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1455. By the SPEAKER: Petition of North-west Public Power Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a sound Federal power policy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, February 2, 1948)

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

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, in this moment of prayer, wilt Thou make our minds and hearts the sanctuaries of Thy presence, Thy peace, and Thy power.

May our groaning and laboring spirits be brought into a glad and willing obedience to Thy spirit to be transformed within us those desires which Hast implanted within our souls.

Create within us those desires which Hast doest delight to satisfy. Make us more sensitive and responsive to the pul­
sations of the higher life which Hast hast implanted within our souls.

Grant that as God-fearing men we may be loyal partners with all who are seeking to build a social order in which peace and prosperity shall be the joyous pos­
sessions of all the members of the human family.

In Christ's name we offer our prayers and petitions. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journals of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 24, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, Clinton P. Anderson, be, and he hereby directed, by virtue of his authority, to transmit, pursuant to the law, a report of the operations of that Office under section 15 of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 (with accompanying report), to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representa­tives on p. 1766.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Attorney General, withdraw­ing the notice from a report relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted by him to the Senate on January 15, 1948, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE UNDER CONTRACT SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1944

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the operations of that Office under section 15 of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 (with accompanying report), to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF PROCEEDINGS AND ACTIVITIES, ETC., OF NAVY CLUB

A letter from the national commandant and nation­shipwriter of the Navy Club of the United States of America, Rockford, Ill., transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of the proceedings and activities and statement of receipts and expenditures of that club, 1947 (with accompanying papers); to the Com­mittee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS

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

by the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A declaration and petition of the North-west Public Power Association, Inc., Van­
couver, Wash., relating to the Federal power policy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

by Mr. COOPER:

A resolution of the House of Representa­tives of the General Assembly of the Com­monwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Resolution requesting the Secretary of Agri­culture, Clinton P. Anderson, to rescind the order directing a 10-percent reduction in burley-tobacco acreage" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

by Mr. COOPER:

A resolution of the House of Representa­tives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Resolution requesting the Secretary of Agri­culture, Clinton P. Anderson, to rescind the order directing a 10-percent reduction in burley-tobacco acreage," (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

"SEC. 2. The Clerk of the House of Repre­sentatives is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to Clinton P. Anderson, Secre­tary of Agriculture, the Governor of Kentucky, and to the Senate and House of Representa­tives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky." (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Ken­tucky; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Resolution upon the proposed elimination of the veterans' flight training program:

"Whereas this general assembly is charged

with the duty of fostering and regulating those undertakings considered by it to be progressive and advantageous to the public welfare and prosperity of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, and to the people and welfare of the United States; and

"Whereas the veterans' flight training pro­gram carried out by the United States Gov­ernment is considered by this general assembly as a program that is advantageous to the people of this Commonwealth, to their prosperity, and to their general welfare; and

"Whereas there is an effort being made by a Member of the United States Congress and the United States Congress legislation designed to elimi­nate the veterans' flight training program; and

"Whereas this general assembly is con­vinced that the veterans participating in the said flight training program are greatly benefited in their education thereby; and

"Whereas the enactment of such legislation will cause over 50 percent of the fixed based operators in Kentucky to cease operations, thereby eliminating a public utility provided to many of their communities: Therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representa­tives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, That they voice their approval of the veterans' flight training program carried out by the United States Veterans' Administration under the provisions of Public Law No. 246 as being a vital aid in the progress and advancement of an educational program contributing to the welfare and prosperity of the people and a sys­tem whereby the United States Office of Civilian Defense can store a well-trained group of pilots ready and able to man the air forces of our country in case of national emergency and at a later date;

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representa­tives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, That they voice their disapproval of any and all efforts of any and all persons to eliminate the veterans' flight training program; and be it further

"Resolved by the said Senate and House of representa­tives, That the United States Senators and Representatives from Kentucky be requested to exert all efforts and in­fluences that they and each of them may have, in a concerted effort to defeat any and all and all attempts that are made to have the United States Congress enact legislation designed to eliminate the veterans' flight training program; and be it further

"Resolved, That this resolution be spread at large on the journals of both the Senate and House of representatives and that copies hereof be sent to all newspapers of the United States of America and to the United States Senators and Representatives from this Commonwealth.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

H. R. 3532. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain ap­propriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and other purposes.

H. R. 3381. An act to continue for a tem­porary period certain powers, authority, and discretion conferred on the President by the Second Decennial Census Act of 1940.
S. 99. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence Benedict; with an amendment (Rept. No. 929); and
S. 100. A bill for the relief of Charles G. Menzies and to extend the same (Rept. No. 932); and
S. 576. A bill for the relief of Dan C. Rodgers; without amendment (Rept. No. 925); and
S. 1164. A bill for the relief of Doris D. Chrisman; without amendment (Rept. No. 909); and
S. 2263. A bill for the relief of Fire District No. 1 of the town of Colchester, Vt.; without amendment (Rept. No. 909); and
S. 8254. A bill for the relief of J. W. Evans, E. M. Rogers, and N. Fannin, Miss Helen Hicks, Miss Marie Hix, Miss Frances Fannin, William O. Thompson, and Mrs. W. D. Thompson; without amendment (Rept. No. 953); and
S. 1454. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. Elizabeth Mason; without amendment (Rept. No. 991); and
S. 1692. A bill for the relief of Anna- tuckas Panage Ionnetos or Tom Panage Yana- tos; without amendment (Rept. No. 912); and
S. 1975. A bill for the relief of the estate of Francis D. Shoemaker; without amendment (Rept. No. 924); and
H. R. 697. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Essie N. Fannin, Miss Helen Hicks, Miss Marie Hicks, Miss Frances Fannin, William O. Thompson, and Mrs. W. D. Thompson; without amendment (Rept. No. 953); and
H. R. 1381. To confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. Elizabeth J. Baker; without amendment (Rept. No. 911); and
H. R. 1296. A bill for the relief of Annatawked Panage Ionnetos or Tom Panage Yana- tos; without amendment (Rept. No. 912); and
H. R. 1994. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Elizabeth Campbell; without amendment (Rept. No. 926); and
H. R. 1054. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ralford D. Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 927); and
H. R. 2049. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pearl Cole; without amendment (Rept. No. 913); and
H. R. 2373. A bill for the relief of Stanley-Yellowstone, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 914); and
H. R. 2574. A bill for the relief of Nila H. Stanley; without amendment (Rept. No. 915); and
H. R. 6631. A bill for the relief of Bertha M. Rogers; without amendment (Rept. No. 916); and
H. R. 6541. A bill for the relief of Jesse F. H. Jones, and the estate of John Halstad; without amendment (Rept. No. 917); and
H. R. 6450. A bill for the relief of Howard A. Yeager; without amendment (Rept. No. 918); and
H. R. 2582. A bill to extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancés or fiancées of members of the armed forces of the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 919); and
By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:
H. R. 3175. A bill to add certain public and private lands to the Shasta National Forest, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 928); and
H. R. 2866. A bill to authorize the United States Park Police to make arrests within Federal reservations in the environs of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 929); and
H. R. 9794. A bill relating to the compensation of Commissioners for the Territory of Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 930); and
H. R. 9489. A bill relating to the acquisition by the United States of State-owned lands in the National Park, in the State of Montana, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 931); and
By Mr. WATKINS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:
H. R. 2590. A bill for payment of $50 to each enrolled member of the Mescalero Apache Indian Tribe from funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 932); and
H. R. 2402. A bill to provide for the general welfare and advancement of the Klamath Indians; with an amendment (Rept. No. 933); and
EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING REPORT ON INVESTIGATION OF THE EFO
Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I am unanimous consent, file a report favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 203, to extend for 1 month the time for filing the report on the investigation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries, submitted by me on February 20, 1948, and I request its immediate consideration.
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware?
There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:
Resolved, That section 2 of Senate Resolution 132, Eightieth Congress, agreed to July 22, 1946, relating to operation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries, is amended by striking out "Month 1" and inserting in lieu thereof "April 1, 1948.

EILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS
INTRODUCED
Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:
By Mr. WILEY:
S. 2214. A bill for the acquisition of additional land adjoining the Federal building in Chippawa Falls, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Works.
By Mr. BRIDGES (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. IRA, and Mr. MURPHY):
S. 2215. A bill to provide for research and control relating to diseases of the heart and circulation; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.
By Mr. REED:
S. 2516. A bill to amend section 206 of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to joint boards; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.
By Mr. McCARRAN:
S. 2217. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the joint claims of Silas Mason Co., Inc., Walan Construction Co., and Atkinson-Kier Co.;
S. 2218. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims of persons employed in Federal penal and correctional institutions for damage to or loss or destruction of personal property occurring incident to their service; and
S. 2219. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the Federal Government for damage to or destruction of their personal property occurring as an incident to their service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MAGNUSON:
S. 2293. A bill for the relief of Albert J. Walch; and
S. 2221. A bill for the relief of Henry A. Ninezires; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. BARKLEY:
S. 2222. A bill relating to the rights of the several States in lands beneath inland navigable waters and to the recognition of equities in submerged coastal lands adjacent to the shores of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.
By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself, Mr. VANDERVOORT, Mr. JOHNS, Mr. BUSCEMI, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. KNOWLAND, and Mr. BARDAKA) introduced Senate bill 2223, to provide for the presentation of Richard Groves to the permanent grade of major general, United States Army, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.
By Mr. FERGUSON introduced Senate bill 2224, to amend the Veterans Preference Act of 1941 with respect to the priority rights of veterans entitled to 10-point preference under such act, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.
By Mr. BARKLEY:
S. 2225. A bill to transfer administration of the Federal Credit Union Act to the Federal Security Agency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.
By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. MILL, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. FURST, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. THURMAN, Mr. TYNDALE, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. CANTWELL, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. HAYES, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. HURST, Mr. NICHOLSON, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. THOMAS of Virginia, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. SIMON, Mr. DALY, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. BARKLEY)
S. J. Res. 191. Joint resolution giving the consent of Congress to the compact on regional education entered into between the States of Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma on February 8, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. FERGUSON:
S. J. Res. 192. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to appoint Maj. Richard M. Groves as general of the United States Army, and for other purposes, for the tenure of General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. TYDINGS:
S. 2258. A bill providing for payment of the widows and dependents of the soldiers killed or wounded in the First Arizona-Carson district operation.
By Mr. THOMAS of Virginia:
S. 2226. A bill to authorize the Department of the Interior to construct a dam and water-reservoir on the Kansas River, to increase the supply of water to the city of Lawrence, in the State of Kansas.
By Mr. HICKENLOOPER:
S. 2227. A bill relating to the rights of the several States in lands beneath inland navigable waters and to the recognition of equities in submerged coastal lands adjacent to the shores of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.
For that reason, Mr. President, I am making this statement for the Record today, so that Senators may anticipate the proceedings on the bill. If no objection, the bill (S. 2232) to authorize the promotion of Lt. Gen. Leslie Richard Groves to the permanent grade of major general, United States Army, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Hickenlooper (for himself, Mr. Vandenberg, Mr. Johnson of Colorado, Mr. Russell, Mr. Mikulski, Mr. Knowland, and Mr. Bennett) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIORITY RIGHTS OF VETERANS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for a concurrent resolution the following:

S. Con. Res. 47. Concurrent resolution for the encouragement of the Civil Service Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2224) to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to priority rights of veterans entitled to 10-point preference under the act, and I request that it be printed in full.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in explanation of the concurrent resolution, I may say that in Senate Joint Resolution 173, which came before the Senate on Thursday, the 17th, and yesterday the action on the House amendment, the date was changed from July to March, but the title of the joint resolution was not changed to conform. The Senate concurred in the Concurrent Resolution, which merely takes care of that situation.

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

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

REDUCTION OF INCOME-TAX PAYMENTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4790) to reduce individual income-tax payments, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

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

H. R. 4790. An act to amend paragraph 1929 of the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to provide for the free importation of exposed X-ray film. As amended, the title will read: Joint resolution to continue until March 1, 1949, the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in explanation of the concurrent resolution, I may say that in Senate Joint Resolution 173, which came before the Senate on Thursday, the 17th, and yesterday the action on the House amendment, the date was changed from July to March, but the title of the joint resolution was not changed to conform. The Senate concurred in the Concurrent Resolution, which merely takes care of that situation.

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

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

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

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

REDUCTION OF INCOME-TAX PAYMENTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4790) to reduce individual income-tax payments, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

H. R. 4790. An act to amend paragraph 1929 of the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to provide for the free importation of exposed X-ray film. As amended, the title will read: Joint resolution to continue until March 1, 1949, the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in explanation of the concurrent resolution, I may say that in Senate Joint Resolution 173, which came before the Senate on Thursday, the 17th, and yesterday the action on the House amendment, the date was changed from July to March, but the title of the joint resolution was not changed to conform. The Senate concurred in the Concurrent Resolution, which merely takes care of that situation.

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

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

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

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

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

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

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

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

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

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

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

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

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

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

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

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.
Wisconsin [Mr. Wiley] the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and it is satisfactory to him. Therefore I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

**SANG HUN SHIM**

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 521) to permit the naturalization of Sang Hun Shim, which was, to amend the title so as to read: “An act for the relief of Sang Hun Shim.”

Mr. McMahan I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

**AUTHORIZATION TO COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS—MOTION TO RECONSIDER**

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside so that the Senate may proceed to consideration of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas] that the vote by which Senate Resolution 180 was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will ask the Senator from Wisconsin to withdraw the request temporarily. The Senator from Illinois is on his way to the Senate, and in the meantime we might have a quorum call.

Mr. KNOWLAND. 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       Moore
Aldrich      Hayden       Murray
Barkley      Hickenlooper Myers
Brewster     Hill          O'Conner
Brooks       Huddleston  Overton
Buck         Jenner        Pepper
Busfield     Johnson, Colo. Reed
Butler        Kearns, S. C.   Red
Byrd         Kem           Robertson, Va.
Cain         Kirshner       Russell
Capelah       Knowland    Sabot
Capper        Langer        Sparkman
Charles       Luci           Steagall
Connally      Lucas         Stewart
Cooper        McCarthy      Thomas, Tenn.
Cordon       McCord        Thomas, Ohio
Connelly      Mitchell       Thompson, Utah
Downey       McFarland     Thye
Dworshak      McGrath      Tobe
Eaton         McElhaney    Vandenberg
Ertz          McElhaney    Vandenberg
Ferguson      McMahan      Watkins
Phfanderson   Magnuson     Williams
Fuller         Martin       Wilson
George        Maybank       Young
Gurney        Millikin

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Ball], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Mays], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Robertson] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Wherry] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Smith] is absent because of illness.

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Elmore], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Hatch], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Taylor] are absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Umstead] and the Senator from New York [Mr. Wagner] are necessarily absent.

**CONTINUATION FOR 30 DAYS OF HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947**

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 5390, an act to continue for a period of 30 days certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947. The reason for the request is that the action of the House taken yesterday, in connection with which they pointed out that in their judgment they could not pass the rent-control bill which the Senate passed yesterday before the expiration of the Rent Control Act of 1947 on next Saturday. Therefore, the House yesterday passed House bill 5390 continuing certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act for 30 days. In the time between first of April and April 30, the House will have an opportunity to consider and act on the rent-control bill which the Senate passed yesterday. I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate at this time consider the bill which the House passed yesterday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk. A bill (H. R. 5390) to continue for a temporary period certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 5390. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I think it is extremely unfortunate that we are not prepared to extend the full period for which Congress is willing to extend rent control. I do not assess any blame at any particular point; but we have been in session for 2 months, and it has been known that there had to be an extension of rent control. Yesterday the Senate passed a bill extending rent control for 14 months. It is unfortunate that the Congress will not be able to complete action on that legislation this week, so as to avoid taking two or three bites at the cherry before we are through.

I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire if he is certain that the House will not be able before the expiration of the present law to act upon the bill which the Senate passed yesterday.

Mr. TOBEY. That is the advice which I have received from Members of the House, and also from the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Taft] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. Carr].

I may say to the Senator from Kentucky that I share his feelings. I deplore the habit of constantly passing continuing resolutions. In my judgment, that is not the way to legislate.

Mr. BARKLEY. The habit is deeper than that. The habit is to postpone things until the last minute, when some law is about to expire, and then rush in with a continuing resolution extending that law for a month or two. That is unfortunate. However, in view of the situation, I certainly shall not object to the consideration of the bill. I hope that within the next 30 days Congress will be able to complete action on rent-control legislation.

Mr. TOBEY. The committee shares that hope.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the House committee has given me every assurance that it will proceed immediately in good faith to consider the Senate bill which was passed yesterday. However, I am informed that action could not be completed by the end of February. I have every reason to hope that we shall have the proposed legislation back here long before the end of March.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the circumstances, I shall not object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 5390?

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

**WORK SHEET FOR FEDERAL BUDGET, 1948**

Mr. Aiken. Mr. President, I wish to take 2 or 3 minutes to explain the blue-covered document on the desks of Senators. I assure the Senate that there is no particular significance in the selection of the color. A condensed version of the budget requests lies between the covers. This document is a budgetary working tool, prepared by the Budget Bureau of Members of Congress by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Almost without exception, Members of Congress in consulting the President's budget are unable to find the complete information they desire, and sometimes become confused, annoyed, or completely frustrated. The President's latest budget was submitted to the Congress contains 1,434 pages of fine print. The volume of detail and the multiplicity of tables make consistent cross-reference necessary and lead to the state of mind I have just described.

In a preliminary effort, for the 1948 fiscal year, the Expenditures Committee prepared a small pocket budget summary which listed all the significant figures in the entire Federal budget. This year, because appropriations bills are yet to be voted on, we have devised an entirely new presentation of the budget. This document we call the Work Sheet for the Federal Budget. All the significant detail in the budget for the entire Federal Government is contained in 18 pages. With three exceptions, every department and large agency has its budget presented on a single page. Cross-references are unnecessary and all the detail that most Senators and Representatives need is presented within the space of a few inches.

To give a comparison, we present the requests of the Department of Agriculture in one and one-quarter pages. In the President's budget this same Department is presented on 219 pages located...
in 8 different portions of the book. If a Member simply must have the details of the budget request on a particular item, he may take a day or two off through the 1,434-page Budget, in the hope that he will be able to find what he is looking for.

So many details are provided in the President's budget that the main issues---how much money is on hand and how much is needed—are frequently obscured.

The President's budget, big as it is, still is not quite complete. It fails to present funds for specific purposes for obligation so that it appears that less money is being requested than is actually the case. This is true in "prior year" and "no year" appropriations and in authorizations to expend from special and operating funds. Table I of the work sheet shows that these funds amount to more than $3,150,000,000. The President requested appropriations of $39,652,000,000.

If this were granted, the Government would have a total of $43,443,000,000 to expend. This should make an impact to Members of Congress and to taxpayers. Our committee wishes to lay special emphasis on this fact. This is not a new condition, but it is one which is never sufficiently pointed out in Congress, so that many Members of Congress even realize that it exists.

In presenting this work sheet, the committee has not merely presented the budget requests for 1948 but has, for purposes of comparison, also set forth amounts approved in 1948 and provided a work-sheet space opposite each appropriation item where the Member may enter amounts which he desires, the amounts approved in the House, in the Senate, in the final appropriation bill, deficiency appropriations, and the totals appropriated in 1949. If a Member is interested only in one department, he can cut that sheet out of the booklet and carry it around with him. The entire booklet can also be carried around with him. If he were only a lighter vein, I might have called it the portable budget.

We hope that each Member of Congress will find these work sheets of use. We have made a copy for each Member's desk and for his office. This project, which has involved a great deal of detailed work, has been entered into by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments as a service to the Congress in furtherance of what it considers to be its duty.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I wish to compliment the Senator on his work. I have read the entire budget. I do not think there is a question about the text. In the second column it is stated:

Full information is provided relative to additional authorizations granted by Congress for operating special funds. Also, compilations have been prepared on the amount of carry-over funds appropriated in preceding years under various departments for authorizations.

In the Senate Subcommittee on the Interior Department, of the Committee on Appropriations, we spent approximately 6 weeks discussing what were carry-over funds. I wish to know if the Senator has clearly in mind the difference between the balance available, the obligation for which, and an unbalanced obligation. In the last session of Congress we proceeded upon the assumption, with respect to public works in general, and particularly with respect to reclamation projects, that if money was available at the end of the fiscal year, it was also unobligated. On that basis there was a substantial cut of the appropriation made in the third column of the budget estimates for public works of that character. Before we were through we discovered that the money may have been unexpended but obligated. The cuts which were made in the regular session had to be restored at the special session of Congress.

There is one other item which I should like to bring to the Senator's attention. In the third column of the letter of transmittal it is stated:

The appropriation acts for 1948 automatically include funds to implement approved 1947 or prior years, and the 1949 budget requests include funds to implement approved 1948 contract obligations.

I wish that were true, but it simply does not happen to be so, because if there were an automatic appropriation merely because the contract had been authorized, we would have had to shut down projects as we did some months ago. So I think that statement is a little broad.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me say that this is an effort to clarify the budget requests, for the benefit of the Members of Congress; and of course there is much work to be done beyond this. For instance, the representatives of a department may come before a congressional committee and may say, "We are out of money. We have obligated all our money." I believe such statements have been made. The Appropriations Committee may say, "We have to have $30,000,000 more to carry on work which Congress wants us to do."

That may be true. Then the department gets the additional appropriation; but subsequently it is found, a month afterward, that the department has more money on hand than its representatives said they had. Evidently what happens is that they obligate the funds, but then close down projects, and then subsequently have on hand for expenditure more money than the Congress appropriated. So the representatives of such departments can come before the congressional committees and state that they need further appropriations, and then subsequently have on hand for expenditure more money than the Congress appropriated. The only explanation is that they unobligate these funds after they get what they request from the Congress.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I sympathize with the Senator says, in this regard. I am not at all satisfied with the bookkeeping of various departments of the Government. An illustration of that situation is the case where there should have been ample notice that funds were not available, so that work would not have been discontinued. But the Reclamation Service simply did not know it in time, so we were in trouble.

I wish to cooperate with the Senator in improving the bookkeeping in the departments. I think that this statement cannot be true:

The appropriation acts for 1948 automatically include funds for carrying out approved contracts—because there can be contracts which run over 3 or 4 years; and, as a matter of fact, many of the contracts for public works do.

It is distinctly set out in the signed agreements that the contract is subject to the appropriations made by Congress; and if Congress does not appropriate the money, the contractor cannot be paid for his work. So that statement needs further clarification, I am sure.

Again I wish to compliment the Senator upon the action he has taken in this regard. It is highly advantageous and will be very helpful to all Members of Congress.

Mr. AIKEN. Probably the word "automatically" is not the correct word to be used there. But there is a moral obligation on appropriations made by Congress and the Congress cannot ignore that obligation.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am entirely in accord with that statement, too.

