

the day, the Chair will then be free to recognize other Senators.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senators waive the time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Do the Senators from Nevada and West Virginia waive their right to control the time from now until the Senate takes a recess?

(Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. KILGORE conferred.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. This ought to be regarded as a notable historic event, when the Senate has run out of something to say. [Laughter.]

Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. FERGUSON addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. I believe the Senator from West Virginia would join with me in saying that no time should be charged against either side for the remainder of the day, and that the Senate could proceed to whatever might be the order of business, as directed by the Senate itself, from now on to the end of today's session, without time being charged either to the Senator from West Virginia or to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. KILGORE and Mr. CHAVEZ addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. I would go along on that basis, myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The two Senators who have control of the time are willing to yield the remainder of the time for today, without affecting their rights tomorrow on the displaced-persons bill, for the consideration of anything else the Senate may desire to take up.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is, the time, as now computed, to remain as it is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would be either charged equally against the Senators, or not charged against either. It would not make any difference, however, in the long run.

Mr. McCARRAN. It would not be charged against either?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I think, under the rules, the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from West Virginia would have a right to make the waiver, but I do not think they have a right to attach a condition to the waiver. To impose as a condition that the time shall not be charged against them, I think would be a violation of the rules of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question as to whether the time is charged against them is an academic one. When the Senate meets tomorrow, for 3 hours they will still have control of the time. At 2 o'clock the Senate will begin voting on amendments, from which time there will be 5 minutes on each side on every amendment offered; so that whatever happens today will not affect that situation, anyway.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, it was decided that

the Senators should control the time until 2 o'clock tomorrow, at which time the Senate would start voting on the pending bill. Under that agreement, is it necessary for the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from West Virginia to get unanimous consent before they can waive or set aside the agreement?

The VICE PRESIDENT. They can waive their control of the time for the remainder of the day, but that does not necessarily suspend the consideration of the displaced-persons bill for the rest of the day.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. FERGUSON addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks it would be necessary to suspend consideration of that bill temporarily for the rest of the day, in order to consider another bill, but it is not necessary to do that in order that a Senator may speak on some other bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But, under the agreement, would it be necessary, in order to consider other legislation or other business, for Senators to obtain unanimous consent?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would take unanimous consent to lay aside the bill temporarily to consider another bill.

Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. FERGUSON addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending measure be temporarily set aside, so that we may consider the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 930) to provide for the liquidation of the trusts under the transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I note the words "temporarily set aside." Does that mean it is to be temporarily set aside for this afternoon?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; for the purpose of taking up the conference report, and nothing else.

Mr. KILGORE. Could not the expression "temporarily set aside" be construed to be operative tomorrow?

Mr. ELLENDER. I can assure the Senator that all I want is sufficient time in which to take up the conference report on Senate bill 930.

Mr. KILGORE. May I not suggest that the Senator use the words "temporarily set aside this afternoon"?

Mr. ELLENDER. "This afternoon?" I will amend the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If an agreement is entered into to lay aside the pending subject temporarily, in order to take up a conference report, any Senator, at any time, may call for the regular order, whereupon the Senate would automatically return to the consideration of the displaced-persons bill. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, is it necessary to have unanimous consent to take up the conference report?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is necessary, in view of the unanimous-consent agreement under which the Senate is operating.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

#### RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is very apparent that we cannot transact any more business this afternoon. We have been trying now for a little over an hour to get some small piece of business considered. It is now a quarter to 4. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 5, 1950, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 4 (legislative day of March 29), 1950:

##### UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

Hon. Charles Fahy to be a judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

##### UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Hon. Irving R. Kaufman to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

William Lee Knous to be United States district judge for the district of Colorado.

Hon. Burnita Shelton Matthews to be United States district judge for the District of Columbia.

William E. Steckler to be United States district judge for the southern district of Indiana.

Hon. Allan K. Grim to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

##### UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Irving H. Saypol to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York.

##### UNITED STATES MARSHAL

William A. Carroll to be United States marshal for the southern district of New York.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 4, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Hugh E. Kemper, First Moravian Church, Easton, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we approach Thy throne of grace, mercy, and truth with deep humility in our hearts, coming before Thee asking that Thou bless us in our work, that we may promote peace and good will on earth. During this holy week we are particularly thankful for the sacrifice of Thy Son, Jesus Christ, through whose blood we are saved.

We ask that Thy blessing may rest upon this Nation of ours and upon those who guide its destiny. Wilt Thou aid them and bless them and comfort them.

In Jesus' name we ask it. 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 amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 212. An act for the relief of John Joseph McKay; and

S. 2084. An act for the relief of Jackson Riley Holland.

## REREFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2058) to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to authorize payment of claims arising from correction of military or naval records, and that the same be referred to the Committee on Armed Services. Past practice indicated the procedure that these bills were always considered by the Committee on Armed Services.

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

There was no objection.

## EIGHTY-FOURTH BIRTHDAY OF HON. ADOLPH SABATH

Mr. CELLER. 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. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. ADOLPH SABATH, celebrates this day his eighty-fourth birthday.

It is not for his age that we pay tribute to our distinguished colleague, but for his years of unremitting service. It is truly amazing that a man of his age can continue to exemplify and display such nimbleness of wit, such rare intelligence, and such good, solid common sense.

He has been a decided asset to this Chamber these many years. Throughout many a struggle he has stood firm as a rock, holding unflinchingly to his principles, staunch defender of the dignity of man and zealous guardian of the inherent rights of our citizenry.

We honor him today as a man 84 years young. I recall the lines of the poem by the famous Robert Browning called Rabbi Ben Ezra saying:

Grow old along with me!  
The best is yet to be,  
The last of life, for which the first was made;  
Our times are in His hand  
Who saith, "A whole I planned,  
Youth shows but half; trust God: see all,  
nor be afraid!"

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I wish to join with the distinguished gentleman from New York in tendering my congratulations to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] on

his birthday. All of us have a feeling of love and affection for the oldest Member of the House. To him on his birthday we extend our sincere wishes for many years of health and happiness.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I, too, join with the gentleman from New York in his tribute and expression of good wishes to the dean of the House, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, ADOLPH SABATH, on this, his eighty-fourth birthday.

I have had the pleasure and the honor of serving on the Committee on Rules with and under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] for a number of years. We have not always agreed on all matters political, or on all means and methods of parliamentary procedure, but it has been a great experience, a great pleasure, to work and serve with him. I have learned to appreciate the fact that he is an opponent worthy of any man's steel when it comes to debate and political sagacity.

ADOLPH SABATH is an unusual character. When he passes on, which I hope may not come for many years, the mold would be broken. There was never but one ADOLPH SABATH in all the world and in all the Congresses. He is a man unlike any other we have ever known. We love him even though we disagree with him at times. I pray that ADOLPH SABATH will be spared to serve with us in this House for many sessions to come.

I, too, extend my personal greetings and congratulations to him on this his natal day. May his health remain good, his wit sharp, and his great abilities unimpaired, is my wish for him today.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. I, too, wish to join with the gentleman from New York in paying tribute to A. J. SABATH on his eighty-fourth birthday. As long as I can remember, coming from the city of Chicago as I do, the name of Congressman A. J. SABATH has been identified with championing the rights of the people. He has long been acclaimed as a fighter for all the things that are good and great in government. He has fought throughout the years for liberal and progressive legislation.

Unlike the two gentlemen who preceded me I have found myself in agreement with everything that Congressman SABATH has fought for. He has been a firm supporter of public housing, civil rights, all legislation looking to freedom for the people, economic and political freedom.

I want to wish him on behalf of my colleagues from Chicago and the State of Illinois long life and continued activity in the interest and on behalf of the people of the city of Chicago whom he represents, and the people of the Nation. I offer my congratulations and best wishes for continuing the good fight.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in congratulating Judge SABATH on his eighty-fourth birthday and to say to my colleague from New York that as a relatively new Member in the House, Mr. SABATH is an inspiration by showing us all how to fight for what we consider to be right and yet to draw from this full years and long life. I wish for Judge SABATH many more years of continued happiness.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McSWEENEY].

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, have the honor of serving on a committee with Mr. SABATH, and I appreciate Mr. CELLER's yielding to me so that I may say a word about my chairman. I feel that he is the embodiment of everything that is good, everything that is great in this country and about which Horatio Alger wrote and which charmed me as a boy. Born abroad, Mr. SABATH came to this country at an early age, by his own ingenuity and hard work he has achieved what he is today—a great, kindly hearted statesman who loves his fellow man and serves him with all his fine strength and ability.

I think that too often we forget the fact that he is surely a devoted husband. His interest now is helping his wife, who is very ill at the present time. That is the reason he is away from Congress.

I am glad to join others in this House today in paying tribute to a great man on his eighty-fourth birthday. As he enters this Indian summer of his life I hope that he may "reap such sheaves of happiness that all his summers past will seem fruitless beside the autumn."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], the ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is not often this House has occasion to pause in its deliberations to pay tribute to a young man, unless perhaps it has been one who on the field of battle has distinguished himself. We are apt to forget that there is a valor as necessary on the field of peace as that which nerves a soldier's arm in battle.

For more than 43 years the young man to whom I refer has battled here for causes and principles he felt were essential to the welfare of his country and his fellow man.

Today this young man, Judge SABATH, reaches his eighty-fourth milestone. The years have diminished neither his loyalties nor his outstanding legislative effectiveness.

We honor ourselves in paying this tribute to this splendid American and invaluable friend.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished friend [Mr. SABATH] is one of the most unusual persons I have ever met. There is only one of his type; I have never met another. He exemplifies to the fullest extent possible the opportunities under a government of laws and not a government of men: born abroad, coming to this country, elected



by the people after taking advantage of our great institutions and our fundamental law, elected to this body and serving 44 years here, yet never wavering in his progressive outlook in the interest of the people. I can truly say that ADOLPH SABATH is an institution. He may be 84 years so far as the passage of time is concerned, but he is still a youth, he has a fine, noble, and understanding outlook on life. I am very glad to extend to him and to Mrs. Sabath, who has been an inspiration and a guide to him, my congratulations on this, his eighty-fourth birthday. May God in His infinite wisdom bless him for many, many years to come.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish my kindly, able colleague, Mr. SABATH, a very happy birthday. I have always admired his youthfulness, I have always admired his fine spirit. All of us respect and admire a fighter and Judge SABATH is a great fighter. Judge SABATH has always fought for what he believed was right. He has always fought for the people of his State and district. He has been helpful to me personally, I know, whenever I have appeared before the Rules Committee. I do not know what we would do without Members like Judge SABATH. He is an inspiration to all of us. I join in wishing his family happiness also on this, Judge SABATH's birthday.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join the gentleman from New York in paying tribute to this great American. He is, and has been a great fighter for the humanitarian principles he advocated during his long service in the House of Representatives. In all of the time I have served in this House I have never known ADOLPH SABATH to substitute expediency, political or otherwise, for that of principle. He himself is almost an institution and we all love him and congratulate him on his eighty-fourth birthday.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I join with all of my colleagues in the fine tribute they are paying here today to one of the most courageous, one of the most sincere men who has ever served in this House, the Honorable ADOLPH SABATH. He came to Congress the year after I was born and has been here continuously ever since. He has served in this House longer continuously than any other man. The finest speech I could make here today would be to say that I agree 100 percent with all the fine remarks that have been made about him by my colleagues.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the world would be a poor place if there were no sentiment in life. Certainly there can be no more appropriate sentiment expressed here than our praise of this beloved man who has labored with us so long and so faithfully and so eminently.

Judge SABATH is a living exemplification of Darwin's theory of survival of the fittest. He is the last and the best. He is the only Member of the present House who was here when I first served at the desk. I was glad to hear the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] quote those favorite lines from Browning:

Grow old along with me!  
The best is yet to be.

I am certain that in Judge SABATH's life and career the last is the best. Certainly today he is more influential, more benevolent, more helpful than ever before in his long and useful life.

He is 84 years old today, and I am certain the Members of the House join with me in the hope he will live to be 184.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TAURIELLO].

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to join my distinguished colleague from New York in paying compliment and praise to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Congressman SABATH. All through the years we read of these men in high positions and public life, and we draw therefrom certain pictures of them. Sometimes we are disappointed; sometimes the picture that we draw is a true one. Congressman SABATH to me is everything I have formed in my own mind. He is a man of deep convictions, courageous, always willing and anxious to serve not only his constituency but to serve the best interests of this country. I join my distinguished colleagues and all the other Members in extending our best wishes on the eighty-fourth birthday to our distinguished colleague from Illinois and sincerely hope the good Lord will continue to give him good health so that he may be with us and serve his country for many, many more years. He is truly an elder statesman.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this moment to add my humble voice in tribute to this grand young man. In my youth I read, I think, every Horatio Alger story. I never thought I would meet in the flesh the real Horatio Alger hero. In my opinion Judge SABATH is just that. He rose in the traditional American way from humble beginnings to the very top. He has long been an inspiration to his colleagues. He is all that a fine gentleman should be. I join the membership of the House in wishing him long life, good health, and much happiness.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, as I listened here today to these younger men say, "I remember him when I was a boy," you may be surprised that a man of my age can almost say that. Many, many years ago, as I picked up the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to use it for instruction in the classroom, one name stood out 40 years ago prominently in that CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and the name was ADOLPH SABATH. I was delighted when I came here 14 years ago that I

should meet the man in person. It has been a richer life for me to have met him in person. May he have many more such anniversaries as he has today and many more years of service in this body.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to know ADOLPH SABATH well ever since I came to this House. Born in a foreign country, he came early to this country. I know that every day of his life he is deeply grateful to the land which has done so much for him and given him a great opportunity.

Mr. SABATH has served longer continuously in the House than any other man. His vigor and his patriotism is an inspiration to us all. He is a lovely character, a real patriot—a friend to man. I am glad I know him.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in eulogy of Judge SABATH.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, today, my friend and colleague, the Honorable ADOLPH J. SABATH, has attained the venerable age of 84 years. I am pleased to have this opportunity to extend to him my hearty congratulations.

As dean of the House of Representatives, he is our inspiration and we receive from him the guidance and counsel we seek.

Congressman SABATH's record of achievements is remarkable. As a judge in his State of Illinois, he instituted the juvenile court and parole system, and brilliantly discharged his judicial duties. He has held high positions in the affairs of our Nation, and has never failed to fulfill the trusts placed in him. He was elected to Congress in 1906 and has been reelected 21 times. He is now in his forty-fourth year of continuous service in this House. As chairman of the Committee on Rules, he renders invaluable service to us and to the people of our country.

We are fortunate to have the benefit of his association, friendship, and wisdom. We cannot praise him too highly, and he richly deserves all the honor we can show him.

I am happy to join with my colleagues in wishing him many more years of continued success, health, and happiness.

#### ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 536) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That CARROLL D. KEARNS, of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on the District of Columbia.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## JAPANESE TEXTILES

Mr. BRYSON. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and amazed to learn from the report of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute that there is an ever-increasing volume of Japanese textiles coming into our country and being disposed of in competition with our own textiles. How anyone could justify such a situation is beyond my understanding.

It is necessary that proper safeguards be taken in the interest of our American textile industry. Grave thought should be given to the ever-increasing imports of cotton goods from Japan, where the textile worker receives 10 cents an hour—while in our own country the average hourly textile wage is more than 10 times that amount.

Surely we cannot afford to impair our own industrial security and reduce our high standards of living as we seek to help those in foreign countries. I quote from the convention's report:

Congress cannot refuse us some protection unless it is ready to admit that textile employees must face drastically lower wages which we as manufacturers surely do not want, and unless they are willing to waive protection for us, thereby bringing chaos in one of our most important industries, and incidentally one which is, indeed, essential for the defense of the country.

It would seem that more than one of the low-wage substandard countries are looking our way with the hope of sending their goods here for sale.

I call upon you, my colleagues, to gird your loins for a fight to the finish against this influx of foreign-made textiles.

## ANTIUNION LEGISLATIVE PLANS

Mr. RAMSAY. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, the United States News and World Report, in its issue for March 31, published an interesting statement by a Member of the other body from Ohio who desires to become President of the United States. This statement outlines the gentleman's future plans to destroy labor unions by legislation.

This publication quotes the gentleman as saying:

With injunctions you can seize the mines; then we ought to have the right to seize the labor unions, too. Of course we can pass a law to break up Nation-wide bargaining. That's under consideration. It would have to provide that bargaining be on a regional basis.

I should like to point out that this would amount to establishment of company unions. I continue to quote the gentleman, as reported by the United States News and World Report:

And you would have to draft a provision—a sort of Sherman Act—to prevent employers

and labor from conspiring together to demand the same wage and other terms. Maybe that would be a solution to recurring difficulty of strikes.

Mr. Speaker, unless I am in error in my estimation of the feelings of workmen these proposed inhibitions against labor and the denial of the peaceful bargain procedures of national unions would cause great disturbance. It would, in my opinion, result in the greatest disturbances the labor world has ever known—strikes and lock-outs would become general, particularly in the steel and coal industrial areas. Maybe the gentleman who represents Ohio in the other body desires this.

God protect America from ever having to experience such policies in reference to labor. They would surely bring discord and hatred as the prevailing reaction of our working people.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. DAVENPORT asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

## IMPORTS WRECKING AMERICAN INDUSTRY

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, the able gentleman from South Carolina, Judge Bryson, spoke of the great competition from importation of textiles from Japan. Before the war I warned about the importation of textiles from Japan. Now they are importing woolsens as well as cotton goods. I warned against the importation from Czechoslovakia of boots and shoes. Today they are allowing boots and shoes to come in from Czechoslovakia. I had a letter from the hat industry saying that that industry may go out of existence because of foreign competition. I have fought to save the watch industry for America and Americans.

Mr. Speaker, it seems as if the Government does not care about our industries. It is much more interested in developing the industries of Japan and Czechoslovakia and of other countries behind the iron curtain than it is in protecting our own industries and our own labor. It is extremely difficult for both management and labor today to compete with other countries. We spend hours and hours talking about other countries and helping them, but what do we do for our own country?

## HOUSING LEGISLATION

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the construction of homes and apartments is being seriously curtailed and hampered by the lack of action by the conferees who are attempting to resolve differences between the House and Senate versions of the housing legislation. We who live in the North have a short enough construction season without having additional impediments placed in the path of progress. The home construction industry in western Michigan and elsewhere can and will build a tremendous number of low-cost homes this spring, summer, and fall, but the builders need immediate action on the FHA extension legislation in order to construct the still badly needed homes for veterans and others.

Title I of FHA is particularly important to us in Michigan. We have thousands who need to convert from coal to gas and oil heating units. Title II loans must be expanded now, not hindered. Six hundred and eight apartment loans are still vital.

I am reliably informed that the home-building industry is at a standstill. Homes cannot be started and as a result carpenters, plumbers, bricklayers, and all others who build homes are forced into idleness. The lack of new home starts is regrettable, but the unnecessary unemployment is worse. We need more homes, especially low-cost homes, and we also need the jobs. I strongly urge that the leadership speed up the House and Senate conferees so that road block can be broken. The necessary action on FHA is long overdue. The administration is solely to blame for the serious situation existing today. Some relief can come if we act promptly. The House and Senate cannot and should not recess over Easter or at any other time until the important legislation is finally enacted.

I notice that the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, one of the conferees, is on the floor. Could he tell the House when the conferees will probably bring back a conference report?

Mr. SPENCE. We have very lively hopes that that may be accomplished before the House recesses over Easter-time.

## CONTINUED BRITISH ARMS SALES TO EGYPT, JORDAN, AND IRAQ

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, a real campaign is being waged by the State Department to reassure the American people that broad-scale shipments of heavy arms like jet fighter aircraft, tanks and gunboats by Great Britain to the



Near East Arab states, notably Egypt, Jordan, and Iraq, is not an incitement to a renewal of the Arab-Israeli war. Last night the Federal Security Administrator, as an administration spokesman, gave this assurance in New York; the Secretary of State had given it before.

Millions of Americans are, however, distinctly not reassured so long as the arms race in the Near East continues unabated which is by now practically admitted. Armistice between the Near East Arab states and Israel, not peace, remains the order of the day and fulminations in these states promising a renewal of the Palestine war are heard daily.

The Secretary of State, in his letter to me of January 12, 1950, said on this subject that information available to the State Department does not indicate any serious preparation for a renewal of the Palestine conflict. He continued:

Should such information be received the United States Government would be quick to use all its influence in an attempt to prevent such a tragic eventuality both inside the United Nations and outside.

These words indicate that we are following a policy of drift in the Near East, a policy which had such tragic results in the Far East. A policy of drift means drifting along with British policy. The British are undoubtedly serving what they consider—though so mistakenly—to be their own national interests in the Near East, but we should serve ours by demanding peace before arms.

#### SURPLUS FOOD COMMODITIES

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include therewith a letter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to locate some dried beans and dried peas. If anybody knows where I can get them in fair amounts, I would appreciate his advice.

However, I have sent the President at Key West the following telegram:

Am now shopping for other food commodities which are stored by Federal Government in gigantic amounts at indefensible expense to taxpayers. Will forward another item to you as soon as I can locate it. Total waste in money to date \$3,690,000. Will you not please do what your message yesterday clearly indicated you can and should do to remedy this situation.

I now want to make available a letter I have received from Don A. Tuttle, farm director, Station WHAI, Greenfield, Mass., outlining graphically the entirely successful effort to distribute surplus potatoes to needy people in that town. I call your attention to the fact that these five tons of potatoes were handled without one cent of expense to the town. The intelligence, initiative and integrity of the fine, public spirited Americans in our communities can be counted on to handle these problems successfully if we will but realize that all the brains in America are not concentrated here in Washington. I

wish I could believe that this experience would penetrate the misty, befogged, and stupid spots in this gigantic, inefficient, wasteful bureaucracy which rides rampant over the real best interests of the American citizen and taxpayer. But, as I have said before, every day more Americans are going to know more and more about the indefensible and shocking waste of their money and their food. And when enough of them know these facts, someone in the executive department is going to pay for it and pay dearly. The American people are not unintelligent in spite of the opinion to the contrary in our executive department, and they resent being considered as or treated as "suckers."

The letter follows:

Greenfield, Mass., March 7, 1950.

Congressman JOHN W. HESELTON,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have missed our daily conversations between Washington and Greenfield. They brought me for the first time in contact with our Congressman from Greenfield and vicinity. I certainly want to thank you for your splendid help and boost. I must admit that at times during our fight for some surplus potatoes I was about ready to toss in the towel. However, due to the friendly spirit of the people here in Greenfield, and through your hearty cooperation, we kept things going here and seem now to have everything under control.

The real purpose of this letter is to let you know that the first 5 tons of potatoes has been exhausted and that another order has been put through. To our critics who said that there was no need I think this is sufficient answer. That 5 tons of potatoes was exhausted in exactly 10 days. I want to commend Capt. Joseph Woods of our local Salvation Army without whose cooperation this entire undertaking would have fallen through. He assisted us in every way possible and is continuing to do so. His organization distributed the entire 5 tons of potatoes and has taken the responsibility of seeing that these potatoes went to the right people. This aspect of the project I can assure you is being handled very discreetly. No one person is receiving potatoes unless his minister or the welfare board or the Veterans Service leader says he is in the category of needing this help. The reason the welfare board here in Greenfield did not want to accept distribution and responsibility was the fact that they thought it was going to be too much of a headache and that incidentally is a quote from one of the members, and also that they were afraid it was going to cost the town money and they would be accused of wild spending. It's not costing the town one cent as the Salvation Army is transporting, storing and distributing these surplus potatoes free of charge. I knew you would be interested to know that the Greenfield plan is underway and doing nicely. There is a definite need and as I stated the first shipment of 5 tons of potatoes has been exhausted.

I understand that Springfield is forming plans for similar action. They have been in contact with me and seem to be well on the way toward action.

Thanks again, Mr. HESELTON, for your encouragement and help and I hope I can thank you personally next time you are in Greenfield.

Sincerely,

DON A. TUTTLE,  
Farm Director WHAI.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

#### HOMOSEXUALS IN GOVERNMENT EMPLOY

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a taxicab driver told me that the homosexuals had quite a celebration on Saturday and Sunday nights. They were celebrating the green light they thought they received from this House because the House turned down the amendment which would have prohibited them from employment with ECA.

That action was taken by almost a straight party vote. It was a small vote, 77 to 66, I do not blame all of the Democrats here today, some of you were not here to vote. I know you who did vote will rejoice with them in their celebration. You gave them the go ahead signal for Federal employment. You did it by almost a straight Democratic vote. Mr. Peurifoy testified there were only 91 whom he dismissed in the State Department. The police department say there are about 7,000 in Washington and about 75 percent of them on the Federal pay roll. Not long ago the police raided a house and got about 60 of them in all kinds of orgies. But I think the Democratic majority in the House who voted on a straight party line would want to know about this celebration, because you like to spread joy and sunshine and by your vote did bring joy to the homosexuals now employed in Government work.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, a young boy one time called an old lady a hoodlum. She said she did not know what a hoodlum was, but she did not think that boy was paying her a compliment. I am just a little like that old lady. I do not know what homosexuals are but I never saw anybody get as much free advertising in the Congress of the United States in all of my life. I do not see any sense in it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STAGGERS. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I feel confident that we, as Members of this House of Representatives, condemn Communists. Our intense desire and determination is to support the continuation

of Americanism, to preserve democracy for the sons and daughters of this country, and offer it to any and all who seek its better way of life.

If there be among us any who would seek to degrade, overthrow, or destroy our Government, let him be accused, given a fair trial, and proved guilty or innocent, and punished or freed. But I say to you let there be employed much care and caution when an accusation is made. Let us be sure we are right.

Communist, spy, traitor. These are strong words, destructive words, malignant words, words not to be hurled freely and promiscuously. To accuse an innocent person of a crime so hideous as that of being a foreign spy or traitor to one's government just because that particular person happens to be a political enemy, a business enemy, or a social enemy, is to employ the handiwork of the devil.

During this Easter season our thoughts are with our dear Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ as He faced the greatest sacrifice since the beginning of time, and we are reminded of the accusations that were flung at Him, and the cry, "Crucify Him," still rings in our ears.

Let us not in our lack of foresight point our fingers at anyone and accuse him of wrongdoing until we have positive proof our accusations are true and in the interest of goodness and justice.

My colleagues, I ask you to join with me in the search of our consciences, seek Divine guidance, and proceed with great caution to legislate, investigate, and navigate this beloved Ship of State into the peaceful waters of trust, brotherhood, and truth.

We have one of the most efficient and best-trained investigators in the world in the FBI. I feel that all matters such as these should be turned over to them. If any of you feel it is not efficient, please help to make it so; and if you feel they need more personnel for the sake of America and the world, let us, as Members of Congress, give them additional personnel.

Let us attack communism and obliterate it from our country, but let us do so with truth.

#### HOMOSEXUALS IN GOVERNMENT EMPLOY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER] seems to be critical of the fact that certain groups are getting a lot of unfavorable free advertising. Well, may I say to the gentleman you have had these unmentionable individuals in the departments; it is your fault, you have been in control of the executive departments here for 13 or 15 years. For the last 10 years practically everybody in Washington knew about all this disreputable, dirty, nasty bunch on the Federal pay roll which is now, at last, being exposed, getting what the

gentleman calls free advertising. Now the gentleman objects to their being exposed. If he wants to take them home and live with them, all right; but you have no right—

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You have no right, I say, to keep those dirty, nasty people on the Federal pay roll, and use the dollars of decent citizens to pay them. Maybe the gentleman likes them; I do not; neither do my people.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I should like to ask the gentleman a question: Can you tell me what a homosexual is?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The term needs no definition—I will not dirty my mouth by defining it.

#### NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3946) to promote the national defense and to contribute to more effective aeronautical research by authorizing professional personnel of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to attend accredited graduate schools for research and study, with a Senate amendment and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (hereinafter referred to as the NACA) is authorized to grant to any professional employee of demonstrated ability, who has served not less than 1 year in the NACA, a leave or leaves of absence from his regularly designated duties for the purpose of allowing such employee to carry on graduate study or research in institutions of learning accredited as such by the laws of any State.

"Sec. 2. Leaves of absence may be granted under authority of this act only for such graduate research or study as will contribute materially to the more effective functioning of the NACA.

"Sec. 3. Leave or leaves of absence which may be granted to any employee under authority of this act shall not exceed a total of 1 year.

"Sec. 4. Tuition and other incidental academic expenses shall be borne by the employee.

"Sec. 5. Any leave of absence granted under the provisions of this act shall be without loss of salary or compensation to the employee and shall not be deducted from any leave of absence with pay authorized by any other law. Any such employee shall make a definite statement, in writing, that he will return to and, unless involuntarily separated, will remain in the service of the NACA for a period of 6 months if the period for which he is granted such leave of absence does not exceed 12 weeks, or for a period of 1 year if the period of leave exceeds 12 weeks. Any employee who does not fulfill any such commitment shall be required to reimburse the Government for the amount of leave granted under this act.

"Sec. 6. The total of the sums expended pursuant to this act, including all sums expended for the payment of salaries or compensation to employees on leave, shall not exceed \$50,000 in any fiscal year."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JACKSON of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Saturday Review of Literature.

Mr. GRANGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a proclamation.

Mr. ADDONIZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the East Orange Record.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include a eulogy of the late Honorable Schuyler Otis Bland and a eulogy of the Honorable MARY T. NORTON.

Mr. McGRATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. BOLTON of Maryland asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances.

Mr. FURCOLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Thomas Hennessey.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial entitled "Benefits From Waterways" published in the Washington Post of this date.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MURPHY (at the request of Mr. CAVALCANTE) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by the Honorable James A. Farley.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a short newspaper article, and to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make later today and include excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and from a statement he made before a Senate committee.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article, notwithstanding the fact that the cost as estimated by the Public Printer will be \$205.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include three editorials.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make in Committee



of the Whole this afternoon and include certain tables.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article on Sporadic Income by Mr. George T. Altman and Mr. Richard L. Rykoff, tax attorneys, of Los Angeles.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ELLSWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement on forestry.

Mr. RIEHLMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. MACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by the distinguished Father Gillis, which appeared in the Catholic Virginian.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. THORNBERRY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the permanent RECORD following the remarks of Mr. WHITTEN on the retirement of the gentleman from Texas, Mr. WORLEY.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. GREEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address.

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include editorials.

#### THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

#### PATRICK CRONIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5709) for the relief of Patrick Cronin.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Patrick Cronin, as of November 20, 1943, at New York City, the date and place he entered the United States. Upon enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the Irish quota of the first year that the Irish quota is hereafter available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the Attorney General is directed to cancel, forthwith, any outstanding warrant of arrest, order and warrant of deportation, and bond in the case of Patrick Cronin of New York, N. Y.,

and is directed not to issue any such further warrants or order in the case of such alien insofar as any such further warrants or order are based upon the same grounds as the warrants or order required by this act to be canceled.

"Sec. 2. That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the said Patrick Cronin shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on November 20, 1943, the date of his last entry to the United States, upon payment by him of the required head tax and visa fee, provided he is not otherwise deportable than on the ground that after admission as a seaman he has remained in the United States for a longer time than permitted by the Immigration Act of 1924, and regulations made thereunder, and on the ground that at the time of entry he was inadmissible under the third category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 136 (e)), and the eleventh category of section 3 of that act by reason of conviction of or admission of the commission of one or more crimes heretofore revealed to the Department of Justice.

"Sec. 3. That, upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Ireland."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ARTHUR O. FISHER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 44) for the relief of Arthur O. Fisher.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Arthur O. Fisher, of New York City, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of June 16, 1947, the date of his last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Czechoslovakia.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PRIMITIVO URCELAY-RUIZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 46) for the relief of Primitivo Urcelay-Ruiz.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Attorney General of the United States be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to cancel deportation proceedings in the case of Primitivo Urcelay-Ruiz, of central Nevada, legally admitted as a contract laborer, but who has remained in the United States longer than permitted by law and regulations and that this alien shall be considered as having been admitted for permanent entry as of the date of his actual entry on the payment of the visa fee of \$10 and a head tax of \$8.

Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Spanish quota for the first year that the said Spanish quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LT. COL. CHARLES H. BONESTEEL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2911) to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Col. Charles H. Bonesteel as Executive Director of the European Coordinating Committee under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, without affecting his military status and perquisites.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, notwithstanding the existing provisions of law or any rules or regulations issued thereunder, the President, acting by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized to appoint Lt. Col. Charles H. Bonesteel, an officer in the Army of the United States, as Executive Director of the European Coordinating Committee and Lieutenant Colonel Bonesteel's appointment to, acceptance of, and service as such Executive Director of the European Coordinating Committee shall in no way affect any status, office, rank, or grade he may occupy or hold in the Army of the United States or any component thereof, or any emolument, perquisite, right, privilege, eligibility for promotion, or benefit incident to or arising out of any such status, office, rank, or grade: *Provided*, That so long as he remains Executive Director of the European Coordinating Committee, Lieutenant Colonel Bonesteel shall retain the rank and grade of lieutenant colonel which he now holds in the Army of the United States, but during such time shall receive the salary and allowances as Executive Director of the European Coordinating Committee as one of the persons authorized to be employed under section 406 (c) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, payable from funds made available by law for the Department of State, in lieu of his military pay and allowances.

