the Hungarians against the burden of treaty reparations and if that was not possible to obtain a postponement of reparations payments. It was not my intention that the Hungarians, for instance, should be deprived of relief after the other body by ratifying the treaty had decided that they should pay reparations. It does not seem to me fair to the Hungarians or to the Italians—insofar as they might be affected—just because the other body decides to ratify these treaties, that they should be deprived of relief. It just so happens that I believe that ratification of these treaties should be withheld. However, since the Foreign Relations Committee of the other body has ratified these treaties, I believe that the change that was made in conference was entirely right. The President will seek a postponement of reparations payments and if he does not succeed the Hungarians will nevertheless receive relief.

Mr. FULTON. I believe the gentleman has made a very excellent statement, that we did not want in any way to find that the relief we send over goes into reparations to any country, instead of to these people that are intended to get the relief. We have taken great care to see that the assistance will simply go in as relief to prevent starvation.

May I cite Senator VANDENBERG as to the necessity for this \$350,000,000? I believe he has served the Republican Party well as our senatorial leader on foreign policy. I ask the Republican side particularly to listen to what Senator VANDENBERG has to say on the necessity for \$350,000,000:

Without this measure there is no use in trying to save Greece, as both Houses of Congress have voted overwhelmingly to do, because this relief is specifically at the base of our Greek plan.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM].

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, the statement read on UNRRA is the statement of the United States participation in UNRRA. UNRRA is an international body. What we are trying to do here is something the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] and I started in New York City at the United Nations last year. We are doing something here on which we have the handle in our own grip. We are doing it. We have the control of this thing completely. If you reduce this from \$350,000,000, which is 57 percent of the \$610,000,000, which we went over very carefully in New York City, not in a minute or a day or a week, for it took months to do this thing—if you reduce that \$350,000,000 to \$200,000,000, then you are automatically reducing the contributions of the other United Nations to the \$610,000,000, which we figured at that time was the lowest

amount, the smallest amount we could possibly try to do the job for in Europe.

It is a fact that since we started the hearings on this legislation and before we had it on the floor of the House we received word from all over Europe and the different countries that the situation there today is much worse, much worse than it was when we had this bill here for consideration. There is no question about that.

We have given \$40,000,000 for the children, and that will be given to the children. A promise has been made that that will be given. I think I had something to do with that as far as the other nations are concerned. Then we will give them \$5,000,000 to defray the expenses of sending food that is contributed to this fund by different organizations, for nothing. So that is \$45,000,000 taken off, which leaves only \$305,000,000.

As was said here, this is an authorization, and we can find out what is necessary to be done to see that proper relief is given. This figure has not been taken out of the air. This figure has been calculated and figured out very carefully. The total sum is \$610,000,000.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am strongly in favor of adopting this bill as reported by the conference committee; first, because we have had assurances that we will have no further relief demands in the near future, and, second, because of the tremendous need and the starvation among the suffering people in Europe as compared with the almost unlimited supply and variety of food available to all Americans.

I believe this bill expresses the innate desire of the American people to do, as they have always done, go to the rescue of our starving neighbors across the sea.

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

Mr. EATON. I yield.

Mr. RICH. What assurances have you that this is the last bill that we will be asked to act upon to authorize and appropriate money for relief?

Mr. EATON. The best assurance I have is the announcement made by the gentleman's leader, Mr. VANDENBERG.

Mr. RICH. He is not my leader; I want you to understand that.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. EATON. It would seem that no one individual can lead Republicans any more. It would appear that our Republican army is composed now entirely of generals.

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

Mr. EATON. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Would not the gentleman agree that the less satisfactory our experience has been in handling relief on a jointly managed basis under UNRRA, the more responsible we are for doing our share under this program where we can do it ourselves in our own American way and carry the food under our own supervision, right down to the ultimate village, if necessary?

Mr. EATON. I am in full accord with the gentleman's view, and I thank

him for introducing that flash of intelligence into what I have to say.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a further flicker, if not a flash?

Mr. EATON. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Does not the gentleman agree that the more opposed many of us have been to the sort of program heretofore carried on, the more we should support the program which is before us today. The very people who voted against UNRRA because so many of those who spent our money were from other countries are under a greater obligation, it seems to me, to carry on this program under Americans, everyone of them cleared by the FBI. I say that as one who very strongly criticized UNRRA. This authorizes only one-eighth of the total amount that we have already given under UNRRA. If we can finish all or most of the job with one-eighth of what we have already given, much of which was wasted, surely we ought to do so, both for humanitarian reasons and for reasons of intelligent long-term self-interest.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlemen for their assistance.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. They have made two crops in Europe since the war ended, and are now stripping the people of Europe and taking the funds to build up armies while asking us to continue to feed the people of Europe who are being dominated by those Communist armies or regimes.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to myself.

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

Mr. EATON. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I should like to answer the gentleman from Mississippi by asking him to read section 5 where it says, "The President shall promptly terminate the provision of relief assistance to the people of any country whenever he determines," among other things, "that an excessive amount of any supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution, or of similar supplies produced locally or imported from outside sources, is being used to assist in the maintenance of armed forces in such country."

Mr. RANKIN. You do not need anything like that to tell the people of Europe how to make a crop. The substance of the people of Europe is being taken over by these Communist organizations maintaining large armies, large military forces, and they are asking us to feed the people that they are supposed to feed.

I live in a country that lost a war once. Our brave Confederate soldiers came home, went to work and fed their own people while rebuilding the devastated South.

If we are going to feed the peoples of the rest of the world at the expense of the American taxpayers while their crops are used to feed useless standing

armies, then there will be no end to the appropriations we will be called upon to make.

The peoples of these countries have had time to make two crops since the war closed. Never in the history of Europe have we seen a demand to feed starving people before except when there was some kind of a crop failure. There have been no such failures in this instance. We had better make a contribution to the Red Cross and let them feed the hungry children. The Red Cross will not make such a farce of it as was made in the case of UNRRA.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, this bill appropriates \$350,000,000. It leaves only \$290,000,000 of actual money to be invested in the salvation of the starving people. The rest goes to the children's fund or for expenses. Fifteen million dollars is to be held in escrow for use in other countries as the necessity may arise.

I hope and pray we will carry this bill through today with a very handsome and substantial majority.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, this problem of participating in relief for foreign countries is not a new one before this body. I want to take you back a few years to the first UNRRA bill and to the subsequent UNRRA bills, because we have appropriated and spent \$2,700,000,000 through UNRRA to help relieve the people of distressed war areas.

A vast majority of the Members of this body voted for that legislation, but they voted for it, many of them, as I voted for it, and as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] today indicated he voted for it, with their tongues in their cheeks, and reluctantly, because UNRRA did not seem to be an efficient set-up for handling the difficult relief problems abroad. It was argued that it should have been an American enterprise. We have before us today such an American enterprise in this conference report.

The second criticism made of UNRRA was that it should have been administered by Americans instead of by foreigners. This bill provides that. It provides for the administration of this relief by Americans who have been screened by the FBI; so we have made progress in that direction.

The third criticism about UNRRA was that we should have provided relief which was identified as American relief. This bill provides that. The relief is to carry labels and identification marks and trademarks as American products right down to the ultimate consumers.

The fourth criticism of UNRRA was that the supplies were not publicized abroad or at home and the press and radio were not permitted to follow through and report on the disposition made of UNRRA supplies. This proposal corrects that shortcoming. It provides that there shall be adequate and complete publication of the information about this relief, not only in Amer-

ica but in the countries receiving the relief.

The fifth criticism made of UNRRA was that it was an extravagant outfit; that it did not get the result it should have out of the \$2,700,000,000. We are asking you today to appropriate only \$350,000,000, a considerably smaller amount than any other we have been asked to provide, to aid legitimately distressed people in war-stricken areas. With the numerous safeguards written into this new program, I am confident this \$350,000,000 will feed more people who are actually in need and in want than would be true of several times this amount if handled through UNRRA.

Now, let me go to the figures of this conference report. As you know, when it left the House, the over-all figure was \$200,000,000. The over-all figure now before you is \$350,000,000, but that does not mean that the House conferees receded entirely from the position which we took in the House because actually we are bringing you this conference report at a working figure of \$290,000,000. That is the working fund for the specific purposes which this act provided when it left the House, namely, the general relief of people in war-devastated areas as specified by our legislation.

The figure that you must compare with the \$350,000,000 item which the Senate approved is \$29,000,000. Let me spell out to you specifically how that is true. Since this bill left the House of Representatives in the course of its enactment it has been expanded to do other things which were not originally included in the original \$350,000,000.

Five million dollars, for example, has been set aside to pay the shipping costs for relief sent overseas by voluntary private organizations, a proposal which multiplies tremendously the benefits to be given by this relief program. So, \$5,000,000 of the \$350,000,000 is not available for the purposes originally contained in this legislation when it was last before us.

Fifteen million dollars has been set aside additionally for so-called emergency relief beyond and outside of the confines of the six countries named in this act, so there is another \$15,000,000 which will not be available for aid to the specified areas, as was originally expected for the relief program.

Forty million dollars more has been set aside to take care of the needs of the International Emergency Children's Fund, \$15,000,000 of it being made available by legislative mandate at once and \$25,000,000 additional being set aside until well into 1948, until it has been demonstrated and determined whether or not the other countries will meet their 43 percent proportionate payments to this children's fund.