Mr. AIKEN. I agree with the Senator from Arizona that probably the better word than "automatically" could have been used in this statement.

The ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND THE IRON-ORE SITUATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the most serious elements in national defense and industrial health picture is the rapid depletion of our commercial iron-ore resources, on which our entire military and civilian economy depend. In supporting the St. Lawrence seaway, the proponents have emphasized time and again the absolute necessity of building the seaway in order to permit the importation of proven resources of Labrador ore, once the Mesabi Range is exhausted.

Although the opposition has made an elaborate show of its sympathy with our program of national defense, it has ignored this vital defense point. Last night the junior Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Lodge), in debating with the senior Senator from Vermont (Mr. Aiken), Representative Made, from Maryland, and myself, over the American Town Hall of the Air, contended that there should be looking to our national defense needs, rather than building this seaway.

It is not a matter of alternatives—either building the seaway or protecting our national defense. It is a matter of doing both, as we see it; because the St. Lawrence seaway, as was testified by authority after authority before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, is a vital component of national defense.

Mr. President, I have here a rather extensive statement on this critical iron-ore situation. I shall not take the time of my colleagues to read it now, but I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Congressional Record. I commend it to the serious attention of my colleagues. I commend it to the
all elements of American industry, which, if they read it in full, will appreciate now, more than ever before, the vital need, and the urgency, of a new effort, a new law, a new understanding of our national problems. It is essential to the future of our country.

Mr. President, if we do not enact the seaway legislation, we shall regret the day of its failure, as we have regretted other sad occasions when we manifested a lack of vision. We shall in effect be tying a noose around our own necks, and as the days go by the noose will be drawn tighter and tighter.

There being no objection, the statement prepared by Mr. Wiley was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

**IRON ORE**

Mr. President, in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway project, I wish to undertake an analysis of the role it will play in the conservation of mineral resources and particularly our exhaustible iron ore. The Junior Senator from Massachusetts dealt with this subject and left the impression that there was no need to be concerned about the exhaustion of iron ores in the United States. It is a fact, however, that there is a conflict of official statements and other facts of iron ore resources in the United States. In support of this subject and left the impression that there was no need to be concerned about the exhaustion of iron ores in the United States. In support of this fact, some of the leading authorities in the iron-ore situation and the future of the steel industry have testified before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in 1946 and stated:

"The knowledge of this impending exhaustion of iron ore is recognized even by the opponents of this project. Mr. R. C. Allen, of the Reserve Mining Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in 1946 and stated:

"It is not that iron mining in Lake Superior shall cease in measurable time from exhaustion of ore that is of present concern, but that productive capacity of the mines will decline below needs. The open pits now supply two-thirds of the whole output. They cannot long maintain their present production, and when they begin to fail the underground mines will not be able to make up the difference. This decline will continue long after the open-pit mines have ceased to dominate the industry. Declining production will be accompanied by rising prices and eventual rise to the level of cost of production from taconite. This is foreseen by all ore producers in the region." -- Prof. Martin Barlow, of Western Reserve University, in Cleveland, Ohio, an authority on the iron and steel industry, confirmed the statements of Mr. White and the Bureau of Mines and Steelworkers in a very profound article in Harper's magazine of August 1947.

This is how he summarizes the situation:

"The steel industry faces a momentous change which will have a far-reaching effect upon the future of the United States, and may in time touch the lives and fortunes of every one of us. New processes are going to have to be added to steel making, and much of the industry is going to have to be extensively remodeled. These changes—which are already beginning—are not the result of the inventions of engineers, but are the inevitable result of simple fact that the iron ore is running out."
"How long could United States ore deposits keep up the long appetite of the steel industry? And what would happen if and when they failed?"

"This is one of the most important of those questions. It's not enough to consider the status of reserves which can be tapped economically, because the steel men are looking towards the distant future as a way off, the steel man's immediate concern is with the exhaustion of ore from material so low in iron content that beyond the state of Tennessee, economical beneficiation is a long and expensive business. Thus, the steel man's current concern is not only with the depletion of the Mesabi iron but also with the exhaustion of the state of Tennessee iron.

"LAKE SUPERIOR RESERVES"

"Since economical beneficiation is a long way off, the steel man's immediate concern is with the exhaustion of ore from material so low in iron content that beyond the state of Tennessee, economical beneficiation is a long and expensive business. Thus, the steel man's current concern is not only with the depletion of the Mesabi iron but also with the exhaustion of the state of Tennessee iron."

"The Mesabi iron range, for its 45 of its 55 years of operation, has supplied about half of the Nation's iron needs. During World War II the proportion reached 66 percent. Mesabi's huge deposits of open-pit, high-grade ore won't be exhausted for 5 or 10 years now, but they may well be used during this generation (Business Week—May 11, 1949, p. 11)."

"The Mesabi iron range, for its 45 of its 55 years of operation, has supplied about half of the Nation's iron needs. During World War II the proportion reached 66 percent. Mesabi's huge deposits of open-pit, high-grade ore won't be exhausted for 5 or 10 years now, but they may well be used during this generation."

"Iron ore is a mineral deposit that can be mined and processed using effective mining and beneficiation methods. The iron ore deposits are primarily located in the Lake Superior region of the United States, which includes Minnesota, Michigan, and Wisconsin. The region is known for its high-grade iron ore deposits, which are essential for the production of steel.

"Iran and steel are approaching that point of production at which the United States must find a substitute for the iron ore which it has been historically dependent upon. The country will have to find a substitute for the iron ore it has been historically dependent upon."

"Mr. President, here is a true statement by an authority on the supply of metals in the United States, Mr. E. Thum, editor of Metal Progress Journal of the American Society for Metals, which appeared in the Chicago Journal on November 14, 1946:

"During the last war the iron and steel industry entered a stage in its history that was entirely new to it, and which is probably the most important metallurgical phases of the country's high-grade iron ore—basic material for making steel—has been obtained from the Mesabi Range in northern Minnesota. Since the opening of the Mesabi mines in the 1880's a billion and a half tons of ore have been mined from a strip of ground some thirty-odd miles long and a mile or two across.

"The Mesabi iron range, for so long our major source of iron ore, is now being worked out and the war the rate of production of the mine was greatly increased, and the demand has carried on into the postwar period. If we continue mining the Mesabi Range as we are mining it today, it will be virtually exhausted by 1964.

"Certain steel corporations have surveyed possible overseas sources of supply. Chile, Brazil, Labrador, and Mexico offer possibilities, but I believe it quiet impossible. The steel industry's future iron-ore supplies will come chiefly from overseas.

"Bethlehem steel plant at Sparrows Point, Md., was originally built for the use of Cuban iron ore. As you know, that tidewater steel plant, so characteristic of our native iron ore deposits, has been used to produce steel.

"Our New England railroads are well equipped and well managed, but by the very nature of the region's economic life they haul three loaded freight cars into New England for every loaded freight car which goes out. Steel products are a prime source of traffic in the area or even iron ore unloaded at New England ports, our railroads could go far toward balancing inbound and outbound carloads, thus assuring ourselves a more economic rail transportation system.

"The England ports are nearer Europe and nearer the rest of the United States than other Atlantic ports—nearer, also, the two most likely sources of iron ore for the future, Brazil and Labrador, and hence it is an important fact in our favor. It may well be that now it is New England's turn to play a major role in the development of this country's huge industry.

"If we can demonstrate to the mining and steel communities that New England offers a large and growing market for steel, the New England ports are nearer Europe and nearer the rest of the United States than other Atlantic ports—nearer, also, the two most likely sources of iron ore for the future, Brazil and Labrador, and hence it is an important fact in our favor. It may well be that now it is New England's turn to play a major role in the development of this country's huge industry.

"If we can demonstrate to the mining and steel communities that New England offers a large and growing market for steel, the local industries will be more likely to build plants in New England and to use the local ports for shipping their products. This will help New England's economy and increase its role in the nation's steel industry.
be sure that they will give serious consideration to other factors favorable to the location in the Middle West. Thus while he opposes the seaway, Mr. Bowditch and the New England Council are making it clear that the steel industry of the Great Lakes area to relocate in New England.

Personally, although the junior Senator from Massachusetts very graciously has disclaimed any regional or local interest in the outcome of hearings, I have been informed by Massachusetts witnesses before the Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. There is no question, of course, but that the senior Senator from Massachusetts is well aware of this situation as he was present at that meeting in Boston on January 12, 1948. He, himself, testified before a Senate subcommittee that his principal worry about the St. Lawrence project was the effect it would have on the port of Boston and the New England railroads. (Hearings on S. J. Res. 104, pp. 701-703.)

I do not claim that there is a conspiracy to oppose the seaway on the one hand, whilst on the other to invite the steel industry to New England witnesses before the subcommittee. There is no question, of course, but that the annual requirements of the steel industry are likely to remain around 69,000,000 tons a year, of which about 20,000,000 tons will come from underground ore and sources other than open-pit mines on the Mesabi Range, and the remainder, 40 or 60 million tons, open-pit ores which must be replaced by beneficiating taconite ores.

The question therefore is, Can we depend upon this beneficating system for an amount up to 60,000,000 tons a year? There are technical questions, financial problems, and cost problems involved in this program which have not yet been solved.

It's stated as a matter of record that the overhead investment in beneficiating plants is about $10 and $15 a ton of annual output. For 60,000,000 tons of beneficiated ore, therefore, we would need between $600,000,000 and $900,000,000 of investment in plant. Three tons of hard iron rock must be processed to obtain 1 ton of concentrated ore rich enough to smelt in a blast furnace.

The property of Reserve Mining Co. contains a large tonnage of taconite, 7 tons of which contain enough iron to make 1 ton of concentrated ore rich enough to smelt in a blast furnace. For each ton of high-grade commercial ore thus produced 2 tons of rock must be discarded. The ton of concentrated ore recovered is four-fifths as much labor to beneficiate as in some way agglomerated into pieces large enough and strong enough to prevent excessive losses and waste. Thus treated, the finished ore contains 62 to 65 percent metallic iron. The taconite, or hard iron rock, is very hard, and although it may be mined in quarries or in open pits, like most of the softer natural ore, it is now being mined, the cost of mining will be greater, and to this must be added the cost of concentration and agglomeration. Although the product will be much richer than the average natural ore and will work better in the furnace, these advantages are outweighed by the lower operating and capital costs of natural ore. The capital investment per ton required to produce ore from such a property as Reserve Mining Co. will be several times that required per ton of natural ore. It will be about $10 per ton of ore, and to attain lowest cost of production it will be necessary to operate on a large scale, which is to say that anyone contemplating production of ore from taconite should prepare to invest a large sum of money in plant and equipment. The laborious character of this process of extraction of iron from taconite is made evident by the necessity of a labor force now estimated at 1,200.

"Plans for the complete operation include a taconite plant, a mill and a refined ingot plant, oil-storage tanks, a power plant, harbor and docking facilities, and a railroad. On the basis of the data of this discussion it is estimated that at the present state of technology, the process of converting taconite into high grade commercial ore will entail a labor force now estimated at 6,000."

Operating expenses also would be higher than at the present time because evidence suggests that you need as much labor to beneficiate a ton of taconite ore as you do now to extract the open-pit ore. As a result, it is estimated that the cost of beneficiating ore will be $2 or $3 more per ton and the cost of steel from such ore will be about 10 percent more than the present mill price, or $6 a ton more. That is the economic picture.

There is some doubt also that sufficient capacity can be built to supply ultimately all of the 60,000,000 tons from this source. The best authorities on the subject anticipate the total amount of taconite obtained from taconite to reach 20,000,000 tons by 1946-1947; 20 to 25,000,000 tons by 1954; and by 1954 about 15,000,000 tons of concentrates will be taken up some of the iron in high-grade open-pit ores. Even assuming that as much as 20,000,000 tons a year may be secured from beneficiation of taconite, there will still be a deficit of 40,000,000 tons of ore which may be made up from other sources. Where is this to come from? The superficial analysis of the opponents of the seaway is silent on this vital issue.
of the third largest steel company in this country. This is what Mr. White said:

"FUTURE OF OUR STEEL PLANTS"

The prosperity of the United States is based upon a plentiful supply of high-grade, cheap, easy-to-mine, and low-cost ores. It is not sufficient to place reserves of coking coal and both near markets for the finished product—steel.

"When three factors get out of balance, our economy will suffer. It is because of this fact that the iron-ore situation in the Lake Superior region is of paramount importance not only to the great industrial centers in the lower Lakes region but to the Nation as a whole."

"Should the ore production of the Lake Superior region be seriously decreased, and if suddenly the sources of supply there were not made available in the lower Lakes area, it would mean that much of our steel industry eventually would be forced to migrate to the eastern seaboard—and perhaps to the Gulf to utilize sea-borne imported ores. There would be nothing to attract any appreciable portion of the steel industry westward from the Lakes. Such a migration to the seaboard would effect vast changes, of far-reaching consequence not only in what we now regard as the industrial heart of America but in the entire Nation and its economy."

"This force of economic circumstances will be a major factor in determining the possibility of recent discoveries in the Lake Superior region."

"But, regardless of that possibility, within relatively few years, the lake-based steel industry must resign itself to a declining steel production when the Lake Superior ore supply begins to fail."

"This would call for the utilization of sea-borne imported ores. There should be no need to use sea-borne ore if we can find other sources of iron ore on continental North America."

Mr. President, if it is a fortunate circumstance, a providential gift, that the people of North America can look forward to the development of high-grade ore resources within their own borders for the life of the St. Lawrence River, in Quebec and Labrador. This is the ore that Mr. Bowditch of the United States Geological Survey, New England ports and deny to the Middle West. Although my friend from Massachusetts considers this discovery 'hypothetical', it is not too hypothetical for certain Boston business interests to plan to benefit by it.

"Let me give you the facts, Mr. President, as derived from official reports from our Embassy in Ottawa and from the Canadian Government. It is based upon the extent of ore deposits discovered in Quebec and Labrador, and the plans now being made for its extraction.

"A report of the Bureau of Mines, Department of Mines and Resources, Ottawa, May 1946, gives the available data up to that time. This report states:

"A new iron-ore region that promises to be of considerable importance is now being developed in the provincial district of Labrador Peninsular. The deposits of hematite discovered so far are the Labrador-Quebec boundary, about one mile north of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. The iron-bearing rocks are several hundred miles in length and the ore deposits have been found to outcrop in the area. For this area, a length of over 100 miles and for a width of 15 or 20 miles."

"We have Mr. President, a more recent statement of the work being done in Labrador just received from the Canadian Government. This document, which I place in the Record in statements that have been already proved and that by next summer 300,000,000 tons will have been proved. Then there is the development of the railroad and loading facilities. The railroad is surveyed and the necessary charters have been granted by the Provincial and Governmental authorities."

"The force of economic circumstances will be an expanding steel industry along the Labrador coast, may be possible to serve this to some extent.
found quite difficult to defend in World War II. Not only are the water routes for shipment of Labrador-Quebec ore shorter, they are more easily defended. In times of emergency the ore could be sent by one of several alternative routes.

The furnaces will be erected between Seven Islands and Quebec to use some of the new ore deposits and old deposits in Nova Scotia, which has relatively high cast metal, but there is an ample supply of electricity halfway between Quebec and Seven Islands.

The eventual production goal of the new field, according to I. W. Jones, chief geologist of the Province, is 40,000 tons a day, which means 43 trains leaving the property each 24 hours. Quebec officials believe that the easiest way to market the ore initially might be to transport by steam from the bay by steamer to Baltimore or through the St. Lawrence to the Middle West.

It is my understanding that, will be done in open cuts to a depth of approximately 300 feet, similar to that in the Mesabi Range. The transportation of a ton by train is estimated to cost approximately 1,250 miles. The transportation of a ton by ocean transportation will average 1,250 miles for $1, and if there are locks to go through then the average is 1,000 miles. In the Mesabi Range, the railroads used to get 85 cents a ton to haul the ore from the mine to the dock; a distance of 35 miles, provided for haul­ing that from Duluth to Toledo and Erie, ranging from 1,000 to 1,100 miles, 90 cents a ton. They now get $1.06 a ton, and the railroads get something over 90 cents. The deep-draft vessels in ocean transportation will move the ton for 2,000 miles for $1.

We, in the interior of the United States, have to haul our raw materials from the center of the continent to the ocean and that was the reason for our heavy railroads. The average is 1,300 miles. The distance from Chicago to New Orleans is about 2,800 miles and from Chicago to San Francisco 2,400 miles. When we have to pay the railroad rate from here to New York and then get the benefit of ocean transportation, you can see the saving that can be made by a combination of lake transportation and ocean transportation.

It is necessary to have larger-scale development if you are going to get the benefit of ocean transportation. We would be able to irrigate only if we were able to ship the boat cargo.

The transportation of a ton by lake transportation, if it is in the area around 89 miles, is averaged 1,250 miles for $1, and if there are locks to go through then the average is 1,000 miles. In the Mesabi Range, the railroads used to get 85 cents a ton to haul the ore from the mine to the dock; a distance of 35 miles, provided for haul­ing that from Duluth to Toledo and Erie, ranging from 1,000 to 1,100 miles, 90 cents a ton. They now get $1.06 a ton, and the railroads get something over 90 cents. The deep-draft vessels in ocean transportation will move the ton for 2,000 miles for $1.

We, in the interior of the United States, have to haul our raw materials from the center of the continent to the ocean and that was the reason for our heavy railroads. The average is 1,300 miles. The distance from Chicago to New Orleans is about 2,800 miles and from Chicago to San Francisco 2,400 miles. When we have to pay the railroad rate from here to New York and then get the benefit of ocean transportation, you can see the saving that can be made by a combination of lake transportation and ocean transportation.

If you take your railroad classification in the booklet Railroad Facts, you will find that the average produces amounts to about 54 cars and a tonnage of about 1,100 tons and the average speed is 15½ miles per hour. Compare that with the railroad that carries 84,000 tons and plows across the bil­lowy sea without stopping at an average speed of 20 miles per hour. There you have the reason why ocean transportation must be through transportation in order to get the distances.

I do not find in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that it has been revealed that there are 600 lake boats carrying iron ore, coal and pulp and oil, that range from 24 to 37 feet in draft and from 500 to 600 feet in length. None of them get out through the St. Lawrence seaway. In the lakes of Canada, as far as I know, there are 200 similar boats. These, in themselves, would be a contributing factor to national defense. Whether a shipyard that could be used more effectively, situated in a steel and timber area, that could be utilized in the case of national defense if there was some way of getting their boats out to sea.

THE AMERICAN LEGION'S FREEDOM BOOKLETS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, we hear a great deal these days, from time to time, about subversive activities in this country. Much is being done toward uncovering those subversive activities and criticizing the various persons who are responsible for them. Sometimes the thought occurs, "Why does not someone do something positive about the epidemic of subversive infections in America? Why does not some kind of program that will serve as a backfire against such activities?"

Our largest organization of war veterans is about to make this question ob­solete. The American Legion is going to do a job of revitalizing positive Ameri­canism on a scale and in a manner which has never before been attempted in this country.

In April the American Legion will launch distribution by mail of the first of a series of 12 freedom booklets containing graphic presentations of the meanings and superiority of the American way of life. The booklets will be received free of charge by more than 1,000,000 Americans during the first month. It is hoped that the number may increase month by month.

This is a nonprofit operation by a non­profit organization. Its purpose is to build stronger Americanism based upon a better understanding of America's blessings. It will not only re­mind our citizens of the priceless heri­tage of freedom that is ours, but it will also enable and encourage them to destroy the alien philosophies of communism and its kin. It is the American Legion's way of carrying the fight to those who would destroy all that we hold dear.

The national commander of the Amer­i­can Legion, Mr. James F. O'Neil, has identified this new Americanism program as a dividends-from-democracy campaign. He anticipates eventual peak distribution of 10,000,000 freedom book­lets a month.

The program already has been en­dorsed by President Truman and many other national figures. Those include Gen. Dwight Eisenhower; AFL Presi­dent William Green; Earl Butling, presi­dent of the National Association of Man­ufacturers; CIO President John Mur­ray; Eric Johnson, president of the Mo­tion Picture Association of America, Inc.; Dr. Daniel Poling, editor of the Christian Herald; His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York, and Rabbi William Franklin Rosenbaum, president of the Synagogue Council of America, as well as many other outstanding and distinguished Americans.

AUTHORIZATION TO THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS—MOTION TO RECON­SIDER

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside so that the Senate may proceed immediately to the consideration of the motion heretofore entered by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucan] to reconsider Senate Resolution 189.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and the order is made. The Clerk will again read the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 189), as follows:

Resolved, That in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by subsection (g) (B) (B)
of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or any other duties imposed upon it. In the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the session recesses and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $125,000, in addition to any unexpended balance authorized by Senate Resolution 75, Eightieth Congress, agreed to February 21, 1947, which is hereby made available for the purposes of this resolution, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee as the case may be.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate I merely wish to say that when consideration of this motion is concluded, it is the intention then to call the calendar from the beginning. I make that statement so that those who have due notice of the motion may be prepared.

The President pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois to reconsider the vote by which Senate Resolution 189 was adopted.

Mr. President, the Senate and the members of the Senate, which was adopted by the Senate at a late hour during the day, when very few Members were on the floor of the Senate. On the day following, the Senator from Illinois moved to reconsider the resolution, and that motion has been pending on the calendar since that time.

The Senate, since the shift in the control of the Congress from the Democratic Party to the Republican Party, which took place in January a year ago, the air has been filled with cries for economy in spending the taxpayer's money.

The majority party earnestly voted to cut the budget submitted by the President to the House and the Senate differed in the amount by which they resolved to cut the budget, but the cut was to be substantial. This year, the majority party quite so confidently of its ability to cut the President's budget, and has voted for a cut of only $2,500,000,000, as contrasted with the original estimates of last year when the House resolved to cut the 1948 budget by $6,000,000,000 and the Senate by $4,500,000,000. The returns are not yet all in on the 1948 budget, but it is already clear from what we know that the President's 1948 budget will not have been cut by a single dollar. It was the realization of this fact that prompted so much misunderstanding and created the impression that budget reduction to a measly $2,500,000,000 dollars.

When the members of the majority party have been asked why they have not done a better job of trimming Federal expenditures, they have had a ready answer, simple and satisfying. They tell you that the officials of the executive department from the President on down are not cooperating with the Congress in trying to cut the budget. This answer, of course, completely ignores the cold fact that if the President had asked, namely, if the Congress has the control of the purse strings of the Federal Government in its own hands. Not a single dollar can be spent unless the Congress authorizes that expenditure by an appropriation. When the President above all the unchallengeable control over the spending of money, no matter how uncooperative the executive departments are, Congress has the absolute responsibility and cannot be heard to come in with a lack of cooperation. I shall not comment on the truth or falsity of the charge of lack of cooperation. The facts speak for themselves on that subject.

