

Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

807. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the organization of the Army and the Department of the Army, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

808. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to permit payment by means of regular salary installments in lieu of payments in a lump sum for all accumulated and accrued annual leave to career employees who are affected in a reduction-in-force program"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

809. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of May 26, 1936, authorizing the withholding of compensation due Government personnel"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

810. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the carrying out of provisions of article 7 of the treaty of February 3, 1944, between the United States and Mexico, regarding the joint development of hydroelectric power at Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

811. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the fiscal year Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KERR: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 327. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases; without amendment (Rept. No. 1132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3480. A bill to authorize the Commonwealth of Kentucky to use for certain educational purposes lands granted by the United States to such Commonwealth for State park purposes exclusively; without amendment (Rept. No. 1133). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 5557. A bill to provide for coordination of arrangements for the employment of agricultural workers, admitted for temporary agricultural employment from foreign countries in the Western Hemisphere, to assure that the migration of such workers will be limited to the minimum numbers required to meet domestic labor shortages, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE of California: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 5725. A bill to stimulate the exploration for strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals; with amendment (Rept. No. 1135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LYLE: Committee on Rules. House Concurrent Resolution 102. Concurrent resolution to provide for the attendance of a joint committee to represent the Congress at the Eighty-third and Final National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic; without amendment (Rept. No. 1136). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 800. Consideration of H. R. 4007, a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes," approved May 16, 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 1137). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 5783. A bill to establish a United States Air Forces Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 5784. A bill to require legislative representatives to register and report, to require those raising or spending money for legislative representatives to register and report, to provide a penalty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 5785. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, with respect to common or contract carriers by conveyor belt or other similar device; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 5786. A bill to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 5787. A bill to make inapplicable to future actions and proceedings section 200 (1) and (2) of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, relating to default judgments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUBER:

H. R. 5788. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the period during which readjustment allowances may be paid; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 5789. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist in more adequately financing education in the elementary and secondary schools of States found to be needy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 5790. A bill to provide more adequate and effective rent control until June 30, 1951, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 5791. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist in more adequately financing education in the elementary and secondary schools of States found to be needy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NOLAND:

H. R. 5792. A bill to extend to July 25, 1950, the time within which readjustment allowances may be paid under section 700 of title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 5793. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code with respect to employment of deportable aliens in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 5794. A bill to provide for the organization of the Army and the Department of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WERDEL:

H. R. 5795. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist in more adequately financing education in the elementary and secondary schools of States found to be needy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. WOODHOUSE:

H. R. 5796. A bill declaring the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power and setting forth ways and means of achieving these objectives; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 5797. A bill declaring the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power and setting forth ways and means of achieving these objectives; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KERR:

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. J. Res. 328. Joint resolution providing that Reorganization Plans Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 of 1949 shall take effect at the close of August 19, 1949; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. Con. Res. 112. Concurrent resolution providing for adjournment sine die of the two Houses of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. Res. 299. Resolution to authorize an investigation of flood control on Georges Creek in Allegany County, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 5798. A bill for the relief of Federick Joseph Reeve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. R. 5799. A bill for the relief of the Acme Finance Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARE:

H. R. 5800. A bill for the relief of Benjamin T. Gaines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 5801. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Soldester; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER:

H. R. 5802. A bill for the relief of Antonio Simonetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 5803. A bill for the relief of Benny Eduard Ulsfeldt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 28, 1949

(Legislative day of Thursday, June 2, 1949)

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

Rev. Paul H. Groseclose, D. D., minister, Andrew Chapel, Colesville Methodist Church, Silver Spring, Md., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we rest and rejoice that we have such merciful evidence of Thy loving care. Continue to dwell richly with us, gracious Lord, by giving us firmness under resistance, hope in despondency, and consolation in affliction. O bring us into the realization that we

are wholly dependent on Thee and cannot reach the heights of manhood without Thee. Harmonize our emotions and keep them right. May they never be allowed to chill, wither, or rob the bloom and beauty of the immortal soul. We pray, our Father, that our tempers may be kindly, just, and considerate of all men of every race, color, and creed. Arm us with the fruits of the Spirit such as love, joy, and peace. We pray in the name of our Lord Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 27, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On July 26, 1949:

S. 255. An act to amend section 205 of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to joint boards;

S. 447. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to regulate the transportation, packing, marking, and description of explosives and other dangerous articles;

S. 1279. An act to amend the Federal Airport Act so as to provide that minimum rates of wages need be specified only in contracts in excess of \$2,000; and

S. 2010. An act to extend for 1 year the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs respecting leases and leased property.

On July 27, 1949:

S. 897. An act for the relief of William Henry Tickner; and

S. 1405. An act to provide for the admission to, and the permanent residence in, the United States of Poon Lim.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3829. An act to provide assistance for local school agencies in providing educational opportunities for children on Federal reservations or in defense areas, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases; and

H. J. Res. 329. Joint resolution amending an act making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1950, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1184. An act to encourage construction of rental housing on or in areas adjacent to Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4566. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law title 14 of the United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard"; and

H. R. 4963. An act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hill	Morse
Anderson	Hoey	Mundt
Baldwin	Holland	Murray
Brewster	Hunt	Myers
Bricker	Ives	Neely
Bridges	Jenner	O'Connor
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Chapman	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kem	Schoeppel
Connally	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kilgore	Sparkman
Donnell	Knowland	Stennis
Douglas	Langer	Taft
Downey	Lodge	Taylor
Dulles	Long	Thomas, Okla.
Eaton	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McCarran	Thye
Ferguson	McCarthy	Tobey
Flanders	McClellan	Tydings
Fulbright	McGrath	Vandenberg
George	McKellar	Watkins
Gillette	McMahon	Wherry
Graham	Magnuson	Wiley
Green	Malone	Williams
Gurney	Martin	Withers
Hayden	Maybank	Young
Hendrickson	Miller	
Hickenlooper	Millikin	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] are absent on public business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is absent by leave of the Senate.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGRATH in the chair). A quorum is present.

ORDER FOR RECESS FROM 6:30 TO 8 P. M. TODAY—LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief announcement for the benefit of Members of the Senate.

As Senators know, we are now discussing the independent offices appropriation bill, and we should, I take it, conclude that this afternoon or late this evening.

A few days ago I suggested that we hold two night sessions this week, one on Tuesday and one on Thursday. I have conferred with the distinguished minority leader, and we have agreed that the Senate should take a recess at 6:30 tonight until 8 o'clock, and then come back and work a couple of hours more. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess from 6:30 until 8 o'clock tonight.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I am in total sympathy with the announcement—I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader if the Senate will continue with the appropriation bill, or whether it is his intention to set it aside and take up the calendar.

Mr. LUCAS. We will continue with the appropriation bill, and call the calendar later.

While I am on my feet, I will make this further announcement: There has

been some talk about holding Saturday sessions, but in view of the fact that we are having two night sessions, and rather long sessions during the day, I feel that there is no need for Saturday sessions, so that Senators may make their arrangements accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask whether it is firm that we recess at 10 o'clock. The Senator from Illinois said we would work a couple of hours.

Mr. LUCAS. No—

Mr. McMAHON. I do not think we ought to remain here later than 10 o'clock. When 10 o'clock comes, I think we ought to go home.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Connecticut may be right. I think we remained in session until 10 or a little later the other evening. I do not want to be arbitrary.

Mr. McMAHON. I do not think we should stay in session until midnight. The other night we remained in session until 11 o'clock. It makes a long day.

Mr. LUCAS. I can understand how some of the older Senators might object, but I cannot understand why a young man like the Senator from Connecticut should object to staying up until 11 o'clock at night.

Mr. McMAHON. I do. I hope we can get away by 10 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader stated that the calendar would be called later. Does he anticipate that it may be called this week?

Mr. LUCAS. No; perhaps the first part of next week.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Members of the Senate be permitted to introduce bills and resolutions, present petitions and memorials, and have matters printed in the Appendix of the RECORD without debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

WITHHOLDING OF COMPENSATION DUE GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of May 26, 1936, authorizing the withholding of compensation due Government personnel (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PAYMENT FOR ACCUMULATED AND ACCRUED ANNUAL LEAVE

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of December 21, 1944, to permit payment for accumulated and accrued annual leave either out of any unobligated balances of appropriation for the fiscal year in which the notice of separation is given or out of the appropriations current at the time

separation is effected (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation, as well as a list of the persons involved, together with a detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reason of ordering suspension of deportation (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS— WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Attorney General, withdrawing the name of Georgios L. Maronitis or George Maronitis from a report relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted by him to the Senate on June 15, 1949; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT OF FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

AMENDMENT OF SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL NA- TIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1943

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the "Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943," approved October 26, 1942 (56 Stat. 990, 999), and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the New Hampshire Dental Hygienists' Association, Inc., of Nashua, N. H., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HILL:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Joint Resolution 24

"Whereas war is now a threat to the very existence of our civilization, because modern science has produced weapons of war which are overwhelmingly destructive and against which there is no sure defense; and

"Whereas the effective maintenance of world peace is the proper concern and responsibility of every American citizen; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Alabama, while now enjoying domestic peace and security under the laws of their local, State, and Federal Governments, deeply desire the guarantee of world peace; and

"Whereas all history shows that peace is the product of law and order, and that law and order are the product of government; and

"Whereas the United Nations, as presently constituted, although accomplishing great good in many fields, lacks authority to enact, interpret, or enforce world law, and under its present Charter is incapable of restraining any major nations which may foster or foment war; and

"Whereas the Charter of the United Nations expressly provides, in articles 108 and 109, a procedure for reviewing and altering the Charter; and

"Whereas the State of Alabama has already gone on record officially as supporting the principles of federal world govern-

ment by passage of the Madison and Sullivan resolution in 1943; and

"Whereas many other States have memorialized Congress, through resolutions by their State legislatures or in referenda by their voters, to initiate steps toward the creation of a world federal government; and

"Whereas, several nations have recently adopted constitutional provisions to facilitate their entry into a world federal government by authorizing a delegation to such a world federal government of a portion of their sovereignty sufficient to endow it with powers adequate to prevent war: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Alabama favors the strengthening of the United Nations and transforming it into a federal world government, with powers to make and enforce laws to promote peace and full power to prevent war among nations;

"That the secretary of the State of Alabama is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to Senators LISTER HILL and JOHN J. SPARKMAN, and to Congressmen FRANK W. BOYKIN, GEORGE M. GRANT, GEORGE W. ANDREWS, SAM HOBBS, ALBERT RAINS, EDWARD DEGRAFFENREID, CARL ELLIOTT, ROBERT E. JONES, JR., and LAURIE C. BATTLE, and to the President of the United States and the Secretary of State.

"Approved July 18, 1949."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 450. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by providing for the delegation of certain authority of the Administrator, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 803);

S. 2201. A bill amending section 2 of the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the National Bureau of Standards, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 795);

S. 2240. A bill to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the United States Coast Guard and the United States Public Health Service to accept certain gifts tendered by foreign governments; without amendment (Rept. No. 796);

H. R. 242. A bill to provide for the conferring of the degree of bachelor of science upon graduates of the United States Merchant Marine Academy; without amendment (Rept. No. 797);

H. R. 4829. A bill to authorize the President to appoint Paul A. Smith as representative of the United States to the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization without affecting his status and perquisites as a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey; without amendment (Rept. No. 798); and

H. R. 5365. A bill to provide for the transfer of the vessel *Black Mallard* to the State of Louisiana for the use and benefit of the department of wildlife and fisheries of such State; without amendment (Rept. No. 799).

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. R. 4406. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals against foreign governments; with amendments (Rept. No. 800).

SENATORIAL ELECTION CONTESTS IN MICHIGAN AND WEST VIRGINIA (S. REPTS. NO. 801 AND 802)

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report two original resolutions, and

I submit reports thereon. I ask unanimous consent for their immediate consideration.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, could the Senator enlighten us as to the nature of the resolutions or reports?

Mr. MYERS. I may say these are reports on the election contests in West Virginia and Michigan. They are unanimous reports from the Committee on Rules and Administration and, rather than send them to the calendar, I thought we might be able to get immediate consideration of the reports and resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. LODGE. Of course, there is no objection so far as I personally am concerned, because I am a member of the committee that considered them, but there may be Senators who are not on the committee who would like a chance to take a look at them, and I think therefore they should go to the calendar.

Mr. MYERS. I have consulted with the minority leader, and I have consulted with several other Senators. I believe the Senator from California, a member of the subcommittee, is agreeable to having them considered at this moment.

Mr. LODGE. If there is no desire that they go to the calendar, then I shall not demand it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should say they are unanimous reports both of the subcommittee and of the full Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. LODGE. I personally understood that to be the case, but I was speaking in the interest of Members who are not on the committee. If there is no demand, however, that they go to the calendar, then I certainly shall not object to having them taken up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the first resolution.

The first resolution (S. Res. 141) was read as follows:

Resolved, That HOMER FERGUSON is hereby declared to be a duly elected Senator of the United States, from the State of Michigan, for the term of 6 years, commencing on the 3d day of January 1949, and is entitled to be seated as such.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the next resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 142) was as follows:

Resolved, That HARLEY M. KILGORE is hereby declared to be a duly elected Senator of the United States, from the State of West Virginia, for the term of 6 years, commencing on the 4th day of January 1947, and is entitled to be seated as such.

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

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

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania whether, with the two resolutions, there are reports?

Mr. MYERS. The reports are attached.

Mr. LODGE. So those reports are now public property, are they not?

Mr. MYERS. They are.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I hope the ladies and gentlemen of the press will give their attention to these reports, because, in addition to clearing completely the two Senators in question, they contain facts regarding the administration of election laws in certain parts of the country which should be of interest to the citizens of those States.

REPORT OF PERSONNEL AND FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, the following report was received by the Secretary of the Senate:

JULY 9, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION—SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1949, to June 30, 1949, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Arthur R. Breor, chief investigator, Jan. 1 to 24	\$6,687.78	\$445.84
Francis D. Carrigan, investigator, Feb. 1 (\$5,529.08)	6,025.66	2,489.95
Joan Burch, assistant clerk, Mar. 1 to June	3,542.74	1,328.49
Betty DuJack, stenographer, Jan. 1 to Feb. 5	4,122.09	400.75
Kelso Elliott, assistant counsel, off Apr. 30	8,669.10	2,189.68
Edward R. Fitzgerald, investigator, off May 30	6,025.66	2,108.94
Mary L. Green, assistant clerk, off Jan. 31	4,122.09	343.50
Janet M. Hartzell, stenographer, Mar. 3 to June 30	3,625.51	1,188.34
Grace E. Johnson, clerk to subcommittee	6,687.78	3,343.86
H. P. Kiley, investigator (\$6,025.66)	7,010.05	3,340.94
Joseph F. Langan, investigator, Jan. 1 to 24	6,025.66	401.70
James E. Lynch, investigator, Feb. 1 (\$4,459.48)	7,484.09	2,857.20
Joseph V. McCann, investigator, Jan. 1 to Feb. 15	6,025.66	753.19
Gerald W. Ohr, investigator, Jan. 1 to 24	5,280.79	348.60
Lena G. Orme, secretary (\$3,542.74)	4,122.09	1,964.44
Sue Patterson, stenographer, Feb. 14 to June 30	3,542.74	1,348.17
George J. Shillito, chief investigator, Jan. 24 to May 9	8,511.09	2,624.37
Sam H. Still, Jr., investigator, May 30 (\$4,949.73)	6,025.66	2,331.33
William P. Reed, investigator, Jan. 1 to 24	5,529.08	368.59
Drew J. T. Okeefe, assistant counsel, June 1 to 30 (must reimburse for Turner Smith \$2,576.21 to Department of Justice to June 30, from Apr. 1, 194) (gross per annum \$10,300)	8,669.10	722.42

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, balance Jan. 1, 1949..... \$65,063.00
Amount expended (salaries, \$31,600.30; expenses, \$5,769.20), total..... 37,369.50
Balance unexpended..... 27,693.50

FRANCIS J. MYERS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections.
CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration.
GRACE E. JOHNSON,
Clerk.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session, The following favorable reports were submitted:

By Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Edith H. Cockrill, of the District of Columbia, to be judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, to fill a new position.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Two hundred and thirty-nine postmasters. By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive D, Eightieth Congress, second session, a consular convention between the United States and Costa Rica, signed at San Jose on January 12, 1942 (Ex. Rept. No. 12).

CONVENTIONS WITH NORWAY RELATING TO DOUBLE TAXATION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive Q, Eighty-first Congress, first session, a convention between the United States of America and Norway for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, signed at Washington on June 13, 1949, and Executive R, Eighty-first Congress, first session, a convention between the United States of America and Norway for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on estates and inheritances, signed at Washington on June 13, 1949, and that the conventions, together with the President's messages be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's messages be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed, and the conventions, together with the President's messages, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the messages from the President will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The messages from the President are as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the convention between the United States of America and Norway for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, signed at Washington on June 13, 1949.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the convention, together with the explanatory memorandum enclosed therewith.

The convention has the approval of the Department of State and the Treasury Department.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 28, 1949.

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State, with enclosed memorandum; (2) convention with Norway, signed June 13, 1949, relating to taxes on income.)

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the convention between the United States of America and Norway for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on estates and inheritances, signed at Washington on June 13, 1949.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the convention, together with the explanatory memorandum enclosed therewith.

The convention has the approval of the Department of State and the Treasury Department.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 28, 1949.

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State, with enclosed memorandum; (2) convention with Norway, signed June 13, 1949, relating to taxes on estates and inheritances.)

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 2342. A bill to discharge a fiduciary obligation to Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 2343. A bill for the relief of Andreas Balafoutis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MAYBANK introduced Senate bill 2344, to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION ACT

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act.

This legislation has been discussed with the chairman of the subcommittee and officials of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and hearings will be held beginning Tuesday morning, August 2, at 10:30.

I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement by me of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2344) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. MAYBANK, was read twice by its title, and referred

to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. MAYBANK is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAYBANK

I have today introduced a bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended.

In his Midyear Economic Report to the Congress of July 11, 1949, the President recommended the enactment of legislation to extend the maximum time limit now fixed by law on the maturity of loans to business made by the RFC in order to permit the Corporation to extend financial assistance to business ventures which are economically sound and urgently needed in an expanding economy, but which require long periods of time to develop and produce earnings that will permit orderly amortization of debt.

Section 1 of the bill which I have introduced will effectuate the President's recommendation by repealing the various maturity limitations now provided in section 4 (b) (2) of the RFC Act. This will leave the question of maturities to the sound discretion of the Board of Directors of the RFC, to be determined in the light of the circumstances of the particular case in the same manner as the Board determines the other specific terms and conditions with which the borrower must comply. Prior to 1947, there were no statutory limitations on the maturity of RFC business loans or loans to aid in the financing of public projects and experience has indicated the desirability of restoring to the Corporation its former flexibility in this regard.

The present RFC Act, in section 4 (c), imposes a limitation of \$2,500,000,000, on the total amount of investments, loans, purchases, and commitments made subsequent to June 30, 1947, pursuant to section 4, which the Corporation may have outstanding at any one time. Section 4 (c) also imposes a limitation of \$200,000,000 on loans for the construction of public projects such as bridges, tunnels, turnpikes, drainage and irrigation works, waterworks, sewage-treatment plants, port-development projects, etc.

Section 2 of the bill which I have introduced amends section 4 (c) in several respects. First, it makes the limitation applicable to all loans made and securities and obligations purchased by the RFC, whether such loans and purchases are made pursuant to section 4 of the RFC Act or pursuant to other provisions of law. Second, the limitation would include outstanding loans which were made prior to June 30, 1947. The limitation does not now apply to such loans, which aggregate approximately \$1,100,000,000. Third, the specific limitation of \$200,000,000 on loans for the construction of public projects would be eliminated. While this limitation on public-project loans seemed reasonable when it was imposed, recent developments indicate that it should be removed lest it serve as an arbitrary barrier to the extension of financial assistance for the construction of worth while, carefully planned projects which are urgently needed throughout the country and which would strengthen our entire economy. Fourth, the over-all limitation would be fixed at \$5,000,000,000, which would apply to all business loans, including railroad loans, public-project loans, assistance to financial institutions, secondary market operations through the Federal National Mortgage Association, and catastrophe loans. This limitation would not apply to loans or advances which the Corporation is directed to make; for example, the temporary \$1,000,000,000 advance recently made to ECA pursuant to the direction of Congress, as provided in section 114 of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

This bill will have the effect of permitting greater flexibility in the lending activities of

the RFC, and will provide the Corporation with adequate lending authority to carry out its basic purposes of assisting in the maintenance of economic stability and the promotion of maximum employment and production. In addition, the broadening of the section 4 (c) limitation to include loans made prior to as well as subsequent to June 30, 1947, will serve the desirable purpose of enabling the Corporation to simplify its accounting and auditing procedures in connection with the limitation.

PAY, ETC., OF MEMBERS OF ARMED SERVICES AND OTHER SERVICES—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5007) to provide pay, allowances, and physical disability retirement for members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Public Health Service, the Reserve components thereof, the National Guard, and the Air National Guard, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT—AMENDMENT

Mr. HUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4146) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INCREASED RATES OF COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference two amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 498) to increase rates of compensation of the heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies, and I request that they be printed and lie on the table for consideration of the Senate at the time when the bill is brought up for vote.

In order that Members of the Senate may be informed of the facts underlying the amendments, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief statement by me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Maryland will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement presented by Mr. O'CONNOR is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONNOR

The general counsel for the Department of the Treasury, by statute the chief legal officer of that Department, is a Presidential appointee subject to confirmation by the Senate. In addition to being charged with the supervision of all the legal activities of the Treasury Department, he is authorized by statute and Executive order to act as Secretary, in the absence of the Secretary of the Treasury, to the same extent as an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

The assistant general counsel for the Bureau of Internal Revenue (popularly known

as the chief counsel of the Bureau) is also appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The salary for each of these positions is \$10,330 per annum.

The general counsel of the Department is charged with the supervision and coordination of one of the largest legal staffs of the Government, dealing with most important functions in the domestic and international fiscal and economic fields and related administrative and enforcement activities. There are over 500 lawyers under his general supervision in all the various branches and activities of the Treasury Department. These include such administrative units as the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the Bureau of Customs, Coast Guard, Office of International Finance, Bureau of Public Debt, and Comptroller of the Currency, as well as the many other activities of the Treasury Department.

The chief counsel of the Bureau of Internal Revenue is charged with all the legal problems attendant upon the collection of over \$40,000,000,000 annually in revenues. Fair and effective administration of our complex tax laws places upon his shoulders a responsibility in this field second only to that of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. By statute he is charged with direct responsibility for the supervision and coordination of a staff of over 400 lawyers in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, located in Washington and in many field offices throughout the country.

The responsibilities of the general counsel of the Treasury Department and the chief counsel of the Bureau of Internal Revenue are acknowledged as being among the greatest of any of the legal offices of the Government, requiring for effective administration a degree of technical competence and administrative ability greater than most any of the professional positions in the private practice of law which bring personal recompense many times over the \$10,000 salaries now awarded those positions.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolutions were each read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 3829. An act to provide assistance for local school agencies in providing educational opportunities for children on Federal reservations or in defense areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases; and

H. J. Res. 329. Joint resolution amending an act making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

ALLEGED INVASION OF SOVEREIGN RIGHTS BY REGULATION OF MONEY SPENT ABROAD—ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK WORLD-TELEGRAM

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Sovereign Rights Not Necessarily Invaded if We Have Say on How Much Is Spent Abroad," written by Ralph Hendershot and published in the New York World-Telegram of July 27, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BRITISH MEDICAL CARE PLAN—REPORT BY JOHN G. HILL

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a report entitled "Has Britain Shown That Health Insurance Can Work?," written by John G. Hill, director of research, health and welfare council of Philadelphia, Pa., which appears in the Appendix.]

**SPEECHES BEFORE AMERICANS FOR
DEMOCRATIC ACTION, FULL EMPLOY-
MENT CONFERENCE**

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a series of speeches delivered before the Americans for Democratic Action, Full Employment Conference, held in Washington, D. C., on July 19, 1949, together with a resolution adopted at that conference, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE EXCISE TAX ON FURS

[Mr. O'CONNOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter received by him from Mr. Alfred A. Greenwood, of Baltimore, Md., relative to the excise tax on furs, which appears in the Appendix.]

**ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR CON-
TROL OF EMERGENCY OUTBREAKS OF
INSECTS AND PLANT DISEASES**

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the House has passed House Joint Resolution 327, making an additional appropriation for control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases. The joint resolution makes provision for an additional appropriation for control of grasshoppers. The joint resolution came to the Senate from the House a short time ago. The Senate Appropriations Committee has considered the joint resolution and, at the request of the Secretary of Agriculture, has increased the amount carried in the measure from \$1,500,000 to \$3,500,000.

I now report the joint resolution favorably from the Committee on Appropriations, with an amendment, to strike \$1,500,000 and insert \$3,500,000, and I submit a report (No. 794) thereon.

By reason of the urgency of the situation, I now ask unanimous consent that the House joint resolution, which has just been reported from the committee be immediately considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. If I correctly understand, this is the so-called emergency grasshopper relief bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is.

Mr. WHERRY. The House has passed the joint resolution and it came to the Senate, and was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and reported from the committee with an amendment; and by reason of the urgency of the situation, and the need for additional money, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is asking for immediate consideration?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I want to commend the Committee on Appropriations for its prompt action on the measure and to endorse the request of the chairman for immediate consideration. I do not know what the situation is in other States with respect to the grasshopper pest, but, insofar as my State of Illinois is concerned, the situation is very serious. I am very happy that the Senate commit-

tee has taken action to increase the amount for the control of this pest.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator from Illinois, and I express the hope that the joint resolution may be considered immediately and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 327) making an additional appropriation for control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with an amendment on page 1, line 9, after the word "diseases", to strike out "\$1,500,000" and insert "\$3,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR subsequently said: Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. YOUNG conferees on the part of the Senate.

**FOREIGN-AID APPROPRIATIONS—NOTICE
OF MOTION TO RECONSIDER VOTE**

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on page 10278 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday appears the vote by which the Senate did not sustain the ruling of the Chair. The RECORD will show that I voted on the prevailing side. At this time I serve notice that I shall move to reconsider the vote by which the ruling of the Chair was not sustained.

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—COM-
MENTS ON HOOVER COMMISSION
RECOMMENDATIONS**

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared, including comments by the Department of Commerce on the Hoover Commission recommendations as they affect that Department.

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

**STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
CHAIRMAN, SENATE COMMITTEE ON EXPEN-
DITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS**

Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, released today a summary of a 70-page report compiled by the Department of Commerce, strongly endorsing recommendations of the Hoover Commission which affect that Department.

The report is in general agreement with the Hoover Commission objective of embracing all of the activities of the Federal Government relating to the development of industry, transportation, and commerce

within the Department of Commerce. The Secretary of Commerce, in submitting the report, stated that such proposal is "in accord with sound principles of Federal organization and would lead to the many improvements which would come from a major grouping of similar functions and purposes."
* * * It is in line with the original purposes laid down by the Congress at the time the Department was created."

The report is divided into seven basic categories, transportation, the merchant marine, civil aviation, highway transportation, railroad transportation, commercial fisheries, and departmental management.

Commenting on the proposed consolidation of most of the nonregulatory transportation functions in the Department, the report concurs with the findings of the Hoover Commission, stating that:

"Adoption of the general program advanced by the Commission would result in a far greater degree of unity both in policy formulation and in the administration of transportation functions that exists at the present time. It should be pointed out, however, that in our judgment the complete adoption of the Hoover Commission recommendations would not automatically result in completely unified national transportation policy.

* * * In the absence of any proposal for a separate Department of Transportation we are also inclined to believe that the Department of Commerce probably represents the most appropriate agency for the location of these functions. This Department has as one of its major purposes the mandate to foster and promote the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States. In carrying out this legislative mandate the Department already engages in a variety of transportation activities and is at the same time analyzing the entire transportation system of the country from the standpoint of determining how well it meets the needs of commerce. These existing activities are certainly closely related to the over-all planning and programing functions which the Hoover Commission considers essential activities for the enlarged Department of Commerce which it proposes."

The report cites but one exception, that of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics which transfer the Department believes cannot be sustained on logical grounds. The Secretary stated that inasmuch as almost all of the research now conducted by the NACA is for military purposes, and since it is unlikely that any future work will have civilian air transport application, there seems little reason to transfer this organization to the Department. The suggestion is also made that further study be given the problem of organizing Federal scientific research before any change is made in the current status of the NACA.

The Department opposes a portion of the recommendation which leaves with the Civil Aeronautics Board a review function over the promulgation of air-safety regulations. The Department feels that these functions should be transferred to the Department in their entirety in order that the possibility of overlapping be reduced, commenting as follows:

"The Department is of the opinion that the Civil Aeronautics Administration is the proper agency to promulgate air-safety regulations. It has a large and well-qualified technical staff stationed throughout the United States, its territories and possessions. The staff is in everyday contact with all phases of the industry, is familiar with all types of operating problems, and is currently dealing with the latest technical developments in the field. This specialized, current, and practical knowledge would make it possible for the Civil Aeronautics Administration to promulgate workable, effective, and timely air-safety regulations. * * *"

The Department expresses apprehension relative to the adoption of the Hoover Commission recommendations dealing with subsidies, but, in connection with the proposed concentration of over-all route programs for air, land, and water transportation, proposes to "perform a critical evaluation of all promotional activities of the Federal Government to evolve a balanced program." In summing up its position, the Department states:

"Entrusting the general planning and programming function to the Department is desirable, but fulfillment of these functions probably would involve difficulties with the regulatory commissions so long as the granting of shipping subsidies is left in the hands of the Maritime Commission and the granting of airline subsidies is left to the Civil Aeronautics Board. * * * While the Department is willing to accept the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and appear before the regulatory agencies in support of the general plans and programs which it evolves, it would like to point out that there would not necessarily result a unified and coordinated program with respect to the granting of subsidies. The regulatory commissions might in general follow policies which were in substantial accord with the program suggested by the Department, but it is equally possible that they might adopt quite different and conflicting policies. As a result the prospects of achieving a balanced promotional program are greatly diminished and the possibility of difficulties between the Department and the regulatory commissions is enhanced. In fact, there might develop sharp conflicts of view between the Department supporting a balanced transportation program and the individual regulatory commissions adopting policies calculated to favor the particular area of transport over which they have jurisdiction."

The transfer of the Coast Guard, the business operations of the Maritime Commission, and the marine functions of the Bureau of Customs to the Department of Commerce is supported. The following extract from the report indicates the Department's views:

"Close relationships with units already in the Department or proposed for transfer to the Department lend support to the view that the Coast Guard might appropriately be lodged in the Department. In reaching this decision we recognize that the Coast Guard performs some auxiliary activities of value to the Treasury Department, and stands in readiness to perform a variety of functions for the Military Establishment in time of war. Since the bulk of the Coast Guard's activities, however, have a close and intimate connection with transportation it appears preferable to place that agency with other transportation organizations rather than to leave it in the Treasury Department or to transfer it to the National Military Establishment. So long as the organization of the Coast Guard is maintained substantially without change, a transfer during time of war to the National Military Establishment could be effected without difficulty. * * *

The Department agrees with the Hoover Commission that most of the functions now supervised by the Maritime Commission are of the character for which unified administration and direction is desirable, commenting on the proposed transfer, as follows:

"The various operating functions, in particular those in connection with the huge Government-owned fleet, can certainly be administered to greater advantage by a single administrator than by a board. The Department thinks that these functions might well be placed within the jurisdiction of the over-all transportation agency of the Government. The same conclusion applies to the training functions of the Commission and this conclusion is strengthened if, as is also proposed, the activities of the Coast Guard be transferred to the Department.

This follows since there should be a close relationship between the training of seafaring personnel conducted by the Commission and the maintenance of employment standards for this personnel by the Coast Guard."

The Department likewise supports the recommendation for a study of the marine functions of the Bureau of Customs with a view to consolidation with other marine functions within the Department, as follows:

"A preliminary review of the activities of the Bureau of Customs suggests the possibility that certain of the functions which it performs might be consolidated with either those of the Coast Guard or with the functions transferred from the Maritime Commission. The Department is inclined to believe that the section of marine administration, the section of admeasurement, and the section of publications and documents might be transferred in whole or in part without any serious interference with the basic work of the Bureau of Customs. Accordingly, we endorse the idea of having a study made by an impartial group, such as the Bureau of the Budget, with a view to determining which, if any, of these functions appropriately belong in the new transportation organization."

The recommendation which would create within the Department a Bureau of Highway Transportation, to be composed of the Public Roads Administration and the motor carrier safety functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission, is endorsed, as follows:

"The basic activity of the Public Roads Administration—sponsoring the development of an adequate system of public roads through a Federal grant-in-aid program—is parallel to the major activities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration; that is sponsoring and promoting the development of an adequate system of airports through a grant-in-aid program and the actual establishment of airway facilities. The Department is convinced that it is desirable to group these related promotional activities under unified policy and budgetary controls and accordingly agrees with the recommendation of the Hoover Commission that the Public Roads Administration be lodged in the Department. * * * It might also be noted that safety work in the motor-transport field has virtually no connection with the basic task of economic regulation entrusted to the Interstate Commerce Commission. Accordingly, this function could be transferred from the Commission without interfering with the Commission's normal operations."

The Department also supports the creation of a new Bureau of Railroad Transportation composed of the railway safety functions, the car-service functions, the railroad-consolidation-planning functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Office of Defense Transportation. Its conclusions are as follows:

"Preparation of a basic consolidation plan might well be entrusted to the Department, which has over-all responsibility for national transportation programming, and which has particular responsibility for planning route patterns for land, air, and water transport. Since these responsibilities have been recommended for the Department and since the Department has already agreed that it represents the most appropriate agency for the centralized coordination of these planning functions, the Department also believes that it should have the initial responsibility for planning railroad consolidations."

The Department agrees that a considerable part of the fisheries functions has to do directly with commercial operation and international agreements, but points out that it is difficult to distinguish between the commercial aspects of these activities

and the conservation aspects, and suggests that further study of the Government fishery activities is necessary before these functions are separated.

In a chapter on Program and Organization for Commodity Research the Commission goes into considerable detail relative to the present program of the Department in which it states that it recognizes the need for commodity studies by other agencies (as recommended by the Hoover Commission task force report), and concludes that when consideration is given to all factors involved in commodity problems, it is not desirable to have them centralized in one agency due to the basic pattern of the Government and the statutory authority of existing agencies which would make it impossible to find personnel with a knowledge of all factors involved. It concludes that, a departmental committee would make a positive contribution only as sparked by forceful Bureau of the Budget leadership through the exercise of its budget responsibility and authority in order to control the functions to be performed by the commodity staffs in each agency, and states that planning will begin immediately on how most efficiently to achieve the goal suggested by the Commission.

The Department report also includes complete discussions relative to the Foreign Affairs role and relationships of the Department (ch. VIII), in which it comments on certain recommendations contained in the Hoover Commission report on foreign affairs, and in chapter IX, on Program and Organization of the Department's Field Service, submitting detailed account of its field office operations and comments specifically relating to the task force reports on Federal Field Services, pointing up certain conflicts between task force reports of the final report of the Hoover Commission relative to the redistribution of personnel and the closing down of some of the field offices.

Chapters X and XI give specific details on Organization for Departmental Management and Proposed Organization Structure of the Department, covering 17 pages of the over-all report.

Concluding the report on departmental management, the Department strongly supports recommendations having to do with strengthening the authority of the Secretary to determine the precise use and assignments of his assistants, but takes exception to the Hoover Commission recommendation that the activities of the Department be grouped into two broad categories, transportation and industrial and commercial activities. The Department contends that this proposal oversimplifies the administrative and policy problems inherent in managing an organization of this type, and that it would be more desirable to organize and staff the Department with Bureau chiefs responsible for each of the major operating functions. The Secretary suggests the creation of four assistant secretaries, one for each of the areas of transportation, international activities, domestic economy, and scientific and technical services, and reiterates that, regardless of the necessity for modification of the top management organization of the departments, the Secretary should always remain free to determine his own organization pattern and personnel assignments.

The remainder of the report (ch. XII) includes Comments on Recommendations in Other Hoover Commission Reports in which is incorporated discussions relative to the Department's relationships with, and the effect the Hoover Commission recommendations would have upon, the Department's contacts with the National Security Resources Board, National Security Council, and other agencies. This section of the report also includes analyses of Federal

statistical activities, the transfer of CAA construction activities, coordination and strengthening of Federal scientific research, interdepartmental and over-all coordination, industrial advisory committees, and relations with the Export-Import Bank, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The summary of the views of the Department of Commerce follows:

"SUMMARY OF THE VIEWS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE ON THE REPORT OF THE HOOVER COMMISSION CONCERNING THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

"INTRODUCTION

"The Department of Commerce concurs, as a matter of principle, with the objective of the recommendations contained in the Hoover Commission report on the Department of Commerce to the effect that this Department should embrace the activities of the Government in the development of industry, transportation, and commerce. This objective is in accord with sound principles of Federal organization and would lead to the many improvements which would come from a major grouping of similar functions and purposes. Furthermore, it is in line with the original purposes laid down by the Congress at the time the Department was created.

"ADVISABILITY OF PROPOSED CONSOLIDATION OF TRANSPORTATION FUNCTIONS

"In its analysis of the present transportation activities of the Federal Government, the Hoover Commission reached a number of conclusions which served as the basis for its recommendation that most of the nonregulatory transportation functions should be consolidated in the Department of Commerce. Two essential points were drawn from these conclusions, namely, the need for a consistent and unified policy with respect to transportation and the need for unified implementation and administration of transportation activities which the Government has decided to perform.

"A substantial share of the Government's nonregulatory transportation functions is already performed by the Department of Commerce and we are in agreement with the general findings and recommendations of the Hoover Commission which would consolidate all, or nearly all, such activities in this Department.

"The one major exception is that proposing the transfer of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to the Department, as we do not believe this proposal can be sustained on logical grounds. We also oppose that portion of the recommendation which leaves with the Civil Aeronautics Board a review function over the promulgation of air-safety regulations and suggest that consideration be given to enlarging the safety-regulation power to be transferred so as to vest final authority in the Department. In addition, we believe that a more unified and coordinated program with respect to the granting of subsidies to the transportation services would result from transferring this function to the Department.

"With these few exceptions, we are in thorough agreement with the underlying purpose of the Commission's recommendations. We believe with the Commission that implementation of the recommendations would result in the provision and promotion of total transportation requirements to meet the expanding needs of commerce and the national defense at a minimum cost to the taxpayer. Immense strains have been put upon our transportation facilities in recent years and will be again in the event of war. Military transportation requirements must be integrated with civilian needs. Wartime transportation requirements must therefore be carefully calculated, taking into consideration the probability that their disruption would be a primary objective of any potential aggressor. These vital considerations point clearly to the urgent need for coor-

ordinated planning, promotion and administration of our transportation functions.

"PROPOSALS CONCERNING THE MERCHANT MARINE

"The Hoover Commission proposals to transfer the Coast Guard, the business operations of the Maritime Commission and the marine functions of the Bureau of Customs to the Department of Commerce have the support of the Department. There are already many areas of contact and cooperation between the constituent agencies of this Department and the agencies proposed for transfer. The transfer would enhance these relationships and make for the maximum degree of unity in the formulation of marine transport policy and in the administration of marine transport functions.

"The various operating functions of the Maritime Commission, and particularly those in connection with the huge Government-owned fleet, should be placed within the jurisdiction of the over-all transportation agency of the Government. The same conclusion applies to the training functions of the Commission and this conclusion is strengthened by the proposal to transfer the activities of the Coast Guard to this Department, since there should be a close relationship between the training of seafaring personnel by the Commission and the maintenance of employment standards for this personnel by the Coast Guard.

"Nearly all of the activities of the Coast Guard now concern marine or aviation safety. It is our belief that the purposes of the Commission report, unified policy and administration, can be more nearly achieved in the safety field than in any other functional area pertaining to the over-all transportation activity of the Government, except that of mobilization planning. To this end we support transfer of the Coast Guard to the Department, but believe that the organization should be maintained substantially without change in order that a transfer to the National Military Establishment in time of war could be effected without difficulty.

"The Department is inclined to believe that certain of the functions of the Bureau of Customs might be consolidated with other marine functions proposed for transfer to the Department. We endorse the idea of having a study made by an impartial group, such as the Bureau of the Budget, to determine which, if any, of these functions belong in the new transportation organization.

"PROPOSALS CONCERNING CIVIL AVIATION

"The Commission proposed the establishment within the Department of a Bureau of Civil Aviation which would include the present activities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration together with some additional safety functions now performed by the Civil Aeronautics Board. The new bureau would also include the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics which would lose its independent status. In contrast to most of the other recommendations of the Hoover Commission, the Department believes those concerning aviation require some qualification.

"We take particular exception to the proposal to transfer the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to the Department. Virtually all the research now conducted by the committee is for military purposes, and it appears unlikely that work to be undertaken in the near future will have direct application for civilian transport purposes. For this and other reasons we suggest that further study be given to the entire problem of organizing Federal scientific research before any change is made in the independent status of the committee.

"We also believe that the function of promulgating air-safety regulations should be transferred to the Department in its entirety and that the function of investigating major aircraft accidents, left with the Civil Aeronautics Board, should be clearly defined

to reduce possible overlapping of responsibility to the smallest possible area. Likewise, we believe the transfer of the subsidy granting power to this Department should be considered.

"PROPOSALS CONCERNING HIGHWAY TRANSPORTATION

"The Commission suggested the creation within the Department or a Bureau of Highway Transportation, which would encompass the Public Roads Administration and the motor carrier safety functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

"The basic purpose of the Public Roads Administration is the promotion and development of a better highway system. Its program is entirely administrative and promotional in character and its activities are obviously transportation functions which should be grouped with related activities in other fields of transport.

"The motor carrier safety functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission are also of an administrative or promotional nature and might well be placed under unified administrative control. The effect of this transfer, together with other proposals made by the Commission, would concentrate in this Department nearly all the transportation safety activities of the Federal Government.

"PROPOSALS CONCERNING RAILROAD TRANSPORTATION

"It was proposed by the Commission that the railway safety functions, the car service functions, and the railroad consolidation planning functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission, together with the functions of the Office of Defense Transportation, be transferred to the Department of Commerce to a new Bureau of Railroad Transportation.

"The proposal to transfer the railway safety functions is similar to the proposal to transfer the motor carrier safety functions. The Department believes these functions can be performed with greater efficiency under an over-all transportation agency such as the Department of Commerce would be under the proposals.

"The Department assumes that the proposed transfer of the car service functions would be restricted to activities concerning the maximum utilization of equipment and would not include control over questions of discrimination between shippers which is quasi-judicial in character and presumably should be left under the control of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The utilization functions belong with the functions of the Office of Defense Transportation and should be transferred to the department.

"There has been little activity in the railroad consolidation planning field for a number of years. Consequently, this recommendation involves a re-creation in the department of a function which formerly represented one of the continuing functions of the Commission. This proposal should be approved if other transportation functions are transferred to the Department of Commerce.

"The basic functions performed by the Office of Defense Transportation appropriately belong in the general transportation framework and should most logically be placed in the Department having the primary concern for assuring that sufficient transportation equipment and facilities are available to meet the needs of commerce.

"PROPOSED TRANSFER OF DIVISION OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

"A considerable part of the fishery functions has to do directly with commercial operations and international agreements and is clearly related to the work of the Department of Commerce.

"Important as the directly commercial operations are, it is extremely difficult to distinguish between these activities and those

bearing upon conservation programs. Because of this, we feel that further study of the Government's fishery activities is required to determine whether the commercial operations are separable and whether there are distinct advantages of separation. If so, we would be in agreement with their transfer to the Department.

"ORGANIZATION FOR DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

"The Commission recommended that the present positions of Under Secretary and two Assistant Secretaries be retained in the Department and that an Administrative Assistant Secretary be added. We agree on the advisability of establishing this latter position. The duties of these officers would be assigned by the Secretary who, it is also recommended, should have explicit authority from Congress to organize and control his organization.

"We should like to emphasize this recommendation for organization flexibility as made in the report on the Department of Commerce and affirmed in the report on general management of the executive branch. This clear authority of the Secretary to determine the precise use and assignments of his assistants is indispensable to sound departmental management.

"The report further proposed that the operations of the Department be grouped into two broad services for each of which there would be an Assistant Secretary—one for transportation, and one for industrial and commercial activities. This proposal, we feel, oversimplifies and does not adequately meet the administrative and policy problems inherent in managing an organization with as great a functional diversification as would exist in the proposed and enlarged Department of Commerce.

"We believe that the Department should be so organized and staffed that the major operating functions are carried on by the bureau chiefs and that these officers should, at least for formal purposes, be considered as being ultimately responsible directly to the Secretary. Under this concept, the Under Secretary, as chief deputy, would be in the supervisory line and the Assistant Secretaries would be largely removed from the administrative field to serve in functional, or advisory and consultative, capacities. We further believe that in order to bring adequate top management to the enlarged department it would be necessary to have four Assistant Secretaries covering the areas of transportation, international activities, domestic economy and scientific and technical services.

"Further study, changing concepts, and actual experience in administration will doubtless cause modification in the top management organizations of the various departments. We wish to reiterate, therefore, that the Secretary should be free to determine his own way of organizing the Department and making personnel assignments. It is particularly important that these matters not be written into law."

MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES—REFERENCE OF MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT AND BILL

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGrath in the chair). The Chair asks unanimous consent of the Senate that, without such action being established as a precedent, the bill and message received yesterday from the President of the United States relating to foreign military assistance be, and it is hereby, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services for joint consideration and study, including the holding of hearings if deemed advisable, and that the said committees, acting through the chairman of one of said committees, shall at the ear-

liest practicable time, by bill or otherwise, submit their recommendations to the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, yesterday several Senators, including myself, introduced the military assistance bill. We would like to have the agreement include not only the message, but the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair included both the bill and the message.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object to the unanimous-consent request, I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the legislation if the unanimous-consent request includes complete reference. Does this mean only hearings, or is this a reference to both committees, which are to act in conjunction, not only with respect to hearings, but also recommendations? Are both committees to have complete charge and jurisdiction of the bill?

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. That is, of course, going beyond the jurisdiction of either one of the committees. It is a precedent, is it not?

Mr. TYDINGS. When I obtain the floor I shall be glad to make an explanation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to answer the question after he has had an opportunity to confer with the Parliamentarian.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that my reservation of objection remain in full force and effect until an explanation is made.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does this mean that when the committees vote they will vote separately? Or are they to vote in total?

Mr. TYDINGS. In total.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would have to be advised by Senators who are sponsoring the legislation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The agreement is scarcely intelligible except as it carries such information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request, as stated by the Chair, does not make clear how the committees are to vote.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am reserving the right to object until an explanation is made.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, when I obtain the floor I shall be glad to make an explanation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair now submits the unanimous-consent request to the Senate, that the reference be made as previously stated.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, if I may be allowed to have the memorandum of the proposed unanimous-consent request, I shall endeavor to explain it, and then Members who wish to object will, of course, have the right to do so,

but in the meantime there will be opportunity for discussion.

I should like to preface what I have to say with the very sincere observation that I have the very highest regard, respect, and admiration for the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate. That committee, during the last 10 years particularly, has rendered outstanding service. I do not think the country will ever be able to pay in full the debt it owes to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], both of whom have served as chairman of the committee and who have labored long and in many places, both in this country and outside, to promote the welfare and friendly relations of the United States during times of war and, more particularly, times of peace. So what I shall say today is not in any wise directed in any way as criticism of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The other day, the President sent to the Congress a bill, the title of which I shall read:

An act to promote the foreign policy and provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing military assistance to foreign nations.

"An act to promote the foreign policy." What in the world is there in our foreign policy that is to be promoted by the giving of arms to any other country. The only and single justification for one bullet or one gun that belongs to the American people being given to any other country is the ultimate defense of the United States of America. If it cannot be laid on that line, it cannot be put on any line under the sun. We do not promote friendly relations per se and in an abstract manner by giving arms to foreign countries; we do it as a part of a general plan, which we have recently approved, which has for its core and its base the defense of the United States of America. We are not obligated by any treaty, by any executive agreement, to furnish a single bullet or a single gun to any country on earth; and it has been so stated by both the proponents and the opponents of the North Atlantic Pact. But there is an international connotation to this whole arms implementation program, and I would be the last to deny it, because we are dealing with foreign governments and, through them, with the military establishments of such countries as we shall give arms to. That brings this whole matter into the field of international relations.

These arms must come from the United States. The Senator from Maryland I think is well advised when he says that a part of these arms will come from our military surpluses, a part, a small amount, of course, will come probably from our reserves, and other parts will be perhaps in the form of money to supplement the armed programs of our potential allies in time of war. That will be the basis, I apprehend, of the arms implementation program.

Mr. President, when we start to take arms from our surpluses or to take arms from our reserves, we bring the question of international defense into play, not

only externally, but internally; for the question must turn finally on whether 10,000 machine guns in the hands of our potential allies, to make them strong and able to resist attack and to preserve the integrity of the North Atlantic security countries, are not better there for our own defense than they would be in the arsenal at Aberdeen, Md., or at Rock Island, Ill., or wherever we may have such implements stored.

Therefore, I want to pay my respects to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I went to him with some of the arguments to which I am briefly referring today, and suggested to him that, since this bill dealt primarily with the defense of the United States and the Committee on the Armed Services of the Senate was charged by law, above every other committee in the Congress, with preserving the defense of the United States of America, I thought it would be a happy solution if, without friction and acrimony and bickering, we could sit down together as men mutually interested in a great enterprise, in which his great committee would play a principal part and our committee would play a principal part, to see if we could not evolve a program for the help of our country, both at home and abroad, which would accomplish exactly that purpose.

I now want to read from the law:

Committee on Armed Services, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

Common defense generally.

The War Department and the Military Establishment generally.

The Navy Department and the Naval Establishment generally.

The Air Department and the Air Establishment generally.

In heaven's name, if this proposition does not relate to the defense of the United States of America, then we have no right to take a single gun or bullet and send it anywhere beyond the shores of the United States of America. There is no treaty obligation that we send guns; there is no executive obligation that we send the guns. If we do send them, we shall send them solely predicated upon the premise that the defense of the United States of America is preserved and strengthened and enlarged and made impregnable by the program we shall approve. On no other terms can such a program be adopted.

The Foreign Relations Committee, according to law, shall consist of 13 Senators—

To which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, and other matters relating to * * * relations of the United States with foreign nations generally.

I do not want to be technical or narrow, but I submit this is not a matter of foreign relations; it is a matter of defense of the United States of America. We have no treaty that demands or requires or obligates us to furnish arms. We have no executive agreement that compels us to do so as a matter of good faith. In adopting the North Atlantic Pact, which was in the pure field of in-

ternational relations, we were motivated from beginning to end by the thought that it was a covenant for defense, which was properly considered solely by the Committee on Foreign Relations. But when we come to promote and provide for the defense of the United States of America, Mr. President, whether we provide guns internally or furnish them externally, that is a matter affecting the defense of America, and the Armed Services Committee, which has labored long in the vineyard of national defense, should not be sidetracked or deprived of an equal voice in its consideration.

I give to the Foreign Relations Committee preeminence in the field of knowledge and understanding and know-how in regard to international relations. My service on that committee, of which I am a new and humble member, has created in my mind an admiration of the comprehension which the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations have of the whole panoply of international dealings. I hope I may with modesty say, likewise, that a long contact with the defense of America—the guns we have, the planes we have, the ships we have, what these guns, planes, and ships will do, where they are, the condition they are in, the men that are necessary to operate them and utilize them in war—is of some value also; and in that field I feel that we on the Armed Services Committee are preeminent, whereas the Committee on Foreign Relations—I say this with no disrespect of the committee—is not well informed in that field. Perhaps the Foreign Relations Committee could not tell us how many men or officers we have in the three services or how many planes we have or what the performance of the planes is or where our bases are or what our research and development program is, or many other things involving various phases which dovetail into the whole plan of our defense. So much for that.

I simply wish to pay my respects again to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who so affably and, I think, patriotically rose above the pettiness which sometimes grips us here when we seek the jurisdiction of a bill. I was instructed by my committee to fight for the complete jurisdiction of this bill, but I told the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that I was reluctant to do so, and I asked whether we could meet together with his committee, rather than to quarrel over the jurisdiction, and whether we could divide the responsibility for this measure. To that suggestion, after some hesitation, he agreed.

Mr. President, I repeat the Armed Services Committee is charged with the defense of the United States of America. I submit that the title of this bill was adroitly drawn so as to short-circuit, if you please, the Armed Services Committee, when it says "To promote the foreign policy of the United States."

Mr. President, when have we ever promoted our foreign policy by sending arms abroad? We have sent arms abroad only for our own defense, not as a matter of foreign policy per se. Under lend-lease, we sent arms abroad to keep the war

away from us. Who is going to say what arms shall be sent? Is the Secretary of State going to say it, or is the Under Secretary of State, or the man in charge of western European affairs, or the man in charge of eastern European affairs going to say it? No, Mr. President; General Bradley, General Vandenberg, and Admiral Denfeld will confer with their counter members from the other countries, I should imagine, and then will evolve some general plan; and the State Department will do nothing but take the plan, after it is evolved, and try to give it execution, because obviously the State Department will not know A from Z about it, in my humble judgment.

Having read the law, I am going to make an appeal to my fellow Members about this arms implementation program. I do not know what the program will be when it comes to the Senate for final action. I do not know whether I shall be in favor of it or against it. Basically I like the idea of it, assuming that it is balanced and sound and approved by our military experts who head our three great armed-service establishments.

But I am thinking of a remark made by the newcomer to the Senate, the able junior Senator from New York [Mr. DULLES], in his address on the North Atlantic Pact, when he said, in answer to a question, I think, that we must not lose sight of the fact that the peoples of the western European nations in becoming signatories to the North Atlantic Security Alliance thereby committed themselves voluntarily to bearing the first cruel, bloody shock that would come from an aggressor if the North Atlantic security neighborhood were invaded.

Mr. President, who are the people who are going to bear this first cruel, bloody shock—and it is nothing more than the naked truth to refer to it in that way. Let us look at one of the larger nations, France. France had 600,000 men killed and missing in World War II, although France was a belligerent in that war for only a relatively short period of time. Six hundred thousand men killed and missing are a good many more than we had, Mr. President. France had 6,000 bridges, large and small, destroyed. France was occupied for 4½ years, during which time the French were allowed no army in France, no arms. All their arms were confiscated, all their military establishment was disintegrated. Finally the day of deliverance came. When it did come, France found many of her towns and cities in ruins, her industry destroyed, her merchant marine gone, her great navy a shambles, and her army nonexistent, its arms all gone, and its great Maginot Line a monument to the folly of attempting to beat a rattlesnake by standing still.

