

get a square deal for the veterans of North Dakota. There, veterans have to travel to Minneapolis or Chicago. They simply have not been taken care of.

Mr. AIKEN. From all I can learn, the Senators from North Dakota were very successful, because it is my understanding that the area served from Minneapolis is by far the best handled of any area in the United States, and that my own area in the northeastern area of the United States is served very poorly. I could name one or two other areas that have been served badly also.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. YOUNG. The senior Senator from North Dakota is absolutely correct as to the situation existing in our section of the country. I should go a step further, however, and state that in order to correct the situation some of the trucks would have to be transported to areas where there are none. For example, we hear that in Dallas, Tex., 7,000 trucks are to be sold. Prospective buyers in our part of the country hear that 200 or 300 may be available to them. They must go to Minneapolis to see them; but in order to get them they must go as far as Columbus, Ohio, or even farther. I believe that a veterans' preference would help somewhat.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in conclusion I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Speaking of Surpluses," published in the Washington Daily News of yesterday.

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

#### SPEAKING OF SURPLUSES

Do you know what the War Assets Administration is? It's the successor to the War Assets Corporation. That was the successor to the Surplus Property Administration. That was the successor to the Surplus Property Board. That was the successor to the Surplus Property Administration.

Do you still wonder why the public doesn't get a chance to buy surplus war goods?

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Night before last I received a call from a veteran in Florida, who stated that six road graders, or something of the sort, had been offered for sale with veterans' preference. This particular veteran wanted only one for the small contracting business upon which he was entering. They were sold to someone for \$115 or \$120 for all six. The veteran then went to see the person who had bought the articles to buy one, and the owner wanted \$100 for one. Obviously the method of selling all six at once eliminated any possibility of the ordinary veteran receiving any aid from the act.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I have in mind a young serviceman from my own town who thought he would get a surplus bulldozer and go into business for himself, with two or three other servicemen, digging

cellars, which are in considerable demand, even though it is impossible to obtain anything to put on top of them. He wanted to go into business digging cellars, ponds, and things of that kind, for which there is a good demand. He learned of some surplus bulldozers offered for sale. He traveled a considerable distance to try to purchase one of them, and was told that he would have to buy eight or none at all. Of course, eight bulldozers for one young serviceman with perhaps three or four thousand dollars saved up were out of the question, so he had to return home without any.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. It seems to me that the whole policy is to deal with large operators, and that the administration has not established a fair policy toward the individual veteran or the small purchaser.

Mr. AIKEN. The speculators seem to be getting the goods. Anyone wishing surplus Army goods must buy them through a speculator. Not long ago the State of New York bought 50,000 pairs of surplus nurses' shoes. I was told by a very competent authority who had to do with the purchase that the shoes could not be bought direct at that time. They had to be bought from a speculator, at an advance of 30 cents a pair.

#### AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 1349) to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, what is the business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], for himself and other Senators, to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], for himself and other Senators, as amended.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield for that purpose?

Mr. TAFT. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Eastland	Lucas
Austin	Ellender	McClellan
Bailey	Ferguson	McFarland
Ball	Fulbright	McKellar
Bankhead	Gerry	McMahon
Barkley	Gossett	Magnuson
Bilbo	Green	Maybank
Brewster	Guffey	Mead
Bridges	Gurney	Millikin
Briggs	Hart	Mitchell
Brooks	Hatch	Moore
Buck	Hawkes	Morse
Bushfield	Hayden	Murdock
Butler	Hickenlooper	Murray
Byrd	Hoey	Myers
Capehart	Huffman	O'Daniel
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Carville	Johnston, S. C.	Overton
Connally	Knowland	Pepper
Cordon	La Follette	Reed
Donnell	Langer	Revercomb

Russell	Thomas, Okla.	Wherry
Saltonstall	Thomas, Utah	White
Shipstead	Tunnell	Wiley
Smith	Tydings	Willis
Stanfill	Vandenberg	Wilson
Stewart	Wagner	Young
Taft	Walsh	
Taylor	Wheeler	