When it comes to the matter of appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government—the expenditures of the Congress for the running of Congress itself—obviously no one can accuse the executive departments of failing to cooperate. They have nothing to do or say about that subject. We in the Congress are the only ones concerned with the question of how much money shall be spent for running the Congress.

On the last day of the regular session last May, I commented on the fact that, while Congress was so bitterly condemning what it called the wasteful and extravagant practices of the executive departments, this very same Congress had made such expensive laws, making body in the whole history of the United States. I suggested that one place to look for waste and extravagance was right here in the Halls of the Congress. I suggested that we were spending enormous amounts for investigations and other matters with little constructive result. I showed the increased amounts that were spent here in the Senate over the amounts spent in the preceding fiscal years, for the purpose of conducting investigations. In 1940, the Senate spent approximately $139,000 for that purpose. For the fiscal year 1948, which ends next June 30, we have already spent in excess of $651,000, with 4 months of the fiscal year still to come, and apparently many other resolutions asking for appropriations of money are still to be submitted to the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to have in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table showing by fiscal years the expenses of investigations conducted by the Senate.

The President pro tempore. Is there objection?

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal year</th>
<th>Expenses of investigations by fiscal years, $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>$257,590.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>$356,474.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>$146,492.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>$211,777.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>$327,638.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>$369,875.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>$375,838.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>$500,987.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>$639,783.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of Jan. 31, 1948.

Authorized to be spent during the Eightieth Congress, including standing committees, special investigating committees and Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, $1,689,950.

Resolutions on Senate Calendar (calendar day, Monday, February 23, 1948) authorizing expenditures from the contingent fund, $132,000.

Mr. LUCAS. I have some personal experience with this kind of expenditure and as chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, it was my responsibility for several years to pass on requests for the expenditure of money for investigations. I tried to be as conscientious as I knew how to be in seeing to it that money appropriated for that purpose would be wisely spent—would be in getting to the point so that we could legislate intelligently. During that time certain minority Members were consistently aiding me in attempting to save money for the taxpayers when the Democrats were in control. How times have changed since the Republicans have taken control. There is, of course, a wholly natural desire on the part of committee chairman to have made available to them funds for the conduct of investigations. But it is our obligation to see to it that the taxpayers' money is not expended unwisely, but only to serve a useful legislative purpose.

While on the subject of the expenses of the Senate, I think it will interest the country and some of the Members of the Senate to find out how we have increased the amount for the pay roll for employees of the Senate.

On December 31, 1946, just before the close of the Congress was shifted to the present majority party, the Senate was spending for employees a total annual amount of $3,297,510. As of last February 20 the Senate was spending for employees a total annual amount of $4,743,708, an increase of almost $1,400,000 in the total pay roll.

I understand that a similar increase has taken place in the House of Representatives.

That, Mr. President, is approximately 43 percent more than was spent while the Democratic Party was in control. This fact should interest those who are really economy minded, especially those who are so outraged by the so-called extravagance in the executive branch of the Government.

I have gone into this background of expenditures so that the Senate may have a clear perspective on the proposal which we are now discussing. Senate Resolution 189 provides for making available to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments the sum of $125,000, plus the unexpended balance under Senate Resolution 75. The Financial Report of the Senate reports that the unexpended balance in the account which was appropriated for use of the surplus-property subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is $44,434.

I think, Mr. President, it is interesting to know just what has happened with the spending of the approximately $600,000 which we have been handing in connection with surplus property.

In January 1947 the Senate by majorities of course agreed to continue the Senate War Investigating Committee for 1 year. At that time the committee's jurisdiction...
was severely limited. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] announced that the committee, under its new jurisdiction, could no longer investigate the disposal of surplus property. He pointed out that the disposal of surplus property was a very serious matter and that those who had spent over $45,000,000 on the Surplus Property Subcommittee, would consider what they had done and should study the advisability of requesting the Senate to place surplus-property disposal within the jurisdiction of the committee.

The senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] replied with the announcement that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments had made arrangements to make a comprehensive investigation of disposal of surplus property, "and the able junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is the chairman of the group which will make the investigation."—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 585, January 24, 1947. The Senator from Michigan stated at the same time that:

I wish to advise the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] that it is the purpose of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to cooperate with the House Committee on Executive Expenditures, so there will not be a duplication of work done by one committee.

The disposal of surplus property was, in January 1947, a current and serious problem. Large quantities of wartime surplus of all categories still had to be disposed of. It was a proper subject of investigation by a Senate committee to insure the use of efficient, prompt, and economical administrative methods to prevent favoritism or discrimination and to detect as well as to deter fraud and incompetence. The disposal of surplus property is still a problem on which the Senate should be kept constantly advised.

The Surplus Property Subcommittee appointed by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the Senate on February 21, 1947, without objection, to investigate, the Surplus Property Property Resolution 75, which made available to that committee $100,000—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 1289.

During the calendar year 1947, $654,972 of this $100,000 was spent by the Subcommittee on War Surplus—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 16, 1948, page 234. I think the Senate should stop and consider just what it has received for the money spent by the Subcommittee on War Surplus under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Michigan, Senator AIKEN.

First of all, the subcommittee has filed no reports with the Senate. Therefore, the Senate and the public have not been advised in the normal manner how this large program is progressing. The committee, especially chosen to investigate the disposal of surplus property, has neither functioned, found nothing to report, nor failed to inform the Senate of any inadequacies or irregularities it may have discovered. No reports have been filed with the Senate, even though, at the request of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senate adopted Senate Resolution 162 on July 26, 1947—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 19460. This resolution authorized the committee to file reports with the Secretary of the Senate during recesses and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress.

In addition to committee reports, printed costs are very often valuable to the Senate and the public. Therefore the printed hearings of the War Surplus Committee have been examined. They reveal that the committee has held hearings on only three subjects out of the vast field of war surplus. Furthermore, hearings which have been printed were held on only seven different days. The chairman of the committee [Mr. FERGUSON] attended only two sessions of hearings. The three subjects investigated by the committee were the disposal of tournapulls by the Navy Department, the disposal of the basic magnesium plant at Henderson, Nev., and the disposal of the Reno, Nev., Armory. The following list shows the dates the hearings were held by this committee and the subject matter:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 25</td>
<td>basic magnesium plant, Washington, D. C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 17</td>
<td>tournapull, war reserve program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 17, 1947</td>
<td>military hospital, Washington, D. C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 24, 1947</td>
<td>basic magnesium plant, Washington, D. C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 17, 1947</td>
<td>basic magnesium plant, Las Vegas, Nev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 22, 1947</td>
<td>basic magnesium plant, Las Vegas, Nev.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is interesting to note that two of the three subjects investigated were real property located in Nevada and that during the entire period, only three hearings were held in Washington, D. C., and Nevada. It seems hardly necessary to say that any Senate committee seriously interested in investigating the disposal of war surplus property would have held public hearings on a great variety of subjects and over a wide geographical area. The disposal of overseas war surplus seems to have been completely ignored.

It is also interesting to note that the Surplus Property Committee's investigation of the two properties in Nevada was a joint investigation. However, it was not a joint investigation with the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, as promised by the Senator from Michigan in January 1947, but was a joint investigation with the Senate War Investigating Committee, whose jurisdiction over the disposal of surplus property was questioned by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]. I believe that the Senate, when the Senator from New Mexico prophesied that the Senate War Investigating Committee would go into the subject of surplus property but though it had no jurisdiction over the subject, but he was assured by the Senator from Vermont that there would be "no need whatsoever for any other committee to undertake to duplicate the work which your committee is doing.

In final analysis, the Senate War Surplus Committee, after a year's work, has produced nothing of value to the Senate, the country, or the taxpayers. In fact, this resolution indicates that the committee was, during 1947, both incompetent and wasteful. The committee was under the chairmanship of the junior Senator from Michigan.

The point I make, Mr. President, and the reason that I discuss the sum of $56,000 which has been spent, is that it seems to me nothing has been accomplished. There is still $45,000 in the war-surplus fund, and another $125,000 is being asked in the resolution to augment the $45,000 already there. So we are asked by this resolution to approve an appropriation, not of $125,000, but of $169,434. The resolution asks that the surplus-property fund be increased with the $169,434.

Mr. President, this is an enormous sum for such a purpose, and it would be useful if we could find out from the committee how they propose to spend the money I earnestly believe that the debate is concluded, my able friend, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who is chairman of the committee, will tell the Senate and the country exactly what the committee proposes to do with $165,000 between now and January 3d next. We are entitled to know.

When we examine the budget that has been submitted for us to listen to, you will find:

Estimated budget for the period February 1, 1948, to February 1, 1949, for the subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

Field investigation expenses of staff members for per diem and travel, $12,000.
Office expenses for telephone, telegrams, supplies and postage, and so forth, $4,000.
Recording proceedings—reporting hearings in the field and in Washington, D. C., $3,000.
Witness expenses—per diem and travel, $6,000.
Miscellaneous expenses—clippings, amplifying system for hearings, photo-stats, newspapers, books, and so forth, $2,000.
Pay roll, $138,000.

These items make a total of $165,000. Mr. President, that is all the information the Senate now has as to how the committee will spend this $165,000. We would like to know what they propose to investigate. The country is entitled to know that.

In listing the expenses for salaries of the staff the budget estimate says they are to have one chief counsel, one chief assistant counsel, six assistant counsels, six in-house lawyers, and one editor, at a total cost of $98,000.

What are those employees going to do, Mr. President? The Senate is entitled to know from the chairman of the committee whether the committee is going to do anything. I distinctly recall that the able senior Senator
from Florida [Mr. Pepper] had a similar resolution before the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate when I was chairman of the committee, and he asked for funds to pay an editor. He was sharply questioned by my colleague the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Reed] and by the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Wernher] about that expenditure. The net result of the questioning was that the Senator from Florida did not get very much in connection with his resolution, as I recall. Now, it seems, provision for an editor can be obtained without any question. I do not know what this editor is to do, but we should know about that. Perhaps it is proper. Perhaps we should have an editor to issue the publicity releases which will come out from day to day. Perhaps that is a thing that should be done, but at least before we vote $165,000 someone should give us in detail what the committee expects to do with the money. I think we are entitled to know that.

Mr. Aiken. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ken in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. Lucas. I yield.

Mr. Aiken. Would it make any difference in the attitude of the Senator from Illinois if he knew just what was to be investigated?

Mr. Lucas. It certainly would. I do not want the Senator to misunderstand me. I am absolutely for any legitimate investigation the Senator desires to make. I am not objecting to his making any investigation, so long as the investigation is a worthy one and as a result of it we can ultimately perhaps pass legislation to correct some evil. That should be the basis for all investigations. But to tell the Senate and the country that the committee is to spend $165,000 for 26 new employees, without anything in the estimate which was filed, to show exactly what the committee is going to do, does not seem to me to be right. It seems to me that we do not know what investigation, and I think the Senator will agree with me about that.

Mr. Aiken. I should like to advise the Senator from Illinois that we shall investigate the committees that the chairman decides to investigate. The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has 13 members. We have worked in harmony during the past year. We have never had a partisan vote on any matter coming before the committee. It is my intention to appoint a subcommittee to handle certain types of investigations where criminal negligence, or criminal action may be involved, because that calls for a certain type of investigation. There has been no decision on the part of the committee as to what would be investigated. We have not had the money with which to investigate anything, and we do not take anything for granted. I stated that I would appoint a subcommittee to handle the type of investigation involving criminal charges against a member of any executive department. I want it to be investigated and prepared by competent counsel.

I call the Senator's attention to the fact that under the Reorganization Act of 1946 every committee is required to hold an open hearing at least once a month, and four times a month, if the committee so decides. The Committee on Expenditures holds its executive hearings on the first Tuesday of every month, and the action of any subcommittee, or the action of the chairman himself, can be overruled in any executive committee meeting by a vote of seven members of the committee.

Mr. President, these are the reasons why I say that we intend to continue to operate as a committee of 13 members. We do not know what we are going to investigate. We have had no money with which to make investigations, other than surplus property investigations.

Mr. Aiken. I thank the Senator for that frank admission. He has asked for $165,000, and he does not know a single subject he is going to investigate.

Mr. Lucas. We should not publicize the information, giving the people to be investigated notice that they were under surveillance. Any notice of an investigation will be given when the subcommittee is appointed, if it is a prosecuting attorney, no investigating officer, who "nows his business, will announce 2 months beforehand whom he is going to investigate.

Mr. Aiken. We have, I suppose, a hundred complaints on hand now, but we have not decided what we are going to investigate.

Mr. Barkley. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. Lucas. I yield.

Mr. Barkley. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois if he doesn't know what he is going to investigate, what are the matters which are to be investigated, whatever they may be—and I have no idea what they may be—will be decided upon by the full committee, some particular member of the committee appointed by the chancellor, independent of any instructions from the full committee, determine what it will investigate?

Mr. Aiken. It is my expectation that, as provided by law, the full committee will have control of any matters which it may properly come within the jurisdiction of the committee, whether they are being handled by the chairman, by a subcommittee, or in any other manner.

Mr. Barkley. I imagine there may be more than one subcommittee of the committee.

Mr. Aiken. We have two subcommittees now.

Mr. Barkley. There are two subcommittees now. Is it not true that the mere appointment of a subcommittee does not give it the power to decide what it will investigate? The full committee has to decide that?
Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate exactly as they were going to do with the money they requested.

During the time that former Senator Mead and the Senator from West Virginia were, respectively, chairmen of that committee they never asked for more money than that. Yet, last March, we authorized the War Investigating Committee to expend $150,000, and in July we authorized an additional $25,000, and that committee has expended in the year $166,083.

I merely point out to the Senate that we are asked to appropriate $165,000 on the theory that 26 new employees are going to various places in the country to find something derogatory to somebody. That is about the sum and substance of it. That would make 55 employees who would be attached to the committee headed by the able Senator from Vermont, as I understand from the records which were attached to the budget.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I might inform the Senator from Illinois that, so far as I know, there have been employed by the committee, including subcommittees, more than 20 people, including per diem employees. We have 10 persons on the regular staff as authorized by law. We had a few on a per diem basis carrying out the purposes of a subcommittee. I am not sure of the exact number.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct; there were 15 employed by the Surplus Property Committee.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand the War Investigating Committee has had as many as 26 employees. I am not sure as to the number. I had nothing whatsoever to do with that committee.

Mr. LUCAS. The What the Senator's committee proposes to do, as I understand, is to try to be on the good side of the War Investigating Committee.

Mr. AIKEN. No decision has been made in that respect. It would naturally be my expectation that if certain employees of the War Investigating Committee had done especially good work they could be retained. That would be better than to bring in new persons.

Mr. LUCAS. I think that is true.

Mr. AIKEN. It is also unquestionably a fact that we could not expect to keep anywhere near as many employees as have been employed by the Surplus Property subcommittee and the War Investigating Committee. I do not have the request with me. Did the Senator from Illinois say that pay for 24 employees was requested?

Mr. LUCAS. 26 new employees.

Mr. AIKEN. The committee has been handicapped in carrying out paragraph (B) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 as printed on page 6, "studying the operation of Government activities with a view to determining its economy and efficiency," for this reason: We are entitled to only four professional employees. We have had six. They are not investigators in any sense of the word. They are kept busy most of the time checking the expenditures of the Government, and following up the activities of various branches of the Congress. We have found that we cannot, under the law and the rules of the Congress, borrow anyone from another committee or subcommittee, even for a day. I know that has handicapped our work, because there are times when we could have used special type assistants to good advantage. If the resolution now before the Senate, I believe we would be able to hire special type employees for a day, an hour, or for 2 months without running the risk of violating any of the rules.

I want the Senator from Illinois to understand that I have not in any way followed the work of the War Investigating Committee.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not going to say to my able friend that I do not think any Member of the Senate begrudges the money spent upon legitimate investigations. To my knowledge up to now the present mi­mesis of investigations has nothing to do with the way of ever contesting a single appropriation. The ease and the speed with which large appropriations have been made available during the past year was most unusual, but I think they evidence the good will which Members of the Senate have toward investigations, and their hopes for their success.

Especially in view of this attitude, the course of these investigations during the past year has been regrettable. I am referring now to the War Surplus investiga­tion, and the investigation by the Brewster committee when I say that I think that the course of their investiga­tions has been regrettable, certainly in some instances at least. These investigations have made a spoilt record. The prestige of investigations generally has suffered a cruel blow at the hands of the War Investigating Committee.

The damage thus done has naturally spread to our department and has damaged the prestige of the Senate itself. Notwithstanding that fact, we are asked by this resolution to grant one of the largest appropriations in the history of the United States Senate.

Mr. President, I think it is advisable to read a few editorials to show what has been said about the War Investigating Committee, and what sort of tradition the Senator from Vermont is taking over. I feel confident that when he takes over, the committee will not be conducted as it was conducted during the past year, thereby giving the press of the country an opportunity to con­demn the investigatory power of the Sen­ate. Let me read a few editorials for the record.

Here is one from the New York Times of August 12, entitled "Inquiry Postponed."

Inquiry Postponed.

Investigation of war contracts must go on. We should know whether public funds were wasted beyond the unavoidable waste of all wars, when the most desperate expedients were sometimes justifiably used. How can we know whether there was corruption? If funds can be recovered we should recover them. But that is an easy lesson of history. For personal squabbles and political maneu­vers degrades the congressional committee investigation. The Warren investigation might take a leaf from the record of a com­mittee of the same name which operated during the early years of the war, with dig­nity and effectiveness, under the chairman­ship of Senator Harry S. Truman, of Missouri.

The following editorial, entitled "Cir­cus Leaves Town," was published in the Washington Evening Star of August 12, 1947:

CIRCUS LEAVES TOWN.

No great sense of loss will attend the an­nouncement by Senator Ferguson that the investigation of Howard Hughes and his wooden airplane has been put off until No­vember 17.

There is no need to dwell upon the un­fortunate aspects of this affair. There is reason, certainly, to be interested in how war contracts awarded under circumstances at­tending those in which the committee pro­ceeded were to be investigated. De­structive can come from such an investiga­tion when it is conducted in such a way as to be a burlesque of the whole affair, vitiating those in which the committee has been engaged. Whether or not, in the end, with a probe.

A natural consequence of the blithe mood in which the present Congress set about ending the fabricated investigations. It was a mood reflected in the announcement by a triumphant Republican leader last fall that every session would begin with a prayer and end with a probe.

The thoughtful Congressman may see some reason in this, but it is not for him to approve or disapprove. The impatient 2.47 is not for him to approve or disapprove. His record.

The same editor, Of August 12, 1947:

INQUIRY POSTPONED.

Investigation of war contracts must go on. We should know whether public funds were wasted beyond the unavoidable waste of all wars, when the most desperate expedients were sometimes justifiably used. How can we know whether there was corruption? If funds can be recovered we should recover them. But that is an easy lesson of history. For personal squabbles and political maneu­vers degrades the congressional committee investigation. The Warren investigation might take a leaf from the record of a com­mittee of the same name which operated during the early years of the war, with dig­nity and effectiveness, under the chairman­ship of Senator Harry S. Truman, of Missouri.

The following editorial, entitled "Cir­cus Leaves Town," was published in the Washington Evening Star of August 12, 1947:

CIRCUS LEAVES TOWN.

No great sense of loss will attend the an­nouncement by Senator Ferguson that the investigation of Howard Hughes and his wooden airplane has been put off until No­vember 17.

There is no need to dwell upon the un­fortunate aspects of this affair. There is reason, certainly, to be interested in how war contracts awarded under circumstances at­tending those in which the committee pro­ceeded were to be investigated. De­structive can come from such an investiga­tion when it is conducted in such a way as to be a burlesque of the whole affair, vitiating those in which the committee has been engaged. Whether or not, in the end, with a probe.

A natural consequence of the blithe mood in which the present Congress set about ending the fabricated investigations. It was a mood reflected in the announcement by a triumphant Republican leader last fall that every session would begin with a prayer and end with a probe.

The thoughtful Congressman may see some reason in this, but it is not for him to approve or disapprove. The impatient 2.47 is not for him to approve or disapprove. His record.

The Howard Hughes investigation ends as it began—in a mixture of politics and corny comedy.

It is where we sit, what we said in our editorial on Wednesday, August 1, still stands: "Anybody who can't identify the odor arising from the activities of the committee hasn't much sense of political smell." * * * On the basis of what has been said and written on the main thing that emerges that is a couple of 'idea men' (Hughes and Kaiser), have had their
t真实 knocked in by a political gravedigger's spade.

If there's a lesson in the Hughes case, it gets back to what we've said earlier—that congressional investigating committees need some kind of rules of practice to keep them on their course.

Mr. President, before I am through I shall submit a resolution which I believe will be instrumental in bringing about some reform, so far as proper standards are concerned, in carrying on these investigations.

The following editorial, entitled "The Wrong Time to Call Off Hearings" was published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of August 12, 1947.

THE WRONG TIME TO CALL OFF HEARINGS

Senator Ferguson's excuse for sending the subcommittee members on a 14-week vacation from their investigating duties could hardly be flimsier. The opinion is bound to be general that the hearings were pretty much a fraud, with precious little information squeezed out of the reams of testimony taken, and with overtones of pure burlesque.

If the Ferguson subcommittee stalls around on further investigation of war contracts it ought to be put out of business permanently and the inquiry placed in the hands of an independent group. One thing is certain: Investigation must go on but not in the inept, unproductive manner in which it has recently been misdirected.

An editorial entitled "Brewster's Debate and Retreat" was published in the Chicago Sun of August 13, 1947. The editorial reads as follows:

The least optimistic of the Senate inquiry into Howard Hughes et al. was at best a shameful end to a shameful spectacle. We probably are destined never to know just how and why the halt was called. But it can safely be said that any prolongation of the inquiry at this time would have been highly unpatriotic to many Republican colleagues of Senators Barrow and Ferguson—let alone to the Republican high command.

The New York Post of August 2, 1947, contained an editorial entitled "Ferguson, Brewster Busy Burning Witches Again." The editorial reads as follows:

This is indeed a book-burning era. The books are burnable, an era of publication and re-publication which play perhaps even of public honesty—are being tossed into the bonfire of neglect by the Senate committee investigating the Hughes flying boat.

So unfortunate has been the record of recent months that more and more public attention has been drawn to the necessity for reviewing the proper uses and procedures of investigating committees; and of reform. The press of the entire country has been calling attention again and again to the need for the reform of congressional investigating procedures.

The Washington Post has been publishing a series of editorials which many of us have seen under the heading "Congressional inquiries should be dedicated to enlightenment and not to persecution." On January 22, 1948, the Post said:

Abuses have crept into congressional investigations at a time when the investigative procedure which was not only in need of new and better methods of practice to keep them on their course.