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

Mr. MUNDT. Not now. I will yield later.

If they meet their quotas the entire \$40,000,000 will be available for children's relief and deducted from the money we are appropriating in this legislation for general relief. If they do not meet it, the President is authorized to expend the residual amount for the general purposes

of the act provided he first determines there is no reasonable expectancy that these quotas will be met before June 30, 1948.

I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JONKMAN. The gentleman says that \$25,000,000 in addition to the \$15,000,000 will go to the children's fund. That will not happen until the other nations contribute their 43 percent. Is not that true?

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. I do not yield further.

Mr. JONKMAN. Can the gentleman name one nation that has said it would contribute to the fund?

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

Mr. MUNDT. I decline to yield. Answering the gentleman from Michigan, I may say that I cannot name specifically any other country that is going to contribute to the children's fund, because this is the first step by which the fund is implemented. We are making the initial contribution with the understanding that collectively the other countries will contribute 43 percent. If they do not contribute, then the \$25,000,000 already referred to reverts to the general purposes of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, may I point out other respects in which the position of the House prevailed over the position of the other body? For example, the children's fund was not mentioned at all in the legislation passed by the Senate. It is now in the bill, as I have described to you. That was a distinct victory for the House conferees.

The countries were not named in the legislation passing the other body. We named the countries specifically, and they remain exactly as named by the House except we added the country of Trieste, which I think we all believe necessarily should be added, since we have assumed international responsibility for Trieste. That is another complete victory for the House position.

The third position of the House that was maintained is the provision for relief distribution, that it shall be done by American citizens screened by the FBI, permitting American control of these goods until they get to the ultimate consumer. The House position in that regard was maintained, as the so-called Mundt amendment remains in the bill.

This brings me to reparations. This has already been discussed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VOYSE] and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE]. To the fullest extent possible the position of the House has been maintained there. We require the President to seek from other countries in the world an agreement whereby they will not extract reparations out of current production from any country being aided by this bill. That is all we can do practically at this present time, in view of circumstances beyond the control of this House. The author of that amendment, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE], supports this action of the conferees.

In the fifth place, the termination date written in by the House remains in the bill; namely, that by concurrent resolu-

tion the Congress can withhold from any country or from all the countries further aid at any time the House and the Senate in the wisdom of a majority vote decide that it should be discontinued.

So I submit to you that in large measure the position of the House prevails in this conference report, and I think the conference report should be adopted. I say this as one of those who voted for the \$200,000,000 amendment as originally presented by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN]. I was in favor of it at that time and am so recorded both by speech and vote. However, we now face a different decision under different circumstances and we are considering legislation covering a much wider field of needs than was then the case.

It should be kept in mind, Mr. Chairman, that our action in reducing this proposed appropriation for relief to \$2,000,000 by our earlier votes has in fact effected a saving for this country of perhaps \$60,000,000 even though we now approve this conference report. This is true because we have expanded the purposes of this act to cover the Children's Fund thus obviating the necessity of the President sending us his \$40,000,000 bill for that purpose as was previously announced and because we are using \$5,000,000 of this fund to provide shipping for voluntary relief shipments and \$15,000,000 is being withheld to meet possible emergency relief needs in countries outside of the prescribed areas. The House thus can take credit for effecting a great and a real saving by our earlier action and by approving this conference report we can supplement that worthwhile action by now expediting the establishment of an effective and efficient relief set-up to meet the most crying needs in Europe. I am not in favor of reducing the appropriation back to \$2,000,000 at this time, however, because, as I have pointed out, we have increased the purposes, the objectives, and the responsibilities of this bill. We have made it responsible for a much larger achievement than was originally the case. So I submit that this \$290,000,000 figure for a working fund is a legitimate and an honest reconciliation between the positions of the two Houses. It enables you to vote for economy and against starvation at the same time.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to ask the gentleman if it is not true that those people have had an opportunity or time to make two crops since the war closed, and if they are not taking the production of their own people and using that to build up military establishments, at the same time calling on us to feed the people of those countries? And will not the gentleman be standing up in this well one year from today asking us for another appropriation to feed them through another year while this same procedure goes on?

Mr. MUNDT. The answer to the gentleman's question is in part "yes" and in part "no." It is certainly "no" as far as Greece is concerned, it is "no" as far

as Italy is concerned, it is "no" as far as Trieste is concerned. The answer is "yes" as far as Poland is concerned and it is "yes" in part as far as Hungary is concerned. However, under the Mundt amendment which remains in the bill it is going to be "no" for all the countries from now on because these goods are being distributed by American relief missions, by American citizens, conveying the goods all the way down to the ultimate consumer. So at least insofar as the future is concerned it is going to be a negative answer under the terms of this legislation.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. LODGE. I want to point out to the gentleman from Mississippi that section 5 (a) provides that the President shall promptly terminate relief if he finds that it is being used to assist in the maintenance of armed forces in such countries.

Mr. RANKIN. May I call attention to the fact that in Italy and Trieste they are reaping their third crops now since the war closed.

Mr. MUNDT. I am not arguing about the number of crops. The food is not going to be taken out of the country to feed the Russians or to build military establishments under the terms of this bill.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MATHEWS. Since the President may terminate this if an excessive amount is used for military purposes, may I ask the gentleman why in a relief bill any part of it should be used for military purposes?

Mr. MUNDT. This says that the President can terminate it. It may be that in a country like Greece or Italy they may have soldiers in their own army who need rations to feed them; so we do not want to make it too conclusive. But the intent of this limitation is crystal clear.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. As one who has supported UNRRA all the way along, may I say that we have listened to the same enthusiastic appeal for that organization as we have for this bill today.

Mr. MUNDT. Not from the present speaker. Every time I spoke on UNRRA I did so with great reluctance because I realized it had an almost impossible administrative setup. But the position recommended by the Republicans on the Committee of Foreign Affairs at that time and the position since recommended both by Democrats and Republicans concerning UNRRA has been written into this legislation. So we are concerned with this decision: Do we want Uncle Sam to do anything at all to help the starving people of the world? If we do, we can do it now with American citizens, with American goods, with American publicity accruing all over the world. If we do not believe we should help them,

then the answer should be in the negative. The decision is yes or no, whether you want America to help feed the people of a war-torn world. As for me, I think we should adopt this conference report and measure up to our responsibilities in an American way, with American methods administered by American citizens whose loyalty has been certified by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. JONKMAN. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Does any Member on the minority side wish to offer a motion to recommit? If not, the Clerk will report the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JONKMAN moves that the conference report be recommitted to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on the House provision for authorization of \$200,000,000.

Mr. EATON. 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 offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN].

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 170, nays 205, not voting 55, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]

YEAS—170

Abernethy	Colmer	Hull
Allen, Calif.	Cravens	Jenkins, Ohio
Allen, Ill.	Crawford	Jennings
Allen, La.	Cunningham	Jensen
Andersen,	Curtis	Johnson, Ill.
H. Carl	Dague	Johnson, Ind.
Andresen,	Davis, Ga.	Jones, Ohio
August H.	Dolliver	Jonkman
Angell	Dondero	Kearney
Arends	Dorn	Kearns
Arnold	Ellis	Knutson
Auchincloss	Ellsworth	Landis
Banta	Elston	Larcade
Barden	Engel, Mich.	LeCompte
Barrett	Fellows	LeFevre
Bates, Mass.	Fenton	Lemke
Beall	Fisher	Love
Bennett, Mo.	Gallagher	Lucas
Bishop	Gavin	McConnell
Blackney	Gillette	McCowen
Boggs, Del.	Gillie	McDonough
Brehm	Goodwin	McDowell
Brooks	Graham	McGregor
Brophy	Grant, Ind.	McMillen, Ill.
Buck	Griffiths	Macy
Buffett	Gross	Maloney
Burleson	Gwynn, N. Y.	Martin, Iowa
Busbey	Gwynne, Iowa	Mason
Butler	Halleck	Meyer
Byrnes, Wis.	Hand	Michener
Carson	Harness, Ind.	Miller, Md.
Chenoweth	Harrison	Morris
Chiperfield	Hartley	Murray, Tenn.
Church	Hess	Murray, Wis.
Clevenger	Hill	Norblad
Clippinger	Hoffman	O'Hara
Coffin	Horan	O'Konski
Cole, Mo.	Howell	Passman

Phillips, Calif. Sarbacher
 Phillips, Tenn. Schwabe, Mo.
 Ploeser Schwabe, Okla.
 Ramey Scoblick
 Rankin Scrivner
 Redden Shafer
 Reed, Ill. Short
 Reed, N. Y. Simpson, Pa.
 Rees Smith, Kans.
 Reeves Smith, Ohio
 Rich Smith, Wis.
 Rizley Snyder
 Robertson Springer
 Robson Stefan
 Rockwell Stevenson
 Rogers, Mass. Stockman
 Rohrbough Sundstrom
 Russell Taber
 St. George Talle
 Sanborn Taylor

Mansfield, Tex. Poage
 Miller, Nebr. Powell
 Mitchell Price, Fla.
 Morrison Sasser
 Norrell Scott, Hardle
 Patman Scott,
 Pfeifer Hugh D., Jr.
 Plumley Simpson, Ill.