Sec. 2. In the performance of his duties as Executive Director of the European Coordinating Committee, Lieutenant Colonel Bonesteel shall be subject to no supervision, control, restriction, or prohibition (military or otherwise) other than would be operative with respect to him if he were in no way connected with the Department of Defense or the Army of the United States or any component thereof.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 7, after the word "grade" insert a colon and strike out the balance of the line and all of lines 8 to 17, inclusive, and insert the following: "*Provided*, That Lieutenant Colonel Bonesteel shall hold the position of Executive Director of the European Coordinating Committee for a period of not to exceed 3 years, but during such time shall receive the salary and allowances as Executive Director of the European Coordinating Committee as one of the persons authorized to be employed under section 406 (e) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, payable from funds made available by law for the Department of State, in lieu of his military pay and allowances."

Page 3, after line 9, insert the following section:

"Sec. 3. All periods of service performed by Lieutenant Colonel Bonesteel pursuant to the authority of this act shall be credited as active service in the Army of the United States for pay, promotion, and all other purposes."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GRANTING OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called House Concurrent Resolution 181 favoring the grant of status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1011; 50 App. U. S. C. 1953):*

A-6357782, Augenblick, Samuel.  
A-6903814, Dobihoff, Anne Marie.  
A-6704251, Graciola, Mercita (Sister) (Genowefa Suwala).  
A-6704683, Grula, Stanislaw (Sister Mercita Laetissima).  
A-6704208, Humiline, Mercita (Sister) (Stanislaw Bil).  
A-6704660, Jachimowicz, Stefania.  
A-6897992, Leoke, Pili Laine.  
A-6817383, Rosu, George G.  
A-6704264, Rygiel, Anna Teresa.  
A-6496579, Sigray, Margit.  
A-6654358, Solomianski, Elia.  
A-6662193, Solomianski, Lipe.  
A-6654357, Solomianski, Sima.  
A-6887200, Szucs, Miklos Joseph, or Doctor Miklos Szucs Nicolson.  
A-6819195, Szukovathy, George.  
A-6886879, Taffet, Isidore (or Izydor).  
A-6881778, Weinberg, Josef.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MRS. MARIE Y. MUELLER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 866) for the relief of Mrs. Marie Y. Mueller.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### FILIP NICOLA LAZAREVICH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1627) for the relief of Filip Nicola Lazarevich.

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

*Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and deportation laws the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to cancel the warrants of arrest and deportation heretofore issued against Filip Nicola Lazarevich of Dearborn, Mich., on the ground that he admits having committed a felony or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude prior to entry into the United States, to wit, perjury; and that hereafter he shall not again be subject to deportation for any offense heretofore committed in connection with his endeavor to be and remain in the United States. For the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, such alien shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of May 23, 1938, the date on which he was admitted to the United States at the port of New York on a quota immigration visa.*

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### JOHN MICHAEL ANCKER RASMUSSEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3464) to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of alien John Michael Ancker Rasmussen.

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

*Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the alien John Michael Ancker Rasmussen, of Brede, Denmark, as of the 22d of July 1948, the date on which he entered the United States temporarily as a visitor, if he is otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Denmark quota for the first year such quota is available.*

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MRS. MARIE GULBENKIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3771) for the relief of Mrs. Marie Gulbenkian.

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

*Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Mrs. Marie Gulbenkian shall be considered to have been lawfully admitted for permanent residence as of the date of her last entry into the United States.*

The Secretary of State is directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that said quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, insert "May 27, 1949."  
Page 1, line 7, after the word "States" insert "upon payment of the visa fee and head tax."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "appropriate."  
Page 1, line 10, after the word "for" insert "Turkey for."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: On page 1, line 6, strike out "May 27, 1949" and insert "May 27, 1947."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### YOSHIKO MATSUMURA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6364) for the relief of Yoshiko Matsumura.

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

*Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of law relating to racial ineligibility and the provisions of the law relating to prerequisites to the issuance of a visitor's visa, Yoshiko Matsumura, the fiancée of Masumi Kinjo, an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, shall, if*

otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, be deemed eligible for a visitor's visa for the purpose of contracting marriage with said Masumi Kinjo: *Provided*, That said marriage shall be contracted within a period of 90 days after the arrival of Yoshiko Matsumura in the United States: *Provided further*, That upon the contracting of the marriage aforesaid within the period of 90 days after the arrival of Yoshiko Matsumura in the United States, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to adjust the status of Yoshiko Matsumura to that of a permanent resident of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Yoshiko Matsumura, the Japanese fiancée of Masumi Kinjo, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, and that Yoshiko Matsumura 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 Yoshiko Matsumura is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to said Masumi Kinjo, 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 Yoshiko Matsumura, 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 entry of said Yoshiko Matsumura, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of said Yoshiko Matsumura as of the date of her entry into the United States, upon the payment by her of the required visa fees and head taxes."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### JODEENE LEHRMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6485) for the relief of Jodeene Lehrman.

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

*Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Richard L. Lehrman, now sergeant, United States Army, 36741982, and his wife, Phyllis Schnarr Lehrman, are hereby declared to be the natural parents of the infant Jodeene Lehrman.*

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, solely for the purpose of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, Jodeene Lehrman shall be considered the alien natural-born child of her adoptive parents, Sergeant and Mrs. Richard L. Lehrman, United States citizens."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.



## MRS. YOUNG JA KIM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7072) for the relief of Mrs. Young Ja Kim.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the 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 Mrs. Young Ja Kim, a native of Korea, the wife of James Kim, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, and that, if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, she shall be granted admission into the United States as a nonquota immigrant for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after the comma, strike out the remainder of the bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## MRS. ISAMU TARASAWA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7032) for the relief of Mrs. Isamu Tarasawa.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the 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 Mrs. Isamu Tarasawa, a native of Japan and the wife of Isamu Tarasawa, a citizen of the United States and presently serving in Japan as a civilian employee with the United States Army, and that, if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, she shall be granted admission into the United States as a nonquota immigrant for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, after the first comma, strike out the balance of the bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## MRS. KARRY WAKEFIELD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7092) for the relief of Mrs. Karry Wakefield.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, notwithstanding any provisions of law excluding from admission into the United States persons of races ineligible for citizenship, Mrs. Karry Wakefield, Japanese wife of Harry Wakefield, a citizen of the United States and a member of the armed services, shall be admitted to the United States for permanent residence upon application herewith filed and without presenting an immigration visa or other travel documents, if she is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That in the administration of the immigration laws the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which exclude from admission to the United States aliens who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not hereafter apply to Mrs. Karry Wakefield, the wife of Harry Wakefield, a citizen of the United States and a member of the United States armed forces."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## MRS. MARIA SALOME HOLLAND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7096) for the relief of Mrs. Maria Salome Holland.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. Maria Salome Holland, widow of Technical Sgt. Cecil F. Holland, who died in a Japanese prisoner-of-war camp in 1942, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of her entry into the United States for a temporary stay. 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 the Philippines for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## TOSHIKO ONO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7173) for the relief of Toshiko Ono.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Toshiko Ono, the Japanese fiancée of John E. Williams, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II: *Provided,* That in the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the enactment of this act, the said Toshiko Ono shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do 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 enactment of this act, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Toshiko Ono as of the date of her entry into the United States, upon the payment by her of the required fees and head tax, if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## MITSUKO YANO KINGMAN AND WILLIAM LEO KINGMAN, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7175) for the relief of Mitsuko Yano Kingman and William Leo Kingman, Jr.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, notwithstanding the provisions of law excluding persons of races ineligible to citizenship from admission to the United States, Mitsuko Yano Kingman and William Leo Kingman, Jr., who are the legal wife and child, respectively, of William Leo Kingman, a United States citizen and a sergeant in the United States Air Force, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence upon meeting all the other requirements of the immigration laws.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That in the administration of the immigration laws the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which exclude from admission to the United States aliens who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not hereafter apply to Mitsuko Yano Kingman and William Leo Kingman, Jr., the legal wife and child, respectively, of William Leo Kingman, a United States citizen and a sergeant in the United States Air Force."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## MRS. CORRINA ARENA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1175) for the relief of Mrs. Corrina Arena.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the late Pfc Virgil A. Arena, who died of service-incurred disease on August 25, 1942, while serving in the Army of the United States, shall be held and considered to have had in effect at the time of his death national service life insurance in the amount of \$10,000. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall pay such insurance to Mrs. Corrina Arena, of North Bergen, N. J., mother of the said Virgil A. Arena. Although the said Virgil A. Arena stated before his death (and the statement was later corroborated by the adjutant of the station to which he was assigned for duty) that he had applied for such insurance in that amount, no such application and no such insurance policy has been located.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## FRANCES L. MARSHALL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1482) for the relief of Mrs. Frances L. Marshall.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frances L. Marshall, Cambridge, Mass., the sum of \$1,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Frances L. Marshall against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained on August 27, 1943, when the motor vehicle in which she was riding as a passenger was struck in the rear by a United States Army truck of the First Service Command from Boston: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on

account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$1,000" and insert "\$537."

Page 1, line 9, after the word "injuries" insert "medical and hospital expenses."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. A. H. HILL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1626) for the relief of Mrs. A. H. Hill.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. A. H. Hill, of Rome, Ga., the sum of \$920. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Hill against the United States arising out of the seizure of her automobile on October 13, 1947, by Federal investigators on a charge that it was being used in violation of the laws of the United States. Although the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia directed a verdict in favor of the said Mrs. Hill in a condemnation proceeding following such seizure and ordered the release of the automobile to her, it had been destroyed in a fire while stored pending such proceeding: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

C. H. BOLLING

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2264) for the relief of C. H. Bolling.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to C. H. Bolling, Pierce City, Mo., the sum of \$2,500. The payment of such sum represents reimbursement for the payment of an equal amount to the United States by the said C. H. Bolling on account of the forfeiture of a bond given for the appearance of one James Thomas Bolling in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California in connection with the case of United States against James Thomas Bolling. The said James Thomas Bolling was present in court within a short time after such payment was made: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account

of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GIFFORD E. MOAK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3527) for the relief of Gifford E. Moak.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$25,000 to Gifford E. Moak, of Worcester, N. Y., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of his wife and three children sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Army plane while being flown from Istres, France, to Udine, Italy, on January 27, 1948: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 11, after "1948," insert the following: "For the expenses incurred in connection with the burial of such four deceased persons, and for the loss or destruction of personal property belonging to Mrs. Moak and carried in the same plane."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOLLIVER: On page 1, line 5, strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$18,931.09."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, the facts in H. R. 3527 are as follows:

Chief Warrant Officer Gifford E. Moak was stationed in the Free Territory of Trieste, Italy, during January 1948. By order of his superior officers it was arranged that his wife, Roselind E. Moak, and his 3 children, Gifford E. Moak, Jr., Mary J. Moak, and Verna Moak were to join him at his station. They sailed from New York and on January 25, 1948, Mrs. Moak talked with her husband at Frankfurt, Germany and advised him that she and the children would be flown to Udine on January 26. Some time

during the day of January 28, Mr. Moak was informed that his family was lost in flight from Istres, France, and on January 30 was advised the plane had been found, but was demolished and that his wife and 3 children killed.

The report of the Judiciary Committee (1832) states this matter in detail and was reported out of committee by unanimous vote fixing the damages in the amount of \$25,000. This figure was in opposition to the request of the Department of the Army that the amount be fixed at \$18,931.09. The committee felt the full amount should be allowed.

There is not much that one can say in matters of this sort, but it seems to me that the sum of \$25,000 was little enough in the way of compensation to Mr. Moak for the loss of his wife and 3 children. I deeply regret that it was seen fit to agree to the amount as requested by the Army instead of allowing the original amount of \$25,000 as reported out by the Judiciary Committee.

MRS. NELLIE K. MARLOWE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4309) for the relief of Mrs. Nellie K. Marlowe.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Nellie K. Marlowe, Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of \$4,440. The payment of this sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Nellie K. Marlowe against the United States for medical and hospital expenses incurred in the year 1947 for Capt. Helen Marlowe, United States Marine Corps, serial No. O32656, daughter of the said Mrs. Nellie K. Marlowe, due to a lack of Navy Department facilities for providing required medical and hospital treatment and care: *Provided*, That no part of any sum appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim satisfied by the payment of such sum, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH LASAGNA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4410) for the relief of Joseph Lasagna.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,000 to Joseph Lasagna, of Salt Lake City, Utah, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, and all expenses incident thereto, sustained as a result of an accident at the Clearfield Naval Supply Depot, Clearfield, Utah, on July 25, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding.



standing. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### FISHER CONTRACTING CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4959) to reimburse the Fisher Contracting Co. There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona to hear, determine, and render findings of fact as to the amount of loss, if any, sustained by Fisher Contracting Co., of Phoenix, Ariz., under Reclamation Bureau contract numbered I2r-15535 arising out of or attributable to the alleged failure of the Government to supply materials as provided for in said district.

Sec. 2. The court shall cause such findings to be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury, who is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money not otherwise appropriated, the amount set forth in said findings to the Fisher Contracting Co.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, after "contract" insert a colon and the following: "Provided, however, That no allowance shall be made for any loss sustained on account of the pouring of concrete during the period between June 1, 1946, and September 30, 1946, if the court shall find that Fisher Contracting Co. requested and was granted permission to perform such work during said period for the convenience of the company."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MRS. NATHALIE E. COBB

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5126) for the relief of Mrs. Nathalie E. Cobb.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Nathalie E. Cobb, New Orleans, La., (widow of Lt. Comdr. Otto C. Cobb, United States Coast Guard Reserve), a sum equal to the amount of the pay and allowances owed her husband plus the 6 months' death gratuity provided for widows of persons who die while serving on active duty with the armed forces of the United States, both of which claims have been established as a result of the correction of the military records of her husband pursuant to the provisions of section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Nathalie E. Cobb against the United States for such pay and allowances and for such gratuity: *Provided, That* no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### C. R. SPRINGMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5295) for the relief of C. R. Springman.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to C. R. Springman, of Brownsville, Tex., the sum of \$11,038.40. Such sum represents reimbursement for excessive duties paid by the said C. R. Springman as a result of the erroneous appraisal of the value of certain chewing gum imported by him from Mexico: *Provided, That* no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### WILCOX ELECTRIC CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5564) for the relief of Wilcox Electric Co., Inc.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Wilcox Electric Co., Inc., of Kansas City, Mo., the sum of \$104,121.52. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims under War Department Contract No. W-36-039-sc-3765, dated November 13, 1943, as amended, which claims are based upon additional costs incurred as the result of changes in packing requirements for military communication equipment furnished under terms of said contract. No part of the amount appropriated in this act, in excess of 10 percent thereof, shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$25,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LOUISE M. KOCH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6585) for the relief of Louise M. Koch.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Louise M. Koch, of Highland, Ill., the sum of \$25,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States, on account of personal injuries, pain and suffering, and loss of earnings sustained, and medical and hospital expenses incurred by her as a result of an accident, involving an Army vehicle, which occurred on November 23, 1946, in

Frankfurt, Germany: *Provided, That* no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$11,973.67".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### KAREN R. McANDREWS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6994) for the relief of Karen R. McAndrews.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Karen R. McAndrews, of Washington, D. C., the sum of \$10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and loss of earnings sustained and medical and hospital expenses incurred as the result of being severely wounded by the explosion of a hand grenade which was detonated by a soldier of the Army of the United States, in Munich, Germany, on July 25, 1948: *Provided, That* no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$25,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CAROLINE M. NEWMARK AND MELVILLE MORITZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1814) for the relief of Caroline M. Newmark and Melville Moritz.

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

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

There was no objection.

#### LOUIS NADASDI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1855) for the relief of Louis Nadasdi.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not

otherwise appropriated, to Louis Nadasdi, clerk in charge of station E, Cleveland, Ohio, the sum of \$100. Such sum represents refund of payment by said Louis Nadasdi as proceeds of a stolen money order, No. 79912, issued for \$100 at A. P. O. 729 Br., Seattle, Wash., which money order was cashed by said Louis Nadasdi on March 16, 1945. The said Louis Nadasdi has otherwise served, having made no other mistake in 22 years of postal service.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of bill add: "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREDERICK C. COWELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1863) for the relief of Frederick C. Cowell.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frederick C. Cowell, Waipahu, Oahu, T. H., the sum of \$475, in full settlement of his claim against the United States on account of damages to the sea wall on his property at Ewa Beach, Oahu, T. H., as a result of Army activity: *Provided, That* no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any one agent or agency, or by any one attorney or firm of attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GLADYS J. SENYOHL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2234) for the relief of Gladys J. Senyohl.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

EDWIN F. SHOCKLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4141) for the relief of Edwin F. Shockley.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edwin F. Shockley, Hemet, Calif., the sum of \$30,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Edwin F.

Shockley against the United States for personal injuries sustained on November 10, 1943, when a collision occurred between the Army plane in which he and his pilot were flying and a Navy plane, at Ryan School of Aeronautics at Hemet, Calif., while he was acting as flying instructor: *Provided, That* no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment.

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$30,000" and insert "\$5,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LONNIE M. ABERNATHY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4996) for the relief of Lonnie M. Abernathy.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lonnie M. Abernathy, of Oklahoma City, Okla., the sum of \$129.50. Such sum represents the amount which is equitably due the said Lonnie M. Abernathy from the United States for the loss of a well on his farm in Jackson County, Okla., in August 1947, which caved in as a result of seepage from the Altus Canal, W. C. Austin project of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior. The United States was precluded from making administrative settlement of such claim by reason of purchase contract No. 164-298 between the United States and the said Lonnie M. Abernathy, which provided that payment of the purchase price of the land on which such project is situated was to include full payment for damages arising out of the construction, operation, and maintenance of such project: *Provided, That* no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

E. H. CORRIGAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6934) for the relief of E. H. Corrigan.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to E. H. Corrigan, of Laredo, Tex., the sum of \$384.90. Such sum represents reimbursement for over-assessment of duties in connection with the importation of fish roe covered by consumption entry No. 3994, dated January 15, 1944:

*Provided, That* no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

E. G. MORRIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6991) for the relief of E. G. Morris.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to E. G. Morris, of Bryn Adda, Dolgelley, Merioneth, North Wales, Great Britain, the sum of \$11,970 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for service aboard the steamship *Taiyuan* and on account of his subsequent restraint and detention by the Japanese Government during World War II: *Provided, That* no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, or attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BETSY SULLIVAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6329) for the relief of Betsy Sullivan.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Betsy Sullivan shall be considered the natural-born daughter of Captain and Mrs. Clarke Sullivan, Jr., of the United States Army, who is presently stationed in Tokyo, Japan.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, solely for the purpose of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Betsy Sullivan, a minor half-Japanese child, shall be considered the alien natural-born child of Captain and Mrs. Clarke Sullivan, Jr., citizens of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 55) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.



There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),* That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months.

A-6097022, Alexander, Leonora Fajardo.  
A-3059032, Ali, Usman, or Usman John Ali or John Ali or Resman Ali.  
A-6438024, Arce Y Castro, Jose Alfonso Villa, or Jose Villa Arce.  
A-5403438, Arce, Maria Elena Villa (nee Celic).  
A-1847610, Ardito, Maria Rose (nee Maria Rose Ferraris).  
A-6153593, Ancheta, Crescenciana (nee Luna, formerly Cala).  
A-6261665, Apostolopoulos, Virginia, or Virginia Socrates Apostolopoulos or Virginia Leonardidou (maiden name).  
A-6857751, Armendariz, Antonio.  
A-6357750, Armendariz, Samuel.  
A-5730160, Atwood, Amalie Lena (nee Knauer or Amalie Lena Kasper).  
A-5669130, Bertone, Domenico.  
A-7766712, Bethel, Verona Malissa Smith.  
A-1250900, Boksh, Khuda or Kuda, or Khuda Bakesh or Bokah Normahand or Bokar Noor Morawed.  
A-5975651, Bon, Chon, or Chu Bond or Chin Band.  
A-5122763, Bourellos, Peter or Panagiotis.  
A-5673753, Buchreiter, Wilhelm, or Wilhelm Buchveiter.  
A-5242746, Buzan, Roko Josip, or Joseph Buzan.  
A-6001952, Caldeira, Antonio Pedro.  
A-5869650, Caltagirone, Angelo Amente.  
A-9764548, Candiano, Carmelo.  
A-6190180, Cardenas-Valdes, Ernesto.  
A-1513767, Chung, Jackson, or Benedict Chung or Chia-Shan Chung.  
A-5914463, Chung, Su Min Yang.  
A-3803515, Conti, Vincent, or Vincenzo Conti.  
A-5783561, Creque, Renold Valiston.  
A-5664119, Crisalli, Saverio, or Sam Crisalli or Samuel Crisalli.  
A-6881280, De Badilla, Abigail Salazar, or Abigail Salazar-Medina or Abigail Salazar-Valenzuela.  
A-5545483, Debs, Elias Joseph, or Elias Jose Debs.  
A-6242286, De Guevara, Laura Violeta Carrasco (nee Carrasco).  
A-6242287, Guevara, Teodoro Ivan.  
A-3135984, De Perez, Maria Lazara Del Rosario Nares or Rosa Nares De Perez or Rosa N. Perez or Rosa Nares.  
A-5953936, Donovan, Anghela Belin.  
A-3794795, Dukarm, Caspar Michael, or Caspar Dukram or Casper Duckerm.  
A-4286237, Dukarm, Elizabeth Marie, or Elisabeth Dukarm or Elizabeth Duckerm (nee Reisinger or Rlsinger).  
A-7768969, Edbom, Yvonne Marie.  
A-5755170, Fermo, Libero Valerio, or Larry Libero Fermo or Larry L. Fermo.  
A-5334443, Fisher, Janet Stobie (nee Foster, formerly Derane).  
A-6363975, Garbi, Elena, or Helen Garbi.  
A-6325053, Garbi, Florida, or Mary Garbi.  
A-6424158, Garcia, Jose.  
A-6424153, Garcia, Juan Manuel.  
A-6479673, Garcia-Tunon, Maria Lourdes (alias Maria Lourdes Gil-Borges).  
A-6461623, Garcia-Tunon, Diana Maria.  
A-5916590, Georgelis, Pantelis.  
A-4175824, Gerda, Juraj John, or George John Sable.  
A-6919777, Godley, Noel Francis.  
A-6238513, Gomez-Franco, Evangelina Alicia.  
A-3662017, Gonatas, Panagiotis, or Panagis Gonatas or Panagis Gonatos or Pete Gonatas or Pete Gonatos.  
A-1382931, Goureglian, Zakar.  
A-4823242, Grabovszky, Ferinand, or Fred Grabovsky.

A-6608775, Guerrero, Dolores, or Dolores Guerrero-Hughes and Dolores Sanchez.  
A-2586024, Harmon, Beatrice Grace (nee Vatcher formerly Chatterton).  
A-6213708, Hernandez, Josephine.  
A-1418418, Hoogeveen, Henry Peter.  
A-7768282, Horasancian, Hacik (alias Horasan).  
A-5765062, Horlick, David Richard.  
A-6587152, Jackson, Susana, or Susana Bohn.  
A-7556562, Jaquillard, Lilavati, or Lillavati Tankha or Lilavati Dass Verma.  
A-2776290, Kahn, Akram, or Mohamed Akram or John Elk or Chief Running Elk.  
A-8961261, Karistinos, Michael John, or Michael John Karystinos or Mike Karis.  
A-6051253, Kondaks, Della, or Della Epaminondou or Ayton.  
A-2889898, Kouvakas, George.  
A-2632458, Kouvoutsakis, Nicholas Polychronis, or Nick Ponis Kouvoutsakis or Nick Kouvousakis or Kouvousakis.  
A-6151550, Lazaga, Robert David.  
A-6151557, Lazaga, Leon Maria.  
A-6151559, Lazaga, Mario Gregory.  
A-6151543, Lazaga, Leon Keene, Jr.  
A-5249490, Lindemann, Alexander Maria.  
A-5249489, Lindemann, Margit or Grete or Margrete (nee Liebermann).  
A-7731189, Lo, Chien-Pen, or Lo Chien-Pen.  
A-6008939, Lo, Lucy Ju-Yung Chu.  
A-3936200, Marchwinski, Waladslaw, or Roy Benson.  
A-3669827, Mark, Ho, or Charles Mark.  
A-6716138, Martin, Stanley Valentine, or Stanley Valentine Martine.  
A-5263015, McShane, Maria, or Mary Dorothea, formerly Veasin or Visn (nee Schakohl).  
A-6261591, Michalitsis, Stergiana (nee Stamboule).  
A-4179719, Montecalvo, Michele.  
A-6861484, Montoya-Juarez, Gregorio, or Gregorio Martinez-Juarez.  
A-9769751, Le Moulec, Guillaume.  
A-6145873, Murphy, Josefina Balgos.  
A-3076753, Navarrete, Guillermo.  
A-6171193, Nazon, Maurice Louis.  
A-5278106, Neuland, August Peter Walde-mar.  
A-6344097, Nicolaidis, Petros Louissos, or Petros Louissos Brotsis (also known as Peter Louis Brotsis).  
A-6005189, Nielsen, Maria Galindo (nee Maria Galindo-Jimeno).  
A-5449793, Novo, Antonio Felicio.  
A-7054952, Oyama, Diana.  
A-5626245, Oyama, Yaichiro, or Joe Oyama.  
A-3790446, Paananen, Helvi Irja (nee Mustaniemi, alias Aili Anderson).  
A-6261582, Pappadina, Ourania.  
A-5187918, Pattison, Clyde Russell.  
A-4331862, Petersen, Kaj Valdemar.  
A-6261578, Petkanas, Malamati (nee Masura or Massoura).  
A-9670818, Pilostomos, Costas, or Constantinos Pilostomos.  
A-5040625, Pinchot, Alexandra, or Alexandra Penchaszadeh.  
A-6350819, Rahimi, Bahram, or Bahram Rahimi Nassimi, or Henry Moore.  
A-5013124, Reisinger, Elena, or Elene or Ilona or Ellen Reisinger (nee Goldmann).  
A-6460330, Roberts, Joseph Edward.  
A-4746492, Rodriguez, Luz Zamora, or Lucy Zamora Ramirez.  
A-5880782, Rogers, Alphaeus Albear.  
A-3624174, Romanovich, Xenia or Senka or Xenia or Senka Romanowitz (nee Gurgula Sowa).  
A-5707236, Russo, Giovanni Guisepppe, or Giovanni Guisepppe Russi.  
A-5171391, Saglimbene, Catino, or Agitano Seglimbene or Roberto or Robert Sessa.  
A-4435453, Schauer, Solomon, or Sam Schauer.  
A-2686911, Schultz, Anton, or Tony Schmidt.  
A-5123434, Sibillo, Leonardo.  
A-4174214, Singh, Labn.  
A-6329548, Sletner, Doris Lydia.

A-6233014, Spirakis, Angeliki Pantelis (nee Moschouris).  
A-4848232, Staudte, Albert George.  
A-1704725, Steiner, Eugen.  
A-1704797, Steiner, Alzbeta (nee Sedlakova, also known as Alzbeta Stein).  
A-6064606, Suarez, Carlos Jesus, or Carlos Jess Suarez.  
A-3243346, Sun, Yun Pei.  
A-5400331, Tjoitis, Nicolaos A.  
A-5887881, Tortora-Silvi, Vicente, or Vicente Silvi.  
A-6345253, Tsuyas, Lefkothea, or Gargatsuya (nee Alexiou).  
A-6339279, Valdes-Rodriguez, Julian Evelio, or Evelio Valdes Rodriguez.  
A-3492573, Varchola, Jan, or John Varhola.  
A-5155933, Weir, Edward, or Edward Weira or John Wilson or "Scotty."  
A-2260781, Zauner, Frank.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer two amendments and ask unanimous consent that they be considered together.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. WALTER:

Page 4, after line 19, insert "A-5371149, Horngacher, Hedwig Magdalena or Sister Mary Blanka Horngacher."

Page 8, lines 10 and 11, strike out: "A-6339279, Valdes-Rodriguez, Julian Evelio, or Evelio Valdes Rodriguez."

The amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 58) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),* That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months.

A-6492271, Alcantar, Raymundo.  
A-3721543, Almida, Leandro or Leandro Rodriguez Almida or Leandro Armelda.  
A-6495123, Alvarez, Maria Arias or Maria Arias.  
A-6261669, Anastasiadou, Theodora or Theodora Anastasiandes.  
A-5988380, Arias-Preciado, Cipriano.  
A-6846914, Atilano, Juana or Juana Atilano de la Rosa.  
A-5839718, Bacica, Sime Fran or Sam Frank Bacica.  
A-5109817, Barreira, Joao Domingues.  
A-6546518, Bartley, Anthony Charles.  
A-5333848, Beinmer, Leah or Leah or Lillian Stein or Lele Staigrud.  
A-1650494, Bouza y Franco, Luciano or Luciano Bouza Franco or Luciano Boyza Franco or Luciano Bouza or Bonza.  
A-4739891, Cackowski, Joseph John.  
A-6200602, Callaghan, June (nee Tipping).  
A-5587493, Carlson, Charles Eglert or Charles Carlson.  
A-6852439, Cervantes, Feliciano Zavala or Antonio Zavala Cervantes or Feliciano Cervantes-Zavala or Antonio Cervantes.  
A-6767387, Chaghlassian, Hagop.  
A-6339958, Chesimard, Faule Bertrand (nee Saffache).

A-9530561, Choi, Juam or Choi Jum or Chan Choy or Chui Cham.  
 A-3536893, Chu, Philip Mei.  
 A-3536891, Chu, Esther Li Tang.  
 A-5549658, Cloch, John or Jan.  
 A-6008860, Clarke, Alton Hiott Alva.  
 A-6261654, Coukos, Maria (nee Varberidou).  
 A-2907854, Cox, Thomas or Tom Cox.  
 A-5796775, Critikos, Anthony Alexander.  
 A-6038532, Czaplicki, Dominika (nee Lojewska).  
 A-5207949, Dagnino, Giuseppe.  
 A-3296513, DaSilva, Manuel Henriques.  
 A-5340066, Davidian, Azneve or Azneve Yeghazarian or Egazarian or Azneve Kuderian.  
 A-5570904, De Gonzalez, Rafaela Lozoya.  
 A-6852437, De La Rosa, Eleno or Eleno De La Rosa-Cervantes or Elano De La Rosa.  
 A-4359977, De Meo, Raffaele Joseph or Ralph (or Joe) de Meo.  
 A-7759673, Donohue, Alicia Margarita (nee Barrales).  
 A-6212825, Dornhelm, Kurt or Kenneth Dorn.  
 A-9559586, Emcken, Carl Christian.  
 A-5280548, Evanoff, George Demo.  
 A-6160996, Evans, Leslie Anthony or Leslie Anthony Legg.  
 A-6712268, Fagundes, Helio Avelar or Helio Da Silva.  
 A-3878487, Falkner, Mabel (nee Cowan).  
 A-6445935, Firth-Hand, John Frederick.  
 A-5627404, Floris, Theodore (alias Gust Panos).  
 A-6719403, Freeman, Terence (alias Terence Maduro).  
 A-6261624, Georgiades, Kalliroe George (nee Kalliroe Kakoutis).  
 A-5341034, Goes, Jacinto or Jacinto De Goes or Jesse Goes.  
 A-5244395, Halkias, Michael Thomas.  
 A-6706836, Hanson, James Alfred or James A. Hanson or James Hanson.  
 A-9671376, Heckman, Anders August.  
 A-7538664, Hernandez, Jr., Alfred William or Alfredo Guillermo Del Corazon De Jesus or Hernandez Y Sariol or Alfred Hernandez, Jr.  
 A-6572460, Hernandez-Navarro, Jose.  
 A-6808590, Janczewski, Marian or Marian Jackowski, or Jancio Grom.  
 A-5452645, Jenkins, Edward or Isidore Dubrofsky.  
 A-6142586, Jensen, Pascuala Aguinaldo.  
 A-7595300, Junghans, Carl Friedrich Walter.  
 A-6207397, Kaufman, Ray nee Radowitz or Ray Radowitz Kaufman.  
 A-3184268, Konstantinos, Constantinos Psarelles or Gust Psarelis.  
 A-6261607, Koukoltis, Constantine.  
 A-5587049, Lahm, Ludwig or Ludvig Lahm or Louis Lahm.  
 A-6834450, Lapadat, Julian.  
 A-9686520, Lau, Chik or Chick or Lau Kan.  
 A-6091756, Lau, Chok, also known as Harry Chok or Harry Chok Lau.  
 A-6301469, Lau, Lai Yung Wong also known as Lau Wong Yung Lai or Lai Yung (Yung) Wong or Wong Lae Yung or Daisy Wong.  
 A-4693214, Lau, Wai Chuen Lillian.  
 A-6262000, Lind, Egil Frode or Frode Lind or E. Frode Lind.  
 A-6727225, Lind, Signe Marie or Signe Marie Soerle or Sorle.  
 A-5722312, Lopez, Alejo or Alejo Lopez Lopez or Jose Guvarra.  
 A-5100890, Lorenz, Agnes (nee De Freitas).  
 A-1443403, Luciano, Carlo.  
 A-6844307, Magallanes-Perez, Julio.  
 A-5247053, Mancuso, Francesco.  
 A-5688547, Manning, Raymond Fred or Raymond Frederick Leaford Manning or Raymond or Ray Frederick Manning.  
 A-5128723, Marrale, Antonino or Antonio Marrale.  
 A-6208487, Masongsong, Buenaventura Garcia.