Mr. President, before I am through I shall submit a resolution which I believe will be instrumental in bringing about some reform, so far as proper standards are concerned, in carrying on these investigations.

The following editorial, entitled "The Wrong Time to Call Off Hearings" was published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of August 12, 1947.

THE WRONG TIME TO CALL OFF HEARINGS

Senator Ferguson's excuse for sending the subcommittee members on a 14-week vacation from their investigating duties could hardly be flimsier. The opinion is bound to be general that the hearings were pretty much a fraud, with precious little information squeezed out of the reams of testimony taken, and with overtones of pure burlesque.

If the Ferguson subcommittee stalls around on further investigation of war contracts it ought to be put out of business permanently and the inquiry placed in the hands of an independent group. One thing is certain: Investigation must go on but not in the inept, unproductive manner in which it has recently been misdirected.

An editorial entitled "Brewster's Debate and Retreat" was published in the Chicago Sun of August 13, 1947. The editorial reads as follows:

The least optimistic of the Senate inquiry into Howard Hughes et al. was at best a shameful end to a shameful spectacle. We probably are destined never to know just how and why the halt was called. But it can safely be said that any prolongation of the inquiry at this time would have been highly unpatriotic to many Republican colleagues of Senators Barrow and Ferguson—let alone to the Republican high command.

The New York Post of August 2, 1947, contained an editorial entitled "Ferguson, Brewster Busy Burning Witches Again." The editorial reads as follows:

This is indeed a book-burning era. The books are burnable, an era of publication and re-publication which play perhaps even of public honesty—are being tossed into the bonfire of neglect by the Senate committee investigating the Hughes flying boat.

So unfortunate has been the record of recent months that more and more public attention has been drawn to the necessity for reviewing the proper uses and procedures of investigating committees; and of reform. The press of the entire country has been calling attention again and again to the need for the reform of congressional investigating procedures.

The Washington Post has been publishing a series of editorials which many of us have seen under the heading "Congressional inquiries should be dedicated to enlightenment and not to persecution." On January 22, 1948, the Post said:

Abuses have crept into congressional investigations at a time when the investigative procedure which was not only in need of new and better methods of practice to keep them on their course. If there's a lesson in the Hughes case, it gets back to what we've said earlier—that congressional investigating committees need some kind of rules of practice to keep them on their course.

Mr. President, before I am through I shall submit a resolution which I believe will be instrumental in bringing about some reform, so far as proper standards are concerned, in carrying on these investigations.

The following editorial, entitled "The Wrong Time to Call Off Hearings" was published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of August 12, 1947.

THE WRONG TIME TO CALL OFF HEARINGS

Senator Ferguson's excuse for sending the subcommittee members on a 14-week vacation from their investigating duties could hardly be flimsier. The opinion is bound to be general that the hearings were pretty much a fraud, with precious little information squeezed out of the reams of testimony taken, and with overtones of pure burlesque.

If the Ferguson subcommittee stalls around on further investigation of war contracts it ought to be put out of business permanently and the inquiry placed in the hands of an independent group. One thing is certain: Investigation must go on but not in the inept, unproductive manner in which it has recently been misdirected.

An editorial entitled "Brewster's Debate and Retreat" was published in the Chicago Sun of August 13, 1947. The editorial reads as follows:

The least optimistic of the Senate inquiry into Howard Hughes et al. was at best a shameful end to a shameful spectacle. We probably are destined never to know just how and why the halt was called. But it can safely be said that any prolongation of the inquiry at this time would have been highly unpatriotic to many Republican colleagues of Senators Barrow and Ferguson—let alone to the Republican high command.

The New York Post of August 2, 1947, contained an editorial entitled "Ferguson, Brewster Busy Burning Witches Again." The editorial reads as follows:

This is indeed a book-burning era. The books are burnable, an era of publication and re-publication which play perhaps even of public honesty—are being tossed into the bonfire of neglect by the Senate committee investigating the Hughes flying boat.

So unfortunate has been the record of recent months that more and more public attention has been drawn to the necessity for reviewing the proper uses and procedures of investigating committees; and of reform. The press of the entire country has been calling attention again and again to the need for the reform of congressional investigating procedures.

The Washington Post has been publishing a series of editorials which many of us have seen under the heading "Congressional inquiries should be dedicated to enlightenment and not to persecution." On January 22, 1948, the Post said:

Abuses have crept into congressional investigations at a time when the investigative procedure which was not only in need of new and better methods of practice to keep them on their course.

Mr. President, before I am through I shall submit a resolution which I believe will be instrumental in bringing about some reform, so far as proper standards are concerned, in carrying on these investigations.

The following editorial, entitled "The Wrong Time to Call Off Hearings" was published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of August 12, 1947.
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done when it asked for a continuation. In other words, the committee knew exactly what it was going to do. But today we find that the committee is at a total loss insofar as having a program.

I read now a portion of a newspaper article appearing on February 10, 1947: COMPLETE WAR-PROFITS STUDY PROPER TASK FOR COMMITTEE

Chairman BREWSTER, Maine, Republican, tells reporters that the Senate's Special War Investigating Committee will make a "complete examination of $315,000,000,000,000 of war profits."

He explains that, according to information given the committee by the United States in the war effort, $315,000,000,000 was spent under contracts where the profits exceeded 10 percent, total profits on these contracts thus running to about $31,500,000,000.

Mr. President, did any of us ever hear any more about that, after the committee went into its investigation of those matters?

The newspaper articles I have read give an indication of the sensational type of statements and headlines that were received in the country at that time when the committee was trying to convince the Senate of the necessity for its continuation. The most extravagant though these were made particularly in press interviews, about what the committee was going to do. When it comes to receiving from the committee what might be called a balance sheet of the work it accomplished, we find that the end of a year of work, thus far, there is exactly nothing—zero.

In addition to the report on renegotiation of war contracts—hardly a sensational subject—we have had two other reports filed with the Senate. The first was filed on January 4, 1947, and covered transactions between the late Senator Bilbo and various war contractors. That report was prepared while the committee was under the chairmanship of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Hatfield). The second report was filed on January 10, 1947, and covered the Inter-American Highway investigation. The junior Senator from Maine referred to that report in the course of the debate on the continuation of his committee on January 15, 1947, as follows:

I think that our report on that is ready so that there is no occasion for further speculation.

Mr. President, I think it is a reasonable inference that that report, too, was based on the investigative work of the Meadowbrook committee. All this is in sharp contrast to the frequency with which reports came to the Senate while President Truman and, later, Senators Mead and Kilgore were in charge of that committee. President Truman filed three annual reports for the 3 years he headed the committee, and filed 29 reports in the nature of interim reports. So far as I know, the committee has not been able to produce a single report during the 2 years that Senator Mead and Kilgore were in charge of the committee, they filed two annual reports and seven interim reports. They recommended and had passed several legislation measures based on the findings of the committee.

In the year in which this committee has been in the charge of the majority party, we have had practically no reports. What has been the work of that committee during 1947?

What conclusion can we draw from these facts? I think the inescapable conclusion is that the committee is not interested in filing reports, but, rather, is after what it considers more important; namely, the garnering of headlines, and the creation of sensations.

It is no part of the committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, through its subcommittee headed by the junior Senator from Michigan (Mr. Franscoso), has been named the successor to the War Investigating Committee to carry on in the same tradition.

We are now asked to appropriate for the use of that committee an enormous sum, judged by any previous appropriation. What has the predecessor committee done which would justify our confidence in the work of the new committee? What subcommittee, after we had from the $166,000 the committee has thus far expended? What legislation has been recommended and passed? What can be the expenditure of another $125,000? We are entitled, certainly, to have some knowledge of the facts, other than the employee budget which has been submitted by the able chairman of the Committee on Expenditures.

Mr. President, I repeat that the Senate should not vote blindly upon any other appropriation, but instead we should have a few facts upon which to base our judgment. I presume that if the committee had requested a quarter of a million dollars, no doubt it would have received that amount, judging from the way that requests for legislative appropriations of this kind are being allowed in this session.

Mr. President, before closing, I should like to refer to the wording of the resolution itself. This is one reason for my making this speech today. I refer to the broad powers which are provided by the resolution in carrying out its duties under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, "or any other duties imposed upon it, the committee is authorized to make expenditures. I wonder why those words "or any other duties imposed upon it" were included in the resolution. I think it should be made perfectly plain just what the words "or any other duties imposed upon it" mean. Who is to impose the other duties on the committee? If the words mean only that the committee is to carry out its duties under the rules of the Senate, then these words are unnecessary. If, on the other hand, it is contemplated that this committee is to have duties which are not now defined by the Standing Rules of the Senate, and the Legislative Reorganization Act, now is the time to find out.

I ask my able friend the Senator from Vermont and Vermont, and I doubt that the Senator from Vermont has said, then those words are surplusage, and should never have been included. So there must be another reason.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me say that I read the resolution before it was printed or sent to the legislative draftsman, and that to me it seemed to be all right. In considering it, it was my expectation that appropriations would be made for carrying out the duties imposed by subsection (g) (2) (B) of rule XXV.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator believes that to be a matter for the committee itself, then I ask why those words were included. In other words, who is to say what are the duties that are imposed upon this committee? Is that to be a matter for the committee itself?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know that they are necessary.

Mr. LUCAS. Would the Senator be willing to eliminate those words from the resolution?

Mr. AIKEN. We cannot eliminate the words now, because the resolution is not presently before the Senate. That question has not been raised before.

It is possible that by a vote of the Senate other duties will be imposed upon the committee from time to time—duties for which no appropriation might previously have been made.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say, Mr. President, that when and if such a thing happens, the resolution upon which the Senate bases its vote at that time will contain whatever provision is necessary in order to provide funds for carrying out the further duties imposed by any resolution.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true; I agree with the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I undertake to say that there are those who can and may continue the language I have just read to mean that the committee can set itself up as a special investigating committee to investigate anything, no matter what it may be.

Mr. AIKEN. I think we have almost that power now.

Mr. LUCAS. Then why was this provision included in the resolution, if that power had never before been used?

Mr. AIKEN. As I have said, this is the first time this question has been raised. It was not raised previously. Certainly if the Senate imposes a duty upon a committee, it must provide the means for carrying out that duty.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that. But certainly there must be some reason—and I doubt that the Senator from Vermont knew those words were included in the resolution—because if there is the power to do this under subsection (g) (2) (B) of rule XXV, as the Senator from Vermont has said, then those words are surplusage, and should never have been included. So there must be another reason.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me say that I read the resolution before it was printed or sent to the legislative draftsman, and that to me it seemed to be all right. In considering it, it was my expectation that appropriations would be made for carrying out the duties imposed by subsection (g) (2) (B) of rule XXV.

Mr. LUCAS. As I see it, it merely gives the committee the power to do anything it wants to do, and that is...
men have refused to devote themselves to working for the Government consists in just this fear of the whirlpool of congressional investigations. This is no new phenomenon. They have pulled to learn how far a committee could go in interrogating a witness. I have talked to Members of Congress many times about the reform which is needed. It is precisely because I am convinced of the indispensable function of the congressional investigating committee in exposing and bringing to light the evil that may be found that I feel the time is ripe for the reform of committee procedures. These committees have in the past made immensely valuable contributions to the welfare of the American people by turning a white light on evil; much beneficial legislation has resulted. It is therefore of the highest importance that these committees should be given the respect and confidence of the American people, for if they do not, they will lose their usefulness as congressional tools.

As a member of the committee investigating the Reds, I attended every hearing of that extensive investigation and time after time heard respected officials of our Government pilloryed on the basis of slander and personal venom, rather than on any substantial evidence. There has never been a committee hearing where so much time and money were wasted on irrelevant, repetitive, insubstantial questions.

The only effective reform in committee procedures is the exercise of judicial self-restraint by members of such committees. They must lay down for themselves rules of the game which command universal respect, and show their pains-taking regard for the traditions of individual rights and liberties. On the other hand, there is a place which can be laid down, which will serve to protect individuals against unwarranted attack. I have in my hand a resolution designed to accomplish this result. In essence it would give any person who feels that his reputation has been impaired the right to file a sworn statement before the committee which must be made part of the record, the right to testify personally, the right to summon witnesses in his own behalf, and the right to cross-examine hostile witnesses. In order to make sure that these privileges are not abused by anyone, no more than four such witnesses may be summoned and no cross-examination may extend beyond the four days after the receipt of such a petition. The right shall be accompanied by counsel. As an additional safeguard, no report alleging misconduct or adversely commenting on any person may be filed unless and until the person against whom such a report has been made has had an opportunity to present the committee with a sworn statement with respect thereto.

Mr. President, I am quite in earnest in the presentation of this concurrent resolution. I have participated in many investigations since I became a Member of Congress. I know exactly what can be done to a witness, and I know what has been done to many good men who have appeared before committees from time to time. Unless the Members of Congress exercise self-restraint and self-discipline in the cross-examination of all witnesses, whether their station in life is high or low, the integrity of the congressional investigatory powers, which are so indispensable to the uprooting of corruption and evil in government, will reach the point where no one will have any confidence in the decisions of the committees that attempt to investigate anything.

As a result of what happened last year in the Senate and Hughes investigation, it is my studied judgment that the American people are still skeptical, still crossing their fingers about any investigation which may be conducted by committees of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to send to the desk the concurrent resolution, and to have it referred to the appropriate committee.

Mr. President, will the concurrent resolution be referred to the appropriate committee?

Mr. Kilgore. Mr. President, will the Senate yield?

Mr. Kilgore. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Illinois to the fact that during the actual war years, as the Senator knows, a number of reports were published by the Special Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and to investigate something connected with agriculture, unless the committee has been specifically given that right under a resolution of this kind. I undertake to say that under the pending resolution the committee can investigate the farm program if it wants to.

Mr. Kilgore. I think the committee can investigate the Department of Agriculture or any other department of government, under the language of subsection (g) (2) (B).

Mr. Kilgore. Mr. President, will the Senate yield?

Mr. Kilgore. I yield.

Mr. Kilgore. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Illinois to the fact that during the actual war years, a far greater number of reports were prepared, which, because of the requirement of secrecy, the committee was not permitted to publish or to disclose publicly in any way. I have felt for some time that further investigations of matters connected with the war could be undertaken properly if reports which are on file were made pubic.

Mr. Kilgore. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Committees of Congress are invested with the enormous prestige and dignity of the Congress of the United States. For that reason they have a special obligation not to infringe on the rights of our citizens.

Reputations have been assassinated before congressional committees on the basis of flimsy hearsay testimony and irrelevant and irrelevant arguments. Men for all walks of life, and particularly those high in public life, have had to suffer the reckless disregard of congressional committees for their cherished reputations. One of the reasons why many talented
Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I had not intended to speak on this subject today, but due to certain remarks made by the able Senator from Illinois, I feel that the record should be considerably clarified. As I understand the remarks of the Senator from Illinois, he was attempting to build up a case for the continued support of the legislative branch of the Government of the United States which has been almost wasteful of the funds allocated to it.

I call attention to the fact that in the paper submitted by the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] today, it is shown on page 2 that the total cost of the legislative branch of the Government of the United States amounts to $33,161,000, those items constituting the total of $39,649,115 out of the total budget of $39,652,954,675.

I submit, Mr. President, and Members of the Senate, that the Congress of the United States is to perform its constitutional legislative duties it must have adequate funds in order to obtain the necessary break that which was testified to before our committee. We did not know at the time the bill was before the committee last year that they had that information. We were not aware of the fact, to which I have recently conducted that a tele-type had gone from California to the Bureau of Reclamation containing the statement that, in their judgment, the carry-over would be approximately $25,000,000.

Mr. President, there may be some who say that the Congress of the United States did not give to the Reclamation Service the funds it should have. I certainly think it should have all the funds it can properly spend in developing the great western projects. I do not speak in any narrow sense, either of a partisan point of view or a geographic point of view, because I am as much interested in projects in other areas of the country as I am in those of my own State of California.

I want to call attention to the official report of the program conference held in Washington, D. C., in 1947. It is an official document issued by the Bureau of Reclamation. Let us see what they say as to whether the Congress of the United States has discharged its obligations.

One of the most embarrassing things I have had to deal with—and I think Mike—

Let me interpose to say that "Mike" is Michael W. Straus of the Reclamation Bureau—

I think Mike is, too—is that every time we go over to the Budget and talk about our desires and ask for the money, they lay up to us that you boys are all sitting on the money bags, and never spending what you have.

He was talking to the Reclamation officials at the conference, and he went on to say:

There is a serious doubt that you are going to spend the money you have this year.

Further on he says:

I think that practically every single one of the regions has more money than it will ever be able to spend at the present rate of progress.

Let us turn over a few more pages and see what Mr. Straus had to say—

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

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

Mr. LUCAS. Who is the witness who is supposed to be testifying?

Mr. KNOWLAND. At this particular point I am reading from the Reclamation Service Conference, from the official statement of the public record.

Mr. LUCAS. Whose testimony?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That of Secretary Krug.
Mr. LUCAS. I he responsible for making statements with respect to the money the Bureau of Reclamation had? Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; the statements I read a moment ago.

Mr. LUCAS. He was cooperating with the Committee, not?

Mr. KNOWLAND. There are two different points about which we are talking. I am now reading some factual information from the report of the Reclamation Service Conference. I shall come to the testimony before our committee in a short time, if the Senator will be patient.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be patient. Mr. KNOWLAND. Now, let me read from what Mr. Straus had to say. I read from page 21:

Neither lack of men nor money can explain in full our present problems, but we might as well discuss the money matter first, because you never let the Commissioner take his Committee, has not been treating the Reclamation Service fairly. I say that the words of the Service officials themselves indicate that the charge is not true. I do not mean by that to imply that they are not in difficulties, but I think that in part the difficulties are of their own making.

I wish to say to the able Senator from Vermont that I certainly hope that when he obtains the additional money for investigations he will give very careful study to building up a proper accounting system, and to making the Reclamation Service agency a success so that they will know their financial condition. If any business in the United States, large or small, operated so loosely or in such a way that it did not know where it stood from week to week and month to month, that business would go to the wall in a very short period of time.

In the investigation of the Central Valley project in California we found that the Commissioner of Reclamation himself visited the Central Valley the month prior to the shut-down of the operations there, and as a matter of fact, within 2 months of the time when that great project was shut down the Commissioner of Reclamation himself did not know that it was going to be closed down. Can Senator Cooper continue a business operating under any such conditions?

During the course of this investigation certain information was disclosed which had not been included in the Committee report at the time of the regular investigation a year ago, and I wish to read to the Senate a memo which was produced by my colleague the senior Senator from California (Mr. Thomas) and which I place in the Committee record. This was a memorandum for all concerned, written by Mr. R. S. Calland, who is the deputy to Mr. Boke, in charge of the Central Valley project.

Subject: Means of effectuating the regional director's responsibilities for construction programming and execution.

1. For reasons valid or otherwise, the construction program in the region has fallen far behind schedule. The Bureau is vitally interested in the status of right-of-way. The construction program in the region has been steadily behind schedule and has brought about a severe criticism upon us from the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner, from members of congressional appropriations committees, and from the Senate and House of Representatives. I shall come to the testimony before our committee in a short time, if the Senator will be patient.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be patient. Mr. KNOWLAND. This was a memorandum for all concerned, written by Mr. R. S. Calland, who is the deputy to Mr. Boke, in charge of the Central Valley project.

Subject: Means of effectuating the regional director's responsibilities for construction programming and execution.

1. For reasons valid or otherwise, the construction program in the region has fallen far behind schedule. The Bureau is vitally interested in the status of right-of-way. The construction program in the region has been steadily behind schedule and has brought about a severe criticism upon us from the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner, from members of congressional appropriations committees, and from the Senate and House of Representatives.

2. The heavy carry-over from the current fiscal year (1947) plus an appropriation in the order of amounts recently passed by the Senate and House of Representatives will give us a total of funds available for fiscal year 1948, which is far above that required to meet our current rate of spending.

Listen to this:

The Secretary and the Commissioner are insistent that 1948 funds be spent early in the year of their availability. The Secretary feels that this situation represents a challenge to our construction ability. The Bureau's reputation and prestige will depend on an early start. As local custodians of this reputation all means at our command must be employed to meet this challenge.

At this time I ask unanimous consent that the enclosed memorandum be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:
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has proven that on many items anticipated delivery dates are often considerably delayed. By starting procurement activities immediately, there will no doubt be a necessity for varying the number of personnel in most areas as they are needed. We should not shrink from this responsibility. Delay incident to non-receipt of construction materials may be more serious than the inconvenience of warehousing those materials which arrive prematurely.

D. PERSONNEL ACTIONS ON CONSTRUCTION

At the recent district managers meeting in Klamath Falls, Ore., the district managers were unanimous in their criticism of the delay incident to completing personnel actions so that new people can be put to work. They were also unanimous in their belief that it is absolutely necessary to talk about an expedited construction program unless these delays can be avoided. Mr. Gendron will work with the personnel office both here and in Denver or Washington to see that personnel actions on construction people are handled promptly and expeditiously.

General instructions to expediters

Each of you in pursuing your separate endeavors will come in contact with problems lying within the field of another. Make it a rule to report any problems to the appropriate expeditor promptly. I would like to have a brief written report from each of you by the time our monthly meeting opens here next Thursday so that all of you may have a better picture of the whole situation, a copy of which will be furnished to each of the other expediters.

I want it understood that bottlenecks you are to break will not all be located in the region—some will be in Denver and some in Washington. Wherever they are, it is your job to locate and take care of them. I will be available for consultation and to give a helping hand.

Our construction program is the number one priority from now on. Everything else must give way to that. I solicit full cooperation and support of all regional personnel and feel confident that if a concerted effort is made by everyone concerned our record next year will be greatly improved over that of the last 2 or 3 years.

R. S. CALLAND.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I submit that when an agency is criticized for not having spent its funds by the end of the year—which I think is an entirely legitimate criticism which great numbers of people have raised about the Bureau of Reclamation—it should be an incentive for them to become efficient so that they can operate and spend the congressional appropriations within the year for which the appropriations are made. Of course there should be a little leeway. It is not possible for an agency to stop on June 30 and begin on July 1. But there will always be a certain amount carried over, and there should be, but certainly no such sums as have been carried over in the appropriations for the Central Valley and other projects over a period of years.

Mr. President, that is one thing, but it is an entirely different matter for a Government department to take the stand that it will not spend its funds by the date granted by the Congress in 6 months. That affects the very ability of the Congress to perform its constitutional function of controlling the purse strings of the Nation. This is the chief thing, as history has shown, that has been able to prevent the creation of dictatorships. The executive branch of the Government knew it always had to come back to the representatives of the people to get appropriations which would function. If we ever permit any executive department to take the position that it is not bound by the congressional policy of the representatives and the Senate of the United States, at least as appropriations are concerned, I say to Senators we threaten our whole legislative and constitutional system.