Taking into consideration the economic side of this matter, the world, through the able leadership of our great General Marshall and others, realized that, quite aside from military matters, we had to revitalize these people, recreate their self-respect, give them the means to live a good life, in order to secure their democratic institutions, their way of life, and also in order to win a

great friend in the civilized community of nations.

So the Senate, with some reluctance, because we were giving away the money of our own people, adopted the ECA plan to help revitalize these countries. The very fact we took that action showed, quite apart from the military aspect, that they were unable to carry on, without some help at once, at least the ordinary business pursuits which enable men and nations to live in democracy and freedom. So we generously appropriated the money.

France had had no army for 4½ years, except the scattered army in the provinces; and during that period France had been devoid of weapons, and her entire World War philosophy had been destroyed with the surrender of the Maginot Line. France now comes of age again, without arms, but with a great reservoir of manpower. There are 450,000 men in the French Army. I believe France is taking 250,000 men into the army each year, giving them a year's training, and then putting them into the reserves. But if they do not have the equipment they need or in some cases bread to eat or the necessary farm equipment and other equipment needed on the economic side, how can France produce the weapons with which to give the necessary training in order to develop the military strength which is necessary in that great country, without some wise help from those who can provide it?

God knows, Mr. President, I hope another war will not come. I am an advocate of world disarmament. I have spoken many times on this floor for world disarmament, saying that whenever we can get the other countries to agree to a sound plan for world disarmament, under proper inspection, both before, during, and after, we should proceed to establish it. But we have had very little luck in that field, and in this interim period the bold proposition comes down to this: Do the boys of America, or their mothers and the fathers, want the United States to have to do all the fighting, to take on whoever it may be, single-handedly, or do they want strong allies who will stand with them and share the brutal responsibility and the heavy toll in some time of future aggression? That is how simple it is—whether we think more of our guns than we do of our sons. If we do not help the nations which we have already almost unanimously said are in such economic plight that they cannot stand, even in an economic way, without help, if we do not help them in the military field, which must thrive on taxation and on prosperity, then we shall have no allies. We shall have committed ourselves to a partnership in which we are the only working partner, because we refuse to get the assistance, the help, the strength, the vitality, the might, the resistance, the psychology, and the over-all integration which we might have had by even a pittance in the way of military help.

Yes, Mr. President, I would be opposed, as I believe the whole Senate would be opposed, to recklessness in furnishing arms abroad, even to members

of the North Atlantic security alliance. I want to see the plan well worked out. I want to see it integrated. Knowing the huge financial burden of military preparedness, I should like to see each of those countries do what they can best do, rather than to try to duplicate what some other nation can do best, so that when we furnish our money, our efforts, and our arms by such an arrangement, we are not going to have to rely on the others entirely, but rely on ourselves and, in a measure, on the others, to build a fortress so strong that no power on God's earth would have the hardihood to attack it without knowledge of certain defeat.

I am for the program if it is a sound one—and I believe a sound one will evolve—because it means the difference, perhaps, between peace and war. Some advocates like to think the atomic bomb is the answer to everything. God knows it is a big answer, but there are a few questions that even it cannot answer. If an aggressor comes from eastern Europe toward the Atlantic, if we go behind him and bomb his cities, kill his people, and destroy his war potential, we cannot, with atomic bombs, destroy the great industrial cities where our friends and allies lie or stand or live. We would turn them all over to the enemy by such a process, perhaps, as nearly occurred when the British shelled the French Fleet in World War II. We have to be careful about such things. Neither do I want to see the enemy come when one little country, such as England, is standing alone, battling desperately for its life, and then to see American boys, by the hundreds of thousands, going over to that little isle and being trained for one or two or three years, and then taking the awful hazard of having to cross the water and land on a beach already occupied by the enemy. If we have European allies without sufficient arms, that is exactly what will occur.

Mr. President, I have gone a little further afield than I intended, to argue blindly for a program. That is not my purpose; and if I have violated my statement that I did not wish to attack a program per se, I retract what I have said until the program itself comes before us. I do so for one purpose only. There is not a Member of this body—and I know them all well—who is not interested in the defense of the United States of America. There is not one of us who has a store of knowledge now which is adequate to pass upon any such program. We have got to find out what the other countries associated with us can and cannot do; how much we can rely on them, even if we give them certain arms; how long they can hold off; what damage they can do; how soon we can come to their rescue, and many other things. Those questions are in the field of logistics, and not in the field of legislation. We must call in the ablest men in our Military Establishment and have them advise and counsel with us before we adopt the final program.

We all love peace. No man likes a program of this kind for itself. He takes it only for its ultimate objective, which is

peace, after he has reasoned deeply upon it.

I ask those of my colleagues who are here, who may initially be opposed to the whole proposition, to withhold judgment until we can call in General Bradley, Admiral Denfeld, General Vandenberg, and General Gruenther and have them tell us, in numbers, in facts, in figures, and in logistics whether our own country will be better off with this program or whether it will be worse off, and then let us vote on the question.

I have been somewhat concerned in reading that some of my colleagues, on my side of the aisle, have already passed judgment on the program before hearing from any of our military experts. I know they have done it in good faith. I believe some of them will recant. My plea today is that judgment be withheld in the interests of the boys of our own country. We do not want to be the only Nation capable of fighting if world war III breaks out. At this time we are the only one, outside of one other.

In closing, Mr. President, I thank the Senate for giving me this opportunity to be heard. I thank my friend and colleague, the Senator from Texas for the magnanimous, broad-minded, and patriotic way in which he acceded to my request, which I think is founded on good law, on good Senate rules, and on good sense, besides. I want to say to him that when the two committees meet, although I happen to be his senior by a slight bit, I shall move that he be made the permanent chairman of the two committees, if the unanimous-consent request is agreed to, because I think magnanimity and cooperation such as he has exhibited are worthy of a return in all the abundance of which we are capable.

I should like to say to the members of the Armed Services Committee, a number of whom are on the floor at this time, that I feel that we can make a great contribution to the whole program; and when we have a program backed by the military advice of men who have proved in time of war that they know what it is all about, I hope the Senate will say yes or no, but not before all the evidence is in.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I shall take but a moment of the time of the Senate. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the Senator from Maryland. My view is that, technically, this is a matter for the Foreign Relations Committee, because, while it deals with arms, it affects the relationship of our country to other countries. Because some matter in connection with it might refer to something else, such as the wheat agreement, it does not rob it of its international character. But, in view of the fact that this question is one which intimately and particularly deals with arms, I, after a conference with the Senator from Maryland, did not further resist the reference of the matter jointly to the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee.

If the Committee on Foreign Relations had jurisdiction, we would necessarily have to call in for hearing the military

experts and the heads of the military and naval departments. In view of the fact that the Committee on Armed Services has already accumulated a vast store of information along the lines of the proposed legislation, by reason of its contact with the whole military problem, I thought it would probably be in the interest of the public welfare and in the interest of the Senate to have joint meetings of the two committees with respect to the legislation. Therefore, so far as lies within my authority, I have agreed to the unanimous consent request which has been proposed.

I shall not enter into any speech on the subject in an effort to convince Senators about the program. That is for their consideration after the committees shall have reported back to the Senate. Senators know that there is in the treaty which we recently ratified, article 3, which reads as follows:

In order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this Treaty, the Parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack.

Realizing the intimate relationship between what we may do in the way of furnishing arms to the foreign countries and our own national self-defense under the obligations of the treaty, it seemed to me a very vital question was presented, and I was not averse to having the aid and advice and cooperation of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. President, I wish to second the suggestion that Senators withhold any definite commitments on this problem. Let us examine it. Let us consult the best authorities there are about how much we can spare before we deplete or endanger our own means of self-defense and protection, how we can comply with our obligations to contribute to the collective self-defense of the Atlantic area without injuring the possibility of our own self-defense.

The point was suggested also that the first impact of any attack in Europe would be on the small and the weak countries. All of us know that a determined attack by a great power would sweep over these nations, and make them conquest victims, unless they had help. Then our problem would be their liberation. How much better it would be for us to furnish proper amounts of arms so that they could at least hold the line for a period until we could prepare and come to their rescue. Liberation would bring many of the horrors of war itself. It would bring occupation by hostile armies.

Mr. President, without taking more time of the Senate at this moment, I join in the request which has been handed down by the Chair.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. Is it the understanding of the Senator from Texas that in the joint committee hearings, and in voting on parts of the program and on the final bill, there will be a full vote, 13 votes to each committee, 26 votes altogether, taken absolutely on every question?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is my present attitude in the matter.

Mr. GURNEY. Would that mean, for example, that the Senator from Maryland would have two votes?

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, no.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the unanimous consent request answers the very proper question of the Senator from South Dakota. When the two committees are constituted in fact one committee, to consider jointly the questions presented, each member of the committee—which would mean 25 members, because the Senator from Maryland is in the happy position of being on both the committees—there would be 25 votes, and each member would vote.

Mr. GURNEY. Does the request so provide?

Mr. TYDINGS. It is so framed that no other interpretation than the one I have given is possible, in my opinion. If the Senator would like to have me read it and point that out, I should be glad to do so.

Mr. GURNEY. I have not heard it. There was so much confusion when it was first offered that I could not hear it, and I should like to hear it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator from Texas yield to me a moment?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to read the request a little slowly, and I think the meaning I have imported to it would appear to be the proper one from the reading of it. It reads:

That without such action being established as a precedent, the bill and message from the President of the United States relating to foreign military assistance be, and it is hereby, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services for joint consideration and study, including the holding of hearings if deemed advisable, and that the said committees, acting through the chairman of one of said committees, shall at the earliest practicable time, by bill or otherwise, submit their recommendations to the Senate.

I do not see how any other meaning could flow from that than the one I have given.

Mr. GURNEY. Nor do I, and certainly not if both chairmen on the floor today will state that that is the understanding, that there shall be 25 votes on any question which may come up on this matter.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have stated very frankly that that is my attitude, but I do not care to give any hard-boiled opinion on it. It seems to me that when we use the word "joint" it means the entire body of the two committees. It does not say that they shall consider questions separately, and that each group shall vote as a committee, but it says "joint." It means the memberships of both committees are, for the purposes of this resolution, more or less merged into one committee. That is my view.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, so that I may be sure I understand, I should like to ask the Senator whether

it is his interpretation, as apparently it is that of the Senator from Maryland, that this in effect constitutes a new and select committee, which will act as a unit not only in exploration and study and hearing, but also in actually writing the law and in actually voting upon the net result.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true. It is a variation of our rule. It is asking unanimous consent that for the purposes of the legislation desired these two committees be one committee.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to make an observation when the Senator has concluded.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, this is, of course, no time to debate the fundamental issue which was presented so eloquently by the distinguished Senator from Maryland. Certainly I am one of those who completely agree with him and with the Senator from Texas that Senators should maintain open minds so that there can be a totally honest assessment of the facts which are subsequently submitted. I respectfully suggest, however, that the emphasis which the Senator from Maryland put upon the situation gave a rather complete priority to the proposals which have been sent down to us. I quite agree that they should be the basis of consideration, but I respectfully suggest to the able Senator from Maryland that one can entirely agree with the analysis which he made, and the more one agrees with him, the more one may wish to be sure that the bill is written on such a sound and solid basis that it stands some chance of conclusive action in the remaining days of this session, so as to avoid the final tragedy of a total default in respect to no legislation at all.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have been in favor of military assistance to Europe ever since the end of the war. I do not suppose any Member of the Senate has been more earnestly in favor of it than I have been, and as time passes I become more strongly in favor of it than ever. So I approach this whole subject from the standpoint of getting action, getting action intelligently, and getting action promptly. I have neither the taste nor the capacity to get into a long hair-splitting argument on jurisdiction. That takes a type of training and of outlook I do not possess. I do say in a very friendly spirit to my friend the Senator from Maryland, that I do not think the membership of the Foreign Relations Committee is completely ignorant of military matters, as I think he feels we are, and I do not think it is quite correct to say that when the end of the war came the French had no army. They made a tremendous effort. They had—

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think if the Senator will look at my remarks as they will appear in the RECORD tomorrow, he will find that I said "except outside of France."

Mr. LODGE. No; they had eight divisions in France.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; but I am talking about the occupation period.

Mr. LODGE. I thought the Senator meant at the end of the war.

Mr. TYDINGS. No; I said during the occupation period. Their armies had been taken away. They had no army except outside of France during the occupation period.

Mr. LODGE. I, of course, accept the Senator's correction. I understood the Senator to say the French had no army in France at the end of the war. Of course there were many French troops who fought very well, and who were of great help to the United States.

Mr. President, I do not have a very hopeful view about the outcome of this experiment. I wonder why we did not try it in the case of the international wheat agreement and send that agreement to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Committee on Foreign Relations, jointly. That would have been an equally appropriate thing to do.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think any committee in Congress is charged with looking after wheat, but I do think the Committee on Armed Services is charged specifically by law with providing for the defense of the United States of America, for its Army, its Navy, and its Air Force. I do not think there is the slightest analogy between the two illustrations which the Senator uses to sustain his position.

Mr. LODGE. It seems to me that the production of wheat relates to agriculture, and that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is supposed to take cognizance of such a matter. It seems to me that is as plain as the nose on one's face. I believe it would have been exactly the same thing without any shred of difference to have referred the international wheat agreement to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Committee on Foreign Relations. But, as I said, I do not care to argue those points.

There are four ways of dealing with this matter. One is to send it to the Committee on Armed Services. One is to send it to the Committee on Foreign Relations. One is to send it to both committees together. The other is to send it to a committee of 13 Senators selected from both committees. Now we have decided to choose the third one of those four possibilities.

I shall not repeat the argument which has been made for sending it to the two committees. There is one added factor. This action completely preserves the prestige of all parties. But I think from the standpoint of getting the job done, of going into some of these very fundamental factors as carefully as they ought to be gone into, experience will show that in trying to avoid a jurisdictional dispute and trying to preserve everyone's prestige, we will have set up something which is largely unworkable.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to make an observation, and I do not believe the Senator from Massachusetts will disagree with me. If I may be permitted to make the observation, with a little humility, I believe that the fact that the Armed Services Committee, together with the great Committee on Foreign Relations are considering this proposition jointly should give it a greater rather than a diminished status.

Secondly, I should like to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that an exploratory investigation made by the Senator from Maryland into certain tentative phases of this matter indicates that we will probably have to take some of our reserves temporarily—not a large number—in order to provide for this program. I think the Senator will agree that those of us who are charged by law with the defense of the United States should not sit idly by and see our reserves taken away without having any voice in saying whether or not it is wise to do so.

Mr. LODGE. No; I have never said that. I say that 26—or 25 men, since the Senator from Maryland is a member of both committees—is an unwieldy number to do this particular kind of work.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one observation?

Mr. LODGE. I want to complete this statement, and then I shall yield. The Senator knows what happens in the Senate. We come into a committee meeting at 10:30 or sometimes at 10 o'clock, and a witness appears before the committee. He talks for three-quarters of an hour, and then usually the chairman interrogates him, and often makes a few speeches of his own, which are not interrogation. That runs along for three-quarters of an hour. The result is that even with a committee of 13 members, it is very seldom that the members who have very little seniority on the committee are reached during the morning session. Then if someone like the Secretary of State, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of the Navy appears before the committee, men who cannot spend all their lives before the committee, the low-ranking members of the committee are in the position of either insisting that the witness come back at a later session or also not ask any questions. Perhaps that is just as well, because sometimes the questions are not particularly pertinent. But the fact is a committee, consisting of 13 members, can hardly get very far in questioning a witness during a morning session, when some of the senior members of the committee take up as much time as they do. Perhaps at times it is just as well that more questions are not asked; but with 26 members on a committee the hearing may well result in a farce.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I am in complete disagreement with him in what he has just said. One of the motivating factors in making the suggestion to the

Senator from Texas was to avoid a long antagonistic jurisdictional fight on the floor of the Senate because the members of the Armed Services Committee, knowing that the chairman of that committee was a member of the Foreign Relations Committee also, served notice upon him that they would fight to the death on the Senate floor to secure jurisdiction over this bill. The fact that the two committees can get together and act jointly, in my opinion, will result in a cut in the time element, so that only 10 percent of the time that otherwise might be used will be taken.

Mr. LODGE. I will say to the Senator from Maryland what I have said many times before—that in the years I have been here I have never gotten into a jurisdictional dispute, and I never shall. I am not saying that this matter should not go to the Armed Services Committee.

I have very little club spirit or "old school-tie spirit" in my make-up. I say experience has proved that 26 men form too large a group to handle such a question as this, and the result will be to bring out a half-baked, hammer-and-tongs proposition, which when it reaches the floor will be full of holes, and will be subject to rewriting and amendment on the floor of the Senate. In my opinion, that is an extremely poor way of doing things. I say that because it is physically impossible for 26 men to give the proper study and consideration and the prolonged analysis needed.

The Senator from Maryland said very frankly that the attempt is made to avoid a jurisdictional fight on the Senate floor. Perhaps it is sometimes better not to have such a jurisdictional fight on the Senate floor, and sometimes it is better to have such a fight, perhaps. Under the proposal a jurisdictional fight on the floor is being avoided, there will be a saving in prestige, but a structure will be put up which will be so large and unwieldy as to be unable to do the job.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wish to call to the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts that in the House of Representatives all the major committees have 26 or 27 members. The Appropriations Committee has, I believe, 39 or 40 members. I know the situation that exists in the House. The committees get along all right and expedite the handling of legislation very well on that side.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Tennessee also knows that the Rules Committee in the House, which is a star-chamber committee, reduces most Representatives to the importance of rear-rank privates, and the Senator also knows that everyone in the House wants to come to the Senate, and no Member of the Senate wants to go to the House. The reason for that is that the committees of the House are so large that the individual Representative often does not count for anything.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts

that there are sitting close around me several members of the Armed Services Committee and several members of the Foreign Relations Committee, who have served in the House. We have had a small caucus, and some of us want to assure the distinguished Senator that if the two committees are set up jointly we will act more or less like House Members, and not ask a great many questions or very lengthy questions.

Mr. LODGE. I will believe that when I see it. I do believe it insofar as the Senator from Tennessee is concerned. Moreover I will go the Senator from Maryland one better. Many members of the Senate Armed Services Committee have a very real grasp of foreign affairs. The Senator from Tennessee is one of them. I would not feel at all bad if the bill went to the Armed Services Committee. I object to a committee of 26. I think it is unworkable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. Mr. President, the pending business is the independent offices appropriation bill—

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

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum until I can submit a conference report which I believe will take only a moment?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Certainly.

SECURITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1949— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TYDINGS submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5632) to reorganize fiscal management in the National Military Establishment to promote economy and efficiency, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SHORT TITLE

"SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the 'National Security Act Amendments of 1949'.

"SEC. 2. Section 2 of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. In enacting this legislation, it is the intent of Congress to provide a comprehensive program for the future security of the United States; to provide for the establishment of integrated policies and procedures for the departments, agencies, and functions of the Government relating to the national security; to provide three military departments, separately administered, for the operation and administration of the Army, the Navy (including naval aviation and the United States Marine Corps), and the Air Force, with their assigned combat and service components; to provide for their authoritative coordination and unified direction under civilian control of the Secretary of Defense but not to merge them; to provide for the effective strategic direction of the armed forces and for their operation under unified

control and for their integration into an efficient team of land, naval, and air forces but not to establish a single Chief of Staff over the armed forces nor an armed forces general staff (but this is not to be interpreted as applying to the Joint Chiefs of Staff or Joint Staff).

"CHANGE IN COMPOSITION OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

"SEC. 3. The fourth paragraph of section 101 (a) of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended to read as follows:

"The Council shall be composed of—

"(1) the President;

"(2) the Vice President;

"(3) the Secretary of State;

"(4) the Secretary of Defense;

"(5) the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board; and

"(6) The Secretaries and Under Secretaries of other executive departments and of the military departments, the Chairman of the Munitions Board, and the Chairman of the Research and Development Board, when appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to serve at his pleasure."

"CONVERSION OF THE NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT INTO AN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

"SEC. 4. Section 201 of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 201. (a) There is hereby established, as an Executive Department of the Government, the Department of Defense, and the Secretary of Defense shall be the head thereof.

"(b) There shall be within the Department of Defense (1) the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force, and each such department shall on and after the date of enactment of the National Security Act Amendments of 1949 be military departments in lieu of their prior status as Executive Departments, and (2) all other agencies created under title II of this Act.

"(c) Section 158 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 158. The provisions of this title shall apply to the following Executive Departments:

"First. The Department of State.

"Second. The Department of Defense.

"Third. The Department of the Treasury.

"Fourth. The Department of Justice.

"Fifth. The Post Office Department.

"Sixth. The Department of the Interior.

"Seventh. The Department of Agriculture.

"Eighth. The Department of Commerce.

"Ninth. The Department of Labor."

"(d) Except to the extent inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, the provisions of title IV of the Revised Statutes as now or hereafter amended shall be applicable to the Department of Defense."

"THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

"SEC. 5. Section 202 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 202. (a) There shall be a Secretary of Defense, who shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. *Provided*, That a person who has within ten years been on active duty as a commissioned officer in a Regular component of the armed services shall not be eligible for appointment as Secretary of Defense.

"(b) The Secretary of Defense shall be the principal assistant to the President in all matters relating to the Department of Defense. Under the direction of the President, and subject to the provisions of this Act, he shall have direction, authority, and control over the Department of Defense.

"(c) (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the combatant functions assigned to the military services by sections 205 (e), 206 (b), 206 (c), and 208 (f) hereof shall not be transferred, reassigned, abolished, or consolidated.

"(2) Military personnel shall not be so detailed or assigned as to impair such combatant functions.

"(3) The Secretary of Defense shall not direct the use and expenditure of funds of the Department of Defense in such manner as to effect the results prohibited by paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection.

"(4) The Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force shall be separately administered by their respective Secretaries under the direction, authority, and control of the Secretary of Defense.

"(5) Subject to the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection no function which has been or is hereafter authorized by law to be performed by the Department of Defense shall be substantially transferred, reassigned, abolished or consolidated until after a report in regard to all pertinent details shall have been made by the Secretary of Defense to the Committees on Armed Services of the Congress.

"(6) No provision of this Act shall be so construed as to prevent a Secretary of a military department or a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff from presenting to the Congress, on his own initiative, after first so informing the Secretary of Defense, any recommendation relating to the Department of Defense that he may deem proper.

"(d) The Secretary of Defense shall not less often than semiannually submit written reports to the President and the Congress covering expenditures, work and accomplishments of the Department of Defense, accompanied by (1) such recommendations as he shall deem appropriate, (2) separate reports from the military departments covering their expenditures, work and accomplishments, and (3) itemized statements showing the savings of public funds and the eliminations of unnecessary duplications and overlappings that have been accomplished pursuant to the provisions of this Act.

"(e) The Secretary of Defense shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Department of Defense, of such design as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

"(f) The Secretary of Defense may, without being relieved of his responsibility therefor, and unless prohibited by some specific provision of this Act or other specific provision of law, perform any function vested in him through or with the aid of such officials or organizational entities of the Department of Defense as he may designate."

"DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE; ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF DEFENSE; MILITARY ASSISTANTS; AND CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

"SEC. 6. (a) Section 203 of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 203. (a) There shall be a Deputy Secretary of Defense, who shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That a person who has within ten years been on active duty as a commissioned officer in a Regular component of the armed services shall not be eligible for appointment as Deputy Secretary of Defense. The Deputy Secretary shall perform such duties and exercise such powers as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe and shall take precedence in the Department of Defense next after the Secretary of Defense. The Deputy Secretary shall act for, and exercise the powers of, the Secretary of Defense during his absence or disability.

"(b) There shall be three Assistant Secretaries of Defense, who shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and

with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Assistant Secretaries shall perform such duties and exercise such powers as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe and shall take precedence in the Department of Defense after the Secretary of Defense, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force.

"(c) Officers of the armed services may be detailed to duty as assistants and personal aides to the Secretary of Defense, but he shall not establish a military staff other than that provided for by section 211 (a) of this Act."

"(b) Section 204 of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 204. The Secretary of Defense is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such civilian personnel as may be necessary for the performance of the functions of the Department of Defense other than those of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force."

"CREATING THE POSITION OF CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF AND PRESCRIBING HIS POWERS AND DUTIES"

"Sec. 7. (a) Section 210 of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 210. There shall be within the Department of Defense an Armed Forces Policy Council composed of the Secretary of Defense, as Chairman, who shall have power of decision; the Deputy Secretary of Defense; the Secretary of the Army; the Secretary of the Navy; the Secretary of the Air Force; the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; the Chief of Staff, United States Army; the Chief of Naval Operations; and the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force. The Armed Forces Policy Council shall advise the Secretary of Defense on matters of broad policy relating to the armed forces and shall consider and report on such other matters as the Secretary of Defense may direct."

"(b) Section 211 of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 211. (a) There is hereby established within the Department of Defense the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which shall consist of the Chairman, who shall be the presiding officer thereof but who shall have no vote; the Chief of Staff, United States Army, the Chief of Naval Operations; and the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force. The Joint Chiefs of Staff shall be the principal military advisers to the President, the National Security Council, and the Secretary of Defense."

"(b) Subject to the authority and direction of the President and the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall perform the following duties, in addition to such other duties as the President or the Secretary of Defense may direct:

"(1) preparation of strategic plans and provision for the strategic direction of the military forces;

"(2) preparation of joint logistic plans and assignment to the military services of logistic responsibilities in accordance with such plans;

"(3) establishment of unified commands in strategic areas;

"(4) review of major material and personnel requirements of the military forces in accordance with strategic and logistic plans;

"(5) formulation of policies for joint training of the military forces;

"(6) formulation of policies for coordinating the military education of members of the military forces; and

"(7) providing United States representation on the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations."

"(c) The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (hereinafter referred to as the

"Chairman") shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among the Regular officers of the armed services to serve at the pleasure of the President for a term of two years and shall be eligible for one reappointment, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, except in time of war hereafter declared by the Congress when there shall be no limitation on the number of such reappointments. The Chairman shall receive the basic pay and basic and personal money allowances prescribed by law for the Chief of Staff, United States Army, and such special pays and hazardous duty pays to which he may be entitled under other provisions of law."

"(d) The Chairman, if in the grade of general, shall be additional to the number of officers in the grade of general provided in the third proviso of section 504 (b) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress) or, if in the rank of admiral, shall be additional to the number of officers having the rank of admiral provided in section 413 (a) of such Act. While holding such office he shall take precedence over all other officers of the armed services: *Provided*, That the Chairman shall not exercise military command over the Joint Chiefs of Staff or over any of the military services."

"(e) In addition to participating as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the performance of the duties assigned in subsection (b) of this section, the Chairman shall, subject to the authority and direction of the President and the Secretary of Defense, perform the following duties:

"(1) serve as the presiding officer of the Joint Chiefs of Staff;

"(2) provide agenda for meetings of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and assist the Joint Chiefs of Staff to prosecute their business as promptly as practicable; and

"(3) inform the Secretary of Defense and, when appropriate as determined by the President or the Secretary of Defense, the President, of those issues upon which agreement among the Joint Chiefs of Staff has not been reached."

"(c) Section 212 of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 212. There shall be, under the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a Joint Staff to consist of not to exceed two hundred and ten officers and to be composed of approximately equal numbers of officers appointed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff from each of the three armed services. The Joint Staff, operating under a Director thereof appointed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, shall perform such duties as may be directed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Director shall be an officer junior in grade to all members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff."

"CHANGING RELATIONSHIP OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE TO THE MUNITIONS BOARD"

"Sec. 8. Section 213 of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 213. (a) There is hereby established in the Department of Defense a Munitions Board (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Board")."

"(b) The Board shall be composed of a Chairman, who shall be the head thereof and who shall, subject to the authority of the Secretary of Defense and in respect to such matters authorized by him, have the power of decision upon matters falling within the jurisdiction of the Board, and an Under Secretary or Assistant Secretary from each of the three military departments, to be designated in each case by the Secretaries of their respective departments. The Chairman shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of \$14,000 a year."

"(c) Subject to the authority and direction of the Secretary of Defense, the Board shall perform the following duties in support

of strategic and logistic plans and in consonance with guidance in those fields provided by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and such other duties as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe:

"(1) coordination of the appropriate activities with regard to industrial matters, including the procurement, production, and distribution plans of the Department of Defense;

"(2) planning for the military aspects of industrial mobilization;

"(3) assignment of procurement responsibilities among the several military departments and planning for standardization of specifications and for the greatest practicable allocations of purchase authority of technical equipment and common use items on the basis of single procurement;

"(4) preparation of estimates of potential production, procurement, and personnel for use in evaluation of the logistic feasibility of strategic operations;

"(5) determination of relative priorities of the various segments of the military procurement programs;

"(6) supervision of such subordinate agencies as are or may be created to consider the subjects falling within the scope of the Board's responsibilities;

"(7) regrouping, combining, or dissolving of existing interservice agencies operating in the fields of procurement, production, and distribution in such manner as to promote efficiency and economy;

"(8) maintenance of liaison with other departments and agencies for the proper correlation of military requirements with the civilian economy, particularly in regard to the procurement or disposition of strategic and critical material and the maintenance of adequate reserves of such material, and making of recommendations as to policies in connection therewith; and

"(9) assembly and review of material and personnel requirements presented by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and by the production, procurement, and distribution agencies assigned to meet military needs, and making of recommendations thereon to the Secretary of Defense."

"(d) When the Chairman of the Board first appointed has taken office, the Joint Army and Navy Munitions Board shall cease to exist and all its records and personnel shall be transferred to the Munitions Board."

"(e) The Secretary of Defense shall provide the Board with such personnel and facilities as the Secretary may determine to be required by the Board for the performance of its functions."

"CHANGING THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE TO THE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD"

"Sec. 9. Section 214 of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 214. (a) There is hereby established in the Department of Defense a Research and Development Board (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Board"). The Board shall be composed of a Chairman, who shall be the head thereof and who shall, subject to the authority of the Secretary of Defense and in respect to such matters authorized by him, have the power of decision on matters falling within the jurisdiction of the Board, and two representatives from each of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, to be designated by the Secretaries of their respective Departments. The Chairman shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of \$14,000 a year. The purpose of the Board shall be to advise the Secretary of Defense as to the status of scientific research relative to the national security, and to assist him in assuring adequate provision for research and development on scientific problems relating to the national security."

“(b) Subject to the authority and direction of the Secretary of Defense, the Board shall perform the following duties and such other duties as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe:

“(1) preparation of a complete and integrated program of research and development for military purposes;

“(2) advising with regard to trends in scientific research relating to national security and the measures necessary to assure continued and increasing progress;

“(3) coordination of research and development among the military departments, and allocation among them of responsibilities for specific programs;

“(4) formulation of policy for the Department of Defense in connection with research and development matters involving agencies outside the Department of Defense; and

“(5) consideration of the interaction of research and development and strategy, and advising the Joint Chiefs of Staff in connection therewith.

“(c) When the Chairman of the Board first appointed has taken office, the Joint Research and Development Board shall cease to exist and all its records and personnel shall be transferred to the Research and Development Board.

“(d) The Secretary of Defense shall provide the Board with such personnel and facilities as the Secretary may determine to be required by the Board for the performance of its functions.”

“COMPENSATION OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, SECRETARIES OF MILITARY DEPARTMENTS, AND CONSULTANTS

“Sec. 10. (a) Section 301 of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended to read as follows:

“Sec. 301. (a) The Secretary of Defense shall receive the compensation prescribed by law for heads of executive departments.

“(b) The Deputy Secretary of Defense shall receive compensation at the rate of \$14,500 a year, or such other compensation plus \$500 a year as may hereafter be provided by law for under secretaries of executive departments. The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force shall each receive compensation at the rate of \$14,000 a year, or such other compensation as may hereafter be provided by law for under secretaries of executive departments.”

“(b) Section 302 of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended to read as follows:

“Sec. 302. The Assistant Secretaries of Defense and the Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force shall each receive compensation at the rate of \$10,330 a year or at the rate hereafter prescribed by law for assistant secretaries of executive departments and shall perform such duties as the respective Secretaries may prescribe.”

“(c) Section 303 (a) of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended to read as follows:

“(a) The Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, the Director of Central Intelligence, and the National Security Council, acting through its Executive Secretary, are authorized to appoint such advisory committees and to employ, consistent with other provisions of this Act, such part-time advisory personnel as they may deem necessary in carrying out their respective functions and the functions of agencies under their control. Persons holding other offices or positions under the United States for which they receive compensation, while serving as members of such committees, shall receive no additional compensation for such service. Other members of such committees and other part-time advisory personnel so employed may serve without compensation or may receive com-

“pensation at a rate not to exceed \$50 for each day of service, as determined by the appointing authority.”

“REORGANIZATION OF FISCAL MANAGEMENT TO PROMOTE ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY

“Sec. 11. The National Security Act of 1947 is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new title:

“TITLE IV

“PROMOTION OF ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY THROUGH ESTABLISHMENT OF UNIFORM BUDGETARY AND FISCAL PROCEDURES AND ORGANIZATIONS

“Comptroller of Department of Defense

“Sec. 401. (a) There is hereby established in the Department of Defense the Comptroller of the Department of Defense, who shall be one of the Assistant Secretaries of Defense.

“(b) The Comptroller shall advise and assist the Secretary of Defense in performing such budgetary and fiscal functions as may be required to carry out the powers conferred upon the Secretary of Defense by this Act, including but not limited to those specified in this subsection. Subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of Defense, the Comptroller shall—

“(1) supervise and direct the preparation of the budget estimates of the Department of Defense; and

“(2) establish, and supervise the execution of—

“(A) principles, policies, and procedures to be followed in connection with organizational and administrative matters relating to—

“(i) the preparation and execution of the budgets,

“(ii) fiscal, cost, operating, and capital property accounting,

“(iii) progress and statistical reporting,

“(iv) internal audit, and

“(B) policies and procedures relating to the expenditure and collection of funds administered by the Department of Defense; and

“(3) establish uniform terminologies, classifications, and procedures in all such matters.

“MILITARY DEPARTMENT BUDGET AND FISCAL ORGANIZATION—DEPARTMENTAL COMPTROLLERS

“Sec. 402. (a) The Secretary of each military department, subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of Defense, shall cause budgeting, accounting, progress and statistical reporting, internal audit and administrative organization structure and managerial procedures relating thereto in the department of which he is the head to be organized and conducted in a manner consistent with the operations of the Office of the Comptroller of the Department of Defense.

“(b) There is hereby established in each of the three military departments a Comptroller of the Army, a Comptroller of the Navy, or a Comptroller of the Air Force, as appropriate in the department concerned. There shall, in each military department, also be a Deputy Comptroller. Subject to the authority of the respective departmental Secretaries, the comptrollers of the military departments shall be responsible for all budgeting, accounting, process and statistical reporting, and internal audit in their respective departments and for the administrative organization structure and managerial procedures relating thereto. The Secretaries of the military departments may in their discretion appoint either civilian or military personnel as comptrollers of the military departments. Departmental comptrollers shall be under the direction and supervision of, and directly responsible to, either the Secretary, the Under Secretary, or an Assistant Secretary of the respective military departments: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall preclude

the comptroller from having concurrent responsibility to a Chief of Staff or a Chief of Naval Operations, a Vice Chief of Staff or a Vice Chief of Naval Operations, or a Deputy Chief of Staff or a Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, if the Secretary of the military department concerned should so prescribe. Where the departmental comptroller is not a civilian, the Secretary of the department concerned shall appoint a civilian as Deputy Comptroller.

“PERFORMANCE BUDGET

“Sec. 403. (a) The budget estimates of the Department of Defense shall be prepared, presented, and justified, where practicable, and authorized programs shall be administered, in such form and manner as the Secretary of Defense, subject to the authority and direction of the President, may determine, so as to account for, and report, the cost of performance of readily identifiable functional programs and activities, with segregation of operating and capital programs. So far as practicable, the budget estimates and authorized programs of the military departments shall be set forth in readily comparable form and shall follow a uniform pattern.

“(b) In order to expedite the conversion from present budget and accounting methods to the cost-of-performance method prescribed in this title, the Secretary of each military department, with the approval of the President and the Secretary of Defense, is authorized and directed, until the end of the second year following the date of enactment of this Act, to make such transfers and adjustments within the military department of which he is the head between appropriations available for obligation by such department in such manner as he deems necessary to cause the obligation and administration of funds and the reports of expenditures to reflect the cost of performance of such programs and activities. Reports of transfers and adjustments made pursuant to the authority of this subsection shall be made currently by the Secretary of Defense to the President and the Congress.

“OBLIGATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

“Sec. 404. In order to prevent overdrafts and deficiencies in any fiscal year for which appropriations are made, on and after the beginning of the next fiscal year following the date of enactment of this Act appropriations made to the Department of Defense or to the military departments, and reimbursements thereto, shall be available for obligation and expenditure only after the Secretary of Defense shall approve scheduled rates of obligation, or modifications thereof: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall affect the right of the Department of Defense to incur such deficiencies as may be now or hereafter authorized by law to be incurred.

“WORKING-CAPITAL FUNDS

“Sec. 405. (a) In order more effectively to control and account for the cost of programs and work performed in the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to require the establishment of working-capital funds in the Department of Defense for the purpose of—

“(1) financing inventories of such stores, supplies, materials, and equipment as he may designate; and

“(2) providing working capital for such industrial-type activities, and for such commercial-type activities as provide common services within or among the departments and agencies of the Department of Defense, as he may designate.

“(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to establish on the books of the Treasury Department at the request of the Secretary of Defense the working-capital funds established pursuant to the authority of this section.

"(c) Such funds shall be—

"(1) charged, when appropriate, with the cost of stores, supplies, materials, and equipment procured or otherwise acquired, manufactured, repaired, issued, and consumed and of services rendered or work performed, including applicable administrative expenses; and

"(2) reimbursed from available appropriations or otherwise credited for the cost of stores, supplies, materials, or equipment furnished and of services rendered or work performed, including applicable administrative expenses."

"Reports of the condition and operations of such funds shall be made annually to the President and to the Congress.

"(d) The Secretary of Defense is authorized to provide capital for such working-capital funds by capitalizing inventories on hand and, with the approval of the President, by transfer, until December 31, 1954, from unexpended balances of any appropriations of the military departments not carried to the surplus fund of the Treasury: *Provided*, That no deficiency shall be incurred in any such appropriation as a result of any such transfer. To the extent that such methods do not, in the determination of the Secretary of Defense, provide adequate amounts of working capital, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not appropriated for other purposes, such sums as may be necessary to provide adequate working capital.

"(e) Subject to the authority and direction of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the military departments shall allocate responsibility within their respective military departments for the execution of functions which each military department is authorized by law to perform in such a manner as to effect the most economical and efficient organization and operation of the activities and use of the inventories for which working-capital funds are authorized by this section.

"(f) No greater cost shall be incurred by the requisitioning agency for stores, supplies, materials, or equipment drawn from inventories, and for services rendered or work performed by the industrial-type or commercial-type activities for which working-capital funds are authorized by this section, than the amount of appropriations or funds available for such purposes.

"(g) The Secretary of Defense is authorized to issue regulations to govern the operation of activities and use of inventories authorized by this section, which regulations may, whenever he determines the measures set forth in this subsection to be required by the needs of the Department of Defense, and when such measures are authorized by law, permit stores, supplies, materials, and equipment to be sold to, and services to be rendered or work performed for, purchasers or users outside the Department of Defense. In such cases, the working-capital funds involved may be reimbursed by charges against appropriate appropriations or by payments received in cash.

"(h) The appraised value of all stores, supplies, materials, and equipment returned to such working-capital funds from any department, activity, or agency, may be charged to the working-capital fund concerned and the proceeds thereof shall be credited to the current appropriations concerned; the amounts so credited shall be available for expenditures for the same purposes as the appropriations credited: *Provided*, That the provisions of this subsection shall not permit credits to appropriations as the result of capitalization of inventories authorized by subsection (d) of this section.

"MANAGEMENT FUNDS

"SEC. 406. The Act of July 3, 1942 (56 Stat. 645, c. 484), as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"(a) For the purpose of facilitating the economical and efficient conduct of opera-

tions in the Department of Defense which are financed by two or more appropriations where the costs of the operations are not susceptible of immediate distribution as charges to such appropriations, there are hereby established the Navy Management Fund, the Army Management Fund, and the Air Force Management Fund, each within, and under the direction of the respective Secretaries of, the Departments of the Navy, Army, or Air Force, as the case may be. There are authorized to be appropriated from time to time such funds as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of the funds.

"(b) The corpus of the Navy Management Fund shall consist of the sum of \$1,000,000 heretofore transferred to the Naval Procurement Fund from the Naval Emergency Fund (17X0300), which amount, and all balances in, and obligations against, any accounts in the Naval Procurement Fund, are hereby transferred to the Navy Management Fund; the corpus of the Army Management Fund shall consist of the sum of \$1,000,000, which shall be transferred thereto from any unobligated balance of any appropriation available to the Department of the Army; the corpus of the Air Force Management Fund shall consist of the sum of \$1,000,000, which shall be transferred thereto from any unobligated balance of any appropriation available to the Department of the Air Force; in each case together with such additional funds as may from time to time be appropriated to any of said funds. Accounts for the individual operations to be financed under the respective management funds shall be established only upon approval by the Secretary of Defense.

"(c) Expenditures may be made from said management funds from time to time for material (other than material for stock) and for personal and contractual services under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense: *Provided*, (1) That no obligation shall be incurred against any such fund which is not properly chargeable to available funds under an appropriation of the department within which the fund is established or, whenever necessary to effectuate purposes authorized by this Act to funds of another department or agency within the Department of Defense, and (2) that each fund shall be promptly reimbursed from the appropriate appropriations of such department for all expenditures properly chargeable thereto. Nothing herein or in any other provision of law shall be construed to prevent advances by check or warrant, or reimbursements to any of said management funds from appropriations of said departments on the basis of the estimated cost of a project, such estimated cost to be revised and necessary appropriation adjustments made when adequate data become available.

"(d) Except as otherwise provided by law, amounts advanced to the management funds under the provisions of this Act shall be available for obligation only during the fiscal year in which they are advanced: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this Act shall alter or limit the authorized period of availability of the funds from which such advances are made. Final adjustments of advances in accordance with actual costs shall be effected with the appropriate funds for the fiscal year in which such funds are advanced.

"(e) The portion of the Naval Appropriation Act, 1945 (58 Stat. 301, 310), relating to the Naval Procurement Fund is hereby repealed."

"ADJUSTMENT OF ACCOUNTS

"SEC. 407. (a) When under authority of law a function or an activity is transferred or assigned from one department or agency within the Department of Defense to another such department or agency, the balances of appropriations which are determined by the Secretary of Defense to be available and necessary to finance or discharge the function or activity so transferred or assigned may, with the approval of the President, be

transferred to, and be available for use by, the department or agency to which said function or activity is transferred or assigned for any purpose for which said funds were originally available. Balances so transferred shall be credited to any applicable existing appropriation account or accounts, or to any new appropriation account or accounts, which are hereby authorized to be established on the books of the Treasury Department, of the department or organization to which such function or activity is transferred, and shall be merged with funds in the applicable existing or newly established appropriation account or accounts and thereafter accounted for as one fund. Balances transferred to existing accounts shall be subject only to such limitations as are specifically applicable to such accounts and those transferred to new accounts shall be subject only to such limitations as are applicable to the appropriations from which they are transferred.

"(b) The number of employees which in the opinion of the Secretary of Defense is required for such transferred functions or activities may, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, be deducted from any personnel maximum or limitation of the department or agency within the Department of Defense from which such function or activity is transferred, and added to any such personnel maximum or limitation of the department or agency to which such function or activity is transferred.

"AVAILABILITY OF REIMBURSEMENTS

"SEC. 408. To carry out the purposes of this Act, reimbursements made under the authority of the Economy Act (31 U. S. C. 686), and sums paid by or on behalf of personnel of any department or organization for services rendered or supplies furnished, may be credited to authorized replacing or other accounts. Funds credited to such accounts shall remain available for obligation for the same period as the funds in the account so credited and each such account shall constitute one fund on the books of the Treasury Department.

"COMMON USE OF DISBURSING FACILITIES

"SEC. 409. To the extent authorized by the Secretary of Defense, disbursing officers of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force may, out of accounts of advances available to them, make disbursements covering obligations arising in connection with any function or activity of any other department or organization within the Department of Defense and charge upon vouchers the proper appropriation or appropriations of the other department or organization: *Provided*, That all said expenditures shall subsequently be adjusted in settlement of disbursing officers' accounts.

"REPORTS OF PROPERTY

"SEC. 410. The Secretary of Defense shall cause property records to be maintained in the three military departments, so far as practicable, on both a quantitative and monetary basis, under regulations which he shall prescribe. Such property records shall include the fixed property, installations, and major items of equipment as well as the supplies, materials, and equipment held in store by the armed services. The Secretary shall report annually thereon to the President and to the Congress.

"REPEALING AND SAVING PROVISIONS

"SEC. 411. All laws, orders, and regulations inconsistent with the provisions of this title are repealed insofar as they are inconsistent with the powers, duties, and responsibilities enacted hereby: *Provided*, That the powers, duties, and responsibilities of the Secretary of Defense under this title shall be administered in conformance with the policy and requirements for administration of budgetary and fiscal matters in the Government generally, including accounting and financial reporting, and that nothing in this title shall be construed as eliminating or modifying the

powers, duties, and responsibilities of any other department, agency, or officer of the Government in connection with such matters, but no such department, agency, or officer shall exercise any such powers, duties, or responsibilities in a manner that will render ineffective the provisions of this title."

"MISCELLANEOUS AND TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS AND SAVING PROVISIONS"

"SEC. 12. (a) The National Security Act of 1947 is amended by striking out the term 'National Military Establishment', wherever it appears in such Act, and inserting in lieu thereof 'Department of Defense'.

(b) Section 207 (a) of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended to read as follows: "Sec. 207. (a) Within the Department of Defense there is hereby established a military department to be known as the Department of the Air Force, and the Secretary of the Air Force who shall be the head thereof. The Secretary of the Air Force shall be appointed from civilian life by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

"(c) Section 207 (b) of the National Security Act of 1947 is repealed.

"(d) The first sentence of section 208 (a) of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended by striking out the word 'under' and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'within'.

"(e) Section 308 (b) of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) As used in this Act, the term 'Department of Defense' shall be deemed to include the military departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and all agencies created under title II of this Act."

"(f) The titles of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Under Secretaries and the Assistant Secretaries of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, the Chairman of the Munitions Board, and the Chairman of the Research and Development Board, shall not be changed by virtue of this Act, and the reappointment of the officials holding such titles on the effective date of this Act shall not be required. It is hereby declared to be the intention of Congress that section 203 (a) of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended by section 6 of this Act, shall not be deemed to have created a new office of Deputy Secretary of Defense but shall be deemed to have continued in existence, under a new title, the Office of Under Secretary of Defense which was established by the Act entitled 'An Act to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to provide for an Under Secretary of Defense', approved April 2, 1949 (Public Law 36, Eighty-first Congress). The title of the official holding the Office of Under Secretary of Defense on the effective date of this Act shall be changed to Deputy Secretary of Defense and the reappointment of such official shall not be required.

"(g) All laws, orders, regulations, and other actions relating to the National Military Establishment, the Departments of the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force, or to any officer or activity of such establishment or such departments, shall, except to the extent inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, have the same effect as if this Act had not been enacted; but, after the effective date of this Act, any such law, order, regulation, or other action which vested functions in or otherwise related to any officer, department, or establishment, shall be deemed to have vested such function in or relate to the officer or department, executive or military, succeeding the officer, department, or establishment in which such function was vested. For purposes of this subsection the Department of Defense shall be deemed the department succeeding the National Military Establishment, and the military departments of Army, Navy, and Air Force shall be deemed

the departments succeeding the Executive Departments of Army, Navy, and Air Force.

"(h) Section 208 (e) of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended by substituting the word 'three' for the word 'two' appearing therein.

"(i) Reorganization Plan Numbered 8 of 1949, which was transmitted to the Congress by the President on July 18, 1949, pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, shall not take effect, notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of such Reorganization Act of 1949."

And the Senate agree to the same.

MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
VIRGIL M. CHAPMAN,
STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAN GURNEY,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CARL VINSON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
CARL T. DURHAM,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
GEORGE J. BATES,

Managers on the Part of the House.

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

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not object to considering it, but I want to know what is in it, and when we are to have printed copies.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the conference report is basically the Senate bill. The amendments made by the House are minor. The Senator will recall that there were four titles in the bill as it passed the Senate. The Senator will also recall that when the House acted on the bill it struck out three-fourths of the provisions, and acted only on one-fourth of it, with respect to which it took the Senate version. Then we struck out the language of the House bill when it came to the Senate and substituted the Senate bill. The Senate bill became the subject of the conference. The amendments are minor and the conference report is unanimously agreed to by conferees on the part of both the House and Senate.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. As the Senator knows, I am a member of the Armed Services Committee, but was not one of the conferees. I am particularly interested to know whether or not any of the Senate provisions in the title of the bill which had to do with administration, and which contained most of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, were subjected to major change, or any change. Was any change made in that particular part of the bill?

Mr. TYDINGS. There was not. I will say to the Senator that there was some change in wording here and there, but in my opinion the new wording is more comprehensive than the wording in the original bill. We eliminated the specification, and put in a generalization so large that it included the specification and more. So we have the Hoover report pretty much in toto.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask that the conference report lie on the desk until Senators have an opportunity to examine it. I do not want to try the patience of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who has already yielded an hour and a half of his time without complaint, so I ask that the conference report lie on the desk.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, does this mean that we are precluded from asking questions about it?

Mr. TYDINGS. No. It will not be laid before the Senate for final action until the Senator has had an opportunity to become familiar with it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hill	Morse
Anderson	Hoey	Mundt
Baldwin	Holland	Murray
Brewster	Hunt	Myers
Bricker	Ives	Neely
Bridges	Jenner	O'Connor
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Cahn	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Chapman	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kem	Schoeppel
Connally	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kilgore	Sparkman
Donnell	Knowland	Stennis
Douglas	Langer	Taft
Downey	Lodge	Taylor
Dulles	Long	Thomas, Okla.
Ecton	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McCarran	Thye
Ferguson	McCarthy	Tobey
Flanders	McClellan	Tydings
Fulbright	McGrath	Vandenberg
George	McKellar	Watkins
Gillette	McMahon	Wherry
Graham	Magnuson	Wiley
Green	Malone	Williams
Gurney	Martin	Withers
Hayden	Maybank	Young
Hendrickson	Miller	
Hickenlooper	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4177) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 18, in line 2, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, in line 2, it is proposed to strike out "\$3,450,000" and insert "\$3,639,000."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, with respect to this amendment, I think I should point out that the House of Representatives cut the appropriation \$289,000 below the amount of the budget estimate, in the belief that it would be possible to effect economies by the reduction of personnel in the administrative functions of the Federal Trade Commission. The representations which were made to our committee—and I think they were amply supported by the evidence, and as disclosed by the questioning—were to the effect that this reduction in personnel

would seriously impede the work of the Commission; it would have the effect of reducing the number of persons employed by approximately 86 less than the number presently employed. The House stated in its report that it was intended by the reduction not in any way to affect the antimonopoly work of the Commission. In other words, the House recognized, as I think the Senate does, the importance of the antimonopoly work of the Commission.

However, an examination of the facts showed that a reduction of the personnel below the number presently employed by the Commission would inevitably interfere with the antimonopoly work because it would require that approximately 32 persons be dropped from the Division of Legal Records. That Division is like the office of the clerk of a court. Of course, if the cases are not properly recorded and filed, and if there is not a sufficiently efficient and well-manned office of the clerk of a court, naturally the work of the court cannot properly be kept up. The committee was convinced that that would be the effect in the Federal Trade Commission.

Likewise the reduction would mean the loss of more than 60 or 65 persons employed in the stenographic pool.

The Federal Trade Commission adopted, some time ago, as a measure of economy, the practice of having officials whose duty it is to prepare documents, write letters, prepare memoranda of various kinds and pleadings in various cases, to draw upon the stenographic pool rather than to have each office equipped with a separate and distinct stenographer. So, obviously, the result of compelling a reduction in the stenographic pool would be to impair the effectiveness of the Commission. So the committee felt there should be a restoration. We did restore, not the full amount requested by the Commission, which was \$289,000; we gave them only \$189,000, which is still \$100,000 below the budget estimate.

Mr. President, during the hearings I addressed several questions to the representatives of the Federal Trade Commission with respect to the status of the antimonopoly work. If it were possible, I would have supported an increased appropriation for the antimonopoly work, because I think there are many important investigations the Commission should carry on.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to ask the Senator, the chairman of the subcommittee, whether, even with the amount appropriated by the Senate committee, that would only give the Federal Trade Commission 655 positions, whereas the amount appropriated for 1949, by the last Congress, gave them 681 positions?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am inclined to believe, from the figures we have had, that the present authorization is for 676. The House bill reduced that to 590, and

we increased it to 660, which is still 16 positions below the present staffing of the Commission. For myself, I think that is too narrow a margin, but the committee felt that it should approve only \$189,000 instead of \$289,000.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to ask the Senator a further question. The Federal Trade Commission requested the Bureau of the Budget to authorize or to approve \$5,753,000, so what has been recommended by the Senate committee is almost \$2,000,000 less than the amount requested by the Federal Trade Commission of the Bureau of the Budget, is it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The budget estimate was \$3,739,000. But the Senator is speaking of the amount the Commission requested the Bureau of the Budget to allow, is he not?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My recollection is they asked for about \$700,000—

Mr. KEFAUVER. The figure is \$5,073,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I asked Mr. Edwards, Director of the Bureau of Industrial Economics of the Federal Trade Commission, what was the specific request, in dollars and cents, and in the number of positions, which was made by the Federal Trade Commission to the Bureau of the Budget, for increased antimonopoly case work. The amount was \$792,000. The Bureau of the Budget did not allow that. That was for three programs it was desired to carry on—investigations into collusive restriction of production, the collusive use of geographic price formulas, and the restriction of production by fixing quantity limits. But the Bureau of the Budget felt, in view of the other demands upon the Treasury of the United States, that expansion of the antimonopoly work should not be allowed, and did not allow it, but allowed practically the sum the Commission had this year.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In reading over the testimony in the hearings, I gained the distinct impression that the scope of the work of the Federal Trade Commission, or at least the things which the Federal Trade Commission should do in order to help to prevent monopoly and to preserve a free-enterprise system, was rapidly increasing, and that, even with the full amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, the work of the Federal Trade Commission would be considerably handicapped, particularly in its antimonopoly program. I ask the distinguished Senator whether he also did not gain that impression from a review of the work being done by the Federal Trade Commission?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say to the Senator, so far as I am personally concerned, I should like to see the work of the Federal Trade Commission in its antimonopoly studies and actions supported to a greater extent than it is supported in the appropriation bill. But we are confronted by a condition of realities, and in view of the large expenditures needed for national defense, for international obligations, and so forth, I can understand the position of the committee in holding down this appro-

priation. I may say to the Senator I sought the full budget amount in the subcommittee, but the subcommittee decided to recommend only \$189,000 instead of \$289,000.