Fernandez
 Fletcher
 Fogarty
 Folger
 Foote
 Forand
 Fulton
 Gamble
 Gary
 Gearhart
 Goodwin
 Gordon
 Gore
 Gorski
 Granger
 Grant, Ala.
 Grant, Ind.
 Gregory
 Gwinn, N. Y.
 Gwynne, Iowa
 Hale
 Hall,
 Edwin Arthur
 Hall,
 Leonard W.
 Halleck
 Hardy
 Harless, Ariz.
 Harris
 Hart
 Hartley
 Havenner
 Hays
 Hébert
 Hedrick
 Hendricks
 Herter
 Heselton
 Hess
 Hill
 Hinshaw
 Hobbs
 Holfield
 Holmes
 Hope
 Horan
 Howell
 Huber
 Jackson, Calif.
 Jackson, Wash.
 Jarman
 Javits
 Jenkins, Ohio
 Jenkins, Pa.
 Jensen
 Johnson, Calif.
 Johnson, Okla.
 Johnson, Tex.
 Jones, Ala.
 Jones, N. C.
 Jones, Wash.
 Jonkman
 Judd
 Karsten, Mo.
 Kean
 Kearney

Ploeser
 Plumley
 Potts
 Poulson
 Preston
 Price, Ill.
 Priest
 Rabin
 Rains
 Ramey
 Rayburn
 Rayfiel
 Redden
 Reed, Ill.
 Rees
 Richards
 Riehlman
 Riley
 Rivers
 Robertson
 Rockwell
 Rogers, Fla.
 Rogers, Mass.
 Rohrbough
 Rooney
 Ross
 Russell
 Sadiak
 Sadowski
 St. George
 Scoblick
 Scott, Hardle
 Seely-Brown
 Sheppard
 Sikes
 Simpson, Pa.
 Smith, Maine
 Smith, Va.
 Snyder
 Spence
 Stefan
 Stevenson
 Stratton
 Sundstrom
 Taber
 Talle
 Taylor
 Thomason
 Tibbott
 Tollefson
 Towe
 Trimble
 Twyman
 Van Zandt
 Vinson
 Wadsworth
 Walter
 Welch
 West
 Whittington
 Wigglesworth
 Wilson, Tex.
 Wolcott
 Wolverton
 Worley
 Zimmerman

NAYS—205

Albert
 Almond
 Anderson, Calif.
 Andrews, Ala.
 Andrews, N. Y.
 Bakewell
 Battle
 Beckworth
 Bell
 Blatnik
 Bloom
 Boggs, La.
 Bolton
 Bradley, Calif.
 Bramblett
 Brown, Ga.
 Bryson
 Buchanan
 Burke
 Byrne, N. Y.
 Camp
 Canfield
 Cannon
 Carroll
 Case, N. J.
 Case, S. Dak.
 Celler
 Chadwick
 Chapman
 Chelf
 Clark
 Clason
 Clements
 Cole, Kans.
 Cole, N. Y.
 Combs
 Cooley
 Cooper
 Corbett
 Cotton
 Coudert
 Crosser
 Davis, Tenn.
 Davis, Wis.
 Deane
 Delaney
 Devitt
 Dingell
 Dirksen
 Donohue
 Doughton
 Douglas
 Drewry
 Durham
 Eaton
 Eberharter
 Elliott
 Engle, Calif.
 Fallon
 Feighan
 Fernandez
 Fletcher
 Fogarty
 Foiger
 Foote
 Forand
 Fulton
 Gamble
 Gary
 Gearhart

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
 Mr. Hoeven for, with Mr. Courtney against.
 Mr. Norrell for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.
 Mr. Stanley for, with Mr. Buckley against.
 Mr. Simpson of Illinois for, with Mr. Flannagan against.
 Mr. Wood for, with Mr. Smathers against.
 Mr. Gathings for, with Mr. Heffernan against.
 Mr. Teague for, with Mr. Somers against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Bender with Mr. Powell.
 Mr. Kilburn with Mr. Mansfield of Texas.
 Mr. D'Ewart with Mr. Gossett.
 Mr. Crow with Mr. Domengeaux.
 Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Cox.
 Mr. Wolcott with Mrs. Lusk.
 Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Bonner.
 Mr. Gifford with Mr. Poage.
 Mr. Elsaesser with Mr. Morrison.
 Mr. Bradley of Michigan with Mr. Bulwinkle.
 Mr. Hagen with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.
 Mr. Jenison with Mr. Evins.
 Mr. Keefe with Mr. Patman.
 Mr. McGarvey with Mr. Bates of Kentucky.
 Mr. Dawson of Utah with Mr. Boykin.
 Mr. Bennett of Michigan with Mr. Price of Florida.
 Mr. Fuller with Mr. Sasser.
 Mr. Plumley with Mr. Bland.

Messrs. BREHM and LEMKE and Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Messrs. VORYS and DREWRY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 289, nays 86, not voting 55, as follows:

[Roll No. 61] YEAS—289

Albert
 Allen, Calif.
 Almond
 Andersen,
 H. Carl
 Anderson, Calif.
 Andresen,
 August H.
 Andrews, Ala.
 Andrews, N. Y.
 Angell
 Arends
 Auchincloss
 Bakewell
 Barrett
 Bates, Ky.
 Bates, Mass.
 Battle
 Beall
 Beckworth
 Bell
 Blackney
 Blatnik
 Bloom
 Boggs, Del.
 Boggs, La.
 Bolton
 Bradley, Calif.
 Bramblett
 Brahm
 Brooks
 Brophy
 Brown, Ga.
 Bryson
 Buchanan
 Buck
 Burke
 Busbey
 Byrne, N. Y.
 Byrnes, Wis.
 Camp
 Canfield
 Cannon
 Carroll
 Carson
 Case, N. J.
 Case, S. Dak.
 Celler
 Chadwick
 Chapman
 Chelf
 Chenoweth
 Clark
 Clason
 Clements
 Coffin
 Cole, Kans.
 Cole, N. Y.
 Combs
 Cooley
 Cooper
 Corbett
 Cotton
 Coudert
 Cravens
 Crosser
 Cunningham
 Curtis
 Davis, Ga.
 Davis, Tenn.
 Davis, Wis.
 Deane
 Delaney
 Devitt
 Dingell
 Dirksen
 Dolliver
 Donohue
 Doughton
 Douglas
 Drewry
 Durham
 Eaton
 Eberharter
 Elliott
 Ellsworth
 Elston
 Engel, Mich.
 Engle, Calif.
 Fallon
 Feighan
 Fellows
 Fenton

Edwin Arthur
 Leonard W.
 Halleck
 Hardy
 Harless, Ariz.
 Harris
 Hart
 Hartley
 Havenner
 Hays
 Hébert
 Hedrick
 Hendricks
 Herter
 Heselton
 Hess
 Hill
 Hinshaw
 Hobbs
 Holfield
 Holmes
 Hope
 Horan
 Howell
 Huber
 Jackson, Calif.
 Jackson, Wash.
 Jarman
 Javits
 Jenkins, Ohio
 Jenkins, Pa.
 Jensen
 Johnson, Calif.
 Johnson, Okla.
 Johnson, Tex.
 Jones, Ala.
 Jones, N. C.
 Jones, Wash.
 Jonkman
 Judd
 Karsten, Mo.
 Kean
 Kearney

LeCompte
 LeFevre
 Lesinski
 Lewis
 Lodge
 Love
 Lyle
 Lynch
 McConnell
 McCormack
 McDonough
 McMillan, S. C.
 MacKinnon
 Macy
 Madden
 Mahon
 Manasco
 Mansfield,
 Mont.
 Marcantonio
 Martin, Iowa
 Mathews
 Meade, Ky.
 Meade, Md.
 Merrow
 Meyer
 Michener
 Miller, Calif.
 Miller, Conn.
 Miller, Md.
 Mills
 Monroney
 Morgan
 Morris
 Morton
 Muhlenberg
 Mundt
 Murdock
 Murray, Tenn.
 Nixon
 Nodar
 Norblad
 Norton
 O'Brien
 O'Toole
 Owens
 Pace
 Patterson
 Peden
 Peterson
 Phillips, Calif.