At the time this testimony was produced there was some question as to whether or not Mr. Calland was acting with an authority sufficient for him to come before the committee in order to obtain the facts in the case. He came, and his testimony was substantially to the effect that the date he fixed he picked out of thin air, that he had no basis whatever for selecting any such date, that he had not had a conversation with the Commissioner of Reclamation or with the Secretary of the Interior wherein they had told him to make such a statement.

This was such an unusual letter that both the senior Senator from California, Senator Hartigan, and I, as a member of the party on the other side of the aisle, and I questioned the witness very closely. Mr. Calland had been in the Reclamation Service for 30 or 30 years, and had borne a very high reputation. It seemed to us very unusual that a subordinate in a great Government department, in a letter sent out to all the employees in the area, should directly quote the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Reclamation that all these congressional funds should "be spent by January 1, if possible." We were convinced, or, at least, speaking for myself alone, I was convinced, that he was covering up for some reason.

In the next day or so after we had questioned him very closely and required him to bring before the committee any memoranda or telegrams or correspondence that might have passed between the witness and the Secretary of the Interior or the Commissioner of Reclamation which showed this correspondence;

Subject: Expediting Construction Program—Report to Secretary Krug.

1. This morning I spoke to you—

This is Mr. Boke to Mr. Calland:

This morning I spoke to you concerning Secretary Krug's last-minute instructions to me on the construction program. He stated very clearly that he would like to see our construction program back on track as early as possible. He put it up to us to let him know how we feel we can give the Secretary a construction personal report. However, I imagine we will not be asked to do so until July 1.

I hope you will take Paul Nelson and another one you need into your office and put them to work getting this stuff done. If you need additional personnel action or authorizations and administrative support, I hope you will take it from whatever branch or field office you wish it. By July 1, I think we should have a much better picture of how things are going to make personnel changes at one or two points. One never likes to do this, but, as I have said, I am in deadly earnest about getting this job done and not willing to let situations or personalities of any kind stand in our way. I hope that you will proceed on that basis.

RICHARD L. BOKE.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Obviously then this gentleman had at least withheld information from a committee representing the Senate of the United States. I pressed him pretty hard on this point, and I think frankly I believe that there is a relationship between the executive branch of the Government and the legislative branch of the Government would break down if congressional committees could no longer rely on the statements and the testimony presented to them by representatives of the executive branch of the Government of the United States.

I charged him with willfully misrepresenting facts to the committee, and this is what he said, and I quote from the record on page 450:

Mr. Chairman, I knew the document—

That was the Boke document—

was in the file. I was not willfully giving false testimony. I may have been evading.

This is a Government witness speaking before a committee of the Senate of the United States.

Let us turn over to a little additional testimony which was given on the last day by Mr. Calland, and I want to make it clear that Senators may realize some of the problems the Congress is sometimes presented with in trying to obtain the facts necessary to do their job. I bring this up because we may have to be a little bit critical of the vast Federal budget of more than $39,000,000,000, and may properly protect the interests of the people of the United States. I want to read some of the transcript from page 748. This is what we had to say on the last day:

Senator KNOWLAND. Mr. Calland, in the intervening period of time since your prior testimony before this committee, do you have any testimony you care to give now to either correct the record or make a little more clear what the facts were? Mr. Calland appeared on the day we adjourned when you were still on the witness stand?

Mr. CALLAND. I believe, Mr. Chairman, the most and perhaps a few more of the pieces may have been gathered together at this time, which I would not be remiss about doing, and they have been already introduced into the record.

Senator KNOWLAND. I again am referring to your testimony on the 11th of February at the time the Boke memorandum was first presented to this committee.

Do you recall the incident at the time the Chairman recessed the meeting over until Saturday?

Mr. CALLAND. Yes, sir.
The correspondence shows, through teletype messages to Sacramento, a caution that not one word should leak out to the thousands of workers or to a single contractor, or to a newspaper, as to what was about to happen. They callously and cruelly caused to be discharged from their jobs overnight the workers of the contractors. They interfered with the operations of material men and subcontractors, willfully and without any justification, because the return of Congress in November had brought their original plan to nothing. We were here from November 17 to January 1. Then, by the manipulation of accounts and the improper use of money, they accomplished the selfsame operation.

Mr. President, in my opinion—and I speak from this side of the aisle—there will finally be revealed a plot involving almost every superior official in the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation, constituting one of the greatest crimes against the American Government that has ever been perpetrated.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to assure myself with the additional remarks of my distinguished colleague, to the extent that I heard them. I was a few minutes late arriving in the Chamber.
peace to prepare the statutory foundation.

That report and the subsequent one dealing with a somewhat similar subject, as well as the final report, have been delayed in part because of the opposition of Members on both sides of the aisle with a variety of questions which arose during the early days of this session. I am sure that it has been possible to fill them at this time, but because of the absence of one or two Senators on the other side we requested a further delay of 30 days.

We also conducted a detailed investigation, the report on which will also be available as early as the Members are available to consider the report, on the subject of petroleum supplies, both at home and abroad, with particular reference to one contract in which many millions of dollars of Government money were involved. Some very extraordinary situations in connection with the procurement of petroleum supplies during the war for the use of our armed services. Apparently at least $55,000,000 more than was apparently warranted by the record in the case.

The matter of Air Forces procurement was handled by the able Senator from Michigan (Mr. Ferguson) as chairman of the subcommittee, with the assistance of able Members on both sides of the aisle. Presentation of the report has been delayed, in part by the absence of some Members because of investigations growing out of the investigation, which prosecutions are now in progress, and which it seemed might perhaps be prejudiced by the filing of a report prior to the prosecutions.

I believe that when the reports are filed they will speak for themselves. Four or five major reports were about the average of the committee each year during the war.

The reports to which I have referred represent the fruits of our labors during the war, and I believe that Members, inasmuch as they are not to be exercised by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments or other appropriate committees in the early stages of the hearings, that we should carry on for 1 year pending the organization of staffs by the standing committees of the Senate.

As to the more particular point before us, the question of the conduct of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program is not here involved, as its powers are now to be exercised by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments or other appropriate committees in the early stages of the hearings, but it is true in view of the fact that the able Senator from Michigan (Mr. Ferguson) is on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

In other words, Mr. President, a year ago it was very desirable that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments should conduct these investigations, and until such time as we have the funds to be provided for carrying on the investigations, very serious doubt is cast from the same source upon the wisdom of following such a course.

I wish to have it clear that the conduct of the War Investigating Committee has nothing to do with the proposal here pending. I did want the Raccoon to be clear that we knew what we had carried on, the principles that had guided us, and the reports which we hope will follow.

Mr. President, I hope that the motion to reconsider will not prevail.
Mr. AIKEN. A short time ago I told the Senator that I could not recall the incident, some months ago, which led to the compromise in the resolution. The director of our staff has now advised me that the occasion was when we had the report of the Comptroller General on the Federal Public Housing Administration. It appeared that some criminal negligence or law violation might have been involved. The full committee did not have an investigator of the type required in such case, so we desired to borrow from the subcommittee an investigator to make an investigation which would enable us to determine whether there was sufficient evidence of fraud in the Federal Public Housing Administration to warrant our recommending a prosecution. But we could not borrow the investigator, because the Senate disbursing officer said that was not permissible under the law, inasmuch as the money appropriated to the so-called Ferguson subcommittee was appropriated for a different purpose.

So we had to go ahead and make the investigation as best we could. We came to the conclusion that there was not sufficient evidence of fraud in the Federal Public Housing Administration to warrant a recommendation for the prosecution of anyone; and nothing further came of it. But that was a time when we did wish to borrow for that purpose from our subcommittee.

Of course this resolution is very broad. It would give us authority to use the requested appropriation for any of the duties which are imposed upon us by the Senate or by the law. But I am asking for the right to use it because I think we can operate more efficiently if we can do so. We can thus save some money.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I would have no objection if there were in the resolution any indication as to who would have the right to impose the duties.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senate would have the right to do so, of course.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in my capacity as chair of the subcommittee on investigations, I have asked that investigation which would enable us to determine whether there is sufficient evidence of fraud in the Federal Public Housing Administration to warrant our recommending a prosecution. But we could not borrow the investigator, because the Senate disbursing officer said that was not permissible under the law, inasmuch as the money appropriated to the so-called Ferguson subcommittee was appropriated for a different purpose.

So we had to go ahead and make the investigation as best we could. We came to the conclusion that there was not sufficient evidence of fraud in the Federal Public Housing Administration to warrant a recommendation for the prosecution of anyone; and nothing further came of it. But that was a time when we did wish to borrow for that purpose from our subcommittee.

Of course this resolution is very broad. It would give us authority to use the requested appropriation for any of the duties which are imposed upon us by the Senate or by the law. But I am asking for the right to use it because I think we can operate more efficiently if we can do so. We can thus save some money.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I would have no objection if there were in the resolution any indication as to who would have the right to impose the duties.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senate would have the right to do so, of course.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think I can explain the situation by referring to subsection (g) (2) (B) of rule XXV. It will be noted that in rule XXV there are other subsections besides (B):

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

(B) Such committee shall have the duty of:

(1) Receiving and examining reports of the Comptroller General of the United States and of submitting such recommendations to the Senate as it deems necessary or desirable in connection with the subject matter of such reports.

(2) Receiving and examining reports of the Comptroller General of the United States and of submitting such recommendations to the Senate as it deems necessary or desirable in connection with the subject matter of such reports.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. It is not true that the Comptroller General has submitted reports covering a vast variety of subjects which this language would enlarge, infinitely more than our staff or any other staff within the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think that is true.

Mr. BREWSTER. Of course.
Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, answering the question asked by the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Langer), I think perhaps the answer was entirely adequate, but in one case there was an undeserved, curiously enough, the exact amount which it had cost our committee to function. One hundred and sixty-six thousand dollars is recoverable.

In another instance the sum of $5,000,-

In another instance the sum of $1,000,000 was returned voluntarily to the Treasury after witnesses had appeared before our committee.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the distinguished Senator very much.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Lucas) to reconsider the vote by which the Senate agreed to Senate Resolution 189.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will illustrate it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. My understanding is that the motion of the Senator from Illinois is to reconsider the vote by which Senate Resolution 189 was previously adopted by the Senate, so that a "yea" vote would bring it back to the Senate as though it had never passed, and a "nay" vote would confirm the previous action of the Senate. Is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, one of the reasons for filing the motion to reconsider the action of the Senate with reference to Senate Resolution 189, which gave the committee the power to investigate, it seemed to me, practically everything, was because of the language "or any other duties imposed upon it." In view of the explicit understanding which I have had with the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Fuszard) as to the meaning of those words, I am perfectly satisfied with the language as it is. In other words, the Senator advises me that the phrase "any other duties imposed upon it" simply means any other duties imposed upon the committee by the Reconstruction Act or by the rules of the Senate. I am perfectly satisfied with the language as it stands.

I make that explanation because it had seemed to me the language was very broad and that a committee, without a strict construction of the language, might interpret it to mean that the committee could investigate practically everything, even going into the jurisdiction of other committees, to which I think we are all very much opposed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Lucas). The motion was not agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, read and ordered, and in the presence of the reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 43) to amend the title of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 179) to continue until July 1, 1948, the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside in order that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of the calendar, starting with order No. 85.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is asking for reconsideration of bills to which there is no objection; is he not?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will call the bills on the calendar.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 669) to provide for the payment of a bonus of 30 cents a bushel on wheat produced and sold between January 1, 1946, and April 18, 1946, was announced as first in order.

On objection, the bill was passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 25) amending XXII relating to cloture was announced as next in order.

On objection, the resolution was passed over.

The bill (S. 354) to incorporate the Federal City Charter Commission was announced as next in order.

On objection, the bill was passed over.

The bill (S. 866) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective, and to provide for the coordinated execution of such policy through a National Housing Commission, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANCER. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 408) to repeal section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act, to amend section 13c of the said act, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANCER. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 409) to establish uniform qualifications of jurors in Federal courts, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

On objection, the bill was passed over.

The bill (S. 18) to establish uniform qualifications of jurors in Federal courts, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 318) to amend the Nationality Act of 1946 to preserve the nationality of citizens who were unable to return to the United States prior to October 14, 1946, was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

TRANSFER OF REMOUNT SERVICE

The bill (H. R. 3484) to transfer the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the bill which has just been called has been on the calendar for several months. The Senator from Oregon (Mr. Morse) is in favor of the bill, but upon my objection the bill has been passed over. I desire to make a motion regarding the bill at the appropriate time, but not at this moment, and I shall ask to have the Senator from Oregon notified.

Mr. R. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma that I hope to be present when the motion is made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will go to the foot of the calendar.

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1038) to amend the Federal Airport Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the bill go over.
The resolution (S. Res. 144) authorizing an investigation of law enforcement and police administration in the District of Columbia, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 1389) to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 472) to provide for the coordination of agencies disseminating technical and scientific information was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1481) to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish day-light-saving time in the District was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 84) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1372) authorizing the Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma to sell tribal cemetery was announced as next in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am informed that one of the Senators who is temporarily absent at this time has asked that this bill go over. So I ask that the bill go to the foot of the calendar until the Senator can return.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will go to the foot of the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 150) to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 116 was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1098) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Any agent, agent in charge, field supervisor, district supervisor, assistant to the Commissioner of Narcotics, or Commissioner of the Bureau of Narcotics of the Department of the Treasury, who is not less than 60 years of age and has rendered 10 years or more of service in one or more of the positions enumerated, may, on his own application and with the consent of the Secretary of the Treasury, ret from the service. Any person shall upon retirement be entitled to an immediate annuity equal to 75 percent of his average basic salary for the 5 years next preceding the date of his retirement, multiplied by the number of years of such service, not exceeding 30 years."

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 144) authorizing an investigation of law enforcement and police administration in the District of Columbia, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICE

The bill (S. 48) to provide for the demonstration of public library service in areas without such service or within inadequate library facilities, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That this act may be cited as the Public Library Service Demonstration Act.

STATEMENT OF POLICY

Sec. 1. (a) It is the purpose of this act to aid the States in demonstrating public-library service to those people now without it or with inadequate service, and to provide a means by which the values of public-library service may be studied and any resulting conclusions reported to the Nation.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve any plan which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a) of this section. The duty of the Commissioner in approving a plan shall be solely the determination of whether the plan meets the specifications set forth in section (a). The Commissioner may not exercise any authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, or compensation of any individual employed, by a State library administrative agency or the local authority directly responsible for the operation of the demonstration.

(c) Uniformity of plans throughout the several States shall not be considered as a standard or condition precedent to the Commissioner's approval of a plan.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED

Sec. 2. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this act such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act to assist the States in the provision of demonstrations of public-library service to areas in adequately served or unserved.

(b) There are hereby authorized to be included for each of four fiscal years following the passage of this act in the appropriations of the Federal Security Agency such sums as are sufficient for the Commissioner, under the supervision and direction of the Federal Security Administrator, to carry out the provisions of this act: Provided, That an amount not to exceed more than 3 percent of the funds appropriated for the States may be used for this purpose.

PAYMENT TO STATES

Sec. 7. (a) From the funds made available for the purposes of this act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State, out of funds in the Treasury, the amount of $25,000 to $75,000, to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, after the state has submitted a plan for the operation of the demonstration: Provided, That the Secretary of the Treasury, after receiving the plan and after determining that such plan is approved, may fix the amount of such payment.
State an additional amount each year for 5 years, equal to the amount provided by the State or its local governmental unit for the program as set forth in section 2 (a).

(c) No portion of any money paid to a State under this section shall be applied directly or indirectly, to the purchase or erection of any building or buildings, or for the purchase of any land.

ADMINISTRATION

Sec. 6. In carrying out his duties under this act, the Commissioner is required to make an annual report to the Congress as to the administration of this act, and to prepare a final report for public distribution outlining in a suitable form the accomplishments of the act authorized to gather such statistics, make such studies, investigations, and reports necessary for the fulfillment of this act.

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 9. As used in this act—
(a) The term "States" means the States of the United States, and Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

(b) "State library administrative agency" means the official State agency charged by State law with the execution under the direction of the State of the State's provisions relating to the establishment of public-library services throughout the State.

The term "public library" shall mean a library that serves free all residents of a community, district, or region, and receives its financial support in whole or in part from public funds.

(d) "Inadequate library service" shall be defined by the State library administrative agency.

PROFIT LIMITATIONS IN CONSTRUCTION OF VESSELS

The bill (H. R. 3051) to amend the act of July 19, 1940, and to amend section 2 and repeal the profit-limitation and certain other limiting provisions of the act of March 27, 1934, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Over.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, this is a very important bill. I shall not ask that the objection be withheld, but I do ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at this point an explanation of the provisions of the bill, and that those interested, especially Senators who have objected, will read the explanation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the statement submitted by Mr. Gurney shall be printed in the Record, and, on objection, the bill will be passed over.

The statement submitted by Mr. Gurney is as follows:

REMARKS BE H. R. 3051

The purpose of H. R. 3051 is to amend certain provisions of the Vinson-Trammell Act and amendments thereto dealing with the construction of vessels and aircraft and profit limitations on contracts therefor. The legislation is also pertinent to the Department of the Air Force, insofar as it relates to the profit limitations on aircraft construction.

The Vinson-Trammell Act, approved March 27, 1934, is a permanent peacetime law and is the basic law governing the construction of the fleet. The profit-limitations provisions of the act relating to vessels and aircraft were made applicable to the construction of Army aircraft by section 14 of the act of April 3, 1935.

The Vinson-Trammell Act became law in 1934, at a time when we were in a period of depression, in order to maintain employment of skilled shipyards, and in order to increase the abnormally low employment level. Due to radically different conditions, the act is not applicable to the construction of vessels, and the construction companies today as compared to 1934, the following objections to the Vinson-

The continuance of such a limitation places the Navy Department in an infeasible and awkward position in the procurement of new hardware. Some of this hardware is so expensive that it is not possible for the Navy to procure the best quantity possible of this equipment. The proposed limitation would place the Navy in a situation where it would have to accept inferior equipment or accept delays in delivery.

The bill removes the maximum profit limitation on aircraft in order to maintain employment at a level consistent with national defense needs. It would also afford additional funds for the construction of new vessels and aircraft.

The bill removes the maximum profit limitation on aircraft in order to maintain employment at a level consistent with national defense needs. It would also afford additional funds for the construction of new vessels and aircraft.

The bill's purpose is to ensure that the Navy Department is able to procure the best quantity possible of this equipment. The proposed limitation would place the Navy in a situation where it would have to accept inferior equipment or accept delays in delivery.

The bill removes the maximum profit limitation on aircraft in order to maintain employment at a level consistent with national defense needs. It would also afford additional funds for the construction of new vessels and aircraft.

The bill's purpose is to ensure that the Navy Department is able to procure the best quantity possible of this equipment. The proposed limitation would place the Navy in a situation where it would have to accept inferior equipment or accept delays in delivery.

The bill removes the maximum profit limitation on aircraft in order to maintain employment at a level consistent with national defense needs. It would also afford additional funds for the construction of new vessels and aircraft.

The bill's purpose is to ensure that the Navy Department is able to procure the best quantity possible of this equipment. The proposed limitation would place the Navy in a situation where it would have to accept inferior equipment or accept delays in delivery.

The bill removes the maximum profit limitation on aircraft in order to maintain employment at a level consistent with national defense needs. It would also afford additional funds for the construction of new vessels and aircraft.

The bill's purpose is to ensure that the Navy Department is able to procure the best quantity possible of this equipment. The proposed limitation would place the Navy in a situation where it would have to accept inferior equipment or accept delays in delivery.
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 2239) to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1844, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Several senators. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1064) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, so as to provide that no person shall be appointed as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission or as general manager of such Commission until an investigation, with respect to character, associations, and loyalty of such person shall have been made by the FEI, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Over.

The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1291) to establish a National Freedom Day, was announced as next in order.

Several senators. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 868) to prohibit the payment of retirement annuities to former Members of Congress convicted of offenses involving the improper use of authority, influence, power, or privileges as Members of Congress, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4042) to control the export to foreign countries of gasoline and petroleum products from the United States, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 1350) to control the export to foreign countries of gasoline and petroleum products from the United States, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 146) to authorize the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, District of Columbia, to make loans to farm operators for acquisition of land, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE RESEARCH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2038) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the act of May 29, 1894.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, this bill would permit the acquisition of land, and would also authorize the establishment of a research laboratory in the United States, to further the acquisition of knowledge regarding foot-and-mouth disease. The disease does not exist in the United States, and it could cost livestock farmers many millions of dollars. For that reason it is felt that the Senate should examine the Department of Agriculture that a research laboratory should be established somewhere, either on an island adjacent to the United States, or in some part of the United States, so that research could be conducted, and so as to perfect the known vaccine which exists today, or develop some other type of vaccine to guard against the disease. That is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Reserving the right to object, I should like to say to the able Senator from Minnesota that I fully recognize the importance of eradicating foot-and-mouth disease, because there was a very bad outbreak in my State of California in 1924 and in 1929, which resulted in the loss of tens of thousands of head of cattle and decimation of the livestock industry in the State. The State Department of Agriculture is very much concerned about the establishment of a laboratory within the continental confines of the United States. I believe that it should spread from a place which was not properly segregated it might cause untold loss to the livestock industry and dairy industry of the Nation. I was wondering whether the Senator would have any objection to an amendment which would limit the establishment of such a laboratory to an offshore island?

Mr. THYE. I should have no objection to such an amendment, but I call the Senator's attention to this fact: It has been brought to our notice that a peninsula could be found, and it might be possible to isolate the point of it so that those on the peninsula could have contact with the mainland, so to speak, and the laboratory would not be established on an island, leading to difficulty of navigation to and from the island, and necessitating the personnel having to be transported by boat to the island for the purpose of conducting the research activities. I think that if the Senator would examine the map he would probably find a peninsula which could be entirely segregated from the adjoining land, either by a fence or by a bridge. I could call his attention to such a peninsula if I cared to do so, but I do not think we should disclose the particular location at this time. That is why I do not desire to be specific.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder if the Senator would object to the bill going to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. THYE. I may say that delay in deciding this question is embarrassing to the Department of Agriculture. While I do not say that I would object to the bill going over today, if it should be delayed for another day, I would ask the Senator to examine the matter very carefully, because every minute of delay is jeopardizing the livestock industry of the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am fully alive to the importance of the problem; and if this bill called for an appropriation of funds to finance conducting the disease, and there were an emergent situation, I should not even hold the bill up and ask that it go to the end of the calendar today, but I should like to have a chance to examine it.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator will ask that it be placed at the end of the calendar, that will be satisfactory.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed at the end of the calendar.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2123) to exempt certain officers of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force from the provisions of statutes relating to the granting of retirement by reason of age, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

TRANSPORTATION FOR CERTAIN GOVERNMENT AND OTHER PERSONNEL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1232) to provide for furnishing transportation for certain Government and other personnel, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments.
The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Does the bill affect per diem payments?