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] is absent on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are detained on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

#### BROADCASTING OF NONCOMMERCIAL CULTURAL OR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the conference report on Senate bill 63, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to prohibit interference with the broadcasting of noncommercial cultural or educational programs.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me that we should conclude action on the pending business. The conference report is a highly controversial matter. If we begin to consider it, the debate may take the remainder of the afternoon. I think it is exceedingly important that we proceed with consideration of the minimum wage bill, which has for so long a time been before the Senate, and which I hope can be disposed of this afternoon. I do not think the Senate should agree to a motion to take up some other controversial matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado request unanimous consent or make a motion that the Senate proceed with consideration of the conference report?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No, Mr. President; I did not ask unanimous consent. I made a motion; and, as I understand, the motion is not debatable. I renew my motion. It is a privileged motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the motion is not debatable.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Colorado. [Putting the question.] The "noes" appear to have it.

light of new purpose shining in her noble face. I want America to give up thinking in State Department language and diplomatic politics and protocol. I want America's spokesmen to speak with the voice of the people, which, after all, in this case is essentially the voice of God, because it is right.

And when America becomes that kind of a shining light for a new order on the earth, based upon righteousness by all nations, in concert, everyone to help keep the peace, because it will be to nobody's interest to break it. Then the dead can sleep in peace, and their progeny can be assured they will not have to take their places in graves beside them.

#### VETERANS' PREFERENCE IN SALES OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to speak in support of the bill introduced this morning by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] to give veterans first priority in the sale or transfer of surplus property under the Surplus Property Act of 1944.

Mr. President, from all over the Northwest, especially from the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana, continuous complaints are being received that the veterans cannot get farm machinery, that the preferences are, for all practical purposes, worthless.

I call the attention of the Senate to section 17 of the original act providing for the disposition of surplus property. Senator Chandler, of Kentucky; the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and I finally secured the adoption of section 17, which provides as follows:

SEC. 17. The Board shall devise ways and means and prescribe regulations in cooperation with the War Food Administrator providing for the sale of surplus property in such quantities in rural localities and in such manner as will assure farmers and farmers' cooperative associations equal opportunity with others to purchase surplus property: *Provided, however,* That in cases where a shortage of trucks, machinery, and equipment impairs farm production, a program shall be developed by the Board in cooperation with the Agricultural Adjustment Agency whereby a reasonable portion of the surplus supply will be made available for sale in rural areas to farmers and farmers' cooperative associations.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to ask the Senator from North Dakota if he thinks that merely giving ex-servicemen priority in the purchase of surplus material is going to help them? I ask the question because I have had many complaints about the inability of servicemen to purchase surplus goods. One of the complaints I have received is of this nature: A serviceman goes to the Army depot where the surplus material is at hand, and whoever is in charge says, "Oh, yes; you are a serviceman, therefore you have priority in the purchase of this material." The selling price set by the OPA is so much. It is more than the serviceman can pay, so he goes home without it. The next day it can be sold in the regular manner to speculators for perhaps one-third as much as the serviceman was asked to

pay for it. So I am wondering if merely giving him a priority, which he does need, is going entirely to meet the problem which exists.

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator comes from the eastern part of the United States, and therefore is not familiar with the situation in the Northwest.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sufficiently familiar with it from what I have learned from people who know the situation in the East and in the West to know that in the Senator's territory the sale of surplus property to veterans, farmers, and others is handled a great deal better than in my section of the country.

Mr. LANGER. Then, God pity the veterans in the eastern part of the United States. In my section a veteran has to go hundreds of miles before he can even see the article he wants to buy. He goes as many as 500 or 600 miles before he can even look at it. The whole theory of the amendment which I sponsored, being section 17, which was adopted and is in the original act, was, and I so stated upon the Senate floor, that the War Surplus Commodity Administration should, for example, send hundreds of tractors, jeeps, and farm machines to cities such as Fargo, N. Dak., or Billings, Mont., and even into the small towns, where they could be inspected and tried out by the farmer or veteran who wished to buy it. Instead of that being done, we find that section 17 has been ignored entirely—by whom? First, by the War Surplus Administration.