NAYS—86

Gross
 Hand
 Harness, Ind.
 Arnold
 Hoffman
 Hull
 Jenison
 Jennings
 Johnson, Ill.
 Johnson, Ind.
 Jones, Ohio
 Kearns
 Knutson
 Landis
 Larcade
 Lemke
 Lucas
 McCowen
 McGregor
 McMahon
 McMillen, Ill.
 Ma'oney
 Mason
 O'Hara
 O'Konski
 Passman
 Phillips, Tenn.
 Pickett
 Rankin

Reed, N. Y.
 Reeves
 Rizley
 Robson
 Sanborn
 Sarbacher
 Schwabe, Mo.
 Schwabe, Okla.
 Scrivner
 Shafer
 Short
 Smith, Kans.
 Smith, Ohio
 Smith, Wis.
 Springer
 Stockman
 Thomas, Tex.
 Vall
 Vorys
 Vursell
 Welch
 Wheeler
 Whitten
 Williams
 Wilson, Ind.
 Winstead
 Woodruff
 Youngblood

NOT VOTING—55

Bender
 Bennett, Mich.
 Bland
 Bonner
 Boykin
 Bradley, Mich.
 Brown, Ohio
 Buckley
 Bulwinkle
 Courtney
 Cox
 Crow

Brown, Ohio
 Buckley
 Bulwinkle
 Dawson, Ill.
 Dawson, Utah
 D'Ewart
 Domengeaux
 Elsaesser
 Evins

NOT VOTING—55

Bates, Ky.
 Bender
 Bennett, Mich.
 Bland
 Bonner
 Boykin
 Bradley, Mich.
 Brown, Ohio
 Buckley
 Bulwinkle
 Courtney
 Cox
 Crow
 Dawson, Ill.
 Dawson, Utah
 D'Ewart
 Domengeaux
 Elsaesser
 Evins
 Flannagan
 Fuller
 Gathings
 Gifford
 Gossett
 Hagen
 Heffernan
 Hoeven
 Jenison
 Keefe
 Kilburn
 Kunkel
 Lusk
 McGarvey

Flannagan	McGarvey	Rich
Fuller	Mansfield, Tex.	Sabath
Gathings	Miller, Nebr.	Sasscer
Gifford	Mitchell	Scott,
Gossett	Morrison	Hugh D., Jr.
Hagen	Murray, Wis.	Simpson, Ill.
Heffernan	Norrell	Smathers
Hoeven	Patman	Somers
Keefe	Pfeifer	Stanley
Kilburn	Philbin	Teague
Kunkel	Poage	Thomas, N. J.
Lusk	Powell	Wood
McDowell	Price, Fla.	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hoeven for, with Mr. Stanley against.
Mr. Courtney for, with Mr. Norrell against.
Mr. Flannagan for, with Mr. Wood against.
Mr. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Gathings against.
Mr. Heffernan for, with Mr. Teague against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Rich with Mr. Smathers.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Gossett.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Morrison.
Mr. Miller of Nebraska with Mrs. Lusk.
Mr. Kilburn with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Bradley of Michigan with Mr. Domenga.

Mr. Bender with Mr. Evins.
Mr. Hagen with Mr. Bonner.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Price of Florida.
Mr. Simpson of Illinois with Mr. Bland.
Mr. D'Ewart with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.
Mr. Crow with Mr. Sasser.
Mr. Bennett of Michigan with Mr. Cox.
Mr. Elsaesser with Mr. Mansfield of Texas.
Mr. Fuller with Mr. Philbin.
Mr. McGarvey with Mr. Poage.
Mr. Keefe with Mr. Boykin.
Mr. Gifford with Mr. Sabath.
Mr. Dawson of Utah with Mr. Patman.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is their objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 10 minutes today after the other special orders.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. R. 3245

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee of conference may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on H. R. 3245.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON H. R. 2798, 2799, 2780, AND 3492

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file reports on the bills H. R. 2798, 2799, 2780, and 3492.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOLCOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Arthur Krock appearing in the New York Times.

Mr. PLOESER (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an enlightening comment on the Texas City disaster.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include annual report, Washington County soil conservation district. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost \$213, 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.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short statement.

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

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

PERMANENT POSTAL RATES

Mr. VURSELL, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, submitted report (Rept. No. 410) to accompany H. R. 3519, to provide for permanent postal rates.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

PREPARE NOW TO DEFEND ALASKA AND CANAL ZONE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, now that we have charted a new course in international affairs, it seems to me we ought to be thinking in terms of preparedness for our country. Certainly our global activities are going to require the spending of a lot of money in the years ahead to keep ourselves prepared in such a way that we can resist any attack that might come from without at any time.

It seems to me that under the bill which we passed last week—the Greek-Turkish matter—that it was nothing more nor less than the pointing of a gun at one whom we consider in the future to be a possible armed adversary. Now, we have charted a course, and we must implement that course by making ourselves strong from a military standpoint. Now is the time to prepare; we cannot wait until the bombs fall.

Mr. Speaker, during the debate of the Greek-Turkish aid bill I charged that it was designed for military purposes; that it would not stop communism in those countries and it was not intended for that purpose. It was clear to many of us that the people of this country were entitled to know all of the facts with their vast implications and that it was the duty of the President to so state. In this respect he is derelict in his responsibilities.

Since passage of the bill the Greek and Turkish Governments have officially stated that the money authorized will be used for military purposes. Thus, we see that our money is going to prepare foreign nations against aggressive action by the Communists. Mr. Speaker, it is my conviction that this is equivalent to a declaration of war. If it is, we had better prepare for the next war, right now. We have pointed a gun at Russia. What would we do, Mr. Speaker, if that country decided to furnish money or military aid to Cuba or to a friendly country in South America? We would consider such action a violation of the Monroe Doctrine and tantamount to a declaration of war against us—and properly so. Thus, we have a situation involving the risk of war under the pretense that it will stop communism.

Mr. Speaker, as we survey the results of World War II, without bias or prejudice, we realize that a full and complete victory was not achieved. Hitler and his Nazis have been eliminated, but another evil has been substituted for them. The price of victory cannot be determined. Lives and the intangibles that make for victory are beyond estimation.

Mr. Speaker, today we wonder about that victory for we realize that our honored dead and those who served in this last war really meant that victory was to bring the "four freedoms" to all mankind. Unfortunately, we have substituted communism for nazism and in the wake of victory the world is about to be engulfed in another wave of political despotism. Red Joe Stalin is as bloody as Hitler and there is no place in a free world for people of this kind. So we are again in a period of suspense, trying desperately to meet the peril of the moment. We have reached another armistice when we had a right to believe we had achieved permanent peace.

Mr. Speaker, although the clouds are dark and ominous, I believe there is a bit of silver lining. When historians appraise the results of World War II, I believe they will record a major victory for all countries in the Western Hemisphere. That victory was climaxed by the Treaty of Chapultepec, signed in Mexico City on the 6th day of March 1945. A most important provision in that treaty provides for a unified defense system for the entire Western Hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, in our very sincere desire to help all the world, by the giving of our resources, we must never forget that we must remain strong at home, politically, economically, and militarily. Outstanding civilian statesmen, and there are many, say that the time has come for us to take account of our own resources

before it is too late. The Godless Communist element at home and abroad, of course, want us to become weak so their task of taking over will be that much easier. It would therefore seem clear that our primary responsibility is to make ourselves secure from attacks without and within. This is necessarily so because we live in a world of power, with two ideologies seeking control. I wish it were not so, but it is and we must face the future with realism.

Mr. Speaker, if we are realists in the matter of hemispheric defense, then we must rivet our attention on the state of our defenses in the Panama Canal Zone and in Alaska to avoid attack from without. There can be no denying that the Communists have alerted both areas. Let us not be fooled by the campaign to stop communism in Greece and Turkey and close our eyes to it right here in this hemisphere.

A very timely article by Jim Lucas in the Washington Daily News for May 19, bearing the headline "Are Communists Monkeying Around With Panama Canal?" directs attention to the necessity for action in that vital spot.

It appears, Mr. Speaker, that a Senate subcommittee is investigating charges that the CIO Public Workers of America in the Canal Zone are led by Communists. A reading of the article by Mr. Lucas seems to leave but little doubt that the Communists are preparing to take over in that area at the proper time. This is indeed a call to action; we are on notice. Our national security must be assured by proper action of our military services, not alone in Turkey and Greece but here at home. There must be no Pearl Harbor in the Panama Canal Zone or in Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, we consider now the Alaskan zone. It was good news to learn from a War Department release that a big bomber base is to be constructed in Alaska at a cost in excess of \$8,000,000. The program involves the building of a new runway, a huge hangar, and other strategic facilities. This is surely on a meager start.

It is common knowledge, Mr. Speaker, that Russia has its eyes on Alaska. Reports were circulated a short time ago that it was prepared to repudiate the sale of that territory to this country. Only a few months ago a returned Army officer told me about Russian military activities on the Kamchatka Peninsula only 500 miles from Attu. His statement was later confirmed by Mr. Lucas of Scripps-Howard, who reported airfields are under construction, warehouses and barracks have been built, roads have been improved, and waterways are being dredged. There is, in addition, ample evidence of increased Russian air activity over Alaska, and that is not "just for fun." If we are not careful a Pearl Harbor is a possibility here. We must keep in mind that in this air age this Alaskan territory is of great strategic value. It is rich in minerals and oils and in addition may some day be the center of commercial air routes over the top of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I do not pose as a military expert. Common sense would seem to indicate that a job of first importance must be tackled without delay.

The military experts must of necessity be called in to map out a plan of defense for Alaska. With due respect to them I venture to suggest a modest plan of action:

First. The immediate recruitment of military personnel.

Second. The promotion of a campaign to induce civilians to migrate to Alaska in order to develop its natural resources.

Third. The improvement of rail and truck facilities to the area. This means the construction of two or three hard-surfaced roads and the maintenance of a modern railroad.

Fourth. Increased and improved air and coast artillery facilities. Fighter- and bomber-plane bases are indispensable. We must have the best. The latest coast artillery equipment must be installed.

Fifth. Establishment and development of adequate naval bases, implemented by a strong air arm and undersea craft.

Sixth. Maintenance of advanced technological station equipped with powerful radar facilities.

Seventh. Statehood for Alaska. This is vitally needed for defense purposes.

Mr. Speaker, this first session of the Eightieth Congress is charged with an important responsibility. We can stop communism in the Western Hemisphere by acting courageously now. It took only a matter of a few weeks to pass the Greek-Turkish bill. Can we do less to protect and defend our very borders? Time is truly of the essence. Let it not be said of this Congress that it has been derelict in its duty. The time to act is now.