A-6208562, Masongsong, Luisa Lopez or Maria Luisa Lopez Masongsong, or Maris Luisa Moreno.  
 A-9695404, Mercier, Louis Lucien.  
 A-5156871, Mielke, Willy Paul or William Paul Mielke.  
 A-6783385, Mitchell, Pamela Lillian.  
 A-6783386, Mitchell, Peter John.  
 A-4335098, Molaro, Luigi.  
 A-5069586, Moldenhauer, Christian Henry (alias Christ Moldenhauer).  
 A-4341326, Monarez-Granados, Alfredo or Alfred Monje.  
 A-6701884, McCornack, Vera Noelle.  
 A-5678670, Nicholoff, Petra (nee Stoyanoff).  
 A-9695884, Olsen, Erling Stoltzenberg.  
 A-6171443, Palmer, Chrysanthos or Chrysanthos Coulouvari (nee Menti).  
 A-6827646, Papamanolakis, Aristides or Aristides Demitrios Papamanolakis.  
 A-6245751, Paul, Evdokia or Evdokia Sitapoulos, Evdokia Sotopoulou.  
 A-5294675, Prado-Ruiz, Ramon or Ramon Prado or Raymond Prado.  
 A-5656013, Racanelli, Michelangelo (Michael Angelo) or Michael Angelo Ragnelle.  
 A-6844310, Rivera-Marquez, Andres or Andres Marquez-Rivera.  
 A-7735232, Rivera-Ortiz, Jose Jesus Pedro or Pedro Rivera-Ortiz.  
 A-6752701, Robiolle, Jean (John) Georges.  
 A-5149179, Rosellini, Guido (alias James Roll).  
 A-6245749, Saragiotis, Despina (nee Despina Ioannis Demarellis).  
 A-6248901, Savrides, Sophia (nee Sophia Kritharides).  
 A-1802003, Schrap, Paul Kurt.  
 A-6432281, Shang, Ting Lin.  
 A-3652526, Shang, Lily Wen Shun Tang (nee Wen Shun Tang or T'ang or Talitha).  
 A-5226632, Shee, Tom or Tom Tiu Gook.  
 A-5974147, Shimizu, Tetsuki Taro or Taro Smeesu or Frank Shimizer or William Smeesu or William Sato or William T. Smeesu.  
 A-6227437, Slater, Gerald Frederick.  
 A-6138457, Snook, Eugene Mayton.  
 A-5728144, Sobek, Tomas Juraj or Thomas George Sobek.  
 A-4687618, Soong, Ts An or Tsau A. Soong.  
 A-7580708, Soong, Ji Ing or Ji Ing Woo Soong (nee Woolh Jung).  
 A-6393393, Soto, Apolonio.  
 A-3316850, Soto, Dolores.  
 A-6295806, Soto-Arvizu, Jorge or Juan Carlon-Gonzalez.  
 A-6861483, Soto-Patino, Felisiano or Feliciano Patino-Soto.  
 A-5897131, Sucic, Ferdinand.  
 A-3309754, Sutcliffe, Daisy Elizabeth (nee Sewell).  
 A-4860775, Ting, Johannes, or John Ting.  
 A-3659501, Torrisi, Pietra Giovanna.  
 A-3356915, Tsao, Makepeace Uho.  
 A-6887120, Teambell, Nicholas John.  
 A-6605104, Ungar, Theodore.  
 A-6103963, Urrutia, Elmer, or Elmer Urrutia Y Herrera or Elmer Urrutia Herrera.  
 A-5279822, Valdes, Maria Luisa (nee Gutierrez or Luisa M. Valdes or Valdis nee Maria Luisa Gutierrez or Maria Luisa Valdes or Gutierrez or Gutierrez or Luisa Maria Valdes or Maria L. Valdes or Maria L. Vda De Valdes or Maria Luisa Gutierrez Vda De Valdes or Ma Luisa Gutierrez Valdis, and others).  
 A-6595198, Valladaves, Roberto Ignacio.  
 A-9042913, Vallanos, Georgios or George Vallanos.  
 A-5194404, Vasquez, Adolfo Duarte or Adolfo Vasquez.  
 A-3101806, Vasu, George Elay.  
 A-6844271, Vega, Eusebio.  
 A-6844272, Vega, Ramon.  
 A-6403040, Velasquez-Rapia, Jesus.  
 A-3868924, Vrahnas, George Andrew (alias Harry Panos).  
 A-6357987, Vrakas, Galliroe Constantine or Kalliroy Vrakas or Mangas (nee Zahariadou).

A-6064645, Watters, Luz Costales or Luz Abraham or Luz Costales.  
 A-6068022, Weidmann, Emilia Santos or Emilia Santos.  
 A-5554370, Yager, Henry or Hyman Yager and Henry William Yager.  
 A-6274068, Yang, Ju Chin.  
 A-5202493, Young, Kenneth Chung Kuen or Yeung Pak Chi or Kai Chong Yeung.  
 A-6677869, Ziebell, Detlev Guenter.  
 A-6453741, Ziemak, Marian Cybulski.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 5, strike out the registration number and the name "A-6546518, Bartley, Anthony Charles."

On page 5, lines 17, 18, and 19, strike out the registration number and the name "A-5688547, Manning, Raymond Fred or Raymond Frederick Leaford Manning, or Raymond or Ray Frederick Manning."

On page 5, after line 23, insert the registration number and name "A-1364379, McLaughlin, Bridget."

On page 7, after line 20, insert the registration number and name "A-6810463, Solan, Julius or Julius Seidner."

On page 8, after line 6, insert the registration number and name "A-6396120, Stefanini, Mario."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 62) that the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months.*

A-6201169, Abadi, Simon Ezra.  
 A-1029369, Abdullah, Abdi or Akbar Mohamed or Abdi Mohamed.

A-6245562, Agarwal, Friederecka or Friederecka Beatrice Maria nee Sacla or Freda Moyea.

A-2329081, Aleci, Giuseppe.  
 A-3007951, Ali, Tahir or Tahir Ullah or Tiah Ali or Tiah Ullah.

A-5356203, Andreadis, Stamatios or Stamatios John Andreadis or Steve Andrews.  
 A-5479649, Arkell, Marjorie Elaine.

A-3260444, Avgoustis, Nicholas Stellanos or Nicholas Stellanou Avgoustis.  
 A-5421256, Baer, Hans.

A-3722049, Baros, Nicholas or Nicholas Barus.

A-5262324, Bavas, Athanasios (alias Thomas Bavas).

A-5214140, Belli, Otello Manlio or Mario Belli.

A-3083903, Benavides, Alfonso.  
 A-5856332, Bevilacqua, Theresa Mary (nee Falzone or Falzono, nickname Tessie).

A-6791526, Birescu, Alexander Stefan.  
 A-6264002, Bizimis, Angelina.

A-6303931, Blythe, David Wardhough.  
 A-3747440, Bonventre, Francesco or Frank.

A-6246094, Bopipas, Dimitroula.



- A-5630271, Borges, Antonio Augusto Da Silva or Antonio Borges.  
 A-9799665, Boutacoff, Alexis Alexander.  
 A-5949003, Bye, Rolf Ole.  
 A-1830412, Calvo, Francesco.  
 A-3998388, Cardenas, Arcadio or Alcadio Cardenas.  
 A-7026401, Carner, Ariel.  
 A-6857770, Castellanos-Ybarra, Joaquin or Jesus Reyes-Mendoza.  
 A-6032675, Castellanos, Maria Trinidad Reyes de or Trinidad Reyes de Castellanos.  
 A-4137847, Chang, Young Chi Sin Yueng or Chi Sin Yueng Chang.  
 A-2587813, Chen, Chia-You.  
 A-5768484, Chuan-Te Liu, Barry.  
 A-6626018, Cobos, Ruben or Ruben Cebos or Ruben Cobos Astorga.  
 A-3686305, Cordaro, Calogero or Charles Cordaro.  
 A-7563142, Crocker, Julie or Juliette.  
 A-4197279, Da Cunha, Constantino.  
 A-9703142, Daley, Roy Augustus.  
 A-5884972, Deinum, Henry Jacob or Hank J. Deinum.  
 A-6303162, De Leon-Garza, Feliciano.  
 A-3559094, De Morales, Gregoria Salazar or Gregoria Salazar.  
 A-5389310, Doesseckle, Thomas Francis or Frank Doesseckle.  
 A-5444981, Doherty, Rose Frances formerly Anslow (nee Firminger).  
 A-5079142, Dryer, Ben.  
 A-7515284, Fang, Sheng Chung.  
 A-5335908, Fennell, Betty Elizabeth (nee Levy or Levee or Bety Marks).  
 A-5825680, Flessas, George Anastasiou.  
 A-6209443, Flores-Palacios, Raimundo.  
 A-6204212, De Flores, Maria Lopez.  
 A-6281370, Franco, Samuel.  
 A-4812082, Frangiskatos, Speros or Spiridon.  
 A-6141195, Franquelli, Leandro Antonio Basilio or Leandro Franquelli.  
 A-5390484, Gallardo, John Ernest.  
 A-6125122, Garcia-Ledesma, Isaias.  
 A-6774172, Giles, Stephen Duffy.  
 A-6870309, Godley, Eric Clive.  
 A-1620146, Gomez, Josefa or Josephine Gomez or Josefa Abascal de Gomez.  
 A-3466704, Gonzalez, Roberto Lorenzo or Robert Lawrence Gonzalez.  
 A-2260872, Gowzeles, Constantinos or Gusor Gust.  
 A-5820732, Green, David.  
 A-3507405, Gruszka, Herman or Raymond Grand (alias Harry Grand).  
 A-1653505, Gulkis, Pauline (nee Pessie Shergick or Pessie Shaw).  
 A-2965670, Gustavson, Helge Waldemar or Helge Gustafsson.  
 A-6248289, Gutlohn, Victoria Veronica Susanna.  
 A-6180925, Hesse, William or Willem Hesse.  
 A-6018694, Heyligers, Louis Aron.  
 A-6140385, Hinds, Humphrey John.  
 A-3657461, Hochberg, Betty or Beila or Betty Smoke or Betty Lahnes or Esther Robert.  
 A-5807798, Hofmo, Emil Lie or Lee E. Hofmo.  
 A-2631184, Hoque, Shamsul or Abdul Kholek.  
 A-5685262, Jacinto, Jose Pereira or Joe Pereira or Joseph Perera.  
 A-3262256, Joest, Otto or William Graak.  
 A-5702119, Karol, Charles Walter Barton or Charles Walter Bartoszewski or Charles W. Bartoszewski or Charles Walter Bradley or Bailey.  
 A-6261611, Kavathas, Evanthia (nee Evanthia Thomaidou).  
 A-6049268, Kehrhaun, Alicia Antonietta or Alicia de Asplazu (nee Alicia Antonietta Aguilera Murillo).  
 A-5662102, Keller, Hermann Friedrich or Herman Frederick Keller.  
 A-3295447, Kipper, Aleksander.  
 A-3891155, Korkos, Lambros Spiros or James Korkos.  
 A-6232433, Kozlowski, Peregrina Rodriguez de or Peggy Rodriguez or Peggy Valadez.  
 A-3850163, Krasnopolsky, Jacob or Jack Krasner or Jack Krasnoff.  
 A-3319669, Krohn, Erwin Gustav.  
 A-6142511, Kuebitz, Hermann Wilhelm.  
 A-5792616, Lacobazzi, Vitonicola (alias Vito Nicola Jacobazzi).  
 A-1051733, Lambie, Thomas Bentley.  
 A-5074647, Laskody, John or Laskodi or Joan Laskodi.  
 A-5380491, Latousakis, Michael or Massis Lasis.  
 A-3738980, Lau, Chong Sul or Sul Lau Chong or Cheung Gim Fay or Chong Kim Fei or Cheung Jung Ming or Cheung Shim Lau.  
 A-7618223, Leung, Paul Yung Tung or Yung Tung Leung.  
 A-7618224, Leung, Peter Fung Tung or Woon Tung Leung.  
 A-2955578, Licata, Salvatore.  
 A-5500662, Lira-Barcenas, Alberto.  
 A-5500663, De Lira, Paula Jimenez.  
 A-6961069, Lira-Jimenez, Victor.  
 A-9179138, Ludvik, Josef.  
 A-5365957, Lykiardopoulos, Gerasimos or Jerry Poulos.  
 A-6378855, Magnani, Margherita (nee Giovannella).  
 A-6404238, Manobbio, Aura (nee Aura Peraza).  
 A-5074629, Martinez y Rodriguez, Gervasio or Gervasio Martinez.  
 A-6264869, Martinez-Torres, Francisco or Enrique Martinez.  
 A-2291044, Mavris, Isidoros Markos or Isidor Marko Mavris.  
 A-3571216, Mazzei, Charles or Carmine.  
 A-6249255, Mellisakis, Maria N.  
 A-3529277, Mesaros, Stefan or John Gabor or Steve Demko.  
 A-5259895, Meza, Agnes (nee Agnes Naomi Lightbourne).  
 A-1785711, Mielke, Wolfdietrich Reinhard Julius Fritz or Wolfdietrich Mielke or George Wolf or Wolfdietrich Mielke or George Wolf.  
 A-5693852, Mihalos, Nicolas or Nick M. Mike or Nicholas M. Mick.  
 A-9730962, Mikalsen, Einar Edvin Hendry or Einar E. H. Mikalsen.  
 A-6772023, Molina, Augustine, Jr., or Augustin Molina.  
 A-5166673, Monache, Eugenio Delle (alias Raffaello Orcini or Ralph Orsini).  
 A-5728143, Monok, Janos or John Monok.  
 A-3759224, Morin, Giuseppe.  
 A-5265514, Mourao, Manuel Vaz.  
 A-6359966, Neumann, Joan (formerly Joan Weller Greer Chaphard or Joan Weller Greer Hope-Johnson).  
 A-5774953, Nevarez-Alarcon, Nolberta or Norberta Nevarez-Alarcon.  
 A-1115513, Orav, Paul.  
 A-6301813, Ortega-Duarte, Jorge or George Ortega-Duarte or George D. Ortega.  
 A-6330435, Owens, Francis Henry or Frank Owens.  
 A-5635369, Paradosso, Eugenio or Jimmie Paradosso Penna or Jimmie Paradosso.  
 A-2889365, Pereira, Antonio Jose.  
 A-5821654, Perez, Ivy Gomez or Rose Perez or Ivy Duchesne Gomez or Ivy Gaston.  
 A-1879601, Perl, Eugene Jacob or Jacob Perl.  
 A-5064255, Perugino, Giuseppe.  
 A-6423807, Pirzio-Biroli, Giacomo.  
 A-4957358, Racey, Lawrence William or Lawrence William Rase.  
 A-5407879, Ramirez, Jose Luis or Jose Ramirez or Luis Ramirez.  
 A-7044230, Rey, Joaquin Israel Trujillo.  
 A-7050671, Rey, Daisi Trujillo or Daisy.  
 A-6366413, Ribes, Elise (nee Fontenelle).  
 A-6459421, Ridgway, Jacqueline Marie Householder or Jacqueline Marie Householder (maiden name).  
 A-6372752, Ripley, Ronald Edward or Ronald Edward Page.  
 A-6372754, Ripley, Mervyn Keith or Mervyn Keith Page Ripley or Mervyn Keith Page.  
 A-6279244, Risteigen, Inga.  
 A-6279243, Risteigen, Gunhild.  
 A-6088873, Rodriguez-Esquivel, Juan or Ernest Gutierrez or Ernest Castro Gutierrez or Ernesto Gutierrez, or Ernesto Castro Gutierrez.  
 A-5129758, Salvemini, Giacomo or Jack Salvemini or Domenico Americo Sforza.  
 A-5796096, Santoya, Francisca Cruz or Francisca Cruz or Francisca Mata.  
 A-4209125, Sarafis, Christos Alexander.  
 A-3851318, Schiavi, Angelo.  
 A-5688544, Schmidt, Hilda Rose or Hilda Rose Manning or Hilda Rose Jackson.  
 A-5601137, Schmitt, Vilma (nee Zold).  
 A-4809719, Schnee, Rose or Rose Shapiro or Rose Meyer.  
 A-5257484, Serra, Juan Mari or Juan Mari.  
 A-4242776, Siebert, Walter Heinrich August or Walter Henry Siebert.  
 A-5377193, Siegel, Freida Rosalie (nee Rascha Fradel Siegel).  
 A-5610957, Silberman, Frank or Traian Lazar Zoladz or Frank Caberman.  
 A-5056181, Simoncic, Martin or John Weber.  
 A-2741589, Sofkitis, George Michael or Mike Sofkitis.  
 A-2518842, Sague, Abdul.  
 A-5886907, Simkunas, Antanas.  
 A-4541327, Solis-Ayerdi de Sanchez, Dolores or Dolores Solis de Sanchez or Dolores Solis de Vara.  
 A-6390856, Sourcin, Alice Paquerette.  
 A-2856317, Spanos, Petros.  
 A-6929710, Sparrow, Florence Blanche (nee Cann).  
 A-6018628, Starosciak, Sophia Jadwiga (alias Zofia Starosciak, alias Zofja Starosciak).  
 A-1868401, Susan, Ferencz or Frank Susan.  
 A-5059057, Sutlovich, Frank Rudolph.  
 A-5374797, Szasz, Gustav.  
 A-3685757, Tamberg, Harry John (alias Harry J. Tamberg, alias John Tamawots, alias John or Johannes Tanawots or Tamawots).  
 A-6805580, Tauber, Laszlo Nandor or Leslie Ferdinand Tauber.  
 A-9705985, Theocharides, Theocharis.  
 A-5427501, Thorne, Sidney Alphonso, or Sidney Durant.  
 A-3889128, Tieger, Mary (nee Weinstein or Glassman, nee Borochovitz or Berkowitz).  
 A-7759520, Tokcaer, Mursit Muraduresit.  
 A-3362361, Tom, Kim Fong or Tom Kim Fong.  
 A-5948146, Trpchevich, Traiche George (alias Nick George alias Mike George Trpchevich).  
 A-5908905, Vasquez, Santos.  
 A-1165476, Vassallo, Damiano.  
 A-9741750, Vatoulos, Theochares Stamatios or Theocharis S. Vatoulos or Harry Vatoulos.  
 A-6136671, Vega-Munoz, Luis.  
 A-5817962, Verhelst, Alfons or Alfons August Verhelst or Alphonse Verelst.  
 A-6402296, Vidal, Jose or Llecha.  
 A-5949830, Wright, Thomas William.  
 A-5569145, Ybarra, Jose Martin.  
 A-5227047, Yuhas, Jan or John Yuhas.  
 A-2156893, Zech, Ludwig.  
 A-3460791, Zizzo, Antonino or Antonio Rizzo.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 9, strike out lines 5 and 6.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THEODORE CONSTANTIN TRANCU AND HIS WIFE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1305) for the relief of Theodore Constantin Trancu and his wife.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Theodore Constantin Trancu and

his wife, Anne Denise, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of the date of their last entry into the United States upon payment of the required head taxes and visa fees.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct appropriate numbers from the nonpreference category of the proper immigration quota or quotas.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MIYOKO OISHI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7778) for the relief of Miyoko Oishi.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, notwithstanding any provision of law excluding from the United States persons or races ineligible to citizenship, Miyoko Oishi shall be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, upon application hereafter filed, if she is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert "That the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Miyoko Oishi, the Japanese fiancée of Sergeant Eugene D. Walls, a citizen of the United States, and that the said Miyoko Oishi may be eligible for a non-quota immigration visa if she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that marriage between the above-named parties occurred within 3 months immediately succeeding the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MARY FRANCES YOSHINAGA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7560) for the relief of Mary Frances Yoshinaga.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mary Frances Yoshinaga, the foster daughter of Mr. and Mrs. James F. Austen, Jr., shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. James F. Austen, Jr., who are citizens of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, solely for the purpose of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Mary Frances Yoshinaga, a minor half-Japanese child, shall be considered the alien natural-born child of Sergeant and Mrs. James F. Austen, citizens of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

#### [Roll No. 131]

Barrett, Pa.	Heffernan	Patman
Bennett, Fla.	Heller	Pfeifer,
Bentsen	Herlong	Joseph L.
Biemiller	Hoffman, Ill.	Pfeiffer,
Blackney	Hull	William L.
Boykin	Jackson, Calif.	Philbin
Buchanan	Jennings	Powell
Buckley, Ill.	Johnson	Redden
Buckley, N. Y.	Kee	Reed, Ill.
Bulwinkle	Kelly, N. Y.	Reed, N. Y.
Byrne, N. Y.	Kennedy	Ribicoff
Carlyle	Kunkel	Rivers
Carroll	Lanham	Seabath
Case, S. Dak.	Larcade	Scott, Hardie
Chatham	Lesinski	Short
Chesney	Linehan	Smathers
Chudoff	Lyle	Smith, Ohio
Clemente	Lynch	Sutton
Combs	McCarthy	Taylor
Cooley	McDonough	Towe
Coudert	Mason	Wadsworth
Dawson	Miles	Walsh
Dingell	Monroney	Welch
Donohue	Morgan	Wheeler
Douglas	Murphy	Whitaker
Doyle	Nixon	White, Idaho
Gavin	Norton	Withrow
Gilmer	O'Brien, Ill.	Wood
Gordon	O'Brien, Mich.	Woodhouse
Hall,	O'Hara, Ill.	
Leonard W. Hand	O'Konski	
	Pace	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 340 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

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 further consideration of the bill H. R. 7786, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] had consumed 1 hour and 17 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] had consumed 1 hour and 15 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 hour to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I have a few comments, mainly of a general nature, to offer on this 1951 military budget.

The first is to pay tribute, sincerely, to this able Subcommittee on the Defense Establishment.

As usual, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], and the

gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] have done a magnificent job on the most complicated and most important budget program of our Government.

Each of them has again earned, as they have each year, the praise and the deep appreciation of the House of Representatives and of all Americans for their splendid national defense work.

I congratulate the distinguished subcommittee chairman from Texas, and I congratulate the patriotic, hard-working Members on his subcommittee. All of us are greatly indebted to you gentlemen.

Now, members of the committee, let us get to some of the bedrock defense questions that influence this budget.

Let us take a moment on this highly publicized economy in national defense.

Now, I have not been one who blindly praises the Secretary of Defense. The fact is, I have voiced criticism of the Secretary now and then for various things he has or has not done. I will continue to do so in the future when it appears that the Department can benefit from counsel or guidance from the Congress in reaching policy decisions on national defense matters.

But the Secretary has fully earned credit in a specific area pertinent to this debate, and I believe in giving credit where credit is due.

There can be no doubt that Secretary Johnson, his comptroller, his management committee, and the three military Departments deserve the commendation of the entire Nation for having carried out so successfully the drive in the Department of Defense, as contrasted, I may say, to other branches of the Government, to squeeze the fat out of public expenditures.

Secretary Johnson's report of March 2 makes it evident that he is producing savings—very substantial savings—in the administration of the defense program. This is a great public service, especially in view of the general condition of the Federal budget. And it conforms fully to one of the objectives of the Congress as reflected in the amendments of last August to the Unification Act.

Mr. Johnson's report shows that about one and one-half billion dollars less were spent for national defense than were requested in 1950 by the President and would have normally been provided in supplemental requests. A little over \$2,000,000,000 less were spent than the Congress authorized. In quick summary the picture looks about like this:

Requested in the President's	
1950 budget.....	\$14,218,000,000
Supplemental items (civilian pay increase, higher freight and passenger rates, Berlin airlift costs, etc.) absorbed by the Department of Defense.....	257,000,000
Theoretical budget total, 1950.....	14,475,000,000
Direct savings in appropriated funds.....	207,063,000
Reductions in armed forces (mainly in items of procurement).....	434,494,000
Cost decreases.....	134,917,000
Savings and reductions (mixed).....	815,619,000
Air Force funds placed in reserve by the President..	735,754,000



Now, it appears to me that of the over \$2,000,000,000 of unexpended funds provided for national defense by the Congress, about a third, or in the vicinity of \$600,000,000, can properly be claimed as direct savings to the taxpayer without injury to the national defense. This is saving at a rate considerably higher than Secretary Johnson promised the Armed Services Committee a year ago when he asked for "authority, direction, and control" over the armed services, and he is, in my opinion, entitled to full credit and the compliments of the Nation for it. In the accomplishment of this fine piece of work, some 163,000 civilian employees have been released from the employ of the Department, and a large number of Service installations has been closed or put in an inactive status.

Here in Washington and vicinity, the number of civilian employees has declined from 29,758 to 28,421, a reduction of 1,337. This means that while there was an over-all reduction of 17.4 percent in civilian personnel—from 905,000 to 748,000 as of January 31—the Washington reduction was only 4.5 percent.

This over-all civilian personnel reduction is a great achievement. I fail to understand why the field employees can be reduced by four times the ratio of reduction in Washington. If it can be done in the field, surely it can be done here. I am utterly convinced that this phase of the economy drive has not received the attention it is due. As usual, we are reducing Federal employment in outlying areas but have shied away from applying the pressure to the Nation's Capital where, in my opinion, it should be first applied.

Now, let us give attention to some other points in this economy program.

I want to mention the recent reductions in the effectiveness of the armed forces, especially since these reductions have been widely confused with economies under unification.

A close examination of Mr. Johnson's report shows clearly evident reductions in the armed forces in an amount of about \$435,000,000. Added to that is the \$736,000,000 in funds appropriated last year to raise the Air Force from 48 to 58 groups which funds were placed in reserve by the President. This makes reductions in the amount of over \$1,100,000,000 in the present or potential fighting effectiveness of the armed forces.

So what does it add up to?

It adds up to reductions in an amount of about \$1,500,000,000 in the fighting capabilities of the armed forces—reductions, administrative cut-backs, not economies under unification.

I want to state emphatically that, in my judgment, Mr. Johnson's economy scalpel has not only carved away some service fat but has cut—deeply in some areas—into sinew and muscle of the armed services.

The Secretary is to be commended in glowing terms for cutting off the fat. But his economy program has also impaired the fighting effectiveness of the armed forces, and for this the Secretary is not, in my opinion, to be commended.

I regret deeply that in his zeal for economy, Secretary Johnson has weak-

ened the national security in very important respects. And what has been his answer to that charge?

He answered only a few weeks ago in a speech delivered in the city of Washington that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have approved the existing budget—and, therefore, the inference was drawn that the Nation's military leaders are content with the funds requested of the Congress.

But, members of the Committee, in that very address the Secretary contradicted himself. He went on to say that the Joint Chiefs of Staff had requested \$20,000,000,000 for national defense. This, in itself, answers the assertion that the Joint Chiefs of Staff are content with the existing national defense budget.

And let me say one thing more about this.

It is an open secret in Washington that the Secretary actually requested a considerably smaller budget for 1951 than was decided upon by the President. It follows, then, that the Secretary, if he had his way, would provide many billions less than the Joint Chiefs of Staff deem to be the minimum required for national security, and considerably less than the President himself considers necessary.

There are issues in this matter of reductions in the armed forces that go to the core of our system of government. They touch the very heart of our representative processes.

I say that until and unless the Constitution of the United States is amended to relieve the Congress of the United States of its responsibilities to provide for the common defense, to raise and support a navy, to provide and maintain an army, the Congress cannot—and, so far as I am concerned, must not—sit idly by and leave to administrative whimsy how small a national defense this Nation will have.

There are some who conceive that the role of the Congress is limited to imposing monetary ceilings on the armed forces—that the Congress has no control, and should have none, over how small the armed forces become.

I deny that categorically.

I say that to the extent that the Congress accedes to that concept, to that extent the Congress unconstitutionally delegates its responsibilities to the executive branch of the Government.

I say that when the armed forces are reduced by others than the Congress, and without prior consultation with the appropriate agencies of the Congress, the American people are thereby deprived of their Constitution-derived control, through their Congress, over the size and type of national defense they want their Government to maintain.

In our scheme of government the Commander in Chief commands the forces placed at his disposal by the Congress; it is not his prerogative under the Constitution to determine the size of those forces. It is the duty of the Department of Defense—which is a creature of the Congress—to request the Congress to provide the armed might that it believes the security of the Nation requires. It is the responsibility of the Congress to decide whether the forces shall be larger or smaller than requested.

Let us get this clear.

The President does not provide the armed forces. That is the function of the Congress. The Congress provides the forces; the President commands them, as Commander in Chief. If we ever get this principle of our Government distorted, our whole fabric of government will be in jeopardy.

But here we have a new concept. It holds that the executive department shall decide how small the armed forces shall be—not the Congress.

It concedes that the Congress can impose ceilings on military strength. But, the idea goes, the Congress cannot establish a floor.

The Appropriations Committee is to be complimented for its searching inquiries of the Secretary of Defense on this point in the hearings of last January.

However, it is not enough merely to point to the problem, important as the problem is a principle of government.

The more important thing is to prevent such unilateral action in the future. For this purpose I introduced a bill on March 6 which would limit the authority of the Secretary of Defense to withhold funds appropriated by the Congress to 5 percent of any particular item. If it is desirable or necessary to withhold more than that, the bill would require consultation with the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives prior to the taking of such action.

The Armed Services Committee will act on that bill at an early date. When it reports the bill, I am hopeful that the House will support it without a dissenting vote and thereby nail down the important principle that the Congress and not the Executive will determine the size of the national defense program to be supported and maintained by this Nation.

Let me call to your attention another point on these reductions.

A new thought is being germinated in Washington these days. It is that by reducing the armed forces we are, by some magical process, growing in strength and becoming militarily more effective.

This is one of the most remarkable ideas I have ever encountered.

It is plausible, of course, that the Army is more efficient today, for immediate combat purposes, than it was a year ago, and despite personnel reductions.

But the Army is much less effective—its fighting potential is lower—today than it was supposed to be on this date under congressional plans of a year ago. Its potential is weaker now, and this is the result of administrative cuts into the muscle of the armed forces.

The same is true of the Air Force. It is far less effective today than the Congress intended it to be today through the appropriation last year for 58 groups; and this is the result of the President refusing to spend \$735,750,000 appropriated by the Congress and by Mr. Johnson refusing to allow the expenditure of \$243,000,000 which the Congress had said should be spent.

And the Navy?

It has been reduced by 79 active ships. Does that make the Navy stronger? Of course not.

It has been reduced by five attack carrier air groups. Does that make the Navy stronger? Of course not.

The Marine Corps air arm has been reduced by seven fighter squadrons. I rather doubt that the marines have greatly improved in fighting ability from that.

The Navy and marines have been cut down by some 2,000 active airplanes, by almost 70,000 men. I suspect that the increased efficiency and greater fighting strength thus created has not thrown great fear in the hearts of our potential enemies or stiffened the will to resist of our friends abroad. These cuts reduce the fighting potential of the Navy and Marine Corps.

There can be no doubt that these reductions have scaled down the fighting potential of the armed services.

It is absurd to contend that the more you reduce the stronger you get.

I will have to leave it to others to sell this idea that we can rise by falling, that we can advance by retreating, that we can achieve strength through weakness.

Of course we must have economy in national defense.

But let us keep our eyes on our main goal—national security.

The purpose of unification is a sound national defense. Economy is a by-product.

Now, I want to turn to matters more directly involved in the appropriation now before the Committee. Let us talk first about procurement of aircraft.

Now, what does the Subcommittee on Appropriations themselves say about this as regards the Air Force?

On page 312 of the subcommittee's report they say that—

At the rate of aircraft procurement in the present bill, instead of having 48 modern groups in the United States Air Force in 1956, we will have 42 first-line groups.

The subcommittee goes on to say that—

A projection of the same amount of funds annually for aircraft procurement—

As provided in this bill—

will produce at the end of fiscal year 1956 a lesser number of modernized groups than is contemplated under the present program for fiscal year 1951.

And that is not all. I find on page 312 that the subcommittee has this to say:

World conditions do not indicate that such a downward trend—

In air power—  
is justified.

But, instead of saying right there that the necessary air power should therefore be maintained, the subcommittee arrives at the conclusion that "a restudy and revaluation of military strength projected into future years should be made."

On page 272, the subcommittee says:

Undoubtedly we are taking certain very grave risks in not being better prepared.

Then, from that honest and accurate admission, the subcommittee goes on to say:

By and large the committee, in writing the bill, has followed the recommendations of the President and defense officials. This

seemed to be the best that could be done under the circumstances.

So, here we have a new idea.

It is that we will knowingly fail to provide the air power the Nation needs.

It is that we will knowingly fail to provide the needed air power in the face of world conditions that, all of us realize, warrant, if anything, an increase, not a decrease, in the Nation's air power.