Mr. KEFAUVER. As the Federal Trade Commission is one of the two departments, the Department of Justice being the other, charged with the enforcement of the antitrust laws and with the prevention of monopolies and the keeping healthy of our competitive system and giving small businesses an opportunity, it seems to me that the amount proposed to be appropriated, while large, still, in comparison with other appropriations, is a very small investment for the great work of the Federal Trade Commission is doing.

Furthermore, the records seem to show that the number of employees the Federal Trade Commission has had, since about 1942, when they had 741 employees, has been reduced to about 100 less than the Federal Trade Commission had in 1942, and at the same time the work and the scope of the activities and duties of the Federal Trade Commission have been increasing all the time. Does the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There can be no doubt about that. With the progress of economic concentration in the United States, the work of the Federal Trade Commission naturally increases. The testimony before our committee showed, for example, that some of the studies which have been carried on there demonstrate that even toward the end of 1948 the profit status of small-business concerns was rapidly deteriorating, and many small businesses were in a loss group.

I call the Senator's attention to a colloquy between the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and Mr. Edwards.

Mr. Edwards had testified that the Commission obtains figures from large companies. "The Federal Trade Commission," he said, "is the only agency in the Government that gets the figures from the small companies. The small companies and large companies do not give the same results." I am reading from page 209 of the Senate hearings. Mr. Edwards continued:

I showed a chart this morning which indicated that in part; and I will show another chart, which is in some ways simpler and more representative, this afternoon.

These are the annual rates of profits by groups of corporations of different sizes, as shown by this reporting program. For the year 1947, the total profit is measured in the solid black line; and for 1948, the same over here. You will see that the total profits shown go slightly up between the 2 years. In the year 1947, the size group which had the largest rate of profit was the middle-sized group of corporations; and from them, profit rates went down as the corporations became smaller, and also as they became larger.

Senator WHERRY. When you say "middle group," about how large would that be?

Mr. EDWARDS. That is the group from \$1,000,000 to \$5,000,000.

Senator WHERRY. You say the greatest profit came from that group?

Mr. EDWARDS. The greatest rate of profit, I meant.

Senator FERGUSON. That is capitalization, I assume.

Mr. EDWARDS. This is profits on investment. Senator FERGUSON. On the capital?
Mr. EDWARDS. Yes, sir.

In other words, the testimony shows that corporations with capital investment of less than a million dollars are rapidly getting into a poorer condition; and one of the reasons the Federal Trade Commission should be equipped to handle this matter is to be found in the situation, as I see it, of the small-business corporations.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I fully agree with the Senator, but I should like to call his attention to the colloquy on page 184 between the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and Mr. Davis, the Acting Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission. Mr. Edwards had said, with reference to the amount of work of the Commission:

It is substantially higher. I would have to check the percentage.

Senator ROBERTSON. I think it is correct. In physical volume it is about 75 percent.

Is it not true that your work is greater now than it was in 1941?

Mr. DAVIS. I think it is.

Senator ROBERTSON. Is it not true that during the war there was an inevitable trend to concentration of business in the hands of the big corporations at the expense of the smaller corporations?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; that is true.

Senator ROBERTSON. Is it true that we are now in a period of falling economy in which competition is going to be greatly increased?

Mr. DAVIS. I think the tendency will be that way.

Senator ROBERTSON. Is it not true that small business and the consumer generally face a greater threat from a monopolistic trend than they have at any time in recent years?

Mr. DAVIS. Well, I think now that that is true.

Then he goes on with an explanation. It seems to me, in reading the record, from the viewpoint of preserving competition and giving small business a chance, that instead of taking the amount the Bureau of the Budget submitted, the committee and the Senate should consider and vote for an even higher amount.

I have an amendment pending to give the Federal Trade Commission an increased appropriation, because I think it is a good investment, from the viewpoint of competition, in protecting small businesses, and in dollars returned to the Government. I think that in tax revenues to the Government it will yield great dividends.

I appreciate very much the attitude of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming in his explanation of the work of the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is getting me in sort of a trap. I am here representing the committee which has cut the appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission \$100,000 below the budget estimate. The committee amendment is on page 18, line 2. I assume the Senator suggests that he has an amendment to that amendment?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; I have such an amendment.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I want to say to the Senator from Tennessee that I voted for the additional amount requested, but we were defeated in the subcommittee. I am placed in the same situation as the Senator from Wyoming occupies.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wonder if the Senator is aware of the fact that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service heard the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, who testified that there were literally hundreds of cases held up during the war and that, as a matter of fact, the Commission needed much more help than it actually had. Is the Senator aware of the fact that various cases could not be tried during the war, and that the work has piled up until some of the cases are 8 or 9 years old?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think that is a fact.

Mr. LANGER. I want to associate myself with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee in saying that certainly the appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission should be increased.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I also wish to associate myself with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. It seems to me the policy of determining the expansion or contraction of the Federal Trade Commission should be in the Senate, and that we should determine whether it is more important to the country to provide sufficient funds for the Federal Trade Commission to carry on the program of undertaking to curb monopoly than it is to effect small savings by cutting down appropriations for the Commission.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is repeating the argument made in the subcommittee.

Mr. MURRAY. Is there an amendment being offered at this time?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I shall offer an amendment when I have an opportunity.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it is very rarely that I rise to ask for an increase in an appropriation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to see the Senator from Illinois in that position today. I am sure the great logic of the Senator will support his position.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I assure the Senator that this is an infrequent occurrence, and I do not expect to repeat it very often in future, but I think in this particular instance, when the Federal Trade Commission has a larger volume of work than it had before the war, with considerably fewer employees, the least we can do is to increase the total to the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

I am very glad the Senator from Tennessee has raised this question, and I should like to associate myself with him in the matter.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, to the committee I offer the amendment, which is on the clerk's desk, and I ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered

by the Senator from Tennessee to the committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, line 2, it is proposed to strike out "\$3,639,000" and insert "\$3,739,000."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, my amendment would bring the appropriation up to the budget estimate, which is almost \$2,000,000 less than the Federal Trade Commission requested of the Bureau of the Budget, and will give the Commission—

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I was simply going to make the statement, Mr. President, that although I have been voting consistently in favor of lower figures in appropriations for independent offices, I believe that here is one instance in which the slight increase provided by the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee is entirely justified. I think the Federal Trade Commission is one Government agency which is a real safeguard to the general public, which of course is the consuming public. I believe adequate funds should be provided for that particular agency. As we go a little further along in the bill I shall be able to point out how the slight amount requested, and as increased by the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee, can save approximately 20 times as much through another provision of the same bill.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Do I correctly understand that the Senator is proposing an increase in the appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission?

Mr. KEFAUVER. In the amount of \$100,000, so as to bring it up to the budget estimate.

Mr. MORSE. Has the Senator, by any chance, placed in the RECORD figures in regard to the personnel of the Federal Trade Commission during the past several years?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have the figures, and I had intended to ask unanimous consent that they be placed in the RECORD following my remarks, together with a short statement which I have prepared.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the figures be placed in the RECORD following my remarks, together with a brief statement, which is self-explanatory.

There being no objection, the figures and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Any shortcoming of the Federal Trade Commission which may be pointed out in this report should not be allowed to obscure the highly salient fact that the appropriations to the Federal Trade Commission, even if the agency were devoting all its time to handling the most significant antitrust cases, would be insufficient to allow it to fulfill its function in helping to reverse the trend of concentration.

The unfavorable odds against which the staff of the Federal Trade Commission must work is nowhere more glaringly illustrated

than by the case against the Cement Institute. In this case only three Commission attorneys participated in the trial, yet they were opposed by lawyers from 41 law firms, many of them among the largest and most successful in the country. Press releases, according to the Federal Trade Commission, have appeared to the effect that the defendants in this case spent in excess of \$5,000,000—\$5,600,000 against three Commission attorneys. Five million dollars represents twice as much money as the entire Federal Trade Commission receives in 1 year. * * *

The Federal Trade Commission lost this case against the Cement Institute by a 2-to-1 decision in the circuit court of appeals. Appropriations are so important to an effective antitrust program that it is worth reproducing below the budget history of the Federal Trade Commission for the last 10 years:

Statement of the estimates of appropriations and the appropriations of the Federal Trade Commission for the fiscal years 1938 to 1947 inclusive

Fiscal year—	Estimate submitted to the Bureau of the Budget	Amount approved by the Bureau of the Budget	Appropriated by Congress
1938	\$2,601,690	\$1,981,000	\$1,981,000
1939	2,462,681	2,180,700	2,180,700
1940	2,792,100	2,324,000	2,324,000
1941	2,802,431	2,300,000	2,300,000
1942	2,867,870	2,300,000	2,300,000
1943	3,147,681	2,302,474	2,050,250
1944	2,715,444	2,043,000	1,943,000
1945	2,781,145	2,095,900	2,054,070
1946	3,715,720	2,224,000	2,173,833
1947	3,572,223	2,619,400	2,299,120
Supplemental estimates based on plan of reorganization	2,551,209	1,857,000	330,000
Total (1947)	5,123,432	3,476,400	2,569,120

¹ FTC comment: "The Budget decided that under the reorganization plan full-time staffing, as represented by the Commission's estimates, was not practicable during 1947 because of flow of work and recruiting problems, and therefore approved an equivalent amount of \$850,000 (plus \$7,000 for printing) for part-time staffing for 1947."

Two facts stand out: (1) With the exception of the 1947 appropriation, Congress in each of the 10 years gave the Federal Trade Commission practically the amount approved by the Budget Bureau. Therefore, as far as the Federal Trade Commission's budget for the last 10 years is concerned, the Budget Bureau must be held, in the first instance, responsible for the agency's limited appropriation. (2) The Budget Bureau made very substantial reductions in the amounts originally requested by the Federal Trade Commission.

The Budget Bureau always musters good reasons for cutting an agency's appropriation. The consistent cuts by the Budget Bureau indicate more clearly than any amount of words either (a) lack of awareness of the importance of antitrust activity to the maintenance of the competitive enterprise economy, or (b) a belief that the Federal Trade Commission's activities were not sufficiently significant to the antitrust program to warrant additional funds. If the latter was the reason, it is no answer to slash the agency's budget. Instead, the Budget Bureau should undertake as the Executive's general manager, to bring about the administrative improvements necessary to enable the Commission to properly carry out its functions. The Budget Bureau in their report to the committee indicated that they are now working with FTC with a view to bringing about administrative improvements. (United States Versus Economic Concentration and Monopoly, committee print, Com-

mittee on Small Business, House of Representatives, 79th Cong., pp. 29-30.)

The Federal Trade Commission appropriations

	Amount	Number of positions
1948 appropriation	\$2,955,000	572
1949 appropriation plus pay-raise supplemental	3,621,000	684
1950:		
A. FTC request to Budget Bureau	5,753,000	1,087
B. Budget Bureau authorized request to Congress	3,739,000	681
C. Appropriation passed by House	3,450,000	600
D. Appropriation recommended by Senate committee	3,630,000	655
All-time high in employment, March 1942		741

EXCERPT FROM ADDRESS BY HON. ESTES KEFAUVER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, "NEEDED CHANGES IN LEGISLATION," AT AMERICAN ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION CONVENTION, DECEMBER 30, 1947, IN CHICAGO

It has become more or less of an accepted tradition in speaking about the requirements for an effective antitrust program to begin one's remarks with an invocation for appropriations—a tradition which has become well established and one which I see no reason to change. Actually, the facts concerning appropriations for the antitrust agencies are even worse than most of you have probably been led to believe. As chairman of the Monopoly Subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee during the last session of Congress, I had an opportunity to make a fairly thorough investigation of this whole subject of appropriations, the results of which are printed in the staff report of this subcommittee (which, unfortunately, is now out of print).¹

Rather than take up your time with a detailed exposition of the findings of that report, I would like to call your attention to just a few simple figures—the requests made by the antitrust agencies to the Bureau of the Budget, the amounts approved by the Bureau of the Budget for submission to Congress, and the amounts actually appropriated by Congress. During the 10-year period, 1938-47, the requests by the Federal Trade Commission to the Bureau of the Budget averaged \$3,101,019 a year; the amount approved by the Bureau of the Budget for presentation to Congress averaged \$2,328,727; and the amount appropriated by Congress averaged \$2,193,597. During the period, 1939-47, the requests by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice to the Bureau of the Budget averaged \$1,986,077; the amount approved for submission to Congress by the Budget Bureau averaged \$1,517,472; and the amount actually appropriated by Congress averaged \$1,634,517—actually more than the amount approved by the Budget Bureau. To quote the report:

"Two facts stand out: (1) With the exception of the 1947 appropriation, Congress in each of the 10 years gave the Federal Trade Commission practically the amount approved by the Budget Bureau. Therefore, as far as the Federal Trade Commission's budget for the last 10 years is concerned, the Budget Bureau must be held, in the first instance, responsible for that agency's limited appropriation. (2) The Budget Bureau made very substantial reductions in the amounts origi-

¹ Seventy-ninth Congress, Staff Report to the Monopoly Subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee, United States versus Economic Concentration and Monopoly, 1946.

nally requested by the Federal Trade Commission."

The report went on to state that: "The Budget Bureau always musters good reasons for cutting an agency's appropriation. The consistent cuts by the Budget Bureau indicate more clearly than any amount of words either (a) lack of awareness of the importance of antitrust activity to the maintenance of the competitive enterprise economy, or (b) a belief that the Federal Trade Commission's activities were not sufficiently significant to the antitrust program to warrant additional funds. If the latter was the reason, it is no answer to slash the agency's budget. Instead, the Budget Bureau should undertake, as the Executive's general manager, to bring about the administrative improvements necessary to enable the Commission to properly carry out its functions." (p. 30).

In regard to the Antitrust Division, the report stated:

"Here again, as in the case of the Federal Trade Commission, one finds that when sharp cuts are made they are made by the Budget Bureau. As a matter of fact, in 4 of the 9 years reported on, Congress appropriated more money to the Antitrust Division than has been approved by the Budget Bureau." (p. 51)

It may surprise you to know (a) that the total amount received by the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division, combined, is less than the appropriation for the Securities and Exchange Commission whose functions of course are much more limited and restricted than those of the antitrust agencies; (b) that the annual appropriations for the two antitrust agencies, combined, would have been sufficient to carry on the war effort for a period of about 30 minutes; and (c) that the Federal Trade Commission has now the overwhelming total of eight economists, as does the Antitrust Division, to survey the entire economy, prepare economic reports for Congress, discover the areas of possible monopolistic practices, determine the relative significance and economic importance of the multitude of possible infractions of the law, develop economic data required on individual antitrust actions, and survey the results, from an economic point of view, of the effectiveness of the agencies' actions, for as the monopoly subcommittee report pointed out: "There is oftentimes a great difference between a legal victory and an economic victory." (p. 26)

The fundamental importance of appropriations to any antitrust program cannot be overstressed. Year in and year out the Congress has added to the number of existing antitrust laws, particularly those administered by the Federal Trade Commission. Yet funds have not been provided to carry on these increased responsibilities. As a result, the Federal Trade Commission has been forced to spread its regular appropriations over a wider and wider number of functions, thereby making it impossible for the Commission to do an effective job on any one of the laws under its administration. There is, I believe, no purpose in continuing this practice of increasing the number of statutes to be enforced, if the means of enforcing them are not also provided.

The former economic adviser to the Federal Trade Commission has stated: "An annual appropriation of \$150,000,000 for the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and \$100,000,000 for the Federal Trade Commission will not be too large if monopoly is to be driven out of business."²

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, do I correctly understand from the Senator from

² Willis J. Ballinger, By Vote of the People, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1946, p. 308.

Tennessee that he is satisfied that the Federal Trade Commission will carry out the President's program as submitted by the President to Representative CELLER, for example, in regard to greater monopoly control, and that the Commission will need more funds in order to employ additional personnel?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I am very happy to support the Senator's amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was under the heading "Federal Works Agency—Office of the Administrator," on page 18, line 18, after the word "expenses", to strike out "\$300,000" and insert "\$325,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$15,500" and insert "\$20,000"; and in line 4, after the word "year", to insert "including not to exceed \$1,200 for administrative expenses in connection with the city of East Peoria sewage project."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 24, to insert:

Conservation of securities: For expenses necessary for the conservation of the Federal Government's interest in bonds and other obligations in the custody of the Federal Works Administrator, issued for the construction of Public Works Administration projects, including personal services in the District of Columbia and travel expenses; \$30,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for Public Works Administration liquidation in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1949.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Buildings Administration," on page 21, line 10, after the word "Columbia," to strike out the comma and "including the salary of the Commissioner of Public Buildings at \$12,000 per annum as long as the position is held by the present incumbent."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 16, after the word "conductors", to strike out "\$31,140,000" and insert "\$32,750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 9, after the word "premises", to strike out "\$23,968,800" and insert "\$24,963,800."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

On page 7 of the bill occurs an amendment which was adopted last evening and which included the expenses of the American Battle Monuments Commis-

sion. Knowing that it is always rather hard to have deficiency bills brought to the attention of the committee and of the Senate, and in many instances there has been neglect on the part of some departments to request deficiency appropriations, I call the attention of the Senator from Wyoming at this time to the fact that it may be necessary for the American Battle Monuments Commission, through no fault of their own, to ask for a deficiency appropriation later.

In order that the Senator may know the reasons why that will be done, I wish to say that the American Battle Monuments Commission, I am advised by the Secretary of the Commission, has recently had three additional cemeteries turned over to it in foreign lands, and within the next 8 to 12 months 5 additional cemeteries will be turned over to it, making a total of 8 which will be placed in its care.

During the past few years, under the law, the Army, through the Quartermaster General, has operated these cemeteries, I wish to make the record clear that it is through no fault of the Battle Monuments Commission, or the Secretary, or any of those connected with the Commission, that the proper appropriations were not requested, but under the conditions which exist it will be necessary for the Commission to come to Congress later for a deficiency, when it can figure out the amount of money which will be needed to continue the operation of these cemeteries, principally in foreign lands, which have previously been operated by the Army.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from South Carolina has alluded to this subject. Since the pending bill was reported to the Senate I have received word indirectly from General Marshall that several cemeteries are about to be turned over to the American Battle Monuments Commission by the Army authorities. When that is done, it will become the obligation of the Commission to provide for their care and upkeep. But there is nothing that can be done about it in this bill, because there is no budget estimate as yet. In due course I assume the request will be made of the Bureau of the Budget for an appropriation, and when the budget estimate is sent to the Congress, the appropriate committees both of the House and the Senate will pay attention to it.

However, I think it is worth saying that this illustrates that many of the obligations which the Federal Government must now meet are altogether new obligations which never were undertaken in the past. The pending bill itself carries \$5,920,800 for the American Battle Monuments Commission, a new expenditure, but one which the Congress of the United States and the people of the United States felt was wholly desirable because the people of America do not want to have the cemeteries in which their sons are buried go unattended.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, it was by the consent of the mothers and the fathers of the men who lost their lives that the bodies were allowed to remain in these cemeteries overseas, with the distinct understanding that the Congress would erect proper markers and care

properly for the graves. The point I wish to emphasize—and the Senator has ably assisted me—is that it will be necessary to submit to the Appropriations Committees a request for a deficiency appropriation insofar as the Battle Monuments Commission are concerned, so that the additional cemeteries may be properly maintained.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is not asking for an amendment now?

Mr. MAYBANK. No; because the budget has not been prepared, but I merely wanted to make the record clear that there would be a deficiency.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the action on the amendment on page 23, line 16, be reconsidered, because I think it should be considered with the item on line 9, page 24. Does the chairman of the committee have any objection to that?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, I have no objection to that at all. These are the two appropriations which deal with the maintenance and upkeep of public buildings in the District of Columbia and in the field. The same considerations apply to both.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the amendment on page 23, line 16, was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I hope the Senator will not ask that the appropriation be reduced.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I am going to do that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to be reconsidered in order that the Senator from Michigan may present his case.

Mr. FERGUSON. It applies to both items.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'CONNOR in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and the vote by which the amendment was agreed to is reconsidered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, referring now to the item on page 23, line 16, \$32,750,000, I wish to speak at the same time on the item on page 24, line 9, because one relates to the employees in connection with buildings inside the District of Columbia, and the second item to employees in connection with buildings outside the District of Columbia.

It appears that it is now the desire of the Senate Committee on Appropriations to increase the appropriation for taking care of public buildings in the District of Columbia from the amount the House allowed, \$31,140,000, to \$32,750,000. This of course would be applied to personnel. In other words, it is now proposed that there be an increase of 430 in the personnel, the guards and various employees engaged in repair and other work in buildings in District of Columbia. It appears that the personnel would be increased from 9,670 to 10,100. It is true that the budget estimated that they needed 10,670, which was the number employed in 1949.

Mr. President, I come back to what I had to say about this matter yesterday.

We find that the Federal Government is increasing the number on the pay roll by some 350 people a day, and the whole question before the Senate is, How can we afford to increase the personnel year by year, instead of cutting it down, as private establishments are required to do because of their incomes?

There is no question involved in this case like that in the last case. I think the increase of 70 employees in the Federal Trade Commission shows the same trend. If the increase in the Federal Trade Commission had been used solely to handle monopolies, that would have been one thing, but when we consider the history of what has happened, so far as the executive branch of the Government is concerned, in the matter of looking after monopolies, I think there should be more action on the part of the Commission than has been evidenced. The item we have before us has nothing to do with controlling monopolies, which are rampant throughout the United States, or with personnel to investigate such monopolies. The employees involved are policemen, guards, and persons who keep the buildings in repair. If there ever was a time when we could do with less policemen, with less guards in our public buildings, it is now.

What do the departments do whenever Congress tries to cut the number of their employees. It was stated in this connection with this item that the guards and other employees were needed to prevent fires. It was said, "We do not have fire insurance. Therefore, we have to spend this amount of money on guards to prevent fires. If the Members of the United States Senate take one man off our pay roll the buildings will burn down." I simply cannot see that such a great danger exists. Ninety percent of our public buildings are absolutely fireproof. It is stated that there is probably one fire each day in each building. Someone may flip a cigarette into a wastebasket, and the wastebasket catches fire; but the employees are in the office; the individual who flips the cigarette into the wastebasket is in the office and can help put out the fire. Oh, no, it is necessary, so it is said, that two or three guards stand outside every door and that two or three guards stand inside every door so as to be ready to take action in case someone flips a cigarette into a wastebasket and it catches fire.

Mr. President, request is made for 430 more employees in buildings in the District of Columbia. The House gave the subject due consideration and felt that, because of the Government's deficit, we should not employ these 430 individuals and pay them by means of deficit spending. That is what it amounts to—deficit spending.

Let us consider the request of the Public Buildings Administration with respect to the remainder of the country, outside the District of Columbia, which is the next amendment. The House provided \$23,968,800 for the remainder of the United States, outside the District of Columbia. The Public Buildings Administration was not satisfied with that amount. It wants to make surveys. It asks for \$24,968,800, which would

mean an increase in the personnel of 350. That makes a total increase for the whole country of 780 employees. They want to add this personnel, not for the purpose of fighting monopoly, not to take care of the backlogs such as existed in connection with the Federal Trade Commission, but they want this personnel to make surveys.

Mr. President, the time has come when it seems all that is necessary in order to get money out of the Treasury of the United States, through action of the Senate, and even of the House, is to say that it is needed for one of two purposes. One purpose is the making of a survey, and the other the conducting of research. I hope that the Senate Appropriations Committee and the House committee will at some time have the various departments spell out in black and white for them what the surveys which have been conducted in such great number have ever meant to the people of the United States.

In 1946 I made a little survey of my own. I asked the various departments to give me a statement of what the research bodies had really done with the \$880,000,000 appropriated for such purposes by the Congress of the United States. I did not receive one satisfactory answer. The departments could not point to one thing the survey or research bodies had done of value for the people of the United States during the previous year.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. We hear a great deal about the Eightieth Congress. In the Seventy-ninth Congress the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and I asked that a fund of \$200,000 be appropriated so as to make an investigation to find what could be done by way of cutting personnel. We said we believed the personnel in the Government could be cut by several hundred thousand if a proper investigation were made. The Congress did not appropriate that amount of money. Do I correctly understand that there are more than 9,000 employees now working for the Public Buildings Administration?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. I have previously given the figures.

Mr. LANGER. How many employees are there inside the District of Columbia?

Mr. FERGUSON. Under the House figures the number would be 9,670. Under the Senate committee amendment the number would be 10,100. Outside the District of Columbia it is sought to increase the number of employees from 8,046, which is the number in 1949, to 9,276. The Public Buildings Administration wants to increase the number by 1,230.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will feel that this is a place where a cut can properly be made. The cut would be a small one. We are here dealing with only a few million dollars. I realize that anyone who takes the floor of the Senate and talks about saving thousands of dollars or millions of dollars is apt to be criticized, not only by the Members of the Senate, but by persons outside the Senate, because he is dealing in what some consider to be small figures. But I say

that each one of these items must have the scrutiny of the United States Senate if we are going to get back on the right road. What is the right road? The right road is to avoid deficit spending. If we cannot cut down on persons employed to make surveys, on police officers and guards in the public buildings, on what can we cut down? We hear it said that we cannot cut down on appropriations for investigation and checking of monopolies. I believe we must have better protection against monopolistic practices in the United States; in my judgment, there are items, such as the one we are considering, in connection with which cuts can be made.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I cannot allow the remarks of the Senator from Michigan to carry the implication that the Senate Committee on Appropriations has been unmindful of the need for economy. I certainly cannot allow his words to carry the implication that the committee on the independent offices appropriation bill was unmindful of the need for economy.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; certainly.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think that is absolutely true. But they have been non-active in the matter of economy. They have not been unmindful, but they have been non-active.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I do not want the Senate to reach the same conclusion that the Senator from Michigan has now expressed, because I want to say for myself and for every member of the committee that the committee has been mindful of the necessity for economy and has been active in consideration of these various items.

So far as the chairman of the subcommittee himself is concerned, he attended every meeting of the committee from the 11th of May until the bill came out of the full committee. The appropriations which we are presenting to the Senate are below the budget figures. So if anyone says that the committee has been either unmindful or inactive, the record does not substantiate that statement.

Let us now take the item which is before us.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency dealing with the coal problem may hold hearings this afternoon during the session of the Senate, beginning at 2:30 o'clock.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish the circumstances under which the Senator is laboring permitted members of the Senator's committee to be present and to consider these various appropriations; but I know that that is out of the question. It is absolutely essential that members of the committee be given permission to hold hearings during the session of the Senate, because so many items must be considered and so much work must be done.

I allude to that subject only to illustrate the fact that many a day during the hearings of this subcommittee the chairman of the subcommittee sat alone listening to the testimony. So I use the request of the Senator from Ohio as a vehicle to convey to my colleagues on the floor of the Senate my own belief that the matters contained in this appropriation bill have been studied, and that when I speak about the conditions in connection with this bill, I speak after having examined the testimony.

I have no objection to the unanimous consent request.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Wyoming. I also join with him in regret that we shall not be able to be present at all times during the discussion of this very important measure, on which he has labored so long and so hard. This morning only one Senator was present during the hearing. There is one witness who desires to return to his home, and we wish to take his testimony. I do not think it will require very long.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request is granted.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the full committee has approved the action of the subcommittee increasing this appropriation by \$1,610,000 above the amount allowed by the House; but the Public Buildings Administration asked for an increase of \$2,740,000. So the figure which we are presenting, and which the Senate approved just a moment ago, before the reconsideration, is below the budget figure by \$1,850,000. So I submit that the record shows that the committee has been active, and that the committee has been mindful of the need for economy.

Why did we increase this appropriation? Was it because of a desire to throw the money of the taxpayers out the window? Not at all. It was because of our conviction that it was essential that the Public Buildings Administration should have this money if it is to do the job which the Congress has committed to it. The evidence before our committee shows that there are rents to be considered. There are facilities to be considered. There is fuel to be provided. There is upkeep and maintenance. Of course, there is guarding and cleaning, and all that sort of thing, but that is not the important matter.

The Senator from Michigan talks about surveys. It becomes necessary for the Public Buildings Administration to make surveys when the Congress passes a new bill creating a new agency, and authorizes the new agency to employ people. For example, the last Congress created the Displaced Persons Commission, requiring new personnel and some place to go. I could go through the list of bills passed by Congress last year, the year before, and this year, placing responsibilities upon this agency to secure space in the District of Columbia and outside the District of Columbia. I could point out the fact that this agency has been handed the responsibility for taking care of the surplus buildings which were constructed or rented during

the war, and which must be taken care of.

There is such a thing as false economy; and I think that is precisely what the trouble is with respect to the criticism of certain items in this bill. As I pointed out when I presented the bill to the Senate yesterday, 86 percent of the appropriations contained in the bill are war-connected appropriations. More than \$5,000,000,000 of the appropriations contained in this bill are for the Veterans' Administration. That is where the great expenditures are coming. I submit that it is impossible to balance the budget by cutting out the expenditures of essential civilian agencies of the Government, of which this is one.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I invite attention to the testimony of Mr. Reynolds, that 6.13 percent of the total estimates for the Public Buildings Administration is accounted for by the passage of Public Law 900 by the last Congress.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. Of course, the effects of the salary increase bill are scattered throughout this legislation.

The following is a description of the work of the agency for which appropriations are provided on page 23, line 16:

This estimate is for a service operation in providing for the space necessary to house the functions of the executive branch, and such space requirements are dependent on the action of the Congress in decreasing or increasing the size of the Federal establishment. We have again reviewed the needs for space. A request of \$350,000 for 200,000 net square feet of additional leased space was made to meet increasing space requirements of the National Military Establishment and the needs of the Veterans' Administration in setting up an insurance-policy-dividend-payment program. We are hopeful now of partially meeting these demands through the further consolidation of the National Military Establishment in the Pentagon and other buildings presently occupied by that activity and the requirements of the Veterans' Administration through reductions made in other activities of that Administration.

And so it goes. The testimony before the committee was convincing that an increase ought to be allowed. I should add that the House committee, even when it made this reduction, spoke in the highest terms of the administrative efficiency and qualifications of General Fleming, Federal Works Administrator, and Mr. Reynolds, who is the head of this particular agency, as well as Mr. MacDonald, the head of the Public Roads Administration, the appropriation for which we shall reach in a moment. The House committee pointed out that these men are career men, and that they have done fine work. I have no hesitation in saying to the Senate that I do not believe that General Fleming or Mr. Reynolds would have put his signature to a request for a budget estimate or would have appeared before our committee defending such an increase if he had not honestly and patriotically been convinced that it was necessary. I have no doubt that these gentlemen are just as desirous of economy in Federal expenditure as is

any member of the committee or of the Senate.

Mr. President, I hope that these appropriations may be approved as recommended by the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the able Senator from Wyoming has indicated that this amendment would reduce below the budget figure the number of personnel in public buildings in and out of Washington.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I did not say that. The fact is that in one segment there will be a reduction in personnel. Under this appropriation personnel in the Public Buildings Administration in the District of Columbia will be reduced by 570 below the number of persons now employed. That would be accomplished by the appropriation recommended by the committee. But with respect to the appropriation for activities outside the District of Columbia, the number of places authorized in the appropriation bill is larger than the number presently employed, but that is because the obligations are larger.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan was talking about the budget figures. I am satisfied that the Record will show that when the able Senator from Wyoming rose after the Senator from Michigan had spoken, he indicated that the budget figures were higher than the figures which the Senate is now considering, and higher than the figures which the House considered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In dollar figures, yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Let us look at the budget figure. The budget figure was made last fall. The budget figure was made by the executive branch of the Government when we were talking about inflation, when we were talking about raising taxes to get more money, plenty of money, with no deficit spending in mind.

But now we are in July of 1949, and we know the income of the citizens of the United States is shrinking daily. We know we are going daily into deficit spending. Yet Senators stand on the floor of the Senate and say the budget figures are what we should consider.

I am not accusing Mr. Reynolds or General Fleming of any fraud in this case. But do Senators realize that those two gentlemen were dealing in terms of more than 19,000 employees—more than the number of soldiers in a division of the Army—who are said to be necessary in order to take care of the public buildings? Do Senators think General Fleming or Mr. Reynolds knows what the employees in the various buildings are doing? I admit that those two gentlemen have to walk past almost an army of employees when they enter any of those buildings, just as they must when they come here to the Capitol or the House or Senate Office Buildings and see the number of guards and employees who are connected with the several public buildings of which we have charge. No, Mr. President, I say that when they are dealing with 19,000 employees, they take the words of those who are below them.

What do we find? Sitting beside me here in the Chamber is the Senator who

last year was the chairman of the Senate Civil Service Committee. Today he is the ranking minority member of that committee, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. He knows that in the civil-service system the pay of the higher ranking employees is determined by the number of employees under them. Of course, if there are 19,000 persons taking care of the public buildings, that means there are just that many more good jobs, for, as I have said, the salaries of the supervisory employees are based on the number of employees under them, and increase when the number of employees under them increases. I say these are two items on which we can make reductions without interfering with the service to the people of the United States generally or to the veterans in particular. Such reductions will not result in preventing a nurse from taking care of a soldier who is ill and confined to a hospital bed; but these reductions will take political jobs away from some persons who otherwise would have them or get them by virtue of patronage, and the purest kind of patronage.

Mr. President, I wish to restate the figures, because I think all Senators should know what is involved in this matter. The House provided \$31,140,000 for the personnel to operate the public buildings in the District of Columbia. The Senate committee voted to increase that amount to \$32,750,000. That would result in increasing the personnel by 430 persons. The House figures would provide for a personnel of 9,670, and the Senate committee figures would provide for a personnel of 10,100.

Outside the District of Columbia, the House figures would allow an appropriation of \$23,968,800. The Senate committee voted to increase that figure to \$24,968,800. That would increase the personnel outside the District of Columbia by 350 and would increase the personnel from 8,376 to 8,726, or a total increase of 780 employees, as compared to the number under the 1949 appropriation bill.

So, Mr. President, on each of these two amendments I ask the Senate to vote not to allow the Senate committee's figures, but to allow the figures voted by the House of Representatives. In other words, I ask the Senate to reject the Senate committee's amendments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan made an allusion which I think requires a simple denial. I know of no patronage involved in appointments of any employees to the Public Buildings Administration. These positions are under the Civil Service. There was not a line of testimony before our committee to the effect that these are patronage employees. They are not patronage employees.

We know what patronage employees are here in the Senate, where we appoint our staffs without regard to the Civil Service. But that is not the question in this case. If anyone should get the idea that the employees of these administrations are political, patronage employees who are appointed to political, patronage jobs, I wish to say clearly that there is not a line in the record to support such a charge.

With respect to the allegation, which is implicit in what the Senator from Michigan has said, that the Appropriations Committee has been neglectful, that it has not been mindful of the necessity for economy in appropriations, I wish to cite three facts which are here involved.

On page 21 of the bill, in line 15, there is an appropriation item carried by the House of Representatives for the general administrative expenses of the Public Buildings Administration. The officials came before our committee and requested that that item be increased by \$250,000. They made a persuasive plea for that increase. However, the increase was not allowed. That, I think, justifies my statement that the committee has not been neglectful.

Again let me say that with respect to the item on page 23, the amount recommended for that item by the Senate committee is below the amount of the budget recommendation by \$1,850,000. This recommendation is made by your committee, not upon the basis of any representations which were made last December, but on the basis of testimony which was given in open public hearing before the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations here in the Capital of the United States since the 11th day of May. In other words, this is current judgment by the committee appointed by the Senate to bear the responsibility of making these recommendations.

With respect to the second item on page 24, in line 9, let me say that the Public Buildings Administration requested an increase of \$2,663,200 above the amount allowed by the House of Representatives. Your committee, having carefully considered the evidence, decided not to go that far, but to provide for an increase of \$1,000,000, instead of an increase of \$2,663,000.

Mr. President, I am trying to convince the Senate that the committee in charge of this bill has been careful with the taxpayers' money, and that its recommendations are made only out of the conviction that these appropriations are necessary to enable the Public Buildings Administration to do the job which has been entrusted to it by the Congress.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I feel that the Senate committee has not been unmindful of economy. The Senate committee sat and heard witnesses. But anyone who has served on the Appropriations Committee realizes that when the representatives of the various governmental agencies come to the Appropriations Committee, the situation is like that involved in a broken-vessel case in equity. All the witnesses are on one side.

No one attempts to call witnesses who would say whether this policeman or that policeman is needed at some particular door of a certain public building, or whether three or four policemen are needed there, or whether it would be perfectly satisfactory to lock the door at night and have only one guard around it. In other words, all the statements made in the hearings are self-serving statements, as has been indicated.

I do not suppose the Senate is naive enough to believe that because there is some kind of civil service, there is no patronage. All I have to do is point to the postmasters. They are under the civil-service system. But, of course, we have patronage in the post offices. I have known of a post-office case in which, as I recall, seven different examinations were given in order that patronage might be served.

So, Mr. President, I am not criticizing the committee. I am saying that many Senators feel we ought to have economy. Many of them have said so upon this floor. Here is a case where we can really decide that we want economy, because I feel that not one of the proposed additional employees is material or necessary for the service of the people of the United States. They are in and out of the buildings, in the District of Columbia, and outside the District. Let us vote economy instead of merely talking economy.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I do not think there is a Member of the Senate who has not, during the past 3 months, at some time or other, stood upon the Senate floor to make an eloquent plea for economy. Every Senator preaches economy. Every Senator claims he wants to balance the budget.

On the 28th of June, 62 Senators signed their names to a petition addressed to both the majority leader and the minority leader, in an effort to bring about the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 108, which would call upon the President of the United States to make a 5-percent cut in all appropriation bills.

I may say I am going to support this joint resolution, if that is the only way we can effect economy, but I think it is a cowardly way to proceed, for the Senate to try to "pass the buck" to the President. It is a cowardly procedure for us to pass appropriation bill providing increases, so we can go back home and tell everybody we voted for their pet appropriations, and then vote for a joint resolution calling upon the President to make a 5-percent cut, so that we can go back home and tell the same people we voted for economy. I think we should stand up and be counted on these year-and-nay votes. On the next two votes we can put into effect exactly what 62 Senators have said they wanted the President of the United States to do; that is, to make a 5-percent cut by simply voting against the increase proposed by the committee amendment.

In order that the taxpayers may know the difference between voting economy and merely giving it lip service, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD immediately following my remarks a copy of the petition to which I have referred, together with the names of the 62 Senators who boast that they are on record as favoring a 5-percent cut. If we are really sincere in wanting to reduce Government expenditures and balance the budget, then let us start voting accordingly.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

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

To the Honorable SCOTT W. LUCAS, majority leader of the Senate, and to the Honorable KENNETH S. WHERRY, minority leader of the Senate:

The undersigned Senators respectfully request that the majority leader of the Senate, Senator LUCAS, and the minority leader of the Senate, Senator WHERRY, so arrange the schedule of the business of the Senate that Senate Joint Resolution 108, entitled "Joint resolution to reduce expenditures in Government for the fiscal year 1950, consistent with the public interest," shall be made at the earliest practicable date the unfinished business of the Senate, so that said resolution may receive full consideration of the Senate and be brought to a vote on final passage.

Democrats: JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, MILLARD E. TYDINGS, VIRGIL H. CHAPMAN, BURNET R. MAYEANK, JAMES O. EASTLAND, KENNETH MCKELLAR, A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, WALTER F. GEORGE, HARRY F. BYRD, G. M. GILLETTE, CLYDE R. HOEY, E. C. JOHNSON, SHERIDAN DOWNEY, SPOSSARD L. HOLLAND, J. ALLEN FREAR, JR., PAUL H. DOUGLAS, G. L. WITHERS, TOM CONNALLY, PAT MCCARRAN, J. W. FULBRIGHT, JOHN C. STENNIS, OLIN D. JOHNSTON, ELMER THOMAS, JOHN SPARKMAN.

Republicans: STYLES BRIDGES, KENNETH S. WHERRY, CLYDE M. REED, CHAN GURNEY, EDWARD J. THYE, JOHN W. BRICKER, ANDREW F. SCHOEPEL, ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON, JOHN J. WILLIAMS, OWEN BREWSTER, WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, ZALES N. ECTON, ROBERT A. TOBEY, ALEXANDER WILEY, CHARLES W. TAFT, JOE MCCARTHY, RAYMOND E. BALDWIN, JAMES P. KEM, HOMER FERGUSON, EDWARD MARTIN, EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, W. E. JENNER, RALPH E. FLANDERS, MARGARET CHASE SMITH, BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, KARL E. MUNDT, GEORGE W. MALONE, IRVING M. IVES, HOMER E. CAPEHART, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, HUGH BUTLER, FORREST O. DONNELL, MILTON R. YOUNG, H. ALEXANDER SMITH, HARRY P. CAIN, H. C. LODGE, JR., ARTHUR V. WATKINS.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on this amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays. Mr. O'MAHOONEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Anderson	Hill	Morse
Baldwin	Hoey	Mundt
Brewster	Holland	Murray
Bricker	Hunt	Myers
Bridges	Ives	Neely
Butler	Jenner	O'Connor
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Chapman	Kem	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kerr	Schoeppel
Connally	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Knowland	Sparkman
Donnell	Langer	Stennis
Douglas	Lodge	Taft
Downey	Long	Taylor
Dulles	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Ecton	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McCarthy	Thye
Ferguson	McClellan	Tobey
Flanders	McGrath	Tydings
Fulbright	McKellar	Vandenberg
Gillette	McMahon	Watkins
Graham	Magnuson	Wherry
Green	Malone	Wiley
Gurney	Martin	Williams
Hayden	Maybank	Withers
Hendrickson	Miller	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. On the pending amendment the Senator from New Hampshire has asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll and Mr. AIKEN voted "nay" when his name was called.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Presiding Officer please state the form of the amendment which is now before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 23, line 16, striking out the figures "\$31,140,000" and substituting therefor the figures "\$32,750,000".

Mr. DOUGLAS. A "yea" vote will therefore be a vote to increase the appropriation provided by the House and a "nay" vote will be a vote to hold to the House appropriation. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A "yea" vote will be in support of the committee amendment, for the increase.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I could not hear the first part of the Senator's question. May I have it repeated?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I merely wanted to find out the form in which the amendment is before the Senate, so that we may know what a "yea" vote means and what a "nay" vote means.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair stated a "yea" vote is in favor of the committee amendment, increasing the amount provided by the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'CONNOR in the chair). The Chair stated that a yea vote is in favor of the committee amendment, and a "nay" vote is in opposition to the committee amendment.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, it is very important that the Senate know what it is doing.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I was not able to hear the Chair's statement. Will the Chair state the amendment for the information of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will announce that the question is now on agreeing to the committee amendment appearing on page 23, line 16, to strike out the figures "\$31,140,000" and substitute therefor "\$32,750,000." A "yea" vote is in favor of the increase as recommended by the Senate committee, and a "nay" vote is in opposition thereto.

The Secretary will proceed with the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] are absent on public business.

The Senators from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE and Mr. RUSSELL] and the Sena-

tor from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are unavoidably detained.

On this vote the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who would vote "yea" if present, is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who would vote "nay" if present.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who is absent because of illness, is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—41

Anderson	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Myers
Chavez	Kerr	Neely
Connally	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Long	Pepper
Downey	Lucas	Robertson
Ellender	McCarran	Saltonstall
Fulbright	McClellan	Sparkman
Gillette	McGrath	Taylor
Graham	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Green	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	Magnuson	Withers
Hill	Maybank	Young
Hunt	Miller	

NAYS—46

Aiken	Hendrickson	Mundt
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Connor
Brewster	Hoey	Schoeppel
Bricker	Holland	Smith, Maine
Bridges	Ives	Stennis
Butler	Jenner	Taft
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Thye
Cain	Kem	Tobey
Capehart	Knowland	Tydings
Donnell	Langer	Vandenberg
Douglas	Lodge	Watkins
Dulles	McCarthy	Wherry
Ecton	Malone	Wiley
Ferguson	Martin	Williams
Flanders	Millikin	
Gurney	Morse	

NOT VOTING—9

Eastland	Humphrey	Reed
Frear	Kefauver	Russell
George	McFarland	Smith, N. J.

So the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. Mr. President, I am so convinced that the vote of the Senate just now in rejecting the committee amendment was not in the interest of economy, and so convinced that the Public Buildings and Grounds Administration ought to have an increase, that I am going to make a motion to increase the appropriation by a million dollars instead of by \$1,610,000, as was recommended by the committee.

Let me point out that the Public Buildings Administration asked for an increase of \$2,740,000. The committee did not allow that. It allowed only \$1,610,000, which was \$1,850,000 below the budget. The amendment which I now offer would be \$2,460,000 below the budget.

Mr. President, I make the motion. I do not, however, ask for the yeas and nays. I hope it may be decided by a rising vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if I understood the Senator from Wyoming

correctly, what he desires to do now, since the Senate has refused to allow—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. An increase of \$1,610,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. He is proposing to add \$1,000,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. One million dollars instead of \$1,610,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, exactly the same principle is involved. The Senate turned down the figure which would have authorized a personnel of 430 for buildings inside the District, and the chairman of the subcommittee desires that they be allowed to employ something over 200.

Mr. President, it has been figured out that what we propose is exactly a 5-percent cut from the budget, and I think the Senate just voted economy, as Senators have been advocating. It has been pointed out, however, that 62 Senators have signed a petition to have brought up a bill to have the President cut the budget 5 to 10 percent, and here we have an opportunity to cut the budget exactly 5 percent. We did so cut the budget, where we did make a cut. Now we are asked to increase by 2½ to 3 percent.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will continue to vote economy rather than just talk economy. This is a case where we can vote economy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] to the committee amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are unavoidably detained.

On this vote the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who would vote "yea" if present, is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who would vote "nay" if present.

I announce further that on this vote the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who would vote "yea" if present, is paired with the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], who would vote "nay" if present.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] who is absent because of illness is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea."

The junior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], is detained on official business and is paired with the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. If present and voting, the junior Senator from Utah would vote "nay," and the senior Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 48, as follows:

YEAS—39

Anderson	Johnson, Colo.	Miller
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Myers
Connally	Kefauver	Neely
Cordon	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Downey	Kilgore	Pepper
Ellender	Long	Robertson
Gillette	Lucas	Saltonstall
Graham	McCarran	Sparkman
Green	McGrath	Taylor
Hayden	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Hill	McMahon	Withers
Hunt	Maybank	Young

NAYS—48

Alken	George	Martin
Baldwin	Gurney	Millikin
Brewster	Hendrickson	Morse
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bridges	Hoey	O'Connor
Butler	Holland	Schoeppel
Byrd	Ives	Smith, Maine
Cain	Jenner	Stennis
Capehart	Kem	Taft
Donnell	Knowland	Thye
Douglas	Langer	Tobey
Dulles	Lodge	Tydings
Ecton	McCarthy	Vandenberg
Ferguson	McClellan	Wherry
Flanders	Magnuson	Wiley
Fulbright	Malone	Williams

NOT VOTING—9

Eastland	McFarland	Smith, N. J.
Frear	Reed	Thomas, Utah
Humphrey	Russell	Watkins

So Mr. O'MAHONEY's amendment was rejected.

SECURITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1949—
CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I call up the conference report on the bill known as the Security Act amendments of 1949, which is at the desk, and ask for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say that the conference report has previously been laid down, and after some debate, was temporarily passed over.

The question now is on the consideration and adoption of the conference report.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland in a word give us the principal differences between the conference report and the unification bill?

Mr. TYDINGS. In view of the fact that there is quite a full attendance of Senators at this time, and in order to avoid repetition of questioning, I should like to say that when the Senate passed the unification bill some time ago and it went to the House it contained four titles. The House returned the bill with only one title in it, striking out the other three titles, which really dealt with unification, and retaining only that feature which had to do with the comptroller and financial aspects of the Unification Act.

When the bill was taken up by the conferees the basis of the conference, however, was the bill as it had passed the Senate, and that is the bill which is before us now, with probably some 28 amendments, most of which are purely clarifying amendments. In my judgment, they constitute, for the most part, an improvement. They do not represent everything that the Senate conferees would like to have had, but I think it only fair to say that 90 percent of the

propositions in dispute were resolved in favor of the position taken by the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator permit me to ask him whether it is true that the conference report provides for three Assistant Secretaries of Defense in place of special assistants, as heretofore provided?

Mr. TYDINGS. It provides for three Assistant Secretaries.

Mr. LODGE. I regard that as an improvement over what was previously done. Will the Senator tell me what, if anything, was done on the matter of transferability of personnel?

Mr. TYDINGS. We had a transfer provision in the Senate version, which permitted transfer of an officer, for example, from one branch of the service to another, assuming that the secretaries of the two branches concerned agreed. The House conferees and certain of the Senate conferees objected to that largely because of a fear that Marine Corps officers or Naval officers or Army officers might all want to transfer to the Air Force, and, therefore, as this was not a transfer bill but a unification act, we decided to leave that question for further study, which is now being made in the House of Representatives. It was one of the recessions made by conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. May it be anticipated that this subject will receive consideration at some time in the future?

Mr. TYDINGS. I believe it may be anticipated that it will. I think the only reason why it was not done at this time was that we did not have and had not taken sufficient testimony to warrant a sound approach to this particular proposition in the bill.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have only one more question. I thank the Senator for his patience. In what respect does the conference report change the language of the bill insofar as the chief or presiding officer of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is concerned?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am glad the Senator asked that question, because it is one of the interesting and controversial propositions in the bill. The House, of course, took no action at all on that point. It provided for no presiding officer over the Joint Chiefs of Staff. As the Senator will recall, the Senate bill provided for a presiding officer for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The conference report provides for a presiding officer for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He is given no vote. He must be confirmed by the Senate. All the Joint Chiefs of Staff, including the chairman or the presiding officer, are advisers to the President on matters pertaining to the military per se.

Mr. LODGE. Let me say, Mr. President, that the conference report, which I have studied since the noon hour, impresses me as being a forward step on the road to true unification. I hope that as time goes by the apprehensions which have been expressed in some quarters that when the Military Establishment is unified the risk is run of having military control of the Government, will disappear. Obviously the best way for the civilian to control the military is to unify

the military, so that the military can be watched, and it cannot play one off against the other.

I hope also that the fears which have been expressed that unification cannot be had except at the expense of the morale of the existing services will also disappear, because I believe we must secure unification, and we will have better unification if we retain the esprit de corps and the morale of the old services.

But in the case of the United States, it is a case of unify or perish. This is a matter which involves the lives of our young men. It involves the question of victory or defeat if we ever have another war. So I hope the progress which has been made in the understanding of this issue will continue.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. Speaking for every member of the conference on both sides of the aisle, and in both Houses, I believe that this is perhaps the best bill for unification that could possibly be evolved at this time. There were many things which might occur to us which I do not believe could be put in the bill. I think we have reached the point where we have an approximation to a good bill.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator from Maryland advise the Senate as to how the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is appointed, and whether there is any requirement that he be civilian or military, or whether that is left to the discretion of the appointing officer?

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, the chiefs of the three branches of the service, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps, make up the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Then there is a presiding officer, appointed from military life, who is the presiding officer for 2 years only.

Mr. AIKEN. Is he appointed by the Secretary of Defense or by the President?

Mr. TYDINGS. He is appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, as an additional precaution.

Mr. AIKEN. He has no vote?

Mr. TYDINGS. He has no vote.

Mr. AIKEN. He makes a report for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to the Secretary and to the President.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I ask the Senator from Maryland to say a word about the unification bill as agreed to by the conference committee, with relation to the reorganization plan suggested by the President.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senate will bear with me for a moment, Senators will remember that only 2 or 3 days ago the President of the United States sent to Congress a reorganization plan for the Military Establishment. In the conference we had that plan before us. That plan largely followed the unification bill as it originally passed the Senate several months ago. We took from the President's reorganization plan such proposals as seemed to us to be an improvement on what we had already decided to

do. Therefore I can answer, in sum, that in many respects this bill is the President's reorganization plan, which was largely the Senate plan to begin with; but it is improved as experience and further examination show it should be, and some of the features of the President's suggestion were not adopted.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator stated to my colleague [Mr. LODGE] that there were three Assistant Secretaries of Defense. One of those Secretaries is the comptroller, who is to be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct. We have made one of the Assistant Secretaries of Defense the fiscal officer, so to speak, for the defense establishment. He is in charge of budgetary, financial, and comptroller matters. In addition to him, there are two other assistants.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. As the lone dissenter on the Armed Services Committee with respect to the Senate bill, I wish to commend and congratulate the Senator from Maryland for the excellent leadership which he has afforded the Senate through the conference hearings in respect to this conference report. I think the conference report bill is in a great many respects superior to the Senate bill.

I wish to associate myself with the point of view of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] with regard to the need for further improvements in the bill, and therefore I wish to serve notice that, come the next session of Congress, I shall reintroduce the amendments which I offered in this session of Congress, and which were voted down, because I think that until the principles of those amendments are adopted we cannot possibly have the maximum in unification which we need in the Military Establishment.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the able Senator from Oregon for his remarks as a member of the committee. He has served on our committee in a very helpful capacity.

I should like to make one further observation. This bill is not what everyone who is for unification would like to have, but it is a very good bill. I think anyone who is familiar with it will say so. Furthermore, I think I owe it to the Senate to say that so far as I know there is no provision of this bill which has met with the disapproval of any of the three Chiefs of Staff of the three armed branches of our service.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is it a correct conclusion from the Senator's response to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] that the President's reorganization plan will now be rejected?

Mr. TYDINGS. We have placed in the conference report a provision which rejects—I do not like to use that word—it makes unnecessary, if I may use the

softer word, the President's reorganization plan, because primarily that plan was the Senate unification bill as we originally passed it. Therefore we have that same proposal, with such improvements as time, the President, and all other factors have been able to contribute to the total.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is not sufficient for us to say that it is unnecessary. We must reject it. Is not that correct?

Mr. TYDINGS. We have put a provision in the conference report bill which makes the President's reorganization plan invalid.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the able Senator kindly specify succinctly and generally what the authority of the Secretary of Defense is?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Secretary of Defense has general authority over the Military Establishment, to effect economies, to eliminate overlapping and duplication in the services, and generally to manage the services and direct them.