[From the Washington Daily News of May 19, 1947]

SENATE GROUP IS ASKING: "ARE COMMUNISTS MONKEYING AROUND WITH PANAMA CANAL?"

(By Jim G. Lucas)

A three-man Senate subcommittee is investigating charges that activities of the left-wing CIO Public Workers of America in the Panama Canal Zone are Communist-led.

The Senators are ZALES N. ECTON, Republican, Montana; EDWARD J. THYE, Republican, Minnesota; and HERBERT R. O'CONNOR, Democrat, Maryland. They have been hearing testimony on the effect of a recent Civil Service Commission ruling which opened civil-service rolls within the Canal Zone to citizens of Panama.

TWO PAY ROLLS

The ruling would abolish gold and silver rolls. In the Canal's early days, two pay rolls were given these designations. One group was paid in gold and the other in silver. This is no longer true, but American citizens on the gold roll receive higher wages for the same work as aliens on the silver roll.

The CIO Public Workers Union, composed principally of silver-roll employees, wants the change. The AFL and Canal Zone military leaders oppose it, the latter partly for security reasons.

IT'S IN A TREATY

Most jobs under the military there are noncivil service, but for jobs which have a civil-service classification, the Commission's rules and regulations must be followed. Arthur Flemming, of the Civil Service Commission, said the ruling giving Panama citizens the same job privileges as Americans was in line with guaranties under the Roosevelt-Arias treaty of 1939 but which were inoperative during the war.

Walter J. Jones, legislative representative for the Canal Zone Central Labor Union, an organization of gold-roll employees, testified the order meant "our files will be made available to persons who owe their allegiance to a foreign government."

LOTS OF PROPAGANDA

"There are agents who already are busy spreading their propaganda among the Panamanians," he said. "We have in the Canal Zone two representatives of the CIO Public Workers of America, J. L. Strobel and Robert Weinstein, who, along with their colleague, Leonard H. Goldsmith, have records of Communist activity, which have been published and which they have never denied."

"It is interesting to note that with the arrival of these gentlemen there began publication of a new Communist magazine 'ACLA' (Accion Comunista Latina Americana). This magazine is devoted to attacking 'Yankee imperialism' and extolling the virtues of the Soviet Union as the defender of Latin America. Their records show they have done nothing but create chaos and confusion in the minds of the workers."

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Here's what happened when Mr. Weinstein appeared before the committee:

Senator O'CONNOR: "Are you a member of the Communist Party?"

Mr. WEINSTEIN: "No; I am not, sir."

Senator O'CONNOR (referring to the magazine Plain Talk): "I find reference to this fact:

"Robert Weinstein was an instructor at the Communist Jefferson School. He has been active in numerous fronts and has a record which might be the envy of many a Communist leader."

Mr. WEINSTEIN: "It doesn't say I did it. It says 'A Robert Weinstein.'"

Senator O'CONNOR: "It says Robert Weinstein, and I understand you are the Robert Weinstein to whom this reference is made."

Mr. WEINSTEIN: "That is right. I do not exactly recall the date, Senator, but about, I guess, a couple of years ago, the publicity department of our organization sent me a memo saying there was a round-table discussion at the Jefferson School on the various questions confronting labor organizations. I went over about 8 o'clock one evening and * * * stayed there 50 minutes. I never got paid and I presume that is what he means."

Senator O'CONNOR: "It says the Robert Weinstein to whom reference is made signed Communist election petition No. 2366 on September 21, 1941."

Mr. WEINSTEIN: "Doesn't it say 'A Robert Weinstein?'"

Senator O'CONNOR: "That is right."

Mr. WEINSTEIN: "It doesn't say me."

Senator O'CONNOR: "Did the Public Workers Union during the last year or so adopt any resolution commenting on the foreign policy of our country or of Russia?"

Mr. WEINSTEIN: "At our last convention in Atlantic City we adopted a resolution asking for the withdrawal of troops from, I don't think we mentioned places, but from foreign countries."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is recognized for 30 minutes.

CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITATIONS ON POWERS OF THE EXECUTIVE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I think there is one subject upon which we can all agree regardless of which side of the House we sit, and that subject

is national security. I congratulate the gentleman who just spoke, Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin, for his splendid presentation of facts relating to that subject. I am going to talk for a few minutes on the same subject.

Mr. Speaker, it not infrequently happens on the floor of Congress that when a legislative proposal is made or one is opposed that some Member will inquire, "Have you not confidence in your President to execute the law?" I shall not attempt to express my views in answer to this question, but instead will let Thomas Jefferson reply to the inquiry. Here is what he said on the question of confidence in the men chosen to make and to execute our laws:

It would be a dangerous delusion if our confidence in the man of our choice should silence our fears for the safety of our rights. Confidence is everywhere the parent of despotism. Free government is founded on jealousy, not on confidence. It is jealousy and not confidence which prescribes limited constitutions to bind down those whom we are obliged to trust with power. Our Constitution has accordingly fixed the limits to which, and no further, our confidence will go. In questions of power, then, let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution.

I know of no time when it is more essential to fix the limits to which, and no further, our confidence in those whom we are obliged to trust with power will go, than to establish that limit right now.

The American people have been put on notice by a series of acts on the part of those in positions of trust and confidence in the Government that our fundamental liberties are in imminent danger of destruction from within from officials sworn to preserve, protect, and defend our liberties from spoliation.

This is the hour of all times in our history when the enemies of our Republic are operating within our Government. A free people and their chosen Representatives in Congress should be on the alert to protect and defend their Government from all subversive activities. It may not be inappropriate at this time to recall the words of Joseph Story, Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court 1811 to 1845:

Let the American people never forget that they possess a noble inheritance bought by the toils, suffering, and blood of their ancestors; and capably, if wisely improved and faithfully guarded, of transmitting to their latest posterity all the substantial blessing of life, the peaceful enjoyment of liberty, property, religion, and independence.

The structure has been erected by architects of consummate skill and fidelity; its foundations are solid; its compartments are beautiful, as well as useful; its arrangements are full of wisdom and order, and its defenses are impregnable from without. It has been reared for immortality, if the work of man may justly aspire to such a title.

It may, nevertheless, perish in an hour by the folly or corruption or negligence of its only keepers—the people. Republics are created by the virtue, public spirit and intelligence of the citizens. They fall when the wise are banished from the public councils because they dare to be honest, and the profligate are rewarded because they flatter the people in order to betray them.

I observe that practically every man who takes the floor to warn his colleagues

and the people of an impending danger to the Republic, either from forces within or from without, is immediately attacked by left-wing newspapers and magazines. This is no time, however, for a Representative in Congress to shrink from his duty of fighting for the security of his Nation as well as for the people he has the honor to represent.

A serious situation has arisen in connection with the trade agreement negotiations at Geneva, Switzerland, which negotiations are now being conducted by our State Department with numerous foreign nations with respect to the tariff rates of the respective negotiating nations.

Since March 26, 1947, the Ways and Means Committee of the House has been conducting hearings with reference to the operation of the Trade Agreement Act and the creation of a proposed International Trade Organization. The first witness who appeared and testified before the Ways and Means Committee was William L. Clayton, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, Department of State. Early in his testimony I inquired of Mr. Clayton how large the delegation accompanying him to Geneva would be. His reply was: "I think about 80. Counting the secretarial service, stenographers, and so on, I think it will be about 100."

On page 18 of the hearings held March 28, Secretary Clayton testified:

The meeting in Geneva will be attended by representatives of 18 countries to do two things. One is to further discuss and attempt to agree upon a charter for the International Trade Organization which subsequently will be submitted to the Congress or the parliaments of the different countries, and the other is to negotiate among those 18 countries reciprocal-trade agreements having to do with elimination of discriminations in trade and the reduction of barriers to international trade.

In response to an inquiry to have the names of the 18 countries meeting in Geneva, Secretary Clayton named Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, India, Lebanon, Luxemburg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom, and the United States.

During the hearing I asked Secretary Clayton whether or not he could furnish the Ways and Means Committee the actual items which he would use for the purpose of trading at the Geneva Conference. Mr. Clayton said, "We would be glad to furnish a list of those commodities, Mr. REED."

The list referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 8, 1947.
The Honorable DANIEL A. REED,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. REED: Under the pressure of preparing to get away for the Geneva Conference Mr. Clayton was not able to communicate with you regarding a matter which arose in connection with his appearance before your committee on March 28 and requested me to do so. You asked him to furnish the committee a list of the items we were to use for the purpose of trading at the Geneva Conference. In his reply he evidently had in mind our published list of November 9, 1946, and said that he would be glad to furnish a list of those commodities for the

record. I am informed that my associates have supplied the clerk of your committee with a copy of that list.

I find, however, that according to the record you requested him to "furnish the committee in a confidential way the actual items to use—which you are to use for the purpose of trading at the Geneva Conference." This leads me to believe that you may have had a different list of products in mind.

As Mr. Clayton explained to the chairman on March 26, they are going to Geneva as a set of traders to negotiate with representatives of other governments and they cannot very well make public to the world the limits of our negotiating ability. I think Mr. Clayton also made it clear in answering Mr. Kean's question on March 29 that the delegation needs to carry all of its bargaining power with it.

If you feel that the list which has been supplied for the record is not responsive to your request, I should appreciate having this letter inserted at the appropriate place in the record so that the reasons why Mr. Clayton was unable to comply with your request may be known.