But what is the Congress to do about it? Why, to quote this report, "the best we can do" is to go along with erroneous decisions someone downtown has made, let our air power decline, put off the decision to tomorrow, next month, next year, and in the meantime, just start a study of the military strength projected into the future.

Now, I subscribe fully to the subcommittee's statement that our Air Force air power is declining, because I know the facts. The subcommittee has accurately represented the facts. It is to be complimented for setting them out so bluntly in its report.

Where I differ with the subcommittee is on its suggested remedy for our declining air power.

The subcommittee suggests only that a study be made.

I say that this Congress has a far greater and a more pressing responsibility than that, in the light of existing world conditions.

I say that it is far from enough merely to start a study and in the meantime approve a program which we know full well will wither American air power on the vine.

It is fine for the subcommittee to make a study. But what are we going to do in the meantime? Let our defenses deteriorate? Let our Air Force air power become second-rate? Let our potential enemies far surpass us in aerial power and in modern, first-line aircraft?

I say, let us have the study. That is fine. But while we are studying, let us hold American air power firm. Any other course of action would be injurious to the national defense. That is what General Eisenhower was trying to get over to the Senate committee a few days ago.

I say that this Congress is defaulting on its responsibility and misleading the people if it sends out word that we will have 48 modern regular groups in the Air Force, and then refuses to provide the number of aircraft necessary to maintain those groups.

This, members of the committee, is a step backward. It is a start toward the unilateral disarmament of our country. It is a refusal to face the facts in today's world. It is putting off to tomorrow what we know perfectly well we must do today.

The issue is very clear. It is clear to all of us here. It is clear to our friends overseas. It is clear to our potential enemies overseas. We cannot dodge it in this bill.

Either we are going to have an adequate air defense, or we are not.

Let us face the facts. Let us do what the situation requires. Let us not shrink in the face of national need. Let us get right down to brass tacks, stand up to

our responsibility, and do exactly what we know has to be done in the interest of national defense.

Now, what are the facts?

Take the Air Force first. What has happened to our Air Force since the war?

Five years ago our Air Force had 273 groups. It was the greatest and most powerful Air Force in all the world. But by the middle of 1946 we had reduced it to 38 groups. It was then that we adopted a program looking to the rebuilding of the Air Force. Our plan was to get 55 groups by the end of 1947. That was to grow to 66 groups by the middle of 1948. Our goal was 70 groups. We were to reach that early in 1949.

And how long ago did the 70-group idea originate?

Here is what General Vandenberg, Air Force Chief of Staff, said on May 26, 1948:

The Air Force has maintained since 1945 that the minimum Air Force we could afford to have was 70 groups. I want to emphasize two things: First, our program is not a new program, generated by present world uncertainties and apprehensions.

Second. It is a peacetime program.

And what lay behind the 70-group concept? It was such thinking as that of the then Acting Secretary of State and former Assistant Secretary of War for Air, Hon. Robert A. Lovett, who said:

This country has got to make up its mind whether it will be the leading air power. There is nothing more pathetic than a second-rate air power, because while you have a sense of security there is no security—as far as I know it is the cheapest way of buying security that there is.

We are now up to early 1948. We had the President's Air Policy Commission—the Finletter Commission. It strongly endorsed the 70-group program. That was followed by the Joint Congressional Aviation Policy Board which reviewed the findings of the Air Policy Commission. It, too, decided that the Nation must have 70 groups for its minimum protection.

So what did we do in the Congress? Did we start another study?

Why, of course not. We did what was right and proper. We knew the facts and acted on the facts. We added \$822,000,000 in aircraft funds to the Air Force appropriations, over the protest of the late and beloved James Forrestal, then Secretary of Defense.

And at that time it was the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], who offered the amendment himself.

By December of 1948, the Air Force had reached a strength of 59 activated groups through our increased appropriation and was well on the road toward our goal of 70 groups.

Then came the 1950 budget. It was preceded by a month on the House floor by the so-called 70-group authorization bill that we reported from the Armed Services Committee. That 70-group authorization bill was passed by the House by a vote of 395 to 4. The Congress wanted it. The people wanted it. And the Congress unhesitatingly shouldered the responsibility.



The debate on the 1950 budget came along in April of 1949. We found that the administration had decided that the Nation did not need 70 groups after all. The new idea was that 48 groups would be enough. And then what did this Congress do?

Did the Congress say then that the best we could do was to go along with the President and the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Johnson?

We said emphatically no.

The House, and later the Senate, asserted that the writing of national defense policy is properly a function of the Congress.

The Congress did then what it should do now, on this budget.

And what was that policy established by the Congress?

It was the policy of the Congress to emphasize air power—to provide, in this year of atomic weapons, the aerial protection and aerial offense necessary for the minimum preparedness of our Nation.

And how did the House vote on that issue?

It voted 271 to 1 in favor of a bill that added \$851,000,000 to the 1950 budget over the protest of Secretary of Defense, Mr. Johnson. And who led the fight? The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], aided and abetted by the able chairman of the Defense Subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

By that vote, the Congress said that, instead of 48 groups, the Nation must—and would—have 58 groups. The Congress insisted upon another step along the road toward the goal of 70 groups.

And then what happened?

The President and the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Johnson, said the Congress was wrong. They said that the Executive, not the Congress, will decide how much air power this Nation will support and maintain. So \$735,754,000 of the funds provided by the Congress for the Air Force were put in reserve. The Appropriations Committee has well stated in its report that this act amounted to an item veto which clearly transcends the authority of the President.

Then after the President held up the funds, Secretary Johnson decided that the air strength left in the Air Force was still too large.

So, now Secretary Johnson comes along and withholds \$243,000,000 more of Air Force funds.

So what do we have? Of last year's appropriations, the executive branch has refused to spend \$978,776,000 of Air Force funds provided by the Congress, on grounds that the Congress knows nothing about the problem and has no business providing more defense than the Executive Department decides it wants the Nation to maintain.

Now we have the 1951 budget which is before us today.

And what does it do to the Air Force?

Well, now we have a brand new approach. This budget says that we will still hang to the magical figure of 48, plus 11 Air National Guard groups. The

figure 70 is now ridiculed. Someone thinks "48" sounds better. And here is the brand new wrinkle. The Secretary of Defense, Mr. Johnson, says we are not even to maintain the 48 groups in a modern condition. We are going to let six of those regular Air Force groups become second-line groups in a very few years by simply not providing enough money for new aircraft.

Now, members of the Committee, just where is this House going to stand? Just what is the House going to do about it?

Just at what place and when is the House going to exert its prerogatives, meet its responsibilities, and provide the defense it knows the Nation must have?

As one Member of the House, I say the place to stand is this 1951 budget.

And the time to stand is right now.

And the way to do it is to amend this bill at least so as to maintain 48 modern air groups in the Air Force. To do that will require an additional \$200,000,000.

That \$200,000,000 will enable the Air Force in fiscal year 1951 to procure approximately 77 additional aircraft, including medium bombers, medium and heavy transports, and helicopters, to rehabilitate 228 aircraft for the flying training program, and to modernize 71 B-29 aircraft as tankers for use in air-to-air refueling flights.

It is this additional sum of money that is absolutely necessary if we are to build up in an orderly fashion the 48-group program in the Regular Air Force. If the House refuses to make this money available, then by 1956 we will have only 42 modern regular groups.

I still maintain that the Congress should hold to the 70-group program in the Regular Air Force. If it was sound in 1948, as two exhaustive studies found it to be, then developments internationally since then, especially the Russian atom bomb explosion announced last September, make it even more necessary today.

And let me say to you that nothing has caused Russia to stop, look, and listen more than the ability of this Nation to conduct intercontinental bombing. Our ability to do so has been a powerful instrument for peace.

But, I am a realist.

I know that the Congress is at this time inclined to measure the adequacy of our defenses by dollars. I disagree sharply with that standard. I maintain that we must buy the defense the Nation must have, regardless of cost. I say that enemy capabilities, not dollars, determine our defense needs. But being a realist, I say that if we are to reduce to 48 Regular groups, well then, let us have 48 groups. And that requires an additional \$200,000,000 in aircraft procurement funds in this bill for the Air Force.

You gentleman call for 48 Regular Air Force groups in this bill.

Well, let us have 48 modern groups. And let us provide the money that will maintain those 48 groups.

Now, to sum up, here we have the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], leading the fight in 1948 for additional air power.

Then, again, we have the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] leading the fight in 1949 for increased air power, ably supported and assisted by the distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

They knew at that time that the security of the Nation requires 70 modern Air Force groups. And they knew it then—well before we knew that Russia had the atom bomb.

It is universally known today that Russia is building the largest air force in the world. What are they building it for? They are building it for use whenever their carefully timed Pearl Harbor day comes around.

And here we are, the richest and most powerful Nation in the world, year by year withering our Air Force on the vine.

Now, the issue is clear-cut.

It is whether the Congress will say what kind of defense the Nation will have, or whether the creature of the Congress, the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Louis Johnson, will tell us what kind of defense he will let the Congress have.

A vote for the additional \$200,000,000 for the Air Force means that the Congress fulfills its constitutional responsibility to provide for the common defense.

A vote against the \$200,000,000 means that Mr. Louis Johnson tells the Congress the character of defense that he will let the Nation have.

And now, what about the air power of the Navy—air power that is just as much a part of the total air power of our Nation as the air power of the Air Force.

What does this bill do to naval aviation?

I can find only one comment in the subcommittee report that hints at the facts on naval aviation. It is a terse little remark on page 295 of the report, which says that the number of aircraft authorized to be procured by the Navy under this bill is 817.

Then the report says that this number does not represent actual requirements.

That is a mighty mild statement as compared with the facts.

For, in truth, this bill continues a trend which ultimately will virtually destroy naval aviation.

The subcommittee dismisses the situation with the mild observation that the number of aircraft provided for the Navy does not represent actual requirements.

The situation is infinitely more serious than that indicates.

Before looking at this bill's effect on naval aviation, let me trace briefly what has happened to naval aviation in the past 2 years.

Less than 2 years ago Congress passed and the President signed a bill providing for a 10,713-operating-plane Navy.

But in 1949 the naval air army was reduced from the 10,713 level to 7,783 aircraft—a reduction of almost 3,000 planes. Now, we go down from 7,783, the fiscal year 1950 level, to 6,233 aircraft proposed in this bill—a further reduction of over 1,500 planes. This makes a reduction in naval aircraft, in the past 2 years, while world conditions

have become more grave, of 4,500 planes—a reduction of over 40 percent in 2 years. Almost 3,700 of the 4,500 reduction has been in Regular Navy and Marine Corps aircraft.

So we have had a steady decline in every phase of naval aviation since 1948. We have had a 40 percent reduction in the total operating aircraft of the Navy in 2 years. We have, in 2 years, cut almost in half the number of Regular Navy and Regular Marine Corps aircraft.

Now, what about this bill? Does it support this sharply reduced level of naval aircraft? Or is it so geared that naval aviation will be rendered impotent in the future?

Let us look at the facts.

The facts are that this bill leaves a deficiency in naval aircraft procurement of 1,349 planes. The bill authorizes the procurement of only 817 new naval aircraft. That is 1,349 fewer than the 2,166 aircraft needed by the Navy to maintain the 6,233 operating aircraft authorized by this bill.

And what effect will this have on naval aviation? Here is what Admiral Pride, Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics, told the Appropriations Subcommittee:

It is significant that this procurement level of 817 aircraft, if continued, would result in a progressive reduction of the aircraft operating inventory to less than 3,000 aircraft, which is less than half the budgeted 1951 operating strength.

So now it is clear what is meant by the cryptic remark in the report of the subcommittee that naval aircraft procurement "does not represent actual requirements."

Why, the fact is, Mr. Chairman, it not only does not represent actual requirements, but it contemplates, within the near future, the cutting of naval aviation in half.

I defy any Member of this House to explain to me what can justify this violent reduction in naval aviation.

Why, even today naval air strength is lower than it was in December 1941, at the time of Pearl Harbor. Then, the Navy's aircraft operating level was 5,432 of Regular Navy aircraft. Then, aircraft deliveries were being made at a rate approximately 300 a month.

And what does this appropriation provide?

It provides only 4,389 Regular Navy operating aircraft—over 1,000 aircraft less than we had in December 1941.

It provides for a monthly delivery rate of less than 70 aircraft. That is less than one-fourth the pre-Pearl Harbor rate.

So we have the same situation for the Navy, under this bill, that we have for the Air Force.

We are proposing an operating level of 6,233 naval aircraft. But we are knowingly failing to provide enough new aircraft to support that operating level.

We are killing this Nation's naval air power. That is what we are doing.

And what needs to be done about it?

I said a minute ago that the 817 naval aircraft proposed for procurement in this bill are 1,349 less than the 2,166 necessary to maintain the 6,233 operating aircraft authorized by this bill.

Of this deficiency of 1,349 planes, 530 are Regular Navy aircraft. The remainder, 819, are for the Naval Reserve.

In view of this situation, the very least we can do is to insist upon providing the Regular Navy with adequate funds to maintain the reduced number of first-line aircraft authorized for Regular Navy units in the next fiscal year.

And what is the Regular Navy's situation in first-line combat aircraft?

The total number of first-line aircraft required in Regular Navy combat units by the end of the next fiscal year is 2,576 of the total of 6,233 Navy operating aircraft authorized in this bill. The Navy will have 1,286 of these planes available by the end of the next fiscal year, leaving a deficiency of 1,290 first-line combat aircraft for Regular Navy combat units.

So to keep up our first-line combat units in the Regular Navy, 1,290 aircraft will have to be procured in the next fiscal year.

But what does this bill authorize in combat aircraft? Only 769. That is 521 short of the total required to maintain even the sharply reduced level of Regular Navy combat planes proposed in this bill.

And what are these 521 planes?

They are 379 fighter planes, 123 attack planes, 19 patrol planes. Nine others, including attack transports for the Marine Corps, are also needed for the first-line combat units of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, giving us a total of 530 planes the Navy is short of its needs—for the Regular Navy combat units alone—under this bill.

And what would they cost?

They would cost \$383,289,221.

So I say, at the very least, the Congress must provide the Regular Navy with the aircraft needed to keep its combat air arm from withering on the vine, as this bill would have it do.

That will take an additional \$383,289,221 more than the \$511,000,000 of new procurement funds authorized for the Navy in this bill. Add to this sum the approximately \$123,000,000 that were withheld by Secretary of Defense Johnson from last year's naval aviation budget, which is carried forward in this budget as part of the new procurement fund, and that would give us a total of \$1,071,289,211 in aircraft procurement funds for the Navy—a fund still low in comparison to need, for it still fails to provide a single first-line combat plane for the Naval Air Reserve.

So what I am recommending in total, Mr. Chairman, is supplemental funds in the amount of \$583,289,221—\$200,000,000 more for the Air Force and \$383,289,221 for the Navy—to support and maintain the first-line combat aircraft strength of those services as provided in this budget.

It can be said categorically and factually—and I am sure the Appropriations Committee must agree with me—that this budget is short by that amount and much more in meeting our air-power requirements.

I say that we will be derelict in our responsibilities to the Nation if we fail to remedy these critical flaws in this proposed appropriation.

Even by providing the \$583,000,000 additional, our defenses will still be serious-

ly deficient in two respects as regards air power.

That additional sum will not restore the over 2,000-plane reduction already suffered by the Navy in the past 2 years and will not provide a single first-line combat aircraft for the Naval Air Reserve.

That sum will provide no increase above 48 groups in the Air Force, and this air strength is at least 13 groups below the minimum required for the aerial defense of the United States.

No Member of this body questions the fact that we must take calculated risks in our defense program.

And we have to have economy wherever possible.

But we are backsliding into impotency in air power; we are critically jeopardizing our Nation's security; we are again encouraging war through weakness, for the Kremlin responds only to force, and I say to you that the safest road to permanent peace is for this great Nation to maintain modern and powerful armed forces, and especially an adequate air power both in our Navy and Air Force, which this bill does not do.

As General Eisenhower said on March 29 before the Senate Appropriations Committee, "in certain details we've been a bit careless."

I say to this House that the national defense is one place where we cannot afford to be "a bit careless."

While I recognize that this Nation can never achieve an absolute defense—and while, of course, our Nation abhors maintenance of large standing armed strength—we are living in a time of international stress and tension that requires, if we are to err, that we err on the side of preparedness rather than on the side of economy.

Gentlemen, the atomic blitz of tomorrow is a real, a genuine possibility.

We have no alternative but to prepare today for meeting it tomorrow, because tomorrow our preparations may well be far too late.

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

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

Mr. TABER. The statement the gentleman has made would indicate that it might be possible to effect a saving in the personnel picture at the Pentagon.

Mr. VINSON. I certainly agree with the gentleman. Over all there has been a reduction of 17.4 percent. Here in Washington, where an equivalent reduction should take place, the Department had 29,758 employees and it now has 28,421, a reduction of only 1,337. We ought to have some fair examination here in the departments to see if we cannot bring about a further reduction in the personnel here in Washington. This is where there should be some reductions, not only in the armed services but in the other departments as well. There are just entirely too many people in the city of Washington on the pay roll.

Mr. TABER. I wonder to what extent the practice has gone on of substituting a uniformed Wac for every one of the civilian personnel who have been cut off?



Mr. VINSON. That is not going on very fast. They probably are doing that, but what we want to do is to get some of this enormous number of civilian personnel out of the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Georgia for his very masterly discussion of a momentous problem, and to state that I concur in the views which he has expressed. However, I am deeply concerned about one aspect of the proposal which he says he is going to offer. Having in mind what has happened in the last 2 years with respect to our Defense Establishment, as I see it, the Congress is gradually and rather rapidly losing control of its Military Establishment. I should like to ask the gentleman what reason he has to believe that, assuming his suggestion is adopted by the Congress, it will be carried out by the administration?

Mr. VINSON. In reply to the question of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], let me say that I am hoping by the time this bill is passed by the House and the Senate the House will have passed a bill pending in the Armed Services Committee today, which will prohibit the Secretary of National Defense from reducing any item in this bill more than 5 percent until he consults with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. Of course, I recognize the fact that we may not be able to pass any law to make the President spend the money, but public opinion will make the President do certain things.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], chairman of the Subcommittee on Armed Services.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I stand here almost defenseless, without manuscript or previous release of my remarks to the press, and I stand here under the further embarrassing situation of following the brilliant address of that legislator and patriot extraordinary, the chairman of the legislative committee on the armed forces, the distinguished gentleman from the State of Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. I appreciate the generous words of tribute which he paid to me and to the members of the subcommittee, and I reciprocate in my esteem for him personally. He has made a tremendous contribution to the cause of good government and national security. These words come straight from the shoulder and right from the heart.

If there is anyone in America who is so naive and ill-advised that he does not want more money for national defense, there is something radically wrong with the information which he has or with his thinking. All of us want

more money for national defense. I can think of no more popular issue than to espouse with enthusiasm and vigor the cause of national defense; and I love to wave the flag, and carry it when I can.

The question is, How much national defense do we have? How much can we afford to spend for military purposes? How much in our best interest should we spend on the cause of national defense? If we spend so much, and our enemies hope we will, that we bring on the collapse of the economy of the United States, we will have spent ourselves into defeat. Our air power, great as it is, and our Navy and our Army, great as they are, are not the things that strike terror to the heart of the enemy today and preserve the peace. These things contribute. The thing that makes America the foremost leader of all the world today is America's industrial potential, America's capacity to fight back and continue to fight back until victory has been achieved. That is what the enemy fears, and anything that enters into the body of this America and destroys the pulsing industrial heart of America is something dangerous indeed. No man can claim to be a true and wise advocate of national defense who would espouse the spending of more money for national defense than we can afford. Those who would spend to the extent that our industrial economy and our way of life is destroyed are not friends of national defense. They inadvertently are winning the victory for the enemy from within. That is a cheaper victory than winning from without.

Not long ago with other Members of Congress I journeyed down to the National Gallery of Art, to see the Austrian exhibits. After looking at the pictures here and there I came to a place where I observed a number of coats of armor, belonging to knights of old, standing at attention. They were quite impressive as they stood there—these figures of steel.

I thought then as I think now that I could have walked up to one of these impressive coats of mail and pushed it over. It would have lacked the capacity to rise because it did not have the blood and the sinew; it did not have life within it, a healthy, pulsating, vigorous life. The thing that we must do in this country is to be sure the industrial heart keeps beating, that the circulation continues to flow, that we are capable of fighting and if pushed aside for a moment to rise and fight again as we did during World War II.

The distinguished gentleman from Georgia almost made me feel as I listened entranced to his rhetoric that we were standing naked, as it were, to the enemies who would destroy us. But I am reminded to say at this point that the United States of America is better prepared to repel immediately an attack from an enemy than it has been on any day or at any hour since hostilities ceased at the close of World War II. We have the most modern weapons we have ever had in the history of our national defense program and our Military Establishment is more in a state of readiness to repel

an attack than at any time since the shooting stopped in World War II.

Mr. Chairman, when we speak of national defense we do not speak of \$12,800,000,000 in this bill or \$13,000,000,000 to use a round figure; we must think of the entire national defense program of this country.

This morning, knowing that the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services would speak, I decided I would like to present to you graphically in these charts a few facts. And I scribbled hastily a few notes as I listened to the eloquent address of the gentleman from Georgia.

The national defense program for the coming fiscal year shapes up about as we see it here on the chart. In the military part of this bill there are \$12,800,000,000 in cash. In contract authority—and the only reason it is not cash is because the military people say that they cannot spend it now, they say, "Just give us contract authority, we cannot spend it for 4 or 5 years"—we give them \$2,000,000,000, making a total of \$14,800,000,000.

In the subcommittee handled by my colleague from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] for the Atomic Energy Commission about \$650,000,000 are included.

Is there anyone so lacking in judgment that he doubts that the work we are doing on the atomic bomb and on the hydrogen bomb is not national defense? I think not. And, because the Commission cannot spend the entire billion dollars in one year, it is given \$310,000,000 in contract authorization.

Stock piling. Who is there among us who can say that there is anything much more important than the stock piling of critical materials from abroad which might be denied us for a season in the event of hostilities? There is \$633,000,000 for stock piling and \$100,000,000 for contract authorization.

These letters "NACA" indicate one of the most important agencies in the world today, the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, which has been pioneering for many years in the field of national defense to make sure that America leads the parade. Here is \$56,000,000 to continue that important work which has made such a tremendous contribution to our security in former years.

Next on the chart is Government and relief in occupied areas, \$321,000,000, a part of the defense program around the world.

Voice of America, \$34,000,000.

Mutual defense assistance, \$650,000,000. That is a very important part of our program. Just recently a number of B-29's set sail on their way across the blue Atlantic in order that they might be over there near the potential enemy and in the hands of friends if trouble comes.

Does anybody say that the hundreds of millions we are spending there is not national defense? It is national defense of the first order. Just this morning I had the opportunity to talk with that able and eminent soldier and statesman, Gen. Omar Bradley, about the conference held in The Hague recently, having

as its aim an agreement that might augment the defense of the western democracies against the threat of totalitarianism.

Next on the chart is military public works, \$300,000,000 in cash, and I will be glad to support, and I urge the immediate bringing by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services to the floor, the public works bill, which was delayed last year, and which was sorely needed, and of which we are more in need now, if we are to meet the situation confronting us in military housing.

ECA. I think the average Member of the House voted for ECA not because of any philanthropy—and let us not let philanthropy and the milk of human kindness dry up within our souls—but let it be said in all frankness that we voted this ECA money in the interest of national defense. Those who thought it had no national defense qualities probably voted against it.

So, we have a total of \$20,500,000,000 for national defense in the fiscal year 1951. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations I do not come before you as one who has in the past been hesitant to recommend vast appropriations for national defense. I yield to no Member in my desire to achieve the maximum in national security. But we must not spend ourselves into bankruptcy in the name of national defense. Our military leaders, men like General Eisenhower and General Bradley, men like General Collins, Admiral Sherman, and General Vandenberg, members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, are right when they say that it is completely out of the question in peacetime for the Nation to be in a state of absolute and complete readiness for war. It would destroy our economy. It would bring on the police state. It would destroy our liberties. No wise man advocates any such program. Why, it would be very nice, indeed, if the pulsing motors of aircraft were tuned up now at Bolling Field, near Washington, D. C., and if every city and installation were fortified with armaments at every moment to meet every possible emergency. It would be a consoling thing, in a way, if we lived in a state of complete armed readiness. But we lack the resources and the manpower to fortify every portion of our great and spacious country. What we are trying to do is not to become like a synthetic man in armor in a museum, having everything in armament and nothing inside, what we are trying to do is to maintain a healthy condition and have the maximum of defense within our capabilities.

We see on this chart that the estimated national income is \$37,000,000,000 and the estimated deficit for 1951 is in round figures \$5,000,000,000. Faced with that situation, the committee brought in a bill approximately as had been recommended to us by General Bradley and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Well may we go slow in buying certain equipment. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGELL], a member of the committee, is one of the finest patriots I know and one of our best informed men on military matters. He said the other day in a radio broadcast that certain times

may be called epoch-making times. We are in one of those periods now, an epoch-making time. It is sort of like the time when gunpowder was discovered, or the steamboat. It is a time of rapid transition in weapons. It would be a serious mistake indeed if we should spend so much money on hardware, weapons of different kinds, that within 2 or 3 years all of that equipment would be out of date and obsolete.

In talking with the Commander in Chief of the Army, Navy, and Air Force a few months ago I was impressed with his urging that the most important money in the military budget is for research and development. In order to keep this expenditure figure for hardware as low as we can, we have tried to spend as much as we dare spend in the field of research and development, in order that we may lead the parade of nations and be prepared for the emergencies that may arise.

I wish you would take a look at that figure for research and development on the chart. Your committee and your Military Establishment have not been asleep. They have been aware for months of the problem confronting us.

We read in childhood that—

The heights by great men reached and kept  
Were not attained by sudden flight,  
But they, while their companions slept,  
Were toiling upward in the night.

America has not slept during this postwar period. But America has been "toiling upward in the night" since 1946, preparing through research and development the finest weapons that have ever been conceived in the history of man. We have made so much progress in the field of research and development that we have outmoded practically every weapon we have. When we have made a little more progress in some more of them, we will be able to get more deeply into the hardware phase—the procurement phase—but do not let us buy too much hardware too soon and have too much obsolete matériel which we will have to consign to the scrap heap.

We are proposing to spend in this budget \$143,000,000 for guided-missile warfare. That is just in its infancy. We do not have much money for hardware yet, but that will come later on. The guided missile will revolutionize certain phases of warfare as we know it. If world war III comes, which God forbid, it will not be like World War I or World War II.

So we are in an epoch-making period. We have come to this epoch-making period by our own plan and design. In research and development we have spent near \$3,000,000,000 in the last few years, more than we spent on the atomic bomb, in order that we might go forward in the most important field which will lead to peace and security, if arms can bring peace and security.

The distinguished gentleman from Georgia has talked to us about the woeful inadequacy of the military appropriation bill from the standpoint of aircraft. The Navy has 14,000 aircraft. The United States Air Force has 21,000 aircraft. It would be easy to insist that we thereby have a tremendous reservoir

of air power. We do have, but the figures I have given you could be misleading. We must admit there are many trainers included in the aircraft inventory and there are many obsolete planes of many types. Thousands of them are in moth balls and may never be used. We have 6,000 bombers in the United States Air Force, not all modern, not all in use. Yet they certainly would have a very important function to perform if war should come tomorrow. But we are looking forward to the new designs, the jet aircraft, and the electronic devices, many of which have not quite been perfected, but are in the process of perfection. We are looking forward to them. They will outmode other aircraft and devices. We are proceeding cautiously with our aircraft procurement program.

Here is a figure on the chart I would like you to look at carefully—\$5,300,000,000. If the House of Representatives and the Senate and the President of the United States approve the military bill which is before you, that much money will be available for expenditure on the morning of July 1, 1950, for aircraft procurement. That is not a trifling sum. "Oh," someone might say, "that is in contract authorization, is it not?" Yes, some of it is in contract authorization. Why is it in contract authorization? Because it takes time to build these airplanes. That money may not all be spent in 3 or 4 or 5 years; we have to proceed slowly. Modern aircraft and weapons are unbelievably complicated in design and construction. But Congress has permitted all the obligational authority to be made available; there is nothing between the military people and the purchase of this material, except the ability of American industry to produce. So look carefully at that figure of \$5,300,000,000 before saying that the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations is not somewhat air-minded in its thinking and in its record in previous years in supporting the cause of air power.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. We heard that same argument in 1940 and 1941. I was in Hawaii in 1937, and I pointed out to the military forces that our Air Force there looked like an air force at a country fair. Yet they neglected the air force and we suffered the greatest humiliation ever inflicted on a civilized nation at Pearl Harbor in 1941.

I agree with the gentleman. I am for economy where it is necessary, but if we have another war it is going to be fought with airplanes and atomic bombs. We cannot wait to fire the second shot. We must be ready whenever any enemy threatens us with an attack, as we should have been when Pearl Harbor fell.

Mr. MAHON. We hope that through the processes of unification which to some degree are successful, and the bitter lesson learned by our Navy and Army at Pearl Harbor, that the human error will not be made again, that our military will be ready and able to meet any attack.



Congress can appropriate the money, but Congress of course cannot administer the program.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. SIKES. Although the equipment was limited at the time of Pearl Harbor, had that equipment been used effectively there would have been no catastrophe there. There was radar. There were planes. There were ships in sufficient number to prevent that attack. Had that equipment been used, the disaster would never have occurred. Piling up equipment is not the sole answer to this question.

Mr. MAHON. Piling up equipment is only one of the segments of this picture.

Mr. RANKIN. Putting the equipment at the right place would have prevented the disaster at Pearl Harbor.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. PATTERSON. I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas what his idea of the preparedness program would be. Would it be one along atomic lines, bacteriological warfare, missiles, or just the conventional-type war?

Mr. MAHON. Our idea of warfare must be realistic. Until the guided missile, which within a few years can be fired 5,000 miles and hit the target area, has been perfected, we had better have something else as a substitute. Until the time comes when a ship at sea can proceed within a thousand miles of its target and hit the target with a guided missile we had better be prepared to fight with conventional ships. Until the time ceases to be when an airplane must fly over its target—and the time will come when a bomber will not undertake to fly over the target but will release its missile possibly hundreds of miles away—until that time comes, we must have the B-36 and the B-29, the B-47 and improved types of these conventional weapons. Atomic warfare is not the complete answer to the problem which confronts us. Everybody knew that Russia would eventually have the atomic bomb, and the atomic bomb had already been discounted in military planning and it was not especially significant that it came a year or so earlier than anticipated. It had already been taken into the picture by our defense planners.

Mr. PATTERSON. If you say that, you are agreeing with the eminent chairman of the Armed Services Committee in his proposal.

Mr. MAHON. I usually agree with the eminent chairman of the Armed Services Committee. I do not take serious disagreement with him, generally. I would like to spend far more money than he advocates. I would go him one step farther and double it, if we could afford it.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Your chart on expenditures for the national defense program, while almost complete, is not entirely complete.

Mr. MAHON. I just thought that up in a hurry yesterday afternoon.

Mr. STEFAN. I notice you omitted approximately \$200,000,000 for the Civil Aviation Administration, much of which contains funds for national defense. You also omitted the money appropriated for a new venture in air-navigation development which, when complete, will cost \$1,500,000,000. The chart is not entirely complete, in that other appropriations for defense would increase that approximately \$2,000,000,000.

Mr. MAHON. Well, I would say the chart is quite conservative. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. For example, these figures for research and development are exclusive of the figures which would pay military personnel who work with the research and development program.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. The \$5,300,000,000 in funds and authority for the purchase of aircraft is quite an imposing figure. That is true.

Mr. MAHON. That is right.

Mr. HARDY. But does the gentleman take issue with the statement of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] to the effect that under this bill the effective strength of the Air Force will be actually 42 groups rather than 48 groups? And does the gentleman agree further with the statement of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] that the Navy's effective fighting force will be reduced by 1,500 effective planes, under this legislation?

Mr. MAHON. I would like to comment on that. The position of the committee will be found in the report. The hearings make it very clear, but it is found in the report which points out that at this time we have 46 modern groups. That does not count the Navy and does not count our National Guard. With the program we have this year we will have 48 modern groups in 1952.

In other words, the point of the gentleman's argument is that by 1956—and much of warfare may be revolutionized by that time in many fields—by 1956 we would have only 42 modern groups if we continued this level of aircraft procurement. That is a matter, as the printed hearings will reveal, which gave the committee much concern. Yet under this bill, in 1952, we shall have 48 modern groups—the strongest we have ever been in modernity, if I may use the word, in our Air Force.

As to the Navy's striking power, it is true that the Navy has fewer planes, but the Navy says, "Qualitatively, we are in the best shape we have ever been."

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 15 additional minutes.

Mr. MAHON. The point is that our emphasis is upon compactness—upon streamlining; it is upon efficiency; it is upon research and development; it is with the idea that if war comes we can spring more quickly to full posture, as the military people say, for the defense of our country.