Mr. GURNEY. No.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 1, page 2, line 8, after the words "Secretary of", to strike out "War or" and insert "the Army".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 1, page 3, line 3, after the words "Secretary of", to strike out "War or" and insert "the Army".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 2, page 2, line 8, after the words "Secretary of", to strike out "War or" and insert "the Army"; and in line 8, after the word "Navy", to insert "the Air Force".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 2, page 3, line 3, after the words "Secretary of", to strike out "War or" and insert "the Army"; and in line 14, after the word "Navy", to insert "the Secretary of the Air Force".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 2, page 3, line 3, after the words "Secretary of", to strike out "War or" and insert "the Army"; and in line 14, after the word "Navy", to insert "the Secretary of the Air Force".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 3, page 3, line 1, after the word "Navy", to strike out "Secretary of" and insert "the Army"; and in line 15, the word "or" after the word "Navy", to strike out "Secretary of" and insert "the Secretary of the Air Force".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 3, page 3, line 1, after the word "Navy", to strike out "Secretary of" and insert "the Secretary of the Air Force".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 4, page 3, line 19, after the words "Secretary of", to strike out "War and" and insert "the Army"; in line 20, after the word "Navy", to strike out "Secretary of" and insert "the Secretary of the Air Force"; and on page 4, line 2, after the word "means", to insert "that reasonable effort be made by the Secretary of the Air Force, or by private facilities to provide the necessary service."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, page 4, line 8, after the words "Secretary of", to strike out "War and" and insert "the Army"; in line 9, after the word "Navy", to insert "the Secretary of the Air Force"; in line 17, after the word "operation", to strike out "and"; in line 19, after the words "Secretary of", to strike out "War or" and insert "the Army"; in line 19, after the word "Navy", to insert "the Secretary of the Air Force"; and in paragraph 4, line 4, the word "Secretary of" after the word "Navy", to strike out "Secretary of" and insert "the Secretary of the Air Force"; shall be exercised in each case only after a determination by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force, or such official within their respective departments as they may designate,

The next amendment was, in section 2, page 4, line 8, after the word "Secretary of", to strike out "War and" and insert "the Army"; in line 9, after the word "Navy", to insert "the Secretary of the Air Force"; and in paragraph 4, line 4, the word "Secretary of" after the word "Navy", to strike out "Secretary of" and insert "the Secretary of the Air Force"; shall be exercised in each case only after a determination by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force, or such official within their respective departments as they may designate.
is possible something may develop in the next 3 months which will make that unnecessary. But if the import controls on fats and oils, the import controls on rice, and a good many other controls which are contained under the Decontrol Act are carefully examined by the committee and if we put off final action until somewhere near the end of the session so we can see whether or not certain controls can be eliminated, I think we will find that some can be eliminated, so we will only have to continue the very limited number of controls that still remain under the War Powers Act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House bill 5391.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5391) to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion conferred on the President by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in two places in the bill the date March 31 appears. I offer the amendment that in both cases the date be changed from March 31 to May 31; in other words, that "May" be substituted for "March" in both instances.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio. The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I wanted to ask a question before the bill was passed. What provision is made in it for tin?

Mr. TAFT. There is a continuation of the powers which now exist, for a period of 90 days.

Mr. LODGE. Is there a substantial difference between the Senate bill and the House bill?

Mr. TAFT. None whatever, I think, except I believe the Senate bill eliminated quinine. I think that is about all the difference there is. Quinine had been decontrolled anyway. At any rate, under the bill control is continued for 90 days only.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair assumes that the Senator from Ohio wishes to have the Senate bill indefinitely postponed?

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senate bill might well remain on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Very well; the bill will remain on the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT—RAILROAD REORGANIZATION

The bill (H. R. 2298) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I should be very glad if the Senator would withhold his objection so I could make a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. LANGER. The bill is very important. I have not had time to examine it. I shall be glad, however, to withhold my objection.

Mr. REED. Normally I would agree with the Senator from North Dakota that important legislation such as is contained in House bill 2298 should not be passed on the calendar. However, the subject matter of the bill has been debated for 3 years in both Houses of Congress. The House has passed six versions of the bill and the Senate two. Two years ago the Senate passed a bill dealing with the subject, which was vetoed by the President. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has considered the bill. The committee has held hearings. We have deleted from the bill every controversial point. No one, to my knowledge, objects to any provision of the bill. The report of the Interstate Commerce Commission gave it a prompt and vigorous recommendation. The organizations which make loans to the railroads do not ask us to delete themselves want it. There is no objection to the bill from any source of which I have knowledge.

I should like to say one thing further. There is an important railroad in the northeastern section of the United States which has some early maturities of bonded indebtedness. It is important that the bill pass at an early date in order to give the Lehigh Valley Railroad the benefit which would come from the operation of the bill. I hope there will be no objection to it.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at that point?

Mr. REED. Yes, I shall be happy to yield; but I remind the Senator that I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. HAWKES. I shall take the time I now consume out of my own time. I simply want to say that the Senator from North Dakota would like very much to have the Senator from Kansas cite the two or three things the bill would do. The Senator from North Dakota is not opposed to the bill. He simply wants the Senator from Kansas to cite the simple things which have been debated and handled by the Senator from Kansas and myself and dozens of others for 2 or 3 years.

I am thoroughly in accord with what the Senator from Kansas has said. The committee has studied this problem. There has been a meeting of minds on this bill. In my opinion, the subject has been thoroughly discussed, and the bill should be passed.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, up to this time there has been no way to reorganize a railroad except through equity receivership, or under the bankruptcy law. Both those procedures are lengthy. They require much time and an enormous amount of money.

The first part of House bill 2298 provides a very method by which the Congress first recognized in the passage of the so-called Chandler Act in 1933. That was followed by the McLaughlin Act, which I think was passed in 1942.

We have written into this bill what is intended to be a permanent statute, providing a method by which railroads may take advantage, through voluntary reorganization, of what the Congress did in the Chandler Act and in the McLaughlin Act.

Furthermore, we have attempted to provide for a period in the future, if it should ever come—and we all hope it will not—where railroads may be in as bad condition as they were in 1930. We have imposed upon the Interstate Commerce Commission an obligation to report any changes which may occur in the process of reorganization. Some reorganization plans have covered a period of 6 or 7 years, and the financial condition of the bankrupt railroad has changed considerably.

There is no objection from any source to any provision of this bill. We have sought to impose certain duties upon the States and upon the Interstate Commerce Commission. We have written the best provision we could for an equitable division all around, including the stockholders, the bondholders, and all concerned in railroad reorganization. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. AIKEN. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, where does the objection come from?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont objects.

Mr. AIKEN. I object to the present consideration of the bill. I appreciate the Senator's explanation, but it is too much to digest on the spur of the moment. I should like time to read and study the bill.

Mr. REED. It has been on the calendar for some time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. REED subsequently said: Mr. President, I have had a conversation with the Senator from Vermont, Mr. AIKEN, who authorizes me to say that he withdraws his objection to the bill H. R. 2298, which is No. 936 on the calendar. I ask that the Senate return to that bill.

Mr. LANGER. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

SERVICE CREDIT FOR PAY PURPOSES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1790) to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act to credit certain service performed by members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Public Health Service prior to reaching 18 years of age for the purpose of computing longevity pay, or for other pay purposes," approved March 6, 1946, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That (a) the first section of the act entitled "An act to credit certain service performed by members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Public Health Survey, and Public Health Service prior to reaching 18 years of age for the purpose of..."
computing longevity pays, or for other pay purposes, "an Act to authorize, and grant funds for, the maintenance of the several armed forces of the United States, and for other purposes," was approved March 6, 1946 (Public Law 339, 79th Cong.), is amended by inserting after "Army," the word "Air Force.

(b) Section 2 of such act is amended to read as follows: "The provisions of this act shall be effective from June 1, 1942."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

ADMISSION OF CANADIAN STUDENTS TO SERVICE ACADEMIES

The bill (S. 1723) to amend Public Law 162 (Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, an act to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy was announced as next in order. Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, this bill does not increase the appropriations, nor does it increase the number of students at either West Point or Annapolis. It merely gives two representatives to students from Canada—the same representation as is accorded to students of other American republics. Would not more students in Annapolis or West Point. Because of the unification of the armed services, the bill was written in this form to amend the old Navy Educational Act.

Mr. LODGE. As I understand, the bill would not change the fundamental course of instruction.

Mr. MAYBANK. Oh, no. It would merely give the right to the Academy to add students from Canada. Among students from Central American or South American republics are added, the number not to exceed the present number of 20.

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

Mr. LANGER. What is it proposed to do with respect to Central and South American countries?

Mr. MAYBANK. At the present time a certain number of students from American republics are permitted to attend West Point and Annapolis. The bill would merely give the same privilege to students from Canada.

Mr. LANGER. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1167) to amend section 2 of the joint resolution approved November 17, 1941, relating to the arming of American vessels was announced as next in order.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this bill?

Mr. CAPEHART. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

CONTROL OF GRAIN FOR PRODUCTION OF ETHYL ALCOHOL

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 186) to authorize allocation and inventory control of grain for the production of ethyl alcohol, to conserve grain in aid of the National Defense, and in furtherance of the stabilization of the national economy, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, with regard to Senate Joint Resolution 186, when similar legislation was under consideration during the special session certain statements were placed in the Record with regard to a well-considered Pennsylvania industry, in connection with its grain quota, and also with regard to the grain and grain products used by that company during the period from October 26, 1947 to December 31, 1947.

In view of those statements, and in order that the record may be kept straight, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record as follows:

Mr. President; with respect to Central American or Annapolis.

Mr. LODGE. Let the bill go over.

In the spring of 1941 Publicker officials pointed out to the Government that the increasing effectiveness of Nazi submarine activities threatened the black market alcohol production of the United States. To forestall the Nazi U-boat menace, Publicker urged the Government to equip all alcohol-producing plants on island grounds, grain-handling facilities, so that they would no longer be dependent upon molasses.

In 1941 came Publicker, along with other United States producers, concentrated its vast facilities on the production of alcohol for our wartime program, resulting in a Government action, Publicker in the summer of 1941 made arrangements to switch a large part of its existing fermentation and distilling capacity to the use of grain at its Bigler Street plant. As a result the company was able to handle 45,000 bushels of grain a day. This gave the company a daily grain alcohol production of approximately 235,000 gallons. In January after Pearl Harbor the Publicker company applied for priorities to construct at its own expense 65,000 bushels additional daily grain-handling facilities.

The Government delayed action on this request until the summer of 1942—until it developed a grain-handling program for the whole alcohol industry. At least 25 projects for the wartime expansion of distillery and industrial alcohol were carried out. Pub­
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The amendment was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1723) to amend Public Law 162 (Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, an act to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy was announced as next in order.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, this bill does not increase the appropriations, nor does it increase the number of students at either West Point or Annapolis. In other words, two representatives to students from Canada—the same representation as is accorded to students of other American republics. It would put no more students in Annapolis or West Point. Because of the unification of the armed services, the bill was written in this form to amend the old Navy Educational Act.

Mr. LODGE. As I understand, the bill would not change the fundamental course of instruction.

Mr. MAYBANK. Oh, no. It would merely give the right to the Academy to add students from Canada. Among students from Central American or South American republics are added, the number not to exceed the present number of 20.

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

Mr. LANGER. What is it proposed to do with respect to Central and South American countries?

Mr. MAYBANK. At the present time a certain number of students from American republics are permitted to attend West Point and Annapolis. The bill would merely give the same privilege to students from Canada.

Mr. LANGER. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1167) to amend section 2 of the joint resolution approved November 17, 1941, relating to the arming of American vessels was announced as next in order.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this bill?

Mr. CAPEHART. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

CONTROL OF GRAIN FOR PRODUCTION OF ETHYL ALCOHOL

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 186) to authorize allocation and inventory control of grain for the production of ethyl alcohol, to conserve grain in aid of the National Defense, and in furtherance of the stabilization of the national economy, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, with regard to Senate Joint Resolution 186, when similar legislation was under consideration during the special session certain statements were placed in the Record with regard to a well-considered Pennsylvania industry, in connection with its grain quota, and also with regard to the grain and grain products used by that company during the period from October 26, 1947 to December 31, 1947.

In view of those statements, and in order that the record may be kept straight, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record as follows:

ABOUT PUBLICKER INDUSTRIES, INC.

Publicker Industries, Inc., was founded in 1913 in Philadelphia as the Publicker Commercial Alcohol Co. for the purpose of producing ethyl alcohol by the fermentation of blackstrap molasses. Alcohol, in various forms for industrial and beverage purposes, was produced in these early days, and beverage spirituous liquors were sold to rectifiers and other permittees as early as 1913. In the late 1920's the company began installing facilities for the production of alcohol from grain.

In 1924 the company greatly expanded its facilities through the erection of its Bigler Street plant, which is now the largest alcohol producer in the world. About 1929 grain-handling facilities were added to this plant and grain spirits were made and sold to permittees desiring this commodity. These facilities were repeatedly enlarged.

With the repeal of prohibition in 1933, Publicker actively entered the beverage-distilling field through a subsidiary, the Continental Distilling Company. Continental plant now has the largest capacity of any beverage distillery in the world. When Publicker entered the distilled-spirits field, competitors like Seagram had not yet acquired their first United States plant, while Schenley and Maker's Mark had only recently begun the acquisition of small plants which is responsible for their present size. These companies were quickly outdistilled by the wartime expansion of these companies when the entire beverage industry was producing war alcohol. Much of the industry came about through the purchase of many small units with whiskey in storage, while others came by great expansion by increasing its own facilities.

In the spring of 1941 Publicker officials pointed out to the Government that the increasing effectiveness of Nazi submarine activities threatened the black market alcohol production of the United States. To forestall the Nazi U-boat menace, Publicker urged the Government to equip all alcohol-producing plants on island grounds, grain-handling facilities, so that they would no longer be dependent upon molasses.

In 1941 came Publicker, along with other United States producers, concentrated its vast facilities on the production of alcohol for our wartime program, resulting in a Government action, Publicker in the summer of 1941 made arrangements to switch a large part of its existing fermentation and distilling capacity to the use of grain at its Bigler Street plant. As a result the company was able to handle 45,000 bushels of grain a day. This gave the company a daily grain alcohol production of approximately 225,000 gallons. In January after Pearl Harbor the Publicker company applied for priorities to construct at its own expense 65,000 bushels additional daily grain-handling facilities.

The Government delayed action on this request until the summer of 1942—until it developed a grain-handling program for the whole alcohol industry. At least 25 projects for the wartime expansion of distillery and industrial alcohol were carried out. Publicker first to propose the expansion of grain-handling facilities for the industry, was practically the last to have its project approved.

Practically each and every United States distillery and industrial alcohol plant which could possibly contribute to the war effort received Government aid in the form of equipment and/or priorities, and in most cases the Government financed their wartime activities.

In the case of Publicker the Government installed primary equipment to dry the residue after distillation. This was done to avoid waste of valuable cattle feed.

It must be distinctly understood that not one gallon of additional fermentation or still capacity was added to the Publicker plant with or without Government money during the war. The fermentation and still capacity had been provided by the company at its own expense prior to the war. One beer still was included in the above-mentioned grain-handling program, but production of butanol and acetone, two highly essential war chemicals, of which Publicker is also the producer. Publicker would have been able, even without the Government's grain-handling facilities, to have greatly increased its alcohol production from grain, but this would have entailed the utilization of many makeshift methods and would have resulted in especially high-cost alcohol to the Government.

It is interesting to point out here that the foresight of the Publicker Co. in expanding its grain-handling facilities in the summer of 1941, a year before Government action, practically kept the Government's synthetic-rubber program going. The Government started its synthetic-rubber program on a 100-percent-petroleum basis. Then, as a result of the Bernard M. Baruch report, it was changed to part alcohol and part petroleum production. But the stepped-up United States aviation program caused so heavy a demand for jet gasoline, that petroleum for the rubber program had to be diverted for wartime aviation expansion. Publicker, in the war increased its grain-handling capacity to 45,000 bushels, was by far the largest single producer of industrial-rubber production, which kept the program going until the Government could expand the production capacity of other distillers and industrial-alcohol plants.
The president pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 186?
Mr. CAPELL. Let the joint resolution go over.
The president pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

USE AND OCCUPANCY OF NATIONAL FOREST LANDS

The bill (H. R. 1809) to facilitate the use and occupancy of national forest lands and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I note that the provisions of House bill 1809, Calendar 943, permit the Secretary of Agriculture to adopt rules and regulations permitting the use by private individuals of portions of the public domain within national forests for a period up to 30 years. I also note that there is no provision for giving notice of intention to do so. In view of the fact that this plan includes commercialization of those areas, unless a provision is made to provide for adequate public notice I must ask that it go over.

The president pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2143) to make the Government-owned alcohol plant at Muscatine, Iowa, available for processing agricultural commodities in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The president pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

PAYMENT OF SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF CERTAIN DELEGATES OF FORT PECK GENERAL COUNCIL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1021) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay salaries and expenses of the chairman, secretary, and clerk of the Fort Peck General Council, members of the Fort Peck Business Committee, and other committees appointed by said Fort Peck General Council, and official delegates of the Fort Peck Tribe, which had been reported from the former Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior, or his duly authorized representative, is hereby authorized, beginning as of July 1, 1947, and until otherwise directed by Congress, to pay out of any unobligated tribal funds of the Fort Peck Indians in the Treasury of the United States the following salaries and expenses:

To the chairman, secretary, and clerk of the Fort Peck General Council and members of the Fort Peck Tribal Executive Board, $300 per month, and all other expenses shall not exceed $898 in lieu of subsistence and all other expenses; to such official delegates of the Fort Peck Tribes, who may carry on the business of the tribes at the seat of government, a salary of not to exceed $20 per day and a per diem of $10 in lieu of subsistence and all other expenses: Provided, That the rate of salary and per diem paid shall be fixed in advance by the general council of said tribes or by the executive board of the said tribes if authorized by said general council: Provided further, That the official delegates of the tribes carrying on said business at the seat of government shall also receive the usual railroad and sleeping-car or day transportation charges and other expenses of the seat of government, or, if travel is by automobile, delegates furnishing such transportation shall receive an amount equivalent to the cost of their railroad and sleeping-car transportation to and from the seat of government, and per diem shall not be paid to delegates traveling by automobile for any period in excess of the time required to perform the travel by railroad: Provided further, That the total amount of the aforementioned salaries and expenses shall not exceed $10,000 per annum: And provided further, That the length of service of the official delegates at the seat of government shall be determined by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill? What is the Fort Peck General Council? Is it a council of Indians?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the Fort Peck General Council will be a council of the Indians. These funds belong to the Indians and are held in trust by the Secretary of the Interior. The bill merely authorizes him to pay the salaries of officers of the tribal council. It has the full approval of the committee.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read "A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay salaries and expenses of the chairman, secretary, and clerk of the Fort Peck General Council, members of the Fort Peck Business Committee, and other committees appointed by said Fort Peck General Council, and official delegates of the Fort Peck Tribe."
In the past, the custom has been to permit the burial of the wife of a service-
man in the national cemetery in the anticipa-
tion that sometime his body would be placed alongside hers. This bill per-
mits the removal of bodies in order that they may be interred at the same place, the same lot, if, as and when that is found desir-
able. It is a custom that has been fol-
lowed by the Department for a long time, but it has been done without defi-
nitive authority. The Department wishes to continue the custom which has prevail-
ed in the past, but to have defi-
nitive authority for doing so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present considera-
tion of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1620) was considered, ordered to be eng-
rolled and passed the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That burial in national cemeteries of the remains of the following classes of persons is authorized under such regulations as the Secretary of War may pre-
scribe: (a) Any member or former member of any government allied with the United States whose last service terminated honorably, by death or otherwise; (b) any citizen of the United States, who, during any war in which the United States has been or may hereafter be engaged, served in the armed forces of any government allied with the United States during such war, and whose last service ter-
mminated honorably, by death or otherwise; and (c) the wife, husband, widow, widower, minor child, unmarried adult child of any of the persons enumerated in (a) and (b) herein: Provided, That the remains of those persons enumerated in (c), above, may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be removed from a national cemetery proper and interred in the new section of a national cemetery or in a post cemetery if, upon death, the relative member of the armed forces of the United States or allied government is not buried in the same or an adjoining grave site. Persons who were members of the Cabi-
net of the President of the United States at any time during the period between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, may also be buried in the new section of a national cemetery.

The amendment was agreed to.

DE SOTO NATIONAL MEMORIAL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4923) to authorize the establish-
ment of the De Soto National Memorial, in the State of Florida, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 2, in line 18, after the word "sums", to insert "not to exceed $25,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

SEWAGE-DISPOSAL SYSTEM FOR YORK-
TOWN AREA OF COLONIAL NATIONAL
HISTORICAL PARK, VA.

The bill (H. R. 2159) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to prepare plans and specifications for a sewage-disposal system to serve the Yorktown area of the Colonial National Historical Park, Va., and for other purposes, was consid-
ered, ordered to be engrossed, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2453) to provide for the establishment and operation of a re-
search laboratory in North Dakota lign-
ite-consuming region was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present considera-
tion of the bill?

Mr. CORDY. Mr. President, reserving
the right to object, although I shall not object, let me say that I do not have a copy of the bill in my calendar file. I would ask the distinguished Senator from Nebraska to advise the Senate as to the amount of the authorization car-
rried in the bill, inasmuch as I do not have the bill before me.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa has asked that the bill go over, and it will be passed over.

DESIGNATION OF PARK RIVER DAM AND
RESERVOIR PROJECT AS HOMME RES-
ERVORY AND DAM

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 61) to provide for the designation of the Park River dam and reservoir project in Walsh County, N. Dak., as the Homme Reservoir and Dam, was considered, or-
ered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will proceed to state the three bills which went to the end of the calendar.

TAX-EXEMPT PROPERTY IN
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Chief Clerk. A bill (S. 1125) to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present considera-
tion of this bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amend-
ments.

The first amendment of the commit-
tee was, on page 2, following section 2, to strike out:

Sec. 3. Paragraph (p) of section 1 of such act is amended to read as follows:

(p) "The building, or portion thereof, owned by a church and actually occupied and used as the episcopal residence of a bishop of such church." The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, in line 23, after the word "Sec. 2", to strike out "4" and insert "5".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, in line 17, after the word "Sec. 2", to strike out "5" and insert "6".

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CAIN. I offer the amendment to which I referred a few moments ago.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment approved by the Senator from Washington will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, in line 11, after the word "exemption", it is proposed to insert:

"Provided further, That use of the ex-
empt property or receipt of rent or in-
come therefrom shall not deprive such pro-
erty of exemption under the following circum-
cstances:

1. Where the owner of the property is an intu-
stitution or organization entitled to ex-
emption of its properties under such an act and a part of such property is made avail-
able without charge for use by other insti-
tutions or organizations, whose property would be entitled to exemption under this act if owned by such other institutions or organizations.