Sincerely yours,

WILLARD L. THORP,
Assistant Secretary.

Representative KEAN inquired of Secretary Clayton whether or not he intended to take any businessmen over to Geneva in connection with the proposed negotiations of trade agreements:

Mr. KEAN. Are you taking any businessmen over?

Mr. CLAYTON. We are not taking any businessmen, as such, over. It has been decided, I think, that other delegations will not generally take businessmen over. We have consulted very frequently, however, Mr. KEAN, with businessmen, not only in the trade agreement matters through these hearings, where, as I have said, they have had a thousand briefs filed with the Department, with the Trade Agreements Committee; we have had over 500 witnesses appear and all of the vast amount of information has been carefully collected and digested and studied. Every interest in the country had an opportunity to present its case, and we had many informal conferences as well; that is on the trade agreements. In the ITO—

Mr. KEAN. I am not asking about those; I just had in mind the trade agreements.

Mr. CLAYTON. About trade agreements; yes.

Mr. KEAN. I was just thinking that as to the Yankee bargaining you are talking about, that when a certain suggestion is made by a foreign government it would seem to me, in spite of all this data you have got, it might be a subject matter on which you would like to know from somebody who knows their stuff exactly what was involved.

Mr. CLAYTON. We have tried to get all of that information in the hearing; the law provides for that, and we will go over all of that information ourselves carefully and fully on these subjects prior to getting to Geneva. I am sure that you could understand that with all this vast information covering the vast number and variety of commodities that are involved, both imports into this country and exports to other countries that are comprised in our total economy that it would be almost impossible to take a man over that would be familiar with any great number of those commodities, so that we have had to try to get our information and to get the views of these people in these preliminary hearings. Also obviously the day-to-day negotiations and trading back and forth cannot be made public.

Mr. KEAN. That is right.

Mr. CLAYTON. In the end everything is made public, but what you say you will do today and what you say you will do tomorrow,

and what the other country says they will do, and so forth, from hour to hour and from day to day in this negotiation cannot be made public.

Mr. KEAN. If some of these businessmen who think that their industry is going to be particularly affected were to decide to go to Geneva at their own expense, do you think some of your people would be willing occasionally to consult with them?

Mr. CLAYTON. I do not think there is any doubt about that; that is to say, to talk with them. But we could not tell them, we could not give away our case to them.

Mr. KEAN. No; but you can say, if such and such a thing were done, how would it affect you?

Mr. CLAYTON. Of course, all those questions have been gone into, Mr. Kean, in great detail. We have got a vast record of just such questions as that, and answers.

I have called attention to the testimony to show that Mr. Clayton considers it most important to hold in strict secrecy, even from Congress and from businessmen, farmers, and industrialists, the items upon which to bargain and trade with foreign nations relating to concessions to be made in trade agreements. If it be true that for Yankee trading purposes neither Congress nor business interests can be trusted to know what items on the list may be subjected to a tariff cut, I say that no Communist in Secretary Clayton's group in Geneva should be permitted to have the information.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. It may be of interest to the gentleman if I make this statement: Last year, along about July or August the industry of this country was expecting Mr. Clayton to publish that list. He later did publish it, but never got around to doing it until after the election. I wrote a letter to the State Department and called their attention to the fact and asked them if that was not the principal factor. Sure enough, they did not publish the list until just after the election.

Mr. REED of New York. And then they did not outline the trading items.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. That is right; they did not make it public until they had to.

Mr. REED of New York. Is there even a top secret in the State Department that is not known to the Communists and their fellow travelers in the State Department? Why should there be Communists in the American group at Geneva? Is it their philosophy to preserve and protect this Government of ours; or is it their philosophy to undermine it through every device at their command? Is it to be supposed that any secret in our trading program is unknown which the Communists believe will enable them to weaken our trading position at Geneva? Surely the Communists or their fellow travelers could penetrate no Department of the United States Government where their activities could and would be more destructive to our Republic.

The trade-agreement group at Geneva holds the power of life and death over large segments of our economy, yet in it and a part of this group are Communists. Not one agreement should be negotiated

or executed until the group with Secretary Clayton at Geneva has been purged of its subversive element.

Now, I am not here making an idle charge. I have definite information that there is quite a large percentage of that group of 100 or more that was taken over to Geneva who are either Communists or fellow travelers. What are they there for? We know there has been a lot of smoke, and there certainly is fire in that State Department. I am not quarreling with Mr. Clayton and I am not charging him with being a Communist except that I believe he could have found out before he went over there what the members of his negotiating group stood for as between Americanism and communism. If our businessmen cannot be trusted and if the Congress cannot be trusted, why let these Communists and fellow travelers be in that group where they may be in position to warn Communists from other nations against the interests of this Nation?

I have reliable information that a substantial percent of his group are either Communists or Communist sympathizers or have had previous connections with Communist organizations. I have this day, therefore, introduced a resolution which reads as follows:

Resolution creating a select committee to investigate the loyalty of certain assistants and advisers to the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation to determine whether any persons among those assistants and advisers to the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs who are in Geneva, Switzerland, for the purpose of assisting the Under Secretary in the negotiation of trade agreements with certain foreign governments, are, or at any time have been, (1) members of the Communist Party or (2) sympathetic with the general aims of the Communist Party.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) on or before August 1, 1947, the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I want to compliment the gentleman on what he

has stated today. I hope his resolution will be adopted. May I ask the gentleman if he has seen the current reports about the Geneva Conference? I get this from the New York papers and the International Chamber of Commerce that at the Geneva Conference Mr. Clayton has found, because of the Communists and the Socialists in the other nations, and because he represents a country where free enterprise is still the guiding principle, he cannot deal with them because he must come back and get his report finally from the people who yet rule in this country; but the emissaries from those other countries can deal right away, one representing a dictator, on representing a communistic country. They can deal together, but we cannot deal with them. We have no business in that conference.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman. The fact remains there are Communists or fellow travelers in this organization at Geneva who can transmit any information they want to the Communist members of other nations and so absolutely sabotage any efforts we may make on a trading proposition. It is a reflection on the American public, on our businessmen not to be able to know whether or not he is being traded away by a little group of Communists within this organization. I say that not a single trade agreement nor one transaction should go on in Geneva until we clean the slate of this subversive element that is operating within our Government and in the one department in which we should have national security.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I think the gentleman has answered my question already. I wanted to ask him, does he not believe that there is much more danger from subversive elements within our own Government than from without?

Mr. REED of New York. There is no question about it. They are working from within and then they are being taken abroad at the expense of this Nation to give away secrets. They are not there for any good purpose because their philosophy is against free enterprise.

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

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLEVINGER. As a Member of the Committee on Agriculture, and backed up by a couple of my fellow Members, I want to say that I have addressed an inquiry to the Secretary of Agriculture, to Mr. Nichols of the State Department, and to the heads of all groups that have come before the Committee on Agriculture recently endorsing this reciprocal-trade program, with the challenge to bring me one item that would show a definite gain for America or American agriculture, and I want to say to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from New York, that up to this good hour I have been promised, but I have never received one single item that can definitely be said to be a gain for America.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman. I will say this, that similar

questions have been propounded by the members of our Ways and Means Committee, and we have as yet failed to receive an answer showing that they have made any contribution to the business of this country.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, if the gentleman will again look at the record of the testimony before our committee, the Committee on Ways and Means, he will find that I put a question to Mr. Clayton as to what he expected to do when he got to Geneva. He said he expected to build up a charter for the ITO but, he said, "That meeting is only the preliminary meeting. From that we expect to go on to the great world meeting"—to the great millennium, although he did not use those terms—when all the nations of the world would be there. And, I suppose, we will be dividing up what is left for their benefit.

Mr. REED of New York. The whole Government seems to be permeated with this godless ideology. I do not attach too much importance to these headlines because it comes out of a trial in court and, every man is presumed to be innocent until he is proven guilty. But, here are some headlines: "Reds plotted army's recall. Communists urged to enlist to destroy morale." So, we hear all these disclosures inimical to the security of our Government, but we have heard more, perhaps, about the infiltration of Communists into the State Department than almost any other Department of Government. Now, you cannot tell me that the head of that Department at this time, when we are carrying on transactions in all parts of the world, is unable to clean house and find honest men who are not Communists or fellow travelers to carry on the affairs of this great Nation through the State Department.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

FIRE PREVENTION

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Eightieth Congress has given considerable attention to measures which will save the lives of people abroad. We have been generous. We have fought starvation and suffering. We have labored to alleviate conditions which might cause disability and death. I have been pleased to give my vote for these worthy causes.

But I now rise, Mr. Speaker, to ask this House to give consideration to saving the lives of American citizens in the United States. I beg the Congress to act to spare another mother from the suffering that befell Mrs. Stella Kreskowski, a constituent of mine living in Passaic, N. J., who had one young son burned to death and another who spent a year in a hospital and another year in a home for crippled children because of burns received when their play suits caught fire.

I ask Congress to act before we see another tragedy such as struck the Zibor family, also of Passaic, N. J., whose small son, burned when his cowboy suit ignited, spent a year in the Passaic General Hospital, where he was given 17

blood transfusions and underwent 11 skin-grafting operations.