Mr. HARDY. That is, of course, an admirable position, provided we do not bring our effective forces to a point below the irreducible minimum for our safety. The question is, Are we going to determine in the Congress what that position is? Or, are we going to permit the Secretary of Defense, through the administration of the funds which we provide, to use his own discretion, notwithstanding the position which the Congress takes?

Mr. MAHON. I do not know about the Secretary of Defense. The President has impounded money in the so-called Presidential reserve fund. I am told by the Secretary of Defense, and it is supported by the printed record, that it was the action of the Commander in Chief that resulted in the withholding of some of the funds that we appropriated last year. I took, and I take, violent disagreement with the executive branch of the Government for impounding funds which Congress appropriates for defense. If the gentleman will read the report, much of which I wrote with my own hand, he will find the views of the gentleman from Texas with regard to that matter.

Mr. HARDY. I commend the committee for the fine work that it has done. I have just one further question to ask. I have been informed that under this bill there will not be one single first-line plane for use by the Naval Air Reserve. Is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. I could not say offhand. If the gentleman will read the hearings, he will have the figure. I would remind him, however, that we are just coming into the use of jets on a large scale. Perhaps the gentleman noticed in the paper a picture of the first jets landing on a carrier. We are just moving into this field, and our Reserve and our National Guard must proceed very carefully with these fast-moving, intricate, electronic, and expensive first-line planes. We are going as far as we can.

Let me say further with respect to the program of the Navy, that we were careful to continue the ship-building program at the rate of \$300,000,000 for 1951. The Navy is not withering on the vine; it continues to be quite vigorous. But it has been reduced sharply in its operations.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. SIKES. I wish to point out that in response to a question by me testimony was given, and it appears in the record, that the naval reservists are flying jet planes. Jets certainly are first-line planes.

Mr. MAHON. One of our Air Force reservists, a Member of Congress, was flying a jet when he lost his life last year. As I say, I sometimes question the wisdom of permitting reservists who are not constantly on the job flying these jets, because disastrous experience sometimes results.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, if my memory serves me correctly, the Navy has in the neighborhood of some two or

three hundred submarines. What progress is the Navy now making in converting those submarines to the snorkel type? In other words, are there any funds in this bill to permit the Navy to go ahead and convert and modernize our old submarines?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman has raised certainly one of the most important questions in the national defense picture. We are making, as you know, real developments in the antisubmarine warfare and undersea warfare. We have under construction at this time killer submarines and other types of submarines, and we are converting numerous destroyers, in order that they may do a better job in antisubmarine warfare. The first, No. 1, priority of the Navy today, and rightly so, is antisubmarine warfare and well might that be true because the greatest threat to us on the seas is the Russian fleet of submarines.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, may I compliment Chairman MAHON and his subcommittee. I do not think any subcommittee I have ever served on knows more about this subject than does the gentleman's subcommittee.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is overly generous.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman from Texas stated that in 1952 there would be a modern 48 group.

Mr. MAHON. I believe that is correct.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman will admit, will he not, that in 1952 it goes down?

Mr. MAHON. Yes. We point that out in our report, and this is a very serious matter and something must be done to meet the situation.

Mr. VINSON. Let the House know that in 1952 by the money in this bill there will be a modern 48 group, but for lack of money in this bill from 1952 on you send it down.

Mr. MAHON. I would not make that statement quite that way because the money in this bill or most of it for aircraft procurement will not be spent for 2 or 3 years. We called upon the Secretary of Defense and General Bradley to make sure that in presenting this budget next year they have adequate funds to keep that 48-group figure level. When General Eisenhower was before us on the 24th day of February in an unreported meeting he said: "Gentleman, you should know before you report this bill what you propose to spend in fiscal 1952, the following year." I agree with him. We went into a huddle with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and with the Secretary of Defense and they said: "Our tentative figure for 1952 is the same, \$13,000,000,000. What we want is stability of national defense."

Mr. VINSON. Since the gentleman mentioned the Secretary of Defense, it recalls to my mind that around 1 o'clock at a news conference the Secretary said that "on account of the money in this bill, on account of the arguments that have been stated about the procurement for aviation, both for the Air Force and the Naval Air Force," he is submitting

the question to the Joint Chiefs of Staff to see if his recommendations were right.

Mr. MAHON. Well, that was the request we made of the Joint Chiefs and the Secretary of Defense some time ago. This committee will not, if we are supported, let our air power wither on the vine.

It might be pointed out that one of the significant things General Eisenhower said was that we cannot have national defense by hysteria. While he points out that he never saw this bill, or the final budget, he can speak generally and authoritatively in military matters, but not with complete accuracy, not having read the details of the program. Repeating, one of the most important things he said was, "Gentlemen, we cannot have national defense by hysteria." He decried hysteria.

It has been my observation, and I say this in all kindness, that about the time we have our military bill each year on the floor, the flying saucers begin to sail across the western horizon and the unidentified submarines flit to and fro in the Pacific waters and even our friends come out and say in the headlines of the press, and I quote, "Russia is planning a new Pearl Harbor," and things of that nature. I am glad to be warned, and it is true we are faced with a grave peril, Mr. Chairman, but I say to you that Eisenhower was never more everlastingly correct than when he said: "We cannot have legislation by hysteria, that we must not underrate the enemy, neither should we overrate the enemy."

What is the potential threat to Washington, D. C., today? The Russian air power. How many heavy bombers does Russia have? None; not one. How many medium bombers does Russia have? About 300, maybe 400. How many do we have? Hundreds and hundreds and hundreds. Russia has a few of the B-29 type. Of course, a nation with three or four hundred bombers in making an attack is going to get some of them through, and that would be gravely serious in an atomic war, but if we had, instead of 5,000 bombers 50,000 bombers, an enemy could still penetrate our defenses to some extent. So, while we do not want to underestimate the potential enemy, we do not want to overrate him, either.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Knowing from personal experience some of the tedious tasks of deciphering some of the military budget, I wish to commend the gentleman on the very fine presentation he has made of this difficult subject today.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman. I think you might want me to say something about the radar fence. For the radar fence we appropriated \$50,000,000 last year, and that money has not been spent nor obligated. It soon will be. It is a difficult task, and we are going to provide more for the radar fence when it is needed. It is a slow-going proposition. We have provided for industrial mobilization and all those key factors as best we could that

would augment and improve our national-defense program.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Very high in our national-defense program is the National Security Resources Board. That Board, I understand, is charged with the mobilization of our industrial might, our civilian preparedness, the preparedness of our cities against atomic attack or poison-gas attack. Yet, that Board has been without a permanent chairman for more than a year and a half, in fact, until the current week, when Mr. Symington was named to head that Board. Does not the gentleman, in carrying out his responsibility as chairman of this most important committee, consider that fact most unfortunate?

Mr. MAHON. I do, and I breathe much easier now that Stuart Symington, that extraordinary man with remarkable vigor and understanding and capacity, is now to be head of the Board. We have provided adequate appropriations, we think, in the bill for the National Security Resources Board. It is a credit to America that we have a man of Symington's caliber in that position. I regret to see him leave the Air Force, and I think he is right when he says we need a 70-group air force. I would even raise that figure if we had the resources to do it. But there are certain limitations which we must keep in mind if we are to preserve our country and not go into a police state program.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman is making a very splendid statement and I want to say that I am usually in accord with his views, so I do not want to be misunderstood by this question. The gentleman stated a moment ago that Russia had exactly no heavy bombers. I am just wondering, purely as a layman, with no authority whatever on the subject, what the gentleman's source of information on that question is.

Mr. MAHON. I would not like to give my source of information.

Mr. COLMER. I do not want the gentleman to disclose anything that would be against the interest of this country, but that brings me to the other point.

Mr. MAHON. Let me say this, if I may impose, that according to the press Russia has about 400 of the B-29 type, which we call the medium bomber.

Mr. COLMER. That question was merely preliminary to the one I wanted to ask next, or the observation I am about to make. I realize in a democracy like ours that the situation is entirely different from what it is in a totalitarian state like Russia. As a layman, I have often picked up magazines and newspapers and seen detailed accounts of our latest weapons and our various plans for national defense. I wonder, and I am constrained to wonder by mail I get from my constituents, why we go into all this detail about everything we have in the way of national defense.



Would the gentleman care to comment on that?

Mr. MAHON. I would be glad to.

During our hearings each year my blood boils and I see red on frequent occasions because of all these public releases by men in the Department of Defense, and others, which, in my opinion, impair the security of the United States.

The last time the late Secretary Forrestal was before our committee he appeared hastily at our request with the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. We pounded the table and said there must be an end to all this talking by men in the Military Establishment, giving aid and comfort to the enemy as to the direction of our national defense program. We cast no discredit upon Mr. Forrestal, he was an able and outstanding patriot, we were complaining about the system.

If you will read the hearings this year, you will read again of our insistence that this confidential type of material be kept out of the press. We do our best, but here is what happens. The Navy is a proud and efficient Navy, but partisans of the Navy want the headlines and they strive to get them, and they do get them. The Air Force advocates love publicity and public acclaim. The same is true with the Army. Our service people are proud. They are not dishonest. They are just proud of what they have and they want to grow in the esteem and favor of the American people and the Congress. Nonmilitary people and Members of Congress are also sometimes at fault. It seems almost impossible to prevent these unfortunate and hurtful statements in a democracy such as our own. Of course we do not want to keep the American people in the dark as to the dangers which confront them.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman spoke a while ago about the hysteria of the ones who are clamoring for a strong Air Force.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will permit me to interrupt, the gentleman from Texas did not say that those who were clamoring for a strong Air Force were in a state of hysteria. I think the gentleman from Texas has been perhaps as active on this floor in behalf of the Air Force as anyone in the Chamber.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not criticizing the gentleman from Texas, but I want to call attention to this fact: Many years ago Gen. Billy Mitchell was accused of hysteria because he insisted on an adequate air force, and was prosecuted out of office. Our Air Force was reduced far below the point of safety, and Pearl Harbor was the result.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman was in Congress at the time of the Billy Mitchell affair; I was not.

Mr. RANKIN. I was here and defended General Mitchell on this floor, as did the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] on the other side of the aisle. They turned the national defense over to those individuals who were getting rid of Gen. Billy Mitchell, after he had sunk the *Ostfriesland* in 20 minutes in

3 shots, the biggest German battleship captured in the First World War. And as I said, Pearl Harbor was the result.

I am like the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. I am not willing to capitulate and to turn over to anybody the responsibility of the Congress of the United States for defending this Nation and to defend it promptly at all times.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from Texas knows no Member of the House who wants to capitulate or turn over the national defense program to anybody else. I say let us have the strongest national defense program that we can afford. Let us be constantly alert to the dangers which confront us from within and without and do our best to preserve our country and prevent war.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time, and thank my committee chairman, Mr. CANNON, very much for the generous amount of time accorded me.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, ordinarily I do not ask the time of the House on the national defense appropriation except to offer, support, or oppose amendments to the bill.

I have felt in the past that the time for general debate should be largely monopolized by the Appropriations Committee members so they could explain fully to the Committee the many details of this very important problem.

I will still defer to the members of that committee for the appropriations details, but we have a collateral problem that also needs our attention today—a problem different from any we have had in the past in regard to national defense.

It is high time we recognized it. And it is of such importance to recognize it that I am taking this time today.

Mr. Chairman, we have, in my opinion, a crisis confronting us as regards the relation of the Congress to the Nation's defense.

More than that, we have a very dangerous situation in another respect. It is a situation unparalleled in my previous service in the Congress. It concerns the veracity of witnesses before the Congress and the freedom of witnesses to voice their convictions before committees of the Congress.

And we have a further problem: that of how to place reasonable restraints on the colossal power of the Secretary of Defense who today wields near dictatorial power over 2,000,000 people, and has at his disposal sums amounting to almost one-third of the Federal budget; sums almost equal to the total Federal budget in 1941, only 9 years ago.

I am gravely disturbed by what has transpired in national defense administration since Secretary Johnson took office.

I am disturbed even more by the portents of the future stemming from his administration to date, disturbing as that has been in so many respects.

Ever since Mr. Louis Johnson took office there has been a rapid-fire sequence of events in the Department of Defense, which, taken together, would indicate to any objective observer that the Secretary has an insatiable ambition—an unquenchable lust for power—a cavalier disregard, strongly colored with con-

tempt for the Congress—an unbridled eagerness for publicity—a dictatorial bent that will brook not only no opposition but no disagreement, whether warranted or not—and no little disdain for honesty, at least before congressional committees.

Mr. Chairman, I am not given to exaggeration. I insist these are not exaggerations. I say that the record of Mr. Johnson's administration supports these statements.

And in the light of that record, I say that every Member of this House should have as much concern over the situation as I have.

It is important to take note of these matters now, if for no other reason than the action of the Appropriations Committee in taking substantially at face value the representations made to them by the Secretary and his minions who presented the budget argument on which the defense items in this bill before us today are based.

Just what has happened in this past year to justify concern over the administration of the Defense Department?

Let us take a look at the record.

The Secretary had not yet gotten his seat warm in the Pentagon—he had been Secretary a month or less—when he administratively threw out the window a project thrice approved by the Congress, the aircraft carrier U. S. S. *United States*.

In this he was not only contemptuous of the Congress but he was guilty of such cavalier disregard of his Secretary of the Navy that the Navy Secretary had no alternative but to leave his office at once under bitter protest.

Mr. Chairman, I know of no recent public event that constituted so direct and flagrant a rebuff of congressional action as this. As one Member of Congress I not only resent the action as constituting a studied insult to the Congress but I am utterly convinced that such a step would not have been taken unless the person responsible, Mr. Johnson, felt—and still feels—within himself that he and his powers supersede the desires of the Congress of the United States.

That, Mr. Chairman, not the aircraft carrier, is the true issue.

That, Mr. Chairman, is why every Member of this House should be as disturbed as many of us on the Armed Services Committee have been by the administration of the Defense Department today.

But that is just one item on the record.

What came next?

About a month after Congress was overruled on the aircraft carrier Washington was flooded with rumors to the effect that Marine Corps aviation was to be absorbed by the Air Force by Secretary Johnson. These rumors became so intense that our distinguished elder statesman of national defense—the gentleman from Georgia—to whom, let me say, the Nation owes far more than it can ever repay for his vision and leadership in national defense in the Congress for over a third of a century—yes; it was the gentleman from Georgia, Chairman VINSON, who finally found it necessary to visit the Secretary to ask his intentions as regard the Marine Corps.

From this visit came a letter from the Secretary. That letter flatly disavowed that it was or had at any time been planned to alter the status of Marine Corps aviation. The Secretary asserted in his letter that no studies had been initiated at any time in the Pentagon on the subject.

Mr. Chairman, the Armed Services Committee and the Congress accepted that letter at face value and dropped the subject.

But it is widely known—and I must mention it to point up further our need for concern today—that the Secretary personally told members of the press in New York, off the record, of course, directly the opposite, and I happen to know that the Secretary had personally directed initiation of comparative cost studies in the Pentagon which had as their purpose justifying the transfer of the Marine air arm to the Air Force, his disclaimers to the contrary notwithstanding.

So now the picture begins to take form.

Not only is contempt for Congress evident in the Secretary's conduct, but now the problem of veracity is added.

There was a flurry of incidents of this sort last spring, Mr. Chairman. For example, in testimony last spring on amendments to the Unification Act, the Secretary flatly denied before the Armed Services Committee having attempted at any time to discipline any members of the press for criticizing him.

But present at that very hearing were members of the press who were prepared to sign affidavits certifying, under oath, directly to the contrary.

Another example at the same time, Mr. Chairman.

The Secretary also testified to the committee that at no time while he was Assistant Secretary of War did he go over the head of, or around, the Secretary of War, then Secretary Harry Woodring, to the President or the Congress, and he asserted that he was working under direct congressional authority which itself bypassed the Secretary of War.

As to his conduct while Assistant Secretary of War, I need not labor the point. Surely there are enough Members still here who were on the old Military Affairs Committee to give the answer to that, regardless of Mr. Johnson's testimony.

But as to the congressional authority under which Mr. Johnson functioned as Assistant Secretary of War, I may say that the Secretary deliberately misled the committee, for the authority he asserted was his was specifically subject to the "direction of the Secretary of War."

But all of this happened last spring, Mr. Chairman.

I am inclined to think that we on the Armed Services Committee should have a sense of guilt ourselves for what has happened since. For having had these warnings, I think we would perhaps have been well advised then to call a halt to the increase in the power of a man who so evidently was contemptuous of the Congress and had displayed a convenient disregard for fact.

The record, members of the committee, speaks more loudly the more recent it gets.

Since last spring, what has happened?

We have seen an arbitrary cut-back of appropriated funds—a completely unilateral abrogation of congressional defense policy, again contemptuous of the role of Congress in national defense.

We have seen sharp reductions of the armed forces directed by the Secretary without consultation with the services, despite testimony, let me say again, directly to the contrary—reductions, I must also say, that were modified only as a result of the vigorous and timely hearings by the Armed Services Committee last October which placed a damper on the Secretary's unilateral actions.

And what else?

We have seen a witness, Admiral Denfeld, the Chief of Naval Operations, fired from his position of high professional responsibility for no reason other than his failure to toe the party line in his testimony before the Armed Services Committee last October.

Yes; he was fired directly in the face of promises that such an act would not be taken—promises made by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, and by the committee itself.

This perfidious act was excused by Secretary Johnson on grounds that the admiral was unfit for his position. But what were the facts? The admiral had served for 40 years in the United States Navy. He had just completed a 2-year tour of duty as Chief of Naval Operations. He has just been reappointed, with Secretary Johnson's approval, for another 2-year tour as Chief of Naval Operations.

To me the most remarkable aspect of this event is not its evidence of vindictiveness and intolerance and disregard for promises on the record. We had seen that evidenced before.

What was remarkable was the extent of the contempt evidenced for the Congress in the belief that the Armed Services Committee and the Congress could be cajoled into believing that the removal of the admiral from his position as Chief of Naval Operations had no relation to his testimony before the Armed Services Committee.

But the record goes on, Mr. Chairman.

The next thing we knew was that the name of Capt. Arleigh S. Burke, a distinguished naval officer, had been removed, contrary to law, from a Navy selection list for promotion to the grade of rear-admiral.

And why was this done?

It was done because Captain Burke had appeared before the Armed Services Committee in October 1949 to present the Navy views on the aircraft carrier *U. S. S. United States*.

But this finally aroused the public. Somewhere in the administration reason prevailed. It was not, I realize, on a basis of responding to justice nor in recognition of the rights of witnesses before congressional committees. Not at all. The injustice was remedied and the captain's name placed on the list, which list, by the way, included a bunch of the palace guard, because the situation was getting unsavory in a political vein.

The vindictiveness was still there, the intolerance, the desire to inflict punishment for testifying frankly before the Congress.

But at last it had become impolitic to carry cut the punishment.

But, Mr. Chairman, the record goes on.

Next we found that every top-ranking officer in the Navy had been set aside in the selection of the officer to succeed the Chief of Naval Operations who had just been fired for speaking frankly to the Congress.

And why were they set aside?

Because they, too, had had the courage, as had Admiral Denfeld, to express themselves frankly before the Congress on national defense policies.

Because their views were not 100 percent in accord with the course of national defense planning under Secretary Johnson, they had become unfit to take the professional leadership of the United States Navy.

As the Navy Secretary told the United States Senate a few days later, he had no objection to a naval officer speaking his mind freely before the Congress, but that officer must be prepared to take the consequences thereafter.

This amazing story can go on and on, Mr. Chairman.

Take, for example, this incident:

A naval officer sought to write a series of articles in answer to General Arnold's series on air power, in which series the general treated the testimony taken by the Armed Services Committee in October before which this naval officer had appeared.

The naval officer was officially requested not to publish the series of articles. General Arnold was permitted to proceed with his series without restraint.

And why?

Because, of course, General Arnold was expounding the accepted, the official view of the Department of Defense.

Take another example:

The Naval Institute planned to publish in its December issue the testimony of naval officers before the Armed Services Committee on the questions of unification and grand strategy. The official request was made of the Institute that the testimony not be published. The request was complied with.

But, at the same time, and without restraint, the Air University was publishing an article contending that the position of naval leaders on strategy and unification was wholly erroneous. No effort was made to censor that article.

And why not?

Because the Air Force article supported the party line.

And take another matter, Mr. Chairman.

In the amendments to the unification act it was unequivocally stated that there shall be no single chief of staff over the armed forces. The law also stated clearly that the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall consist of four men—the chairman, and the three chiefs of services. All four of the chiefs of services were made the advisers to the President, the National Security Council, and the Secretary of Defense.

But what is happening?

The chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff alone usually represents the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the highest Government councils. This is understandable. Not only are the Nation's civilian lead-



ers trained in Army organization and hence predisposed to a Chief of Staff system, but Secretary Johnson recently, in a speech, went so far as to characterize the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as the "quarterback" for national defense.

So what are we getting, despite the law? We are getting the equivalent in power, in prestige, and in duties a single chief of staff, regardless of the prohibitions of law.

And take the weird propaganda that America is getting stronger daily while the Secretary is sharply reducing the armed forces—the mass publicity on economy in the armed forces while sidestepping the question of injury done to the defense of the Nation through those reductions—the assertion that General Eisenhower is responsible for and approves this budget whereas he tells the Nation that the budget compels cuts below safe levels.

Add the beat-the-hell-out-of-Joe-Stalin speech of Secretary Johnson several weeks ago, at a time when our Nation has suffered a terrible defeat in China and is outweighed in almost every branch of the armed forces by Russia, as stated publicly, contrary to Mr. Johnson, by the Secretary of the Air Force. Then mix in the Secretary's charge that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have approved the budget as sufficient unto the hour, despite his own statement that the Joint Chiefs of Staff believe many billions more should be added.

And now the picture is adequately complete, although I could go on.

Members of the committee, that record is enough to warrant concern on the part of the House of Representatives.

That record is enough to make every Member of this body seek some restraint on the power of the Secretary of Defense.

That record is enough to cause the Committee on Appropriations to act without hesitation to plug the many holes in this defense budget which, I am convinced, exist simply to keep the budget low enough to make the economy record of the Secretary of Defense look politically defensible.

For my part, Mr. Chairman, for the integrity of the Congress, for a sound national-defense program, and for the future of our Nation, I hope that the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee will take the initiative and see that steps are taken to bring reason and mature judgment to the Pentagon; and, if that is impossible, that he will initiate legislative action to circumscribe the authority of the Secretary of Defense so as to keep the Congress, and the will of the American people, from being flouted at the caprice of any one man in the Department of Defense.

#### THE FEDERAL-AID PROGRAM

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, provision of funds for continuation of the

Federal-aid highway program is not a new matter to Members of Congress. This program was initiated in 1916 at a time when the country had almost no improved roads. It caused a marked acceleration in road improvement following the First World War and has been a major factor in creating the great system of highways that now reaches to every part of the country. This system is far from adequate for our present need, but, even with its many deficiencies, it is the greatest highway system in the world.

The policy of Federal aid to the States was adopted with the support of all political parties. It has produced great benefits in every section of the country and to every segment of the population. No Federal improvement activity is more general in its benefits or more firmly established by demonstrated value. In considering the provision of funds for continuing the work it is appropriate that we review what has been accomplished and examine the extent of the benefits.

When the Federal-aid plan was adopted there were few surfaced rural roads. Travel between cities by highway was rare and few people traveled more than 5 or 10 miles from their homes by highway. In 1921 Congress authorized the designation of a Federal-aid highway system and required that Federal-aid funds be concentrated on that system. It established the objective of connecting the population centers of the country with a system of two-lane roads which would also serve as the main arteries of a more extensive system reaching all productive areas.

At that time, it appeared to many that the country was embarking upon a task so large and costly as to be far beyond its means. Federal funds furnished an incentive toward the construction of highways that resulted in the purchase of more motor vehicles. Soon these vehicles were producing large amounts of revenue in registration fees and gasoline taxes. These funds were used to build still more roads. Through the twenties and thirties the process of more Federal aid, more roads, more motor vehicles, and more funds for still more roads continued. Highway transportation became an important factor in practically every phase of our social and economic life.

Prior to the war the 233,000-mile Federal-aid system had been improved in some degree throughout almost its entire length, largely with two-lane surfaces. The goal set in 1921 had been reached.

Highway use had become essential in the daily life of almost every citizen. Highways were used to transport farm products to market, children to school, products of mines and forests to places of use, by industry, and for the daily movement of millions of people to and from work.

Our tremendous effort in war production, one that far surpassed anything our enemies expected, was made possible only by a network of highways reaching all parts of the country. Highways were essential in building war plants and homes for workers, in the movement of workers to and from the plants, in feed-

ing the workers, in delivering materials to the plants, in the interchange of parts and partly processed material between plants, and in the rapid delivery of completed material. Throughout the war our main highways that make up the Federal-aid system teemed with war traffic. We hope that they will not be needed again for such traffic, but readiness in this respect is just as necessary as any other phase of national defense.

In the years before the war it became increasingly evident that there was need for much more highway improvement, according to standards greatly advanced beyond those used in the twenties and early thirties. Grades, curves, and surface widths designed for the early motor vehicle traffic were not suitable for the swiftly moving masses of modern vehicles.

The serious highway deficiencies became more conspicuous during the war period. Great service was rendered by highway transport, but it fell far short of being the best, most rapid, and cheapest service possible. Congestion, delays, and accidents on main routes, particularly in and near cities greatly hampered war traffic.

Influenced by knowledge of prewar highway inadequacies and experiences with war transport, Congress enacted the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1944 authorizing a broad program of improvement. The legislation was based on detailed surveys and studies made before the war, and was designed to meet highway needs of all kinds.

This and supplementary legislation authorized a total of over \$1,000,000,000 for primary Federal-aid highways, \$720,000,000 for secondary or farm-to-market roads, and \$600,000,000 for urban sections of the Federal-aid system.

The program was slow in getting under way at the close of the war. Disruptions caused by the war, high prices, and shortages of many kinds greatly delayed progress. These troubles gradually disappeared and during the past 2 years excellent progress has been made.

Statistics showing the accomplishment with postwar funds are impressive. Completed work includes 57,576 miles of road, 7,619 bridges, 232 grade crossings eliminated; 60 grade-crossing elimination structures reconstructed, and 464 grade crossings protected by warning devices. This work cost \$1,900,000,000, the Federal contribution amounting to \$960,000,000.

Although the 1950 construction season is not yet under way in most of the country, there are nearly 10,000 miles of Federal-aid highway classified as under construction—much of it inactive because of the season of the year—and over 4,000 miles have been approved for construction and should be placed under construction soon.

Summarizing these classes of work shows that the Federal postwar program has provided or will soon provide nearly 72,000 miles of road, 10,503 bridges, 405 grade-crossing eliminations, and 105 grade-crossing elimination structures as replacements at a total cost of \$2,900,000,000 with the Federal Government contributing close to \$1,500,000,000.

## PRIMARY FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

Let us examine the parts of this program and the character of work being done. The work of greatest general interest and service is that on the primary Federal-aid system, consisting of 233,000 miles of main highways. These are the main highways interconnecting cities of all sizes.

For the greater portion of the system two-lane highways will be adequate for a number of years to come. However, conditioning these two-lane roads for safe and expeditious movement of modern vehicles presents one of the major problems to be solved. A portion of the mileage needs widening to four lanes.

Because of the large accumulation of worn-out surfaces that cannot be maintained at reasonable cost, it is not surprising to find most of the State highway departments assigning Federal-aid funds to obtain the maximum of resurfacing and widening.

The problem of replacing surfaces on the primary Federal-aid system as they wear out and can be kept in use only through very high expenditures for maintenance is a serious one. For rural portions of the system the average age and the percentage expected to wear out in the next 10 years are as follows:

Average age in years:	
Low-type surfaces.....	10.6
Intermediate-type surfaces.....	8.2
High-type surfaces.....	13.5
Total .....	10.7
Percentage of mileage that will wear out in next 10 years:	
Low-type surfaces.....	93.5
Intermediate-type surfaces.....	74.0
High-type surfaces.....	44.0
Total .....	64.4

Large expenditures on these highways are inevitable, either for maintenance when it would be more economic to reconstruct, or for reconstruction. There is danger that lack of funds will create too much tendency toward resurfacing alone when correction of grades and curvature is necessary for complete modernization. In many States Federal aid furnishes the margin that makes possible full modernization on work that is done.

The \$1,080,000,000 in Federal funds provided since the war for primary Federal-aid highways has permitted the improvement of many highways that were difficult and dangerous to travel. Improvements have been completed on 18,357 miles of highway, 3,041 bridges, 182 grade-crossing eliminations, and 44 grade-crossing elimination structure replacements. This work cost nearly \$1,000,000,000, the Federal Government supplying approximately half. If we include projects now under construction and those approved for construction there results a total of 23,038 miles of highway, 4,214 bridges, 182 grade-crossing eliminations, and 67 replacements of obsolete grade-crossing elimination structures.

## URBAN HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS

No phase of the Federal-aid program meets a more pressing need than that of improving the main routes in and near cities. In past years State and Federal

highway funds have been concentrated mainly on the rural roads. The improvements made have generated great streams of traffic that encounter narrow, congested roads and streets as they approach our cities. There they must pass over routes laid out and built to accommodate the horse-drawn traffic of a city of the size that existed long ago. Narrow widths, parked vehicles, and conflicts with cross traffic cause intolerable delays and many accidents. Modern improvements at great cost are needed. For the largest cities the only possible solution is the construction of express highways.

The Federal Government has authorized \$600,000,000 in postwar funds for use on urban sections of Federal-aid highways. Availability of the funds has greatly stimulated action by States and cities in the planning of projects and in obtaining necessary funds. Every city wants all the improvements possible and wants them now. There is considerable pressure upon State authorities to spread available funds too thin in too many places rather than to make the necessary concentration of funds for permanent solution where congestion is worst.

The Bureau of Public Roads has emphasized the importance of applying Federal-aid urban funds to projects that will give a permanent solution where congestion and accidents are worst.

In and near Washington are some excellent examples of the kind of work being done or planned for practically every large city. A four-lane bridge across the Potomac nearing completion will eliminate the long columns of vehicles that back up every morning and afternoon on the approaches to the present bridge. The new Whitehurst elevated expressway leading to Key Bridge serves a free flowing traffic that once fought its way in a bumper-to-bumper column along M Street in a succession of starts and stops.

In my own State, Nebraska, there are two large urban projects that will greatly relieve congestion. In Grand Island a subway with a 48-foot pavement on one of the most heavily traveled routes is nearing completion. In Omaha, work will soon begin on the Q Street bridge, a magnificent and urgently needed structure that will cost close to \$1,000,000.

In the Federal postwar urban program 571 miles of highway, 398 bridges, 79 grade-crossing eliminations, and 8 replacements of obsolete grade-crossing elimination structures have been completed. This work cost \$275,000,000, the Federal Government contributing \$63,000,000. Work under construction or approved for construction will bring the totals to 852 miles of highway, 762 bridges, 174 grade-crossing eliminations, and 16 replacements of obsolete grade-crossing elimination structures.

Statistics of this kind are inadequate to describe the real value of the improvements being made. One has to spend an hour or more fighting his way through the congestion of a city with obsolete main arteries and then breeze through another city on an expressway at 35 to 40 miles an hour to appreciate what expressways mean. Their cost is great, often \$2,000,000 or \$3,000,000 or more per

mile but the highway cost per mile of vehicle travel is almost always less than similar costs on less heavily traveled highways.

## THE NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS

The Federal-aid Highway Act of 1944 authorized the designation of a national system of interstate highways not exceeding 40,000 miles in extent. This system has been selected by joint action of the State highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads. It is composed of the most important routes of the Federal-aid primary system. No special Federal funds have been provided for this system but since it is a part of the Federal-aid primary system it is being improved with funds provided for that system.

The action taken has had the desirable effect of centering attention on the most important routes of the Nation, both their rural and urban sections. The Bureau of Public Roads has cooperated with the American Association of State Highway Officials in the formulation of high standards for the system. A large portion of the notable projects in the Federal-aid program are on this system. They include many sections of divided four-lane highways, urban expressways, large bridges, and elimination of railroad grade crossings.

In my own State the most heavily traveled highway is included. This is the transcontinental route that passes through Chicago, Omaha, North Platte, Cheyenne, Salt Lake City, and on to San Francisco. Beyond North Platte there is a branch to Denver. The route is the main artery of east-west traffic across Nebraska and there is every reason for improving it to meet modern conditions at the earliest possible date.

A recent report by the Bureau of Public Roads, prepared with the assistance of the State highway departments, shows the large amount of work needed on the interstate system. To make the system adequate for present traffic and that expected in the immediate future will require the expenditure of \$11,300,000,000.

Nebraska estimates that 454 miles of the system in rural areas and 6.7 miles in urban areas require further improvement at a total cost of \$48,000,000.

## SECONDARY ROADS

The provision of \$720,000,000 in the postwar program for secondary roads has resulted in a more businesslike attack on the secondary road problem than ever before. Secondary roads are being better planned, better built, and constructed in greater quantity. The program has extended engineering aid and cooperation by the State highway departments into 2,990 counties or about 97 percent of the 3,070 counties.