But we have carefully separated the military administration from the civilian administration. The Secretary has over-all authority in operating the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, so far as concerns the men and officers who actually compose those services. We leave those things largely up to the military people.

Mr. PEPPER. They, in turn, being accountable to the Commander in Chief.

Mr. TYDINGS. To the Commander in Chief and to the Secretary.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will allow this observation, I voted for the unification bill, and I am heartily in accord with the principle. However, I think it must not be forgotten that what we have done gives great power to one man. I am sure that it is within the contemplation of the Congress that he will use that power with an awareness of the solemn obligation which he owes to the country and to the several services involved.

It strikes me that there is this distinction between the future Military Establishment and the three services of the past: Formerly the Secretaries were members of the Cabinet. They had the ear and the association of the President. Each one had access, I assume, to the President's ear and to his council. They had equal access to the Congress, without having to go through anyone, I suppose, except the Commander in Chief or the Bureau of the Budget. It was the Congress which finally made the decisions as to what the several services got.

I assume that under this law there is vested in one man the power to make directives. We have seen in the press statements to the effect that members of the various services have been precluded from issuing press releases, from writing magazine articles, or from expressing to the public their opinion about military, naval, or air policy.

I am sure that no man who will have the confidence of the Commander in Chief and of the Senate would desire to

suppress anyone's initiative and enterprise, or the expression of honest sentiments by men who have the safety of our country at heart. At the same time, I say that it is a great power which we place in one man, if he may determine, before the question ever gets to the Bureau of the Budget, what each service shall have, or what it may ask for, or even how it may appeal to public opinion with regard to what is in the public interest and to the greatest advantage.

That also is a great power. If he can tell his people who may appear before Congress and what they shall say, and shut the mouths of honest advocates of certain military policies, even before the American Congress, that, too, is a very great power, which no one man has possessed in the past.

I merely wish to say that we are making a solemn decision here. This power must be exercised tenderly by its possessor. Certainly no branch of the service should feel that it is precluded from an honest advocacy of what it believes to be for the best interest of the United States.

Mr. TYDINGS. I heartily agree with all the Senator from Florida has said, in philosophy. I may say that I do not believe that the dangers which he senses, and which might be inherent in the bill, will ever come to pass, for this reason:

First of all, as a matter of practical mechanics and administration, there is never a bill affecting the Air Corps that we do not call for the Secretary of the Air Force and his Chief of Staff, General Vandenberg. There is never a bill affecting the Navy that we do not call for the Secretary of the Navy and his Chief of Staff. The same is true of the Army. That brings those gentlemen in direct contact with the Armed Services Committee.

As the Senator also knows, when appropriations come up affecting the Air Corps, for example, the Secretary of Air, together with such officers, civilian and military, as he may deem necessary, come before the Appropriations Committee. The only place where they could be short-circuited, so to speak, would be in some directive which was beyond legislation or some order of that sort. As they were the final points of danger, we felt, and so did the Secretary, that the right to come to Congress or to the President was an inherent right, and that we had not in any way abridged it. In the case of the military, we specifically provided that any one of the Chiefs of Staff, in addition to the Chief of the Chiefs of Staff, could go to the President if there were a controversy affecting the integrity or standing or capacity of any one of the armed services or its ability to perform its role and mission.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator. I certainly know that so long as he occupies the position he now does, this power will never be abused.

Mr. TYDINGS. We have been careful to write in every restriction we could.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have the greatest respect for and confidence in the Secretary of Defense. I have no information about this matter except what I have read in the newspapers, but I have read that the Secretary of Defense has

sent to the Secretary for Navy what appears to be a rather peremptory order to stop the construction of what has been called a supercarrier.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida permit me to clear up that myth for once and all, here in public?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; I think that would be a great service to everyone.

Mr. TYDINGS. In the first place, the Congress never authorized the building of the supercarrier. We said that in the discretion of the President, he could or could not have it built. I think quite often we have fallen into the error of believing—particularly if we have not read the legislative measure, and I had to read it, in order to see for myself—that we had commanded or ordered or legislated the building of the carrier. Actually, we left that matter to the discretion of the President. The matter was referred by him to the Joint Chiefs of Staff for Army, Navy, and Air Force. My information is—and I think it is reliable—that two of those gentlemen did not favor the building of the carrier, but the third one did. The controversy was carried to the Secretary of Defense, and was carried by him to the President. Although I have no right to speak for the President, and although I have no first-hand information on this subject, yet I believe the cancellation was made with the President's approval, if not by his direct order. In any event, it was totally within his discretion, as the Congress passed the act, to determine whether he would or would not allow the carrier to be built.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, what troubled me more than anything else was the manner in which it is said the Secretary of Defense had that action taken.

Mr. TYDINGS. I merely state that in the handling of this matter there was room for improvement, and I believe that in the handling of this incident there is a lesson for everyone, and there is not likely to be a repetition of the mechanics of this incident in the future.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if our discussion today has had that salutary effect, so that hereafter the Secretary for the particular service involved will at least not be precluded from discussing the matter with the Secretary of Defense in an honorable and fair way, I think we have made a worth-while contribution.

Mr. TYDINGS. He has that right, under this bill.

Mr. PEPPER. I wanted to have that matter clarified, so that in the future what the Senator has stated will be possible.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to repeat that the military chief of the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force will have the right to go to the President or to the Congress at any time he wishes, under the provisions of this measure.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Apparently there is some doubt in the minds of some Members as to whether the President's reorganization plan is specifically rejected by this measure.

Mr. TYDINGS. I would appreciate it if the Senator would read the language

relative to that matter. That will give him a better answer than I could give offhand.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Subsection (1) states:

Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1949, transmitted to the Congress by the President on July 18, 1949, pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, shall not take effect, notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of such Reorganization Act of 1949.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Massachusetts will recall that the concluding phrase there means that this particular plan cannot take effect. But, inasmuch as the President has this power for the three more years, I believe, he could send us another plan, which we could either accept or reject. We were careful to use that particular language in order to reject this plan only. Its rejection was not made because we were opposed to it, but because we had adopted 90 percent of it, for, in fact, the President had taken almost his whole plan from the Senate bill, in the first place.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask the Senator to yield because I know it is in the public interest to allay any fears as to these matters.

I understand that some steps have been taken so as to allay any fears that the Marine Corps can be abolished.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Marine Corps cannot be abolished, either under this measure or under any other measure which has been passed, without an act of Congress directing or authorizing that to be done.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator from Maryland know of any person anywhere in the National Defense Establishment who would wish to abolish the Marine Corps?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Maryland, so long as he is in the Congress, will resist any attempt to abolish the Marine Corps, because it has been of tremendously valuable assistance to the United States and is worth millions or billions of dollars to our country.

Mr. LODGE. To my mind the talk of abolishing the Marine Corps is one of the wonders of the age, for it is completely without justification.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree entirely.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to inquire about Reorganization Plan No. 8.

Mr. TYDINGS. It has been abolished under the measure.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder whether that can be done in this manner.

Mr. TYDINGS. It can be.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understood it was to be done by concurrent resolution, rather than by an act of Congress, a bill, because the President would not have to sign a concurrent resolution rejecting or approving his plan.

Mr. TYDINGS. There are three reasons why I believe it is rejected by this measure, let me say.

First of all, I am so certain that the President is pleased with this unification bill, because it is 90 percent of the proposition he sent to the Congress, which was our proposition to begin with, that I feel sure he will sign it.

In the second place, our legislative counsel, who is very able—Mr. Simms—ably assisted by his counterpart in the House of Representatives, thinks we have approached it in a thoroughly proper way.

In the third place, as to the prestige which may be involved, an act of Congress, as I am sure the Senator from Michigan will agree, will have more binding effect than will a joint resolution of the Congress, although there is actually very little difference.

Mr. FERGUSON. My point is purely a matter of law.

Mr. TYDINGS. I understand that. In other words, the Senator wishes to inquire whether the Congress really has to pass a resolution on this subject, or whether this purpose can be subserved by the passage of an ordinary bill or act of Congress.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, because when we do not act upon the reorganization plan, it becomes law.

Mr. TYDINGS. If we are in session.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; and it would become law as of that date. So, in effect, that would be a subsequent act to what we are doing today. I wonder whether we can proceed in this way.

Mr. TYDINGS. In order to allay the fears of the Senator from Michigan, let me say to him that at his suggestion I shall have the matter reexplored; and in the event there is any doubt at all that this method will be efficacious, we will have a resolution brought from our committee and presented to the Senate for adoption.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what I am concerned with, so that we shall not find that by passing this bill we shall automatically have voted in the President's reorganization plan.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall charge myself with that duty.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am very glad to hear the statement the Senator from Maryland has made regarding the Marine Corps, for, as he will recall, when the debate was in progress on the bill, there was a proposal in which the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Oregon joined, which would have had the effect of making it possible to transfer for special detail military personnel, including Marine Corps personnel, and also making possible the joint use of military property. But the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Oregon made perfectly clear that the amendment did not affect the roles and missions of the Marine Corps, because, as the Senator from Maryland has pointed out, the only way the roles and missions of any branch of the service, including the Marine Corps, can be affected is by a special act of Congress.

The Senator from Maryland will recall that both Senators made as clear as the English language will permit it to be made clear that under the amendment there was no intention to transfer the Marine Corps, and that furthermore that would be impossible because a specific act of Congress would be required, if that were to be done.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct. I may say, in furtherance of trying to put this ghost to sleep for all time, that I do not think there is a single member of the House Armed Services Committee or of the Senate Armed Services Committee, or, so far as I know, any single Member of Congress, who contemplates any legislation, or the support of any legislation, which would abolish the Marine Corps. Why this bugaboo keeps rising up, when nobody has offered a bill or is suggesting doing it, I am at a loss to know.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I understood the Senator from Maryland to refer to the heads of the separate departments—Army, Navy, and Air Corps.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. MALONE. I misunderstood. I understood first that the heads of the departments, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Corps, could go direct to the President, regardless of the Secretary of Defense. I was going to ask if that included their coming to the Congress independently as they always have.

Mr. TYDINGS. It does, and I may say to the Senator I am glad that he asked that question, because I think it is worthy of this additional comment about what has happened. A man who is a civilian in one of the three defense departments has a certain liberty in coming to Congress and talking with Members of Congress and coming before committees that a member of the armed services does not enjoy, for he is in an organization which is under strict orders and discipline. Therefore, we have worded the bill so that no one of the three services could be put into a strait-jacket, if they felt their particular branch was not receiving the consideration to which it was entitled. The bill provides that they may go to the President or any place else, to complain, if they think a complaint is necessary.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator understands why there is a great difference between a civilian head and a military man who wears the uniform and is under orders of the Commander in Chief. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I understand the difference. I frankly confess I have never posed as an expert as to what particular kind of defensive or offensive tactics or equipment should be adopted and employed—but of one thing I am fully convinced—four men cannot direct—it must have one head. That is what happened to our friend, Jim Forrestal—a lack of unification, everybody in the Department running wild and offering advice to Congress and to the President. I

brought it up because, even if he be a civilian and can bypass the Secretary of Defense and come to Congress and to the President, offering independent advice, it is not good—can they do that under this bill?

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. He can come to Senators and he can appear before committees without the knowledge of the Secretary of Defense. Is that correct?

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. As I understand, he can do that, without the consent of anybody and without consulting anybody.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. Then, in my opinion, it is a mistake.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think there is a good deal to be said on both sides of the question, but the committee frankly erred on the side of not wanting to cut off these men, for fear we would be charged with creating a dictatorship.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to make a further comment in the form of a question. None of us, least of all the junior Senator from Nevada, knows exactly what should be done for national defense, but I have confidence in the present Secretary of Defense and in the Military Establishment set up through legislation in which the Senator from Maryland had an important part. But from whom are we to get authentic information? Are we to get it from the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense, or can just anybody barge in with their conflicting advice, as they always have.

Mr. TYDINGS. I may say to the Senator, in that regard, we are permitted to call upon anybody in uniform in the Defense Establishment, to come before any committee of Congress, and to honor any letter or request for information that is sent to the department.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. It is not a question of whom we shall call. If I invite someone to my office, I understand he is to be permitted to come, and the same is true with respect to the Senator from Maryland and with respect to committees. But I do not believe that the heads of departments should continue their free, unlimited, and, I may say, uncoordinated advice as in the past; the place to offer their advice is to the Chiefs of Staff and to the Secretary of Defense, then come officially with a properly coordinated story.

Mr. TYDINGS. I see what the Senator is particularly addressing his questions to. The point escaped me at first, when he asked the question. What he is asking me is, if we allow this privilege, can one of them come before Congress and attempt an undermining operation, so to speak.

Mr. MALONE. Yes; and can they continue as they have in the past?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think that would be possible, unless some committee of the House or Senate asked the individual to come. Otherwise, he would have to resign in order to make his protest.

Mr. MALONE. That is perfectly satisfactory. All the junior Senator from Nevada is interested in is to know the objectives in case of an emergency, and how they intend to reach such objectives. I am not the least interested in any particular arm of the services nor in personalities, but I do want to know that the best brains available have been utilized and that they have reached a decision and what Congress must do to make it possible to carry out the plans.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I compliment the Senator from Maryland upon his assurance there is no danger that the Marine Corps will be dissolved.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is not the slightest danger of that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is what friends of the Marine Corps feared. We were not afraid the Corps would be abolished, but we were afraid the functions of the Corps would be stripped from it, and that it would be reduced merely to guard and housekeeping duties. I wonder whether the Senator from Maryland could give us any assurance on that subject.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator can rest assured. I shared his apprehension, but did not share all the fears we heard expressed. So, whether they were sound or unsound, we said we would write into this bill certain language which would make impossible even an indirect approach to the fear and apprehension the Senator has expressed that there might be a means whereby the Marine Corps' function could gradually be sapped away, so that it would be only a deck-duty or deck-guard outfit. We have specifically provided that its roles and its missions cannot be affected in any way, even by transfer on a temporary basis. The Senator may take my word for it that we have gone out of our way by additional language to reemphasize everything I told him before.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Did the Senator consider the possibility of establishing the strength of the Marine Corps at 6 percent of the combined strength of the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy?

Mr. TYDINGS. That would have to come up in a separate bill, which we have before our committee, and is not properly, if I may say so, a part of this bill. The strength of the unit is not considered in this bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But will the Senator give assurance the Marine Corps will not be reduced to mere guard and housekeeping duties?

Mr. TYDINGS. Valuing my word, I may say to the Senator in answer to his question, I foresee not the slightest diminution in the glory, the traditions, and the future of the United States Marine Corps. I am proud to make that statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator very much.

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

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

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4177) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the committee amendment on page 24, line 9, to strike out "\$23,968,800" and insert "\$24,968,800."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to say a word in connection with this amendment. It is the same kind of an amendment we have previously passed upon, except that I think it is more important, because it adds 1,230 employees over the 1949 figure. The House figure provided for 350 fewer employees than the Senate committee is now suggesting. It has been fully debated. The amendment relates to buildings outside the District of Columbia. They are similar to those inside the District.

I think the Senate should vote to reject the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I shall not burden the Senate with any discussion of this amendment, except to say—and I wish that this statement might be heard by every Member of the Senate—the committee, in making its recommendations to the Senate, has reduced the total appropriation in the bill by 5.2 percent below the budget figures. This particular amendment is below the budget figures. The Public Buildings Administration asked for an increase of \$2,663,200. The committee denied that increase, and granted only \$1,000,000. But there is a budget cut of 5.2 percent, which is, I understand, in compliance with the recommendations made in the petition signed by some 62 Senators. Here is a compliance with that suggestion.

I hope the committee amendment will be adopted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in order that the RECORD may be kept straight, let me say that I think the Senator from Wyoming is a little bit confused. In 1949 the Senate authorized 8,046 employees for the same agency. The House amendment provided for 8,276 employees, or an increase of 230 more than last year. Even if the Senate rejects the committee amendment and cuts this agency 5 percent, we would still be providing 230 more employees for the same agency than were provided last year.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming is not confused. He is perfectly well aware of what the personnel situation is. I have said, and I repeat, that the recommendation made by the committee is below the budget figure. There can be no question about that. Of course, there has been an increase in personnel, but that is by reason of the fact that the Congress of the United States, by law, has placed additional burdens upon the Public Buildings Administration with respect to the handling of buildings outside the District of Columbia. We give them, with one voice, additional duties to perform; we

then, by law, increase salaries by \$550,000,000, and then by another action we undertake to deny the appropriations necessary to enable the agency to perform the functions it is obligated and directed, under the law, to perform.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hendrickson	Maybank
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Miller
Baldwin	Hill	Millikin
Brewster	Hoey	Morse
Bricker	Holland	Mundt
Bridges	Humphrey	Murray
Butler	Hunt	Neely
Byrd	Ives	O'Connor
Cain	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Connally	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kerr	Schoeppel
Donnell	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Knowland	Sparkman
Downey	Langer	Stennis
Dulles	Lodge	Taft
Ecton	Long	Taylor
Ellender	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	McCarran	Thye
Flanders	McCarthy	Tobey
Fulbright	McClellan	Vandenber
George	McKellar	Watkins
Gillette	McMahon	Wherry
Graham	Magnuson	Wiley
Green	Malone	Williams
Gurney	Martin	Withers
Hayden		Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 24, line 9.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—38		
Anderson	Hunt	Miller
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Connally	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Kerr	Pepper
Downey	Kilgore	Russell
Ellender	Long	Saltonstall
Gillette	Lucas	Sparkman
Graham	McCarran	Taylor
Green	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	McMahon	Withers
Hill	Magnuson	Young
Humphrey	Maybank	

NAYS—49

Aiken	Gurney	Morse
Baldwin	Hendrickson	Mundt
Brewster	Hickenlooper	O'Connor
Bricker	Hoey	Robertson
Bridges	Holland	Schoeppel
Butler	Ives	Smith, Maine
Byrd	Jenner	Stennis
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Capehart	Kem	Thye
Donnell	Knowland	Tobey
Douglas	Langer	Vandenberg
Dulles	Lodge	Watkins
Ecton	McCarthy	Wherry
Ferguson	McClellan	Wiley
Flanders	Malone	Williams
Fulbright	Martin	
George	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—9

Eastland	McGrath	Smith, N. J.
Frear	Myers	Thomas, Okla.
McFarland	Reed	Tydings

So the amendment of the committee was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Roads Administration," on page 27, line 23, after the word "means", to strike out "including the salary of the Commissioner of Public Roads at \$12,000 per annum so long as the position is held by the present incumbent, and."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to address a question to the chairman of the subcommittee. I wonder if in the interest of saving time the chairman of the subcommittee is willing, with respect to all items of the bill which involve increase in personnel, to have them voted on en bloc? The motion of the Senator from New Hampshire would be to reduce such items, to bring them back to the House figures, leaving out the item dealing with the Housing Expediter, a matter which should be discussed, and the provision for the Veterans' Administration, which has to do with getting out Government life-insurance dividends?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I will say that I cannot quite agree with the premise which the Senator lays down. In most of these cases the amendments reported by the committee do not involve any increase of personnel. The Senator speaks of an increase of personnel with respect to the relation between the bill as reported by the Senate committee and the bill as passed by the House. When I speak of personnel I speak of the relationship between the bill as reported by the Senate committee and the present personnel as authorized in the appropriations passed at the last session of Congress for the fiscal year 1949.

For example, in a moment we will come to the item relating to the Public Roads Administration. I do not think that item should be determined upon the basis of personnel. So I hope the Senator will not pursue that course, but that we may proceed with the consideration of the items.

Mr. BRIDGES. I understand the Senator would not consider that proposal?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am afraid I cannot do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 27, line 23.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 8, after "(58 Stat. 838)", to strike out "\$373,491,000" and insert "\$390,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 14, after the word "and", to strike out "\$225,000,000" and insert "\$241,509,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wonder if we may have an explanation of the increase in the items for Public Roads?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very glad to make an explanation. The reduction in the House bill was a percentage reduction. Of course, it went far below the budget estimate. The restoration which the committee has recommended is still below the budget estimate. The Public Roads program was initiated in compliance with an act of Congress for the post war rehabilitation of roads throughout the United States. I know of no expenditure by the Federal Government which is more productive of new business, of new revenue to the Government, of employment and of improved economy generally, than that for public roads.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I correct in my understanding that the estimate made by the Bureau of the Budget in the fall of last year, was \$400,000,000?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And that the amount recommended by the Senate committee is \$390,000,000?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; \$10,000,000 below the budget.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Or a cut of only 2½ percent. In view of the fact that the general price level has fallen by approximately 7 percent since then, is it not possible for the committee to make a larger reduction than \$10,000,000 in the appropriation, and still receive the same amount of service which would have been possible under the amount called for in the budget estimate made 6 months ago?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The figure is far below the authorization, far below the need. I think it would be a great mistake to make any further cut from that which the committee has made.

There is great unemployment throughout the United States. There is no expenditure which does more to alleviate unemployment by creating substantial productive employment than this. The automobile industry, the manufacture of trucks, the manufacture of passenger cars, the refining of oil, the servicing of cars, all sorts of business and industry are promoted by the construction of the Federal-aid highways. Such construction provides revenue for the Government. To reduce this program at a time when we are receiving reports of increased unemployment would, in my opinion, be a most short-sighted and uneconomic action.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that approximately the same defense can be made for virtually every other item in the budget? Cannot every item be defended on the ground that it gives employment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no.

Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. HOLLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Cannot every item be defended on the ground that every dollar expended by the Federal Government gives employment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall try to reply to the Senator from Illinois before yielding to my colleague from Florida.

There are many items in this bill in connection with which we have recommended no increase, though increases were requested. There are items in the bill in connection with which we will recommend reduction. When we come to the national service life insurance, for example, I shall recommend a reduction of some \$202,000,000 below the budget estimate, because I believe it is not an essential expenditure at this time. But expenditures of public money for the construction of public roads are essential and they are productive. There is a difference between a productive expenditure and a purely ministerial expenditure.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, indeed; I am very happy to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly the fall in prices since the time the budget was drawn has been more than 2½ percent, the percentage of the cut made by the Senate committee in its recommendation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; but the Senator is proceeding from the assumption that the program should be limited. I say to the Senator that the program of the Bureau of Public Roads has not yet begun to approximate the need of the country.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I then point out to the Senator from Wyoming that what he is in effect arguing is that a larger volume of construction with \$390,000,000 should be carried out than was contemplated by the Budget Bureau when it made its estimate of \$400,000,000?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I acceded to the action of the committee in cutting \$10,000,000 below the \$400,000,000, because I believed that with the \$390,000,000 we might be able to carry out the \$400,000,000 program; but I am not altogether certain that that will be possible.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But that is sixteen and one-half million more than the amount appropriated by the House.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes; the Senator is quite correct.

Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. THYE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield first to the Senator from Florida, who was first on his feet.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to address a question to the distinguished Senator. Is it not true that this particular item represents the Federal contribution to a cooperative effort with the States?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. In that effort joint State-Federal budgets have been worked out. It would constitute a decided breach of faith on the part of the Federal Government to cut the amount provided for and prescribed by the cooperative budget.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator, as a former governor of the State of Florida, is thoroughly familiar with the plan under which the Federal aid highway program is carried out. It may be well to state it. In the first instance, the State highway department submits to the Public Roads Administration its requests. Those requests are sifted by the Public Roads Administration. Some are approved and some are rejected. When the program is approved, the State proceeds to draw up plans in conformity with the regulations of the Public Roads Administration. Then the contracts are let to public bidding, and the work is begun. In the meantime—and this operation requires several years—the obligations of the Federal Government and of the States begin to pile up. So, of course, unwise cutting of these appropriations would undermine the capacity of the Federal Government to meet the obligation which has been assumed.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Wyoming is entirely correct in his statement that there is a great deficit in highway construction because of the war restrictions, which delayed highway construction during the war years. Likewise, the States were restricted. The States were under restrictions so far as cement and reinforcing steel were concerned. They accumulated balances. Practically all States with which I am familiar have large highway funds awaiting the day when the restrictive measures would be lifted. The restrictive measures have been lifted, and the States have the funds with which to match Federal funds. It is for that reason that this Federal appropriation is absolutely necessary, and should be supported, because there is a deficit in highway construction the Nation over.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not also true that the cost of building roads has increased about one-third over the cost 8 or 9 or 10 years ago?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, the cost of construction is much greater now than it was prior to the war.

Mr. LANGER. Not only that, but this program also includes a plan for secondary roads, which we did not have 8 or 9 years ago.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. LANGER. I associate myself with the Senator from Minnesota. We certainly need every dollar we can get for roads in farming areas.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. To supplement what the Senator from Wyoming has said, Mr. MacDonald, Public Road Administrator, who I believe is one of the best Federal officials and one of the fairest and more honorable men I know in the Federal Government, makes this statement, which I think answers the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] more specifically. He said in substance before the committee:

The approved programs are based upon the apportionment, that is correct. We make the apportionment under the formula approved by Congress, to each State. The State then proceeds to submit the program of projects to take up the individual amounts that go into their programs. There is a lag at the present time of about 24 or 25 months. It is the only way that an aid program could possibly be carried into effect.

I think the Senator from Wyoming will agree with me that this is a program which stretches over the future, by at least 2 years. As to the question of costs as compared with costs a few months ago, that really does not enter into consideration in connection with this appropriation to nearly so great an extent as it does with respect to some of the other items, because of the lag.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. I should like to ask my distinguished colleague if he is aware of the fact that park approach roads have a backlog of \$175,000,000 worth of projects.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That was the testimony which was given before our committee.

Mr. HUNT. I am sure that my colleague understands that in this bill there is only \$7,500,000 available for that purpose.

I should like to ask my distinguished colleague one further question. Is it not a fact that the people throughout the United States are misguided in thinking that the 1½-cent gasoline tax collected by the Federal Government goes for the building of highways?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct. That money goes into the general Treasury, as I understand.

Mr. HUNT. Does my colleague know that in the past 10 years that amount has exceeded by 33 percent all the money poured back into the States for highway construction?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My colleague will confirm my statement, I am sure, that in our small State—small in terms of population, but great in beauty and great in area, and great in its production—there is collected every month more than half a million dollars, if not \$600,000, in gasoline taxes, which money goes back into the building of roads.

Mr. HUNT. Every cent goes back into the building of roads. Twenty-five per-

cent is returned to cities and counties, but that must go into highways and into secondary roads.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Many times when we go down the Federal-aid highways of Wyoming we see cars from Illinois on the way to Yellowstone National Park, to Grand Teton Park, to the oil fields of Wyoming, and the coal fields of Wyoming. Is not that a fact?

Mr. HUNT. That is certainly a fact.

Let me ask my colleague another question. Is he aware of the fact that during the frontier days celebration the count of cars shows that the greatest number of cars in Cheyenne are from the State of Illinois?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is true.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. My little share in this debate is as follows: I am sorry that the Committee on Appropriations did not see fit to go beyond the Budget Bureau and recommend to the Senate that it appropriate what was authorized, which was \$450,000,000 a year for 1950 and 1951. The Congress at its next session will have to take some action, because the backlog which the Senator from Wyoming has so well described exists. Highway construction is greatly in arrears. Highways took a terrible beating because of the war. As a matter of fact, highway authorities from the State of Illinois and from the State of New York, two heavily populated States, recommended an authorization of \$1,000,000,000, not \$450,000,000. So I am sorry that, notwithstanding the authorization of \$450,000,000, and the fact that we are in arrears, the appropriation recommended is \$60,000,000 less than the authorization.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming two questions, but before I do so I wish to say that the people of Illinois have always had a very high opinion of Wyoming and its distinguished representatives. We gave to Wyoming the distinguished junior Senator [Mr. HUNT]. It is always a great pleasure for our citizens to go West and broaden their minds and cultivate their spirits in Wyoming.

I should like to ask two questions. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming stated that we could not cut these appropriations below \$390,000,000, because authorizations had been made in advance. I should like to ask him who made those authorizations—the Public Roads Administration or the United States Congress.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The United States Congress made the authorizations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In previous years.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. Then the Public Roads Administration, carrying out the authorization and carrying out the provisions of the appropriation acts, incurred the obligations with the States to which the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has alluded.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then do I correctly understand the Senator from Wyoming

to say that once an authorization has been made, the Congress must appropriate sums in equal amount?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course not.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is obvious that an authorization does not bind us to make an appropriation in equal amount.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course I did not say that. But I say that when the Government of the United States assumes an obligation, it should meet the obligation. The Senator from Illinois should not confuse the word "obligation" with the word "authorization."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I can slap my hands together as loudly as the Senator from Wyoming can; and I shall say in reply that if we are going to try to reduce expenses, this is the place to begin to do it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this is the place in which to begin to create unemployment and to reduce business, if that is what Senators desire to do.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming whether the question asked by the able junior Senator from Wyoming is quite to the point. He spoke of our taking in more money from gasoline taxes than we pay out in expenditures on public roads, and I thought he inferred that the gasoline taxes are earmarked for public-road construction.

I have always thought that our revenue system is one in which all revenues go into the general Treasury and are mixed together, and are not specifically earmarked for special purposes.

I submit that the question is not how much we take in from gasoline taxes, as compared with how much we spend for roads, but the question is the general fiscal situation of the Government.

I know that making appropriations for public roads is a very popular thing, and I know that any Member of Congress who proposes to cut appropriations for public roads loses votes. I know that perfectly well. But if we are going to try to reduce expenses, I submit we need more than a 2½-percent cut in appropriations.

I shall not ask for a yea-and-nay vote on this amendment; I shall not try to put any Member of the Senate on the spot. But I shall move to strike out the addition proposed by the committee and permit to stand the amount of the appropriation made by the House of Representatives. I now make that as a motion.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Illinois that it is not necessary for him to make such a motion. All he has to do is vote against the committee amendment. The amendment provides for the increase which has been under discussion. All the Senator needs to do is to vote "no."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I wish to say that I cannot agree with the junior Senator from

Illinois when he says this is one place where economies can be made. Ours is a growing economy, Mr. President. We have a greater population today than we had at the conclusion of the war. At the conclusion of the war there was a deficit in highway construction because of the fact that during the war we had to forego such construction. Considerable amounts of State funds are waiting for matching funds on the part of the Federal Government for the construction of roads.

We must construct highways. We must construct highways that are needed in the United States, not only in my State, but in every other State of the Union. The highway system which this fund will assist in building is not only one which aids and strengthens our economy, but it aids us in the safety measures we must take, in case we ever again are confronted with a situation comparable to the one we have just experienced during the years of the recent war.

I say this is a very worthy appropriation, Mr. President. If we attempt to bring about economy here, it will be a short-sighted step.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I wish to say that I was in the House of Representatives many years ago—in 1915 or 1916, as I recall—when the first Federal-aid road bill was enacted into law. Mr. MacDonald, the present head of the Public Roads Administration, has been with that administration all along, and during most of his service with it he has been its head. It is one agency of the Government which, so far as I can recall, has never been subjected to any real criticism. I cannot recall ever having heard any real criticism of it. The money appropriated for this purpose has been wisely and beneficially spent. It has probably done more good than has any other expenditure, in the way of contributing to the growth and prosperity of the Nation and the happiness of the people. The bills by which funds have been appropriated for this purpose probably have contributed more to the happiness and prosperity of the people than has any other bill ever passed by the Congress.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will vote for the small increase that is recommended in this case by the committee, as compared with the amount of the appropriation made by the House of Representatives. I think it is wise. I think it is the best thing possible for the people of the United States at this time. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like to say that I certainly hope the Senate will agree to the committee amendment. Funds for roads are definitely needed.

In Idaho, with the Republican State administration, we find that the situation is—as it usually is when we have a Republican administration—that the roads are in deplorable shape. [Laugh-

ter.] In fact, the roads in Idaho are so bad that when Bing Crosby went across the State recently, he said he did not see how Lewis and Clark ever crossed the State at all. [Laughter.]

So if the Senator from Illinois will stop and think for a moment, I am sure he will realize that, as a Democrat, he does not wish to add to the troubles we already have in Idaho because of the Republican State administration. Certainly we should vote to add at least these funds to the amounts available for building roads.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

SEVERAL SENATORS. The yeas and nays, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are requested.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Did not the Chair rule?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair ruled that the amendment was agreed to. However, inasmuch as the yeas and nays were previously requested, and now have been additionally requested, without objection, the vote by which the amendment was agreed to will be reconsidered. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. President.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the amendment upon which we are about to vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the committee amendment in line 14, on page 31.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] are absent on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is necessarily absent.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is absent by leave of the Senate.

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

present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea."

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 20, as follows:

YEAS—61

Alken	Hunt	Mundt
Cain	Ives	Murray
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	O'Connor
Cordon	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Downey	Kerr	Pepper
Dulles	Kilgore	Russell
Ecton	Langer	Saltonstall
Fulbright	Lodge	Smith, Maine
George	Long	Sparkman
Gillette	Lucas	Stennis
Green	McCarran	Taft
Gurney	McCarthy	Taylor
Hayden	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Hendrickson	McKellar	Thye
Hickenlooper	Magnuson	Wiley
Hill	Maybank	Withers
Hoey	Miller	Young
Holland	Millikin	
Humphrey	Morse	

NAYS—20

Bricker	Ferguson	Martin
Bridges	Flanders	Robertson
Butler	Jenner	Schoeppel
Byrd	Kem	Vandenberg
Capewhart	Knowland	Wherry
Donnell	McMahon	Williams
Douglas	Malone	

NOT VOTING—15

Anderson	Frear	Smith, N. J.
Baldwin	Graham	Thomas, Okla.
Brewster	McFarland	Tobey
Eastland	McGrath	Tydings
Ellender	Reed	Watkins

So the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Community Facilities," on page 34, line 9, after the figures "\$367,000", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That the foregoing limitation of \$4,000,000 for administrative expenses is reduced to \$3,800,000."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be divided.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, there is a mistake in the submission of the amendment. There are two amendments here, one dealing with water pollution, in two items, and there is another in lines 10 and 11, which has to do with the proviso. It has nothing to do with water pollution. That is a separate amendment, and I think it should be disposed of first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 34, beginning in line 9, it is proposed to strike out the words "Provided, That the foregoing limitation of \$4,000,000 for administrative expenses is reduced to \$3,800,000."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am interested in the next amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 34, beginning in line 12, to strike out down

to and including line 2, on page 35, as follows:

Grants for plan preparation, water pollution control: For grants to States, municipalities, or interstate agencies to aid in financing the cost of action preliminary to the construction of projects for water pollution control as authorized by section 8 (c) of the Water Pollution Control Act of June 30, 1948 (62 Stat. 1155), \$400,000.

Administrative expenses, water pollution control: For expenses necessary to carry out the administrative functions of the Federal Works Agency under the provisions of the Water Pollution Control Act of June 30, 1948 (62 Stat. 1155), as authorized by section 8 (e) of said act, including personal services in the District of Columbia; travel; hire of passenger motor vehicles; health service programs as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); and exchange of books; \$100,000.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I desire to oppose the committee amendment. The committee has stricken out all the money provided for the financing of grants-in-aid to cities, States, and other subdivisions, in connection with the administration of the Stream Pollution Act. The committee has entirely eliminated the money which is to be used for grants to States, and it has also eliminated all the administrative expenses of the Public Works Administration to administer the act, although the administration had \$75,000 last year and is proceeding in a very preliminary way with the administration of the act.

The Stream Pollution Act was passed last year. I think it was sponsored jointly by the then Senator from Kentucky, now the Vice President, and myself, and I think it was finally passed after approximately 10 years' effort, or 20 years' effort. I do not recall how long it may have been. In any event, it was finally passed by Congress and simply provides for Federal cooperation. There are loans authorized, but no grants except for this one purpose. The pollution of our rivers and our harbors in all parts of the country has steadily increased. Not only has there been a substantial and steady increase in sewage in the rivers but there has been a steady increase in industrial waste which, throughout all the industrial sections of the country, is threatening to make the water practically undrinkable and is interfering seriously with the development of all water projects. It is also interfering seriously with the health of the people.

The committee struck this provision out on the ground that it was a new program. The only thing in the committee's report with relation to it is a statement to the effect that the committee is of the opinion that the work can readily be postponed without serious consequences.

The amount of money involved is small and it is not a case in which the work can be postponed. It is not like starting on a new project to improve something which we have had for a long time. It involves the whole field of water pollution, as to which conditions are becoming constantly worse. We are much worse off than we were 5 years ago. Unless we begin this work promptly, the rivers and harbors throughout the Nation will steadily deteriorate. The entire elimi-

nation of these two provisions will postpone the whole program for a year. The amount involved is really for preliminary work.

In one sense it is not a State-aid program, because the Federal Government itself is made a partner under the terms of the law, and properly so. The Federal Government has a direct interest in interstate streams, and without Federal cooperation it is almost impossible to secure the necessary result.

Take, for instance, the city of Cincinnati, which is located in the southwest corner of the State of Ohio. All the sewage of the city flows into the States of Indiana and Kentucky. Naturally, there is no particular incentive on our part to stop the pollution in other States. On the other hand, the water of the Ohio River at Cincinnati is completely polluted by the industrial waste put into it higher up, in West Virginia and in Kentucky. So it is a matter in which the Federal Government has an interest, and in which it was properly made a partner. It is receiving the full cooperation of the States. There are various interstate compacts. There are 10 States, from Virginia to Illinois, which have entered into a compact and are taking joint action in connection with the project, but they cannot accomplish the desired result without the help of the Federal Government. Last year the Congress thoroughly approved of the program by the passage of the bill. I feel, therefore, that there is no reason to delay the program.

I should be perfectly willing to have the final amount settled in conference, but I think the committee should at least be willing to restore some part of the appropriation. I do not think we should stop the work started in the administration of the program under the Public Works Agency. I do not think we should completely turn down the proposal for the assistance of States and localities in working out the plans necessary for a comprehensive survey, because it does not do any good to operate in only one State or one city; there must be a complete program. The Federal Government serves a very useful purpose by being a partner and proceeding with the work.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan knows the importance of this particular item, because of his knowledge of the waters of the Great Lakes. I wonder whether the Senator from Ohio would feel it would be satisfactory if the Senate would agree to take to conference an appropriation of \$200,000?

Mr. TAFT. I suggest that. If the committee would be willing to take \$200,000 on the first item and one-half on the other, and let the matter be worked out in conference, I would be agreeable.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Ohio if the appropriation which he seeks would serve

to construct facilities to prevent pollution of water, or if the appropriation which he is requesting would be simply to aid in the preparation of additional plans.

Mr. TAFT. The first item is under 8 (c) of the Water Pollution Control Act. The total sum authorized in that bill was \$1,000,000. The budget reduced it to \$500,000, and the House reduced that amount to \$400,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it for the preparation of plans?

Mr. TAFT. That is all. It is for grants to States, municipalities, or interstate agencies to aid in financing the cost of action preliminary to the construction of projects for water pollution control, including architectural and economic investigations, studies, surveys, designs, the drawing of plans and specifications, and other actions preliminary to the starting of the entire program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Was the Senator from Ohio in the Chamber earlier in the afternoon when the Senator from Michigan made a very eloquent attack upon the spending of additional sums of money for the preparation of plans? I listened to him with a great deal of interest and approval, and I am somewhat surprised that that Senator from Ohio now proposes an additional appropriation of \$400,000 for further plans.

Mr. TAFT. It is not a WPA or relief proposition or a make-work program. It is a proposal to get an over-all plan started for the elimination of stream pollution throughout the United States. The Federal Government has just as much interest in it as have the States. The Federal Government comes in as a full partner. The streams which are involved are interstate streams, in which the Federal Government is as much interested as are the States and cities themselves. Therefore it seems to me, Congress having approved the entire policy, that we should not now suddenly undertake, through failure to appropriate, to reverse a policy established at the last session of Congress. Whatever is reasonable is satisfactory to me. I suggest that half the amount might be considered, and the exact amount worked out in conference. That would be entirely agreeable to me if it is agreeable to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the Seventy-ninth Congress provided for cooperative action between the Federal Government and the localities in the preparation of plans to guard against stream pollution?

Mr. TAFT. The Eightieth Congress.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Was there not an act in the Seventy-ninth Congress?

Mr. TAFT. No. We tried to get it through, and my recollection is we got it through the Senate, but it was held up in the House, in the Seventy-ninth Congress and also in the Seventy-eighth.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I wish to emphasize what has been said by my colleague in regard to the necessity of beginning the plans for prevention of stream pollution. It has been a serious problem in our State, as the President of the Senate well knows. We started the movement between Kentucky, Ohio,

Pennsylvania, and Illinois, some 10 or 15 years ago, which resulted finally in an interstate compact, which Virginia joined last year, I believe, at the urgent insistence of the two Senators from Virginia.

The situation is more serious than most people realize. In the city of Cincinnati, the home city of my colleague, at the present time three-quarters of every gallon of water that goes through the water system has been previously through sewerage systems in cities to the north and to the east of Cincinnati in the Ohio River Valley. If it were not for the neutralizing acid waste from the industrial firms in the great industrial centers of Pittsburgh, Youngstown, Wheeling, and other cities, we would be facing a very serious epidemic situation every year along the Ohio River.

In years gone by I have participated in the contest involving the city of Chicago, the home of the Senator from Illinois who has just made his comments on this matter. They were dumping into the Illinois River, through the drainage canal, millions of gallons of sewage every hour of every day of the year.

A serious situation is being created on the streams of our country, and the local communities seem unwilling, or may be incapable, of solving the problem in the interest of public health and welfare.

It was even necessary to take the city of Chicago to the Supreme Court at least twice in contempt proceedings in order to get them to comply with the mandate of the court fixing the amount of water that could be drained from the Great Lakes to wash out the sewage from the city of Chicago.

The States have been unwilling or unable to cope with this situation, and a movement has been started, through an interstate compact in the Ohio River Valley, which promises much for the health and welfare of the communities.

I join with my colleague in urging that the program be continued.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Ohio has made certain references to the city from which I come. Is the Senator from Ohio aware of the fact that the Sanitary District of Chicago is floating bonds of several hundred million dollars, and that now it has virtually eliminated the dumping of sewage, that we have gone to great expense to deal with this situation, as we should have done, and that therefore the Senator from Ohio is bringing up something that is 20 years old, and which has been virtually rectified in the period since that to which he referred?

Mr. BRICKER. The situation has not been completely rectified, and it was necessary for the lake States to take the city of Chicago to the Supreme Court of the United States to enforce a mandate of the court. The city was cited for contempt of the mandate of the Supreme Court. The lake States have engaged in joint efforts to compel local communities to do the things which are necessary to be done in the interest of public health, but which they are unable to do without assistance.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not a fact that the city of Chicago has complied fully with the mandate of the Supreme Court? I do not like these left-handed aspersions on my city.

Mr. BRICKER. It is neither left-handed nor an aspersion. It is a statement of fact. If the Senator has lived there as long as I think he has, he ought to remember well that the city was cited three times for contempt by the Supreme Court. I tried one of the cases myself, and we got an order out of the Supreme Court holding the city guilty of contempt.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sure the Senator from Ohio, to be perfectly honest—and he is perfectly honest—should complete his statement by saying that the city of Chicago has fully complied with the decisions of the Supreme Court, and I want the Record to show that.

Mr. BRICKER. After two or three citations they have complied.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this bill does not provide for the Federal Government to put up any money in large sums to build sewage-disposal plants. It merely provides that it shall help make the plans. It then provides that it shall make loans of small amounts. The city of Cincinnati is spending \$17,000,000 on its sewage-disposal projects, and the plans will be prepared by that city, but in order that the activities may be coordinated, and in order that remedial steps, particularly where there is uncontrolled industrial waste, may be taken by the smaller communities, which are located throughout all the Ohio River sections, it is absolutely essential there should be some Federal participation.

The distinguished Vice President, who now presides over the Senate, and I am certain he will bear me out in my statements.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to everything the Senator from Ohio has said, and he has made a most persuasive argument. The Congress of the United States has authorized this expenditure, and it ought to be made.

Mr. President, I made that same argument yesterday and today over and over again. The Senator from Ohio and his colleagues upon the other side marshalled together in a solid phalanx to say "No, we want to economize."

Appropriation after appropriation has been recommended by the Committee on Appropriations to enable the Government agencies to carry out obligations imposed upon them by law, and Senators rise on the other side of the aisle and say, "No; these obligations should not be carried out. We must economize. Are we not hurrying on to deficit spending? Why, then, should we spend another dollar that can now be saved?"

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly I yield to the amiable leader of the budget cutters, the amiable, the able, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, who says, "Let us not engage in deficit spending. Let us forget the obligations which Congress has imposed by law upon the executive agencies, and let us cut

off the appropriations so that we may make a record vote."

I yield, of course, and most gladly.

Mr. BRIDGES. I merely want to say to the Senator that he attributed the economy move to this side of the aisle, and I wish to take credit on this side of the aisle for calling for all the votes, but may I point out that we have had some very able help from the other side of the aisle.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator misunderstood me. I do not give the credit to the Senator from New Hampshire for economy. I say the Committee on Appropriations deserves the credit for economies, because I say to the Senator from New Hampshire that many of the votes which he cast here today and yesterday to reduce expenditures were not in the interest of economy and not in the interest of saving money for the taxpayers, but were in the interest only of postponing to some future date the obligations which the Government imposed by law.

Oh, no, I do not give the Senator from New Hampshire any credit at all for seeking to economize. The Senator from New Hampshire is making a record. He is calling for yea-and-nay votes. He is calling for them now so as to make a record and go before the people and say, "See how we have saved the money of the taxpayers," because he well knows that memories are short, and that next year or the year after, or perhaps in the closing months of this session, when we pass the deficiency appropriation bills, we will be putting in the very items which are now being cut out.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. Oh, Mr. President, I say the Senator from Ohio made a very persuasive argument. It is true that the law under which this appropriation was asked by the President of the United States in his budget message was the result of a bill introduced jointly by the present distinguished Vice President of the United States, who was then a Senator from Kentucky, and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the head of the policy committee of the Republican Party.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will yield in a moment. The bill was introduced in order to meet a very serious problem of water pollution. There can be no doubt, as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has said, that the correction of water pollution by one municipality will do no good at all with respect to water pollution as it affects another city farther up the stream. The water pollution must be fought upon all the interstate streams of the United States. There is no question about that. It is an interstate problem.

I am merely pointing out, Mr. President, the inconsistency, and I am saying this in the hope that if I yield upon this matter, if I accede to the request and grant my acquiescence to an appropriation for \$200,000 for this matter, in the remainder of the consideration of this bill both Senators from Ohio, the senior Senator and the junior Senator, and other Senators who are talking so elo-

quently in behalf of Federal spending for water pollution, may give a little credit to the Senator from Wyoming for the recommendations which he makes in the Senate on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I now yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. A few moments ago, in the course of the remarks of the Senator from Wyoming, he made a remark which gave me a very great deal of concern. He used the phrase "in the closing month." There was an "s" on the end of that word; "In the closing months of this session." I should like to know if that is official.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is nothing official about anything I say, save when I speak for the Appropriations Committee on the independent offices appropriation bill, and then I officially speak in the interests of efficiency and economy and the discharge of public responsibilities.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator proposed to make a deal with me. Perhaps I could make a deal with him. I am willing to accept 45 percent of the budget figure on this item, and half the House figure. Is the Senator willing to make the same allowance on his side?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I object to the distinguished Senator's making any deals on the floor of the Senate. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAFT. I object to a complete elimination of the project. I think it is a very different and distinct matter when the committee entirely eliminates a project which has already been started. I will never vote to cut any of the appropriations presented by the Senator, on behalf of the Appropriations Committee, below half of the House figure. Will the Senator accept my suggestion?

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I listened to the remarks of the able Senator from Wyoming and to the rather severe remarks he made. Does the Senator not recall that some old Senator wise in the ways of the world said sometime ago that there are times when a man has to rise above principle?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I could tell a funny story about that which I heard from the tongue of the distinguished Senator from Vermont who, when he was visiting the city of Philadelphia during a presidential campaign not so long ago was riding in a taxicab from the railroad station to the hotel, and, in accordance with custom he, if I understood the story correctly, spoke to the taxicab driver to inquire of him what was going to happen in the presidential election. The taxicab driver said, "Why, Roose-

velt will carry Philadelphia." "How can that be?" asked the Senator from Vermont. "Is not Philadelphia a Republican city?" "Yes," said the taxicab driver, "and I am a Republican. But there comes a time when we have got to do our duty and vote right and forget principle." [Laughter.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. May the Chair inquire what is before the Senate at the moment?

Mr. TAFT. I asked the Senator from Wyoming whether he would be willing to restore the amount to about perhaps half the figure and take it to conference.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If I were to follow the pattern which has been set for me by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] I would say, "Let us have the yeas and nays from this question. Let us put it to the test. Let us have the vote." I am not going to do that, Mr. President. I say that as the representative of the Appropriations Committee upon the floor I must point out to the Senate that here is an expenditure which is altogether new. Because it was a new expenditure, because we have not fought with stream pollution throughout the history of the Government on the Federal front, the committee said, "We will let that appropriation go to the next Congress, or into the future." I suggest that the Senator from Ohio offer his amendment and let the amendment be presented to the Senate. The amendment before the Senate, of course, is the committee amendment which strikes out the whole item.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in the committee amendment on page 34, line 17, I offer an amendment to strike out "\$400,000" and to insert "\$200,000"; and on page 35, line 2, to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$50,000."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And to restore the other language.

Mr. TAFT. The amendment would have to be, I take it, first to amend and then to reject the committee amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. I will say that the committee amendment strikes out all the language from line 12, on page 4, to line 2, on page 35. The Senator is asking for the rejection of the committee amendment with the understanding that he will offer an amendment including the House language, and substituting \$200,000 for \$400,000, in line 17, on page 34, and substituting \$50,000 for \$100,000 in line 2 on page 35.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. I thought perhaps the better way would be to offer the amendment to strike out \$400,000 and insert \$200,000 and in the next paragraph to strike out \$100,000 and insert \$50,000, and then to offer an amendment to reject the committee amendment. However, that is immaterial.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is immaterial.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The suggestion of the Senator from Ohio would be the most direct way to reach it.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. I offer the amendment to the committee amendment, in line 17, on page 34, to strike out "\$400,000" and insert "\$200,000"; and on page 35, line 2, to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$50,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was rejected.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator from Ohio intend to offer the amendment which he offered in the committee for the construction of a research laboratory at Cincinnati?

Mr. TAFT. No; I shall not offer that amendment at this time. The authorization bill is so confused that I think the amendment involves questions which have to wait, I think, until next year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General Accounting Office," on page 35, line 5, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "\$31,743,000" and insert "\$34,169,000."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this is an amendment dealing with the General Accounting Office. The amendment increases the appropriation from \$31,743,000 to \$34,169,000. It provides for an increase in personnel over the House figure of 800 individuals. I think it speaks for itself. The General Accounting Office is a very important office. Generally speaking it does a good job. There is no need of increasing the personnel over the House figure by 800 individuals. I hope the Senate amendment will be rejected, and that we will return to the House figure.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, how soon I am rewarded for my acquiescence. Here is an amendment which has been put in the bill by the committee at the request of the General Accounting Office, which is, in fact, an arm of the Congress of the United States, which is equipped to conduct independent investigations of the obligations which the Government of the United States must meet.

This is an office which saves the United States Treasury millions of dollars every year. When the Comptroller General appeared before our committee he pointed out that it was the first time in his official career as head of the General Accounting Office that he had appeared before any committee of Congress to ask for an increased appropriation. His testimony before us was that the reduction made by the House would seriously cripple the work of the General Accounting Office.

I sincerely urge the Senator from New Hampshire not to insist upon a vote on this amendment. The committee was unanimous with respect to this item, as it was with respect to the succeeding amendment. This is an expenditure definitely and clearly in the interest of economy, because it enables the General Accounting Office to meet the task which is thrust upon it by the great obligations of expenditure which this Government must meet. I hope the Senator from

New Hampshire will withdraw his resistance to this amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I hope that this appropriation for the General Accounting Office may be approved as reported by the committee. Under Public Law 601, the Reorganization Act, the Congress put seven duties upon the General Accounting Office. This additional appropriation, as I understand—or a part of it, at least—is to enable the General Accounting Office to carry out those duties under section 206 of the act of August 2, 1946, which it is supposed to do in accordance with the directions of the Congress. I think the General Accounting Office has been very zealous in doing its best to see that the intent of the Congress is carried out in the matter of expenditure by the executive agencies. I do not think it can be too zealous in that respect. I hope that the full appropriation recommended by the committee will be approved.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me say that this committee amendment is under the budget by \$1,101,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, there is no single governmental agency or department for which I have greater respect than I have for the General Accounting Office. I think it has done a wonderful job. I recognize it as an arm of Congress, and I feel that we should give it the proper amount of money.

On the other hand, I am reminded of the fact that 62 Members of this body have signed a petition calling on the President of the United States to cut appropriations. We have asked that they be cut a minimum of 5 percent. In drafting that resolution we did not exempt a single one of the Federal-aid programs, with many of which we were sympathetic. We did not except the General Accounting Office. We did not except anything. We merely called upon the President of the United States to cut the over-all budget 5 percent.

I say that if we mean what we say, if we want the budget cut 5 percent, then we should vote accordingly. If we do not want it cut 5 percent, or if we want to make exceptions, let us merely vote for the appropriations and do away with the resolution. I do not see any point in standing before the people and saying that we want to cut the budget 5 percent if we do not want to answer these roll calls.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is aware, is he not, that this bill represents a reduction of 5.2 percent below the budget? In other words, we have already made the cut.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I recognize that, but I point out the fact that that same excuse has been used in connection with the other votes. The resolution to which I referred was placed in the RECORD on June 28, 6 or 7 months after the budget was figured. We did not call on the President to cut 5 percent below the budget. We asked him to cut 5 percent below what we as Members of Congress have the nerve to stand up and vote for.

I do not believe that we should be unnecessarily hard on the General Accounting Office. Instead of calling for the defeat of the committee amendment, I ask the Senator from New Hampshire if he will accept a modification calling for a flat 5 percent reduction in the General Accounting Office budget, which would be in line with what 62 Members of the Congress have said they want to do. I wonder if the Senator from New Hampshire would be willing to go along with a flat 5 percent cut below the \$34,169,000, which would be placing upon the General Accounting Office exactly what we are calling upon the President to place upon not only the General Accounting Office, but all other departments of the Government.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am willing to go along with the suggestion of the Senator from Delaware. I think that would allow the General Accounting Office a modest increase, along the line of what the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Delaware have suggested. That would arrive at a figure of \$32,460,550, rather than an item of \$31,743,000, as in the House figure. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment on page 35, line 5, to strike out the figure in the committee amendment, "\$34,169,000", and insert the figure "\$32,460,550", which would represent a 5-percent cut in the appropriation recommended by the committee. That would mean that we would be voting to carry out exactly what we are calling upon the President of the United States to do, because we did not except the General Accounting Office at that time, regardless of how much respect we have for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 35, line 5, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out "\$34,169,000" and insert "\$32,460,550."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the committee amendment on page 35, line 5.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think the views of the junior Senator from Florida on the various proposed economy amendments will stand up in comparison with those of almost any other Senator. I am perfectly willing to have them compared with the views of any other economy-minded Senator. In connection with this matter, I think we would be practicing false economy if we were to reduce the amount recommended by the committee.