2. Where rent or income is received from indigent persons, inmates, patients, students, or others who are able to pay and who legitimately receive the benefits or services of an intu-
stitution or organization entitled to ex-
emption under this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senate agrees to this amendment, it would be passed over, and it will be passed over, as follows:

"Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (e) of section 1 of the act entitled "An act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia," approved December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1089, ch. 629), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

(e) "Property belonging to foreign gov-
ernments and used or held for legation pur-
poses; Provided, That any such property not actually used for legation purposes shall be assessed and taxed unless the Secretary of State of the United States of America shall certify to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia that the property or property similar in character to the property held for legation purposes due to the exigencies of war or other emergency and that it is in the interest of the United States that the ex-
emption of such property from taxation be continued."

Sec. 2. Paragraph (o) of section 1 of such act is amended to read as follows:

(o) "The building, or portion thereof, ac-
tually occupied and used as a pastoral resi-
dence of the pastor, rector, minister, or rabbi of a church: Provided, That such building be owned by the church or congregation for which said pastor, rector, minister, or rabbi officiates: And provided further, That not more than one such pastoral residence shall be exempt for any one church or congrega-
tion."

Sec. 3. Section 2 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. If any building or grounds, or por-
tion thereof, entitled to exemption under the provisions of paragraphs (d) to (r) of section 1 of this act are not actually used by or for the activities of the institution or organization which owns such property and for which the exemption is granted, or are used to secure a rent or in-
come of any character from any activity or use other than that act, exempt or use which enti-
tifies such property to exemption under this act, such building or grounds, or portion thereof, shall be assessed and taxed: Pro-
vided, That lack of actual use of grounds
exempted under sections 1 (r) (2) of this act shall be deemed such grounds or exemption: And provided further, That use of the exempted property or receipt of rent or income therefrom shall not cause such property to be exempt under the following circumstances:  

(1) Where the owner of the property is an institution or organization entitled to exemption of its property under this act and a part of such property is made available without charge for use by other institutions or organizations whose property would be entitled to exemption under this act, if owned by such other institutions or organizations;  

(2) Where rent or income is received from indigent persons, inmates, patients, students, or others who are able to pay and who legitimately receive the benefits or services of an institution or organization entitled to exemption under this act; or  

(3) Where rent or income is received from employees whose official duties require that they live in the property exempted in order to properly perform such duties. If the tax assessed is not paid and becomes delinquent, it shall be sold at auction by the sheriff, or by parcel of land, with improvements thereon, or otherwise in the same manner as taxes on other real property which the District of Columbia are collected.”  

Sec. 5 of such act is amended to read thus:  

“Sec. 5. Any institution, organization, corporation, or association aggrieved by any assessment of real property deemed to be exempt from taxation under the provisions of this act may appeal therefrom to the Board of Tax Appeals for the District of Columbia in the same manner and to the same extent as provided in sections 3 and 4 of title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1867, as amended: Provided, however, that payment of the tax shall not be prerequisite to any such appeal. No appeal under this section, nor any proceeding in any court, shall be filed or maintained to establish the exemption of any property deemed to be exempt unless, prior to July 1 of the fiscal year involved in any case, written application, in such form as may be prescribed by regulation, shall have been filed with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia requesting that such property be placed on the list of property entitled to exemption.”  

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not quite understand the effect of the clerk's calling. There is nothing now on the calendar.  

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk is calling the bills which were passed on the calendar which reversioned to the end of the calendar.  

Mr. TAFT. I understand.  

TRANSFER OF THE REMOUNT SERVICE  

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next bill which has been passed over which has reverted to the end of the calendar.  

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3484) to transfer the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture.  

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, in respect to the bill just called by title, I have made an investigation. I find that the junior Senator from Oregon is now on the floor of the Senate or in the city, and cannot be here today. Of course, in view of that fact, I shall not make the motion I have intended to make, but for a moment I should like to state to the Senate the issues involved.  

Herefore the War Department has maintained remount stations in the United States, one located in Virginia, one located in Nebraska, one located in California, and one located in Oklahoma. A bill was introduced to transfer those four remount stations to the Department of Agriculture. The bill passed the House, and came to the Senate, where it was referred—and properly so, I think—to the Committee on Agriculture.  

But in my opinion, thereafter the bill should have been referred to the Committee on Agriculture, for I regard this bill as one which should properly have been considered by two committees—in this case the Committee on Armed Services and also the Committee on Agriculture. The bill provides that the War Department shall relinquish its control of the stations, and that they shall be turned over to the Department of Agriculture.  

Mr. President, in my opinion the Committee on Armed Services acted properly in the first instance; but when it recommended that the War Department should cease its operation of those remount stations, then it had a desire to end its responsibility and authority of the Committee on Armed Services in the matter. I am not criticizing that committee because it saw fit to recommend that the four remount stations be turned over to the Department of Agriculture, with authority and directive to carry on the work of the Remount Service.  

Mr. President, I have no desire to interfere with the operation of the Remount Service in the State of Virginia. I have been to the station at Front Royal, and I think the land there is adapted to the Remount Service. If the Senators from Virginia want to have the Front Royal remount station continued as a remount station, I shall gladly accede to their request and shall be favorable to that program.  

If the Senators from the State of Nebraska want the remount station in Nebraska to be operated as a remount station, I shall not have objection. In the same way, if the Senators from California want to have the remount station presently in California maintained there, I shall have no objection.  

But as to the remount station in my own State, I do have objection. I refer to the Fort Reno remount station, which is located on a tract embracing some 10,000 acres of some of the finest land in the central section of the United States. Much of the land is bottom land. It is now covered with alfalfa.  

Mr. President, in Oklahoma we do not use horses very much any more. Oklahoma has mechanized its agricultural industry. Today we use tractors, trucks, and other mechanical devices in our agricultural industry, and we do not need horses there any more.  

This bill proposes to continue these remount stations, in the belief that the propagation and production of riding horses—for example, polo ponies and show horses—that is all right for other States if they want it, but we do not want it in our State. Senator, as I can determine, the people of Oklahoma want this land made available for subdivision and under the provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.  

That is the whole story; and as soon as I can obtain recognition from the Chair at a time when the Senator from Oregon is present in the Senate, I shall ask that the bill be taken up.  

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over under continuing objection.  

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?  

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.  

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. If the Senator's only desire is to have the Oklahoma remount station exempted from the bill, why could he not attain that objective by an amendment from the floor, instead of having the bill sent back to his committee?  

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, that would suit me, but I am not sure how the Senators from Nebraska want their land treated. I have discussed the matter with one of the Senators. The remount station in Nebraska occupies a large tract; but I am not favorably disposed toward doing anything which should be done with it. The same thing is true of the California station. I do not know what should be done in California.  

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Was not this bill reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry?  

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. No; it was not, and that is my complaint. On the House side, if I may take another moment, by unanimous consent—I  

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator may proceed.  

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. On the House side, when the Armed Services Committee considered the bill and decided that the War Department should no longer maintain its remount service, the House committee referred the bill to the Committee on Agriculture and asked the chairman of that committee to consider it. The chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture called his committee together and reconsidered the bill. They agreed to the program of the Armed Services Committee. I contend that a similar procedure should be followed in the Senate before the bill is considered further. I contend that if the lands are to be under the Department of Agriculture, the bill should be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, in order that the committee may ascertain whether or not that is the best program.  

Furthermore, Mr. President, there are two reports on the bill. The Secretary of Agriculture makes one report, and the Under Secretary makes another. I am not sure whether one of the reports might not be acceptable to our committee because of various angles in connection with the bill. It is of importance to my State, and I am hopeful that at the proper time it may be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for further consideration and report. I may say to my friend, the Senator from Virginia, who is responsible for his program, so far as I am concerned.
Authorization to Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma to Sell Cemetery

The President pro tempore. The clerk will state the next bill which has been put over the end of the calendar.

Mr. KNOWLAND. A bill (S. 1372), authorizing the Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma to sell tribal cemetery.

Mr. REED. Let the bill go over.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as to this bill, objection has been made in behalf of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. CAPPER), and I understand that the Senator from Kansas still objects to consideration of the bill.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I do object. No one in Kansas City wants the proposed legislation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let the bill go over.

The President pro tempore. Objection is heard. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. BUTLER subsequently said: Mr. President, I desire that the bill (S. 1372), with an amendment, page 565 of the calendar, to which the Senator from Kansas objected, be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for further consideration.

The President pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Foot-and-Mouth-Disease Research

The President pro tempore. The clerk will state the next bill which has been placed at the foot of the calendar.

Mr. CAPPER. A bill (S. 2123), to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the act of May 29, 1894 (33 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the Senator from Minnesota if he would be willing to accept an amendment, which I understand is roughly comparable to the one offered in the House of Representatives, and which has been placed at the foot of the calendar, although I think it is more restrictive than mine would be. Would the Senator accept an amendment, page 1, line 6, after the word "laboratories", to insert "on an island or other isolated area adequate to guard against the accidental spread of the virus."? In other words, the Department of Agriculture of California and I think some of the other agricultural departments are very much concerned lest the virus spread from an experimental laboratory. As I read the bill now, a research laboratory could be located in the middle of a dairy county, if the Department of Agriculture should desire. I should like some restriction to show that this body in giving its approval of this fundamental principle that proper safeguards will be taken against the spread of the virus. I understand that in the House bill the limitation is that the laboratory be on an offshore island. My proposal gives a little more latitude, and I suppose it is something that should then be worked out in conference.

Mr. THYE. The junior Senator from California sees no objection to such a provision. However, I should say that the expression "isolated area" does not in any sense exclude a peninsula of the continent.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would think that if properly safeguarded that would come within the meaning of an isolated area.

Mr. THYE. The only reason the bill was so written was that we had assurance from the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture that they could see the size of the virus and would confine the work to an area where it would not in any sense jeopardize the animal industry.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The only difficulty the junior Senator from California sees is that, as frequently happens in connection with acts of Congress, if the law is not perfectly plain, it may be interpreted by some future Department of Agriculture in a manner different from the present understanding. I should feel better if the law were made clear on that point.

Mr. THYE. I should not object.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I desire to offer such an amendment.

The President pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the order is made.

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of May 29, 1894 (33 Stat. 31), as amended, is hereby amended by adding thereto section 12.

"Sec. 12. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish research laboratories, including the acquisition of necessary land, buildings, or facilities, and also the making of research contracts under the authority contained in section 10 (a) of the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935 as amended by the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, for research and study, in the United States or elsewhere, of foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals, in the opinion of the Secretary, constitute a threat to the livestock industry of the United States. To carry out the provisions of this section, the Secretary is authorized to employ technical experts or scientists without regard to the Classification Act. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as Congress may deem necessary; in addition, the Secretary is authorized to utilize, in carrying out this section, funds otherwise available for the control or eradication of such disease."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I now submit the amendment to which I previously referred.

The President pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from California, which will be stated.

The Chief Clerk. On page 1, line 6, after the word "laboratories", it is proposed to insert "on an island or other isolated area adequate to guard against the accidental spread of the virus."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Retirement of Regular Army and Air Force Officers

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, having conferred with the senior Senator from North Dakota (Mr. LANGER), I ask unanimous consent to return at this time to the consideration of Senate bill 2123, Calendar 393.

The President pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk. A bill (S. 2123) to exempt certain officers of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force from the provisions of statutes requiring retirement by reason of age, and for other purposes.

The President pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, this bill refers only to those officers in the Army, Navy, and Air Force who hold five-star rank. Five-star rank cannot now be resigned, which fixes four-star rank as the maximum. The bill relates to what may happen in the future, to certain officers of the Regular Army appointed in the grade of General of the Army pursuant to the act of March 29, 1949 (60 Stat. 15), as amended, to extend it to generals of the Air Force and ground forces the same as it is now extended to five-star men of the Navy. It extends the option to Admiral King, Halsey, and Halsey. It allows these officers in the Army and Air Force to retire on an active-duty status. It does not cost an additional dollar. It merely makes them available to return to the service for advice and consultation whenever the Army and Air Force want them.

The President pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the laws requiring retirement of Regular Army and Regular Air Force officers because of age shall not apply to officers of the Regular Army or Regular Air Force appointed in the grade of General of the Army pursuant to the act of March 29, 1949 (60 Stat. 15), as amended. The President may, in his discretion, upon the request of the officer concerned, restore to the active list of the Regular Army or Regular Air Force any Regular Army or Regular Air Force officer who holds five-star rank or whose retirement from the Regular Air Force on the retired list who was ap-
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Losch in the chair). Eight-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of Senator from California that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 186.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry. Would the adoption of the motion displace the unfinished business, that is, the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that it would displace the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution until 12 o'clock Friday.

Mr. BARKLEY. That raises a very important parliamentary question whether, notwithstanding the agreement to vote Friday, the joint resolution can be brought back under consideration except by another motion. If it cannot be brought before the Senate except by another motion, a very serious question is raised, namely, whether there will be anything to consider at all, because if the measure which is under consideration is displaced, it seems to me that that would displace everything that had happened in regard to it.

I do not care to have the Senate get into a technical situation in which we might find ourselves on Friday without anything to consider because the measure which was the unfinished business had been displaced by a motion to take up another measure. The Senate has been proceeding by unanimous consent in the consideration of other measures. I do not know whether the Senator from California is proceeding on the theory that unanimous consent in this instance cannot be obtained.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the junior Senator from California has asked unanimous consent to proceed along the line the able Senator is now suggesting. Objection was made, but after the junior Senator from California made the motion which is now pending, that does not alter the parliamentary situation, that if the pending motion should prevail, the unfinished business would be displaced.

I realize that in an informal ruling a few days ago the Chair held that inasmuch as the Senate had agreed upon a time when it would vote on a day in the future, automatically that order would be carried out although the measure to which the agreement related was displaced and was no longer before the Senate. If it is displaced, it cannot regain its place except on motion, and if no motion were made and carried to resume the consideration of the measure, in my judgment we might find ourselves on Friday without anything on which to vote.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. If the motion shall be agreed to, then will not the unanimous-consent agreement restore the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution at 12 o'clock Friday as the unfinished business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the opinion of the Chair that in the light of many precedents, the Senate would revert automatically to 12 o'clock on Friday to the consideration of the St. Lawrence seaway measure, but if it were desired to revert to that measure before that time, a motion would be necessary.

Mr. BARKLEY. No Senator seems to have an amendment to the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution, because the time has passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for offering amendments has passed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, any Senator could make a speech on the joint resolution tomorrow, whether it was the unfinished business or had been displaced, as he can make a speech on any subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No question of germaneness is involved in debate.

Mr. BARKLEY. It would be more or less informal, because the joint resolution, in a parliamentary sense, would not be before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

THE PARTITION OF PALESTINE

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay a vote on the pending question. I do wish to make a few comments on another subject.

The Evening Star of today carries this caption:

 Partition delay indicated in United Nations Palestine debate; even repeal of plan appears possible; Assembly call asked.

This is an Associated Press dispatch from Lake Success dated February 25:

Delay in partitioning Palestine and perhaps even repeal of the whole scheme appears possible in the light of Security Council developments.

Colombia asked the United Nations to consider a special session of the General Assembly to reconsider at a later date the U.N. partition plan. The United States asked for a Big Five committee of study and conciliation.

Mr. President, I wish to say just a word or two. I believe I share the sentiment of millions of people in this country, and I hope of the Congress, when I say that it is my earnest hope that our Government and the United Nations are not at this late hour going to renounce on the declaration previously made that they were going through with the policy of allowing the partition of Palestine. This was a great test for the United Nations organization, and I have the feeling that the United Nations courageously met the test. It heard the case from Arab and Jew. It deliberated, and finally arrived at a decision. It may be that the territory that was marked out as the area that should become the Jewish state was not the area which everyone would have preferred, or perhaps the territory which should have been there would have been an honestly made decision, and I think there was a feeling of satisfaction all over this country and in many other parts of the world that at long last we were about to
have an international and righteous solution of the age-old problem of the wandering Jew, by allowing his weary footsteps to come to rest again upon his old home soil.

Mr. President, the British Government made a forthright declaration that it intended to withdraw its troops from Palestine and that the question is now as to how the implementation of the partition policy should be carried out. What happened then? The Arabs set out to intimidate the United Nations organization by a concerted effort to defeat by force the decision arrived at by the United Nations organization. Then we had the spectacle of troops moving from one country to another, well armed, well disciplined, well organized, and well led, with an announcement to the world by the Arab leaders that they were going to invade this territory, that they were not going to permit the decision solemnly made by the United Nations organization to be put into effect.

In this case, only 2 days ago I saw in a newspaper pictures of Arabs in the Arab section of Jerusalem looking at a store filled with arms, guns, ammunition, hand grenades, there on display ready to be purchased by the Arab who might chance to purchase them. The Arabs have plenty of arms, much of which may be coming from Great Britain by its own admission, but the Jews, to whom have been awarded by the United Nations organization this territory, are denied by our own embargo the right to buy arms.

Mr. President, the question, of course, may arise, has there to be decided whether the United States will send troops—of course, as a part of a United Nations force—to partition or to preserve the peace in Palestine. I hope that necessity will not arise. I think it is probably correct that it would be only the Congress that could make that decision. I do not, however, consider it to be our place to decide that question, although I do believe that we ought to stand behind the decisions of the United Nations, and see that they are carried out.

Mr. President, if we will give the Jews, who have at long last received the historic land, the weapons with which to defend themselves, and to defend the United Nations' decision, I believe it will not be necessary to call upon the United States Government, or perhaps any other member of the United Nations organization, to send an international police force to Palestine.

I notice from the newspapers that our able ambassador and delegate to the United Nations stated that we would consult about the removal of our embargo policy if requested to do so by the United Nations. It is my humble opinion that the United Nations should call upon every member of that organization and see that they are not only authorized but requested, in furtherance of the United Nations decision, to allow the purchase of arms for self-defense by the Jewish people in that part of Palestine which the United Nations has said of right belongs to them.

Mr. President, if we do that—and do it before it is too late—before the Arab has already won the victory with the arms which he has been able to buy in many markets—at least many markets in Europe and in the broad middle eastern area—I believe that the question of subsequently having to send an international force there might not have to be answered, either by the Congress or the country.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Florida that even far beyond the arms embargo in the present situation, there exists a great parallel between what is now taking place and the attempt, after World War I, to form and hold together and make effective the now defunct League of Nations. In which we did not participate. There is a strong parallel between what then took place and the immediate threat of enforcing the decision of the United Nations or inducing the world to accept its decision. What we now see happening is similar to what took place in Manchuria and in Abyssinia, which broke up the League of Nations and step by step led to World War II. In my opinion, this is the first test of world peace.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the able Senator from Washington is, in my opinion, absolutely correct. If a decision of the United Nations can be repudiated by force, by the threat of arms, by an actual invasion, then the question is, Mr. President, what sanctity will the decision of the United Nations have?

I want to make one point clear, so far as I am personally concerned. There have been many times in the past when I have said upon this floor that I do not think the United States should act unilaterally. I have said it with respect to Greece and Turkey. I may say it again. But no one has ever heard me say that the United States should not back up the decision of the United Nations. I will support it. If we cannot get everyone in the United Nations to act with us when we think we are right, then let us get all we can in the United Nations to act with us, and go ahead in a policy which will be right.

But, Mr. President, after the solemnly arrived at decision respecting the partition of Palestine, by which the Jewish people received only a very small part of what they might have been awarded, if the Arabs can, by intimidation, by threat, by force of arms, and by invasion, cause the United Nations to do what is inconsistent with the decision to which I referred, namely, reverse their previously arrived at decision, then Mr. President, such cringing and about face will do more harm to the prestige of that organization than can be measured. Goodness knows it has suffered enough discredit already. And now when the major nations have gotten together upon this partition policy, and have said they would support it, to enjoin the face of this Arab threat will not only continue the injustice to the oft misused Jew, Mr. President, but I am afraid will strike almost the last blow to the maintaining prestige and the authority of the only hope on earth to keep the peace of mankind—the United Nations.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, in line with the statement just made by the distinguished Senator from Florida, I should like to read into the Record a relatively brief letter which I am this day mailing to Dr. Sidney Cohen, who is chairman of the Liaison Committee of the Zionist Organization of America. The letter deals directly with the subject which has been under discussion. It is as follows:


Dear Dr. Cohen:

Your very kind invitation to attend the rally you are holding tomorrow evening is greatly appreciated. I have delayed in making earlier reply in the hope that it might be possible for me to be with you. I find that I must remain in Washington.

As you probably know, I have always been strongly in favor of the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine. A sensible and justifiable action on this question was finally taken by the United Nations on the 29th of last November. I was most happy over this propitious turn in events. At the same time, I realized that the struggle for an independent Jewish state was not over.

Subsequent deplorable incidents in Palestine have confirmed my gravest fears. Worst of all, due to lawlessness and the failure of the responsible for the protection of law and order in Palestine to provide adequate protection for the people of Palestine, the situation there has reached a very critical stage. And with the deterioration of conditions in Palestine there has arisen a serious threat to the future of the United Nations and the peace of the world.

It seems to me that the role of the United States in the present world crisis is wholly obvious. Unless the United States takes appropriate action to back up the Assembly's recommendation in favor of partition, the prestige and purpose of the United Nations will be dangerously impaired. As the most influential member of the United Nations, the United States occupies a most responsible position in determining the United Nations' policy.

It seems to me that our task now is to do all that we can to make sure that the authority of the United Nations is upheld and that our proper measure of the Charter of the United Nations are taken with the least possible delay. We must be ready to implement any obligation, under the Charter, assigned to us by the Security Council.

Of greatest importance to us is that we recognize our obligation to the United Nations and our responsibility where the partition of Palestine is concerned and that, recognizing this obligation, we accept it unqualifiedly and without any reservation. It would seem to be our primary duty to exercise all the influence we possess to bring to the end that the United Nations shall take definite, decisive, and immediate action to meet the crisis which now faces the world.

With unbounded personal regards, I am, Sincerely yours,

IVING M. IVES.

I thank the Senate for permitting me to read that letter into the Record.

ALLOCATION AND CONTROL OF GRAIN FOR DISTILLING PURPOSES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on an accrued vote of the Senate from California [Mr. Know-
The President's Economic Report shall consider the national question of stabilizing the national economy.

The President, Mr. Flanders. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. It is proposed to substitute a colon for the period at the end of subsection (a), in line 7, page 2, and add the following proviso: "Provided, That, subject to the requirement that the minimum allotment to any distilling plant shall be 6,000 bushels per month, the percentage of the total monthly allocation of grain allotted to a distiller shall be the percentage of the total amount of grain which that distiller used of the total number of bushels used by the entire distilling industry from December 1, 1946, to June 30, 1947, inclusive."