A Federal-aid secondary system of 393,000 miles has been designated through cooperation of county, State, and Federal agencies. Scientific methods were used in the selection of routes, thus assuring improvement of roads most needed and of widest benefit. Benefits of the Federal funds have been widely distributed. Improvements have been or will soon be made in over 2,800 of the 3,070 counties in the United States.



Work already completed includes 38,600 miles of road, 4,180 bridges, 37 grade-crossing eliminations, and replacement of 8 obsolete grade-crossing elimination structures. The Federal Government paid approximately half of the total cost of \$640,000,000.

The totals of work completed, under construction and approved for construction are 48,000 miles of highway, 5,527 bridges, 49 grade-crossing eliminations and 22 replacements of obsolete grade-crossing elimination structures.

Reports from all parts of the country show the great value of the improvements being made and the advantages of State technical assistance in planning and directing the work. The program has included a surprising number of roads serving highly productive agricultural areas that were of more than average cost because of natural obstacles. In past years many such roads have been badly needed but could not be built because of lack of funds. Examples are roads across swamps, on causeways across lakes, and through mountainous areas.

One of the best examples of benefits derived is found in my own State. Cherry County in Nebraska is in the sand-hill country where the native grasses produce sleek cattle and the sand produces terrible travel conditions. Sand-hill trails to the ranches, even when partly stabilized with straw or topsoil, limit average speed to 10 or 15 miles per hour. When snow falls practically all travel ceases. In recent years State and Federal secondary road funds have been used to convert a sand trail across the county to an all-weather highway. As one rancher puts it, "improved roads remove much of the fear of being unable to secure help, supplies, or medical attention because of transportation barriers." The road across Cherry County was of great value in the severe winter of 1948-49. It was quickly cleared of snow by State forces and used as a main artery in movement of snow-removal equipment and supplies to the areas east and west. Where cattle were formerly driven long distances from the ranch on the way to market they are now picked up by trucks from corrals along the road.

#### IMPORTANCE OF FEDERAL AID TO NEBRASKA

To fully understand the benefits of the Federal-aid program it is necessary to go into some particular State and study the highway needs and the importance of Federal aid in meeting these needs. Nebraska is an excellent example for such study. Highways are of the greatest importance to the people of the State in making use of its resources. It is important to the people of other States that Nebraska have good highways since the meat and other foods that it produces feed many people beyond its borders and streams of traffic from east and west flow across the State.

Delivery of livestock to the big markets at Omaha and Sioux City, Iowa, is necessary for a large portion of Nebraska producers. Well-fattened stock must be transported from ranch and farm without suffering from hunger, thirst or other discomfort that will cause them to lose

weight and the producer to lose profit. It is a decided advantage for the producer to make delivery on short notice and sell on a favorable market. These factors have led to a continual growth in the proportion of livestock delivered by highway. The accompanying table shows this marked trend and also the remarkable growth in the total deliveries:

*Livestock receipts and percent of "drive-in" receipts at Omaha, Nebr., and Sioux City, Iowa*

OMAHA				
Year	Cattle and calves	Percent drive-in	Hogs	Percent drive-in
1937.....	1,459,375	56.0	1,109,682	75.9
1940.....	1,328,163	72.2	2,061,508	68.5
1945.....	1,670,037	74.7	1,802,257	62.2
1948.....	1,628,146	74.1	2,331,447	84.6

  

SIOUX CITY				
Year	Cattle and calves	Percent drive-in	Hogs	Percent drive-in
1937.....	700,443	70.2	827,170	91.4
1940.....	797,074	77.9	1,709,589	83.2
1945.....	1,528,504	70.5	1,355,357	82.7
1948.....	1,205,115	75.1	1,812,302	95.8

<sup>1</sup> The term "drive-in" designates livestock received other than by rail.

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Deliveries by highway in 1948 were about double what they were in 1946. The livestock trucks must have good road surfaces on which to operate. The existing surfaces have been a big factor in raising production to its present level.

Nebraska has 105,000 miles of highways of all kinds, including city streets. Of this mileage, 71,800 miles or nearly 70 percent is still unsurfaced and the condition of the surfaced roads is by no means adequate for present traffic. A comprehensive study of Nebraska road and street needs was made in 1948 by Nebraska State authorities. The cost of meeting the needs on the three major road systems was found to be as follows:

State highways.....	\$259,000,000
County roads.....	120,000,000
City and village streets.....	86,000,000
Total.....	465,000,000

In addition to these construction requirements the people of the State must continue to maintain the existing highways.

The urgency of the needs and their great cost present a perplexing problem to the people of the State. Since there are only 13 people to each mile of highway it is not an easy matter to obtain the needed revenue. Yet, since the State depends mainly on agriculture and stock raising for its prosperity, it must have good highways for these operations.

The Nebraska Department of Roads and Irrigation reports that during the 16-year prewar period 1926-41 inclusive the State spent on an average of \$7,500,000 annually for State highway improvements. Due to increased costs and improved design made necessary by increased traffic and heavier loads, a mile of road today costs at least double what it did during the 16-year period.

Almost everything purchased in building a highway costs double what it did before the war. Our State engineer tells me that the highway department purchased 2,600,000 gallons of gasoline in

1937 which cost 6.83 cents per gallon, exclusive of tax. In 1949 2,700,000 gallons were purchased at 12.05 cents per gallon, exclusive of tax. Gasoline is costing 76 percent more than it did before the war.

If progress on highways is to be kept at the prewar level at least \$15,000,000 must be provided for highways. Action by the State legislature increased the gasoline tax from 5 to 6 cents, effective in May 1949. The additional highway revenue and continuation of Federal aid will permit the State to just about equal the prewar progress. This will be far below a satisfactory rate, but we can take some satisfaction in the recovery of lost ground.

Without Federal aid the situation would have been far worse. Nebraska has been apportioned nearly \$40,000,000 in Federal postwar funds. This substantial sum and the necessity of matching have furnished the incentive toward providing more State revenues and increasing the size of the road program. Many major improvements are being made in our highways to serve the ever-increasing number of motor vehicles and intensity of use by the heavier vehicles. Postwar Federal-aid funds have been used to complete over 1,400 miles of highway. Additional projects programmed with available funds or in a more advanced stage will bring the total to nearly 2,500 miles. This is a substantial achievement.

Compared with total needs the progress is not yet satisfactory but it does represent a marked improvement. Federal aid is a necessity to the State if it is to go forward rather than backward.

#### COORDINATION AND RESEARCH RESULTING FROM FEDERAL AID

The policy of Federal aid to the States has resulted in marked benefits other than the actual construction of many miles of highway. It has brought together the highway officials of all of the States and the Bureau of Public Roads to discuss common interests and problems. The degree of uniformity that exists on our highways is largely attributable to this factor. The Nation has benefited through the common effort in the designation of all of our major highway systems and in the production of reports on the condition of these systems that have been used as a basis in the determination of national highway policy.

A large part of the Nation-wide cooperative effort is through the American Association of State Highway Officials, organized in 1914 to foster adoption of Federal aid and to discuss and plan operations. This cooperation has resulted in the adoption of high standards for the various highway systems, specifications for materials, methods of testing, methods of construction, and numerous manuals for use in design. These products have become the standards for American highway practice and are widely used throughout the world.

As a guide in administering the Federal-aid program and also for use in developing standards of the Association of State Highway Officials, the Bureau of Public Roads has conducted extensive

physical research. It has continuously studied the characteristics of various materials and their most effective use in construction, the effect of vehicles and weather on highway surfaces, and the behavior in service of various types of construction. Work is done at the research station at Arlington, Va., in field tests at selected locations, and in cooperation with the States on Federal-aid projects. The kind of soil on which a highway is constructed has great influence on the life of the surface. Good soils permit economies in construction. Poor soils such as clay require more substantial surfaces. The Bureau has developed scientific methods of surveying soils, testing them, and applying the information in design and construction. This work has been of particular importance in the construction of low-type roads with local materials.

Many different types of road surface are now constructed with tar and asphalt with far greater success than was attained 20 or 30 years ago. Results from laboratory studies and field experiments have been applied to improve the qualities of high-type pavements and to make possible the construction of low-type roads with materials close at hand.

As a result of many discoveries concerning the characteristics of cement and other materials that go into concrete, the strength and durability of concrete roads and bridges have been greatly increased.

In various sections of the country there have been road failures because of the chemical content or other characteristics of materials. Sometimes the cause is a combination of material characteristics and climatic effects. The trained specialists of the bureau study such failures, make laboratory tests to determine the cause and devise methods of avoiding failures.

One of the most important investigations has been to determine the forces that the wheels of motor vehicles apply to road surfaces and bridges, and the effect of these forces on the surface or structure. The information derived has been essential in the enactment of laws regulating the weights of vehicles to avoid excessive damage to highways and in the design of road surfaces and bridges to withstand legal loads.

No one knows with any accuracy the return that has been made from expenditures for physical highway research but, with each State spending many millions of dollars annually for highways, it is certain that the small Federal expenditure has produced a big return in better highways.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations of the House has given its answer to millions of people throughout the length and breadth of this land of ours who are crying for reduced taxes and for reduced living costs. The answer, Mr. Chairman, seems to be to "let 'em cry."

Against the enormous expenditure of \$42,400,000,000 recommended by the

President of the United States, of which \$24,400,000,000 is contemplated in the requests passed upon in connection with this bill, the committee has effected a reduction in expenditure amounting to \$204,000,000.

That is less than 1 percent of the over-all total recommended. It amounts to \$1.35 per person in the United States.

The average American today is paying more than one-quarter of his income to the tax collector. The average American is squeezed between inflated prices, on the one hand, and sky-high taxes, on the other hand. The Nation is being driven down the road, by taxes and constantly increasing debt, to bankruptcy and dictatorial government.

The answer suggested by your committee in this bill is a reduction in spending of \$1.35 per person.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has taken credit for a reduction in expenditure of \$979,000,000. Upon analysis, however, this claimed reduction largely disappears. It is a mirage—now you see it, now you do not.

If we examine this claimed reduction closely, we find in the first place—and this is not an inclusive figure—that at least \$380,000,000 of the total claimed reduction is of a character which cannot be counted upon. I say this because the items involved depend for their size, in the last analysis, not upon committee decisions but upon the law.

I have in mind such apparent reductions as are included with respect to veterans' pensions, with respect to veterans' readjustment benefits with respect to the Railroad Retirement Board, with respect to the Civil Service Retirement Fund, and with respect to hospital-construction grants.

There may be further items, but there are at least \$380,000,000 of claimed reductions which cannot be counted upon.

In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, the committee seems to have claimed an increase in income of \$395,000,000 at one point and of \$125,000,000 at another point, both because of anticipated increase in postal rates.

The total increase anticipated by the President was \$395,000,000, and, as a practical matter, the only step in that direction up to date is favorable action by the House on a bill contemplating an increase of \$125,000,000. The maximum that can be claimed therefore in this connection is \$125,000,000 instead of \$520,000,000.

If we take the \$380,000,000 of claimed reduction that cannot be counted upon, and allow \$125,000,000 increase for postal revenues, but take off the other \$395,000,000, we have a total of \$775,000,000 which, deducted from the over-all claim of \$979,000,000 leaves us as a maximum reduction in expenditure that can be counted on \$204,000,000.

That, as I have already indicated, is equivalent to a reduction of \$1.35 per person in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress must do what the committee has failed to do. The Congress must eliminate waste and extravagance in the reckless requests for expenditure which have been submitted

to the Congress by the President. The Congress must heed the cries of the people for less spending, for lower taxes, for lower living costs, and for the preservation of what is left of the dollar.

America must remain strong in this time of world crisis, and to remain strong America must remain solvent. We cannot possibly measure up to our tremendous obligations at home and abroad while floundering in a sea of red ink.

Mr. Chairman, we are confronted by an unparalleled national debt. The direct debt which we usually refer to approaches \$256,000,000,000. That means a debt of about \$6,400 for every family of four in America. If we include contingent obligations, obligations in respect to which the Federal Government has a secondary liability, the over-all debt approaches \$430,000,000,000, or \$10,750 for every family of four in America.

We are confronted also with a further deficit some 3 months hence of between five and six billions of dollars.

We are confronted with a tax burden of between five and six times the tax burden prior to Pearl Harbor.

We are confronted by the fact, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has pointed out, that the maximum revenues in sight for fiscal 1951 amount to only \$37,300,000,000.

That is the important figure to be kept in mind throughout the consideration of this bill, Mr. Chairman. It is in order to consider appropriations against that over-all figure that the omnibus appropriation bill has been adopted this year for the first time.

Against this background, Mr. Chairman, against these revenues of \$37,300,000,000, the President has submitted to the Congress the largest peacetime appropriation request in the history of the country, carrying with it, as I have said, an anticipated over-all expenditure of \$42,400,000,000.

If that expenditure is made, it means a further deficit in fiscal 1951 of \$5,100,000,000, and a further increase in our direct national debt up to somewhere around \$266,000,000,000.

You will find the over-all expenditure to which I have referred included in three separate items in the committee report. First, there are the items of expenditure specifically included in this bill amounting to \$23,423,000,000. Second, there are the items of expenditure which are to be met out of prior-year appropriations and revolving funds amounting to \$7,079,000,000. Third, there are the items of expenditure not considered at all in this bill, such as requirements for the Senate, permanent appropriations, expenditures out of non-appropriated funds, expenditures for various items of foreign aid, and expenditures involved in new legislation that is proposed, amounting to \$10,955,000,000. The over-all total is \$41,459,000,000.

You will find the first two items in a table on page 6 of the committee hearings. The third item is in a table on page 7 of the committee hearings. A



further break-down of item 3 is in another table that has been presented to

the committee in this connection. I shall insert all three tables, under leave

to extend my remarks, at this point in the RECORD:

## I

## Analysis of estimated expenditures for the fiscal year 1951

Organization unit	Budget estimates		Recommended in bill		Bill compared with budget estimate	
	Appropriations in this bill	Expenditures in 1951 from appropriations in this bill	Appropriations	Revised estimate of expenditures in 1951 from appropriations in this bill	Appropriations	Expenditures
Legislative branch (excluding the Senate)	\$65,296,396	\$53,540,003	\$56,822,450	\$46,015,553	-\$8,473,946	-\$7,533,450
The judiciary	24,113,700	24,956,526	23,580,165	24,376,526	-553,535	-580,000
Executive Office of the President	10,492,553	9,712,053	9,947,553	9,252,053	-545,000	-460,000
Independent offices	8,149,421,777	7,801,784,288	7,629,304,944	7,532,261,888	-520,116,833	-269,522,400
Federal Security Agency	1,635,083,600	1,459,548,159	1,591,784,590	1,418,438,159	-43,299,010	-41,110,000
General Services Administration	861,883,194	749,471,696	836,126,434	724,009,696	-25,756,760	-25,462,000
Housing and Home Finance Agency	47,000,000	46,009,632	23,400,000	22,629,632	-23,600,000	-23,380,000
Department of Agriculture	806,278,446	701,354,465	764,032,701	664,470,555	-42,245,745	-36,883,810
Loan authorizations	(610,000,000)	185,130,000	(520,350,000)	168,130,000	-(89,650,000)	-17,000,000
Department of Commerce	782,419,000	759,059,847	725,429,000	703,803,847	-56,990,000	-55,256,000
Department of Defense:						
Military functions	13,025,000,000	9,957,043,330	12,822,182,300	9,815,503,330	-202,817,700	-141,540,000
Civil functions	834,867,500	564,382,500	632,620,000	429,644,500	-202,247,500	-134,738,000
Department of Interior	669,251,505	524,532,029	621,634,130	488,605,629	-47,617,875	-35,926,400
Department of Justice	147,425,800	157,603,960	144,230,000	134,645,160	-3,195,800	-2,938,500
Department of Labor	220,014,700	175,938,771	208,873,100	173,270,771	-11,441,600	-2,668,000
Post Office Department (payable from general fund of Treasury)	554,607,000	554,607,000	401,500,000	401,500,000	-153,107,000	-153,107,000
Department of State	230,077,397	167,321,355	217,651,297	161,166,455	-12,428,100	-6,154,900
Treasury Department	576,548,600	519,317,664	545,605,000	494,109,064	-30,943,600	-25,208,600
District of Columbia	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000		
Bill total	28,651,781,168	24,403,321,978	27,266,403,664	23,423,832,918	-1,385,377,504	-979,489,060
Estimates of 1951 expenditures out of prior year appropriations, working, transferred, and revolving funds		7,079,776,516		7,079,776,516		
Items not considered in this bill <sup>1</sup>	11,592,751,053	10,955,658,912	11,592,751,053	10,955,658,912		
Budget total	40,244,532,221	42,438,757,406	38,859,154,717	41,459,268,346	-1,385,377,504	-979,489,060

<sup>1</sup> Represents budget estimates of anticipated appropriations and expenditures for the Senate, foreign aid, permanents and indefinites, proposed legislation, nonappropriated funds, etc.

## II

The amounts shown at the foot of the foregoing table as "not considered in this bill" are enumerated as follows:

	1951 appropriations	1951 expenditures
Proposed legislation (1950)		\$78,500,000
Proposed legislation (1951)	\$4,452,316,000	2,356,696,400
Nonappropriated funds		2,086,949,973
U. S. Senate	12,486,891	12,334,155
Expenses, occupied countries	350,000,000	196,000,000
Mutual defense assistance (liquidation of present contract authority)	500,000,000	100,000,000
Reserve for contingencies	211,969,631	170,800,000
Permanent and indefinite appropriations	5,949,018,531	5,842,953,384
1951 supplementals under existing legislation	116,960,000	111,425,000
Total	11,592,751,053	10,955,658,912

## III

Items not considered in this bill—Proposed legislation fiscal year 1950

	1951 appropriations	1951 estimated expenditures
Funds appropriated to the President:		
Assistance to economically underdeveloped areas (point 4)		\$55,000,000
Assistance to the Republic of Korea		20,000,000
Relief of Palestine refugees		
Department of Commerce:		
Civil Aeronautics Administration, construction of public airports, Alaska		3,500,000
Total		78,500,000

Items not considered in this bill—Proposed legislation fiscal year 1951

	1951 appropriations	1951 estimated expenditure
Funds appropriated to the President:		
Assistance to economically underdeveloped areas (point 4)	\$35,000,000	\$25,000,000
Assistance to the Republic of Korea	115,000,000	55,000,000
Disaster relief	5,000,000	5,000,000
Economic cooperation:		
Foreign assistance and other foreign aid	3,100,000,000	1,700,000,000
Mutual defense assistance	647,500,000	200,000,000
Independent offices:		
Expanded displaced persons program (Displaced Persons Commission)	2,640,000	2,430,000
Extension of rent control (Office of Housing Expediter)	16,000,000	15,000,000
Fair Employment Practice Commission	700,000	600,000
National Science Foundation	500,000	400,000
Selective service program (Selective Service System)	4,226,000	3,923,000
Federal Security Agency:		
Education of children on Federal properties and emergency areas	7,000,000	7,000,000
General aid for operating expenses, elementary and secondary schools	300,250,000	290,240,000
General assistance to college students	1,000,000	900,000
Expansion of vocational rehabilitation program	4,300,000	4,279,000
Surveys and emergency construction, elementary and secondary schools	45,200,000	22,190,000
Public Health:		
Aid to medical education	45,000,000	30,000,000

Items not considered in this bill—Proposed legislation, fiscal year 1951—Continued

	1951 appropriations	1951 estimated expenditure
Federal Security Agency—Continued		
Public Health—Con.		
Increased aid to local public health services	\$5,000,000	\$4,500,000
Health services for school children	35,000,000	25,000,000
Extension of public assistance programs	250,300,000	200,280,000
Increased grants to States for maternal and child welfare	9,500,000	6,930,000
Housing and Home Finance: Cooperative housing for middle-income families	35,000,000	35,000,000
Agriculture: Administration, Commodity Exchange Act	780,000	700,000
Commerce:		
Civil Aeronautics Administration: Construction of public airports, Territory of Alaska		
Bureau of Public Roads: Forest highways, Alaska	2,888,000	2,888,000
Inland Waterways Corporation	3,000,000	3,000,000
Defense:		
Department of Defense: Military functions	131,722,000	70,000,000
Department of the Army: Civil functions, Corps of Engineers, St. Lawrence seaway and power project	6,000,000	4,000,000
Interior:		
General investigations, research, and utilization of salt water, Bureau of Reclamation	500,000	500,000
Baltimore-Washington Parkway (National Park Service)	3,000,000	2,000,000
Post Office: Proposed postal rate increase	-395,000,000	-395,000,000

*Items not considered in this bill—Proposed legislation, fiscal year 1951—Continued*

	1951 appropriations	1951 estimated expenditure
Justice: Civil rights program.	\$300,000	\$740,000
Labor:		
Expansion of unemployment insurance program:		
Administration and re-insurance.....	12,525,000	12,373,400
Unemployment compensation payments to Federal workers.....	13,500,000	13,365,000
Industrial safety program.....	6,000,000	5,973,000
State: Contribution to international organizations.....	2,485,000	2,485,000
Total.....	4,452,316,000	2,356,696,400

*Items not considered in this bill—1951 estimated expenditures from nonappropriated funds*

	1951 appropriations	1951 estimated expenditures
Independent offices:		
Export-Import Bank of Washington.....		\$47,800,000
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....		1,128,466,241
Tennessee Valley Authority.....		18,936,000
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....		35,327,411
Department of Agriculture.....		912,875,421
Department of Defense.....		129,000,000
Department of the Interior.....		26,400
Department of State.....		390,500
Total.....		2,086,949,973

<sup>1</sup> Excess of receipts over expenditures.

*Items not considered in this bill—foreign aid fiscal year 1951*

	1951 appropriations	1951 estimated expenditures
Funds appropriated to the President: Mutual defense assistance.....	\$500,000,000	\$100,000,000
Department of Defense: Government and relief in occupied areas.....	320,000,000	178,000,000
Department of State: Government in occupied area of Germany.....	30,000,000	18,000,000
Total.....	850,000,000	296,000,000

*Items not considered in this bill—Reserve for contingencies*

	1951 appropriations	1951 estimated expenditures
Total as per budget estimate.....	\$200,000,000	\$175,000,000
Budget amendments:		
Legislative.....	-73,375	-----
Department of Agriculture.....	-1,600,000	-1,900,000
Department of Interior.....	+245,000	-----

*Items not considered in this bill—Reserve for contingencies—Continued*

	1951 appropriations	1951 estimated expenditures
Budget Amendments—Con-		
Department of Commerce.....	-----	+5600,000
Department of State.....	-\$2,902,594	-2,900,000
Atomic Energy Commission.....	+16,300,000	-----
Revised total.....	211,969,631	170,800,000

*Items not considered in this bill—Permanent and indefinite appropriations, fiscal year 1951*

	1951 appropriations	1951 estimated expenditures
Total carried in table.....	\$5,949,018,531	\$5,842,953,384
Major items are—		
Interest on the public debt.....	5,625,000,000	5,625,000,000
Refunds and draw-backs (customs).....	16,000,000	16,000,000
Alaska Railroad special fund.....	14,100,000	12,100,000
Payments to States under Mineral Leasing Act.....	13,500,000	13,500,000
Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities.....	110,000,000	54,047,000
Other (miscellaneous).....	96,314,531	48,402,384
Interest on refunds of internal revenue receipts.....	74,104,000	73,904,000

*Items not considered in this bill—1951 supplemental under existing legislation*

	1951 appropriation	1951 estimated expenditures
Agriculture:		
Eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals and poultry.....	\$19,550,000	\$16,500,000
Research facilities, animal industry, Agricultural Research Administration.....	4,500,000	3,500,000
International wheat agreement (reimbursement to Commodity Credit Corporation).....	82,385,000	82,385,000
Commerce: Civil Aeronautics Administration: Claims, Airport Act.....	1,000,000	600,000
Defense: Panama Canal: Maintenance and operation.....	4,000,000	3,500,000
Interior:		
Management of lands and resources, Bureau of Land Management.....	50,000	40,000
Management and protection, National Park Service.....	250,000	200,000
Indian resources management, Bureau of Indian Affairs.....	125,000	100,000
State: Consolidation of building space in New York.....	5,100,000	4,600,000
Total.....	116,960,000	111,425,000

The over-all total of \$41,459,000,000, of course, includes the claimed reduction of \$979,000,000.

The third table, Mr. Chairman, is particularly interesting, because it includes the items proposed for foreign aid and for new legislation, amounting to some \$2,400,000,000.

Further savings are, of course, possible in this field. It is obvious, however, that further and substantial reductions must be effected in the bill before us if we are even to approach a balanced Federal budget.

I have here, Mr. Chairman, a rather interesting table in respect to Federal receipts and expenditures over a 40-year period. The table shows that during the period from 1910 to 1949 there was a Republican administration in Washington for 15 years and a Democratic administration for 25 years. It shows the Republicans had control of the House 15 years and the Senate 19 years and that the Democrats had control of the House for 25 years and the Senate for 21 years.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, under the Democratic administration there were deficits in 18 out of the 25 years, and of course, there are further deficits anticipated of between five and six billion dollars this year and between four and five billion dollars in the next year.

If we eliminate the eight war years, 1917 to 1919 and 1942 to 1946 the result is 10 deficit years out of 17 years controlled by a Democratic administration, with two more deficits estimated, in comparison with 15 years of control by a Republican administration with only three deficit years.

A comparison of results of fiscal operations during years of control of the House by each party shows a similarly striking picture. Twenty-five years of control by the Democrats resulted in 19 deficit years with a twentieth, and twenty-first deficit a practical certainty in the current and succeeding fiscal years. Eliminating the war years results in a Democratic House showing of 11 deficit years out of 17 with 2 more to follow. On the other hand, the 15 years of Republican control of the House produced only two deficit years.

Twelve successive years of Republican control, 1919 through 1930, resulted in 11 successive reductions in the national debt as a result of annual surpluses. The per capita debt was steadily reduced from \$242.54 in 1919 to \$131.51 in 1930. The next 11 years of control of the House by the Democrats, 1931 to 1941, produced annual deficits and a constant increase in the per capita debt from \$135.45 in 1931 to \$367.57 in 1941.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I shall include the table at this point in the RECORD:



Fiscal year	Majority party <sup>1 2</sup>			Millions of dollars				Per capita debt		Fiscal year	Majority party <sup>1 2</sup>			Millions of dollars				Per capita debt	
	House	Senate	Administration	Receipts	Expenditures	Surplus or deficit (-)	Public debt				House	Senate	Administration	Receipts	Expenditures	Surplus or deficit (-)	Public debt		
1910	Republican	Republican	Republican	676	694	-18	1,147	\$12.41		1931	Democrat	Republican	Republican	3,190	3,652	-462	16,801	\$135.45	
1911	Democrat	do	do	702	691	11	1,154	12.29		1932	do	do	do	2,006	4,741	-2,735	19,487	156.10	
1912	do	do	do	693	690	3	1,194	12.52		1933	do	Democrat	Democrat	2,080	4,681	-2,601	22,539	179.48	
1913	do	Democrat	Democrat	724	724	0	1,193	12.27		1934	do	do	do	3,116	6,745	-3,629	27,053	214.07	
1914	do	do	do	735	735	0	1,188	11.99		1935	do	do	do	3,800	6,591	-2,791	28,701	225.55	
1915	do	do	do	698	761	-63	1,191	11.85		1936	do	do	do	4,116	8,540	-4,424	33,779	263.79	
1916	do	do	do	782	734	48	1,225	12.02		1937	do	do	do	5,029	7,806	-2,777	36,425	282.75	
1917	do	do	do	1,124	1,978	-854	2,976	28.77		1938	do	do	do	5,855	7,031	-1,176	37,165	286.27	
1918	do	do	do	3,665	12,697	-9,032	12,244	117.11		1939	do	do	do	5,165	9,027	-3,862	40,440	308.98	
1919	Republican	Republican	do	5,152	18,515	-13,363	25,482	242.54		1940	do	do	do	5,387	9,305	-3,918	42,968	325.59	
1920	do	do	do	6,694	6,403	291	24,299	228.23		1941	do	do	do	7,607	13,766	-6,159	48,961	367.57	
1921	do	do	Republican	5,625	5,116	509	23,977	220.91		1942	do	do	do	12,799	34,289	-21,490	72,422	537.80	
1922	do	do	do	4,109	3,373	736	22,963	208.65		1943	do	do	do	22,282	79,702	-57,420	136,696	1,001.46	
1923	do	do	do	4,007	3,295	712	22,350	199.64		1944	do	do	do	44,149	95,572	-51,423	201,003	1,455.67	
1924	do	do	do	4,012	3,049	963	21,251	186.23		1945	do	do	do	46,456	100,397	-53,941	258,682	1,853.21	
1925	do	do	do	3,780	3,063	717	20,516	177.12		1946	do	do	do	43,038	63,714	-20,676	269,422	1,907.62	
1926	do	do	do	3,963	3,098	865	19,643	167.32		1947	Republican	Republican	do	43,259	42,505	754	258,286	1,793.23	
1927	do	do	do	4,129	2,974	1,155	18,512	155.51		1948	do	do	do	42,210	33,791	8,419	252,292	1,721.29	
1928	do	do	do	4,042	3,103	939	17,604	146.09		1949	Democrat	Democrat	do	38,246	40,057	-1,811	252,770	(?)	
1929	do	do	do	4,033	3,299	734	16,931	139.04		1950 <sup>3</sup>	do	do	do	37,763	43,297	-5,534	(?)	(?)	
1930	do	do	do	4,178	3,440	738	16,185	131.51		1951 <sup>3</sup>	do	do	do	37,306	42,439	-5,133	(?)	(?)	

<sup>1</sup> Calendar year.<sup>2</sup> Inasmuch as the Congress and administration in a given calendar year are largely responsible for the fiscal condition of the ensuing fiscal year, it is logical to charge the results of fiscal operations accordingly.<sup>3</sup> Estimate.

Source: Financial statistics, 1910 through 1947, Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury, June 30, 1948; 1948 and 1949, the Treasury daily statement, June 30, 1949.

Mr. Chairman, in considering the overall situation which confronts us the experience of the Canadian Government immediately to the north of us in the postwar years is striking and interesting.

In each postwar year the Canadian Government has succeeded in effecting tax reductions so that the total tax reduction in the five postwar years today amounts to almost \$1,300,000,000, equivalent in American terms to \$17,400,000,000.

It is also interesting to note that in spite of these five annual tax reductions, the annual tax receipts have varied very little.

The greatly increased economic activity resulting from additional purchasing power in the hands of consumers provided an enlarged tax base in addition to providing consumers with goods and services they could not have had without tax reductions.

Here is how the tax-reduction programs have affected revenues:

In the year 1945-46, with a tax reduction of \$300,000,000, the revenue dropped \$100,000,000.

In the year 1946-47, with a tax reduction of \$266,000,000, there was a revenue increase of \$183,000,000.

In the year 1947-48, with a tax reduction of \$265,000,000, there was a revenue drop of only \$5,800,000.

In the year 1948-49, with a tax reduction of \$92,000,000 there was a revenue drop of only \$10,500,000.

In the year 1949-50, with a tax reduction of \$376,000,000, there is an estimated revenue drop of \$148,000,000.

Thus, after five successive tax reductions totaling \$1,300,000,000 per year at the present time, the estimated 1949-1950 revenues are only \$81,000,000 less than in the last war year of 1944-45.

If this country had kept pace with Canada in tax reduction, such reductions

would total \$17,400,000,000 annually by now. Actually they total about \$11,000,000,000. In other words, we need a further cut of about \$6,500,000,000 to catch up with Canada.

This is not all, Mr. Chairman. The Canadian Government has not only reduced taxes in every year. It has also reduced its national debt each year, beginning with the first full peacetime fiscal year 1946-47. At the end of 1949-50 the net national debt will have been reduced \$1,700,000,000, or 12.9 percent.

Had our Government done equally well since the end of fiscal 1946 our national debt would be reduced by \$34,700,000,000 by the end of fiscal year 1950, and at that time would be around \$234,000,000,000 instead of around \$256,000,000,000, with the trend down instead of up.

On the basis of current population estimates of 13,500,000 for Canada and 150,000,000 for the United States, the per capita debt at the end of fiscal 1950 will be \$866 in Canada and \$1,723 in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I am advised that the Canadian budget has been, is, and is expected to be in the next fiscal year, in balance with surpluses in each instance.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that Uncle Sam can afford to take a lesson in the fiscal field from our neighbor to the north.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to repeat in passing, that the rate of expenditure at the present time has reached an all time peacetime high. During 8 years under President Woodrow Wilson the average annual expenditure was \$5,800,000,000. During the first 8 years under President Roosevelt, before World War II, the average annual expenditure was \$8,400,000,000. The average expenditure under President Truman during his first 4 1/4 years in office amounted to \$45,000,000,000.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that the over-all expenditure which the President recommends in the coming fiscal year of \$42,400,000,000 amounts to more than \$8,000,000,000 in excess of expenditure during the fiscal year 1948, which ended only 21 months ago.