The distinguished Senator will remember that members of that Administration were appointed and confirmed by the Senate. The agency was headed by former Senator Gillette, of Iowa. Time and time again I accompanied other Senators to the office of the Administration in the hope of getting the War Surplus Administration to send machinery to the West. Former Senator Gillette's answer—and he spoke in behalf of the administration—was that they had too small a force, that rules and regulations had not been prepared, and so on. The first thing we knew former Senator Gillette resigned from that Administration. Then as successor to the War Surplus Administration we found the Surplus Property Board, and we had no better luck with that Board, although the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], former Senator Chandler, of Kentucky, and I went there time and again. Then all of a sudden a new agency took over. In a little while along came a successor known as the War Assets Corporation. Lo and behold, today we have another successor called the War Assets Administration.

So, Mr. President, in a period since 1944 we have had five different outfits trying to administer war surplus, and of the five not one has give many satisfaction to the Northwest, nor has any administrator done so, with the exception of Mr. Stuart Symington. Mr. Symington went to the Northwest and met with farmers and veterans of the Northwest and for the first time, through Jerry Wadsworth, who was at the head of the veterans division, we received a little assistance.

So I believe the bill introduced by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]

will be of some benefit, because today if a veteran goes to a place to buy a surplus article he is told "We cannot sell it to you because first of all the Federal Government may take it. If the Federal Government does not take it, a State may take it. If a State does not take it, a county make take it."

We find that the present administrative agency has given no more attention to the sale of surplus property to veterans and farmers than was given to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and adopted as part of the Selective Service Act. Those administering that act ignored the so-called Tydings amendment in all parts of the country. There were farmers in my section of the country who had farm units of sufficient size to bring them under the provisions of the amendment, yet they were not given the benefit of its provisions.

If the bill which gives veterans a preference is passed, and veterans go to a place where surplus property is located, at least the one in charge of the surplus property will not be able to say to them, "Well, we would like to sell this property to you, but we have to give the Federal Government first choice, we have to give the State the second choice, and give the third choice to counties, and the fourth choice to school districts," and so on.

As I stated a moment ago, this preference is due to the veterans now, in view of the fact that the Federal Government, the States, and the counties, and so forth, have had months and months and months in which to buy what they need. Therefore the veterans ought to have the opportunity to buy some of this material now.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I hope the Senator from North Dakota is correct in believing that the bill will help the ex-serviceman who has not had a chance up to now. I have in mind the case of two young ex-servicemen who bought a couple of farms on which there was some timber. They wanted to get some sawmill machinery so they drove to Boston. From Boston they were sent to Washington. From Washington they were sent to Chicago. Finally they went home, as I am told, with one truck in not very good condition.

At the time this complaint came to me I was also advised by one who was in the best position to know in my State that more than 600 servicemen had tried to buy surplus property up to that time, and less than 30 had succeeded in getting anything. As I stated, they would go to the Army depot, or wherever the surplus property was kept, and would be told there that they had priorities next to the States and counties, and so forth, and the selling price was so much, but the selling price would always be more than they could afford to pay, and then, after they went home, the goods would be sold to speculators and traders at perhaps one-third of the price which was charged to servicemen.

Mr. LANGER. I might say to the Senator that my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and I tried repeatedly to

erage embodied in the language "affecting commerce."

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. Section 8, subsection (b) of the committee bill provides:

No employer who is engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce or in any other activity affecting commerce shall employ any oppressive child labor in or about or in connection with any enterprise in which he is so engaged.

Does the Senator's amendment affect that provision?