This year I had the experience of serving as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate. That committee was engaged in an earnest effort to find out just what the financial situation of the Commodity Credit Corporation funds, vital as they are to agriculture in this Nation, might be.

We examined representatives of the General Accounting Office. I am sure

that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and other Senators on the other side of the aisle who, like myself, are members of that particular committee, will remember this instance.

This fund amounts to more than \$4,000,000,000 a year, as I recall. Notwithstanding the fact that it is so vital to agriculture, and to the Nation as a whole, and notwithstanding the fact that it is a fund with respect to which we ought to be able to get quick and certain information as to the details of its handling, notwithstanding the fact that there were no charges of fraud and no questions of that nature to disturb the committee, but only a desire to find out what were the actual facts with reference to the handling of that fund, we were amazed to find that the General Accounting Office was 3 years behind in the auditing of that fund, and that it was working just as hard as it could with the personnel it had which could be assigned to that particular objective. Notwithstanding that fact, as I recall, they were then working on the year 1945.

We were unable to get up to date information as to the handling of that important fund. It was necessary for the committee to have such information, if it could get it, in order that we might intelligently act upon legislation then pending before us with reference to certain changes which were suggested in the functioning of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

I note that since I began these remarks the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] has entered the chamber. He likewise serves on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

When an arm of the Government which was created to inform and advise the Congress on the technical subject of how the funds of the United States are being handled by the executive agencies of government reports to us, as it did on that occasion, that it is simply unable to cope with a problem of that magnitude with the personnel which it has, and very earnestly implores members of the Appropriations Committee to assist in making available a larger staff so that that heavy problem can be handled adequately, I say to the Senate that it is poor economy to turn a deaf ear to a request of that kind coming from an agency which, I repeat, is created out of the wisdom of Congress and because of a sincere effort of Congress to be well advised as to how the finances of the people of the United States are being handled.

So I strongly hope the committee's recommendation on this matter, already reflecting, as it does, a reduction of more than 5 percent below the amount of the budget figures, will not be turned down, but, to the contrary, will be agreed to, so that it may be said that the Senate has, at least in large part, recognized the justice of the request for additional personnel for the arm of the Government created by the Congress to serve and advise us in this important field.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it is quite evident that we cannot reach a decision on this matter without having a quorum call. I hesitate to suggest the absence of a quorum at this time, because

the Appropriations Committee was summoned to meet at 5 o'clock to consider the continuing resolution which now is necessary and also to discuss the ECA bill. Inasmuch as the majority leader announced earlier in the day that at 6 o'clock, which is only half an hour from now, he would move to have a recess taken until 8 o'clock this evening, I ask the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania if he thinks it would be agreeable to take a recess now, half an hour earlier.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is reminded that an order was entered that the Senate take a recess at 6:30. That was ordered by unanimous consent.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, let me suggest to the Senator from Wyoming that we postpone the consideration of this amendment, by unanimous consent, and proceed to consider other provisions of the bill.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Wyoming that I have consulted with the majority leader, and he has no objection to the Senator's suggestion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Of course, that could be done only by unanimous consent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, inasmuch as the order has been entered, perhaps the suggestion the Senator from Georgia has made is the proper one to be followed. Obviously I hesitate to suggest the absence of a quorum at this time, for that would take the Members of the Appropriations Committee away from the most important meeting they are having now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the pending amendment will be passed over temporarily; and the clerk will state the next committee amendment.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, before that is done, I should like to ask the Senator to yield for a question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very happy to do so.

Mr. WILEY. I have been very much intrigued with the way the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has fought for the things he thinks are proper in this bill. I am particularly interested in knowing whether among the duties of the General Accounting Office is the duty—if it is not one of its duties, it seems to me the General Accounting Office should have the duty imposed upon it by law—not simply of rendering an accounting, not simply of examining the pro and cons in regard to the expenditure of money, but the function or duty of making recommendations in regard to how the Government can operate more efficiently. Should not that be one of its duties?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a little later in the course of the consideration of this bill it is my intention to call attention to a report which has been filed within the month by the General Accounting Office with respect to the administration of the Maritime Commission. I have read that report. I have found in it what seems to me to be very pertinent and effective suggestions for the improvement of the administration of the operations of the Maritime Commission. That matter involves legisla-

tion. So that does precisely what the Senator from Wisconsin has inquired about.

I have another letter, to which I shall call the attention of the Senate at the appropriate time, with respect to the Veterans' Administration appropriation for the national service life insurance fund. There the General Accounting Office has pointed out to us that an item in the budget, which has been approved by the Appropriations Committee, of \$202,000,000 to pay interest upon the reserve fund out of which the insurance losses are paid, is unnecessary at this time. Although required by law, in the opinion of the General Accounting Office the law should be amended. That matter is under consideration, I think, or will be presently by the appropriate legislative committee. Since the appropriation does not seem to be essential, with the consent of members of the Appropriations Committee whom I have consulted, I am going to ask that \$202,000,000 be cut from the appropriation.

Those are two evidences, within the month, of the valuable work which is done by the General Accounting Office.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Those are two evidences; but there seems to be a general impression, as I think the Senator from Wyoming will agree, that there is a great deal of waste of effort and considerable duplication of effort in many of the departments and agencies of the Government.

I had in mind that various large industries or large industrial concerns employ what are called efficiency experts, men whose job it is, when the income of the particular industry or concern is decreasing and when it cannot balance its budget, to determine where corners can be cut and where efficiency can be injected into the picture.

In the almost 11 years I have served in the Senate, I have not known of such suggestions by any agency of the Government, although the Senator from Wyoming has just given us two instances of that sort.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me give another instance. When the legislative reorganization bill was passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress, it contained a section—section 206, if my memory serves me correctly—providing that it should be the duty of the General Accounting Office to conduct current expenditure analyses in the executive branch of Government. I felt that that was a perfectly splendid recommendation. I was sorry that when Mr. Warren, the Comptroller General, appeared before the joint meeting of the Appropriation Committees at the beginning of the Eightieth Congress, and suggested his willingness to assume this duty, it was deemed not desirable to undertake the work at that time. In any event, it was not done.

But in the consideration of this bill, I offered to the committee an amendment providing for an appropriation of \$800,000. It will be the next amendment but one to be considered. That amendment would authorize the General Accounting Office to conduct these current expenditure analyses. I offered the

amendment in the belief that we could get much better economy and a much more intelligent view of what is the expenditure situation in the executive departments of the Government by not only clothing the General Accounting Office with the power—as we have done in the Legislative Reorganization Act—but also equipping it with the personnel to enable it to do that work. I trust that when that item comes before the Senate, as it will in a few minutes, it will have the support of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I have nothing but respect for the Senator's judgment, and I think he speaks very well on this subject.

Of course there is a vast difference between an accountant's job and the job of one who can take the facts as he sees them and can observe the personnel on the job and can see where efficiency can be injected into the picture. Probably I have not made the differentiation sufficiently clear.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Wisconsin has made it very clear, and that was precisely what was in my mind when I discussed the matter with Mr. Warren and, I may say, with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who is in complete accord with this amendment. So we wrote into the amendment this proviso:

Provided, That the Comptroller General of the United States is authorized to employ all personnel under this appropriation without regard to the civil-service laws, rules, and regulations.

The purpose was to enable the Comptroller General to secure employees who could sit down with the heads of the agencies. The purpose was to give him the authority to employ, not bookkeepers or accountants alone, but persons who understood bookkeeping and accounting and all of that, but who also had a much broader view of the responsibilities of Government and of the problems of management in a big enterprise.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, there has been a rule in Government, as the Senator well knows, by which the salaries in certain agencies have gone up in accordance with the number of personnel employed. What we need is an efficiency expert to go into an agency to see whether employees are falling over one another, or whether there are employees who do not seem to have work to perform. We need, of course a checking of accounts to see that money is properly disbursed and proper dollar value is received, but, if we are really running into a period when there must be a curtailment of overhead, the curtailment should be brought about in the places where the taxpayer's dollar is not earning a dollar's worth in return. I cannot speak from my own experience, but I have had brought to my attention a number of instances in which businessmen have returned from bureaus and departments and told of employees sitting around, smoking cigarettes, and doing nothing. I personally knew of one instance concerning a girl who resigned

some years ago after sitting around for 5 months, during which time one letter was dictated to her. Her conscience would not permit her to continue in the position. Those are things I have in mind. I do not know whether they are generally prevalent or not, but I think the Congress owes an obligation, with the increasing public debt, to see that the General Accounting Office understands that its function—if it is its function—is not simply to check accounts, but to employ efficiency personnel to see whether the Government is operating efficiently.

RECESS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is what would be done by the amendment.

Mr. President, while I have been standing here, engaging in this colloquy with the Senator from Wisconsin and others, numerous Senators have come to me, indicating they are going off the floor to have a little supper, dinner, or whatever they may want at this time.

Mr. WILEY. Who is buying it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Apparently, themselves.

Mr. President, there seems to be no profit in continuing the session at the moment, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may stand in recess until 8 o'clock, as was originally intended.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator mean, until the time we were originally supposed to come back?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct—until the time set, 8 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.), the Senate took a recess until 8 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION

On the expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the Vice President.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hill	Morse
Anderson	Hoey	Mundt
Baldwin	Holland	Murray
Brewster	Humphrey	Myers
Bricker	Hunt	Neely
Bridges	Ives	O'Connor
Butler	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Chapman	Kefauver	Saitonstall
Connally	Kem	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Kilgore	Sparkman
Douglas	Knowland	Stennis
Downey	Langer	Taft
Dulles	Lodge	Taylor
Ecton	Long	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	McCarran	Thye
Flanders	McCarthy	Tobey
Fulbright	McClellan	Vandenberg
George	McKellar	Watkins
Graham	McMahon	Wherry
Green	Magnuson	Wiley
Gurney	Malone	Williams
Hayden	Martin	Withers
Hendrickson	Maybank	Young
Hickenlooper	Millikin	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. House bill 4177, the independ-

ent offices appropriation bill, is before the Senate.

CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside so that I may report a joint resolution from the Appropriations Committee and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Tennessee temporarily to lay aside the pending appropriation bill? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. From the Committee on Appropriations, I report favorably with an amendment the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 329) amending an act making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1950, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 804) thereon.

The House has passed this joint resolution continuing the pay of certain Government employees for the next 31 days, to August 31, 1949. The Senate committee has placed in the joint resolution an amendment to strike out "August 31, 1949," and insert in lieu thereof "August 15, 1949." I now ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution, so it may be acted upon tonight, because it will have to go to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 329) amending an act making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1950, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, to strike out "August 31, 1949" and insert "August 15, 1949."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 329) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. THOMAS of OKLAHOMA, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. GURNEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4177) making appropriations for the executive office and sundry independent executive bureaus,

boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the committee amendment on page 35, line 5.

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. Mr. President, the committee recommended that the appropriation for salaries in the General Accounting Office should be raised from \$31,743,000, as passed by the House, to \$34,169,000. The argument was made in support of this increase that the General Accounting Office is an arm of the Congress, that its function is to audit the Government accounts, and make recommendations to the Congress. The committee felt that the increase should be granted.

Before the recess I pointed out that the Comptroller General, Mr. Lindsay Warren, appeared before the committee and strongly urged a larger increase than the committee allowed. He pointed out that this was the first time in his experience as Comptroller General that he had appeared before an Appropriations Committee of the Congress asking for an increase in appropriation. The committee was of the opinion that the increase in the appropriation would be money well spent, properly to equip the General Accounting Office to supervise and survey the various expenditures of Government.

Prior to the recess I pointed out that there are before the Senate now, to be presented later in detail, reports and recommendations from the General Accounting Office which will unquestionably save money if they are followed out. For example, there is a letter with respect to the national service life insurance fund raising a legislative question with respect to the appropriation for interest upon the reserve fund. I was so impressed with that letter that it will be my purpose when the item is reached in the consideration of the bill to ask the Senate to follow the recommendation of the Comptroller General. If that is done, it will mean a saving of more than \$202,000,000.

There is also before the committee a report from the General Accounting Office with respect to the operations of the Maritime Commission. This report, which will be filed and made a part of the Record, urges a change of policy with respect to the method by which the differential subsidy under the maritime law is fixed. The Comptroller General and the General Accounting Office have recommended that provision should be made for public hearings when the evidence is taken upon which this differential subsidy is fixed.

The point I make, of course, is that this is evidence of the constructive and economical work performed by the General Accounting Office.

It was testified before the committee that from 1940 down to the time just before our hearings began this year, the General Accounting Office had collected or caused to be collected and paid into the Treasury of the United States more

than \$635,000,000, almost two and one-half times the total cost of the operation of the Office. The collection figure for the last fiscal year was approximately \$107,000,000. For the current fiscal year to April 30 the figure is more than \$76,000,000. So on the record it seems to be perfectly clear that this is a completely justifiable increase of appropriations. Mr. President, that is the recommendation of the committee.

Before the recess the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] made a motion to amend the committee amendment by reducing the sum to \$32,460,556, which I understand was a computation he had made by deducting 5 percent from the budget estimate. My feeling is that the committee amendment should be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the committee amendment on page 35, line 5.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words in reply to the Senator from Wyoming before the vote is taken on the amendment. First, I want to repeat what I said before the recess was taken this evening, namely, that there is not an agency or office in government for which I have a higher respect than the General Accounting Office. On the other hand, that does not mean that we cannot cut appropriations for the General Accounting Office. If we are going to take the attitude that we will cut appropriations 5 percent for all the executive branches of the Government but under no circumstances can we make any cuts in any agency or office that affects the Congress of the United States, then we shall not get very far in the way of reducing appropriations. If we are to make effective cuts in appropriations we should make the cuts apply to all agencies, even though they may affect ourselves.

I agree with the Senator from Wyoming that the recommendations of the Comptroller General are very important to the Congress and would result in saving the Government a great deal of money if the Congress would pay attention to them. But I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the recommendations to which he refers regarding the Maritime Commission, which were included in the letter received from the Comptroller General—and I am glad to note that some attention is being paid to it—were contained in a report submitted to Congress 4 or 5 years ago. I have in my hand now a report on the Maritime Commission, submitted by the Comptroller General and dated June 30, 1945. I may say that I secured this report from the Archives through the Secretary of the Senate. It has never been printed as an official document. It has never been used by the committee, and the Congress paid no attention whatever to it. So I believe that our great concern should be not because the General Accounting Office is not getting more reports to Congress, but because of the inaction of Congress with respect to the reports when they do arrive.

This report calls attention to numerous cases of fraud, overpayments, and charges of other kinds, which may or may not have been turned over to the Department of Justice. I doubt if any other Member of Congress knows. The report was not even recognized to the extent of having it printed. I wish to read a couple of statements from page 5. The report says:

The Commission—

That is, the Maritime Commission—

failed to make reports of cases involving fraud or irregularities to the General Accounting Office in accordance with the requirements of General Accounting Office Regulation No. 50, as amended.

The files of the Maritime Commission in February 1947, disclosed 171 cases of alleged fraud.

The cases are itemized. We in Congress have paid no attention whatsoever to the report. I think instead of talking about increasing the appropriation for the General Accounting Office, which has done a good job with the funds we have been allowing them, we had better pay a little more attention to the reports when they get here, and see that they are put to some use.

I have another report before me which Congress never thought enough of to have printed. This is an official document—

Mr. BRIDGES. How many cases of fraud did the Senator say were cited in the report to which he referred?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I read from the report:

The files of the Maritime Commission in February 1947, disclosed 171 cases of alleged fraud.

I am not saying that some of these cases might not have been clarified. I do not know; but if anyone else knows, I should be glad to be informed.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The reports of the General Accounting Office showing fraud, collusion, wastefulness, and inefficiency in the Maritime Commission date back to 1942, if not earlier than that. So far as I know, no one in the Commission has ever been called to account for any of those things which the General Accounting Office said were done wrongfully, illegally, or wastefully.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think that is correct. We have been letting these reports come up here, and have taken no action.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. One Member of this body who called them to account was the Senator from Vermont [GEORGE AIKEN]. He got very little support in the Senate when the scandals were shown up.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to ask the Senator if he knows that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, under the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], last year went into

the affairs of the Maritime Commission and made a report indicating extravagance, wastefulness, and so forth. Naturally the committee would not go into the criminal actions. They had all been investigated, and it is assumed that they were turned over to the Attorney General. But so far as the Senator from Michigan knows, there has been no check-up to ascertain whether there were prosecutions, or whether the money was ever recovered from the various people.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to read another report which was sent down by the Comptroller General, with regard to the Maritime Commission. This report was submitted on March 31, 1948, and included the period ending June 30, 1947. Mr. Warren said:

There was a lack of adequate control over the expenditures of appropriated funds during the fiscal year 1947, which resulted in at least one instance of payments exceeding the amount appropriated for a specific purpose.

Congress has done nothing about it; yet here a violation of the law was cited to us.

Continuing to read from the report:

The accounting records for the fiscal years 1946 and 1947 have not been completely recorded or adjusted to the facts. On the whole, the accounting records were in even worse condition than in the prior years.

Surely there is nothing wrong with the job which has been done by the GAO on their available funds. They have done their job well without benefit of this proposed increase. We in Congress are the ones who have fallen down.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If I correctly understand the Senator from Delaware, he is arguing that because the General Accounting Office pointed out patent frauds in the administration of the Maritime Commission, the General Accounting Office now should suffer a penalty in the reduction of its appropriation. I desire to point out that largely as a result of the very reports to which the Senator has alluded, not only did the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] bring the matter to the attention of the Senate upon the floor, but the President of the United States has appointed a new head of the Maritime Commission. He has placed General Fleming, who in the Federal Works Agency and in numerous other positions has demonstrated remarkable capacity as an efficient administrator, at the head of the Maritime Commission. I submit that this is no reason for penalizing the General Accounting Office or rejecting the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming what the President did with the man whom he removed from office because he was incompetent. Was he promoted or transferred to some other agency, or was he held responsible for these irregularities?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure I do not know about that. The man removed has not to my knowledge been given any other appointment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think that we should know. Merely appropriating extra money to the GAO will not clear up these corrupt agencies. That is our job.

I should like to read from another report which came from the Comptroller General, and which was never considered of sufficient importance to the Congress to be printed or receive any attention. I have said many times on the floor of the Senate that the corporations and executive agencies of the Government needed some attention by the Congress to see that they were living within the law. We should take some action when any irregularities are called to our attention.

The report on the Commodity Credit Corporation was mentioned by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] this evening. He pointed out that the General Accounting Office was 4 years behind in getting that audit report up here. I wish to point out that that report, according to the statement of the General Accounting Office, was prepared and ready for submission to Congress about the 31st of December 1946; but under the law the General Accounting Office was required to forward it to the Department of Agriculture for verification. It was held in the Department of Agriculture and never returned until sometime this year. The mere addition of extra men in the General Accounting Office will not correct this. What we need is a good housecleaning in the Departments who, according to these reports, are not keeping their records straight.

It is claimed in many of these reports by the GAO that it is not so much because of lack of auditors that they are not getting reports up here as it is lack of cooperation on the part of the executive branches in our Government. In the case of the Commodity Credit Corporation it was stated by Mr. Warren that the primary handicap in rendering the report sooner was lack of cooperation on the part of the Department of Agriculture. In that report we were told that the sum of \$366,000,000 had not been accounted for. Apparently the Members on that side of the aisle are not too much concerned about this discrepancy. The General Accounting Office said that the trouble in auditing the Commodity Credit Corporation was not a shortage of auditors but lack of sufficient appreciation on the part of the managers of the Commodity Credit Corporation of their responsibility even to have books from which a report could be rendered to the taxpayers. The manager of the Corporation did not feel that the Corporation was supposed to make a report, and many of the accounts are still not reconciled. We might add \$100,000,000 to the appropriation for the General Accounting Office, but until the agencies themselves are forced to keep records which can be properly audited, we shall never get an audit that is any good.

Here is another interesting report made by the General Accounting Office, which was submitted to the Senate:

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith for the information of the Senate a report concerning the conversion

of two price-minus contracts between the United States Maritime Commission and Froemming Bros., Inc., to a selective-price contract. The report shows that this action resulted in a financial loss to the Government of nearly \$400,000. The report also shows that by reason of accounting methods employed by the contractor, acquiesced in by the Maritime Commission, a possible saving of over a million dollars was lost to the Government.

Apparently no one thought it was of sufficient importance to do anything about it. The report has been lying in the Archives for the past several months.

Here is another report—

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I regret that I was not in the Chamber when the Senator was speaking about the report with regard to the Maritime Commission, with which I am familiar. I understand that the Senator intimated that it is a report about which no one has done anything.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No—

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to inform the Senate, including the Senator from Delaware, that the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is very familiar with that report. It has been submitted to us within the past 30 days. It is now in the hands of a special subcommittee, which is in process of investigating the entire maritime situation in the United States, including the Maritime Commission.

Also, many of these reports by the General Accounting Office have been submitted to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and from time to time attention has been called to them.

The very fact that the General Accounting Office has done this during the past 3 and 4 years has led, in my opinion, and in the opinion of the committee—I do not speak for all the members of the committee, but I speak for myself in that respect—to a complete revolutionizing of the administration of the Maritime Commission in the past 18 months.

I merely wished to inform the Senator that if he is alluding to the fact that no one has done anything about the report, I can tell him that the report is in process of being combed very thoroughly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What I was pointing out—

Mr. MAGNUSON. Because of the General Accounting Office, many factors have been brought to light. I must admit that there has been a great deal of mismanagement in the Maritime Commission, which the Senate will hear about in due time.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield, and then I will reply to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator from Washington indicate whether any of the 171 cases of fraud alleged in the report have been prosecuted by the Department of Justice?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say that the use of the term "fraud" is somewhat of

a misnomer. Of course, there is such a thing as fraud that can be prosecuted, and then there is mismanagement that can be termed fraud by some persons who are investigating such matters.

Mr. BRIDGES. These were cases of alleged fraud.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator will read the report, I think he will find that as to the 171 cases mentioned, there would be some question in the Senator's mind as to whether there was actual criminal fraud which could be prosecuted.

The General Accounting Office frequently says to the departments, "You have been given funds for purpose A, and the law says they shall be used for purpose A, but you have used the funds for another, quite different purpose."

The funds probably are legally and wisely used; but the minute there is a different interpretation in the General Accounting Office, the term "fraud" is used, because the department in question violates what the General Accounting Office regards as the congressional directive.

In all those cases I doubt whether criminal fraud will be found to appear at any time, even if the cases are thoroughly combed. Of course, we on the committee have gone into them in some detail.

Mr. BRIDGES. At least they involve violations.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Technical violations, possibly, I would say.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield, but I still am waiting to reply to the Senator from Washington myself.

Mr. AIKEN. When I said a little while ago that nothing has been done about these charges on the part of the General Accounting Office against the Maritime Commission, I was not strictly correct, because in the last 3 or 4 years the committees of both the House and the Senate have paid attention to them. Last year our own Committee on Expenditures had a staff of approximately seven or eight people working from the time Congress adjourned until almost the first of January, making management survey, in cooperation with the General Accounting Office. As a result, last summer the Commission began to reorganize.

Unfortunately, the Congress cannot go all the way in bringing these people to account. We do not have authority to take them into court and have them tried in court. I do not know that any of them have ever been called to account by the Department of Justice for the wrongs they have committed, according to the General Accounting Office. But it would not be quite true to say that the Congress has done nothing.

I admit that from the time when I first began to call these reports to the attention of the Senate, for a few years there was very little response to my efforts. But during the last 3 or 4 years, more has been done; and I feel that the Committee on Expenditures, which was really set up 2 years ago for the first time in a workable form, has performed a very valuable function.

I wish to say that since General Fleming has assumed the Chairmanship of the Commission, things have been getting better. However, there is still a great deal of room for improvement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to read into the RECORD again, in order to clarify the point raised by the Senator from Washington, what the General Accounting Office states regarding fraud. What I shall read is not my statement, but the statement received by the Congress from the General Accounting Office:

On page 5 of one of the reports it is stated:

The Commission failed to make reports of cases involving fraud or irregularities to the General Accounting Office in accordance with the requirements of General Accounting Office Regulation No. 50, as amended. The files of the Maritime Commission in February 1947 disclosed 171 cases of alleged fraud.

The General Accounting Office breaks down those cases as follows:

Kick-backs.....	\$100,941.98
Overcharges.....	772,321.12
Commissions.....	55,848.02
Theft of Government property.....	3,338.45
Diversion of labor and/or material.....	17,922.28
Pay-roll padding.....	446,987.73
Irregularities in termination claims.....	282,936.80
Surplus sale irregularities.....	99,643.09
Defective material and equipment.....	332,923.00
Others, miscellaneous.....	76,017.03

Or a total amount of \$2,188,879.50.

There is a footnote by the General Accounting Office to the effect that they think possibly the Government will recover \$1,000,000.

Now I call the attention of the Senator from Washington that what we are discussing here are not mere technical violations.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course what the Senator has been saying is correct. However, that is not a question of fraud for which the Maritime Commission is responsible. What the General Accounting Office is talking about there are cases occurring during the war, during the period of the wartime construction of ships, at which time the Maritime Commission contracted for shipbuilding in the amount of hundreds of millions of dollars. In some cases there might have been a conspiracy between some employees. Of course there were thousands of employees at that time, perhaps employees of the Maritime Commission or perhaps employees of competing contractors.

No doubt those records involve cases where a ship inspector may have done something wrong. All of those are individual cases which have been called to the attention of the prosecuting authorities in the local communities where such things occurred; and in those cases there have been some prosecutions.

If the Senator from Delaware will examine the record, he will find that many cases arising as a result of wartime operations in connection with the

great shipbuilding program were prosecuted. What he has read is absolutely correct.

The great complaint which the General Accounting Office has against the Maritime Commission is that the Congress in a very complex and comprehensive law gave the Maritime Commission certain moneys to be used by it for the construction of ships, for the improvement of ship design, for shipping operations, and for similar operations. The Maritime Commission's interpretation of that law involved a different interpretation than that made by some of the lawyers of the General Accounting Office.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But, Mr. President, I should like to point out that we are not talking about the interpretation of laws. And I doubt very much that the Senator from Washington has even read this report which I have here.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am talking about the Government departments.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Any man in the Maritime Commission, having any position of authority, certainly knows better than to interpret kick-backs, overcharges, thefts of Government property, and similar offenses as minor affairs; if he does not, he is not competent to hold his job.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not think they are minor. But in view of the great amount of shipbuilding which occurred during the war, operations involving hundreds of millions of dollars, I am sure that in some shipyards someone was engaging in some kick-backs, and someone may have been stealing in some way or other, here or there. We found that in practically every activity which was conducted during the war. But that is not the fault of the Maritime Commission or of the General Accounting Office.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am not finding fault with the General Accounting Office. I am congratulating the General Accounting Office on the thoroughness of the job it did in reporting this to the Senate. I still do not know why the appropriate committee has not taken some action.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, I think it did an excellent job on these matters.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Every time irregularities are pointed out in any of the Government agencies, immediately reference is made to the wartime operations, and the war is cited as an excuse for all such irregularities. The war does not excuse fraud.

The report to which I have been referring is accompanied by a letter of April 10, 1947. Again, a letter dated March 31, 1948, together with another report from Mr. Warren, of the General Accounting Office, stated that the books of the Maritime Commission were even in worse shape than they were before in the prior years. Instead of improving, the affairs of the Maritime Commission are getting worse.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator from Delaware is indicting the General Accounting Office and General Lindsay

Warren for failure to have other agencies of the Government carry out their duties.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, Mr. President; on the contrary, I am praising the General Accounting Office for the good work it has done in calling the situation to our attention. If there is any indictment at all, it should be against us as Members of the Congress for our failure to see that the situation was cleared up. I think the General Accounting Office has done a wonderful job, and I might say they did it without the benefit of the increased appropriations now being requested by the committee.

Mr. GEORGE. Then I do not see the relevancy of the Senator's criticisms, when they are presented in connection with an appropriation which is urged for the General Accounting Office. If someone else has been derelict in duty, it is not the responsibility of the General Accounting Office.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The point is this: With the appropriations which have been made to the General Accounting Office in the past, they have been doing a wonderful job, a very much better job than we in Congress have done in following up their recommendations. They have been able to submit reports to us on time. Reports which have not reached us on time from the General Accounting Office have been late as the result of a lack of cooperation on the part of the executive branch of the Government and I submit an increased appropriation for the GAO will not correct that situation.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, what the Senator is saying may be entirely true, but I do not see how that is quite pertinent, when we are called upon to consider an appropriation for a very efficient officer of the Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—
Mr. GEORGE. If the Senator from Delaware will permit, I do not want to interfere with his statement, but let me say to him that I happen to know something about the General Accounting Office. In the first place, I have regarded Mr. Warren, from the time he served in the House, as one of the ablest public servants in the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with the Senator on his ability. But that is not the question upon which we are voting.

Mr. GEORGE. I have not qualified that opinion at all. I wish to remind the Senator, as he must know if he has followed closely the history of the General Accounting Office, that General Warren has not hesitated to take issue even with the Chief Executive, and with every single branch under the President's Cabinet, when the occasion demanded it, many times at his cost. He has been really a fearless public servant.

The Senator is now referring to war-time contracts. I want to make this statement on that point: Shortly before the war came to an end, the Senate authorized the appointment of a special committee on postwar economic policy and planning. A committee was created, and, since I offered the resolution, I was named its chairman. It was a committee of 10 Senators, as I recall, appointed by the Vice President. One of the bills recommended by that commit-

tee to the Congress and passed by the Congress was the Contract Settlement Act, an act for the clearance of plants, for the cancelation of war contracts, and for settlements under war contracts. If I do say so myself—and the credit goes to other members of the committee, not to myself—that was one of the constructive steps that kept this country from really having 8,000,000 unemployed, as Mr. Robert Nathan, who is now making his latest report on steel and on the steel controversy, warned us might happen. Even the Vice President of the United States said we were bound to have an unemployment of 8,000,000, and he thought perhaps more.

The administration of this plant-clearance, war-contract cancelation, Contract Settlement Act, fell very largely into the hands of the Comptroller General of the United States. Of course I cannot go into details at the moment, but I think I should say in behalf of a really great public servant that I have personal knowledge that literally hundreds of millions of dollars were saved upon war contracts through the vigilance and diligence of the Comptroller General and his office.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—
Mr. GEORGE. If the Senator will pardon me, I know that such things as have been mentioned occurred because many of the contractors complained to me, as the head of the committee. In every instance I said, "Make your peace with the Comptroller General. If he is right, and if you are not entitled to full settlement, you should not receive all that you claim." I should not want to make a statement I could not verify, but I unhesitatingly say that hundreds of millions of dollars—I am not sure that it did not run into the billions of dollars—were actually saved.

Whether the Attorney General prosecuted, or whether any other branch of the Government acted, I do not know; but I do know that Mr. Warren and his office, in every case where he thought there was fraud, withheld payment, compelled adjustments, and saved to the Government literally hundreds of millions of dollars on all sorts of war contracts: I think I should make this statement, in justice to Mr. Warren.

I desire now to make another statement. The Comptroller General is distinctly and definitely a creature of the Congress, and is in fact an arm of the Congressional power in the Government, though not exclusively such. Of course he is appointed by the President. He is amenable in certain ways to the Chief Executive, but nevertheless his office and his whole function is to aid and assist the Congress of the United States. If anybody is derelict, it is the Congress, the Senate as well as the Members of the House. Certainly dereliction should not be charged to Mr. Warren. Whether this particular appropriation that is requested is justified entirely, I do not undertake to say; but I do undertake to say it would be most unfair and most unjust to hold General Warren responsible for a failure of the executive branch of the Government, particularly when such action upon our part would constitute

the severest indictment of the legislative branch of the Government that can be imagined or formulated. So, in no event should he be held responsible for our failure.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I do not know whether the Senator was present when I began speaking, but I made it very plain that anything I was saying was in no sense to be interpreted as a criticism of Mr. Warren or the General Accounting Office. There is not a man in the executive branch of the Government for whom I have a higher respect. I agree with everything the Senator from Georgia has said regarding his ability, but just because we respect the man does not mean that we should give him an extra \$3,000,000.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not think the Senator should attempt to cut off his water, then, because somebody else has failed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But, merely because we think a man is doing a wonderful job, does not necessarily mean we cannot cut the appropriation for his office. We still propose to allow him more than he ever had prior to 1942.

Mr. GEORGE. That is true, and I do not think the appropriation is either too large or too great. But I do say that the appropriation should not be reduced for the reasons advanced by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was merely pointing out that the Comptroller General had been doing a wonderful job and that he had been doing that job with the employees he had, and therefore I did not see why the committee should again increase the appropriation for his office \$3,000,000 more than the House considered necessary.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President—
The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.
Mr. O'MAHONEY. I sought to interrupt because of the statement the Senator made at this particular point, namely, that the Comptroller General is doing this work with the staff he has. As a matter of fact, the reports are piling up because he does not have a sufficient staff. That is the statement he personally made to our committee. More than that, the staff of the General Accounting Office—and the Senator from Massachusetts will recall his testimony, I am sure, because he inquired of Mr. Warren—the staff has been reduced by more than 6,000, and if this amendment offered by the committee is rejected, he will have to cut off 1,200 more.

What the Senator from Georgia has said is perfectly accurate. It does not go quite far enough. Not only did the Comptroller General save millions under the Contract Settlement Act; not only did he, since 1940 recover \$635,000,000 by way of collections from accounts; but he was responsible largely for the Government Corporations Act, which was introduced by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and in two instances alone, the Federal Prisons Industries Corporation and the Panama Railroad Corporation, the work of the Comptroller and his staff has resulted in the payment of dividends

amounting to \$22,000,000 to the Government of the United States. I submit it is very poor acknowledgment of remarkable services to cut down the appropriation and the staff of such an able public servant as that.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I want to be sure that I understand the point which the Senator from Delaware is trying to make. I will state the point as I have understood it, and then ask the Senator if I am correct in my understanding.

If I am correct in my understanding, the Senator from Delaware is making the point that the General Accounting Office now is furnishing us with more cases than we follow up.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. FLANDERS. He is asking why we should continue to provide the General Accounting Office with facilities for following up cases much faster than we can pay attention to them. Is that the point the Senator is trying to make?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is the point, plus the fact that the General Accounting Office, to my knowledge, is up to date, as nearly as it could be, on the reports. With respect to the reports as to which it is behind in its work, it is not the fault of the General Accounting Office, but is the fault of other Government agencies for not furnishing the adequate information as they are required to do under the existing law.

I know that after the war the General Accounting Office was given the extra job of auditing war contracts. But that job is over, the reports are here now before Congress and have been for several months.

Besides I call your attention to the fact again that we are not proposing to put this agency out of business, we will still be leaving them more employees than they ever had before the war or before 1942 and we will be giving them more money than the House considered necessary.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to say a word in regard to the employees of the General Accounting Office. In some of the instances in which we have increased appropriations and I voted with the committee, I was not absolutely clear. This case, I think, is the clearest one we have. In 1946 the General Accounting Office had 14,904 employees. It now has 9,450, or a decrease of 5,454 employees in 3 years. If a 10-percent cut should be applied, there would be a further reduction of 1,200 employees. If I correctly understand the Senator's amendment, approximately 600 more employees would have to be dropped.

During the past 5 years the General Accounting Office has voluntarily turned back to the Treasury \$13,000,000 from appropriations. As the Senator from

Wyoming has said, in the past 3 years it has collected \$635,000,000, and has this year already collected \$76,000,000.

It seems to me it is one office that has made an extremely good case for an increased appropriation. We gave it only about half the amount it requested.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield. But first I say that the Senator from Massachusetts is wrong in that you say you gave them only half the amount requested. If the full committee amendment is adopted you are giving them all.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts as to the comparison of the Federal budget of 1946 and that of this year. It seems to me it makes a great deal of difference as to how much accounting there is to do.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I cannot answer the Senator's question.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not true that there were enormously inflated expenditures in the war years, when we were spending as much as \$80,000,000,000 to \$100,000,000,000 a year. We are now spending approximately \$40,000,000,000. Does it not make a great deal of difference how much accounting there is to do in a job of that character?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think so. As to the amount of collections the office has turned back into the Treasury, there is always the problem that the department responsible does not get credit for it on its own books. The question of additional collections for the Internal Revenue brings up a similar problem.

Mr. BREWSTER. I have the very highest regard for Lindsay Warren, with whom I served in the House. I think he is one of the best officials the Government has. But I do not think that means that any given amount should be appropriated. In view of the very great reductions in Federal expenditures, I think we might very well go along that line.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Should not this point be considered? Because of the heavy expenses of the war years, unless the General Accounting Office is able to carry on its investigations, the statute of limitations is likely to run very quickly, if it has not already run in a great many cases? Therefore, it seems to me we may be getting toward the jumping-off place where the General Accounting Office cannot find any fraud or other similar situations existing, and we may lose a good opportunity of rectifying the situation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The audit of the war years has been completed and is in the possession of the Senate besides. The statute of limitations has already expired, so far as the war years are concerned. The war is over, and I do not think we should compare the personnel of the Office at this time with what was required during the year in the postwar years. I repeat, if we adopt this amendment and reduce the number of employees 5 percent, the General Accounting Office will still have approximately

50 percent more employees than it had at any time before the war.

Prior to 1942, which was a war year, it never had as many employees on the pay roll at any time as it will have even if the reduction is made. In 1942 the expenses of the Government were just as great as they are today; in fact, they were greater. If at some time we do not begin to cut back the number of Federal employees, we shall never balance the budget. Before the war started, the General Accounting Office had between 4,000 and 5,000 employees, not 8,000 or 9,000 as they now request. I am speaking of the years 1938 and 1939. We are still giving the office double what it had before. I feel that if Congress is really sincere in its desire to balance the budget, we may as well vote for these cuts. In the resolution which was signed by 62 Members of the Senate requesting the President to cut the budget 5 percent there was no exception made for the General Accounting Office or any other agency. We were very bold in endorsing that resolution, placing the responsibility on the President, yet when we call the roll here on cutting any individual agency we hesitate.

We are planning to tell the President we wanted him to cut every department of the Government 5 percent. If we meant that, then let us adopt this amendment. If we did not mean it, and want our pet agencies exempted, then let us write such exemptions in the resolution proposed and be frank about it. I think it is very cowardly to vote for the full appropriations here, then later call on the President to do the job we are not men enough to do. There are many amendments to be proposed to this bill calling for reductions. It is our opportunity to tell the country whether or not we ever intend to balance this Federal budget.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 8, after the word "only", to strike out "\$1,423,800" and insert "\$1,582,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 8, to insert:

Agency expenditure analysis: For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 206 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 601), including personal services in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, printing and binding, and the procurement of services authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600), \$800,000, to be immediately available: *Provided*, That the Comptroller General of the United States is authorized to employ all personnel under this appropriation without regard to the civil-service laws, rules, and regulations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Housing and Home Finance

Agency—Office of the Administrator," on page 36, after line 2, to strike out:

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Office of the Administrator, including a health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150), \$1,200,000.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Office of the Administrator, including personal services and rent in the District of Columbia; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the Agency; payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); a health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement; and dissemination of the results of research and studies undertaken pursuant to title III of the Housing Act of 1948, notwithstanding the provisions of 39 United States Code 321b; \$1,200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Housing Administration," on page 37, line 12, after the word "housing", to strike out the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay any public housing agency any contribution occasioned by payments in lieu of taxes in excess of the amount specified in the original contract between such agency and the Public Housing Administration or its predecessor agencies."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, after line 21, to insert:

OFFICE OF THE HOUSING EXPEDITER

Salaries and expenses, Office of the Housing Expediter: For expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the Office of the Housing Expediter, including personal services in the District of Columbia; attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with rent control; hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding; purchase of newspapers (not to exceed \$10,000); services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); not to exceed \$5,000 for payment of claims pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C. 2672); and health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); \$24,075,000: *Provided*, That as to cases involving the functions transferred to the Office of the Housing Expediter by Executive Order 9841, section 204 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, shall be considered as remaining in full force and effect during fiscal year 1950.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this item has to do with the Housing Expediter. The particular question has to do with rent control, primarily. When the House passed the bill the Rent Control Act was not yet in effect, and this item was not put into the appropriation bill until it came to the Senate. The Senate committee recommends \$24,075,000. The top peak in personnel this year, for rent control, is 4,947. The figure recommended by the committee calls for an increase in personnel of 553. If I correctly understand the situation, eventually rent control will be on its way out. There are certain areas of the country which are being controlled, and certain hotels were reconrolled, but

there is no reason why the Housing Expediter cannot do his work with the existing personnel, which numbers 4,947 persons, or why he should need 553 additional employees.

For that reason, Mr. President, I move that the appropriation reported by the committee be cut \$2,407,500 to \$21,667,500, which is a 10-percent cut.

I take that figure because 553 is slightly more than 10 percent of the personnel.

Mr. President, I think my proposal is a fair one, and on the amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 38, line 9, it is proposed to strike out "\$24,075,000" and to insert "\$21,667,500."

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this question the Senator from New Hampshire asks for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I am a member and possibly the president of the Silent Senators Club. Some 2 or 3 months ago, Senators will remember, I organized the Silent Senators Club on the floor of the Senate. Since that time I have had very little to say, and I rather suspect that the organization we created that night has been helpful to the United States Senate. In spite of the fact that it may not seem that we have accomplished very much since then, at least we have had less talk than we had, at least we have had less talk on the part of many Senators. We have had no filibuster.

Mr. President, I possibly should not be talking tonight, but I wish to ask this question: When are we going to live within our income?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will please be in order, on the left and the right particularly. [Laughter.]

Mr. CAPEHART. When are we going to live within our income, Mr. President? When are we going to have the courage in the United States Senate and the United States Congress to appropriate no more money than we reasonably can anticipate collecting in revenue?

I signed the petition, along with 61 other Senators, to direct the President of the United States to reduce expenditures from 5 to 10 percent, and I am frank to tell my colleagues that when I signed it and became a party to it I felt rather sheepish, as we say in Indiana. I felt as though I was a party to passing the buck to the President of the United States to do something which I personally did not have the courage to do myself. My only reason for signing it was that we at that time passed on four or five appropriation bills, and it was impossible to withdraw them or reconsider them.

I ask the President of the Senate, how long can he as an individual expect to keep out of the hands of the sheriff if he spends more money each day and each week and each month and each year than he takes in?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator want the Chair to answer that question? [Laughter.]

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not, because I know the answer. The answer would be that the sheriff would catch up with him just as soon as he was unable to pay his bills.

What are we thinking about? How long can we continue as a Government to spend more money than we take in each year? How long can we continue year in and year out to incur a deficit?

Mr. President, why have we not the courage to appropriate only the amount of money which we reasonably anticipate we are going to receive in revenue? There is not a Senator on the floor who would run his business as we run the business of the Government. Is there a single Senator here who would deliberately and intentionally in any given month or any given year spend more money than he anticipated he was going to have in revenue?

What are we thinking about? When do we expect to balance the budget? When do we expect to live within our income? What is wrong with the American people, through their Congress, saying to the United States and to the people throughout the world, "We expect that we are going to have X amount of money to spend in a given year or a given period," and then set about in an intelligent way to allocate the available money to this department and that department, to this branch of the Government and the other branch of the Government.

Why do we legislate in a hodge-podge way? There is not a Senator on the floor tonight who knows how much money the Congress is going to appropriate. There is not one here who knows, and there is not one here who would run his own business or his own private affairs on the basis of not knowing how much he was going to spend and not knowing what his personal income was going to be.

Mr. President, I say that, unless we stop this foolishness, sooner or later we are going to run out of money. I say—and I can talk from experience—that there is nothing worse in this world than to have more liabilities than assets. I have experienced it, and I suspect some of my colleagues have. Why should we deny that a government is any different from an individual, or a company, or a corporation, or an institution? Why do we do what we do here tonight, and why have we done what we have been doing all year? Why do we appropriate more money than our income?

I appreciate that there are those who hold the philosophy that deficit spending is a good thing. How much deficit spending? When are we going to stop this practice? When are we going to stop the growth of this great Government of ours? Are we at war? If so, whom are we fighting? When are we going to do the thing which every Senator on the floor of the Senate and every Member of the United States Senate knows we should do? Why do we argue about these things?

Let me put it this way: I care not whether we spend \$40,000,000,000, whether we spend \$50,000,000,000, whether we spend \$60,000,000,000, I care not how much money we spend if it is properly

spent so long as our revenues at least equal that which we spend. I am by nature a great spender. I have spent a lot of money in my time. I love to spend money. I doubt if there is a man on the floor of the Senate tonight who loves to spend money any more than I do. But I learned from bitter experience that one cannot spend more than he takes in without getting into trouble. Why do we do it?

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

Mr. CAPEHART. My question is, When are we going to balance the budget?

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I will yield in a moment. I see many Senators smiling. Go ahead and smile. It is perfectly all right with me. Go ahead and laugh at what I am saying. It is all right with me. But I am saying to the Senate that if the time ever comes in the United States when the American people lose confidence in the money of the Government and in their Government, Senators will not laugh. They can shake their heads and say, "It cannot happen in America," but I will stand here and list 25 things, possibly, which have happened in the past 20 years which 25 years ago many said could not happen here.

Mr. President, we had better consider this matter seriously, because it is a serious matter. There is not a Senator who knows how much money Congress is going to appropriate for the fiscal year. There is no way of knowing how much we are going to appropriate, the way Congress is now handling appropriation bills.

Mr. President, I ask again: Why do we not cut expenses? Why do we not reduce the budget? Why is it necessary to have a budget today of more than \$40,000,000,000, when the war is more than 4 years behind us? Why is it necessary to have more than 2,000,000 Federal employees?

Mr. President, I have the highest respect in the world for Mr. Warren. I think he has done remarkable work. I am not standing before the Senate tonight to speak about the pending amendment. I know Mr. Warren has done a remarkably fine job. But the war is over. When he was handling war appropriations which ran up to almost \$100,000,000,000 a year he needed a great many employees. In my opinion he did not then have a sufficient number of employees.

Mr. President, why is it so difficult to cut appropriations? Many persons hold to the philosophy that the Federal Government should spend \$40,000,000,000 in order to maintain our economy on a high level and to avoid unemployment. Would it not be much better to cut the appropriations, to cut the cost of Government back to the point where it should be cut, keeping the Federal Government within its tax revenue, but, if it should become necessary, appropriate money for the purpose of so-called pump priming? It may become necessary to appropriate money in order to deal with unemployment, and I have no objection to appropriating money for that purpose only. I would not object to money being appropriated and spent for such a purpose.

Mr. President, why do we hide the cost of Government in a dozen or more appropriation bills?

My question is: When are we going to balance the budget? When are we going to live within our income? When are we going to discontinue appropriating on a hodge-podge basis? When are we going to follow the provisions of the Reorganization Act, which specifically state, if I understand them correctly, that the Congress shall arrive at a reasonable anticipated Federal income figure for the specific year and appropriate money accordingly? Why is it necessary to have the fights and the arguments which occur on the floor of the United States with respect to appropriations?

Is there a single Senator here tonight—if there is I wish he would stand up—who thinks that our Government, as it is constituted, and under the private enterprise system can continue year in and year out, and year in and year out to spend more money than it receives in revenue, and pile onto the debt, which stands today at the figure of approximately \$252,000,000,000, billions and billions of dollars more? Where is the limit? How high a debt can this Nation afford? Is it \$260,000,000,000? Is it \$275,000,000,000? Is it \$300,000,000,000? Is it \$350,000,000,000? Is it \$400,000,000,000? Have we completely forgotten thrift? Have we completely forgotten debt? Are we some day going to repudiate the national debt?

Mr. President, I feel very deeply and sincerely on this subject. I say to the Members of the Senate that unless we stop spending more money than we take in each year, some of these days—Senators many shake their heads if they want to and laugh about it—Congress will be considering some sort of a fiscal policy which will be very unpleasant. Congress must come to it if we do not change our policy.

As I said a moment ago, Mr. President, I care not how much money we spend, if we have the money to spend. I should like to give the people of Europe billions of dollars. I should like to give everybody money. I should like to see people everywhere have a higher standard of living. I should like to give money for the purpose of raising the standard of living for all people and so, I suppose, would every other Senator. But I want to caution Senators and say that if we are not careful we will create in the United States a situation which will be harmful to those we are trying to help. It is not a matter of whether we should do all the things that are being advocated. We might well afford to indulge in some of them; many of them, if not all of them, may be desirable; but if we do not place a limit to the amount of money we spend, if we place no limit on the amount of our appropriations, we will injure the people we are trying to help.

Mr. President, I wish I had a blackboard before me tonight on which I could present a graphic illustration of what I have in mind. If I had a blackboard before me I would draw a line down the center of it, and on the left side of the line I would write down all the governmental expenses, and I would write

down all the people who are dependent upon the Government. I should like to write on the left side of the line also all the things that are being advocated today to be done by the Federal Government.

On the other side, the right side of the line, I should like to write down the people and the institutions that must make the money to pay the taxes to support the group on the other side of the line. I say to the Senate that if we are not careful, the group on the left side of the line will become so numerous, their demands will become so great, and the cost of satisfying their demands will become so great, that those on the right side of the line, meaning those who are working and producing and paying taxes, will become unable to support those on the left side of the line. When that time comes, the thousands, and tens of thousands, and hundreds of thousands of people on the left side of the line who are deserving of help, who ought to be helped—and I want to help them—are going to lose, are going to be injured, because our Government will run out of money.

Mr. President, I shall not argue about the pending amendment or any particular amendment. I shall not argue about this particular bill or the other particular bill. As president of the Silent Senators Club, I have possibly talked too much already. I am not criticizing any individual Senator. I may be wrong in my position. I may be old-fashioned. Perhaps more money can be spent each day and each month and each year than the Government takes in, without the Government eventually going broke. I do not know about that.

When I look about me, Mr. President, and see the intelligence displayed on the faces of Members of the Senate, when I look at the Members of the House of Representatives and see the intelligence displayed on their faces, and when I meet officials of the administration and see the intelligence displayed on their faces—when I look around and see so much intelligence displayed, I wonder what, after all, we are all thinking about. If we are not careful how we appropriate and spend money, it is my personal opinion that we will hurt the people we are trying to help.

Please keep in mind the imaginary blackboard I have described. Those on the left of the line drawn down the center of the blackboard are people we are trying to help. Those on the right of the line are those who provide the funds with which help can be extended to those on the left side of the line.

Mr. President, I was going to make a motion in connection with the pending appropriation bill and every other appropriation bill from this time on, to recommend each bill to the Appropriations Committee with instructions to deduct 5 percent from each appropriation bill. I have decided not to make such a motion.

I for one, as a signer of the petition, with 61 other Senators, asking the President to make a cut in the appropriations, am certainly not proud of myself. In signing that petition I am passing the buck to the President of the United States to cut expenses. The responsibility is here. It is not with the President

of the United States. The President is supposed to spend the money which the Congress appropriates. Why do we pass the buck to the President?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. In a moment I shall be very happy to yield.

Why do we pass the buck? Why do we not have the courage to reduce expenditures and balance the budget? When are we going to do it? It is said, not this year. Are we going to do it next year, or the year following? When are we going to do it? The war has been over for 4 years, and yet this year we will appropriate more than \$40,000,000,000. Our State, county, city, and township governments are increasing their appropriations year in and year out. For the first time in its history the State of New York has made appropriations in excess of \$1,000,000,000. For the first time in its history the appropriations of the State of California have exceeded \$1,000,000,000. Property taxes throughout the State of Indiana are increasing. What is the end going to be?

Think of the blackboard. Think of the line in the center. Think of those on the left who are trying to live off those on the right, and say to yourself, "How long will it be before there will be so many on the left side of the line living off those on the right side of the line that those on the right side of the line can no longer support those on the left side of the line?" When that time comes, we shall be in trouble.

Mr. President, I apologize to the Senate for taking so much time, but I am sincere. As I have said, I care not how much money we spend, if we have it. I should be delighted to see a national income of \$400,000,000,000 a year. I should be delighted to be able to spend \$75,000,000,000. The point is that we do not have it. Some day we may have it. In my opinion the best way to get it is for the Federal Government never to spend a dollar more than it takes in in taxes. That is the way to build confidence in business. Taxes come from business. They come from the people. They do not come from any other source. They cannot come from any other source. They come from the people of the United States, who must earn them. They must make a profit before they can pay taxes. If we are to load down the people who are working and must pay the taxes, with so many people on the left side of the line, and make taxes so high and put such a great burden on those on the right side of the line, we shall break the backs of the people on the right-hand side, and they will not be able to pay it.

I do not want to argue about individual amendments. I am perfectly willing to leave that to the administration and the Appropriations Committee. We cannot determine those questions on the floor of the Senate. But there is one thing we should know; there is one thing we do know; there is one thing we learned in the first grade when we went to school; and that is that two and two make four. We should have learned, and we did learn, that we cannot spend more than we take in without getting into trouble.

We shall eventually go bankrupt if we continue to do so. There is no other answer. We learned that in the first grade in school. It is taught in every school in the 48 States.

I can think of nothing that would be finer for the American people than to have the word go out that the Congress has decided that tax revenues for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, are expected to be X amount, and that we are not going to spend one penny more than that, but are going to balance the budget and live within our income.

Perhaps I am wrong. Senators may smile about it or laugh about it, or do anything they care to do about it. But let me say in closing that if we do not stop it, the day will come when the Congress of the United States will be considering a fiscal policy for the United States which will be very unpleasant, and will be a repetition of what has happened in other nations. Then it will be too late.

Mr. President, I apologize for taking so much time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] to the committee amendment on page 38, line 9.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to make a comment or two with respect to the pending appropriation. At the same time, I wish to compliment the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], who has just taken his seat, for the evident sincerity with which he spoke.

I wish to say to him and to other Members of the Senate that the Senate Appropriations Committee has not passed the buck to the President of the United States with respect to this item, nor, so far as I know, with respect to any other item. The budget recommendation which came to the Senate for the Office of the Housing Expediter was \$26,750,000. The amount which the committee recommended was \$24,075,000. The amount which we cut from the budget was \$2,675,000, or exactly 10 percent. With respect to this particular item we have already done precisely what has been recommended. The Bureau of the Budget asked for 10 percent more than we granted. So I say that on the record we have not passed the buck.