Mr. Flanders. Mr. President, I desire to make an explanation of Senate Joint Resolution 186, authorized, a statement of location and inventory control of grain for the production of ethyl alcohol. On January 29 of this year the President of the Senate sent a message to the Congress recommending that it provide for allocation of grain for the production of ethyl alcohol. The message was in accordance with section VI of Public Law 395, which I had the honor of adding to Senate Joint Resolution 167 when it was before the Senate. That section requires that in proposing measures for conserving raw materials, commodities, and supplies there is a critical shortage, he shall give, first, a full statement of the circumstances; second, a detailed procedure for the administration of the restrictions or controls and the third, a statement as to the proposed degree of curtailment, including a specific formula therefor; and, fourth, a complete record of the factual evidence. It is further provided that within 15 days of the submission of such proposed conservation measure the Joint Committee on the President's Economic Report shall conduct public hearings thereon and shall make such recommendations to the Congress for legislative action as in its judgment the recommendations of the President and any additional information disclosed at the public hearings may require.

The message of the President meeting the requirements of section VI, Public Law 395, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report completed public hearings and reported to the Congress on February 11. That report recognized the shortage in grains and approved the proposal for saving grain by allocation and inventory control of the distilling industry. It stated that while this industry uses corn primarily it was the committee's expectation that limitations would save an equivalent amount of wheat for human consumption. It recommended, furthermore, that exports of grain to other countries, including Canada, be reduced, that the President direct that such exports shall be subject to at least the same general degree of limitations as are imposed on distilleries in the United States. They recommended finally that the procedure to this effect should be prepared and enacted:

In accordance with this resolution, a subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee prepared Senate Joint Resolution 186 and reported it to the full committee, which in turn has reported it to this body with Report No. 80. This joint resolution and report are now before the Senate.

The need for controlling the amount of grain used in making distilled spirits does not seem to be in dispute. Little or no opposition was heard at the hearings on February 5 and 6 before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. The chief point of contention was not whether grain should be allocated, but on the form in which it should be made. In spite of this lack of opposition, however, I should like to review the evidence as to the necessity for allocation.

The joint committee hearings were held just when grain prices began to substantially soften in the commodity markets. Consequently, there was little direct testimony on the effect of market fluctuations on the supply of feed grain and, of course, on this proposal. Ups and downs in the commodity market, however, cannot alter the over-all fact that our supply of grain is less than what we need at home and abroad. Of course, price changes can affect the use of grain. A somewhat lower price level, if it continues to prevail, could increase grain feeding on farms and grain consumption everywhere. This conceivably could intensify our shortage before harvest and, as a result, require even more stringent conservation measures than we are now considering.

Our basic feed grain is corn, and last year's crop was short of both our needs and the required feed. As of January 1, we entered the present crop year last fall was 2,700,000,000 bushels—720,000,000 bushels less than what we had a year earlier. This is a reduction of 21 percent, and our supply, as a result, is much less than we could use. These corn statistics are the basic reason why corn must be conserved. All grains are interchangeable in the human food and as animal feed as Dr. Fitzgerald of the IEFC testified. But wheat is preferred for human food, while here in the United States corn ranks as the primary feeding grain. We were most fortunate last year in harvesting the largest wheat crop in our history. It came to 1,400,000,000 bushels. We are now anticipating a crop of 1,300,000,000 bushels. Secretary Anderson has said that we can ship 500,000,000 bushels, perhaps more. To do so, however, the use of wheat in animal feeding from January 1, 1948 to June 30, 1948, must be held between 125,000,000 bushels. If we feed more, we will not be able to export 500,000,000 bushels and carry over 150,000,000 bushels as the law now requires.

Dr. Fitzgerald summed up the question when he declared that, if the United States "can spare more grains this year, we will not be able to plant them in the form of wheat, and use any savings that may be made in this distilling industry or any other place as a replacement in the feeding industry for the conservation of grain.

Corn is the distillers' preferred grain, and the industry used nearly 60,000,000 bushels in the year ending June 30, 1947. Whatever amount industry's use is currently more than farmers' requirements in producing meat. Assistant Secretary Brannan of the Department of Agriculture testified to the relationship between corn and meat when he pointed out that "farmers and distillers are competing for a short feed supply." There is little need for me to add that we must supply our export this year is far less than what we could consume. The scarcity of meat points to higher prices. In spite of momentary market swings, higher meat prices are likely before the year's end.

Allocation of grain to distillers, therefore, will serve the double purpose of assuring wheat for overseas relief and checking—at least in part—the rise in meat prices here.

The distilling industry can contribute substantially to our grain supply by using more than 2,500,000,000 bushels a month. The Joint Committee on the Economic Report estimated the saving at 22,000,000 bushels up to the end of October, when the allocation period would end at the latest under this resolution. This saving was figured from the industry's use during the year ending June 30, 1947. The rate at which grain has been used so far in February is much higher than the rate this legislation would allow. Figures from the Alcohol Tax Unit set the monthly rate for February at 6,000,000 bushels, even though some distillers were reported to be operating voluntarily at the restricted rate. It is easy to see, therefore, that there is a critical shortage in grains and the testimony of A. P. Fenderson, of Public Industry, one of the largest distilling firms, that the distillers' use of grain must be cut back to 150,000,000 bushels a month unless controls are applied. No matter what consumption rate is used, the saving will be large. The committee's estimate of 22,000,000 is on the conservative side.

Grain conservation in the distilling industry was resumed last fall after virtually a year of unrestricted operation. The distillers shut down production for 60 days, beginning in late October. The prospect of the shut-down led the industry to step up their use of grain to 6,000,000 bushels in the last 25 days of October. This is very much the pattern that is being followed this month. Excessive use in October nullified part of the saving from the 60-day shut-down. As the shut-down comes to an end, it becomes apparent that a continuing reduction in the use of grain in the distilling industry would be required. Exhaustive efforts were made to reach a voluntary agreement on the allocation of the feed grain for the conservation of grain.

The Distillers Coordinating Committee, composed of representatives of the industry, labor, and the Department of
Agriculture, tried to recommend a voluntary agreement which could take effect December 25, when the voluntary shutdown ended. At the last meeting of this conference on December 16, 1946, it had become obvious that an agreement was impossible. The chief reason was and still is, for that matter, the intense spirit of competition in the industry.

Therefore, the Department of Agriculture proposed the allocation of 2,500,000 bushels of grain up to January 31, 1948, and the same amount monthly thereafter. The industry met to consider this program on December 17. Again at this meeting and a later one on December 23, the industry representatives were unable to agree on any effective conservation measure. The result was that the Department of Agriculture turned to Congress for legislative authority to restrict the industry's grain intake. This authority was granted in Public Law 395, which the President signed December 30. As a result, the industry operated until January 31 with an allocation of 2,500,000 bushels.

When the authority seemed ready to lapse, the President, as I have already reminded you, asked Congress to extend the December 31, 1946, grain allocation period. In his message of January 28, he summed up the industry's differences when he declared:

"Throughout all negotiations with the distilling industry, various factions of the industry have advocated different methods of allocation and there is apparently no possibility of producing a workable plan by voluntary agreement. Therefore, further action will be required by the Congress to conserve grain and to reduce its nonessential use."

At least one industry spokesman likened efforts to obtain an industry agreement to getting water from a dry well. The cleavage in the industry was revealed by the testimony at the hearings, and the industry spokesmen were ready at all times to name names. It is interesting that even within the united front of the Distilled Spirits Industry Association, claiming 65 percent of the industry, there was some disagreement on the method of allocating grain. Both the Joint Committee on the Treasury and the Committee on Banking and Currency recognized this condition in their reports.

The lack of harmony within the industry is obvious, and the only clear-cut reason for it is the industry's spirit competition. This is apparent in the hearing record.

Mr. President, perhaps a brief description of the industry and the Committee on Banking and Currency recognize the condition in their reports.

The lack of harmony within the industry is obvious, and the only clear-cut reason for it is the industry's spirit competition. This is apparent in the hearing record.

Mr. President, perhaps a brief description of the industry and the Committee on Banking and Currency recognize the condition in their reports.

The lack of harmony within the industry is obvious, and the only clear-cut reason for it is the industry's spirit competition. This is apparent in the hearing record.

Mr. President, perhaps a brief description of the industry and the Committee on Banking and Currency recognize the condition in their reports.

The lack of harmony within the industry is obvious, and the only clear-cut reason for it is the industry's spirit competition. This is apparent in the hearing record.

Mr. President, perhaps a brief description of the industry and the Committee on Banking and Currency recognize the condition in their reports.

The lack of harmony within the industry is obvious, and the only clear-cut reason for it is the industry's spirit competition. This is apparent in the hearing record.

Mr. President, perhaps a brief description of the industry and the Committee on Banking and Currency recognize the condition in their reports.

The lack of harmony within the industry is obvious, and the only clear-cut reason for it is the industry's spirit competition. This is apparent in the hearing record.

Mr. President, perhaps a brief description of the industry and the Committee on Banking and Currency recognize the condition in their reports.

The lack of harmony within the industry is obvious, and the only clear-cut reason for it is the industry's spirit competition. This is apparent in the hearing record.

Mr. President, perhaps a brief description of the industry and the Committee on Banking and Currency recognize the condition in their reports.

The lack of harmony within the industry is obvious, and the only clear-cut reason for it is the industry's spirit competition. This is apparent in the hearing record.
Mr. BARCKLEY. I am not opposing it. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment will be received and will lie on the table, to be taken up after the pending amendment is disposed of.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, the first of these safeguards will prevent the President from reducing the allocation below 2,500,000 bushels in any 1 month. In other words, the industry will know the minimum quantity of grain it can expect to use from now until the end of October when the 1948 corn crop is coming in.

However, the resolution authorizes the administrative authority to deduct from any plant's monthly allotment the grain it has used in excess of what it would have had 30 days before the 1947 corn crop. This provision applies particularly to the plants that have received under this resolution. Some plants and some companies in the distilling industry have been operating at or near their capacity since January 31 when the previous authority lapsed. Other plants and other companies have held down their use of corn to a third of their intake last year. This is about what they would be allotted under this resolution.

The Government, both in its legislative and executive branches, is intended to prohibit such transfers, but the defects which the Department of Agriculture, the officer in charge, has discovered, is the amendment pending is the amendment. Mr. President, I assume that it is simply this: Those who have used an excessive amount of grain must now make it up by foregoing the use of an equal quantity. In other words, the industry is placed on an equal footing.

The second safeguard would end the allocation whenever the price of corn has been at the support level or less for 30 days. This consideration the apparent softening in the commodity market. The downward trend could continue, and it is possible but unlikely that the Government could reduce corn below the support level. Certainly, in that event, the distilling industry should not be barred from using grain in whatever amount it wants. This provision assures that the formula formula adopted has needed revision from time to time in order to correct inequities that were not at first expected and in order to allow for changing factual conditions. If Congress fixed a formula and it later appeared that the formula was defective, or that changing conditions made it in some way unfair, the responsibility would be ours and we would have to find time to debate and work out a new formula. If the defects did not appear until after adjournment, they could not be corrected at all. Therefore the responsibility for apportioning grain with the greatest degree of justice and fairness properly should rest with those who have administrative responsibility.

Mr. President, I trust that the Senate will support the judgment of the Joint Committee on the President's Economic Report that grain allocation to the distilling industries should be extended. I trust that, furthermore, this body will support Senate Joint Resolution 186 which your Committee on Banking and Currency has prepared in support of the request of the President, properly presented under the terms of Public Law 395, and the report of the Joint Committee on the President's economic Report.

Since this morning I have had called to my attention a news item in today's New York Journal of Commerce which relates to one of the problems we have met in giving assurance that none of the grain exported to Canada would find its way into competing or distilling capacities. The United States decides to apply that restriction within its own borders.

The formula which the Department of Agriculture used in January is such a compromise. The Department has told the committee that it intends to continue using this formula if the amendment is passed. Under this formula, the historical production of the industry is given two-thirds weight while distilling capacity is given one-third weight.

Our committee is not ready to say that this is a perfect formula. The committee does feel, however, that the Congress would find it very difficult to write a better one. The formula is the result of years of Government experience in trying to arrive at a workable solution of the problem, and I believe that the problem of a fair and practicable allocation formula is a problem for the executive branch of the Government. This is the normal practice of the Senate. I see no reason to deviate here in an effort to allocate grain for what is after all a brief period.

Mr. President, experience has proven that each formula adopted has needed revision from time to time in order to correct inequities that were not at first expected and in order to allow for changing factual conditions. If Congress fixed a formula and it later appeared that the formula was defective, or that changing conditions made it in some way unfair, the responsibility would be ours and we would have to find time to debate and work out a new formula. If the defects did not appear until after adjournment, they could not be corrected at all. Therefore the responsibility for apportioning grain with the greatest degree of justice and fairness properly should rest with those who have administrative responsibility.

Mr. President, I trust that the Senate will support the judgment of the Joint Committee on the President's Economic Report that grain allocation to the distilling industries should be extended. I trust that, furthermore, this body will support Senate Joint Resolution 186 which your Committee on Banking and Currency has prepared in support of the request of the President, properly presented under the terms of Public Law 395, and the report of the Joint Committee on the President's economic Report.

Since this morning I have had called to my attention a news item in today's New York Journal of Commerce which relates to one of the problems we have met in giving assurance that none of the grain exported to Canada would find its way into competing or distilling capacities. The United States decides to apply that restriction within its own borders.

The formula which the Department of Agriculture used in January is such a compromise. The Department has told the committee that it intends to continue using this formula if the amendment is passed. Under this formula, the historical production of the industry is given two-thirds weight while distilling capacity is given one-third weight.

Our committee is not ready to say that this is a perfect formula. The committee does feel, however, that the Congress would find it very difficult to write a better one. The formula is the result of years of Government experience in trying to arrive at a workable solution of the problem, and I believe that the problem of a fair and practicable allocation formula is a problem for the executive branch of the Government. This is the normal practice of the Senate. I see no reason to deviate here in an effort to allocate grain for what is after all a brief period.

Mr. President, experience has proven that each formula adopted has needed revision from time to time in order to correct inequities that were not at first expected and in order to allow for changing factual conditions. If Congress fixed a formula and it later appeared that the formula was defective, or that changing conditions made it in some way unfair, the responsibility would be ours and we would have to find time to debate and work out a new formula. If the defects did not appear until after adjournment, they could not be corrected at all. Therefore the responsibility for apportioning grain with the greatest degree of justice and fairness properly should rest with those who have administrative responsibility.

Mr. President, I trust that the Senate will support the judgment of the Joint Committee on the President's Economic Report that grain allocation to the distilling industries should be extended. I trust that, furthermore, this body will support Senate Joint Resolution 186 which your Committee on Banking and Currency has prepared in support of the request of the President, properly presented under the terms of Public Law 395, and the report of the Joint Committee on the President's economic Report.

Since this morning I have had called to my attention a news item in today's New York Journal of Commerce which relates to one of the problems we have met in giving assurance that none of the grain exported to Canada would find its way into competing or distilling capacities. The United States decides to apply that restriction within its own borders.
They were commenting following Washington reports that the Senate Banking Committee had voted in favor of rationing grain to whiskey makers in the United States until October 31. Officials in Canada said there already have been discussions with American authorities and suggested Canada could adopt the plan on American grain imports if the United States puts the proposed measure into law.

At the same time, they pointed out that the only American grain which Canada imports in any quantity is corn, of which about 80 percent goes to Canadian distillers. At that, corn imports are comparatively small, totaling only 7,860,600 bushels last year.

There already is a Canadian restriction on the use of wheat for distillery purposes which allows distillers to process only wheat which is unfit for human consumption. This is part of the Dominion's effort to provide more grain for Europe. Rye, because of its high price, now is not widely used for distilling.

Mr. President, when the Congress enacted the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 it was the ostensible purpose, and I believe the honest purpose, to grant to honorably discharged veterans of World War II certain benefits and privileges outlined in the Servicemen's Readjustment Act; and

Whereas one of the major provisions of this Readjustment Act provided for the rehabilitation of veterans by the guaranty of loans for the primary purpose of aiding and assisting veterans in the borrowing of funds over a long period of time at a reasonable rate of interest to finance the purchase of homes, farms, or businesses; and

What has happened to the provision of the act has failed to give any relief to the majority of veterans in that no provisions have been made in the act for the purchase of homes and the great majority of veterans desiring to build or purchase homes, farms, or businesses have been unable to obtain loans from local banks or other lending institutions largely because local institutions do not have the surplus funds to invest in real-estate loans, or to any of the many governmental agencies financing almost every phase of American business life.

Whereas the Reconstruction Finance Corporation's policy of purchasing these loans was discontinued as of July 1, 1947, and since that time no governmental agency has either the authority or the funds to underwrite or purchase loans made under the said Servicemen's Readjustment Act; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be urged to enact such legislation and appropriate such funds as may be necessary to enable and direct the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or such other governmental lending agency, to purchase such loans, and securities as are given by the World War II veterans to banks and lending institutions under the provisions and regulations of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (Public Law 346, 78th Cong., as amended, title 38, U. S. Code); be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States of America, and a copy of the same be transmitted to the Senate of the United States of America from South Carolina and a copy to the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

There is pending before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency a bill, Senate bill 1537, which was introduced by me on July 9, 1947, and which would authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase home mortgages guaranteed, secured, under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. I urge this committee to report this bill or a similar bill which may be pending and allow us to vote on it in the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that last July, right in the very closing days of Congress, the Senate passed a bill which authorized the RFC to resume the purchase of GI home mortgages. That bill is now pending before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives.

It is true that in order to get the bill through we had to agree to some amendments on the floor of the Senate which perhaps restrict it a little unduly. Yet, it was felt that if we could resume this secondary market, even with these restrictions, we might prove the real merit of this undertaking.

I certainly agree with the Senator from South Carolina as to the need for this action, and surely that need is easily seen in areas such as that represented by him and by me, that is, areas which are primarily agricultural, and where large financial institutions are not available to handle all these loans.

I know that in my own section and in many other sections, the condition now is that the banks are not available to many veterans so as to facilitate the construction of homes.

That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States of America from South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I agree with everything the Senator from Alabama has said. I remember that the bill which passed the Senate, and is now pending in the House, prescribes a very small amount as the limit, and it would only be sufficient to last for a short time. Personally, I should like to see even more made available than was indicated by the measure which passed the Senate and went to the House, and I believe my colleague from Alabama will agree with me.
that the nominations in the United States Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Without objection, the President will be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

That completes the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask that the nominations in the United States Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

That completes the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED NATIONS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Coert du Bois, of California, to be a representative of the United States of America on the Good Offices Committee of the Security Council of the United Nations on Indonesia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask that the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John T. Jarecki, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask that the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask that the nominations in the United States Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Without objection, the nominations will be confirmed.

That completes the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 25 (legislative day of February 21), 1948.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

George V. Allen to be Assistant Secretary of State.

UNITED NATIONS

Coert du Bois to be the representative of the United States on the Good Offices Committee of the Security Council of the United Nations on Indonesia.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Richard P. Butrick to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iceland.

John C. Wiley to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.
To be assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

To be assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

To be assistant surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

To be assistant surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel), effective date of acceptance

To be temporary medical director (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel), effective date of acceptance

To be temporary senior surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

To be temporary surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Pitzer, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2192. An act to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, to provide for the modification of controls on maximum rents in areas and on housing accommodations where the conditions justifying such controls no longer exist, and for other purposes.

DR. JOHN COVENTRY SMITH

Mr. FULTON. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, Dr. John Coventry Smith, who gave the prayer this morning, is the pastor of the Mount Lebanon United Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh, Pa., the largest congregation in that denomination. He is the first presbyter of the Church in Pittsburg and one of the outstanding preachers of Pennsylvania.

Dr. Smith was a missionary of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America in Japan from 1929 to 1942, engaged in educational and evangelistic work. He was interned in Yokohama by the Japanese for the first 6 months of the war and on his return on the first flight of the 

Gripsbom.

Dr. Smith is here today on a very pleasant mission, which is the installation this evening of the Reverend Harry Rankin, his present assistant, as the pastor at the River Road United Presbyterian Church in Washington, D.C.

We all wish Dr. Smith and the Reverend Rankin the very best in this ceremony this evening, and know that Washington, D.C., will be as proud of the Reverend Rankin in his future service to this community as we have been of his service in Pittsburgh.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA IS AGAIN IN CHAINS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, Czechoslovakia, as we have just learned, is again in chains. This small country, great in its men and women, with its constitution based upon our own, has temporarily passed under the Communist yoke and into the concentration camp of subject nations.

I say "temporarily" because I mean just that. Czechoslovakians cannot permanently remain enslaved. Throughout the centuries they have known many conquerors. But their determination to be free has emerged unabated when their erstwhile masters mingled with the dust. Other Masaryks will arise to lead them once more toward the light of liberty.

The Czechoslovakia as we so lately knew it began in this country. Their constitution, the fruits of the written free, their freedom was announced from these shores. Even in the anguish of their second captivity in 9 years they have left the people of the United States a priceless legacy.

And what is this challenging inheritance from a people who have so recently undergone their Lidice as a nation? It is this; they have revealed to us the ominous pattern of Communist conquest.

Communist puppet Premier Gottwald is only the symbol of Soviet savagery. Czechoslovak industry was first nationalized. Then the labor unions were brought under Communist domination. Then the press and radio were given over to Communist control. Finally, the police and the military were placed in the hands of the Communists. From that point it remained only a short step to the stifling of the legislative body and the ringing down of the iron curtain over the prostrate nation.

This must not happen here. We of the United States must be eternally vigilant. We must beat down any attempt at the nationalization of industry. We must eradicate Communist influence from the labor unions. We must see to it that the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the American Military Establishment are not Communist-ridden and used as political police.

If we relax in our alertness, even for a moment, the present sacrifice of Czechoslovakia will have been fruitless, our own Constitution will have been trampled to earth, and our more than a century and a half of freedom will have been in vain.

We have no assurance that we are not next on the Kremlin's plan of world conquest. But we are also forewarned. Czechoslovakia has given her life as a nation that we might know what is in store for us.

Gentlemen, we have been forewarned. There can be no misinterpretation of the message of what has happened in Czechoslovakia.

Let us, therefore, be forearmed against the peril which has demonstrated that today's freemen may be tomorrow's slaves.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday this House unanimously passed the conference report on an excellent retirement bill. While we are thinking about retirement, I would like to call the attention of the House to the present Railroad Retirement Act, which leaves much to be desired. When it was established, the rates which were set up were probably fairly adequate. It is obvious that since then the constant increase in the cost of living have made these rates wholly inadequate. The survivor benefits are also far too low for the present cost-of-living index and