Mr. PEPPER. There is nothing in the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana about child labor. All it does is to amend the pending amendment, of which I was one of the authors, so as to substitute a minimum wage of 60 cents an hour for the 60, 70 and 75 cents contained in the pending amendment, and to delete the words "any activity affecting commerce" from the pending amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I understand that the amendment now offered by the Senator from Louisiana strikes from the section of the bill prescribing the minimum wage scale the broader coverage found in the phrase "any activity affecting commerce."

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. CORDON. The same provision appears thereafter in sundry sections of the bill. If the Ellender amendment should be agreed to, and if that should conclude the amendments; that is, should no other amendment be adopted, I should like to have the Senator state what would be the effect of the use of the same terminology in other sections of the bill, particularly sections carrying a prohibition.

Mr. PEPPER. We are dealing only with the pending amendment. Let the Senator clarify his mind about the parliamentary situation. There is pending an amendment which, for better name, might be called the Pepper amendment, because I am one of the sponsors of the amendment. The so-called Pepper amendment is now pending, and to that amendment has been added the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. The amendment is still open to amendment. The Senator from Louisiana proposes to amend the first part of the amendment affecting the wage scale. If this amendment shall be agreed to, it will still carry along with it the Russell amendment, which was adopted to my amendment at a recent session of the Senate. All that is in question at the immediate time is the substitution of a wage minimum of 60 cents an hour, to take effect 6 months after the effective date of the act, instead of a wage scale of 65, 70, and 75 cents, as proposed by the committee.

If the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana shall be agreed to, I dare say he may have another amendment he will wish to offer, which would at a subsequent time take care of the matter the Senator from Oregon has in mind.

Mr. CORDON. My question went to the result in case of the eventuality that further amendatory action should be offered but not agreed to. In that event there would have to be some changes in the language of the Pepper amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. One of the comments I was about to make was that the Senator's fears are groundless that any such progress in extended coverage will be made.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, not only is the Senator from Louisiana likely to offer an amendment, but he has given notice that he will offer an amendment, to be considered once the pending amendment is disposed of, and that amendment would strike out all of sections 2 to 9, inclusive, which contain all the words to which the Senator from Oregon refers.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish further to state that should the Senate agree to the pending amendment, I shall then ask unanimous consent to modify the so called Ellender-Ball substitute to conform with the wage scale provided in the pending amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, all of us wish to be fair to our colleagues about this matter. What the Senator from Louisiana is doing represents an effort on the part of a good many Senators on both sides of the Chamber to come to an area of agreement sufficiently large to enable us to have any kind of a bill at all. It is like all other compromises, it does not satisfy anyone altogether, and I am sure that there is no Senator more disappointed than I am that we are not extending the wage scale to a higher figure, that we are not extending the coverage, and that perhaps the net effect of our action will be to reduce the coverage.

I suppose one of the lessons we have to learn in life as we go along is the lesson of patience and compromise. Some of us have had difficulty in accepting the second part of that concept, at least we are happier when we are advocating than when we are compromising. But we are faced with the practical situation of having no bill at all unless we can arrive at an area of agreement sufficiently large to encompass possibly a majority of the Senate. The only way we could do that was to try to arrive at a figure which seemed to meet with general approval on the part of a large number of Senators on both sides of the aisle, and to progress at a later time when we might find it possible to do so.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Is the Ellender amendment acceptable to the Senators who are associated with the Senator from Florida in his amendment? Also, are they all agreed that the original rates named in this amendment are the highest that can be successfully achieved at this time? Is it the opinion of the Senator that it is these rates or no bill?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, I can say that it is. The chairman of the committee and the majority leader and others on this side of the aisle who have been very much interested in the proposed legislation have conferred with the Senator from Louisiana, the Senator from Ohio, the Senator from Minnesota, and other Senators, and we have tried to arrive at an area of agreement sufficiently large to include perhaps a majority of the Senators to enable us to pass any bill at all.