We are asking for 90 percent of the budget recommendation to carry out a law which the Congress enacted this year. In passing that law the Congress understood that there were many complications. The Congress understood that there would be evictions. The Congress understood that there were landlords who, under rent control, would suffer; and precisely because that burden was recognized, in that law the Congress provided for the personnel to do the work involved. According to the testimony produced before our committee, 86 percent of the additional personnel provided for in this appropriation are for the purpose of handling problems of evictions, and for local assistants. This is what was said:

We have said many times that eviction control is the heart of rent-control enforcement. Yet we must not delay the processing

of legitimate eviction actions. Accordingly, we estimate that to process eviction petitions promptly and to handle the thousands of complaints brought into the open by eviction control will require 815 people.

The problem with which the committee was confronted was simply this: Shall we provide the funds to enable the Housing Expediter, whose office was created by order of the Congress, to carry out the responsibilities which the Congress, by majority vote, imposed upon him? The committee had no jurisdiction to say, "No; we will defeat the law by denying the appropriation." That is not our function. Of course, if the Senate wants to do it, that is something else.

This reminds me of what I conceive to be an incorrect assumption which has been made by many people who talk as the Senator from Indiana has just talked—and very sincerely, too, as was quite apparent. We talk of the war as though it were over; but the war is not over. The war cannot possibly be over until the peace is written. We have our occupation forces in Germany; we have our occupation forces in Japan. Who proposes to bring them back? Who proposes to withdraw them? We had the Berlin episode with the Berlin air lift. We appropriated for it; we bore that expense. That was an obligation of the Government. We carried it on because we felt that was the only way to prevent the advance of communism. That was our responsibility.

It is true that the budget which was submitted to us this year called for an expenditure of almost \$42,000,000,000—\$41,900,000,000. That is true. But how many Members of the Congress and how many of the people have stopped to realize that of that sum 76 percent goes to four war-connected categories, namely, national defense, international obligations and payments, veterans' benefits and payments, and interest upon the national debt? Out of this budget, there is only \$9,900,000,000 for the civilian departments and agencies of the Government. So we have \$32,000,000,000, upon one side, to be used to carry on the activities to bind up the wounds of war and to wage the peace, and, on the other side, we have \$9,900,000,000 to carry on the normal activities of Government.

Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senate that these four categories I have mentioned have risen in cost 1,200 percent since 1939, 10 years ago. They have risen 1,200 percent because the Congress year after year since the fighting stopped has voted the authority to do these things.

Is it to be said that Congress is blind or that the administration is blind to this burden? Here on this very floor this afternoon the Senate agreed to the conference report on the armed forces unification bill, which was the result of the studies of the Hoover Commission. What was its purpose? Its purpose was to reduce the cost of the national defense. That bill was passed by the Congress in the conviction that if it became law, the expenditures for national defense might be reduced by \$1,000,000,000.

When the Armed Services Committee reported that bill, it did so because it wanted to decrease the cost of national

defense, one of the items which have increased in cost 1,200 percent since 1939. I could point to many others.

But, Mr. President, bear in mind that while these four categories have increased in cost at that tremendous rate, the other categories, the civilian departments and agencies, have increased in cost only 40 percent. I say "only 40 percent" merely by way of comparison. But I wish Senators to realize that the principal cause of that increase has been that wholesale prices have doubled and the wages and salaries of Government employees have, in many cases, tripled since 1939; and the Congress voluntarily, and out of the conviction that it was necessary, increased them.

The danger we confront is that by indiscriminate cutting of the appropriations for the civilian departments and agencies of Government, we shall reduce the capacity of the Government to function in such a way as to maintain the economy.

Consider, for example, some of the new expenditures—for instance, the expenditures for civilian aviation, for building airports, and for providing safety facilities in connection with aviation operations. No one but the Government will provide such facilities and engage in that work. If the Government did not do that, it would be utterly impossible to maintain the aviation industry. Similarly, I could point to comparable operations in every one of the various civilian agencies of the Government.

All day yesterday and all day today we have been struggling over appropriations having to do with some of the civilian departments and agencies of the Government, and we have been seeking to balance the budget by cutting those appropriations. Mr. President, the Members of the Senate could eliminate every dollar of the \$9,900,000,000 of appropriations proposed in the budget this year for the civilian domestic activities of the Government, but there would still be \$32,000,000,000 of appropriations needed to carry on the cost of war and peace, and that would be 3½ times greater than the entire cost of the Government 10 years ago, in 1939.

The war categories of which I have spoken, which have increased in cost 1,200 percent in 10 years, and which now constitute 76 percent of the entire Federal budget, constituted only 29 percent of the entire Federal budget 10 years ago.

So, Mr. President, I say that when we present these items dealing with the operations of the civilian departments and agencies of Government, we should not assume that by means of making excessive cuts we shall be able to balance the budget.

In the case of the particular item now before us, the Appropriations Committee, because it sincerely desires to keep the cost of the Government down, has cut the appropriation 10 percent below the amount of the budget estimate.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Wyoming why in his opinion there should be a

larger number of employees in the Office of the Housing Expediter for the coming fiscal year than for the fiscal year just passed?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Because the Housing Expediter is doing many things this year which were not done last year, because of the fact that rent control is coming to an end, because of the fact that landlords seek to obtain higher rents, because of the problem of evictions, because of a number of other problems which the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] can discuss much more ably than I can since he was on the committee which reported on those matters. We may have some differences of opinion between ourselves as to whether that should be done; but the Appropriations Committee was not confronted with that question. The Appropriations Committee was confronted with the law and the necessity of enforcing the law.

Mr. CAIN. Let me suggest that I raise this question because I have been and am a member of the Banking and Currency Committee which has had the subject of rent control under serious consideration for several years. Against that background, I should like to ask the Senator what has been the net result of the operations of the Housing Expediter since the Rent and Housing Act was passed on April 1 of this year. Can the Senator from Wyoming indicate to the Senate how many community areas or portions of areas have been completely decontrolled since April 1 of this year?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The evidence before our committee was that 108 communities had been decontrolled. How many have been decontrolled since that time, I do not know.

Mr. CAIN. I think it is safe to say that in a general way approximately 175 areas have been completely decontrolled since April 1 of this year.

Against that knowledge, I raise the realistic question, why is it necessary to have more people to operate a job which obviously requires much less to be done in connection with it, as of the present time? I think it is agreed by every member of the Banking and Currency Committee, as it was agreed by Mr. Woods, that his job is essentially that of liquidating an operation which the American people and National Government want to get rid of at the earliest possible moment.

I suggest that in providing for that office 553 additional employees, as proposed for the coming fiscal year, we are but encouraging the maintenance of an operation which all of us wish to get rid of, and an operation which is getting rid of itself, so to speak.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that we had evidence on that very subject. The areas which had been decontrolled when the Housing Expediter appeared before our committee were described by him as being fringe areas. That operation involved a small number of employees. He told of at least one case in which, after there had been decontrol, application was made to resume control. That was America's decision. The Senator is quite right.

Let me read this from the statement:

On the credit side of the ledger is the matter of the various types of decontrol under the new act. On my own initiative I have taken 108 decontrol actions throughout the country. These were semirural and fringe areas and involved only 35 employees. I cannot tell exactly how many more of these actions may be justified before the expiration of the present act. Probable savings in salary and expenses have been considered in the preparation of the budget.

Mr. President, let me say at that point, by way of interpolation, I think we cannot assume that Mr. Tighe Woods, the Housing Expediter, will not continue voluntarily to decontrol when the conditions appear justifiable. I submit if on his own initiative he has decontrolled or had decontrolled, when he appeared before the committee, 108 areas, then it is not surprising to me that the Senator from Washington tells me that now about 175 have been decontrolled. In other words, the Senator gives testimony that Mr. Woods is continuing decontrol where the conditions warrant.

Mr. CAIN. There are several ways, I should like to suggest to the Senator from Wyoming, by which areas and communities may become decontrolled. The Housing Expediter has authority within his organization to decontrol an area. It is likewise true, fortunately, that the communities and States now have authority to decontrol, whether or not the office of the Housing Expediter is in agreement. I am delighted to compliment Mr. Woods with reference to those areas he has decontrolled in recent months, but I simply cannot see, from my own point of view, why he needs a substantial addition to his present personnel in order to get on with the performance of his job, which he and the various States are presently doing reasonably well.

The Senator from Wyoming mentions that Mr. Woods testified, generally speaking, that the decontrol actions were in the fringe areas. I suggest that in the immediate months which lie ahead, some very large American communities will either be decontrolled because of the action of the Housing Expediter, or they will request through their governors decontrol for themselves. If I am not mistaken, the city of Spokane, Wash., which can hardly be considered to be on the fringe of any other community, since it has a population of approximately 150,000 American citizens, is to be decontrolled as of August 1 of this year.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Tighe Woods testified:

We have only one standard of decontrol; that is to get out of a particular area or portion of an area when the demand for rental housing has been reasonably met.

I think the members of the committee, when they approved this appropriation for 90 percent of the budget estimate, did so because they were convinced that Mr. Woods was telling us exactly how he felt and exactly what he would do.

I should like to add another word. I have been in a position to observe Government employees ever since early in

the year 1917. I have only words of highest praise for the patriotism and the diligence of the American citizens who come to Washington to work for their Government. During wartimes, I have found, as I am sure everybody else has found, among the men and women working for the Government a high degree of efficiency and loyalty. Certainly the Congress of the United States must have felt so when last year it passed the Pay Increase Act, which added \$550,000,000 to the cost of the Government of the United States for the fiscal year 1950. I do not believe we can save money by criticizing these employees and talking as though they are all time wasters and salary grabbers who do nothing for the compensation they receive.

Mr. CAIN. So far as I know, the junior Senator from Washington has not made any such charge.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

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

Mr. CAIN. I should merely like to complete the answer, if I may, in response to the observation made by the Senator from Wyoming. The junior Senator from Washington has not cast any reflections, directly or otherwise, on the personnel of the Office of the Housing Expediter. I have raised the simple question, Why is it necessary to have more men and women in that operation to do less work? I submit to the Senate we have not yet been provided with sufficient information to justify increasing the reasonably substantial group of admittedly reliable and competent workers the Congress granted the Office of the Housing Expediter one short year ago.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I do not care to discuss the issues of the rent-control law. Those were decided some 3 or 4 months ago. But I recall that at the time of that vote most of us voted in the belief that this would be the last year for the rent-control law extension. Practically every one of the Senators, I think, voted for this year's extension in the hope that this would be the last year of rent control, from the Federal Government level. There are only a few spots in the United States, as there were then, that yet have any imperative situation. Those either have or could have State and local rent-control laws adequate to their needs.

At that time it was brought to the attention of the Senate that many of the employees of this agency were engaged in stirring up trouble against the owners of property, on behalf of the tenants, until one court was forced to dismiss hundreds of cases because the owners of small property did not have sufficient money to hire counsel, and it had become an annoyance to the court to pass upon the details of the cases which were brought to the court in an attempt to make it a collection agency as against the property owners and in favor of the tenants. That being true, it would seem that the Administration was overstaffed at that time.

What is the situation since? Not only have many areas been decontrolled but there has been an increase, the largest increase, I think, in the history of the country, in housing facilities, both houses

for sale and, we are glad to say, some few houses and apartments for rent; so the problem is less acute than it was when the bill was passed.

What is the evidence of the activities of this agency since the enactment of the law? Only this afternoon I read the forms which have been proposed to property owners by the Housing Expediter under the fair-net-return provision of the law. I said at the time the bill was passed that that provision was unintelligible. If it is, the forms sent out under it are more so. They are complicated and confusing. Of course, many persons will be required to interpret, plan, print, and circulate them in the various areas of the country. That is one of the methods by which the demand for more employees was built up for this agency, which ought to be passing out instead of being increased and enlarged.

Not only that, Mr. President, but since the enactment of the law the housing agency has been engaged in political propaganda, throughout the Nation, I presume. I know whereof I speak when I say that the local office in the city of Cleveland, Ohio, sent representatives to councils in suburban areas to induce them not to pass decontrol resolutions. They were on the Government pay roll, and, of course, they were among the number the Expediter wants to continue on the pay roll. The Expediter himself, on a recent occasion, in the State of Texas, when the Texas Legislature passed a decontrol resolution for the entire State, took an airplane and went to the Governor's office to try to induce him to veto the resolution of the State Legislature of Texas to decontrol the whole State of Texas. In my judgment, it is certainly outside the contemplation of the Senate or of the House, in the enactment of the law, that the funds appropriated should be used by the Expediter in order to propagandize local authorities to continue rent control so that he might enlarge the department and, no doubt, come back next year with a request for additional funds, and possibly more employees. On the basis of the number of employees he has and the amount of business the agency has, including traveling around the country on this propaganda activity, he will make the claim that it is necessary to continue the law another year.

We are now 5 years past the war, Mr. President, and this law is continued only under the authority that Congress has during a war and in the rehabilitation era succeeding the war, according to decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. We have certainly reached the time when we should be considering getting rid of war controls—this is one of the last, it is true—rather than enlarging them and extending them.

So, Mr. President, in my judgment, the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire not only should be agreed to, but I shall be very happy to fight for a further decrease in the personnel in this agency, which, in my judgment, and, I think, in the judgment of every Member of the Congress who voted for the bill, is and ought to be a dying agency of the Government, no longer hanging on to

a war power for the building up of its personnel, but, rather, going out of business in the interest of the public.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have no desire to extend the debate, but I believe some things should be brought out in connection with this proposed amendment.

I believe, along with the able Senator from Ohio—and I have stated it on the floor of the Senate many times—that this year's extension of the rent-control law in all likelihood represents the last extension of rent control as a Federal matter of legislation. I have stated that many times, and I believe it is the feeling the committee had when it reported the rent-control bill this year.

I pay my respects to the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], because they have been absolutely consistent all along in their belief that rent control should not be extended this year. They worked and voted against it. But the President and the Congress saw fit to extend it.

I should like to call the attention of Senators to the fact that when we extended rent control we directed the Housing Expediter to place in every rent-control office in the country an extra man, and we defined what his duties should be; we enumerated his duties. We did not leave it discretionary with the Housing Expediter. He is not placing employees there because it wants to, but he is doing it because Congress told him to do it. Congress wrote it into the law.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator read the provision which specifies that an extra man shall be placed in each office to perform certain functions?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not have the law before me, but I will tell the Senator, in substance, what it provides. The committee wrote it into the law and the Senate confirmed it. We directed that one person in every rent-control office should be detailed to the job of assisting landlords and tenants in filing claims for adjustments.

Mr. FERGUSON. That does not mean an extra man. Any man on the job could do it. For instance, the men who went to the town councils to persuade them not to pass ordinances of decontrol could have been doing that particular job. We did not provide that the Expediter should hire an extra man over and above the employees he had in the office. We said that certain functions were to be performed. It was up to him to perform them through the employees he had in the office.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will read the debates, he will find that we many times referred to the fact that we were detailing a man in each office to do this job.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. As a matter of fact, while we did not specifically say these men should be hired, an extra duty was cast upon each office.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.
Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me proceed for a moment. If we laid down an extra duty we would have to assume that there was an extra man already at work in the office. It was our thought that there would be in every rent-control office a man who would help landlords and tenants. That was part of the philosophy behind the rent-control law as it was written this year. We believed there were numerous landlords, particularly small ones, who were not receiving a fair deal under rent control, and, for the first time during the history of rent control, we provided that rents should be such as to enable landlords to do more than merely to break even. That is what the law provides.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely want to read the law which the Banking and Currency Committee wrote, and I want to show that the House insisted upon it and put it in the House bill:

In order to help assure fair adjustments for tenants and small landlords the Housing Expediter is authorized and directed to designate for every defense rental area an officer whose function shall be to assist tenants and small landlords by (a) informing them concerning the conditions under which rent adjustments may be obtained; (b) helping in the preparation of applications for rent adjustments; and (c) providing them with such other information and services as may be necessary and appropriate.

That, Mr. President, was in the bill which the Congress passed, which the conferees agreed to, and which the President signed. That is the reason why additional employees are, in my judgment, necessary.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. It certainly does not provide for extra men. It assigns an extra duty.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Michigan can assume that if he wishes, but we who wrote the law assume the other. I believe, when the Senate voted and when the House of Representatives voted, they also assumed it. We assigned additional functions and said that the Expediter should designate the men whose functions would be to do that specific thing.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. In the conference the House of Representatives claimed that they wanted to protect the small landlords. If we had not accepted that amendment I doubt if we would have been able to have the conference report agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, it was a part of the very heart of rent control that we were putting a man into each office to help get these adjustments.

Let us see something of what has been done since the law was passed. The Housing Expediter is asking for this man

in each office, and the number he is asking for is 508.

Mr. CAIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me finish this thought, unless the Senator's question is in line with what I am discussing.

Mr. CAIN. I think it is in line with what the Senator is saying.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. If I understood the Senator from Alabama correctly, he said this means that the Housing Expediter is asking for X number of additional men.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Five hundred and eight.

Mr. CAIN. But that does not preclude the Expediter from selecting from among any number of these 508 offices the particular individual whom he charges, perhaps for the first time, with doing a reasonable job. The only reason why we wrote that provision in the law was that, distressingly but truly, we found that the Expediter was not giving the service for which he and his employees were being paid.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I admit that we found that the small landlords did not have the bookkeepers, and the well-kept records, the financial records, the accountants, and the lawyers, to enable them to make their claims, and therefore we directed the Expediter to put these men in the local offices; and that is what he is trying to do.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just one question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Was it not considered in the committee of which the Senator and I both were members that we had taken away from the Expediter a considerable amount of the business arising from determining which were distress cases, and the duty of deciding upon individual cases of landlords and tenants, and that therefore there would be a good bit of relief in the matter of employees, and that we centered upon one formula for the landlord, which was the formula of net-operating income? Therefore the process would be simplified; there would be an over-all formula, which would be applied to the country at large; there would not be the need for all the employees; and therefore the Expediter could designate one of those who had heretofore been engaged in passing upon the distress cases to spend his time on helping the small landlord, who was really a distress case.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No, Mr. President, I cannot agree with the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. That was discussed at the time, was it not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to call the able Senator's attention to the fact that we specifically provided that the fair net operating income formula did not displace hardship cases, and they are still giving relief in hardship cases, just as they have been doing throughout. They were supplemental.

Mr. President, I desire to move along and complete the very brief statement

I wish to make. But let me say that within 6 weeks after the rent-control law went on the statute books, the Expediter's office had given out over a million applications for rent adjustments. It is necessary for those applications to be processed just as fast as they can be, that help be given to the landlords in filling out the applications, and for relief to be granted just as fast as possible. We have called on the Expediter for a report as to the progress which has been made.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire as to how long the Senator will speak?

Mr. SPARKMAN. If I were left to my own wishes I think I could finish in about 5 minutes. Of course, I cannot yield for questions and finish within that time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has control of that.

Mr. LUCAS. My only reason for making the inquiry was that I more or less agreed with Senators that when the hour of 10 o'clock arrived we would take a recess.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That will not interfere with me.

Mr. LUCAS. Would the Senator be willing to resume his remarks tomorrow?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should be very glad to comply with that arrangement.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I note in the report of the committee that the statement of the Housing Expediter upon which the committee's action was predicated was made in May of this year. I happen to know that in the case of my own State most of the defense rental areas have been decontrolled since that time by action of the legislature. I am informed by other Senators on the floor that there have been a great many decontrols in their States since that time. I wonder if the Senator would be willing to let the matter go over until tomorrow, and to advise the Senate at that time, from the rent data available, as to just what the situation is.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I shall be very glad to try to get that information up to the very latest date.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to offer at this time two amendments to the pending appropriation bill so that they may be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

INVESTIGATION OF APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN EXAMINERS UNDER ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted the following resolution (S.

Res. 143), which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to activities of the Civil Service Commission in determining qualifications for appointment of examiners under section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act, including the activities of any advisory committee appointed by the Commission pursuant to such section. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

INCREASED RATES OF COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN HEADS AND ASSISTANT HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. GEORGE (for himself and Mr. MILLIKIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 1689) to increase rates of compensation of the heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a statement which I have prepared on the subject of Reorganization Plan No. 1.

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

One of the most important issues facing us at the present time is in connection with the President's reorganization plans.

I have already indicated my strenuous opposition to Reorganization Plan No. 2 which would transfer the unemployment compensation and employment service functions from the Federal Security Agency to the Labor Department. Naturally, like my colleagues, I am most familiar with that particular plan because it has been up for consideration in the past, and we have turned it down flatly, as I am hoping we will do now.

Another plan requiring our close scrutiny is Plan No. 1 on which hearings will conclude tomorrow in the Senate Executive Expenditures Committee. Since this is the first time the plan has come up, many of my colleagues, like myself, have not had the opportunity to complete our review of the question. Let me, however, state that I am very skeptical of many features of the plan.

In addition I want to report that groups in my State have already expressed their active opposition on the basis of grounds which appear to me to be very strong.

In particular, the physicians of my State have expressed their vigorous objection to the plan. It is obvious that the plan is not in accord with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission for the setting up of an independent health agency headed by a professional career director general. Naturally, the physicians of my State do not want politics to control American medicine, and I join with them in their position. I

should like to quote from some messages which I have received on this very day:

From Markesan, Wis.:

"The medical profession asks you to fight for the passage of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, setting up a separate Department of Health."

From Chippewa Falls, Wis., an eminent physician expresses his strong opposition to the elevation of the present director of the Federal Security Agency to a cabinet post and states:

"We doctors favor the Hoover Commission plan of public health."

I could cite many other telegrams which I have received from all over my State.

Suffice it to say that I feel that the objections of the medical profession, as well as other groups, must receive our most careful consideration. These are the men who, after all, have done so magnificent a job in tending to the health of our people. They know our medical problems best.

Surely the Congress should not lightly dismiss their expert views on a subject to which they have devoted their lives.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, July 29, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received July 28 (legislative day of June 2), 1949:

WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION

The following-named persons to be members of the War Claims Commission:

Daniel F. Cleary, of Illinois.
Mrs. Georgia L. Lusk, of New Mexico.
David N. Lewis, of New York.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Jones Floyd, of Arkansas, to be United States marshal for the western district of Arkansas. Mr. Floyd is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 18, 1949.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 308, Public Law 625, Eightieth Congress (Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948):

To be majors

Dorothy Bernstein	Elizabeth Johnston
Bertha Breskin	Bestrice Landry
Frances S. Cornick	Elizabeth L. Muenchinger
Rosalie R. Feldman	Virginia Mynard
Dixie E. Harmon	Dorothy E. Salpante
Agnes M. Hoffman	Ilae M. Tucker
Margaret D. Horn	

To be captains

Mildred R. Bachman	Maimie P. Oliver
Kathleen M. Berry	Mary C. Ryan
Gladys F. Erwin	Frances E. Scafile
June Everett	Dora E. Skelton
Dorothy M. Foxworth	Doris M. Smith
Marilynn Fritz	Myrl D. Stiles
Massy E. Goins	Beatrice Tarnoff
Margaret Graham	Charlotte E. Temple
Maudie E. Johnson	Edith M. Toffaletti
Genevieve J. Larges	Kathryne M. Walls
Gladys M. Nelson	

To be first lieutenants

Margaret M. Banfill	Fannie A. Griffin
Kathleen J. Curtin	Barbara M. Hadley
Betty T. Ethen	Jeanne M. Holm
Elnora L. Garlow	Helen M. Horvath

Lois C. Jones	Mary C. Lynn
Doris E. Jordan	Ione C. Severson
Bertha R. Kaepffel	Peggy J. Wier
Norma M. Loeser	Betty L. Woods
Ruth A. Lucas	Helen C. Wyatt

The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law, 38th. Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenants

Carey T. Harrison	Norman C. Kramer
Thomas A. Horst, Jr.	Harold S. Viall

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Bernard H. Kirk	Jacob G. Goldberg
George R. E. Shell	Robert O. Bisson
James H. Brower	William K. Lanman, Jr.
Ernest R. West	
Howard J. Turton	Martin A. Severson
Thomas J. Colley	Herbert C. Freuler
Walter Asmuth, Jr.	John T. L. D. Gabbert
Alpha L. Bowser, Jr.	Ewart S. Laue
William K. Enright	LeRoy Hauser
Harvey C. Tschirgl	Richard W. Hayward
Lyle H. Meyer	John O. Holmes
Daniel W. Torrey, Jr.	William F. Whitaker
Avery R. Kier	William K. Pottinger
Thomas J. Noon	Robert L. Denig, Jr.
Warren E. Sweetser, Jr.	James C. Bigler
Wallace T. Breakey	James G. Smith
Lewis H. Delano, Jr.	Forest C. Thompson

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Eustace R. Smoak	Elmore W. Seeds
Sidney S. Wade	Alexander G. Bunker
Guy M. Morrow	Jack R. Cram
Paul E. Wallace	Henry C. Lane
James F. Climie	Hamilton D. South
James M. Masters, Sr.	Robert G. Ballance
William A. Kengla	John P. Condon
Wilbur J. McNenny	Ralph K. Rottet
Robert O. Bowen	Victor H. Krulak
James L. Beam	George C. Ruffin, Jr.
Joslyn R. Bailey	Harold O. Deakin
Ethridge C. Best	Samuel R. Shaw
Donald W. Fuller	Henry W. Buse, Jr.
William M. Hudson	Robert E. Hommel
Edward L. Hutchinson	Frank C. Tharin
Reynolds H. Hayden	Harry W. G. Vadnais
Clyde R. Nelson	John W. Sapp, Jr.
Joseph L. Dickey	Lawrence B. Clark

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

George J. Waldie, Jr.	Crawford B. Lawton
Paul S. Treitel	Marshall J. Hooper
Clifford B. Drake	Howard J. Rice
Charles R. Baker	Hulon H. Riche
Robert E. Snider	James O. Bell
Robert H. Armstrong	Paul T. Johnston
Wallace H. Robinson,	Orville V. Bergren
Jr.	

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, for limited duty, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Ira Brock
Edward J. McCabe
Frederick Dykstra

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Walter F. Cornnell	Harry W. Taylor
Elliott Wilson	Karl W. Kolb
Bernard T. Kelly	Stoddard G. Cortelyou

William H. Souder, Jr. Alexander R. Benson
 Andre D. Gomez John H. Jones
 George B. Kantner John F. Holt
 Harry T. Milne Thomas J. O'Connor
 Tolson A. Smoak Clyde P. Ford
 Daniel S. Preganall Marlin C. Martin, Jr.
 Robert J. Oddy Robert D. Shaffer
 Virgil W. Banning Walter E. Lischheid
 Richard W. Wyczawski Albert H. Schierman
 Fred J. Frazer William P. Kaempfer
 Franklin B. Nihart Dale H. Heely
 Howard A. York Elbert D. Graves
 David Ahee Kenneth C. Houston
 Edward V. Finn William S. McLaughlin
 Winsor V. Crockett, Jr. Kermit C. Zieg
 Victor J. Crolzat Frank E. Hollar
 Ernest C. Fusan Charles J. Prall
 Charles E. Warren Russell D. Rupp
 Roy J. Batterton, Jr. Eugene H. Strayhorn
 Earl E. Anderson James "N" "M" Davis
 Robert D. Taplett John R. Bohnet
 Wilson F. Humphreys John A. Copeland
 Victor J. Harwick John L. O'Connell
 Earl A. Cash Richard L. Boll
 Herbert F. Woodbury Robert D. Kennedy
 Wade H. Hitt Elbert S. Maloney, Jr.
 Phillip B. May Andrew I. Lyman
 Robert H. Houser Finley T. Clarke, Jr.
 Paul M. Jones Robert L. Smith
 Tillman N. Peters Clifton M. Craig, Jr.
 Allen T. Barnum Alfred L. Owens
 Robert A. Merchant, Jr. Charles J. Bailey, Jr.
 Walter L. Eddy, Jr. Gordon R. Lockard
 Hugh J. Chapman Robert R. Davis
 John E. Decher, Jr. Joe B. Russell
 John L. Donnell Richard S. Johnson
 Leyton M. Rogers Nathan C. Kingsbury

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Robert S. Hudson Lester Miller
 Howard W. Bollmann Richard E. Sullivan
 Alexander M. Hearn Virgil T. Wills
 Dan H. Johnson Earl J. Stearns
 William H. Costello Frank W. Harrington
 Norman O'Bryan Dave E. Severance
 Edmund W. Berry Harold E. Nelson
 Alton W. McCully Frederick Simpson
 George U. Smith Don P. Wyckoff
 James R. Dyer Sanford B. Hunt, Jr.
 Wilbur F. Evans, Jr. Thomas S. Wither-
 Leslie J. Parnell spoon
 Alfred H. Peterson John R. Stone
 Phillip T. Kujovsky Douglas E. Haberlie
 Clarence T. Risher, Jr. Robert Hall
 "J" "E" Estes Roy H. Elrod
 Henry Brzezinski William H. Nuckols,
 Joseph L. Abel Jr.
 Kenneth B. Boyd William H. Rankin
 Edward H. Voorhees James W. McIlwain

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major, for limited duty, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Cecil E. Anderson
 Floyd M. McCorkle

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Leo S. Maddy Paul L. Pankhurst
 Robert V. Burns Lynn E. Midkiff
 John S. Chambers, Jr. Judson C. Richardson,
 Charles J. Keen Jr.
 John D. Lines, Jr. Charles H. Woodley
 William E. Vorhies Richard Hey, Jr.
 Gilbert Percy George P. Blackburn,
 Thomas H. Hughes, Jr. Jr.
 Eugene G. McIntyre Ben L. Hoover
 Austin Wiggins, Jr. Edwin H. Simmons
 Robert W. Hengesbach Edgar D. Webber
 Joseph P. Lynch David W. Bridges
 Albert L. Clark George W. Carrington,
 Gerard M. Shuchter Jr.
 Edwin E. Shifflett Thomas M. Fields
 Paul H. Kellogg Richard H. Jeschke,
 James H. Phillips Jr.

John P. McNeil John Marston, Jr.
 Ralph J. Parker, Jr. Eugene J. Robinson
 Arthur M. Hale Dennis P. Casey
 Robert A. Scherr Samuel "C" Roach, Jr.
 Grover C. Williams, Jr. William L. Gunness
 Robert L. Rathbun
 Thomas J. Cushman,
 Jr.
 John J. Windsor
 Thomas M. Forsyth,
 Jr.
 Willis L. Fairbanks
 Robert F. Steinkraus
 John Skinner, Jr.
 Elswin P. Dunn
 Robert H. Brumley
 Oscar C. Hauge, Jr.
 Walter W. Turner
 William D. Armstrong
 George M. Warnke
 Wesley R. Christie
 Charles H. LeClaire
 George W. Ellis, Jr.
 Fred E. Haynes, Jr.
 William L. Bates, Jr.
 Robert M. Calland

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Lyle S. Stephenson Thomas T. Tulpane
 Hayward M. Friedrich John F. Driftmeyer
 Joseph L. Boll Henry Mayer
 Earle W. Belknap, Jr. Erskine B. Crew
 George W. Foulson Gordon I. Field
 Gilbert R. Templeton Otis W. S. Corman
 Donald F. Draeger Jerry E. A. Miller
 Carl A. Doll Charles S. Brown
 Boris J. Frankovic William P. Elzey, Jr.
 Glennon A. Johnston James C. Riffle
 Alan B. Lemlein Ernest J. Berger
 Sam A. Dressin Earl H. Falk
 James E. Victor, Jr. John J. McShane
 Bruce A. Rushlow Paul L. Robinson
 Robert C. Knauf Emil Skocpol
 Carlton K. Perkins Robert L. Simmons
 Cornelius Scheffer George B. Farish
 Joseph L. Svejkosky William D. Smart
 Berry P. McRobert John R. Brodrick
 James W. Judy Albert T. Lavers
 Norman R. Stanford Christopher M. Canan
 Byron C. Turner William "S" McCaslin,
 Gordon D. McPherson Jr.
 Roy C. Gray, Jr.
 James C. Camp, Jr. Ralph E. Bowen
 Paul B. Watson, Jr. Edward L. Lewis, Jr.
 Robert L. Allen Elmer R. Daniels, Jr.
 John W. Beckett, Jr. Francis E. Blake
 Arthur D. Challa- Robert A. Owens
 come, Jr. Edward J. Miller
 George R. Rupp Arthur L. LaRoche, Jr.
 Kenneth G. Meyer Walter E. Trantham,
 Jack H. Wilkinson Jr.
 Roy L. Anderson John J. Howe
 Howard L. Hean Edward J. Artnak
 Clarence W. Tuxbury George L. Haggerty
 Dale W. Hansen Charles S. Vohnhorn
 Robert T. Bell William E. Lesage
 Deane M. Barnett Charles I. Campbell,
 Norman W. Gourley Jr.
 Guy M. Cloud Robert I. Nelson
 Jesse T. Hastings, Jr. William E. Swetnam
 Walter E. Carr Nolan E. Tucker
 James C. McFerran III William F. Simpson,
 William Biehle, Jr. Jr.
 Godfrey Muller William F. Simpson,
 Wayne Johnson Fred B. Rogers

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain for limited duty, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Woodrow W. Brown
 Virgil R. Martin
 Adolph J. Kutilek

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

James M. Jefferson, Jr. Henry K. Bruce
 Vivian M. Moses Phillip G. Dyer

Raymond Dewees, Jr. Gordon V. Hodde
 Norman L. Hamm Willard D. Collup
 Robert F. Shields Doil R. Stitzel
 James H. Magill Cleveland C. Barry
 Frederick J. Helling, Jr. William R. Morrison
 Clark E. Merchant Arnold B. Capps
 Paul M. Ruffner Dwight F. Johns, Jr.
 Harris L. Whynaught Ralph P. Mawyer
 Charles A. House Frank E. Seabeck
 James H. Rinehart Eibert F. Veuleman
 Charles E. Dove Thomas M. Sagar
 Ernest I. Melin Jack Dunlap
 John N. Orr Edward B. Eisenhardt
 Robert M. Healy Homer E. Pettit, Jr.
 James C. Harrington Edward D. Oglesby
 Harry D. Scott Charles J. Irwin, Jr.
 LeRoy C. Barton Lewis J. Cox
 Gaylord C. Greenfield Clarence E. Schwa-
 James McDaniel neke
 Milford V. Seaman John C. Johnston
 George W. Piland, Jr. Eugene N. Bennett
 Leland R. Smith John N. Wester
 Vernon E. Ball Darrell L. Ritter
 James L. Lillie, Jr. Raymond R. Davis
 Ernest A. Mitch William H. Quick III
 Henry Hart Howard D. Campbell,
 Lester G. Harmon Jr.
 Gene "W" Morrison Marvin R. Russell
 William C. Carlson Johnnie C. Vance, Jr.
 Roger M. Sanders Charles E. Gocke, Jr.
 Thomas E. McCarthy Dewey H. Jackson
 George W. Callen Robert "L" Willis
 David H. Kennedy John M. Whitcomb
 William L. Traynor Emmons S. Maloney
 Robert E. Woerner Warren L. MacQuarrie
 Kevin Cochran William G. Mars, Jr.
 Boyd "M" Phelps Albert F. Dellamano
 Robert W. Lebo William Farrell
 Bryce Howerton Harry E. Nevill
 William C. Bell John A. Brown, Jr.
 William E. Zane William E. Culp
 Archie J. Clapp James W. Brayshay
 Donald A. McMillan David S. Reid III
 Carl Coon Kenneth W. Maust
 Ray D. Rushlow Clyde H. Slaton, Jr.
 Richard E. Oldwald William "J" Webster
 Richard M. Taylor Delmer O. Morris
 Walter E. Magon Henry N. Schwendi-
 James H. McRoberts man
 John G. Heidrick Oliver W. Curtis
 Russell G. Arndt John Strickland, Jr.
 Joseph W. Malcolm, Jr. Frank M. Hepler
 Carl M. Viner Oliver O. Arnold
 James V. Holcombe Wendell M. Waskom
 Alden McBarron William F. Guss
 Albert W. Simmons Robert R. Roy
 Charles B. Armstrong, Jr. Harding H. Holloway
 Jr. Robert E. Wellwood
 Thomas C. Billings
 Murray O. Roe David O. Takala
 Clifford W. Bucking- Byron J. Costello
 ham Arvene J. Kugler
 Byron M. Burbage John T. Molan
 Richard M. Moore James K. Johnson
 Karl B. Witte Robert W. Baker
 Edward J. Geishecker Mont L. Beamon
 Royce M. Williams Rodney D. McKitrick
 Walter T. McMillin Don M. Hinshaw
 Frank P. Moran Leonard A. Miller
 Arthur R. Causer Brett E. Roueche
 James C. Frew Joseph O. Lynch
 John L. Read Walter Sienko
 Jack E. Perry Paul "F" Bent
 Benjamin A. Fornon- Robert "J" Vroegin-
 zini, Jr. dewey
 William T. Witt, Jr. Paul L. Hirt
 Thomas A. Coleman John D. Ross
 Alfred F. Garrotto James A. Feliton
 George T. Lovelace Ralph M. Sudnick
 Rupert C. Wesley, Jr. Charles W. Fitzmau-
 Charles L. Schroeder rice
 Howard C. Veach Edward J. Orem
 John McManus Robert E. McNew
 Dean Wilker Welby W. Cronk
 Dellwyn L. Davis Homer E. Tinklepaugh
 Thomas E. Archer Joseph R. Arnaud
 Robert J. Larsen William H. Anderson
 George W. Ross William E. Barber
 Burks A. Via Phillip A. Terrell, Jr.
 Kenneth R. McCoy Harold "E" Bryant

John Urell
 James Aldworth
 Robert S. Hemstad
 Byron H. Beswick
 Joseph E. Blattman
 Kenneth A. Matheson
 Thomas J. Johnston, Jr.
 Richard C. Browning
 John L. Herndon
 Laurence J. Stien
 Richard B. Fielder
 Claude O. Barnhill, Jr.
 Thomas J. Norman, Jr.
 Walter W. Vatcher
 William "L" Beach
 John F. Cox
 John J. League
 William E. Brown
 Joseph Keller
 Karl T. Keller
 Earl W. Cassidy
 Donald C. Mitchell
 James E. Graaff
 Raymond E. Wase
 Raymond E. DeMers
 Malcolm G. Moncrief, Jr.
 Otis E. Millenbine
 Alexander J. Gillis, Jr.
 George L. Winneberger, Jr.
 Robert G. Klein
 Gerald J. Maire
 William W. Eldridge, Jr.
 Richard A. Polen
 George A. Parant
 Herbert C. Reed
 Edward W. Turcotte
 Lloyd B. Dochterman, Jr.
 Edward H. Rice
 Charles W. Weitzel, Jr.
 Daniel R. Kingsley
 Albert H. Risner
 Richard E. Moody
 Boyce L. Lassiter
 George L. Wineriter
 William M. Sigler, Jr.
 Walter B. Patton
 Bevan G. Cass
 Thomas F. McGraw, Jr.
 Albert C. Schoner
 Dwight E. Mayo
 Robert W. Hohl
 Richard J. Schriver
 Robert B. Clay
 John W. Walker
 John E. Shields
 Roscoe R. St. John
 David G. Swinford
 William J. Longfellow
 Richard A. Bauer
 Norman G. Ewers
 Roger A. Morris
 Harold O. Jones
 Raymond M. Smith
 Oliver R. Davis

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Harold R. Mackey
 George F. Good III
 Kenneth R. Snyder
 Lemuel C. Shepherd III
 Reuel W. Stephens, Jr.
 Robert L. Gover, Jr.
 Foster W. Blough
 George A. Babe
 Elmer J. Anderson
 Joseph Koler, Jr.
 William F. Young
 Lawrence J. Bradley
 Thomas C. Shanahan
 Elvin R. Coon, Jr.
 Donald F. Hillmer

Ewald A. Vomorde, Jr.
 Phillip H. Ronzone
 Robert A. Foyle
 William J. Vetter, Jr.
 Ralph G. Dekle
 Frederic A. Gessner
 John J. Bozek
 William M. Vanzuyen
 Jack M. Lerond
 Donald L. Hall
 Charles R. Munn, Jr.
 Arthur C. Beverly
 Howard E. Reese
 Michael L. Cannon
 Robert J. McNicholas
 George L. Peters

Louis Baerlsowl, Jr.
 Wilber F. Taylor
 Richard D. McClintic
 William R. Medlock
 Roma T. Taylor, Jr.
 William H. Macklin
 James G. Webster
 Charles F. King, Jr.
 Bertram F. Pryor
 Sidney H. Hilliard, Jr.
 Neal E. Hefferman
 Joseph L. Davis
 William R. Lipscomb
 Jack R. Hansen
 Guenther W. Lenfer
 Charles A. Merrill
 Earl R. DeLong
 Joris J. Snyder
 Lewis R. Webb
 John F. Miniclier
 John E. Quigley
 William A. McClelland
 William T. Hickman
 Nicholas A. Canzona
 Chew E. Lee
 James A. Horn
 Alvin W. Burri
 Robert E. Barde
 John E. Dolan
 Donald L. Mann
 James H. A. Flood
 Carl Pedersen, Jr.
 Clair "F" Runyan
 Charles W. Cox
 Robert V. Anderson
 Albert C. McLean
 Bruce Magruder, Jr.
 Robert G. Work
 Lee D. Martin
 Charles W. Blyth
 Willard G. Orth
 Samuel L. Grier
 Jack A. Cohoon
 Henry J. Witkowski
 Paul Kessler
 Weldon L. Keating
 Alfred L. Lelidy
 Richard M. Ulf
 Gene M. McCain
 Michael J. Vrabel
 Alfred L. Perry, Jr.
 Joseph M. Brent
 Gordon S. Baxter
 William L. Hewetson
 Kenneth E. Rice
 Richard R. Miller
 Robert M. H. Dupuy
 John R. Barnard
 Robert E. Hill
 William A. Harris
 John C. Alexander
 Raymond J. Elledge
 Chester E. Tucker
 Kenny C. Palmer
 Robert J. Perrich
 Stanley H. Carpenter
 Gerald B. Zwetzig
 Joseph R. Cross
 Harold B. Wilson
 Charles R. Stephen-son III
 Albert J. Richter
 Robert J. Laws
 Gayle K. Broussard
 Donald E. Gilman
 Herbert J. Blaha
 James F. Gallagher
 William C. Patton
 Stanley T. Moak
 Joseph F. McPartland
 John "S" McNulty, Jr.
 Nye G. Rodes, Jr.
 David A. Rapp
 Burl B. Bevers
 James A. Sloan
 Robert J. Daeschler
 William T. Walker

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to

the grade of commissioned warrant officer, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

George S. Nelson
 John M. McCarty
 Gene F. Wightman
 Edward E. Gibbon
 John E. Curtis
 Robert K. Adams
 James H. Edmonson
 William B. Greear, Jr.
 Buford Blalock
 Frederick L. Weath-erby
 Carl Omasta
 Robert J. Plumbley
 Thomas E. Reaves
 James M. Hays
 William B. Sweetser
 Henry H. Schroder
 Arnold V. Allen
 William H. Amos
 Arnold W. Stogner
 Joseph A. Williams
 John A. Harper
 William R. Myers
 George T. Edwards
 Ray Graham
 James H. Kates
 Joseph F. Barry
 Richard A. Carlson
 Daniel W. Merrill
 James L. Hoffman
 Richard C. Overby
 Charles P. Johnson
 George Alexander
 Perry R. Fillingim
 William B. Kohl
 Andrew F. Marshall
 Almon D. Embrey
 George Cicala
 John A. Scarborough
 Aloysius C. Gidlewski
 Harlice H. Green
 Harold Sobol
 Paul Carter
 Beauford Griffin
 Frank R. Roberson
 Jose Liera
 Kenneth G. Arnold
 Carroll W. Horton, Jr.

Clifford J. Fields
 Audra F. Ridenour
 Meade H. Warthen
 Lawrence W. Reed
 Edward C. Needham
 James M. Riley, Jr.
 James C. Smith
 Donald D. Amick
 Walker R. Lynch
 Jerry A. Harness
 Arthur E. Treadwell
 James "C" Eiland
 Novis I. Rains
 Jerry K. Butler, Jr.
 Warren B. Jones, Jr.
 Paul V. Lloyd
 Jack R. Nielsen
 Maurice O. Bennette
 Sargent Goen
 Edward C. Schmidt
 Jessie R. Collins
 Charles A. Cole, Jr.
 Clyde D. Therrien
 Raymond E. Lewis
 Glenn L. Kemp
 William T. Faulk
 Charles C. Jensen
 James F. Sparrow
 John B. Beard
 William B. Edmondson
 Roland D. Vary
 Bill E. Parrish
 Kermit R. Jensen
 Thomas G. Taylor
 Edward S. Norris
 William J. Heacox
 George "W" Graves
 Samuel R. Coffey
 Joseph E. Clement
 John A. Wright
 Claude A. Fisher
 Hans DeJong
 Paul F. Honeycutt
 Edward O. Smith
 Ewing B. Harvey
 Clayton D. Sketoe
 Murray G. Dowler

The following-named woman officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Julia E. Hamblet

The following-named woman officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Pauline B. Beckley

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Jeanne Fleming
 Ben A. Day
 Margaret S. Ordemann
 Frances A. Denbo
 Kathleen J. Arney

Jeannette I. Sustad
 Margaret L. Stevenson
 Mary F. Fischer
 Mary J. Hale

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 28, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
 The Acting Chaplain, James P. Wesley, LL. D., offered the following prayer:

We give Thee thanks, our Father, for all who serve our Nation and especially for those who share in the work of this great legislative body. Strengthen Thou them as they bear the burdens of

the day. Grant Thy tender and gracious care to any who are sick and the comfort and peace of Thy love to those who sorrow. Watch over our loved ones by day and by night. Be Thou the companion of all who travel on errands of business for our Government. Keep and guide the representatives of our country in far-away lands. Refresh those who are on vacation. Lovingly and gratefully we praise Thee for our beloved Chaplain whose Christlike ministry in our midst brings comfort and cheer to our hearts and blessing to our Nation. Let Thy richest benediction rest upon him, upon us, and our Nation today, we pray in Jesus' name. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4963) entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1184) entitled "An act to encourage construction of rental housing on or in areas adjacent to Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 50-4.

TEMPORARY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 329) amending an act making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1950, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That Public Law 154 (81st Cong.), making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1950, and for other purposes, is hereby amended by striking out, in section

(c) thereof, "July 31, 1949" and inserting in lieu thereof "August 31, 1949."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this is a continuing resolution, providing temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1950. It is the second continuing resolution making appropriations for the new fiscal year and is made necessary by the failure of the other body to dispose of the appropriation bills messaged over from the House and now pending on the other side.

The House passed all the major supply bills and messaged them to the Senate prior to April 15. As of this date—considerably more than 3 months later—only eight of the appropriation bills, six of the annual supply bills and two deficiency bills, have become law.

One bill, the civil functions appropriation bill, is in conference but, on motion of the Senate conferees, further conference on it has been suspended pending action on the foreign aid and armed services appropriation bills.

Five of the bills—Interior, military, independent offices, foreign aid, and the third deficiency bill—are awaiting passage by the Senate. Of these five bills, the foreign-aid bill has been recommitted to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, the independent offices bill is now under consideration on the floor of the Senate, the Interior and military bills have been reported and are now on the Senate calendar awaiting action on the floor. The third deficiency appropriation bill has not yet been reported by the Senate committee.

The House is marking time awaiting action on the part of the Senate and is ready to cooperate on all appropriation measures not yet disposed of.

The continuing resolution now before the House is identical with the joint resolution previously agreed to in every respect except the date. The joint resolution passed June 29, 1949, continued current appropriations to July 31, 1949. The pending joint resolution extends the date to August 31, 1949. It is to be hoped that final action can be taken on all 1950 supply bills by the middle of August or soon thereafter.

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

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman have in mind the conversation I had with him this morning about the ECA?

Mr. CANNON. May I say to the gentleman that I looked into the matter to which he refers very carefully and consulted the authorities, and am assured that this resolution takes care of foreign aid and no special mention is required in order to make it applicable or effective.

Mr. McCORMACK. The only information I have is that I was informed yesterday by the majority leader of the Senate that a Mr. Rice, if I am not mistaken, or someone over there in the Legislative Counsel's office, has given an opinion that the last continuing resolution did not cover ECA.

Mr. CANNON. We consulted Mr. Rice and he informs us that he was misunderstood. In his opinion no further lan-

guage is necessary to make it applicable to ECA funds. We also had an opinion some time ago from the General Accounting Office, which assures us that the joint resolution applies to ECA as fully as to all other affected agencies.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, my friend states that this resolution applies to ECA appropriations and continues them the same as the other appropriations?

Mr. CANNON. I think there can be no doubt about it.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is the intention that it should so apply, is that correct?

Mr. CANNON. That is entirely correct.

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

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Does this resolution include the \$624,000,000 additional that Great Britain is asking for ECA?

Mr. CANNON. This joint resolution includes support of all Government agencies at the rate provided for the fiscal year 1949.

Mr. RICH. She is asking for \$624,000,000 additional, I noticed in yesterday morning's paper. The gentleman is not in favor of giving Great Britain \$624,000,000 to keep that socialized government going?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman understands that the pending resolution applies only to appropriations which have been made in former supply bills. It is a continuation of past appropriations. The gentleman realizes it has nothing to do with any future proposed appropriations.

Mr. RICH. Under ECA you have already given Great Britain over a billion dollars in the appropriation bill that passed the House.

Mr. CANNON. I have given no more than has been given by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who supported the appropriations passed by the last Congress.

Mr. RICH. No, the gentleman from Pennsylvania was against it. I want the gentleman to know I am against it, and I want it in the RECORD that I am against it.

Mr. CANNON. But when these appropriation bills were passed in the last Congress the gentleman voted for them.

Mr. RICH. I am standing up here now fighting. I am against socialism and I am against keeping any government in power that is Socialist. I am against keeping any government in power that is Communist. I am for free governments of all the people all over the world. I do not want the gentleman or anybody else to say that I am trying to support the socialized Government of Great Britain, because I am against it.

Mr. CANNON. I am certain when the subjects to which the gentleman refers come before the House we shall be glad to hear the gentleman. They have nothing to do with the present resolution.

Mr. RICH. I do not want ECA to be included in this because I do not want you to appropriate money that is going to keep any government in power that is

socialistic. I would not give 1 cent to keep this country in power if it were socialistic. I would run away from it. But I hope and I am sure the American people are never going to let it go socialistic. I am going to do everything in my power to keep that from happening.

Mr. CANNON. We are always glad to hear the gentleman when he speaks on subjects before the House.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I feel the House should have a picture of just what the situation is with reference to the bills to which this resolution relates.

The civil functions appropriations bill was passed by the House on the 29th day of March. It was passed by the other body on the 20th of May and went to conference on the first of June. It is still in conference. We have had many sessions, but no results.

The next bill covered is the Interior Department appropriations bill which was passed by the House on March 30. It was reported to the other body on July 13, almost 3 weeks ago, and has not yet been taken up by the other body.

The National Military Establishment appropriations bill passed the House on the 13th of April, was reported to the other body on the 22d of July, a week ago, and has not yet been taken up by the other body.

The independent offices appropriations bill, which passed the House on the 14th of April, was reported to the other body on July 8, and was taken up by the other body yesterday afternoon and is before them at the present time. When that bill will go to conference, I do not know.

The foreign aid, or ECA appropriation bill, which passed the House the 26th of May, was up before the other body and was recommitted to the Appropriations Committee of that body on yesterday.

The third deficiency appropriation bill, which passed the House on the 24th of June has not yet been reported to the Senate.

This is the first time, Mr. Speaker, that I have ever known it to be necessary to pass a second continuing resolution. I do not know how many more such resolutions we are going to have to pass. The Democratic majority is in control of both Houses of Congress and this failure to pass ordinary routine appropriation bills demonstrates the constitutional incapacity of the Democratic Party to govern.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. In view of the extensions that have been had, why not just make this extension until next January so that we can adjourn and go home and give the country a little chance?

Mr. TABER. That would interfere with the routine operations of the other body and give them so much rope that they would think they do not have to agree to a conference report.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. With reference to the ECA, I see that the other body voted yesterday 41 to 37 to increase the amount for Great Britain by \$624,000,000. Then they voted to send the bill back to committee. That is going to be 42 percent of all of the ECA. Forty-two percent of all the money you are spending is for no other purpose than to keep a Socialist government going.

Mr. TABER. Well, there is another purpose. There is the purpose of keeping Great Britain bankrupt and keeping her in such condition as well as her people, that they cannot support themselves on a permanent basis.

Mr. RICH. That is a fine statement. I agree with the gentleman exactly. If it was not for America, they would have to go to work, would they not?

Mr. TABER. They would have to go to work, and that is not what they are doing.

Mr. RICH. It would be a good thing for somebody to make them go to work and earn their own way and show what socialism means to them. It means bankruptcy to any nation in my language. I am sick and tired of taxing the American people who work hard to pay Great Britain for their socialism. Socialism is a menace to any nation. Great Britain has already proven it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

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

STEAMSHIP "TAIYUAN"

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1288) for the relief of certain officers and members of the crew of the steamship *Taiyuan*, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 17, strike out "and."

Page 2, line 19, strike out "\$3,675;" and insert "\$3,675;" and

"Vincent Foster, care of J. P. Bowman, Standard Oil Co. of California, marine department, San Francisco, Calif., the sum of \$2,310."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OLYMPIC HOTEL

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1472) for the relief of the Olympic Hotel, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, after "pay," insert ", out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DANIEL KIM

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1466) for the relief of Daniel Kim, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 4, after "canceled," insert "Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Korea for the first year that such quota is available."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHRISTINE KONO

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1625) for the relief of Christine Kono, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Christine Kono, the Dutch-Japanese fiancée of Charles Kramer, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, and that Christine Kono may be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Christine Kono is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to Charles Kramer, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of said Christine Kono, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of said Christine Kono, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of said Christine Kono, as of the date of her entry into the United States, upon the payment by her of the required fees and head tax."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TEIKO HORIKAWA AND YOSHIKO HORIKAWA

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2084) for the relief of Teiko Horikawa and Yoshiko Horikawa, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which exclude from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not apply to Teiko and Yoshiko Horikawa, minor twin stepdaughters of David Bailey Carpenter, a World War II veteran who married Yoshi Horikawa Higo, a Japanese national and the mother of such minor stepdaughters, on August 6, 1947, and for the purpose of the immigration and naturalization laws Teiko and Yoshiko Horikawa shall be considered to be the natural-born daughters of their stepfather, David Bailey Carpenter."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DENISE SIMEON BOUTANT

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2850) for the relief of Denise Simeon Boutant, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, notwithstanding the provisions of law which makes ineligible for permanent residence persons who are racially ineligible to citizenship, the Attorney General shall record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Denise Simeon Boutant, now Denise Simeon Boutant Peterson, who is the legal wife of William S. Peterson, a United States citizen, as of December 1948, at which time she was temporarily admitted into the United States."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article showing the honor list of the dead and missing for the State of Mississippi during the recent World War.