I pray for congressional action in the name of the more than 11,000 Americans who will die in fires during the course of this year. Is Congress ready to do what it can to save some of these lives? I have cited some sad instances that occurred in my own District, but such accidents are not limited by any geographical bounds, and will occur this year in every State and district.

Does Congress intend to do its part to prevent tragedies such as occurred in the Winecoff Hotel in Atlanta, in the Canfield Hotel in Dubuque, Iowa, in the LaSalle Hotel in Chicago? Congress has the power to aid in preventing catastrophes such as those that sent hundreds to flaming and horrible deaths in the Coconut Grove in Boston, and in the blazing circus tents in Hartford. Will Congress do nothing to prevent the merciless killing and maiming of helpless children who wear playsuits that are nothing but death traps?

Several bills are pending in the present Congress that will prohibit the shipment of highly flammable fabrics in interstate commerce. One of these bills, H. R. 505, I introduced early this session. The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has held hearings on this problem, and has considered the bills which have been introduced. I hope that in the near future it will report out a bill, containing proper prohibitions. To delay is dangerous.

Meanwhile, I cannot understand those segments of our business world that say, "This is not the time for such legislation," and offer no solutions of their own. This attitude is shamefully un-American. If industry were to meet this problem squarely, as indeed several textile companies have, it would take the necessary steps to prevent these holocausts, and it would not be necessary for Congress to move. But when representatives of some textile industries come before a committee of Congress and say they are opposed to any legislation of this nature, and take no steps to keep their products from enveloping our fellow citizens, even our children, from tortuous and fiery deaths, offer no substitute proposal or concrete plan to remove this peril from the American scene, then it is up to Congress to act.

Early this month President Truman called a conference of the outstanding fire prevention experts of the country. These authorities, from all parts of the United States and representing all phases of our economy, meeting here in Washington, endorsed appropriate legislation to remove highly flammable textiles and apparel from the markets.

A May 7 newspaper account of this meeting states:

Alarmed over the increasing incidence of disastrous fires which have exacted a heavy toll of both life and property, the Conference on Fire Prevention, convened at President Truman's request, adopted without revision a report of its committee on building construction, operation, and protection. The report singled out the types of merchandise the committee concluded should be kept out of circulation as a dangerous fire hazard for all types of buildings.

"Long-nap fabrics of a material more flammable than wool, silk, and nylon and other highly flammable materials are extremely dangerous as wearing apparel," the President's conference agreed. "Celluloid buttons and trimmings and pyroxylin-coated materials are also dangerous. A garment should not be made out of material so flammable that, if ignited, the wearer cannot divest himself of it without getting seriously burned."

The conference did not limit itself to condemning flammable wearing apparel. Such materials take hundreds of lives each year, but it takes a major disaster, such as a hotel or night-club or circus fire, to focus the spotlight of public attention on the dangers of flammable textiles and fabrics. On these, the report of the President's conference says:

Flammable draperies, decorations, upholstering, rugs, and bedding were said to have contributed significantly to the spread of fire and mounting loss of life in those structures. Combustible decorative trim, although part of the building structure, nevertheless, falls in the same category.

Consideration should be given to the flameproofing of flammable fabrics, decorations, draperies, and clothing, or avoiding the use of such flammable materials when possible in buildings where the public is admitted, such as hospitals, hotels, theaters, auditoriums, restaurants, and night clubs.

This is not the first time that this matter has been called to our attention by experts. Last summer the Eastern Association of Fire Chiefs, meeting in New York, termed the United States "the world's No. 1 fire trap," and pointed out that within a year 11,000 lives would be lost in fires, and that property damage would amount to \$600,000,000.

In March of this year, Life magazine presented a study on this very subject. It recalled the narrow escape from death of a New York girl whose flowing tulle dress ignited when she merely danced over a cigarette carelessly tossed on the floor. Life conducted experiments, and dressed a manikin in yards of gauzy rayon net, long a favorite party-dress fabric. When a burning match was touched to the skirt the dress exploded into flames, and in 14 seconds the dummy was reduced to a smoking, sizzling ruin. Right here in the District of Columbia, as well as in New Jersey and every part of the country, this horrible accident has occurred, not to dummies, but to human beings.

When I introduced H. R. 505 last January I received a message which typifies the call that is being made on Congress. This telegram is from a constituent of mine, Irving Sukinik, of Passaic, N. J., and it says:

We lost our little boy last June through one of the cowboy suits that you are trying to outlaw. We thank you for your efforts to spare other parents the pain that we endured. If I can do anything in any way to further the bill, please let me know.

Is Congress ready to move to spare other parents such pain? Are we ready to do our part to combat death by burning in the United States? Or are we to yield to the temporizers who see the loss of profits in remedial legislation? No

real American would ever approve clothing an infant with a garment that could in seconds make that infant a human torch. "Theirs not to reason why, theirs but to burn and die?" Never. Congress will not fail America's boys and girls.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to include certain tables in the remarks he made today.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

ADMINISTRATION WANTONLY DESTROYS FOOD

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, today the House authorized the appropriation of large sums of money to provide food for starving people in other countries. These people cannot eat money, so it takes food. Therefore, I shall talk about food, and in particular about potatoes. Potatoes are a vital and nutritious food and there should be no waste of them.

I call upon Secretary Anderson to halt the Department of Agriculture's wanton destruction of potatoes as it goes on today.

Some of us had thought that the new dealers' philosophy of scarcity—plowing under of crops—had been thoroughly exploded. But they are at it again—and at a time when food prices are high and people abroad are starving.

It is bad enough to destroy food in a hungry world, but when imports into this country of the same commodity occur simultaneously, the sinful policy becomes a worse scandal.

While Department of Agriculture agents pour kerosene on huge piles of new potatoes in Alabama, North Carolina, Virginia, and other Southern States, potatoes come in from Canada to supply those markets, and at higher prices for consumers already staggering under the cost of living.

The country must have been shocked by recent publication in newspapers of pictures of wanton destruction of potatoes. That was only part of the story. I have in my possession bills of lading and tags proving that potatoes are being imported for sale in the very territory where farmers are being paid not to harvest their crops.

This situation is on a parity with the reckless and ill-planned buying of wheat by the Commodity Credit Corporation for export to needy countries abroad. This buying set off a wild rise of \$1 a bushel in the price of wheat.

That means higher prices for flour, bread, and other wheat products. Wheat being a bellwether crop, its price usually sets the pace for corn and other grain, and meat.

The Agriculture Department pours kerosene on newly harvested potatoes to make them unfit for human or animal consumption and for any other use. I am sure that there are thousands of low-income families in all parts of the country, and particularly in the South, who cannot afford to pay from 5 cents to 10 cents a pound for new potatoes.

Giving the surplus potatoes to these families would not destroy the purpose of the price-support program. There are civic agencies that would be happy to have some of these potatoes to distribute among the less fortunate families.

Congress is appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars to feed hungry peoples in other countries. Potatoes are a staple food. Surely the hungry peoples overseas would be happy to have surplus American potatoes.

Unfortunately, the surplus does not apply in other commodities. Witness the high prices for food generally. The only exception is found in the prices of certain manufactured dairy products. I hope the foreigners do not get a false impression of the food supply in America from pictures showing potatoes being wantonly destroyed.

The price-support program for potatoes does not add up. Our Government destroys potatoes after paying the farmers to produce them. Creating a scarcity in supply literally invites foreign countries to produce more potatoes to be sold in the United States.

During the last 8 months Canadian producers have shipped to the United States approximately 5,000,000 bushels of potatoes. These potatoes are now being sold to consumers throughout the Northeastern States at a price range from 6 to 10 cents a pound.

A typical illustration of what is going on in the potato program can be found at Richmond, Va. Several carloads of Canadian potatoes are being sold weekly to consumers at Richmond.

The wholesale price of Canadian potatoes at Richmond has advanced from \$3.60 to \$4.50 per 100 pounds during the last 30 days. There is a shortage of potatoes at Richmond.

However, investigation reveals that the Department of Agriculture is paying potato producers within 30 miles of Richmond \$2.25 per hundredweight to destroy potatoes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Last summer in North Carolina—you may have the figures—there were literally hundreds of thousands of bushels of potatoes that they did not dig up.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. That is much closer to Richmond than Canada is.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am going to mention a point 80 miles from Richmond. I have a letter from a farmer living in North Carolina about 80 miles from Richmond. The report from this farmer in North Carolina advised me that the Government has paid him for not digging his potatoes this year. This farmer states that the Government agent had him dig up one row in order to permit the agent to estimate the entire crop. He could easily have sold his potatoes in the Richmond market but it would have been in competition with Canadian potatoes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I have never seen the figures as to how many millions or hundreds of millions of bushels of potatoes they did not dig up. We can see those that they do dig up and burn and destroy, and so forth.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am going to touch on that.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Do you have the figures on that?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes, I have.

During the last 12 months, the Federal Government has spent \$3,235,000 to support the price of potatoes in Virginia, and producers in that State have received \$2.25 per hundredweight, less handling charges, to destroy their potatoes. Around 442,000 bushels of Virginia potatoes were destroyed at a cost of \$450,000.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Probably you heard me tell the Committee on Agriculture about 20,000 bushels of potatoes being dumped on a single farm in my congressional district. The farmer got \$2.70 per hundred for them, and now the people are paying excessive prices. It has not been going on only in the South. Throughout Pennsylvania and New Jersey it is full of it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. But we are dealing now with new potatoes that are being destroyed in the South. New potatoes are being sold in Washington and eastern cities at from 5 to 10 cents a pound. For the old potatoes, to which the gentleman refers, we are getting Canadian potatoes in this country that are taking the market here at a higher price than the gentleman's farmers are receiving.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Are they going to carry this on this year? Is the 1947 crop going to be dumped also?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. This program is now being carried on. If the gentleman saw the picture in last Sunday's Star, he would notice the big pile of potatoes down in Alabama that Government agents were pouring kerosene on so that the low-income families down there, who did not have the money to buy potatoes, could not eat them.