Of that increase of more than \$8,000,000,000, \$5,300,000,000 is in respect to domestic expenditure. It is expenditure recommended outside of foreign aid, outside of national defense, outside of veterans' programs, outside of servicing the national debt.

That increase of \$5,300,000,000, Mr. Chairman, amounts to almost a 100 percent increase over expenditure for the same purposes in the fiscal year 1948 and it exceeds by some \$200,000,000 the anticipated deficit under the President's recommendations for the fiscal year 1951.

Mr. Chairman, it is impossible to blame the contemplated unbalanced budget for fiscal 1951 solely on the cold war.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I wonder if the gentleman has the figures to show how much of that increase is due to the salary increases for Federal employees that have been voted by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do not have the exact figure in mind. Of course, the main difficulty in all this expenditure increase comes from authorizations which are voted on the floor of the Congress.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I think the figure for which the gentleman from

Virginia asks would be interesting, but I think it would not be accurate unless there were added to it a statement of what reductions in unnecessary employment forces and duplications could have been made in order to absorb the additional salaries, which I think was in the mind of the Congress when they made the additions. It was so stated on the floor, that these additions could be made if the agencies themselves would absorb them without adding to the budget. I find that very few of the agencies made very much effort to do that, so much so that in the subcommittee on which I serve they have pretty well been instructed to do it, if they will not do it of their own volition.

Mr. GARY. I have here the figures for the pay acts that were adopted last year alone. It cost \$700,000,000. Of course, it was not my purpose to enter into a discussion at this time as to the propriety of those increases, because Congress debated that question last year and decided it. But I do want to call attention to the fact that the Congress cannot continue to vote for increased costs, and expect the budget to remain the same. In addition to this \$700,000,000, we authorized last year approximately \$1,000,000,000 a year for low-cost housing. We have authorized various other items. If the Congress continues to vote expenditures of that nature, we must expect the budget to rise.

The total, I understand, is \$2,350,000,000.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. What was that figure?

Mr. GARY. The total cost of the new legislation enacted at the last session of Congress.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. But the cost of the salary increase was \$700,000,000?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I think that is a very interesting figure, because just a rough calculation in my mind would indicate that if the agencies of the Government had let their lapses stand without filling them, they would have absorbed that figure almost to the dollar without any additions.

On the other hand, I think the gentleman should give us the figures of further additions to the bureaucracy, the additions to Government employment over and above what the agencies had a year ago or 2 years ago which I think you will find very interesting; and further his own distinguished Senator from Virginia can give him the figures and tell him how we could have saved more than that money.

Mr. GARY. The facts are we have increased the compensation of postal employees alone \$740,000,000 since 1945. I think it should be said in all fairness that there had been no increases whatever for a number of years prior to 1945. Those employees had to pay the additional cost of living just as everyone else, and we had to take that into consideration. What I am interested in bringing out is that we should not get up on the floor of the House and vote for these

mandatory increases and then when the budget comes before us, talk about how much the President of the United States has increased the budget, or how much any other agency of the Government has increased the budget, because such increases have largely been through the action of the Congress itself in legislating that these increases shall be made.

When the increases are made, necessarily they must be reflected in the budget which is presented to the Congress.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I still insist that there should be some statement made regarding the necessity or advisability of the increases in employment during the same year which, in my mind, is the explanation for the increased budget rather than the increase in salary.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman from Virginia should remember, too, that plan No. 18, which has been sent to us means another increase in compensation of Federal employees. Do not forget that one, and that came down to us from the President. It did not originate here.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. GARY. That came to us from the White House, but it is my understanding it originally was the recommendation of the Hoover Commission.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know, but you have taken that label and pasted it on all the quack remedies.

Mr. GARY. I personally do not think the Hoover Commission report is a quack report. I think it is a very excellent report. I do not think it is altogether perfect. I do think it is a very excellent report, however.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not say it was a quack report. I said that you had taken the Hoover label or the President has, and pasted it on a lot of quack and cracked remedies. That is what I said.

Mr. GARY. The recommendation that the gentleman just mentioned—was not that a recommendation of the Hoover Commission?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, it is just like a lot of other things. Like the one I have in my hand here, to do away with the office of the general counsel and to do away with the wages and hours Administrator and putting it in the Department of Labor. Those things are not in the Hoover report.

Mr. GARY. The one the gentleman referred to at first is in the report. The transfer of the employees from the postal department to the General Services was recommended by the Hoover Commission.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, but there is nothing said there about increas-

ing their pay, that is, letting the postal employees take their schedule of pay over to the general services and also grab off additional days of leave.

Mr. GARY. That automatically follows the transfer, does it not?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, why do we have this tremendous request before us at this time? Why is it so difficult to eliminate waste and extravagance?

There are many reasons. I want to stress two of them which are important, to my mind, at this time.

In the first place, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, the necessary leadership by the President of the United States is lacking.

We shall never put this Government on the efficient and economical basis, to which the people of this country are entitled, until the President of the United States, whoever he may be and whatever party he may represent, concludes that this result is vital in the national interest, and puts his back into securing it.

We shall never put this Government on a proper basis as long as the Harry Hopkins' creed of spending and taxing controls Executive thinking.

We all know by experience, Mr. Chairman, the difficulty of effecting economy in the face of opposition by the executive branch of this Government, particularly in the light of the enormous propaganda set-up which it has at its command at this time, a set-up which, as many will recall, the Bureau of the Budget testified only a few years ago amounted to some 46,000 persons, either part time or full time, working at the expense of the people of this country.

We all know equally well how readily substantial economy could be effected if the President of the United States really desired economy.

The so-called Hoover Commission has pointed the road to savings estimated at between three and four billion dollars.

Mere directives to the heads of departments and agencies by the President could effect very substantial economies.

The President, of course, plays a major part in respect to new legislation that is submitted to the Congress, and its cost.

The President could readily control the size of the Federal pay roll.

We have today over 2,000,000 people on that pay roll. All impartial opinion seems to be agreed that the pay roll is grossly overstaffed. The Hoover Commission has pointed out that there is a turn-over in that pay roll of about 25 percent in each and every year. In other words, some 500,000 people on the pay roll in any given year leave their positions for one reason or another.

All that is necessary is to let nature take its course and to rigorously control reappointments when vacancies occur. If that policy were pursued, if vacancies were filled only when absolutely necessary, it would not be long before the swollen pay roll would be down to the size that it ought to be, in terms of efficiency and economy, and no one would



be removed against his will from the pay roll.

These are but examples. The Nation is entitled to the leadership and cooperation of the President in the interest of efficiency and economy at this crucial time.

In the second place, Mr. Chairman, the hands of the Eighty-first Congress were tied when the Democratic leadership of the House allowed the expert bipartisan staff of investigators of the Appropriations Committee to be thrown out of the window at the first meeting of the committee in 1949.

No Appropriations Committee under present conditions can function properly without a skilled staff of investigators.

I sat for a time this year as a member of the Armed Forces Subcommittee. I sat there as a substitute because one member of that subcommittee was compelled to be away from Washington.

There were five Members of this House entrusted with the enormous responsibility of passing upon some \$15,000,000,000 worth of requests in terms of appropriations or contract authorizations, or more than one-third of the entire budget.

No expert staff of investigators was available. It was possible only to interrogate the officers in charge of the several divisions of the armed services and to draw the best possible conclusions.

I did not attend the executive session at the end of the hearing to mark up the bill, but I think I can picture the subcommittee, confronted by the all-important question of national defense; confronted by the realization that in the event of trouble they would be responsible for any unjustified cuts; arriving at the conclusion that it was impossible to make any cuts unless justified beyond any shadow of doubt; and finally recommending a reduction of \$141,000,000, or less than 1 percent of the total request.

Mr. Chairman, I am not reflecting upon this subcommittee or any one of its members. They are all personal friends of mine. They are all able Members of this House, desiring economy where economy is possible. The point I make is that no subcommittee can possibly do the job properly in respect to this enormous request for funds, and make intelligent cuts, unless it has the facts.

Personally, I am for every cent that is necessary for national defense. I never want to go through again the experiences some of us went through in 1940 and 1941, when we knew from figures confidentially presented which could not be made available to the public, that this country was lamentably unprepared for World War II.

The situation was so bad that General Marshall subsequently in an official report stated, if I recall correctly, that aside from plans we were in worse condition prior to World War II than we were in 1917 prior to World War I.

This country accomplished miracles between 1940 and 1945. We were lucky to have 5 years. We will not have 5 years next time.

It may be that some adjustment is necessary in certain respects in reference to national defense appropriations. General Eisenhower's views are certainly entitled to every consideration.

Personally, I think that aid for our major ship construction yards in the near future is vital.

The situation in these yards today is deplorable. Employment is deteriorating rapidly. There is little or no naval construction in view, and commercial construction is practically ending. There will be only eight commercial ships under construction in our major yards on the Atlantic coast in the calendar year 1951. Only one will be under construction in the calendar year 1952, and I am advised that two of these yards will have to close in the near future unless something is done to help the situation.

This is not a matter for consideration in connection with this bill. There is a bill, however, which has been pending before the Committee on Rules for months. It was introduced with a view to meeting this situation. A long-range program of construction must be encouraged if we are to take care of our skilled staffs of workers at essential shipyards, which have proved themselves to be vitally essential from the standpoint of national defense.

There is another item in this bill which I think is important in this connection. I refer to the proviso in the independent offices chapter of the bill which states:

*Provided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for, nor any obligation made for, the payment of an operating-differential subsidy for any number of ships in excess of the number of ships receiving such subsidy as of January 1, 1950.*

Mr. Chairman, those concerned maintain that the present wording of this proviso would in effect cancel all operating subsidies provided in the 1936 Merchant Marine Act, designed to assure an adequate merchant marine equipped to serve as auxiliaries in time of war.

They point out also that the proviso is unnecessary inasmuch as adequate control over the situation is maintained through the annual appropriation of funds for operating subsidies.

I believe this proviso should be deleted or so amended as to meet the objections that have been made to it.

The fact remains, however, Mr. Chairman, that the over-all request for national defense, whether you consider it \$15,000,000,000 or \$20,000,000,000, is an enormous sum of money.

The fact also remains, Mr. Chairman, that over the years our armed services have been notoriously wasteful in the handling of funds.

Generally speaking, it is fair to say I think that our military and naval officers are not trained to assess cost. On the contrary, and probably rightly so, they are trained to obtain results regardless of cost.

I am confident that an expert bipartisan group of investigators, such as was available in the Eightieth Congress, could

have found ample opportunity for very substantial savings without in any way impairing the national defense within the over-all figure of \$15,000,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, under present conditions, the Bureau of the Budget is responsible primarily to the President of the United States. What the President desires the Bureau of the Budget supports. What he does not desire the Bureau of the Budget opposes.

It has been made responsible to the Chief Executive on the theory that it is the executive branch which does the spending of money, and that, therefore, it should have the assistance of the Bureau of the Budget in determining its recommendations for spending.

To me it has always seemed that the purse strings of the Federal Government were deliberately placed in the hands of the Congress; that the executive branch spends only what the Congress authorizes; and that, therefore, the Bureau of the Budget or some equivalent organization should be available and responsible to the Congress in its determination of what sums it will authorize to be expended.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, in the absence of the Bureau of the Budget an investigating staff for the Appropriations Committee of this House becomes vitally necessary.

This need was recognized for years by Members on both sides of the aisle and after many years authority to appoint such a staff was finally obtained in the Reorganization Act of 1946.

In the succeeding year a start was made in setting up such an organization.

We had, as the members of the committee well recall, a staff of some 10 permanent investigators with FBI and General Accounting background. We had in addition some 25 part-time members on the staff, including outstanding leaders in the accounting profession, and in the research profession throughout the length and breadth of this country, men drawn from both major parties who willingly gave of their time because of their desire to contribute to the maintenance of the solvency of the Nation.

Those investigators, going directly into departments and agencies, were able not only to make exhaustive reports of the greatest value, but to bring back to the various subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations figures which could be relied upon.

As the result, as the Members will recall, the budget was balanced both in fiscal 1947 and in fiscal 1948, for the first time since President Roosevelt entered the White House in 1933. Rescissions or reductions were effected to the extent of \$9,800,000,000, debt reduction was made possible to the extent of \$7,000,000,000, and tax reduction was afforded to the extent of \$4,800,000,000, one-half of the tax relief going to those with incomes of less than \$5,000; 7,500,000 people with low incomes being taken off the tax rolls entirely.

That, Mr. Chairman, was a major accomplishment for the investigating staff,

it was a major accomplishment for the Committee on Appropriations of the House, it was a major accomplishment for the Congress as a whole.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, despite this record at the very first meeting of the Committee on Appropriations in January of 1949, after control of the Congress had passed from the Republicans to the Democrats, this staff was completely abolished.

It was no mere change of personnel. The whole principle behind the staff was discarded and we were advised that we were to return to the former policy of investigation when necessary, by one executive agency of another executive agency.

That method, Mr. Chairman, had been tried and found wanting. It will always be found wanting, in my judgment, as long as human nature is what it is.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman will recall that that action was taken in the full committee of the Committee on Appropriations with no opportunity to debate whatsoever and with no defense on the majority side of the action taken. I am referring to the then majority side, which was a year ago last January. To me the action in doing away with that trained investigating staff has cost and will cost the taxpayers of America a good many hundreds of millions of dollars. If the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] would care to do so, I would like to hear him defend that action on the floor.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do want to make it plain that I am not accusing the gentleman from Virginia of fomenting that particular action, but it did come from the majority side of the full committee and took away from our full Committee on Appropriations the eyes that we need to cut this budget.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Does the gentleman know that this committee at the present time is using the staff of the FBI for that purpose, which staff is recognized as one of the best investigating staffs in the entire world?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Virginia that any staff that has been used—and I have personally seen no results that have amounted to anything in the last 2 years—has been of a temporary character, employed from time to time as may be required, under the authority given the chairman at the meeting to which I referred.

That is a very different proposition from having a staff that is primarily responsible to the committee and to the Congress, such as we had before, and, in my opinion, will never produce the desired results.

As the gentleman from Minnesota has pointed out, the action was taken under

the leadership of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], by the unanimous vote of the Democratic members at that meetings over the unanimous opposition of the Republican members, and without permitting a word of debate or a single question by any Republican Member present.

I predicted at the time that the action would cost the people of this country billions of dollars, and I think that prediction has already been fulfilled.

The action, in my judgment, killed the one best hope of an intelligently balanced budget.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I submit that essential economy is difficult, if not impossible, first, because of the lack of necessary leadership by the President of the United States, and second, because this Congress rendered itself largely impotent by the denial of essential staff.

Sometime ago, Mr. Chairman, a distinguished American made the following statement:

We are going down the road to statism. Where we will wind up no one can tell. But if some of the new programs seriously proposed should be adopted, there is danger that the individual, whether farmer, worker, manufacturer, lawyer, or doctor, will soon be an economic slave, pulling an oar of the galley of state.

These are not the words of any Republican.

They are the words of a lifelong Democrat who has rendered distinguished service under the New Deal as a Member of Congress, as United States Senator, as a member of the Supreme Court, as wartime Director of Economic Stabilization, and as Secretary of State.

They are the words of an old friend and colleague known well to many of us here, Mr. Justice Byrnes.

Mr. Chairman, the elimination of waste and extravagance is vital if America is to avoid national bankruptcy, dictatorial government, and the loss of precious liberties.

A strong and solvent America is vital at this time in the world's history, not only in the interest of America itself but in the interest of the entire civilized world.

We should not forget, Mr. Chairman, the words of the great Communist leader, Lenin, when he said, "Some day we will compel the United States of America to spend itself into destruction."

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SADLAK. I desire to commend the gentleman on his able, factual, and documented presentation. It occurs to me, after listening to the gentleman's expressions, which indicate great research and familiarity with his subject, that there are many items in this appropriation measure which, because of the fact that they are fixed items, cannot in any way be tampered with in this appropriation. However, after listening intently to the gentleman, it seems to me we have only one alternative in proceeding on this appropriation measure,

namely, to endeavor to make as many small cuts as are possible; and, by a number of small cuts pyramided, attain a goal where the small cuts will then in effect become substantial cuts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I hope as we go along with the consideration of this bill it will be possible not only to effect small cuts but to effect large cuts.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman referred a few moments ago to the superior staff of experts for investigation that was available to the Eightieth Congress.

I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not know that during the second session of the Eightieth Congress there were five references in committee reports to investigations made by the experts. Whereas, during the second session of the Eighty-first Congress there were six references to such investigations in the committee reports.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I will say to the gentleman from Virginia I do not have the list with me now. On a previous occasion, however, I inserted in the RECORD a compilation of the more important investigations made by the experts during the Eightieth Congress. I think if the gentleman will refer to that list he will be very much surprised, not only by the number, but by the far-reaching importance and thoroughness of the investigations made at that time.

Mr. GARY. I have a list of committee references to investigations conducted by the committee's staff.

There were five references to these investigations in the committee reports of the Eightieth Congress, second session. One, the supplemental independent offices report. That was on the Veterans' Administration and Army and Navy pensions.

Another reference was in the Interior report. That referred to the accounting systems in the departments.

Another was in the State, Justice, Commerce and Judiciary report which related to Department services. Another reference was to the Weather Bureau.

In the Treasury Department there were references to the Bureau of Internal Revenue and typewriter purchases.

In the Eighty-first Congress, second session, the references were as follows: In the Commerce report to the CAA investigation, to the CAB investigation, and to the Bureau of Standards.

In the Agriculture report, to the investigation on entomology.

In the Interior report, to the Road Commission's claims.

In the Eighty-first Congress, the Civil Service Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Atomic Energy Commission.

It would appear from this list that the Committee on Appropriations has been more zealous in referring to and making its investigations in the Eighty-first Congress than in the Eightieth Congress.



Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. In order that the gentleman from Virginia, who is usually so well informed, may be better informed on this matter, I shall insert at this point in the RECORD a copy of my previous remarks listing the principal investigations made during the Eightieth Congress:

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—STAFF AND ORGANIZATION

I have been a member of the committee for many years, I have long considered it the most important committee in the House of Representatives. Because of present conditions in the world both at home and abroad I consider it has a tremendous responsibility.

Over the years, Mr. Chairman, it has been the opinion of Members on both sides of the aisle belonging to this great committee that that committee could only do its work properly, in a manner worthy of the confidence of the House and of the country, if by some means or other it could obtain a competent, expert, permanent staff, a staff equipped to make investigations and analyses when the occasion demands.

As I stand here and look back over the years I can hear Member after Member standing in the well of this House, Members from both sides of the aisle, making an appeal for that kind of staff.

We finally got the necessary authority for that staff, Mr. Chairman. It came in the so-called reorganization bill approved August 2, 1946.

That bill provides that "Each standing committee of the House and Senate, other than the Committee on Appropriations, is authorized to appoint by majority vote not more than four professional staff members \* \* \* on a permanent basis, without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office."

That bill goes further, Mr. Chairman. It provides that the Committee on Appropriations in the House and in the Senate is authorized to appoint such staff as each committee by majority vote shall determine to be necessary and to conduct such studies and examinations of the organization and operation of any executive agency as it may deem needed.

In other words, each Appropriations Committee was authorized to have an unlimited staff, subject only to the judgment of the committee, and essential appropriations.

In my judgment this was one of the most important and most helpful features of the entire Reorganization Act.

What happened, Mr. Chairman? Not long after the Reorganization Act a beginning was made on a real staff for this great committee. Some 8 or 10 permanent employees were appointed, with contemplated expansion. The regular staff was augmented by a group of consultants from private enterprise, who gave generously of their time in the interest of economy. A small allowance for expenses was permitted, and the time and transportation of these individuals was a donation to the cause of good government.

In this manner, skills far beyond the ability of the Government to provide were made available to the committee.

Numbered among these men were 10 of the country's outstanding accountants, picked as a special committee by the American Institute of Accountants. All of these men were, of course, certified public accountants of national standing, and one is currently president of the New York State Certified Public Accountants Society.

The remaining men were business executives and research assistants of considerable standing, many of whom were, and are continuing to be, used as consultants by various

Government agencies which have learned to value their counsel and assistance.

There was no partisanship in the activity, as the group was very representative of both political parties, although all were united on behalf of Government economy.

In addition to the day-to-day work of the staff, the major studies completed were as follows:

First. An exhaustive study of the then Federal Public Housing Administration, extending into nine States. The study exposed many vicious illegal practices and was the basis of corrective legislation. As a result, the agency undertook a real reorganization, eliminating frills, waste, and extravagance.

Second. A review of the Department of Agriculture budget for 1948, including all the bureaus and agencies of that Department, resulting in many recommendations of benefit to the Department. This review also encompassed a particular inquiry into the Rural Electrification Administration.

Third. A study of the Maritime Commission for both 1948 and 1949, which resulted in corrective legislation recovering for the Government hundreds of millions of dollars.

Fourth. Studies of the Veterans' Administration's requirements for both 1948 and 1949, which information has been the basis of a great deal of organizational correction. This study likewise went into the Federal hospital picture in great detail and has formed the basis of continued study by the Hoover Commission as well as the Veterans' Administration themselves.

Fifth. A study of the War Assets Administration for 1948.

Sixth. Continuing studies of the Department of the Interior for 1948 and 1949, including such technical subjects as an analysis of existing Federal power policy and including spot checks of the accounting systems in the various field installations, which were made available to the Department of the Interior and are currently the basis of accounting reorganizations.

Seventh. Detailed analyses of the operations of the United States Employment Service and the Bureau of Employment Compensation which materially assisted in the reorganizations of those agencies and will no doubt be very helpful in the 1950 hearings. This particular investigation required a great deal of field study and resulted in the exposure of especially flagrant violations of the Hatch Act in the State of Tennessee. This information has been forwarded to the Department of Justice and to the United States Civil Service Commission who are currently investigating the matter, with a view to dealing with the offenders.

Eighth. A detailed analysis of the operations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue which resulted in the location of widespread abuses and inefficiency. The report has been made available to the Secretary of the Treasury, and studies are now being made and many improvements instituted that were recommended in this report. As a corollary to this investigation, particularly flagrant violations of the Hatch Act in Massachusetts were uncovered. This information was likewise turned over to the Civil Service Commission and to the Department of Justice for their investigation.

The Civil Service Commission has cited for removal some twenty-odd employees in one Massachusetts office of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. I understand the Department of Justice still has the matter under consideration.

Ninth. An exhaustive investigation of the Department of State which likewise located many flagrant abuses of good administration, and also located a list of undesirable individuals with subversive connections who were

then employed by the State Department. Subsequent to the exposure, some 30 to 40 of these individuals were separated from the service. It is also interesting to note that many of the individuals mentioned in the original list were later questioned by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Tenth. A study of the Treasury Department budget for 1948 and 1949.

Eleventh. A study of the Army and Air Force budgets for 1948 and 1949, which formed a basis for rescissions approximating \$5,000,000,000 returned to the taxpayers by this committee.

Twelfth. A study of the budget of the Navy for the fiscal years 1948 and 1949, which likewise formed a basis for substantial monetary rescissions and appropriations reductions.

Thirteenth. An executive study on operations of the Government in the Territory of Alaska. It touches upon the activities of almost every Federal agency operating in Alaska and should be of great value to the committee in the 1950 deliberations.

Fourteenth. A report on the study of the subsistence procurement of Army for use in the 1950 hearings. The report indicates that corrected procedures can save tremendous sums of money.

These are only a few of the more important studies undertaken by the group. In addition, scores of comparatively minor studies were made of specific units of the Government.

The over-all result was that the committee was able to effect savings on rescissions detailed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of some \$9,800,000,000 in 2 years, making possible a balanced budget for the first time in 16 years, making possible a reduction in our national debt of some \$7,000,000,000, making possible a reduction in our tax burden of \$4,800,000,000, 71 percent of which went to those with incomes of less than \$5,000, some 7,000,000 persons being removed from tax rolls entirely.

It was a fine start, and I agree with the sentiment of a close friend of mine now on the majority side of this great committee, who said to me shortly after our return to Washington in January, that in his opinion the Republicans of the last Congress had made a fine start with this staff, and that his only criticism was that the staff had not been large enough.

Now, Mr. Chairman, you may be surprised, in view of this record, to know that this staff has been completely abolished. It has been abolished, despite the experience of years, despite the intent of the Reorganization Act, despite the splendid record that it made.

The staff has not only been abolished, it is not only a question of relieving those who served on the staff, the whole theory of a staff responsible only to the Appropriations Committee has been, for the time being, abandoned, and we have gone back to the old idea of asking one executive agency to please investigate the actions of another executive agency, whenever an investigation seems necessary.

Mr. Chairman, that plan has been tried. It is better than nothing. But as long as human nature remains what it is, it will never, in my opinion, get fundamental results. In fact it may tend at times to conceal rather than to disclose.

Real results depend on a permanent, non-political skilled staff, responsible to the Appropriations Committee and to that committee alone.

I want to pay my tribute, Mr. Chairman, to the work done by the staff of the Committee on Appropriations during the last 2 years. They made a splendid contribution to the Nation in terms of lower prices, in terms of lower taxes, in terms of a stable economy.

I want also to record for the RECORD, Mr. Chairman, my opinion that the action taken in abolishing the staff and certain other action taken in connection with the organization of the committee for this Congress is most unfortunate.

That action was taken contrary to the views of the minority members of the committee. In fact, it was taken without allowing any minority member of the committee the opportunity to question, to debate, or to offer to amend any one of a half dozen resolutions that were adopted in the full committee.

I regret the manner in which the action was taken. In my judgment, it was unworthy of the traditions of the great Committee on Appropriations.

I regret the action taken, because, in my judgment, it is likely to cost the people of this Nation literally billions of dollars.

I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the Eightieth Congress had investigations into every single department and almost every agency of the Government. As a result of this we were able to cut the appropriation bills which were reported to the House \$2,774,000,000 as against the proposed cut here of \$1,385,000,000.

Mr. GARY. Practically all of that was restored through supplemental and deficiency appropriations.

Mr. TABER. That is not correct.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 hour to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, since we are discussing the greatest peacetime budget in history, I feel we should have a quorum present instead of the apparent 50 or so Members on the floor.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RABAUT and Mr. TABER.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 14, noes 56.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas has made the point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

#### WHAT IS NEW IN WEATHER

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, every now and then someone tells us the climate is changing. Not many years ago a professional climatologist probably would have answered such a remark by saying there is no indication that significant changes are taking place in our climate now. Climatologists have always recognized the occurrence of variations in average weather conditions from year to year—warm winters, cool summers, and periods with below-normal rainfall. Unusually dry years led to the disastrous Dust Bowl conditions of the mid-1930's. Until recently most scientists in this field believed these fluctuations from year to year were averaged out in the long run, leaving little or no permanent change in climatic conditions in recent times. But now more comprehensive studies of temperature trends and recession of glaciers and the polar ice cap have led to a conclusion that perhaps the climate which contributes so much to our national economy and prosperity may not be the changeless and everlasting natural resource we have taken for granted. This is a subject of great concern to the public and it is reassuring to know that research workers in the fields of weather science and climate are devoting more attention to investigation of the stability of climate. Even small changes of a few degrees in temperature or a few inches a year in rainfall would seriously modify the agricultural and business activities of many flourishing communities situated in marginal climatic regions. It is necessary to know as far in advance as possible about the long-term trends in weather and climate so that suitable readjustments may be planned. Even now there are localities in the relatively dry parts of the Middle West where wheat farming is being exploited beyond the natural water resources of the area and in dry years that are sure to come sooner or later, we shall doubtless witness another Dust Bowl problem.

Even in the East where rainfall is usually adequate, we hear much about the water shortage in New York City and we find that serious consideration is being given to the possibility of supplementing natural rainfall by artificial rain making. I am informed that these possibilities have been exaggerated in many of the claims by so-called rain makers quoted in the newspapers. Although the United States Weather Bureau is very much interested in seeing a full investigation of the possibilities of increasing the rainfall by artificial means and although success in these efforts would be of inestimable value to the people in many parts of our country, it appears that such methods are likely to be rather limited in practical application and economic value. The trouble is you cannot produce rain economically by artificial methods unless there is adequate moisture in the atmosphere and in most cases when the conditions of moisture and clouds are favorable, nature itself provides the mechanism by which rain is formed. I understand there are occasionally special circum-

stances, such as the cases where clouds persist more or less continuously over the crests of mountains in winter time and the instances where shower-type clouds are on the verge of precipitation but upper air conditions are not quite right for their full development, and in such cases it would sometimes be possible to start precipitation by use of dry ice or other condensation nuclei. But these favorable instances are relatively infrequent and there is no reason to believe at present that artificial methods will provide a solution for water shortages in time of widespread drought. This shows why it is so important for our meteorologists to learn more about the fundamental natural controls of weather and climate.

During the recent war we heard much about research and development in meteorology and improvements in weather-forecasting services. Almost 5 years have passed since cessation of hostilities and I have again inquired into the activities and progress of the Weather Bureau. The war made the American people more weather-conscious than ever and the needs of agriculture and commerce have greatly increased demands for weather reports and forecasts. Moreover, the weather-reporting system on which our weather forecasts in the United States are based has taken on a world-wide aspect. It depends upon daily weather reports from stations in the Arctic and from weather-patrol vessels at sea, as well as from a vast network of land stations closely related by international cooperation. The reports from domestic and overseas stations contain not only comprehensive data of weather conditions measured on the ground or near the surface of the sea but also the conditions of air temperature, pressure, humidity, and wind at each successive altitude up to 40,000 or 50,000 feet and in some cases higher. All of this information is essential for diagnosis of the ever-changing structure of the atmosphere and its accompanying influence on the weather and climate we experience on the ground.

Our citizens should know more about this extensive system of international weather reporting which is the basis for the weather reports and forecasts we see each day in the newspapers or hear over the radio. The collecting center of the Weather Bureau in Washington now receives more than 25,000 reports of surface and upper air meteorological conditions by radio or wire every day. They come from all parts of the Northern Hemisphere and from some of the Southern Hemisphere. Many more are received by mail from countries in the Southern Hemisphere, the delay in transmission by this channel being no handicap for most climatological purposes. Since the weather south of the Equator does not immediately affect our weather in the United States the reports are not required by radio or cable for daily weather forecasting as is the case with conditions in the Northern Hemisphere where the interrelationships of weather are more direct. In the course of a year



it requires more than 15,000,000 different weather observations and reports to serve the needs of agriculture, aviation, business, and industry in the United States, and weather conditions differ so much from place to place and from day to day that about 300,000 different forecasts are needed each year to describe the different local weather conditions. During 1949 an additional 4,300 forecasts of flood conditions in various river valleys of the United States were issued by the Weather Bureau to enable the populace to take precautions against damage and loss of life by floodwaters. This flood-warning service has been improved and extended during recent years and is the best developed and one of the most interesting and valuable services of its kind anywhere. I shall say more about it a little later.

A handicap of the weather forecaster before the war was the lack of weather reports from the Arctic where cold waves that grip the United States in winter-time usually originate. Reports were very sparse also from many ocean areas where moist air masses which bring rain to this country have their source. The forecaster had to guess the nature of changing conditions in the Arctic and over the oceans in order to estimate the effects of air masses from these regions when they reached the United States. To some extent deficiencies in reports from these areas have now been corrected.

Through international cooperation with Canada and Denmark and with the assistance of the Air Force and Navy, the Weather Bureau now participates in the operation of joint weather stations in six widely separated localities in the far north. One of the stations is within 500 miles of the North Pole. Their reports of surface and upper air conditions transmitted daily by radio have contributed much to improvement in forecasts of cold waves, blizzards, and other severe weather conditions in our Middle West.

The meteorological station network over the oceans has also been improved as result of international cooperation. In the Atlantic the bordering maritime nations have joined together to support 10 weather patrol vessels. These ships also serve as navigational aids and for search and rescue missions for aircraft and ships in distress. Four of the stations are manned by the United States, two by Great Britain, one by France, one by Norway, and the other two jointly by Canada, Netherlands, and this country. The apportionment is based upon the relative volume of air traffic of the respective countries. In the Pacific where there is still a great expanse of water where weather observations are rarely, if ever, made, our weather maps are comparatively incomplete and the forecasting of weather, therefore less accurate. At present there are three station weather ships in the Pacific, all in the eastern half, maintained by the United States primarily as aids to aerial navigation.

Much of the progress in meteorology during the war was in the development

of apparatus and instruments. The radar has been adapted for use in detecting formation of destructive thunderstorms. It has been used also to locate and track hurricanes at distances of a hundred miles or more and it is being tested experimentally as a means of recognizing tornadoes before they come within a range of the regular weather observer's eye. Radar installations have been placed at three stations in the Middle West to serve as outposts for tornado warnings. In effect, they extend the "visual" range to distances of 75 miles or more with respect to heavy rainstorms. The three installations are at Wichita, Kans., Wichita Falls, Tex., and Norfolk, Nebr. Another interesting wartime development in meteorology is the use of seismographs to detect hurricanes while they are far at sea beyond the observation of vessels in regular ocean lanes. The microseisms produced by hurricanes and typhoons are not yet well understood and they do not occur every time hurricanes are present but frequently they are the only sign of a hurricane in some remote part of the ocean. Present evidence indicates that whenever microseisms of a particular type are recorded they point infallibly to existence of a hurricane.