Mr. ADDONIZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KILDAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

ACTING CHAPLAIN DR. JAMES P. WESBERRY

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, during the well-deserved vacation of our beloved Chaplain of the House, Dr. James Shera Montgomery, our Acting Chaplain is Dr. James P. Wesberry.

It is a great privilege to have Dr. Wesberry serve with us in the House of Representatives in the high capacity of Acting Chaplain. I feel sure that I am joined in this sentiment by every Member of the House.

Dr. Wesberry is the beloved pastor of Morningside Baptist Church in Atlanta, which pastorate he has filled for the past 6 years.

At the present time Dr. Wesberry and the congregation of that church are engaged in building a new church and educational plant on a beautiful 14-acre lot in the heart of one of Atlanta's loveliest residential areas. The plant will ultimately cost approximately half a million dollars.

Dr. Wesberry is a native of South Carolina, having been born at Bishopville, S. C., April 16, 1906, the son of William McLeod Wesberry and Lillian I. Galloway. He received his education in the public schools of Columbia, S. C., and received degrees of bachelor of arts and master of arts from Mercer University, Macon, Ga. He received the degree of bachelor of divinity and master of sacred theology from Andover Newton Theological School, Newton Center, Mass. He was a special student at Harvard University in 1931, and attended summer conferences at the Union Theological Seminary in New York City. He is a graduate of the Yale School of Alcohol Studies, and was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of laws by the Atlanta Law School.

Dr. Wesberry was ordained as a minister of the gospel at the age of 23 on September 5, 1929, by the Park Street Baptist Church of Columbia, S. C.

He was a pastor of rural churches while a student at Mercer University, and during his last two years at that University was pastor of Soperton Baptist Church, Soperton, Ga. During that time a new church was erected at Soperton.

Dr. Wesberry also was pastor of the South Medford Baptist Church, at Medford, Mass., while a student in the seminary. His first pastorate after graduation was the Kingstree Baptist Church, Kingstree, S. C.

He served as pastor of the Bamberg Baptist Church, Bamberg, S. C., for 11 years, and since March 1, 1944, has been the pastor of Morningside Baptist Church in Atlanta.

Dr. Wesberry has received special recognition for his active efforts in many

fields of endeavor. Early in life his unusual ability began to be recognized. He was student manager of athletics in the Columbia High School in 1924 and 1925. He was editor in chief of the Columbia, high school magazine. He served as assistant scoutmaster while in high school.

At Mercer University he was elected master Mercerian, the highest honor bestowed by the student body and faculty of Mercer University, receiving this honor in 1930.

He was president of the South Carolina Baptist Ministers' Conference, and chairman of the committee on order of business for the South Carolina Baptist Convention in 1943.

He was a moderator of the Barnwell Baptist Association, and since 1944, he has served in the capacity of trustee of Mercer University.

He has served as vice president of the home mission board of the Southern Baptist Convention since 1944, and is a member of its executive committee. He is a former member of the radio committee of the Southern Baptist Convention. He served in May 1949 as a member of the committee on boards and of the committee on committees, at the last meeting of the Southern Baptist Convention in Oklahoma City.

His fellow ministers in Atlanta have elected him to the position of president of the Atlanta Baptist Ministers' Conference, which position he fills at the present time.

He was vice president and chairman of the committee on order of business of the Georgia Baptist Convention in 1947.

Dr. Wesberry is recognized not only for his active efforts in church and ministerial work, but is likewise recognized for his fine civic work.

He is at present chairman of the trustees of the educational foundation of the Atlanta Lions Club. He is chairman of the trustees of the Atlanta extension of Mercer University, and professor of New Testament. He is also at present the national president of Alpha Chi Omega Divinity Fraternity.

He is a past president of the Bamberg (S. C.) Lions Club, and a past chaplain of the South Carolina State Lions convention.

During the Second World War Dr. Wesberry served as chaplain, holding the rank of captain, in the South Carolina Home Defense Guard for Bamberg County. He is chairman of the radio committee of the Georgia Baptist Convention, and is a past member of the executive committee of the Georgia Baptist Convention.

Dr. Wesberry is also known and recognized for his fine work as an author and writer. He is the author of the Life and Work of William Screven, First Southern Baptist Preacher, and is a writer of programs for the Young Peoples' Training Union Quarterly of the Southern Baptist Convention. He is a contributor of editorials, articles, and sermons to various other magazines.

It has been my privilege to know Dr. Wesberry intimately for almost the entire length of his period of service in

Atlanta. I have known him as a consecrated, sincere, and effective worker in all fields of Christian service.

His selection as Acting Chaplain of this body, I feel, brings honorable recognition to the Fifth Congressional District of Georgia, where he lives and serves. I know that during his period of service here as Acting Chaplain he will endear himself to all those with whom he comes in contact, and the example of his Christian life will inspire us to apply ourselves with renewed faith and energy to the difficult tasks which we face here.

HON. MARY T. NORTON

Mr. HOWELL. 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week while I was necessarily absent from the House briefly, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] made an unfair and unwarranted attack on the motives and abilities of my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON]. It seems that anyone who disagrees with the views of the gentleman from Mississippi, his views on human rights and decent legislation is Communist-inspired, and any organization that supports that type of legislation is a Communist-front organization. I know that virtually every Member of this House has nothing but the highest regard for my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] and they know that she has served usefully and in a very splendid manner for 25 years or more in this House. Everyone I know respects her and resents this type of attack.

I sincerely hope the gentleman from Mississippi will see fit to make an apology to the distinguished gentlewoman from New Jersey.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in the first to include an address by the Solicitor General of the United States, notwithstanding that it may exceed the limit; and in the second to include an editorial by Mr. Frank Aiken.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the extensions may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. FRAZIER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in today's Washington Post.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a certain newspaper article.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today following the special orders heretofore entered.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 1758) to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. And also that minority views may be filed, if there be any?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

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

There was no objection.

MINIMUM-WAGE BILL

Mr. LUCAS. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, as I advised the House yesterday, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] has stated that he was going to call up the bill H. R. 3190, the minimum-wage bill, on August 8, under his rule. I wish to advise you again that I am going to offer as a substitute, H. R. 4272, a bill which has been prepared by a number of Members of Congress and which will be offered for your consideration. I invite each of the Members to get a copy of H. R. 4272 and study the bill so that he may understand its provisions and understand that it is a good, clean bill protecting the small businesses of the Nation. If there are any questions I shall be pleased to answer them.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CHURCH. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CHURCH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE REFUNDS TO VETERANS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, for one reason or another the national service life insurance refunds have not been paid to the veterans. I took this matter up with the President and have received the following letter from him:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 27, 1949.

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: Replying to yours of the 22d, space in Washington is the most

unobtainable thing there is. I can't even find space enough for my own personal secretaries to transact their business.

The State Department is scattered all over town in 22 buildings, and that is true of every other department in the Government. I regret that situation but it isn't of my making—I have to take the situation as I find it and do the best I can with it.

I naturally appreciate your interest in the disbursement of the veterans insurance refunds and I am glad you are interested, for I am very much interested in it myself, and hoping that the matter can be worked out promptly.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that all departments in Washington ought to be willing to give up space in order that the money due the veterans may be returned to them at once. We have heard much about the streamlining and reorganization of the Government, but we know the records show the departments are expanding.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Mr. King entitled "Deficit Financing and Shrinking Dollars."

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

PEACE AND HOW IT MAY BE OBTAINED

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GORE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday you made the statement in the House of Representatives that we are still in a state of war. I wonder if that statement caused the President to send down here a request that we appropriate \$1,400,000,000 to arm a lot of countries that have been spoken of as the North Atlantic Pact nations. Are you going to arm those countries? What are we going to arm them for? More war? If you want war that is the way to get it. Prepare for war, arm the countries and you get war.

The way to secure peace in this world is to stop talking about war. Stop spending for war. Get that power and spirit away from the President and then let us talk peace and we will have peace in the world. That is the only way you are going to get it. Work for peace and you get peace. Prepare for war and you will get war.

Here is another thing, Mr. Speaker. We owe \$253,000,000,000 according to the Treasury statement of July 25. We have not \$1,400,000,000 to spend arming a lot of these countries in Europe. I say let us get down to the proposition of talking peace. Again I ask you where you get the \$1,400,000,000 to arm Europe. The only way to get the money is to tax our people; our people now holler, "Stop taxing us, reduce our taxes," and I am for that.

Peace be unto you.

Peace be with us for evermore—is my fervent prayer.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HAYS of Arkansas addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

IS OUR NATION FACING MORAL DECAY?

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, twice recently two outstanding figures, one the leader of a great religious faith and the other the chief of our Army, have sounded a warning of the moral decay facing our Nation and the world which should be heeded by all.

Pope Pius XII declared that morality is in retreat and called upon the women to fight against the sensuality of youth which is endangering civilization. He warned, as he has in the past, of the dangers of communism, which fastens its roots on the shattered home when parents fail in their duty to practice moral life and properly care for their offspring.

General Bradley, in his warning to the Nation asserted that the greatest single cause for delinquency in citizenship can be traced to the declining sense of responsibility in the home, the church, and the school. He said that the family is the basic unit of our society and that is where the responsibility begins.

Here we have a world church leader and a qualified military official telling us in strong words of the moral decay facing the people today. When warnings come from men of this stature, they cannot be ignored. There is a great suffering ahead for the world unless there is a moral and spiritual revival. We must halt the infection of moral decay in the homes which has spread to the youth which is walking hand-in-hand with the crass materialism of modern political philosophy. The plea of the Pope and the warning of General Bradley must not go unheeded, for if it is not heeded the forces of Marx, Stalin, and Lenin will reap the harvest.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and have printed in the RECORD General Bradley's article which appeared in the Reader's Digest.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short editorial.

Mr. DAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include an editorial in each.

NO APOLOGY

Mr. RANKIN. 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I was not facetious a while ago when I was asking the name of the individual who was up here attacking me. I asked all the Members around me what his name was, and none of them could tell me. I finally found out it was the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWELL].

Day before yesterday the bill you passed here, of which many of you are utterly ashamed, was heralded in the Communist Daily Worker as the Marcantonio bill. I said that the other day and I say it now, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWELL] voted with the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

On yesterday about the most ridiculous movement I have ever known to be made in this House was made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] to bury, you might say, the military housing bill, and only a few Members followed the gentleman from New York's [Mr. MARCANTONIO'S] leadership. One of those few was a man by the name of HOWELL from New Jersey. I presume it is the same gentleman who was up here attacking me a few moments ago. I have no apology for what I said in the debate on day before yesterday.

Whenever any Member attacks the people I represent, that Member may expect to hear from me in no uncertain terms.

That is what happened day before yesterday; and I have no apology for what I said.

1950 WHEAT ACREAGE ALLOTMENT

Mr. DEWART. 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 Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Speaker, the 1950 acreage allotments on wheat announced by the Secretary of Agriculture are a serious blow to the agricultural economy of the State of Montana.

The Secretary has announced that the 1950 production of wheat will be restricted to 82.9 percent of the acreage in production this year in the Nation as a whole.

This is a sizable reduction, but for the State of Montana he has announced a 1950 acreage allotment of only 76.4 percent of the 1949 figure.

This means that Montana wheat farmers, who this year have 5,579,000 acres planted in wheat, will be permitted to have only 4,265,806 acres in 1950, a decrease of 23.6 percent.

In Montana, where county and farm allotments are now being decided, there is considerable resentment against the

Secretary's decision. I think this resentment is justified.

Montana is one of the large wheat-producing States of this country. Wheat is a principal item in our agricultural economy, and agriculture is the principal item in our State economy. Such a drastic cut in wheat acreage will have a damaging effect on the entire State.

I cannot understand how the Agriculture Department arrived at this terrific reduction for my State, unless it could be that the Department has overlooked the significant fact that the lands used for raising wheat in Montana are not generally suitable for any other crop. There cannot be an easy change to another crop, as there could be in New York, Iowa, or Missouri, States which have similar reductions.

If we cannot grow wheat on our land, the land must lay idle. Montana farmers who already are suffering the effects of a serious drought in the eastern section of the State, an almost unprecedented grasshopper infestation in the southeastern section, and the general decline in prices which has occurred with particular severity in the crops in which we specialize, cannot be expected to accept without protest a Government decree which will further cut their income, especially when it appears to be unfair and all out of proportion to the importance of the matters involved.

I realize that there is little hope that the Department of Agriculture, having once spoken, will review its decision. I wish it were possible to have them do so, and I wish to be on record as protesting what appears to be an unwarranted injury to the farmers of Montana.

NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. KEATING. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, before they take off for Europe it is essential that the Army, Navy, and Air Force leaders indicate to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs just what parts of our national defense program they are prepared to forego or curtail in order to make arms and equipment available to the Atlantic Pact nations.

We cannot add a billion and a half dollars, or even half that, on the already staggering figure of \$15,910,000,000 which we have appropriated for defense purposes for the next fiscal year. This record peacetime figure is already nearly 40 percent of our total budget. It must not be increased.

Our military leaders have indicated that there is a definite and urgent need for this program to implement and make effective the Atlantic Pact. That may be so. The best use of the defense dollar may be made by allotting a part of it to the arming of our friends among the western democracies. We must insist, however, that our National Defense Establishment undertake the selective

process of pointing out what part of present plans they consider less important to our national security and, therefore, worthy of elimination or deferment.

Military assistance to Europe can only be justified if it lightens the budgetary load on the United States for other items of defense.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. SCUDDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the New York Times of July 26.

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Stewart Alsop.

Mr. ELLSWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SANBORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an address made by Mr. Sprague, a native of Texas, before the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce, and in the other the remarks made by Representative DEANE recently before the Home Rule Committee.

Mrs. HARDEN asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial which appeared recently in the Indianapolis Star.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Professor Newman.

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Mr. T. M. Medford, of Salem, Oreg.

Mr. JAMES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include various articles.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he delivered before the Disabled American Veterans.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the mayor of the city of Manitowoc, Wis.

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

CONTINUATION OF SESSIONS OF CONGRESS BEYOND JULY 31, 1949

Mr. JENKINS. 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 Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure every Member of the House was much interested in the discussion yesterday between our distinguished former Speaker [Mr. MARTIN] and our distinguished Speaker [Mr. RAYBURN]. The Reorganization Act of 1946 provides "Except in time of war or during a national emergency proclaimed by the President, the two Houses shall adjourn sine die not later than the last day in the month of July in each year unless otherwise provided by the Congress."

Mr. MARTIN claimed that under this law Congress should adjourn before the 31st day of July. Speaker RAYBURN maintained that our country was still at war in view of the fact that peace treaties had not been signed by all the countries against whom we were fighting in the Second World War.

The language in the law is "in time of war." This does not mean in the time while peace negotiations were being carried on. Furthermore it is very probable that we will never enter into a peace treaty with Germany. If the position of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] is sustained we will always be at war with Germany.

The Speaker's ruling may bring serious consequences because the constitutionality of any law passed in this session of Congress after July 31 might be questioned in court. The claim would be that Congress was not legally in session.

There is a way out of this dilemma. Congress should immediately pass a concurrent resolution to cover this situation.

On yesterday I introduced such a resolution which reads as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Saturday, August 20, 1949, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

This or some similar resolution should and could be passed immediately.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He is absolutely right. If we are in a state of war and we have to stay here all summer and fall, let us appropriate the money for the defenses of this country. We have to fight the wars anyway. We fought the last one with our money, and the first one. As I remember the history of the war, it was the Americans that landed in Africa, in Italy, in France, and in the Pacific Islands. So let us look out for ourselves here instead of trying to carry on the battle of everybody else. As the gentleman pointed out, we owe \$252,000,000,000. If we are going to go in debt again, let us do it for the United States.

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. TOLLEFSON. 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, a recent suggestion by Budget Director Frank Pace that a simplified budget summary be issued next January is commendable. The idea is to boil down the 1,400-page budget into a 30-page summary and in such simple terms that the average citizen will be able to understand it.

Director Pace also suggests that President Truman make a major address on the budget later this summer. With a deficit of \$1,800,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and a possible deficit of \$5,000,000,000 plus for the next year, the President will have much to talk about.

But it occurs to me that we should have something more than talk. And commendable though reducing the physical budget to 30 pages may be, I believe the average citizen, who might thereby be able to understand it, would be much, much more interested in seeing a boiling down of the actual figures of the budget. Except for the brief period of 1947-48 the Federal Government is still engaged in deficit financing. When and where is this spending going to stop? The average citizen wants to know—judging from the mail which his Congressman receives. He wants his Government to begin practicing some economy. He wants the Hoover Commission recommendations put into effect. And he wants some tax relief.

Yet what do we find? In a single month in 1949 our Government spends as much as the \$3,500,000,000 total cost of 4 years of the Civil War.

In the last four peacetime years, 1946-49, the Federal spending was \$177,000,000,000. This exceeds the \$167,000,000,000 spent during the entire 152 years following George Washington's inauguration as President of the United States. Just think of it. Is it any wonder that the average citizen is more interested in boiling down the budget figures than in reducing the size of the book which contains them?

I am quite certain he is not going to be satisfied with talk about the budget—by the President or anyone else. He wants some action and that right soon.

ARMY WASTE

Mr. TABER. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a copy of the Oneonta Star paper of New York of Friday, July 8, 1939, and I read:

This is an inspection by the Chief of Army Engineers.

The inspection group arriving at Keyes Airport in the general's DC-3 Army transport

was met by three Government cars sent from Baltimore, Md., to transport the party to the dam.

That is 350 miles. It probably would cost to send those cars up, including the per diem of the chauffeurs and the mileage and the maintenance and all that sort of thing, from \$400 to \$500.

In brackets in the article is this statement:

[An Oneonta taxi firm estimated that the party, which required three cars, and took 1 hour and 45 minutes, could have been provided local transportation at a cost of slightly more than \$10.]

Mr. Speaker, this is a sample of the way the bureaucrats are wasting the money of the people of the United States.

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. 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 Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words of praise about the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWELL]. Our colleague, who is in his first term here, is making an outstanding record for himself. He is very faithful in attendance on the floor of the House and with his committee meetings. He takes part in all the functions of the House of Representatives. If the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] was sincere in saying he did not know who the gentleman from New Jersey was, he must be one of the very few Members of Congress who does not know.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I demand those words be taken down. A man cannot stand on the floor of the House and accuse another of insincerity.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. If the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] was sincere in saying he did not know who he was, he must be one of the very few Members of Congress who does not know.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order. That does not violate the rules. I thought he said I was insincere.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] just said that if he had voted yesterday he would have voted with Mr. MARCANTONIO on that radical motion to bury the military housing bill.

So that settles the matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the point of order is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include certain editorials and printed matter.

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

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the Sabine-Neches waterway

project, and also in another instance and include certain extraneous matter.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order that I may ask the majority leader with reference to the program for next week and the balance of this week, if he is prepared to tell us.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be very glad to announce the program as far as I am able to.

Monday, of course, is Consent Calendar day. There are 11 bills to be considered under suspension of the rules. An important one, H. R. 5598, a pension increase of service-connected disability cases. I have agreed with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] that if there is to be a roll call on that bill, I will try to have it put over until Tuesday.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon termination of the debate on the bill H. R. 5598 on Monday next that final action be taken on the bill on Tuesday.

Mr. RANKIN. That is perfectly agreeable, Mr. Speaker. The bill will be taken up under suspension, and if there is a roll call, which undoubtedly there will be, it will be put over until Tuesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I wish to make the same request with reference to the conference report on the unification bill. In the event the conference report is submitted with reference to the unification bill, if it is called up on Monday and there is a roll call, that the vote will be taken on Tuesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. I may state to the House that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], told me that the conferees have agreed on the unification bill for the armed services. Of course, the Senate must act first. As we are going to adjourn tonight until Monday, that would come up on Monday. I would suggest to the gentleman that in the event of a roll call final action on that matter be taken on Tuesday.

I ask unanimous consent now, Mr. Speaker, that if there is a roll call on the adoption of the conference report on the unification bill, and I assume there will be, because the amendments of the Senate are far-reaching and important and the Members of the House may want to go on record, that the final action be taken on Tuesday.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman permit the Chair to make a suggestion. If we do not finish these bills that are on the calendar to be considered under suspension on Monday, they will all have to go over for 2 weeks. I was wondering

if it would not be better to say that in all probability, unless we get through with those 11 suspensions on Monday, the conference report would not come up until Tuesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Monday, the Consent Calendar will be called, and 11 bills will be called up under suspension of the rules, the one of very substantial importance being H. R. 1558, to provide a pension increase in service-connected cases.

We hope to adjourn today over to Monday.

The SPEAKER. I think it would probably save some time if the Chair's suggestion were followed.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, it will be perfectly satisfactory to me to call up the conference report on Tuesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I withdraw my consent request, Mr. Speaker.

The bills to be called up under suspension are:

H. R. 4446, the Administrative Practitioners Act.

S. 1076, Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act.

H. R. 1746, restoration and management, fisheries projects.

H. R. 5535, Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946.

H. R. 5730, Institute of Inter-American Affairs.

H. R. 4403, recreational facilities.

H. R. 3282, Indians—liquor law.

H. R. 4548, Fort Logan, Colo., National Cemetery.

H. R. 3788, Vermejo reclamation project.

H. R. 163, construction of canals in Sacramento Valley.

Following that we will take up H. R. 29 under a rule. If taken up on Monday but not concluded, its consideration will be continued on Tuesday; if not reached on Monday it will be the first order of business on Tuesday, following the Private Calendar.

The Private Calendar will be called on Tuesday.

For the balance of the week other bills will be considered if rules are reported on them. I may say that the House has been far ahead of the Rules Committee. However, if rules are reported, the following bills will be called up for consideration:

H. R. 5472, public works, rivers and harbors bill.

H. R. 5330, Korean aid.

H. R. 1758, Natural Gas Act amended.

H. R. 5738, amends Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938—cotton acreage.

Conference reports may be called up at any time.

That program depends on what the House may receive through the generosity of the Rules Committee; all of them are dependent upon whether or not rules are reported. There are certain things we would like to dispose of and the quicker we can do so the quicker the House can get through and be in position to take 3-day recesses. I make this statement in all frankness to the House, that I am looking forward to being in a position, if certain bills are disposed of, if the Committee on Rules makes their consideration in order, when we can take 3-day recesses. We have

a rivers and harbors bill, the consideration of which is waiting on the pleasure of the Committee on Rules. As a matter of fact appropriations have already been made, some of which are dependent on authorizations contained in that bill. The bills have been reported. It is to be hoped that the Rules Committee will cooperate so the House can express its will, that is all. Let the House do the expressing of its will. Then we are in a very good position to take some 3-day recesses in the not-too-remote future.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. In the matter of the suggestion of the gentleman from Massachusetts that votes go over until a later date, I want to refer to what happened on Monday last when certain matters came in here upon which some of us wanted to have a record vote, but we were advised that some agreement had been entered into preventing that. I do not propose to let that happen any more. I think we ought to get along with the business of the House and expedite it in every way possible.

The SPEAKER. That is one of the reasons for the consideration of these bills under suspensions.

Mr. McCORMACK. We are only trying to expedite the business of the House.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUCAS. May I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if he will inform the House, if he can, what procedure will be followed on August 8 when we have two privileged bills due to come up for consideration?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a matter for the Speaker and the majority leader would not venture an opinion. I may say that I would never invade the jurisdiction of anyone, particularly our beloved Speaker. The question of who will be recognized is a matter of recognition for the Speaker to determine. I am sure if the gentleman will confer at the right time with the Speaker—and this is 2 weeks off—knowing the Speaker as I do and knowing him as the gentleman does, he will probably receive adequate information. I shall not attempt to answer the inquiry.

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

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY TO MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object at this time, but I want to serve notice that hereafter for the balance of this session I shall object to the long week-end recesses of the House until we have completed our business for this session. As long as we have to sit here and sweat it out during the heat of a Washington midsummer we should devote our time to the business of the House, so that we may adjourn at the earliest opportunity. I say this in all kindness: It

seems that the policy of conducting the business of this House throughout the past several years has been for the benefit of the Members of the House who live along the Atlantic seacoast so they can join their families over the long week ends and attend to their business affairs. Those of us who live out in the Midwest and the far West scarcely ever get home during sessions of the Congress and I think some consideration should be given those of us who come from that part of the country. So, Mr. Speaker, I shall not object to the present request, but I do want to serve notice that the gentleman from Iowa for one is going to object to such requests during the remainder of the session.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman that any thing he says does not disturb me in the least, but in justice to the Members of the House may I say that the leadership on both sides of the House have been very cooperative. The reason for these week-end adjournments is not for the convenience of any particular Members who live in particular areas nearby. That is purely an incidental matter and I think the House should know that. However, when the House has performed a real week's work I have always felt that we can go over from Thursday to Monday to enable the Members to do their office work, for instance. All of us are busy. We are not loafing and when the Members get a real week's work in I have felt that the membership of the House deserves the recess.

Also, may I say that when we have adjourned from Thursday to Monday it has always been because we have had no business to transact; otherwise the House would have met on Friday, and then adjourned until Monday. I agree with the basic purpose of the gentleman's objection, but I think that explanation should be made to show that we always sit on Friday when there is business to be transacted. Of course, nobody objects to adjourning from Friday to Monday. The only time we have gone over from Thursday to Monday is when we have not had any business to transact. We will dispose of a bill that will come up shortly and there is no other rule that we can call up today or tomorrow, so that if we did meet tomorrow we would simply meet and adjourn. That is why I made the statement that I hope the Rules Committee will be generous and I think the significance of my remarks was caught by every Member present.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I was on my feet to join in this move when the gentleman from Iowa rose back there. What the majority leader says about working in your office is all right, but over the years I have noticed that when we got along to the last of the session—and sometimes we used to stay here until 10 or 11 o'clock at night—the legislation was not given very much consideration. Instead of being in the offices, I noticed that some of these Members—

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman was talking about a Democratically con-

trolled House when he said that they worked late?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Sure, in 1937, 1940, and along in there.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, all right; we will not go into that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will not quarrel with the gentleman. I think what these gentlemen from the west coast, and even some up in Maine and out in Michigan, are objecting to, is that so many of these gentlemen from New York and around here, dig out Thursday and go home and engage in business, and they come back on Tuesday. I know what I am talking about, and we do not like it any more.

Mr. McCORMACK. I said that I have no business for tomorrow; therefore I asked that we go over until Monday. We have not wasted a Monday. I put bills on for Monday that we have to take up, which run over to Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday. They are bills on which there is not much controversy, so why not put them on and clean them up?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is my point. Why not bring them in here and get them out of the way?

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman will help me with the Committee on Rules we will get them out.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I had not quite finished. May I have 1 second more, or 2? When the gentleman from Massachusetts was talking about the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, was sitting right there by him and I heard him say—I am not so far away—I heard him say that he was waiting for the President.

Mr. McCORMACK. He was what?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I heard him say that he was waiting for the President.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, you see, the gentleman did not hear correctly what he said.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, yes, I did. The gentleman was talking and I was listening.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was talking about a particular bill.

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

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I make this reservation for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader why, in the enumeration of the bills that are now before the Committee on Rules on which action is hoped for, he did not mention the National Science Foundation bill. Was there a reason for eliminating that?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, we have been trying to get that out just as vigorously as we could and as we can. We are very anxious to get that rule out.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I am pleased to hear that. That is in line with what the gentleman said with reference to the other bills.

Mr. McCORMACK. What I said was not meant to exclude other bills, but I

just simply referred to some as an illustration.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I am very glad to hear that.

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

There was no objection.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found duly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

EIGHTY-THIRD AND FINAL NATIONAL ENCAMPMENT, GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 102 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby created a joint committee which shall be composed of five Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The committee shall select a chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. The joint committee shall represent the Congress at the Eighty-third and Final National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, to be held at Indianapolis, Ind., from August 28 to September 1, 1949.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the honor of calling up this resolution. There was a time when it would have been most unusual for a member of my State to handle a resolution concerning an encampment of Union soldiers. Time has erased all ill feeling and we now have in our hearts only respect for the great Americans who fought on both sides of the Civil War.

One of Texas' great Senators, the Honorable Tom Connally, likes to tell the story of a southern boy who came home after the war and was chided about having said the South could whip the Yankees with cornstalks. "Well," he said, "I did tell you that and it's true. But you know, they wouldn't fight with cornstalks."

Inevitable as it is, Mr. Speaker, we regret the passing of all but a few of the grand old men. They will have seen their eighty-third and final national en-

campment. This Congress could do no less in honor of these great Americans than to send representatives to this final encampment.

Again, I say, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the honor of handling this resolution.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I have no request for time at the moment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LYLE. Then, Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Jacobs], the author of the resolution.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I am the author of this resolution. First, I want to endorse wholeheartedly the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Texas. We are all happy that the bitterness that existed at the close of the War Between the States is now a thing almost past. I have the same feeling toward those old soldiers who wore the gray as I do for those who wore the blue uniform in that war.

This final encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic is being held in my district, in the city of Indianapolis, where the first encampment was held 84 years ago. As the gentleman from Texas said, it is a fitting tribute to those few who tarry on this side of the river, in the late evening of their lives before they join the larger encampment of their comrades on the other side, that we send representatives of the Congress of this great Union to this, their final encampment in this world. There are but a few of them left, I think 29. There probably will be only six or eight who will be able to attend this encampment. As a greeting and a final tribute to those who fought in the war to preserve the Union I ask that you approve this resolution. Thank you.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud to be the namesake and grandson of a Confederate veteran. In view of that fact, it may seem odd to some of you that I rise in support of the resolution now before the House for consideration. I think the resolution is a grand gesture and furthermore that it is indicative of an attitude nurtured by many of us who during the last three quarters of a century have realized and enjoyed the benefits guaranteed to us as a result of the War Between the States.

Many people do not appreciate the real purpose and influencing motive of that war. Many people do not appreciate the courage and valor with which the Confederate soldiers fought. He was willing to sacrifice his life to save a principle of government in which he believed; a principle of States' rights without unnecessary Federal intervention. Many people do not appreciate that those poor soldiers returned to their homes only to find them in shambles and ruined. They had nothing, they were penniless. Their currency was more worthless than a Chinese yen is today. However, they met their fate with a determined vigor

and through the past 75 years the South has prospered to a degree that it is now the most outstanding section of our country. Such prosperity and progress is demonstrative of good citizenship and sound political philosophy.

Most of us regret that there was bloodshed, but we should all be proud that the most unfortunate war in the history of our country solidified our United States and gave rebirth to a philosophy of government that has promoted our youthful Nation to the pinnacle of honor and freedom for all men throughout the world.

Most people do not realize that the gallant soldiers of our Confederacy have never been permitted to enjoy the benefits of hospitalization, pensions, and so forth, that have been afforded the veterans of all the other wars of our country. Yet they did as much to give you and me a free country as did any of the veterans of the other war.

It is a late date, but not too late for our great Government to express its appreciation to those fine gentlemen for their part in uniting our States. Consequently, I intend to introduce within the next few days a bill that will afford them a pension or cash benefits during the remainder of their lives. There are only a few. Their honor is great, and they may not desire to receive it at this time. However, I think it is only proper that our Government offer it.

I do not know whether the Confederate veterans will hold another reunion. I hope they do, because I want to attend as a member of a delegation from this Congress. To the members of the Grand Army of the Republic on their reunion, I offer my sincere best wishes and many happy returns of the day.

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

Mr. HARE. I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JACOBS. I have the honor of being descended from both Confederate and Union soldiers. I am proud of it, and I endorse what the gentleman says in reference to our unity 100 percent.

Mr. HARE. That is very generous of the gentleman.

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

Mr. HARE. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PETERSON. I think at this time it would be apropos to place in the Record the statement that the gentleman represents a county which contributed seven major generals to the Confederacy. Is that not true?

Mr. HARE. That is correct.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPERIMENTAL SUBMARINES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 300, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4007) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes," approved May 16, 1947. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the bill H. R. 4007. This is a bill to amend the act of May 16, 1947, which authorized an appropriation of \$30,000,000 for the construction of two submarines.

The bill before us increases that appropriation by \$11,000,000. This notwithstanding that the Navy engineers and experts all testified that the cost of construction of these two experimental submarines would not be more than \$12,000,000 or \$13,000,000 each, or a total of \$25,000,000.

Personally, I was under the impression that the Navy had sufficient unexpended funds that could easily be used for the additional cost that they claim these two submarines would cost. I could not understand why it is that after 2 years, when material costs have been reduced, it is necessary to spend \$11,000,000 additional on these two submarines.

Is it possible that they have some new gadgets to install in these submarines. I feel that the men assigned to the hazardous duty in these vessels should have all comforts and safeguards provided for them, and they are entitled to them in order to insure adequate protection of both life and limb, but I do not feel the submarines should be equipped with the most expensive fittings. Of course, the Navy gentlemen claim there are new devices that they desire to use for the completion of the submarines.

I am not going to set myself above the experts in the Navy Department. In view of the fact that the chairman of the committee and especially the chairman of the subcommittee and these Navy gentlemen felt that favorable consideration should be given to this bill for an increase of \$11,000,000, we reported the rule.

But once more I want to call attention to the fact that not only the Committee on Armed Services but other committees should be more careful in reporting bills that call for additional millions of dollars of appropriations. The country is commencing to complain, and my Republican friends, who criticize so continuously that we appropriate large sums

of money and are spending more money than we should, are the very ones who advocate, urge, and vote for all these appropriations, and additional expenditures.

However, I feel that the rule should be adopted. I feel that the bill will be passed. Of course, when it comes to spending money I know nearly all of the Republicans will vote for it.

Before I conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I am in honor bound to answer some statements that have been made by our extremely efficient, capable, sincere, honest, and hard-working majority leader, who kindly criticizes the Rules Committee for inaction and says that the House is way ahead of the Rules Committee. If the House is ahead on account of the failure of the Rules Committee to report some of the bills, so is the country. Had we reported all the bills that have been recommended by some of the committees, an additional five or six billion dollars would have been appropriated, and in most instances I think unnecessarily. I do not only advocate economy, but I am trying to practice it.

Of course, the Committee on Rules, as constituted, is not in accord on all matters. Each and every member of that committee has his own ideas, beliefs, and viewpoints, and rightly so. Unfortunately, we cannot always agree on all fours in reporting rules. Had the leadership given me one or two additional progressive members for my committee, my task would be easier and more cooperative action could be obtained. If such were the case we could have reported more of the bills that are pending and which the President and the administration desires.

I hope I will be able to report rules on some of the pending requests before the Committee on Rules sometime next week. Some of the pending requests for rules are: the Korea-aid bill—we have held several hearings on this measure. It is a bill that involves \$150,000,000 and there are many outstanding Members who feel it is not justifiable to spend this money at the present time.

The National Science Foundation bill is pending in committee. I know that the President and others are desirous of obtaining a rule thereon and I am trying my best to comply with their requests, but I do not have the votes and I cannot club the membership into voting out a rule when they feel they want more time to study and consider same.

Unfortunately, some gentlemen who were especially interested in the rivers and harbors bill insisted that a vote be taken on the granting of a rule notwithstanding that the hearings on this bill were not completed. Consequently, by a majority vote of the Committee on Rules, the motion to grant a rule was defeated. As long as I am a member of the Rules Committee and its chairman, I shall not deny any Member of the House his right to be heard, whether it be in favor of or in opposition to any bill. That was my position yesterday, that was my position the day before yesterday, and it shall continue to be my position. I am not

going to deny any Member the right to be heard before the Committee on Rules even if it takes a day or two longer. Sometimes I am obliged to call two or three meetings in 1 day.

We also have the reforestation bill which calls for the expenditure of perhaps a million dollars plus. That has been delayed. There is a liquidation trust bill and a rehabilitation bill which we should act on favorably because it means \$46,000,000 for the Treasury of the United States.

Then there is the Engle mining bill which will cost perhaps three to four hundred million dollars. Personally, I feel that some bill to relieve these small independent miners in the West should receive consideration because the money appropriated will eventually come back to the Treasury of the United States and it would also result in our obtaining strategic materials such as copper, zinc, lead, and also one or two other important minerals that we are obliged to import at higher prices than we could obtain them if these small mines were permitted to operate. If these mines do not obtain some aid from the Government, they will be obliged to close and by closing they will be ruined because the water will seep in and it will cause a tremendous loss to the small-mine owners, as well as to the country at large.

Then we have a very important bill involving the State of California, which would permit the harnessing of the waters of the San Joaquin and Sacramento Rivers. This will make available for farming 300,000 or 400,000 acres of land for the production of additional crops and at the same time it will save that section of the country from the danger of a shortage of water.

I am extremely desirous that the Committee on Ways and Means bring in the bill to amend the Social Security Act, and, of course, I know that many Members are anxiously waiting to vote for the minimum-wage bill. However, with respect to that bill, in view that a discharge resolution has been introduced and is in order, the bill is scheduled to be considered by the House on Monday, August 8. This consideration has been made possible under the rule which I introduced and which passed the House early in the session, providing that if the Committee on Rules did not act on a request for a hearing within 21 calendar days, the chairman of the committee reporting the bill would be privileged to call the bill up for consideration after the expiration of 21 days. However notwithstanding the statement of the majority leader who has inferred that we are delaying the House in legislating, I wish to say in justice to the Committee on Rules that it has reported this session, 82 rules making in order the consideration of various bills and 6 resolutions giving investigatory and subpoena power to legislative committees of the House. This is a greater number of rules than has been reported by any previous Committee on Rules in any one session of the House.

Consequently, I feel that the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts is not exactly justifiable, although I know that he has the best interest of the membership at heart, notwithstanding what some of the gentlemen on the other side may say. He does desire that the House should as speedily as possible complete its business so that we may take recesses for 3 days at a time and at the same time that our action may encourage the other body also to go to work instead of filibustering on important measures, that it may get busy and complete the legislative programs so that the Congress can adjourn as speedily as possible.

Personally, as to adjournments over Fridays or over week ends, let me say that there may be a few Members from the East or nearby district, who desire to go home, but these are Members who are not afraid to go home. They go home and meet the people and find out the viewpoint of the people and learn what the people desire. That is the reason they go home, and at the same time, perhaps, to enjoy a little cooler weather than we are experiencing here.

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

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sorry indeed that my very dear friend from Illinois manifests such a sensitive disposition. He knows, of course, the fond affection I have for him, and my remarks were not directed toward him. But then, again, his loyalty to the Committee on Rules comes to the surface. So we grant the gentleman our complete blessing and absolution for the defense. The fact remains, however, I may say to my dear friend, that we have no business for tomorrow. The fact remains that I had to put many bills on the calendar of suspensions for Monday. To most of them there is no objection except that in some instances they go beyond the \$1,000,000 rule. But I am doing so merely to try to get some action. I could have used Monday for other purposes. For instance, we could have begun consideration of the rivers and harbors bill, or the cotton quota bill, Korea bill, or some of these other bills. These bills should be brought to the floor of the House that the House may express its will upon them.

There are three or four important bills that must come up. A lot of others can go over until next year. I think we should get through with these important bills. Then we can commence a series of 3-day recesses and it might, as the gentleman said, inspire quick action elsewhere to bring about an early adjournment. All that I have in mind is the best interest of every Member of the House and of the other body, as a matter of fact, in trying to speed up this work. As far as I am concerned, I could stay here all year, but I recognize that the Members have worked hard and are entitled to a vacation. I apologize to nobody in stating that we are entitled to a vacation, but there is certain legislation that must be considered. So the gentle-

man cannot answer the fact that we have no business. There is only one rule out of the Rules Committee outside of the one we are now considering and that is the one relating to parity prices on tung oil and honey. That will come up for consideration on Monday or Tuesday. I put that off so that we would have some sort of a program next week and in the hope the committee will report out some bills so that we can bring up real business.

Mr. SABATH. May I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I do not feel that I need any defense, for if he would search his heart I am certain the gentleman would conclude that there is no man here more desirous of expediting the business of the House than I. This is the underlying reason for the creation and the existence of the Committee on Rules. Besides expediting legislation we withhold consideration of ill-advised and unnecessarily expensive legislation and appropriations.

Personally, I do not feel that I need any defense for my own actions, for as I said before, if I had a majority on the Rules Committee which is the policy committee of the House, I could have reported without any unnecessary delay, rules on legislation in which the President and the administration is interested.

Notwithstanding the friendly admonition of the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, and other gentleman from time to time, to the effect that the Rules Committee is not a legislative committee and is usurping a power not theirs, I wish to state were it not for the fact that we have some lopsided committees who report bills in the interest of and affecting the local economy of their own districts, States, or section and upon which they request rules for consideration, the Committee on Rules would not be obliged to withhold action on those bills which their committees report which are in the interest of the entire country.

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

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman will recall, of course, that I had the great privilege of serving on the Committee on Rules. I have watched the operation of the Committee on Rules, and I would just like to say to the gentleman that from my standpoint I would not be too apologetic about the fact that every now and then the Committee on Rules does not report out rules on some of the bills that are brought there. I think that by reason of its action in that regard through the years the Committee on Rules has served the best interests of the Congress and the country.

Mr. SABATH. Yes; it was my pleasure to have served with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] on the committee of which I am chairman, and I thank the gentleman for his statement.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] states that he is here continuously. So am I. As a matter of fact, I have not been away for a single

day and with the exception of one evening, I work nearly every evening, many times until 1 or 2 o'clock in the morning, going over bills and resolutions and reports so that I could inform the House from time to time of their contents. Nearly all of the Members are extremely busy. It is not like when I came to this House when we did not have anywhere near the amount of work that we have now. Realizing that fact, I am trying to be of service to the membership of the House, to both sides, obtaining and giving information that I can impart to the membership, preparing reports and arranging for the scheduling of hearings to the best of my ability. So, I am doing all I can. Unfortunately, my committee is so constituted, as I said before, that I cannot always get the votes for the bills that the administration desires or that some committee has reported.

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

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. I want to compliment the gentleman for the statement he has made. I want to compliment the gentleman because I believe he is forthright; I believe he is saying what the people back home are demanding. I think he has shown excellent judgment. He has pointed out in one case an attempt to save \$150,000,000. I want to congratulate the gentleman on his forthrightness and his courage in this respect.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman.

Now, let me say this to the majority leader and to the Members present, that there are different ways to bring up bills outside of going to the Committee on Rules. We have the Unanimous-Consent Calendar, we have suspension day, and above all we have Calendar Wednesday. When I came to the House 43 years ago Calendar Wednesday was the only day that a committee could bring up bills, whether the Speaker liked it or not. At that time Uncle Joe Cannon, who had the reputation of being the "czar of the House" and whom I respected for his great ability, though he was a Republican, from my personal observation I was satisfied he had perfect vision in the evenings, but who, during the day when the House was in session could only see out of his left eye—the Republican eye; he could never see the Democratic side, and no one could be recognized therefrom. But under the Calendar Wednesday rule which he tried to abolish but which we finally succeeded in saving, we have safeguarded the Member's interests and if we did not get unanimous consent, either then or today, every Wednesday the bills that were on the calendar that were not reported by the then reckless, indifferent, and useless Rules Committee, could be called up on Calendar Wednesday. As a matter of interest, the Rules Committee in those days was composed of three members and was dominated and controlled by Uncle Joe Cannon, who was its chairman and Speaker of the House.

In view of the statement made, I do not feel that I should be placed in the position that I, as chairman of the committee, have not done my duty. I want

to assure you that I have done everything in my power to help the House to continue to expedite legislation, as I said before, and that has always been my position, and that the Committee on Rules should aid in every way to help bring about early consideration of legislation that the country demands and is entitled to.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. May I say to the gentleman, who is a Member of long standing and the chairman of the Committee on Rules, that I commend the good work of that committee and its chairman for its discernment and protection of the people and the Congress from hasty and ill-considered legislation in its handling of the matters that have come before it.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman, who was one of the Members who desired to present important evidence on the rivers and harbors and flood-control bill. I think the majority of the Members feel that I have tried to do my duty.

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

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I, too, want to compliment the gentleman on his fine work as chairman of the Committee on Rules. May I point out that the gentleman does not exercise dictatorial control over the Committee on Rules on either side of the aisle, and that there have been differences of opinion on the Democratic side, when certain members of the Committee on Rules teamed up with the Republicans to withhold certain legislation from the floor. I see no reason for this great alarm because there has been, shall we say, a switch of tactics and the other group at this time sees fit to vote with our good friends the Republicans. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. I know the gentleman has no control over this situation, and I certainly do not think he should be criticized for it.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman. Of course I cannot blame some of the members on the other side, because frequently they come to my rescue and my aid, which I frequently need, and for which I am thankful. I want to express my appreciation for their cooperation from time to time, but I would hope that they would cooperate with me more frequently than they have. Of course, they have their own views, their own ideas, their own beliefs. I have tried for years to change their views to make them feel that the Democratic principles and policies are the best for the Nation, but I have not been able to convince them all. I hope I will be able to convince a few more in the near future.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I surely do not want to get in between on the gentleman's controversy, but I just want

the RECORD to show that in my tenure here the gentleman from Illinois has been one of the most fair-minded men in the House. I never have presented anything to his committee but what he has given me every cooperation.

I know the gentleman is familiar with the greatest playground of America, northern Wisconsin, and I know he would like to come up into northern Wisconsin and spend a few days there.

Mr. SABATH. I would be only too pleased to go to that land of milk and honey. They have plenty of milk there, in which the gentleman has always been interested, and, of course, others have some honey, so I can call it the land of milk and honey. Some people say "business before pleasure," but my duties here come before the pleasure of availing myself of the gentleman's invitation. I am therefore obliged to deny myself this privilege and pleasure of visiting the great State of Wisconsin, which borders on the great State of Illinois, but I shall do so sometime because I know the people of Wisconsin are good people.

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

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. May I say to my good friend from Wisconsin that after Michigan is considered his State comes first.

I also wish to pay tribute to the chairman of the Committee on Rules. I have been before his committee many times in the last 17 years, and have always observed that every Member is treated with uniform kindness and consideration.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman from Michigan and others who have spoken so kindly of me and I wish to say further, that in my experience, the Members of the Rules Committee from the State of Michigan have always been extremely fair, straightforward and conscientious men, namely the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], and the gentleman who preceded him, Mr. Carl Mapes.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I appreciate sincerely all the remarks made here today and I hope that I shall continue to maintain the confidence of you gentlemen as well as that of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to compliment our young chairman of the Committee on Rules for the excellent work he has done in that capacity. He is unquestionably one of the hardest working and one of the most faithful Members of the House. Inasmuch as he has explained this resolution so thoroughly, I do not think we have to go into it any further.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. BONNER]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States is now weighing his choice to fill the vacancy which exists on the Supreme Court. The judiciary branch of the Government has traditionally been considered to be beyond the realm of politics. Until the advent of the New Deal, Republican and Democratic Presidents alike had made a conscientious effort to maintain a political balance in their appointments to the Federal judiciary which would insure proper representation of all political views. I must, however, take note that since 1933 the trend has been toward placing the Federal judiciary on a spoils basis, a trend which has been deplored not only by the legal experts, students of jurisprudence, and lawyers, but by thinking people everywhere. Presidents Roosevelt and Truman during their tenure have named 10 men to the Supreme Court; 9 of those 10 have been Democrats. President Truman provided the single exception when he named Justice Burton, a Republican. Of the last 189 Federal judgeships, 182 of them have been Democrats, only 7 were Republicans. The Senate in its wisdom and in its response to the overwhelming demand by the American people, may have killed President Roosevelt's ill-famed court-packing bill in 1937, nevertheless the Federal courts have been packed steadily during the last 17 years, with the result that as of today the Federal judiciary is top-heavy with Democrats.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to this House, and I will insert a table in the RECORD supporting my figures, that at no time in this century was the Court as unbalanced in favor of one political party as it is today. From 1900 until 1909, there were seven Republicans and two Democrats on the Supreme Court, from 1910 to 1916, six Republicans and three Democrats; from 1917 to 1921, five Republicans and four Democrats; from 1922 to 1932, six Republicans and three Democrats; from 1933 to 1937, five Republicans and four Democrats; in 1938, four Republicans and five Democrats; in 1939 to 1940, three Republicans and six Democrats; from 1941 to 1946, two Republicans and seven Democrats; and for the past 3 years, one Republican and eight Democrats. Thus, it can be seen that the historic proximate 6 to 3 ratio has been discarded by the last two occupants of the White House.

Mr. Speaker, I urge upon President Truman, in the interests of maintaining the integrity of our basic institutions, and preserving proper political representation on them, that he name an outstanding Republican jurist to the Supreme Court vacancy which now exists. To do less, would be an admission that the highest Court of the land is being turned into a political instrument in violation of all fundamental principles of our great Republic and against the fundamental philosophy of equal justice for all.

Justices of the Supreme Court 1900-49

Year	Chief Justice	Associate Justices								
1900	Melville W. Fuller (D).	David J. Brewer (R).	Henry B. Brown (R).	George Shiras, Jr. (R).	Horace Gray (R).	John M. Harlan (R).	Rufus W. Peckham (R).	Joseph McKenna (R).	Edward D. White (D).	
1901	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	
1902	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	
1903	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	
1904	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	7R
1905	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	2D
1906	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	
1907	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	
1908	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	
1909	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	
1910	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	
1911	Ed. White (D).	Chas. Hughes (R).	Willis Van Devanter (R). ¹	do	do	do	do	do	do	Joseph R. Lamar (D). ¹
1912	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1913	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1914	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1915	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1916	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1917	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1918	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1919	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1920	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1921	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1922	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1923	William H. Taft (R).	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1924	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1925	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1926	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1927	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1928	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1929	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1930	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1931	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1932	Charles Hughes (R).	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1933	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1934	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1935	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1936	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1937	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1938	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1939	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1940	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1941	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1942	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1943	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1944	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1945	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1946	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1947	Fred Vinson (D).	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1948	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do
1949	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do

Addenda: In the following cases (as indicated by reference figures) there was a vacancy on the Court as of Jan. 1. Therefore, the Justice (or Justices) appointed after Jan. 1 was (were) named. These men were appointed on the dates noted below: ¹ Jan. 3. ² Mar. 18. ³ Jan. 2. ⁴ Feb. 5. ⁵ Feb. 15.

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

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4007) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes," approved May 16, 1947.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4007, with Mr. BONNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill,

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is an extremely important measure. It is not complicated. The facts are rather simple and very understandable, and I think it is an extremely important bill.

In 1946 this Congress passed an authorization bill under the terms of which we authorized the construction of 4,000 tons of submarines at a cost not to exceed \$30,000,000. The Navy came back to our committee about 2 months ago and indicated that the \$30,000,000 authorized for the construction of these two submarines would not be sufficient for that purpose and asked that the ceiling be

taken off of the amount of authorization so that the submarines could proceed to construction. The committee decided not to take the limit off but to change the limit from \$30,000,000 to \$41,000,000 as the maximum amount to be authorized for the construction of these two experimental submarines.

The reason for the change was twofold. According to the witnesses who appeared before the subcommittee, of which I am chairman, the increased cost is due to labor and material, and to the improvement in design. Those two features are the reasons for the increased cost.

The Navy had no adequate basis on which to figure the cost of the submarines, other than the basis of what it cost to do this work in 1944 and 1945. That was the period when we did some submarine construction and we knew what it would cost. So when these two

7R

2D

6R

3D

5R

4D

6R

3D

5R

4D

4R

5D

3R

6D

2R

7D

8D

1R

experimental-type submarines, called prototype submarines, were considered, the estimate of cost was set on the basis of what it had cost in 1944 and 1945. That estimate would have given a cost of twelve or thirteen million dollars per submarine, and that would figure approximately twenty-four or twenty-five million dollars. The committee originally set a maximum of \$30,000,000 as being the ultimate cost of the two submarines.

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

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. REES. Does that mean that the cost of \$30,000,000 in 1945 and 1946 has increased to \$41,000,000 for the same general type of ship?

Mr. BROOKS. No. It was due to two factors: The increased cost of labor and materials, and improvement in the design of the submarine since that time. I will go into that in detail.

Since the end of the war we have come into possession of the secrets which were used by the Germans in the course of their submarine construction. We all know that Germany reached a high point in submarine construction. We now have available the secrets which they used in their submarine design and construction. In addition to that, our own laboratories have shown improvement in equipment and submarine design.

It is the purpose of this bill to permit the construction of experimental types of submarines of the most modern design. As a result of it, the hull has to be changed; the type of equipment placed in the submarine is improved, the idea being improvement for increased depth and increased speeds of the submarines.

All of those things together indicate clearly that there is an increased cost in the building of this type of submarine.

Now you say, why could that not have been anticipated? The reason is this, that these are submarines of experimental type. If they were standard types of ships, you might estimate the cost fairly accurately, but when you are building something which is experimental in nature, it is almost impossible to estimate the cost.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. COX. As I recall, at the hearing yesterday one of the experts before the Committee on Rules on the gentleman's application for a rule made the statement that the engines used in the present-day experimental submarines cost 300 percent more than the engines that were used in the conventional type of submarine in the Second World War.

Mr. BROOKS. That statement is correct; and I thank the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] for repeating it here. These two submarines are fashioned after the schnorkel-type submarine made famous by the Germans, and the design is very much changed from the standard type of submarine which we used in the Second World War.

Let me say in conclusion that we need these submarines in our Navy. I believe

that aircraft development and submarine development are fundamental to our defense. The keels of these submarines have been laid, one at Portsmouth, N. H., and the other at the Electric Boat Co. in Connecticut. The work is going to be retarded if we do not now authorize this increased amount, and I think it would be little short of folly for us to abandon our effort to go ahead with improved types of submarines so that we can meet the perils of the future which we can all see in the program of the Soviets in developing submarine warfare.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana yields back 3 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I can think of nothing that is more important in these modern days of technical development than the work that is being done in the matter of undersea craft. It is important that these vital research projects continue. This bill comes to you not only with the unanimous report from the subcommittee, but likewise from the full Committee on the Armed Services.

Mr. Chairman, I have no requests for time on this side.

I hope the bill will be speedily enacted.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take much of the time of the Committee on this bill in the matter of these two ships. I should like to call your attention to the fact that the subcommittee held hearings on the bill and reported it out expeditiously because we knew it would be national suicide for us not to continue expeditiously the construction of this type of warcraft. There is no type of warcraft in the world today to compare with the new type of submarine. We know that the Germans had the schnorkel type submarine, but we have made an improvement on that.