Mr. GROSS. The farmers do not want to do this kind of business.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No, indeed; they do not.

Mr. GROSS. The fellows in my district had red faces, that the Government made them dump the potatoes. They did not want to do that.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman spoke about red faces. I saw the picture of those potatoes in the paper but I did not see any story about it. Did the gentleman see any story? The paper showed the picture of those potatoes being destroyed.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, the pictures spoke for themselves. No additional story was necessary.

But getting back to the situation that prevails here, I have said that Maine

was our big potato-producing State. They produced 77,000,000 bushels of potatoes last year and the Government stepped in and bought 13,282,000 bushels at a price of \$2.20 per hundredweight, less handling charges for those surplus potatoes. More than 12,000,000 bushels of Maine potatoes were destroyed, at a cost of \$12,000,000 to American taxpayers.

It seems to me that the Maine farmers could have supplied some of their high-quality potatoes to the eastern market, rather than have them destroyed and the market turned over to foreign producers.

Secretary Anderson has been advocating a policy of abundance. I urge him to give his attention to the sinful destruction of potatoes.

I also call upon President Truman, when he inveighs against the high cost of living, to tell the people about the impact on prices that buying for foreign relief has upon prices paid by American consumers.

I do not question that we should give relief to the starving abroad. But let us not have any red herrings, such as blaming the farmers for the high cost of food.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Gross]?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Is it true that the Government has made a lot of whisky out of potatoes?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, I do not know that potato whisky is being sold, but I do know that large quantities of these potatoes were sold at 5 cents per bag, and made into alcohol.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know how this potato whisky compares with the good old corn or rye whisky?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will have to beg off on that because I am not a judge of whisky.

Our Government since July 1946, has bought 87,000,000 bushels of potatoes at a net cost of \$80,000,000, to carry out the price-support program. Of this gigantic purchase, 22,000,000 bushels were destroyed. That will be news to the housewife when she goes to market.

It never was the intention of the price-support program to bring about a scarcity of potatoes or any other agricultural commodity in this country, so as to provide a support price and a market for potatoes produced in another country.

This is the second year that the Department of Agriculture has pursued its wanton destruction of a necessity of life. No changes have been made in policies in the light of last year's experience.

The Truman administration should learn from experience. If the ill-advised policies now in operation are continued, they will shake confidence in the entire price-support program for all agricultural commodities.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. J. Res. 153) entitled "Joint resolution providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HOEVEN (at the request of Mr. DOLLIVER), until May 26, 1947, on account of business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 193. An act to amend section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437; 30 USC. sec. 191), as amended;

H. R. 1584. An act authorizing the erection and operation of a memorial museum and ship on the Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho; and

H. R. 2123. An act to amend the Locomotive Inspection Act of February 17, 1911, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 22, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

699. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 24, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on, and a preliminary examination and survey of, Big Sandy River and Tug and Levisa Forks, Ky., W. Va., and Va., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on January 10, 1940, and authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 22, 1936, and an act of Congress approved on June 25, 1936 (H. Doc. No. 264), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed, with six illustrations.

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. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1436. A bill to repeal the prohibition against the filling of a vacancy in the office of district judge in the southern district of New York; without amendment (Rept. No. 408). Referred to the Committee

of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 214. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 814, a bill to provide support for wool, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 409). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. VURSELL: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 3519. A bill to provide for permanent postal rates; without amendment (Rept. No. 410). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 2798. A bill to amend section 5, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 411). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 2800. A bill to amend section 5 of Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 412). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 2799. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, title IV of the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 413). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 3492. A bill to provide for the expeditious disposition of certain war housing, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 414). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MUNDT: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 3342. A bill to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries, and by means of public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people, and its policies; with an amendment (Rept. No. 416). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Agriculture was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2472) to provide expert assistance and to cooperate with Federal, State, and other suitable agencies in promoting the conservation of wildlife by promoting sound land-use practices, and for other purposes, and the same was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: H. R. 3554. A bill providing for the incorporation of the Franco-American War Veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSSETT: H. R. 3555. A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH: H. R. 3556. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended to provide annuities for United States marshals and deputy marshals of the courts of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 3557. A bill to amend the Federal Insurance Contributions Act with respect to rates of tax on employers and employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3558. A bill providing for the incorporation of the Franco-American War Veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OWENS:

H. R. 3559. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to make the overtime compensation provisions of such act applicable with respect to employees of common carriers by railroad; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 3560. A bill to amend Public Law 242 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, entitled "An act to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War With Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 3561. A bill to accord free entry to bona fide gifts from members of the armed forces of the United States on duty abroad; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3562. A bill to authorize the sale and grant of certain public lands and water rights to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., for water and power-supply purposes, and repealing certain acts dealing with withdrawn lands and the sale of lands in Inyo and Mono Counties, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BRADLEY of California:

H. R. 3563. A bill to provide a government for Guam, and to confer United States citizenship upon certain of the inhabitants thereof; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 3564. A bill to provide a government for American Samoa, and to confer United States citizenship upon certain of the inhabitants thereof; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 3565. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide loans for the construction of low- and medium-cost homes for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 3566. A bill to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Ohio:

H. R. 3567. A bill to correct an inequity existing in the case of holders of adjusted-service certificates who did not accept payment in bonds under the Adjusted Compensation Payment Act, 1936; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 3568. A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of an additional number of aliens of Italian nationality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3569. A bill to authorize the construction of a chapel and a library at the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y., and to authorize the acceptance of private contributions to assist in defraying the cost of construction thereof; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 3570. A bill to establish the Cowpens Battleground National Military Park; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3571. A bill to create a United States Civil Service Board of Appeals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. J. Res. 205. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell timber within the Tongass National Forest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. J. Res. 206. Joint resolution to prohibit the increase of rents in federally owned housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VORYS:

H. J. Res. 207. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Con. Res. 49. Concurrent resolution against adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of May 1, 1947; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. Con. Res. 50. Concurrent resolution against adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of May 1, 1947; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. Res. 215. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate the loyalty of certain assistants and advisers to the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GRANT of Alabama:

H. R. 3572. A bill to place John P. Shaffer on the emergency officers' retired list, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GWINN of New York:

H. R. 3573. A bill to authorize the cancellation of deportation proceedings in the case of Helena Bielska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEFEVRE:

H. R. 3574. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Gardner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. R. 3575. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Morris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 3576. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bernice T. Mackey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3577. A bill for the relief of Ewing Choat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

549. By Mr. BUFFETT: Petition of 23 citizens of Elmwood, Neb., petitioning for canning sugar so that the fresh fruit will not need to go to waste this year; to the Committee on Agriculture.

550. By Mr. HARNESS of Indiana: Petition of Mrs. Laura E. Kindley and 60 others, of Huntington County, Ind., urging enactment of S. 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

551. By Mr. HART: Petition of United Synagogues of the Hoboken Jewish Community, urging the immediate admission to Palestine of 100,000 Jews in accordance with the President's repeated request and the unanimous recommendation of the Anglo-American Commission last year; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

552. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of Miss Loleta Shipp and other members of Local 487, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, in needle industry, Chariton, Iowa, in opposition to the present labor legislation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

553. By Mr. FELLOWS: Memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the ninety-third legisla-

tive session assembled respectfully petitioning and urging the Members of Congress that the existence of the Marine Corps be assured by amendment to any merger bill, such amendment specifically providing that the United States Marine Corps shall continue to serve as our Nation's amphibious troops and as a force in instant readiness to protect our Nation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 22, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

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

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of our Fathers, give unto us, Thy servants, a true appreciation of our heritage, of great men and great deeds in the past, but let us not be intimidated by feelings of our own inadequacy for this troubled hour. Remind us that the God they worshiped and by whose help they laid the foundations of our Nation is still able to help us uphold what they bequeathed and to give it new meanings. Remind us that we are not called to fill the places of those who have gone, but to fill our own places, to do the work Thou hast laid before us, to do the right as Thou hast given us to see the right, always to do the very best we can, and to leave the rest to Thee. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 21, 1947, 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	Hawkes	O'Connor
Bail	Hayden	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hill	Pepper
Bricker	Hoey	Reed
Bridges	Holland	Revercomb
Brooks	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kem	Smith
Cain	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capehart	Knowland	Stewart
Capper	Lodge	Taft
Chavez	Lucas	Taylor
Connally	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McClellan	Thye
Cordon	McFarland	Tobey
Donnell	McGrath	Tydings
Downey	McKellar	Umstead
Dworshak	McMahon	Vandenberg
Eaton	Magnuson	Wagner
Ellender	Malone	Watkins
Ferguson	Martin	Wherry
Flanders	Maybank	White
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
George	Moore	Williams
Green	Morse	Wilson
Gurney	Murray	Young
Hatch	Myers	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent by leave of the Senate.