The net effect of the amendment, if it shall be agreed to, will be to raise the 40-cents-an-hour wage provided in the existing law to 60 cents an hour. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator has referred to the fact that there is a compromise. Is the entire compromise included in the pending amendment?

Mr. PEPPER. No; the Senator from Louisiana has another amendment to offer.

Mr. OVERTON. Is there any objection to a statement of what the full compromise is?

Mr. PEPPER. Since whatever else there might be would be included in the amendment of the Senator's colleague, he would probably best give any further statement about it. At the present time all the Senator is intending to do is to raise the hourly wage.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as I understood the Senator from Florida, the pending amendment is not the gallows that has been contrived to hang the hopes of the farmer, but that will be offered in an amendment which will come at some later period?

Mr. PEPPER. The only execution we hope we have effectively postponed is the execution of all those who can benefit from any kind of a law at all, because if something is not done to unscramble the present scrambled situation we all will have to admit we will have no law at all.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I should like to ask my colleague the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] if he will be kind enough to give us a full statement of the compromise entered into in order that we may more intelligently vote on the different amendments as they are successively brought up. If we can have the whole picture before us we will have a much better understanding of the situation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I may say that, in view of what happened a few days ago, several Senators met in order to try to agree on a minimum-wage bill. As was stated by the majority leader several days ago, who spoke for the President, if the Russell amendment should be retained the bill would be vetoed, which would mean no minimum-wage bill at all. In an effort to obtain a minimum-wage bill some of us representing the minority membership of the committee felt that we would be willing to go along with a reasonable wage bill along the lines suggested in the proposed amendment. There were two factors involved. First, we felt that there was no evidence justifying an increase of the legal rate

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask for a division, and first I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll and the names:

Aiken	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Austin	Hart	Overton
Bailey	Hatch	Pepper
Ball	Hawkes	Reed
Bankhead	Hayden	Revercomb
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Russell
Bilbo	Hoey	Saltostall
Brewster	Huffman	Shipstead
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Briggs	Johnston, S. C.	Stanfill
Brooks	Knowland	Stewart
Buck	La Follette	Taft
Bushfield	Langer	Taylor
Butler	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Capehart	McFarland	Tunnell
Capper	McKellar	Tydings
Carville	McMahon	Vandenberg
Connally	Magnuson	Wagner
Cordon	Maybank	Walsh
Donnell	Mead	Wheeler
Eastland	Millikin	Wherry
Ellender	Mitchell	White
Ferguson	Moore	Wiley
Fulbright	Morse	Willis
Gerry	Murdock	Wilson
Gossett	Murray	Young
Green	Myers	
Guffey	O'Daniel	

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I desire to withdraw the motion which I previously made that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on Senate bill 63.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has a right to withdraw his motion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have been assured by the majority leader that we may have all day tomorrow, if necessary, to consider the conference report. With that assurance, I am glad to get out of the way of the unfinished business which has been temporarily laid aside.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like to urge Members of the Senate to read carefully the Lea bill, because it was originally introduced for the purpose of curbing Mr. Petrillo and preventing him from interfering with broadcasts of the Interlochen group. The bill was referred to a committee and thereafter practically a new bill was written without testimony being heard from persons in the entertainment field, such as musicians, composers, and so forth. In its present form the bill is a very vicious antilabor bill, and not directed at Mr. Petrillo, but instead at the whole musical industry. I have a telegram signed by Bing Crosby, Lawrence Tibbett, Dinah Shore, Art Obler, Eddie Cantor, James Melton, Norman Corwin, Frank Sinatra, Jean Hersholt, and Bob Hope. We know that when Bob Hope says something he is not "kidding"; he really means what he says. The persons whose names I have read are very much opposed to the bill. I hope that the Senate will look into the matter before the bill comes before the Senate for consideration.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a telegram I have re-

ceived this morning from Bing Crosby and others regarding the conference report on Senate bill 63. I think it is similar to the telegram referred to by the Senator from Idaho.