The ordnance alone on these ships costs over \$16,000,000. These things are highly secret, highly necessary to our defense, and highly necessary to our national existence. I know the Committee will pass this bill without one dissenting vote.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time. I ask that the bill be read for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of May 16, 1947 (61 Stat. 96), is hereby amended by deleting the following: "Provided, That the cost of the vessels, the construction of which is authorized by this act, shall not exceed \$30,000,000," and substituting in lieu thereof a period."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out the words "deleting the following" and insert in lieu

thereof the words "amending the proviso to read as follows."

Page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike out all after the word "exceed" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$41,000,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BONNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4007) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes," approved May 16, 1947, pursuant to House Resolution 300 reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have until Friday midnight to file a conference report on the bill H. R. 5632.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, instead of speaking for 5 minutes this afternoon, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 5 minutes on Monday next after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE REPUBLIC OF MEXICO SHOULD PAY THIS SMALL BILL

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, you will recall that I suggested, Tuesday afternoon of this week, when I asked that this special order be reset for today, that I wished to discuss a matter

which was rather small in itself, but which involved a larger principle. You will agree, as I said then, that when you or I, or any other citizen of the United States, goes to his bank to ask for a loan, one of the factors which the lending agency will take into consideration will be his previous record of paying his debts.

I have been convinced also, over the years, that small items often contribute to the success or failure of what seem to be larger events. The small item I will discuss this afternoon involves the Republic of Mexico, our neighbor to the south, and a debt owed a well-known citizen of my district. I have no desire to create an international incident; in fact, Mr. Speaker, my desire is to prevent an international incident. I think that will be obvious as I discuss the subject.

On November 22, 1930, which you will observe, Mr. Speaker, was 18 years and 8 months ago, the Hulse-Anderson Tractor and Equipment Co., of El Centro, Calif., confirmed by letter—a photostat of which I have in my hand—a contract with the state of Baja California, for 1 Caterpillar 60 tractor, and 2 Caterpillar 30 tractors. These tractors were new, the latest model, and in first-class condition when delivered. There are other details of the contract which are not important at the moment; for example, a stipulation that the seller was to provide an instructor for a reasonable length of time, to instruct the representatives of the buyer in the care and operation of the equipment.

The Governor of Baja California at the time was General Arturo Bernal. His signature, approving the contract, is on the letter which represented the contract instrument, and there is also a notation that the contract number was 343. The total price of the equipment, according to the contract, was to be \$9,640.

The next item that I submit is a statement dated December 31, 1937, which you will observe is 7 years later, showing the accounting to that date. Two payments amounting to \$4,500 had been received against the contract price, but the balance at that time, plus interest, plus a supplementary account for parts purchased during the intervening 7 years, left a balance still due, on December 31, 1937, of \$8,262.42.

No further payment has been made on the account.

This is not a disputed account. The original contract bears the signature of the Governor of Baja California, General Bernal. Payments made against the contract confirm the debt. In order to assure myself that there was no dispute regarding the debt, I asked State Senator Ben Hulse, one of the parties to the contract, as recently as June of this year, to write a letter to the American consul at Mexicali, and ask him again to take up the matter with the present Governor of Baja California for a statement regarding the debt. I submit, as one item of the material for my file, a letter dated June 24, 1949, from Mr. George H. Zentz, the American vice consul at Mexicali,

and from that letter I now quote the following:

Since the administration of Bernal, there have been six other Governors, who apparently have been totally disinterested in the Government's obligation to you. Lic. Castro—

I interrupt to explain that this indicates Licenciado Elias Castro, Lieutenant Governor of the Northern Territory of Baja California, with whom Mr. Zentz talked, in the absence of Governor Gonzalez—

Lic. Castro stated that the present Territorial Government recognizes this obligation and it is their hope and intention to pay off this indebtedness along with certain other commitments made by Bernal, but when they will be able to meet with it is still problematical.

Under the Constitution of Mexico, the governor of a state or territory, is appointed by the President of the Republic, and is responsible to him. The debt of a state is not necessarily the debt of the Republic, but there is an obligation placed upon the Republic, to see that the debt of a state, owed to an individual of another nation, is not permitted to drag for 18 years. You can visualize a similar situation, under which a citizen of, shall we say, France, sold farm equipment to the State of California, or any other State, and the State, after making payment for several years, simply discontinued further payments. The matter would immediately be presented by the Ambassador of France, to the State Department, and from there to the Governor of California, and every effort would be made to see that a just and acknowledged debt was paid promptly. This would be particularly true if the debt were as small as is the debt I am now talking about. All parties concerned would realize that a small incident of this kind could develop itself, if left unchecked, into an incident of larger proportions, to the great embarrassment of the two countries involved. That is the situation we face here.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I have a great deal of material here regarding this case. I have no desire to burden the RECORD with it. The debt was originally incurred in an ordinary business transaction between the governor of Baja California and the agent in the area for the Caterpillar Tractor Co. I wish to pass on to more recent incidents in the situation.

When I came back to the Eighty-first session, I brought the file back with me, and I decided that perhaps the best way to bring the matter to a conclusion would be to suggest to the Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of Washington that an informal, and entirely friendly, question should be raised with the representatives of the Republic of Mexico, in connection with any loans which might be requested of that bank. I wrote a letter outlining the situation. Actually, I never mailed that letter, nor did I mail copies of it, as I intended, to the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, which handles the appropriations for the Export-Import Bank,

nor to the chairman of the subcommittee which has the appropriation for the State Department. The reason I did not mail the letter, nor other letters on the subject that I had written, including letters to the State Department, was a suggestion which seemed to me to keep this out of the field of possible international complications. A friend of mine, Mr. W. G. Herron, was in my office at the time I was dictating the letters, and I discovered that he knew personally the present Ambassador of Mexico to Washington, Señor de la Colina. I may add that we in California have a very high regard for the present Ambassador, Señor de la Colina, who at one time was the consul general for Mexico on the west coast, and who went through some of the troubled days of the depression with us. None of us in the California delegation would want to do anything to embarrass him. Mr. Herron asked me at that time if I would be willing to withhold the letters and let him talk the matter over personally with the ambassador. I was not only glad to do that, but suggested that he actually consider himself a representative of Senator Hulse in the transaction, so as to make it less formal than it would be if a Member of the Congress of the United States were involved. I can only add that apparently Ambassador de la Colina has made every possible effort to get the debt paid, but that, as of this moment, it still remains unpaid.

The relations between the United States and the Republic of Mexico, in my part of the world, have always been very friendly. If you will picture a small community with the international line running through the middle of it, on one side the United States, on the other side Mexico, with people passing back and forth through the gates with a minimum of inconvenience and control, then you will get something of the picture of the life we lead there. We have a high regard for the Mexican people, and I think those who live south of the border have that same regard for us.

Our friends who live on the Canadian side of the northern line make a great deal of the fact that there is no fence between the United States and Canada. I may say that although technically there is a fence between Mexico and the United States at certain border points, in fact there is no fence, as it has long since been punched full of holes and rotted away. The Immigration Service has been helpful in persuading the State Department to start to rebuild that small section of the fence between Mexicali and Calexico, for a distance of about 4 miles, which lies in the actual city boundaries, but all along the border, outside of the immediate city transfer points, there is in effect no fence. We have never thought we needed one.

I am firmly convinced that a borrower, coming to a lending agency and asking for a loan, should have a record of paying not only big debts, but small debts. I am equally of the opinion that a debtor is entitled to a chance to clear a record, which may be questioned, particularly in

some small item, and I have a firm feeling that in all probability the only reason this debt has not been paid is that it has not yet come somehow to the attention of the proper authority in the Republic of Mexico who will see that it is paid, and at once.

The point I am making is that our relations have always been excellent, and I do not want anything to disturb that relationship.

I have observed over many years of experience that little things like this have a habit of growing into very big things, so I take this rather formal way of calling the attention of the State Department, the necessary agencies of this Government, the Ambassador of this country to Mexico, and the Ambassador of Mexico in this country, to the fact that I believe it is now time for them to see that a small debt is wiped out, that the good relations may be continued, and that the good credit of the Republic of Mexico may not be in any way clouded. For that reason I have brought the matter in this way before you and before the Congress of the United States.

DISCRIMINATION IN THE BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I have here a copy of a newspaper, the Pittsburgh Courier, which shows on page 2 a picture of a group of people walking in front of the White House. It is a picket line. I understand that this picket line has been in front of the White House for the past 2 weeks. The pickets are in the main Negroes. There are signs asking President Truman to take Jim Crow off the American dollar and enforce FEPC at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing of the Treasury Department.

Upon an inquiry, I learned that the reason for this picket line was a most basic one. I learned that some 1,800 women, the vast majority of whom are Negroes, are being denied permanent employment in the jobs that they now hold in this agency because of arbitrary application of the war-service regulations. Many of these women have been employed in these jobs for as long as 7 or 8 years. I learned that these women are picketing the White House because they have been denied the same treatment that has been accorded a group of white workers, the plate printers in the same agency, who secured their permanent status simply by filling out a form for the Civil Service Commission. In other words, they are picketing the White House against racial discrimination. Moreover, I learned that the agency has stated that beginning on August 1 it will start its lay-offs and continue at the rate of 50 dismissals every 2 weeks until the task has been accomplished. They are to be replaced with new, untrained workers at great expense to the American taxpayer.

I have heard for many years of the vast discrimination and Jim Crow in this agency. I understand that the agency's treatment of its Negro veterans of World War II is a shame and a disgrace to this Nation. I learned that even among the women being dismissed that one of them is the widow of a veteran killed in combat in the European theater. These workers have taken their problems to every level of Government with the hope of settlement but they have only been met with evasion and denials. It is conceivable, therefore, that they would, as a last resort, utilize their legal right as citizens of the United States to seek redress of their grievances from their Government by the peaceful method of picketing. What is inconceivable to me is that as this newspaper story states that inquiries by the press at the White House brought forth statements of no comments either on the picket line or on the situation. What is also inconceivable is that the Secretary of Treasury, shortly before his trip to Europe, hastily called a press conference and issued blanket denials that these workers had any grievances. Ironically one of the Secretary's own aides refuted this denial to the press that same day.

We have heard a lot of talk from the President of the United States and from both major parties about the question of civil rights. The time has now passed when statements about civil rights are sufficient. The time is here for action and not words. The best place to begin the application of civil rights for this administration would be among its own employees. The Government must set the example for private industry and all other sections of the Nation insofar as fair-employment practice is concerned. I am, therefore, introducing Mr. Speaker, a resolution calling for an investigation of the situation at the Bureau of Engraving, including the dismissal of these hundreds of women, at this time by Congress. Deeds, not words, will convince the people of this Nation that this Government means business about the constitutional rights of all its citizens for equality of employment and the other civil rights.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YATES). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

PROGRESS IN GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION DURING THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Government reorganization has become a watchword of the American people. They want Uncle Sam to put his house in order. The Federal Government is said to be the biggest enterprise on the face of the earth. As stockholders in that enterprise our citizens demand that modern techniques of management be applied for efficient and economical operation. This is a common-sense demand. It stems not from a desire to see essential services of Government reduced, but from a recognition that the vast, complicated, and unwieldy struc-

ture of Government must be overhauled to permit the better performance of these services.

President Truman and the Congress are alert to the need for carrying on the public business with greater efficiency and economy. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization of the House Expenditures Committee, I am pleased to report, Mr. Speaker, that substantial progress has been and is being made during the present session of the Congress in reorganizing the executive branch of the Federal Government. Four enabling statutes have been passed which permit the President and several of the executive departments and agencies to proceed with necessary changes in organization and other important legislation is pending. Eight reorganization plans have been submitted by the President to take effect within 60 days of submission, if not disapproved by either House of Congress.

The job of reorganization cannot be done overnight. We are dealing for the most part with departments and agencies that have grown through many years and in many directions. Some date back to the early days of the Government.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I would like to ask the gentleman why, when it says in the reorganization plan that the Congress should adjourn on the 31st of July, and when as a matter of fact it is mandatory, because the word "shall" is used—why is that not done, if this is such a good proposition?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I understand the gentleman's question. He is referring to the Reorganization Act of 1946 which was a reorganization of the Congress of the United States. I am referring to the Executive Reorganization Act, which is a different act entirely. I prefer not to confuse that with my remarks at the present.

Others have grown up in response to some particular need of the times. All must be examined now and regrouped by major purpose or activity into workable departments which the President can adequately supervise. Wherever possible, duplicating, overlapping, and otherwise unnecessary parts of the governmental structure must be eliminated. Within and among many departments, lines of authority must be redrawn and clearly defined in accord with up-to-date concepts of administration.

In the course of this vast undertaking, numerous studies must be made to insure that basic changes in the structure of government are solidly grounded and capable of meeting present and future needs. Here the work of the Hoover Commission is immensely helpful. Its factual findings and recommendations serve to guide both the President and the Congress in effecting major reorganizations in government. Not the least of its contributions has been to stimulate a greater public interest in public administration.

However, the reports of the Hoover Commission are only the beginning of

this reorganization job. In certain important matters the Commission refrained from making recommendations. Sometimes the members of the Commission could not agree among themselves or with the findings of the task forces that were set up to make specialized studies. The Commission has ended its work and wound up its affairs. Final responsibility as to the wisdom or the feasibility of specific reorganizations lies with the President and the Congress. Accordingly, it is necessary to examine the Hoover Commission reports and studies with a fine-tooth comb, and to supplement or revise them where sound policy dictates.

Considering first the legislative side of reorganization progress, the four reorganization statutes, in order of their enactment, are the following:

First. Public Law 73, enacted May 26, which strengthens the staff of the Secretary of State and prepares the way for integration of the Foreign Service and other personnel of the State Department.

Second. Public Law 36, enacted June 2, which provides for an Under Secretary of Defense. This is a first step in better organization of the armed forces. As the Members well know, additional legislation creating a Department of Defense and proposing major changes in the conduct of the National Military Establishment has been passed in different form by each House. To overcome this impasse and present an alternative, President Truman has submitted a reorganization plan on the military, but legislative action is more appropriate. I hope we can proceed quickly to a satisfactory fulfillment of this urgent legislative task on the military side. In terms of dollar savings, military unification is a large part of the reorganization job. Considering that the armed services now spend about \$15,000,000,000 annually, or one-third of the Federal budget, estimated savings of one and one-half billion dollars a year can be reasonably expected in this field.

Third. Public Law 109, enacted June 20, which directs the President to prepare and transmit to Congress reorganization plans by which agencies may be regrouped, coordinated, consolidated, or otherwise altered—with certain limitations—to promote economical and efficient operation. This law, titled the "Reorganization Act of 1949" is the basic enabling legislation. It permits the exercise of Presidential initiative in reorganization activities. Plans may be submitted by the President up to April 1, 1953, and each such plan will have the effect of law after 60 days, unless a constitutional majority in either House of Congress disapproves. Counting all the recommendations of the Hoover Commission equally, it has been estimated that about 25 percent of the whole reorganization program can be put into effect through Executive action provided for in this law.

Fourth. Public Law 152, enacted June 30, which establishes in the executive branch an agency called the General Services Administration. This law, known as the "Federal Property and Ad-

ministrative Services Act of 1949" deals with the so-called housekeeping functions of the Federal Government. The purchase, storage, and disposal of property, the keeping of records, the management of buildings, and other internal services are brought together under one roof. The new agency takes in the War Assets Administration, the Federal Works Agency, the Bureau of Federal Supply—from the Treasury—the Office of Contract Settlement—also from the Treasury—and the National Archives. Some 27,000 employees are involved in this transfer. The Citizens Committee on the Hoover Report refers to this move as "one of the largest consolidations in Government history."

I am very proud to say, Mr. Speaker, that the law creating the General Services Administration represents careful study and intensive work on the part of our Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization. Here is created the legislative framework for changes that will effect large economies in the Government's housekeeping activities. It has been estimated that in supply activities alone \$250,000,000 can be saved by proper integration. The huge inventory of Federal supplies in warehouses and storage points, value at more than \$27,000,000,000, possibly can be reduced by \$3,000,000,000. Although such estimates always can be debated, it is clear that Uncle Sam as a buyer, user, mover, and seller of goods valued in the billions, should go about his daily business far more efficiently than is now the case. In such fields as records and traffic management, now within the General Services Administration, further substantive legislation to amplify the basic statute will be necessary to insure the maximum benefits of reorganization in housekeeping services, and such legislation is now in course of preparation by our subcommittee.

Promptly upon signing the Reorganization Act of 1949, President Truman submitted to the Congress—June 20—seven reorganization plans. The eighth plan was submitted July 18.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 creates a new Department of Welfare and absorbs the functions and programs of the Federal Security Agency.

Reorganization Plan No. 2 transfers to the Department of Labor the Bureau of Employment Security and related services, now in the Federal Security Agency, and the functions of the Veterans' Placement Service Board.

Reorganization Plan No. 3 transfers to the Postmaster General the functions of all subordinate officers and agencies of the Post Office Department and authorizes him to delegate appropriate functions to subordinate officers.

Reorganization Plan No. 4 transfers the National Security Council and the National Security Resources Board to the Executive Office of the President.

Reorganization Plan No. 5 provides for unified direction by the Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission of the executive affairs of the Commission.

Reorganization Plan No. 6 makes the Chairman of the United States Mari-

time Commission the executive and administrative officer of the Commission and vests in him responsibility for the appointment of its personnel and the supervision and direction of their activities.

Reorganization Plan No. 7 transfers the Public Roads Administration to the Department of Commerce.

Reorganization Plan No. 8 constitutes the National Military Establishment an executive Department of Defense and vests in the Secretary of Defense direction, authority, and control over the Department.

It will be noted that the reorganization plans submitted by the President and the legislation enacted or pending in the Congress during 1949 have had two major objectives. These are:

First. Improvement in the general management of the executive branch.

Second. Improvement of the organizational arrangements for the achievement of particular purposes or programs of the Government.

Thus, in the category of changes designed to strengthen general management are Reorganization Plan No. 4 for the transfer of the National Security Council and the National Security Resources Board to the Executive Office, and Reorganization Plan No. 5 for the internal organization of the Civil Service Commission. The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act effects a major statutory reorganization in line with the first objective, for it streamlines property administration in the Government and establishes for the first time a General Services Administration charged with various housekeeping functions.

With regard to particular purposes and programs, Reorganization Plan No. 1 will achieve a long-approved objective by converting the Federal Security Agency into a Department of Welfare, and Reorganization Plan No. 3 will substantially improve the internal organization of the Post Office Department. Reorganization Plan No. 2 will take the first step in the direction of strengthening the Department of Labor.

Of considerable significance is Reorganization Plan No. 6, designed to strengthen the office of the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission. This agency is by far the largest of those commonly designated as regulatory commissions, and the plan providing for its reorganization is a major step toward establishing a framework for efficient internal administration in the conduct of the Government's merchant marine and shipping responsibilities.

On the legislative side we have the act strengthening the authority of the Secretary of State and providing him with additional top-level assistance in the conduct of foreign affairs.

Proposed amendments to the National Security Act, including the changes contained in Reorganization Plan No. 8 would improve the capacity of the Secretary of Defense to carry out his responsibility for the direction of the military departments. The amendments would have the effect of establishing a Department of Defense in place of the existing

confederated National Military Establishment.

In addition, legislation strengthening the authority of the Postmaster General and providing for the more flexible administration of the Post Office Department has been recommended by the President and is now under consideration by the Congress.

The reorganization plans and legislation which I have mentioned constitute but a partial summary of the reorganization activity launched during 1949. They do indicate, however, the major directions in which progress is being made. If the reorganization plans are allowed to become effective, and if the pending legislation relating to the National Military Establishment and Post Office Department is enacted, the achievements in better management of the Government will be a source of gratification to executive officials, Members of Congress, and the public. Nevertheless, certain major areas touched upon by the Hoover Commission in its reports will remain for further consideration and appropriate action. The principal problem areas toward which attention may well be directed in future months are five in number:

First. Integration of transportation agencies.

Second. Assignment of responsibility for public works planning and construction.

Third. Integration of natural resources activities.

Fourth. Disposition of lending and finance functions.

Fifth. Organization of the medical activities of the Government.

The only reorganization action now pending which relates to any of the preceding five problem areas is Reorganization Plan No. 7 which will transfer the Bureau of Public Roads to the Department of Commerce. Further action must be based on the most careful preparatory investigation and planning. Fundamental reorganizations in these fields affect many agencies of the Government.

It is difficult to estimate the economies which will result from the reorganization legislation and plans which can become effective during this year. As the President has pointed out, the enactment of a law or the approval of a reorganization plan does not of itself produce efficiency or reduce expenditures. However, the ground work is laid for improved administration which over a period of time may lead to substantial economies. How large those savings eventually will prove to be will become evident only after the new organizational arrangements have been in existence for a considerable period of time.

The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch recognized that the precise magnitude of savings to be derived from changes in administration cannot easily be determined in advance. Very rarely, therefore, did the Commission in its official reports attempt to set forth in dollars and cents the economies expected to result from proposed reorganizations. Mr. Hoover has, however, occasionally referred to specific savings which task forces of the Commission

estimated as likely to follow certain recommended changes. He has stated that a minimum of \$3,000,000,000 per year could be saved if the recommendations of the Commission on Organization were put into effect. Reorganizations believed to contribute most of the attainment of this \$3,000,000,000 in savings are summarized as follows:

Reorganization of the National Military Establishment	\$1,500,000,000
Revamping of Federal personnel policies	600,000,000
Reorganization of supply services	250,000,000
Reorganization of the Post Office Department	300,000,000
Improved records management	16,000,000
Reorganization of the Agriculture Department	44,000,000
Total	2,710,000,000

The \$290,000,000 of additional savings included in the \$3,000,000,000 estimate presumably are to result from reorganizations of other aspects of the business of the Federal Government.

It is of particular interest to note that legislation already passed or pending and reorganization plans now before Congress deal with every one of the six major savings areas listed above except the Department of Agriculture. This does not mean, of course, that the 1949 reorganization program will lead to cover two and one-half billions in economies. It does, however, indicate that attention is being directed to those areas in which observers have concluded that major savings can be attained.

In a fundamental sense, the task of achieving efficient and responsible administration in an organization as complex as the executive branch of the Federal Government is never ending. Changes in the domestic economic situation, in our relations with foreign powers, and in the demands made by the people upon their Government may render obsolete organizational patterns well adapted to the needs of an earlier day. Reorganization, therefore, is not simply a task for 1949 or for 1950. It is a task toward which the President and Congress must unceasingly devote their attention. If both the legislative and executive branches possess the authority and procedures necessary for the swift but orderly adaptation of organizational arrangements to changed conditions, and if they are constantly alert to deficiencies as they appear, it will be possible to assure that high quality of administration which the Nation must have. Both the program of the administration and the actions of Congress during 1949 give encouraging evidence that the need for constant attention to the organization of the executive branch is fully understood.

Mr. Speaker, in order that the Members may have further information on the background and objectives of the eight reorganization plans submitted to Congress by the President, I have prepared individual statements on these plans.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that these statements be included with my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(The statements referred to are as follows:)

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1949

The purpose of this plan is to establish a Department of Welfare which will take its place among the principal executive departments, performing the functions and conducting the programs now administered by the Federal Security Agency.

The affairs of the department are to be administered by a Secretary of Welfare, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. Provision also is made for one Under Secretary and three Assistant Secretaries to be appointed by the President subject to Senate confirmation.

To fix responsibility and clarify lines of authority, all functions of the Federal Security Agency are vested in the Secretary of Welfare, who may delegate appropriate authority to any officer, employee, or to any bureau or other organizational unit of the department.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 accords basically with the Hoover Commission recommendation that a new executive department be created to administer education and welfare activities, and conforms to the Commission's general policy of placing full legal authority and responsibility in the head of the department.

It should be noted that this plan culminates a long history of effort and activity looking to the establishment of a department of welfare. For a quarter century Presidents, special commissions, and students of government have made specific recommendations to that effect. President Harding proposed the establishment of a welfare department in a message to Congress early in 1923. Similar recommendations were made about that time by the Joint (Congressional) Committee on Reorganization of Government Departments and by William F. Willoughby, Director of the Institute for Government Research (now the Brookings Institution).

In 1932 reorganization orders submitted to Congress by President Hoover proposed the grouping of education, health, and welfare activities in one of the existing departments.

In 1937 both the President's Committee on Administrative Management and the Brookings Institution in its report for the Senate Select Committee To Investigate the Executive Agencies of the Government (Byrd committee) recommended the creation of a department of welfare to administer these activities. President Roosevelt had the same recommendation in a message to Congress on January 12, 1937, and Senator Robinson introduced a reorganization bill including a provision for a department of welfare.

In 1939 Reorganization Plan No. 1 submitted to the Congress by President Roosevelt provided the nucleus for a department of welfare by bringing together in the Federal Security Agency the previously scattered agencies in charge of welfare activities. The Director of the Budget has recently pointed out that a department of welfare undoubtedly would have been created at that time had not the Reorganization Act of 1939 specifically forbidden the creation of executive departments by reorganization plan.

In 1945 the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress proposed the establishment of a department of social welfare as a means of improving and coordinating relationships between the executive and legislative branches. The following year Reorganization Plan No. 2 submitted to the Congress by President Truman transferred additional welfare activities to the Federal Security Agency.

The Director of the Budget has noted that of eight comprehensive plans for the reorganization of the executive branch developed by

responsible officials and agencies within the last 30 years, six have concentrated the functions as to education, health and welfare in a single department—five of them in a new department devoted exclusively to these activities—and the other two plans have provided for a new department in charge of the greater part of these functions.

According to the Director of the Budget: "It has long been recognized that in practice the Federal Security Agency is a department in virtually all respects except in name and official status, and that the failure to give it its appropriate title and rank is anomalous and unfortunate."

As evidence of the magnitude and importance of this agency, it is pointed out that the agency has more than 35,000 employees and total annual expenditures of more than \$2,000,000,000. Thus the Federal Security Agency outranks three departments in size of personnel and a majority of the civil departments in expenditures. Excluding payments for grants-in-aid and insurance benefits, it still exceeds several departments in volume of expenditures.

Acceptance by the Congress of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1949 will mark the end of a long series of efforts to establish a Department of Welfare, which many observers agree with President Truman is long overdue.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 OF 1949

The purpose of this plan is to strengthen the Department of Labor by transferring to it two major labor programs—employment security and veterans' placement.

The Bureau of Employment Security (including the United States Employment Service and the Unemployment Insurance Service) would be transferred from the Federal Security Agency to the Department of Labor. This Bureau administers the activities of the Federal Government with respect to employment services and unemployment insurance, including activities which involve mainly the review and apportionment of grants-in-aid, approval of State plans and grants, the conduct of research and developmental activities, and the provision of advice and assistance to the State agencies which actually conduct the services.

The functions of the Veterans' Placement Service Board, created under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, would be transferred to the Secretary of Labor, and the Board abolished. Although the veterans' employment service functions through the regular employment service, its policies are now determined by an independent board. In order to simplify the administration of the Service and insure the fullest cooperation between it and the general employment service, the elimination of the Board is proposed.

In his message accompanying Reorganization Plan No. 2, President Truman stated:

"One of the major needs of the executive branch is a sound and effective organization of labor functions. More than 35 years ago the Federal Government's labor functions were brought together in the Department of Labor. In recent years, however, the tendency has been to disperse such functions throughout the Government. New labor programs have been placed outside of the Department and some of its basic functions have been transferred from the Department to other agencies.

"In my judgment, this course has been fundamentally unsound and should be reversed. The labor programs of the Federal Government constitute a family of inter-related functions requiring generally similar professional training and experience, involving numerous overlapping problems, and calling for strong, unified leadership. Together they form one of the most important areas of Federal activity. It is imperative

that the Labor Department be strengthened and restored to its original position as the central agency of the Government for dealing with labor problems."

The Hoover Commission unanimously recommended that the Bureau of Employment Security be transferred to the Labor Department.

The dependence of an efficient employment service upon the work of other agencies within the Department of Labor has been emphasized by the Hoover Commission, the President, and the Director of the Budget. Statistical studies on wages, hours, and employment, vocational-counseling aids, information on labor standards and working conditions, analyses of the employment problems of women, learners, and other special groups, are among the Labor Department services which tie in directly with employment-service work. In turn, the employment-office system is expected to furnish up-to-date information on employment and labor-market problems.

Unemployment compensation, the other program of the Bureau of Employment Security, also is closely related to employment service. The Hoover Commission and the President have pointed out that although it is a form of social insurance, unemployment compensation has greater connection, administratively, with job-finding activities than with old-age and survivors' insurance and public-assistance programs administered by the Federal Security Agency.

The purpose of unemployment compensation is to tide workers over limited periods until suitable employment can be obtained. The more effective the employment service, the less drain is made on the compensation fund. In the States this interdependence is recognized by making the same agency responsible for handling employment service and unemployment compensation work. The Director of the Budget has testified that it is very difficult to separate the two programs in the budgets on which Federal grants are based. Furthermore, many States, including such large industrial States as New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Illinois, have the employment service and unemployment compensation programs administered by their labor departments.

The Veterans' Employment Service is not abolished by Reorganization Plan No. 2, but responsibility is fixed in the head of the department by which the service will be administered after transfer of the Bureau of Employment Security.

At the present time we have an independent Veterans' Placement Service Board determining policies for the Veterans' Employment Service which by law is administered by the United States Employment Service within the Bureau of Employment Security. The Chairman of the Board also appoints the Chief of the Veterans' Employment Service. A Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights, originally in the Selective Service System, and now within the Department of Labor, has responsibilities for assisting veterans to find employment. By abolishing the Veterans' Placement Service Board, responsibility for the policies of the Veterans' Employment Service is concentrated in the officer supervising its administration (the Secretary of Labor under the proposed reorganization), thereby eliminating what the Hoover Commission called an "anomalous administrative arrangement".

In sum, the Bureau of Employment Security, including employment service and unemployment compensation activities, and functions relating to veterans' placement all have a logical place in the Department of Labor, as proposed by Reorganization Plan No. 2.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3 OF 1949

The purpose of this plan is to make a first step in strengthening the organization of

the Post Office Department by giving the Postmaster General authority to organize and control his Department.

The functions of all subordinate officers and agencies of the Department, including the functions of each Assistant Postmaster General, the Purchasing Agent, the Comptroller, and the Bureau of Accounts, are transferred to the Postmaster General. He is authorized to delegate to subordinates, designated by him, such of his functions as he may deem appropriate.

To provide the Postmaster General with top-level assistance in running the huge business of the Post Office Department, the plan establishes the positions of Deputy Postmaster General and four Assistant Postmaster Generals comparable to the positions of Under Secretary and Assistant Secretaries in other departments.

The plan also establishes an Advisory Board for the Post Office Department, composed of the Postmaster General, the Deputy Postmaster General, and seven other members representing the public who shall be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

This plan accords with the basic recommendations made by the Hoover Commission in its first and subsequent reports that subordinate officials should not have separate authorities; that is to say, the head of the agency should have full authority to organize and control his department. The Advisory Board for the Post Office Department also follows the Hoover Commission recommendations.

In his accompanying message President Truman pointed out that Reorganization Plan No. 3 puts into effect those of the Hoover Commission recommendations that can be accomplished under the provisions of the Reorganization Act. Further legislation, which the President has proposed, will be necessary to effect other recommendations of the Commission and to place the operations of the Post Office Department on a more business-like basis.

The need to improve the efficiency of the Post Office Department is documented by the Hoover Commission, which points out that a mass of archaic laws and regulations hamper the work of the department, and that its methods of budgeting and appropriation are entirely unsuited to a business operation of this kind and size.

The Commission reported that the Post Office Department's total deficit in 1947 was \$253,000,000 or 20 percent of revenues; in 1948 the deficit was \$310,000,000 or 22 percent of revenues; and in 1949 the deficit is estimated at \$500,000,000, or more than 30 percent of revenues.

Changes in the organization of the Post Office Department were considered as long ago as 1896 when President Cleveland recommended certain improvements to gain the full benefit of the immense sums expended in its administration. From time to time various changes have been suggested to improve the work of the department, leading up to the present reorganization plan and legislative recommendations made by the President.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 4 OF 1949

The purpose of this plan is to improve the staff assistance to the President by transferring the National Security Council and the National Security Resources Board to the Executive Office of the President.

Since the creation of the Executive Office of the President, the Congress has further recognized the need for more adequate central staff and created two new important staff agencies—the National Security Council and the National Security Resources Board.

The National Security Council was established under Public Law 253, July 26, 1947, to advise the President with respect to the integration of domestic, foreign and military

policies relating to the national security. In addition to performing such other functions as the President may direct, it is the duty of the Council—

1. To assess and appraise the objectives, commitments and risks of the United States in relation to our actual and potential military power, in the interest of the National security, for the purpose of making recommendations to the President in connection therewith.

2. To consider policies on matters of common interest to the departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security, and to make recommendations to the President in connection therewith.

The National Security Resources Board was established by the same act; it is composed of the chairman, who is appointed from civilian life by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, and such heads or representatives of the various departments and agencies as the President may designate. The Board advises the President concerning the coordination of military, industrial and civilian mobilization, including effective use of manpower, civilian economy adjustments, war production and procurement, unified action of war agencies, the relationship between potential supplies and requirements of war goods, etc., strategic and critical materials, and relocation of industries.

In performing these functions, the Board is required to utilize to the maximum extent the facilities and resources of other government agencies. Reorganization Plan No. 4 accords with specific recommendations of the Hoover Commission. In submitting the plan, President Truman stated:

"Since the principal purpose of the National Security Council and the National Security Resources Board is to advise and assist the President and their work needs to be coordinated to the fullest degree with that of other staff arms of the President, such as the Bureau of the Budget and the Council of Economic Advisers, it is highly desirable that they be incorporated in the Executive Office of the President. The importance of this transfer was recognized by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, which specifically recommended such a change as one of the essential steps in strengthening the staff facilities of the President and improving the over-all management of the executive branch."

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 5 OF 1949

The purpose of this plan is to provide a unified administrative direction by the Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission, while at the same time retaining the advantages of the bipartisan three-member commission.

The plan provides that the President shall from time to time designate one of the Civil Service Commissioners as presiding head of the Commission with the title of Chairman. The Chairman shall, in turn, appoint an executive director under the classified civil service. The titles of President of the United States Civil Service Commission, Secretary of the Commission, Executive Director and Chief Examiner are abolished. The functions of the Chairman are listed as follows:

1. The functions of the President of the Commission.
2. The functions of the Executive Director and Chief Examiner, and of the Secretary of the Commission.
3. The functions of the Commission, with certain specified qualifications, with respect to the appointment of personnel employed by the Commission.
4. The functions of the Commission with respect to the direction of employees of the Commission, the supervision of all activities

of such employees, and the distribution of work among them.

5. The functions of the Commission with respect to directing the preparation of budget estimates and with respect to the use and expenditure of funds.

6. The functions of the Commission with respect to executing, administering, and enforcing the civil-service rules and regulations, and such other activities as classification and retirement, with certain specified exceptions.

The plan recognizes that day-to-day administrative operations should be separated from the regulatory, deliberative, and appellate functions of the Commission. It leaves with the Commission final authority with respect to:

1. Formulation of civil-service rules and regulations.
2. Hearing and action on all types of appeals.
3. Administration of statutes relating to political activity.
4. Investigation of all matters pertaining to the civil service.
5. Recommending measures to the President to promote the more effectual accomplishment of the objectives of the Civil Service Act and rules.

The plan carries out a major recommendation of the Hoover Commission that the Chairman should be given full responsibility for the administrative direction of the work of the Civil Service Commission. It also follows in line both with developments in recent years in the States and cities, and with recommendations made from time to time for improving the personnel organization of the Federal Government.

Back in 1923 the Joint (Congressional) Committee on the Reorganization of Government Departments recognized that the Civil Service Commission must retain the Commission form of organization and continue in independent status, because much of its work was quasi-judicial in character. However, the need for a chief administrative officer, acting as Chairman of the Commission, was pointed out by President Hoover in a message to Congress of February 17, 1932. President Roosevelt's Committee on Administrative Management recommended the establishment of a Civil Service Administrator together with a nonsalaried Civil Service Board.

President Truman's message accompanying Reorganization Plan No. 5 described the changes in Federal personnel activities which justify its approval:

"The Civil Service Commission was established in 1883 as a three-member body to aid the President in making the civil-service rules and to administer a comparatively simple civil-service system. Each commissioner was made equally responsible under the law for performing the functions assigned to the Commission and the three members functioned as a body in the management of the agency.

"Sixty-six years ago the new agency conducted a single major operating program—the recruitment and examination of candidates for admission to the civil service. Eight executive departments then constituted the entire executive branch. The total Federal employment was about 110,000. That is less than are now employed by any one of the five largest executive agencies.

"Today the work of the Commission is vastly different, reflecting the great changes in the Government itself and the progress that has been made in personnel management, both in Government and private business. To this original job of recruitment and examination, acts of Congress have subsequently added many other operating programs. Two of them in particular involve large-scale operations: The administration of the civil-service retirement system and the administration of the Classification Act. This augmented program applies today to a govern-

ment about 20 times as large as that of 1883, employing men and women drawn from almost every American occupation and profession. The statutory structure of the Civil Service Commission itself, however, has not been adjusted over the years to its changing functions."

As the President further pointed out, the need for this reorganization stems from the Government-wide importance of the civil-service administration. Almost every agency and department is intimately affected, and competence and morale among employees determines the effectiveness of the Government's work. "It is essential," the President said, "that the Commission which directs that system should be effectively organized to discharge its responsibilities."

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 6 OF 1949

The purpose of this plan is to strengthen the administration of the United States Maritime Commission by making the Chairman the chief executive and administrative officer of the Commission and vesting in him responsibility for the appointment of its personnel and the supervision and direction of their activities.

The plan transfers from the Commission to the Chairman the functions of the Commission with respect to the following matters:

1. The appointment and supervision of all personnel employed under the Commission.
2. The distribution of business among such personnel and among organizational units of the Commission.
3. The use and expenditure of funds for administrative purposes.

The plan accords with the general recommendation of the Hoover Commission that responsibility for the internal administration of regulatory commissions should be vested in their chairmen.

The United States Maritime Commission was created by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 which sought to further the development and maintenance of an adequate and well-balanced American merchant marine, to promote the commerce of the United States, to aid in the national defense, and for other purposes.

The act directs that the Commission shall be composed of five members appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate for staggered terms of 6 years. The Chairman is designated by the President, but the Commission may elect one of its members as vice chairman and is authorized to appoint and fix the salaries of a secretary, a general counsel, and other officials and employees.

On February 7, 1942, under authority of the First War Powers Act, by Executive Order 9054, the President established the War Shipping Administration within the Office of Emergency Management. Certain functions, duties, and powers were transferred from the Maritime Commission to the War Shipping Administration; these powers were transferred back to the Maritime Commission when the War Shipping Administration ceased to exist on September 1, 1946.

In discussing the background of this plan, the President pointed out in his accompanying message: "Unlike other major regulatory commissions, the Maritime Commission is responsible not only for the performance of important regulatory functions but also for the administration of large and complex operating and promotional programs. Whereas the budgets of most regulatory agencies amount to only a few million dollars annually, the expenditures of the Maritime Commission exceed \$130,000,000 a year. As a result of the war the Commission is the owner of a fleet of over 2,300 ships aggregating more than 23,000,000 dead-weight tons."

During the war period, while the above-mentioned transfer of functions under the

First War Powers Act was in effect, the Chairman of the Commission, as War Shipping Administrator, was made directly responsible for the administration of several major operating programs of the Commission. This arrangement, the President observed, proved its value under the stress of war. About a year after the end of the fighting, however, it was terminated and the organization reverted to its prewar pattern.

Following wartime experience, independent studies stressed the need for concentrating in a single official a large part of the Commission's work. In 1948 the Commission appointed a general manager, which resulted in considerable improvement but, as the President noted, "it has not extricated the Commission from administration to the degree which is desirable." Summarizing the advantages of the present plan, the President stated:

"It leaves in the Commission as a body the performance of regulatory functions, the determination of subsidies, and the determination of major policies. Thus, it utilizes the Commission for the type of work for which such a body is best adapted. At the same time the plan places under a single official the day-to-day direction of the work of the staff within the policies and determinations adopted by the Commission in the exercise of its functions. This will provide more businesslike administration and help to overcome the delays, backlogs, and operating difficulties which have hampered the agency. At the same time by freeing the members of the Commission of much detail, the plan will enable them to concentrate on major questions of policy and program and thereby will obtain earlier and better considered resolution of the basic problems of the agency."

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 7 OF 1949

The purpose of this plan is to transfer the Public Roads Administration (now the Bureau of Public Roads) from the General Services Administration to the Department of Commerce.

This plan carries out a specific recommendation of the Hoover Commission.

The three major reasons for transferring the Public Roads Administration to the Department of Commerce may be summarized as follows:

1. The Department of Commerce is charged by its organic law with the responsibility for promoting transportation and commerce, and the Public Roads Administration, as an agency concerned with the sound development of the Nation's highway system, is directly related to basic responsibilities of the Department of Commerce.

2. The General Services Administration would be unduly burdened in the performance of its central serving functions by retaining the Public Roads Administration, which contains a major Federal program not primarily related to servicing the executive agencies.

In the past fiscal year the Public Roads Administration has expended approximately \$444,000,000, of which some 93 percent is in the form of grants to States. The Public Roads Administration develops standards, reviews projects and State programs, and conducts research. It is believed that to burden the General Services Administration with supervision of this huge and important but unrelated program, would weaken the attention and drive otherwise given to its central area of responsibility, and substantially dilute the major purpose behind the establishment of such an agency.

It is noteworthy that when the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 was considered, both the House and Senate Expenditures Committees indicated that inclusion of the Public Roads Administration in the transfer of the Federal Works Agency to the General Services

Administration was provisional, pending decisions on the consolidation of transportation agencies.

3. The Federal Works Agency, which has had supervision over the Public Roads Administration since 1939, is not a major Federal agency for construction activities or for grants and loans to State and local governments for non-Federal public works. It has been a customary practice of the Congress and the President to assign public-works activities to various Federal agencies in terms of the major program objectives of those agencies. The bulk of direct Federal works (involving direct Federal construction) has been and is being conducted outside of the Federal Works Agency (the only major direct works program in that agency in recent years is public buildings). The Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration in the Department of Interior, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Veterans' Administration (veterans' hospitals) all have major Federal works programs dwarfing in total the amount centered in the Federal Works Agency. In addition, other agencies have lesser programs for direct Federal works—for example, the Coast Guard in the Treasury Department, the National Advisory Council on Aeronautics, the Alaska Railroad, and the American Battle Monuments Commission.

The assignment in relation to specific agency program objectives is even more sharply evident with respect to Federal grants and loans to State and local governments for non-Federal public works. The airport program is assigned to the Civil Aeronautics Administration in the Department of Commerce, the hospital program to the Public Health Service in the Federal Security Agency, rural electrification to the Department of Agriculture, and housing to the Housing and Home Finance Agency. An exception to this functional pattern is the Bureau of Community Facilities of the General Services Administration (formerly of the Federal Works Agency) in making advances for State and local works planning, and this appears to be due to the fact that this program has no single functional basis but rather is primarily concerned with the possibility of a general emergency public-works program.

Whatever decisions may be subsequently made with respect to the reorganization of the Department of Commerce to integrate transportation activities, or with respect to the assignment of responsibilities for public works planning and execution, Reorganization Plan No. 7 is a logical first move. Nothing that the Congress and President Roosevelt were guided by the statutory concept of the Commerce Department's responsibilities toward transportation in transferring to the Department the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Inland Waterways Corporation under the Reorganization Act of 1939, President Truman stated: "A careful review of the structure of the executive branch reveals no other department or agency in which the Public Roads Administration can be so appropriately located."

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 8 OF 1949

The purpose of this plan is to establish a Department of Defense and to clarify and strengthen the responsibility and authority of the Secretary of Defense.

Specific proposals included in the plan are the following:

1. Changes the name of the National Military Establishment to the Department of Defense, and constitutes it an executive department.

2. Gives the Secretary of Defense full control over the organization and administration of the Department and authorizes him to delegate authority to subordinates.

3. Provides for a civilian Deputy Secretary of Defense to assist the Secretary of Defense and to serve in the latter's absence.

4. Provides for three Assistant Secretaries of Defense, drawn from civilian life to perform such activities as the Secretary of Defense may designate.

5. Changes the name of the National Security Council to the Armed Services Policy Council, and makes certain changes in its composition.

6. Establishes the office of Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and prescribes the duties thereof.

7. Provides that the Munitions Board and the Research and Development Board shall each, upon request, assist the Secretary of Defense in the performance of his duties.

8. Establishes in the Department of Defense a Personnel Policy Board, prescribes its composition and outlines its duties; i. e., establishment of personnel policies for both military and civilian personnel, coordination of appropriate activities of the Department of Defense with respect to personnel matters, and liaison with the various executive departments and other agencies of the Federal Government for the correlation of personnel activities.

The plan conforms to the basic recommendation of the Hoover Commission that within the National Military Establishment full authority and accountability should be centered in the Secretary of Defense, empowering him to establish policies and programs, to delegate authority where appropriate, and to control the service departments.

Since the Reorganization Act of 1949 prevents the President from abolishing an executive department as such, the plan formally retains executive status for the three service Departments, making them subject, however, to the "direction, authority, and control of the Secretary of Defense," who becomes the head of the Department of Defense.

The Hoover Commission recommendation for a Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is also embodied in the plan, except that the Chairman is to be appointed by the President with Senate confirmation, rather than by the Secretary of Defense.

Another recommendation of the Commission, that an Under Secretary of Defense and three Assistant Secretaries be established is also included in the plan, except that the plan changes the name of the Under Secretary to Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Other recommendations of the Commission to the effect that the Secretary of Defense should have full control over the preparation and execution of the military budget and should establish uniform budgetary and accounting practices throughout the Military Establishment are not included in the plan, inasmuch as they have been substantially agreed to by both Houses of Congress.

The problem of the organization of the military has been a major concern for more years than most of the people now living can recall. As far back as 1885 President Cleveland called attention in his annual message to the startling abuses and waste in the Navy Department. Practically every President since then has commented on the need for various improvements in organization of the military departments.

In 1922 the Joint (Congressional) Committee on Reorganization recommended the coordination of the Military and Naval Establishments under a single Cabinet officer as the Department of National Defense, with three Under Secretaries for Army, Navy, and National Resources. In 1945 the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress also recommended the setting up of a Department of National Defense.

After various minor improvements through reorganization plans in 1946 and 1947 the National Security Act of 1947 was passed, providing for the setting up of the National Defense Establishment, and taking a further

step in the direction of the unification of the three services into a single defense establishment. As President Truman has pointed out, this act failed to provide for a Department of Defense and for a fully responsible official with authority adequate to meet his responsibilities whom the President and Congress could hold accountable. Lacking also were the basis for an organization and staff adequate to achieve the most efficient and economical defense program and to attain effective and informed civilian control of the armed forces.

On March 5, 1949, the President recommended to the Congress that the National Security Act of 1947 be amended to strengthen and clarify the position of the Secretary of Defense and to provide him with more adequate staff assistance, on the basis of experience gained under the act, the recommendations of the first Secretary of Defense, and the extensive study made by the Hoover Commission.

Legislation substantially embodying the President's recommendations was passed in the Senate, but only a limited part dealing with financial and budgeting matters was accepted in the House. As an alternative to a limited legislative and unsatisfactory program for military reorganization the President submitted Reorganization Plan No. 8 on July 18, which would accomplish the major organizational changes represented in the Senate bill. The President expressed in his accompanying message a clear preference for direct legislative action to achieve the desired reorganization.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOEVEN (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4566. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law title 14 of the United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard"; and

H. R. 4963. An act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1184. An act to encourage construction of rental housing on or in areas adjacent to Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 142. An act excepting certain persons from the requirement of paying fees for certain census data;

H. R. 459. An act to authorize the payment of employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry for overtime duty performed at establishments which prepare virus, serum, toxin, or analogous products for use in the treatment of domestic animals;

H. R. 585. An act for the relief of Jacob A. Johnson;

H. R. 1127. An act for the relief of Sirka Siiri Saarelainen;

H. R. 1303. An act for the relief of Dr. Elias Stavropoulos, his wife, and daughter;

H. R. 1360. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a free bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Del Rio, Tex.;

H. R. 2021. An act to provide increased pensions for widows and children of deceased members and retired members of the Police Department and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 2417. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Air Forces to operate and maintain a certain tract of land at Valparaiso, Fla., near Eglin Air Force Base, as a recreational facility;

H. R. 2474. An act for the relief of Frank E. Blanchard;

H. R. 2799. An act to amend the act entitled "An act regulating the retention on contracts with the District of Columbia," approved March 31, 1906;

H. R. 2853. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue duplicates of William Gerard's script certificates No. 2, subdivisions 11 and 12, to Blanche H. Weedon and Amos L. Harris, as trustees;

H. R. 3467. An act for the relief of Franz Eugene Laub;

H. R. 3512. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to authorize the exemption of certain employees of the Library of Congress and of the judicial branch of the Government whose employment is temporary or of uncertain duration;

H. R. 4022. An act to extend the time for commencing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex., to July 31, 1950;

H. R. 4261. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to L. J. Hand a patent in fee to certain lands in the State of Mississippi;

H. R. 4646. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to lend certain property to national veterans' organizations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4705. An act to transfer the office of the probation officer of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, the office of the Register of Wills for the District of Columbia, and the Commission on Mental Health, from the government of the District of Columbia to the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, for budgetary and administrative purposes;

H. R. 4804. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Karl Frederick Kucker;

H. R. 5508. An act to amend the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948; and

H. J. Res. 170. Joint resolution designating June 14 of each year as Flag Day.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, August 1, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

812. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 for the Department of Justice (H. Doc. No. 281); to the Committee on Appropriations; and ordered to be printed.

813. A letter from the Comptroller of Currency, Treasury Department, transmitting the annual report of the Comptroller of the Currency for the year of 1948; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3113. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," and incorporate therein provisions relating to the United States Tax Court, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1138). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 5526. A bill to authorize the President to provide for the performance of certain functions of the President by other officers of the Government, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1139). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 1758. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 1140). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CANNON: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 329. Joint resolution amending an act making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1950, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VINSON: Committee of Conference. H. R. 5632. National Security Act Amendments of 1949; without amendment (Rept. No. 1142). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 5804. A bill to prohibit the establishment of a valley authority in any State that would be substantially affected thereby, until the people of the affected areas of such State have voted affirmatively for such valley authority; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 5805. A bill to amend the act of August 28, 1937, which relates to development of facilities for water storage and utilization in order to promote conservation in arid and semiarid areas, so as to extend such act to all areas of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 5806. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 with respect to mutual savings banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 5807. A bill to provide additional compensation, in lieu of overtime pay, for certain Federal employees engaged in criminal law-enforcement work; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 5808. A bill to repeal the retailers' excise taxes on luggage, jewelry, furs, and toilet preparations, and to terminate the war tax rate on the transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 5809. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 5810. A bill relating to the furnishing of accommodations at Klamath Falls, Oreg., for the United States District Court for the District of Oregon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 5811. A bill to amend section 1007, title 18, United States Code, with respect to exemption of nonfraudulent transactions under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. Con. Res. 113. Concurrent resolution providing for adjournment sine die of the two Houses of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. Con. Res. 114. Concurrent resolution calling for investigation of specific charges of discrimination against Negro employees of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing of the Treasury Department; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. Res. 301. Resolution disapproving of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1949; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. WHITTINGTON:

H. Res. 302. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 5472, a bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 5812. A bill to readmit Mr. Angelo Monica to United States citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 5813. A bill for the relief of Haralson County Hospital; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 5814. A bill for the relief of Jan Karszo-Siedlewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 5815. A bill for the relief of Sidney Terry, an individual trading as Midwest Painting Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWE:

H. R. 5816. A bill for the relief of Reginald Hrachia Devletian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JULY 29, 1949

(Legislative day of Thursday, June 2, 1949)

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:

Almighty God, we rejoice that daily we are the beneficiaries of Thy bountiful providence.

We pray that the assurance of Thy continuing care and goodness may in-

spire our minds and hearts with a more vivid sense of social responsibility.

Make us eager to share our blessings, and may they become contributions in our hands with which we shall seek to minister to needy and struggling humanity.

Help us to feel and understand that the question, "Am I my brother's keeper?" must be answered conclusively in the affirmative.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 28, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on July 28, 1949, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1429) for the relief of Lacey C. Zapf.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4007) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes," approved May 16, 1947, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 102) to provide for the attendance of a joint committee to represent the Congress at the eighty-third and final national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Anderson	Hill	Morse
Baldwin	Hoey	Mundt
Brewster	Holland	Murray
Bricker	Humphrey	Myers
Bridges	Hunt	Neely
Butler	Ives	O'Connor
Byrd	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Chavez	Kefauver	Saitonstall
Connally	Kem	Schoepfel
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Kilgore	Sparkman
Douglas	Knowland	Stennis
Downey	Langer	Taft
Dulles	Lodge	Taylor
Ecton	Long	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	McCarran	Thye
Flanders	McCarthy	Tobey
Frear	McClellan	Tydings
Fulbright	McGrath	Vandenberg
George	McKellar	Watkins
Gillette	McMahon	Wherry
Graham	Magnuson	Wiley
Green	Malone	Williams
Gurney	Martin	Withers
Hayden	Maybank	Young
Hendrickson	Miller	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]

and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] are absent on public business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is absent by leave of the Senate.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, submit petitions and memorials, and present routine matters for the RECORD, as though the Senate were in the morning hour, and without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT ON SURPLUS PROPERTY DISPOSAL IN FOREIGN AREAS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourteenth and final report on the disposal of United States surplus property in foreign areas, dated July 1949, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

BOWMAN COUNTY (N. DAK.) WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of Bowman County, N. Dak., relating to the establishment of a Bowman County Water Conservation District.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the Bowman County Board of Commissioners hereby requests that the Water Conservation Commission of the State of North Dakota create a Bowman County Water Conservation District, and take all necessary steps toward that end.

Attest:

SUE V. MCINTYRE,
County Auditor.
O. J. SORIDE,

Chairman, Board of County Commissioners.

SUGGESTED AMENDMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS ACT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted at the national convention of the American Aid Societies for the Needy and Displaced Persons of Central and Southeastern Europe, New York City, N. Y., relating to amendment of the Displaced Persons Act.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there are many hundred thousand of our kinfolk among the refugees and expellees now in Germany and Austria, who are excluded from the care of the IRO because of their German ethnic origin; and

Whereas these people were again for that reason excluded from consideration as displaced persons by the DP Act of 1948, although they have fled or were deported from