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

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 3, 1946.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,  
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of 60,000 rank-and-file employees of radio industry, including actors, announcers, technicians, and directors we strongly urge that you vote against Conference Report 1824 on amendment of the House to S. 63. Although ostensibly a bill in the public interest framed to restrict specific action of James Petrillo bill in present form restricts labor rights of all radio workers. Most clauses of conference report bill have nothing to do with public interest and benefit only radio station employers at expense of their employees. Respectfully call your attention to fact that present bill was never debated on floor of Senate and that radio artist unions affected were never informed of original hearings on House bill or invited to attend and present above information. Your vote against this bill will prevent great injustice to group of union which has splendid record of labor relations.

Bing Crosby, Lawrence Tibbett, Dinah Shore, Art Obler, Eddie Cantor, James Melton, Norman Corwin, Frank Sinatra, Jean Hersholt, Bob Hope.

#### AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 1349) to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I understand that now pending is the amendment which I proposed yesterday to the Pepper amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may we have the amendment read so that we all may understand what it contains?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from North Dakota for the purpose of having the amendment read?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for himself and other Senators to amend the amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], for himself and other Senators, to the committee amendment as follows:

On page 1 of said amendment, beginning with line 3, strike out down to and including line 17 on page 2 and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"Sec. 5. (a) Effective upon the expiration of 6 months after the effective date of this act, section 6 (a) of the act is amended by striking out all of such subsection through the figure '(5)' in the last paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 6. (a) Every employer shall pay to each of his employees who is engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce wages at the following rates—

"(1) not less than 60 cents an hour;

"(2) in the case of employees in Puerto Rico or in the Virgin Islands, not less than

the rate (not in excess of 60 cents an hour) prescribed in the applicable order of the Administrator issued under section 8;

"(3) ."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in order that any confusion may be eliminated, I may say that the pending amendment has nothing whatever to do with the so-called substitute offered approximately 2 weeks ago on behalf of myself and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL]. The pending amendment merely seeks to amend the Pepper amendment, which has as its purpose a vote by the Senate on section 6 of the pending bill. The effect of my amendment would be merely to strike from the Pepper amendment to section 6 all the language beginning in line 3 on page 1 and substituting therefor the wage scale which appears on page 2 of my amendment. Under the Pepper amendment the wage scale begins at 65 cents and is to continue for 24 months. Thereafter it is fixed at 70 cents, and at the end of 48 months it becomes 75 cents. The amendment proposed on behalf of myself and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] fixes a straight 60 cents-an-hour-rate effective 6 months after the law becomes operative. That is all there is to the amendment.

In addition to striking from the Pepper amendment the scale of 65 cents, 70 cents, and 75 cents, there is also stricken from the amendment the cover-all clause which would take under its wing department stores, and so forth.

The language to which I refer appears at the top of page 2, and reads as follows:

And every employer who is engaged in any activity affecting commerce shall pay to each of his employees employed in or about or in connection with any place of employment where he is so engaged.

The amendment now pending will, as I have just stated, strike from section 6 of the bill that language, and will restore to section 6 the language which is now included in the law.

Mr. President, that is all there is to it, and I am very hopeful that the Senate will vote favorably on the amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana has correctly stated the purport and the effect of his amendment. It accomplishes only two things, if adopted, as he has already pointed out. First, it proposes a wage of a flat 60-cent minimum. There is no provision for any raise in that rate by statute or by the action of industry committees.

The 60-cent minimum itself, it should be told to the Senate, would not become effective until 6 months after the effective date of the act, and 3 months, or 120 days, by the language of the bill, must elapse before the act becomes effective after it is passed. We would not wish to deceive anybody. The effect of the Senator's amendment would be to provide a wage scale of 60 cents an hour to take effect 9 months after the passage of the law. As the Senator has also said, the amendment would strike out of the pending amendment the extended cov-