Still another important device in modern weather analysis and forecasts is the rawinsonde perfected by the military services during the war. By means of a small radio set which transmits meteorological measurements and is tracked by a special type of radio compass, this instrument as it ascends with a sounding balloon gives for the first time a practical means for measuring the wind direction and velocity above the clouds by use of recording equipment installed on the ground. Because measurements of the upper winds are most important during periods of overcast sky and storminess the rawinsonde has added much to the accuracy of forecasting under certain conditions. This has reference in particular to prediction of the rate of movement of storms and preparation of maps of winds aloft for aircraft operations.

In 1941 the Weather Bureau established a new system of flood-warning service in northeastern Nebraska. This organization makes use of immediate reports from cooperative observers who serve without pay and go into action whenever rainfall passes a certain critical figure. The system is designed to furnish warnings in river valleys where heavy showers cause flash floods. Although this method has its limitations, it is the best means so far developed for providing a warning service for flash floods, and its success as the first of its kind has led to organization of similar cooperative networks in 20 other localities, one of which is the Potomac River Basin.

Flood-control projects of the Corps of Engineers and irrigation works of the Bureau of Reclamation call for extensive studies of meteorological situations which give rise to flood conditions. The weather conditions determine to a large extent the location, type, and magnitude

of flood-control dams and reservoirs for conservation of water. As one of the steps in its advancement of the flood-forecasting services for the country, the Weather Bureau during the past 2 years has been supported by Congress in establishment of six river forecast centers and one seasonal water supply forecast station. As an example of the responsibility of these centers, the Weather Bureau office at Portland, Oreg., issues river forecasts for about 100 localities in the area. During 1949 estimates for the country as a whole indicated that precautions against damage by flood as a result of timely and accurate forecasts prevented losses amounting to \$180,000,000 or more. The total losses by flood during the year were of course in excess of this, but they would have been greater by this amount if flood forecasts had not been available.

Naturally, the public is interested in the cost of maintaining the Weather Bureau. During the past 10 years appropriations to the Bureau have increased from about \$5,000,000 to almost \$25,000,000 per year. Perhaps half of this increase is the result of increased operating costs for salaries, communications, expendable sounding balloons, and similar items. The other half represents expansion of the Bureau due to the greatly increased uses of weather information in business and industry and especially the new requirements for accurate forecasts in agriculture and air commerce. The present cost is equivalent to about 18 cents per capita. Although it is impossible to place a dollar value on the lives saved as result of warnings issued by the Weather Bureau in advance of hurricanes, blizzards, and so forth, estimated at a minimum of several hundred lives each year, it has been shown by surveys that practical use of weather reports and forecasts in the agricultural and commercial activities of the country are worth more than a billion dollars each year. This represents a value in excess of \$7 per capita, a very good return on the investment.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, the one-package appropriation bill now before the House is supposed to give the Members of Congress and to the American people an opportunity to consider at one time the relationship between appropriations, expenditures, and revenues. If it will accomplish that purpose, it will obviously be a step in the right direction. However, from present indications and knowledge which I have obtained up to date I have serious doubts in my mind as to whether it will in reality accomplish the objectives that its sponsors had in mind.

I desire at this time to refer to a statement made by the President in his recent annual message to the Congress on the state of the Union. The President among other things stated:

Largely because of the ill-considered tax reductions of the Eightieth Congress the Government is not now receiving enough revenue to meet its expenditures.

You all heard that statement, and you heard the President make that statement time and time again, and you have heard it again on this floor and out on the political stump by those who adhere to the philosophy of the present occupant of the White House. You have heard them make that statement repeatedly, and you have heard the President and those who aid him in making that statement seek to place responsibility for his continuing budget deficits on the Eightieth Congress.

When we are faced with facts that are so clear, facts that anyone can get if they simply take the time to read the President's budget and the explanatory material that goes along with it, and when we are faced with a fiscal situation so dangerous, why not tell the people of America the truth? Why stand in the well of this House and repeat something that cannot be substantiated on the facts?

Now, let us get the facts. It will be recalled that in fiscal 1947 which began July 1, 1946, and ended June 30, 1947, the Treasury showed a surplus of \$800,000,000. In fiscal year 1948, which began July 1, 1947, and ended June 30, 1948, the Treasury showed a surplus of \$8,400,000,000. A Republican Congress was in charge of appropriation bills, and through the medium of reductions in appropriations and rescissions of appropriations previously made, the Eightieth Congress not only balanced the budget but has enabled the Treasury to show the surpluses to which I have just referred in fiscal 1949, which began July 1, 1948, and ended June 30, 1949. In the first year of the Democratic control of the Congress a deficit of \$1,700,000,000 was incurred. The projected deficit in the revised estimates of the President for fiscal 1950, the year in which we are presently operating, indicates a deficit of \$5,700,000,000 and in view of the recent drop in tax receipts indicated in reports that have recently come from the Treasury Department it is certain that the President will have to revise his estimates again and it may be that the deficit for 1950 instead of being \$5,700,000,000 may perhaps be six or seven billion dollars.

Now, the tax law has been vigorously assailed and condemned by the President and by the majority leader and by the distinguished orator from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER] who has repeatedly referred to it, and by numerous others, including the Vice President and many others I have heard speak on this subject. And, by the way, you Fair Dealers have been in control now of the first session of the Eightieth Congress, you have been in control since January 1950 of this session of Congress and despite your condemnation of the action of the Eightieth Congress in passing a tax-reduction bill not one of you has dared to offer a bill and bring it to the Congress proposing to repeal that action of the Eightieth Congress. Why do you not do that? You have complete control of the House Ways and Means Committee, you can bring in a bill here in 10 minutes if you

want to. If that law is so bad, if it is as bad as it has been pictured, if that action of the Eightieth Congress is responsible for your budget deficits, why have you not brought a bill in here to repeal it? Why do you continue to kid the American people? You are going to find out that they will not be kidded much longer because they have access to the facts.

What are they? That tax law of the Eightieth Congress became effective on April 2, 1948, and was made retroactive to January 1, 1948. The revised rates of withholding went into effect on May 1, 1948.

Fiscal 1948, which includes 6 months of calendar 1948, during which the new law was effective, shows that personal income tax collections—by the way it should be noted right here that the Republican tax reduction law only related to personal income taxes—were \$20,997,780,699. In fiscal 1949 personal income tax collections were \$18,725,152,438. Thus showing and indicating a net drop in personal income tax collections of \$2,272,628,261.

You recall that when that bill was brought before the Congress it was contended that if tax reductions were given to the people, and they had the right to spend some of their money themselves instead of letting the Government take it from them and direct how it should be spent, that there would be an upturn of business and the corporation income taxes would show a tremendous increase. That was the contention. What has happened?

Let us examine the corporate income taxes for the same period. Corporate income taxes for the fiscal year 1948 were \$10,174,409,834, and for 1949, after the passage of this infamous income tax reduction, as it has been called by my Fair Deal friends, who ought to know better, corporate income taxes rose to \$11,553,669,234, or an increase on the corporate income side of \$1,375,259,400.

Now, my friends, let us not talk in half-truths in this very eventful and fateful hour. Let us tell the truth, and I defy anyone in or out of Congress to dispute the figures which I have quoted. Thus, it will be seen that in spite of the recession which was getting under way when this income tax law was passed—and everyone knows that—which the Revenue Act of 1948 unquestionably halted, corporate income tax receipts increased in the amount just referred to exactly as was contended by the advocates of that tax-reduction law in the Eightieth Congress. Thus it can be seen that the tax-reduction bill passed in the Eightieth Congress placed additional money in the hands of the people of America to spend themselves and relieved thousands of little-income people from paying any tax at all, and the result is that it stimulated American business so that the net loss of income tax receipts, both corporate and individual, was only \$893,368,861, yet the deficit in that year was \$1,700,000,000.

Now Mr. Truman, now Mr. Majority Leader, now Mr. Christopher from Mis-

souri, now all of you people who have been making such rash statements as you have been making, placing the responsibility for your budget difficulties upon that tax-reduction bill, why not tell the truth? We will admit that there was some reduction in the over-all tax picture, but in no sense can it be said that that tax-reduction bill is responsible for the budget difficulties.

What about the deficit you face today? The President in his annual budget message to this Congress specifically stated that income-tax payments were maintaining a constant level, and yet we are faced in fiscal 1950 with a budget deficit of over \$5,700,000,000.

There can be just one answer to this whole situation. There is just one reason why we are going in the red, and that is because we are spending just too much money. We do not have the courage to put first things first and apply the reason you would apply to your own business and your own life and your own family and seek to make reductions where they are possible without interference with the general services of the Government, and try as near as possible to bring this budget into balance.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. I do not know whether or not I understood the gentleman correctly a moment ago, but is it correct that the tax bill passed by the Eightieth Congress did not increase or affect corporate income-tax rates? Did I understand the gentleman correctly?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; I so stated.

Mr. JACOBS. Then if you collected a billion and a third more dollars in corporate income taxes after that went into effect, that meant the corporations made a whole lot more money.

Mr. KEEFE. Exactly as was contended. It was the contention here in this Congress, and it was contended in Canada and by all other people that have given any thought to this tax question, that if you will put some money in the hands of the people and let them spend it for the purposes for which they want to spend it, business will be stimulated. As the result, the Government will not lose revenue, but will gain on the corporate side.

Mr. JACOBS. It looks as if the corporations gained, too.

Mr. KEEFE. I have no doubt they did. I am not questioning that. So what? That is the very argument—that corporate income will go up and business will be better if you give the people an opportunity to spend some of their money, instead of having a lot of bureaucrats and Government agencies take it away from them, and take away from them a large clip for their own expenses before it gets out into circulation. It is the velocity of spending, as everybody knows, that creates business and determines whether or not profits will be up or down.

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



Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is not the whole enterprise system of America based on the proposition that profits must be made and income must flow before we gather any revenue whatsoever?

Mr. KEEFE. If we are to maintain the capitalistic system of America—let us call it by its right name. We use the term "democracy" in its widest sense, but the thing that has given this country the position it has is the capitalistic system. Inexorably interwoven with that system is the profit motive. Whenever you take the profit motive away, you are approaching socialism, or its first cousin, communism, make no mistake about that.

If I had the time, I would like to point out, and I shall take just a moment to point out that every person I know of in your party and in the other party that is seriously considering the picture that faces the country today realizes that if we continue down the path we are going, 25 years from now, 30 years from now, 40 years from now, or sooner, perhaps, we will have completely changed our concept of government, and, in fact, have realized a socialistic system in America.

It took them a half a century in England to do exactly the same thing as we are doing here. They did not realize many of the steps they were taking when put together in the total mosaic would spell socialism. After 50 years of effort they have a socialistic government in Great Britain. We are taking that same course here and traveling at a very rapid rate as every intelligent and sensible and nonpartisan thinker on that subject in America is willing to concede.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Is it not true, history shows each and every time personal income taxes have been reduced, revenue to the Government has increased and that happened not only as a result of the tax-reduction bill of the Eightieth Congress, but as a result of every tax-reduction bill?

Mr. KEEFE. That was true after the last war. The distinguished gentleman who now occupies the chair, and who is a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and my distinguished friend, the chairman, sitting in the Chamber well know, that when they advocated tax reduction they did so on the theory that it would stimulate business—and it did. I am certain, may I say to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, if you will report a bill which will eliminate some of these nuisance taxes which are a stumbling block to business, and which are keeping people from buying furs and jewelry and other items, you will not have to be talking about what you are going to do up in New England to take care of the industry in Connecticut or Rhode Island.

Business will revive and, in fact, you will not lose any real revenue.

Mr. Chairman, I want to devote my-devote myself in the balance of the time I have remaining to a subject which is very near and dear to me, and the one on which I spent most of the years of my legislative experience. That subject is the field of public health. May I say to you I have had a hundred Members of Congress come to see me personally and call me on the telephone and ask the question, "What have you done to the public-health program?" They have stated that they have received letters from governors, from this party and that party, and from this organization and from that organization, demanding that they be told what the Committee on Appropriations has done to the public-health activities of this Nation.

I want to answer some of these questions so that you will be able, intelligently, to answer those same questions.

At the outset, I want to emphasize good health is the greatest asset any individual can possess. Is there anyone here who will deny that statement? Good physical health in the people of America is the greatest asset we have. A vigorous, alert, healthy citizenry is the greatest asset of any nation, and we in the United States can be justly proud of the remarkable advances that have been made in the field of public health. As a result of the constant painstaking efforts of thousands of men and women engaged in scientific research and the application of approved principles we have seen a steady decline in the mortality rate as a result of the incidence of infectious and contagious diseases, such as smallpox, diphtheria, yellow fever, typhoid, malaria, and many other diseases. We have seen a gradual accumulation of scientific knowledge resulting in the constant discovery of new and better means of controlling diseases which formerly resulted in high mortality rates.

Scientists and researchers working in the field of sanitation, nutrition, and hospital and medical services, have seemingly performed miracles in extending the average expectancy of life here in the United States. The Biblical expectancy of life of 70 years has practically been reached by the female population of America today and the male population is only 2.3 percentage points behind that. Think of it. The normal expectancy of life in the time of Andrew Jackson and Alexander Hamilton was only 28 years. This year in America a baby born tomorrow has a normal life expectancy of over 67 years, if it is male, and nearly 70 years if it is female.

Think of that, my friends. Take it home with you to the doubting Thomases who say that money expended for research, hospital facilities, and sanitation is money thrown down the drain.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. TACKETT. The gentleman mentioned the other day about a cut in the appropriation for hospital construction.

Mr. KEEFE. I am coming to that right now. I am going to discuss it.

As a result of the constant increase in the age groups over 60 years of age, special attention is now being given to those diseases that take a terrific toll of human suffering and life. I refer especially to cancer, diseases of the heart, and circulation. I also refer to the amazing, outstanding increase in the number of people afflicted with mental illness. These diseases, together with infantile paralysis, rheumatic heart, multiple sclerosis, peptic ulcers, and a number of other diseases affecting sight and hearing are now being attacked on a wide front in order that our rapidly growing aged population may end their days in peace and comfort, and contribute to the general welfare by living the normal expectancy of life safe from these terrible scourges.

The work of the National Cancer Society, the American Heart Association, the National Mental Hygiene Association, the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, the Damon Runyon Cancer Fund, and many other public and private philanthropies and organizations working throughout the country have turned the thinking of the American people to ways and means that must be found to ultimately eliminate these great destroyers and cripples of human beings in the future.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, dealing with public-health questions—and I have been a member of that committee now for more than 10 years—I have been pleased to devote the major part of my time, as most of you know, to knowing and understanding those problems.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I want to say that having sat next to the gentlemen from Wisconsin upon that subcommittee for 6 years, it is my firm conviction that no man in America, at least in the Congress of the United States, has done as much for public health in its various branches, through his interest in such things as trying to do away with cancer and heart disease, and such, as has the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. I am very thankful to the gentleman for those more than kind remarks.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I can go even further than the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and say that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has gone right into my home to help me in a personal situation, and I shall never forget him for all that he has done for me and mine.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I believe always in the back of the gentleman's mind is the desire to help people who are ill. He deserves an enormous amount of appreciation.

Mr. KEEFE. I may say to my friends in the House that the thing that has kept me in the Congress has been the interest which I have had in this field of public health. Were it not for the fact that there is a tremendous amount of work to be done, a tremendous amount of work to be done in the face of opposition from people who do not know and understand the problem, I am frank to confess that I would not be attracted to service in this House much longer. But I say to you that this matter of public health and the part that the Congress of the United States can play in fostering those great programs that we now have in operation promise such astounding and unheard of results that if I get no other compensation in this life at all, it will be enough compensation for me to have played a small part in attempting to make the services that are now available to a few available to all the people of America.

If I have my way and Congress supports the attitude of the chairman of this subcommittee and my own attitude we will see to it that this program we have developed over the last 10 years is not destroyed capriciously, but that it will be maintained at a level that will permit it to continue to function in the direction that Congress has indicated that it wants it to function and not be curtailed and limited, if you please, because some one man does not believe that research is worth while.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Will the gentleman explain to us just exactly what this bill does to this program?

Mr. KEEFE. I am going to get to it right at this moment.

There is a demand in certain parts of the country and in some quarters for the establishment of some sort of system of public health insurance, and it is directly associated to and made attractive to the public through the promise that if such a program is established it will be able to more effectively bring to all the people the benefits of advanced scientific knowledge and improved hospital and medical service. It is this natural allurements that is being overplayed, in my judgment, by those who advocate compulsory national health insurance. I think we can agree that the ultimate objective of any program whether it be compulsory or voluntary, is to achieve a wider distribution of hospital and medical services and to bring to a greater number of our people the prospects of better health. In considering this ultimate objective I have long felt that we should not merely denounce the proposal of Mr. Oscar Ewing and those associated with him, those who clamor for compulsory national health insurance without being able to suggest a solution for an admitted problem by tendering a

better program more in keeping with the American system of liberty and freedom, and free from the withering and destructive influence of bureaucratic or socialistic control. To suggest an alternative proposal it is not necessary to present a detailed and utterly new concept of medicine and hospital care. In my judgment, the answer to the Ewing proposal is to be found in the over-all progress that is being made in the hospital construction program, in the expanded research program, in the development of State and local and public-health services, in sanitation, in pollution-control development, in aids to develop better medical schools, clinics, laboratories, and facilities; in the development of more and better doctors and researchers, and in the constant education of the public so that they will avail themselves of these facilities before it is too late.

Oh, how often we see the case of an individual believing himself to be in good health, with no previous notice, toppling over in his chair. We have seen that repeatedly manifested in this Congress. A visit to a properly trained doctor or technician might have put that person under care and possibly have avoided the calamitous situation resulting from his sudden and unexpected passing. It is a human experience that each and every one of us sees every day of our life; and I, for one, intend to try to do something about it. You are going to have a chance to vote to do something about it before this bill finally is passed.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us today the proposed 1951 budget of the Public Health Service. At this time, we must subject every proposed expenditure to the closest scrutiny to ensure ourselves that the funds must be spent and that they will contribute amply to the health, well-being, and economy of the Nation. We have a corresponding obligation to protect standards of health and to avoid being "penny-wise and pound-foolish."

I wish to apply these principles specifically to the construction program of the Public Health Service. This program falls into two interlocking parts which at first glance seem unrelated. All medical research—fundamental and applied—is worth undertaking and deserves support from public funds only because it will—sooner or later—relieve human suffering. Research findings are valuable to human beings not in the laboratory, but when they are applied to the prevention of illness or to the cure of illnesses in doctors' offices, clinics, and hospitals. The major gap in our medical care facilities is the Nation's hospital facilities. Unless they are expanded, research findings must remain in large part sterile. Moreover, we must have an adequate hospital system—particularly in rural areas—if preventive medicine is to be practiced on the scale required both to save lives and to avoid the heavy costs that arise from postponing adequate medical attention.

The second element of the program is aid to hospitals, medical schools, and universities for the construction of research facilities. Just as hospitals are

necessary if research is to be fruitful, research is critically important if the Nation is to avoid a constantly rising bill for the cost of medical care. The Hoover Commission, after noting what research has done over the last 50 years to reduce the incidence of what used to be the major communicable diseases of children—smallpox, diphtheria, and so forth—and of adults—as witness the treatment of pneumonia and venereal diseases with antibiotics—warned that we must step up the pace of medical research if the cost of medical care is to be kept within bounds. If we can substantially reduce the incidence of such major scourges as heart disease, cancer, and mental disorders, the savings to the Federal Government in provision of medical care to veterans alone will repay the cost of the research many times over. At this time, the shortage of space for research is—as I shall point out in detail in a few minutes—reducing the productivity of research expenditures and forcing the postponement of urgently needed work.

I am convinced not only that measures such as these will save Federal, State, and local expenditures in years to come. I am also convinced that adequate hospital facilities and adequate research facilities are a means of raising health standards to levels that the people of the Nation should enjoy and that will cut the ground from under extreme and impractical proposals in the field of medical care.

## II. HOSPITAL FACILITIES

I should now like to discuss specifically the item concerned with the construction of community hospitals and health centers under the Hospital Survey and Construction Act.

I doubt that there is a single Member of Congress who is not familiar with this great program, who has not had one or more hospitals built in his district which would not otherwise have been possible except for the assistance under the Hospital Survey and Construction Act.

We all know that the program has been successful. Those of us who have taken an active role in the hearings preceding passage of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act of 1946 and in subsequent congressional action relating to this legislation know that this success is not attributable to accident. I want to explain precisely why it has been successful, and why the arbitrary action of the Committee on Appropriations in cutting the 1951 appropriation for this act is an affront to both Houses of Congress, a breach of faith with States and communities, and a threat to the standards of health of the people of the Nation, particularly those in rural areas.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I agree with the statement of the gentleman, and at the proper time in the consideration of the bill I



expect to offer an amendment to restore the cut back to the budget item.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman. I have such a proposal already prepared.

To begin with, I know of no legislation—and I say this advisedly—that was more carefully planned and that was based upon more careful consideration of needs and of alternative ways of meeting them.

A commission on hospital care established under the auspices of the American Hospital Association with the full support and backing of the American Medical Association began its studies of a careful long-range plan for hospital construction in 1944, 2 years before passage of the act. It found that the hospital resources of the Nation were truly in a critical condition, that there was not only an acute shortage of hospital beds but that many were grossly obsolete and inadequate to carry on modern medical care. They found that the hospitals then in existence were poorly distributed leaving large areas of the country with virtually no hospital beds of any kind. They found that doctors were rapidly disappearing from the rural areas primarily because there were too few hospitals in which to practice their highly technical professions. In large part, these deficiencies stemmed from the virtual cessation of hospital construction during the depression. They could not be remedied during the war, when stop-gap measures centered around the needs of defense areas had to suffice.

This commission reached the conclusion that there was no possibility of constructing the needed hospital beds without Federal aid. But they did not stop there. They said that these Federal funds should not be provided to any State until that State had carefully surveyed its needs and arrived at a comprehensive long-range plan for construction, giving first consideration to the most needy areas. Finally, they stressed the point that any Federal program that might be adopted should have a large element of State and local control.

The Hospital Survey and Construction Act, embodying these principles, became law in August 1946 after hearings that began in January 1945. In hearings before both Houses of Congress, representatives of medicine, hospitals, labor, industry, farm groups, education, and many others not only stressed the need for hospitals but expressed their support of the principles laid down by the commission.

I recount these developments not as an exercise in historical exposition, but to make clear the fact that the statute was not hurriedly drawn, that it had and has now a broad base of support—labor and management, Republican and Democratic, urban and farm, medical and lay, that it permits no expenditure of Federal funds until a sound, detailed State plan is established, and that it draws the States and localities fully into planning and operation of the act. This is no bureaucratically engendered Federal hand-out. It is a model of cooperative planning to meet human needs.

Now, how has the act worked out?

The beginning was slow. I say this not apologetically but with pride. The actual start on construction was slow because the required surveys had to be made, and plans based on the surveys developed. By the end of the fiscal year 1947, all of the States and Territories had completed their surveys and had their long-range master plans approved by the Surgeon General. They showed a total need for more than 900,000 new hospital beds, the long-run goal of the program. Under these long-range State plans, the needs of each and every community have been carefully evaluated. The needs of each one have been objectively considered and rated in relation to the needs of all the others. Each community, therefore, knows in advance its relative position and approximately when it might expect to receive financial aid.

I stress this planning for two reasons. First, the plans are a remarkable instance of measuring needs and ranking them in order of priority. More important, their usefulness rests upon the reasonable assumption that the Congress of the United States will observe its commitments. These plans are not dreamed up. They are produced by the hard labor of thousands of interested people—doctors, hospital administrators, and lay groups and individuals—in all States and in hundreds of communities. They are linked to plans for bond issues. They involve municipal finance plans. They are the base for fund-raising drives in cities, towns, and counties. The Committee on Appropriations has, as I shall point out, proposed action that will throw these efforts into complete chaos.

The act has produced more than plans, and has done more than stimulate cooperation—desirable as these are. It has gotten hospitals built, particularly in rural areas. Of the 1,019 projects approved since the beginning of the program, up to December 31, 1949, 797 are general hospitals; 71 percent of these are in communities of less than 5,000 population, and 87 percent are in communities of less than 10,000 population. It is obvious therefore that the general hospitals are going into rural communities, most of which have never before had the advantage of hospital care. Hospitals for tuberculosis, mental, and chronic diseases are for the most part of necessity located in larger population centers since this is where the necessary specialists are found.

The financing of the act has been upon a conservative basis. I had some part in insuring that this would be the case. Let me cite a pertinent example. The original provided for an annual cash appropriation of \$75,000,000 with which to pay one-third the cost of hospital construction. Since it was difficult to estimate accurately the cash demands of the program, the Appropriations Committee substituted for the fiscal year 1948 a contractual authority for the \$75,000,000 in cash appropriations. This permitted the Congress to make the cash appropriations later and in such amounts as were required to meet these contractual obligations. Some said that this was a device to hold back the program

and delay its execution. It was in reality a common sense method of financing that has characterized the total operation of the program, and has proved to be entirely satisfactory.

The success of the act led the first session of the Eighty-first Congress to extend the time of operation of the act from 1951—the original expiration date—to 1955. Moreover, the original annual allotment of \$75,000,000 was raised to \$150,000,000 in the light of experience gained as construction actually got under way. It is to this level of appropriations that the planning of State and local bodies has become firmly and justifiably linked for the next 5 years.

The original act was not perfect. It was not, for example, flexible enough to permit adjustment of the Federal share of hospital costs to the financial ability of the States, nor to permit reasonable adjustments to meet the needs of richer and poorer areas within the States. This has been rectified.

A second deficiency of the original act was that it did not lay sufficient emphasis on means of making hospitals more effective as medical care institutions. This Congress dealt with this problem by authorizing the Surgeon General to make studies and demonstrations directed toward the improvement in hospital practices and regional integration of hospitals, and to make grants to hospitals, universities, States, and other appropriate professional bodies for these purposes.

These cooperative studies are badly needed because most of the hospitals of the country are small and isolated. The small rural hospital can be fully effective only if it is associated with a larger medical center so that it can call upon specialized personnel and facilities in order to provide a complete service. The fact that the large majority of the hospitals being built under the Hospital Survey and Construction Act are quite small increases the necessity for doing something to insure the quality of the care to be given. The practicability of such a regional organization of a group of small hospitals around a medical center has already been amply demonstrated in a few places with the financial support of a number of philanthropic foundations.

The necessity for these studies and demonstrations has been stressed in testimony before Congress by State departments of health, the American Hospital Association, and the American Medical Association. I share the views of these leaders that the Hospital Survey and Construction Act will fall short of its goal if in aiding hospital construction, it fails to insure that the quality of hospital care in rural areas is as good as that given in metropolitan centers.

I have reviewed this program with some care to make a number of things clear. First, the program has been thought out with extreme care. Second, the States and localities have been brought fully into the planning and operation of the program. Third, the program is working out as was intended. Fourth, the rate of construction—even

with the liberalizing amendments enacted by the Eighty-first Congress—is moderate in relation to the needs for hospitals, particularly in rural areas. Fifth, attention is being given not only to building hospitals but to working out arrangements that will provide better medical care—again, particularly in rural areas—at minimum cost. Sixth, the success of the whole undertaking and the good faith of the Congress in dealing with States and localities, which must plan far in advance, rest upon a reasonably stable level of appropriations for the act.

For these reasons, I protest the action of the Committee on Appropriations in reducing the cash appropriation for this act in 1951 from \$125,000,000 to \$100,000,000, in cutting contract authority from \$150,000,000 to \$75,000,000 in eliminating entirely the funds proposed for study of means of making the services provided by hospitals more effective and in cutting the appropriation for administration of the law.

Look first at what the committee proposes to do with contract authority. Both Houses of Congress have, after extensive hearings, enacted a statute to extend for a 5-year period and committed the Federal Government to provision of \$150,000,000 in contract authority for each of these years. The committee presumptuously proposes to nullify the express will of Congress. This House cannot deal in an off-hand cavalier fashion with its commitments to States and localities. State planning groups, local citizen groups interested in hospital construction, local governmental authorities, and State legislatures are making commitments, laying plans, negotiating bond issues, and expending funds for blueprints on the assumption that the Congress of the United States can be relied upon.

I propose that the \$150,000,000 contract authority for this act be allowed in accordance with the commitment in the basic legislation.

Look now at what the reduction of the cash appropriation from \$125,000,000 to \$100,000,000 will do. These funds, bear in mind, are to liquidate obligations already incurred. Figures from the States already indicate that at least \$108,000,000 must be available during the fiscal year to cover these prior obligations. The figure of \$125,000,000 is the probable level of cash needed to liquidate these and other obligations already incurred on the basis of contract authority authorized by Congress. There is no point in cutting back this cash appropriation, as the committee proposes. If this is done, there will simply be a request for a deficiency appropriation, and the request must be honored.

Elimination of \$1,377,094 for the studies which I have described—\$1,000,000 for grants to States, hospitals, and other qualified bodies and \$377,094 for investigations by the Public Health Service—is equally short-sighted. We have embarked, I am glad to say, on a long-overdue hospital-construction program. But we are ultimately concerned with medical care and not with bricks and

mortar. I propose that this item be restored so that the Federal and State Governments and the hospitals and medical schools can jointly work out means—adjusted to local needs—that will make the hospitals most effective in helping sick people.

Finally, I propose that there be appropriated \$1,429,906 to administer this act. The committee proposed to reduce administrative funds on the assumption that its other proposed reductions would be agreed to by the House. The reasonable sums thus far devoted to administration account in substantial part for the success of the act. An increase in the scope of the program accompanied by a cut in the level of appropriations found necessary for effective operation would court inefficiency and deterioration of the fine Federal, State, and local relationships established over the last 4 years.

### III. CONSTRUCTION OF MEDICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

I now wish to lay before you the purpose, status, and prospects for extension of the Nation's medical research facilities.

The construction of medical research facilities must, as I have explained, be considered as part of a total program for establishment of adequate public health facilities. The sums are far less than those involved in construction of hospitals, but they are equally important.

I have followed the development of medical research in this country during and after World War II with a great deal of care.

Before the end of the war, I was impressed by the fact that cessation of wartime programs would result in a catastrophic slump in medical research in our medical schools and universities unless the Federal Government took an active role in financing investigations during the postwar period.

I did all that I could both to establish the necessary legislative base and to set appropriations at a level which would permit medical research to go forward. The research-grant program of the Public Health Service is now a going concern. It has played a major part in forestalling the sharp curtailment of medical research that appeared imminent in 1945.

As I have watched this program in operation and from talks with medical investigators and deans of universities and medical schools, it has become clear to me that research grants alone are not sufficient in themselves to establish a well rounded medical research program for the Nation. The research grants help to buy equipment, and supplies and to pay salaries. But they cannot be used to construct research facilities.

We have reached the point where further development of medical research depends heavily upon expansion of the space available in universities and medical schools. This is particularly true in the fields of cancer, heart, and mental health.

Now let me explain what has been done and what ought to be done in each of these fields.

(a) Heart research facilities: Last year, recognizing the urgent need for additional space if vital research in heart diseases were to be undertaken, Congress appropriated \$6,059,000 for construction of heart-research facilities.

This was a start. The appropriated funds have been made available to 25 institutions in 16 States. I am submitting for the RECORD a list of these grants—see appendix A.

The Committee on Appropriations has proposed that this program be brought to an abrupt and total halt.

I want to explain as clearly as I can what the consequences of this action would be.

First, the funds provided last year forced an arbitrary selection among equally needy institutions. Dr. Paul White of Boston, a member of the National Advisory Heart Council and one of the foremost experts in the Nation in the field of cardiovascular research, has said this:

It was with the greatest difficulty that we established even a remotely passable priority list among all the institutions throughout the country whom we knew had complete justification for expecting construction aid from us in order not to delay seriously or to bog down important research in heart disease in progress or in prospect.

Dr. Stafford Warren, of Los Angeles, another distinguished investigator in the cardiovascular field, has this to report on needs for heart research facilities:

Meritorious requests have exceeded the Federal funds available, and the minimum needs have not been met. More widely distributed centers for cardiovascular research are needed. In the West and Southwest, for example, the research potential cannot be adequately realized without additional assistance, carefully extended, for construction of research facilities.

Dr. T. Duckett Jones, a third outstanding scientist and member of the National Advisory Heart Council, has this comment on the need for construction:

Members of the National Advisory Heart Council have visited some 59 institutions in need of better laboratory facilities to conduct cardiovascular research. The findings have been rather consistent in most parts of the country. Most medical schools, teaching and research hospitals, and other research institutions are in great and often dire need for laboratory space. The present able investigators and personnel are seriously hampered by this lack of space.

I have at hand, and will submit for the RECORD, a list of requests for aid in constructing heart research facilities—see appendix B. These requests are from 45 institutions in 21 States and the District of Columbia. They total \$28,000,000. Seventeen additional institutions in 11 States have expressed an intention to apply for this aid.

In my opinion, it would be unwise to appropriate a sum of this magnitude in 1 year for construction of heart research facilities.

On the other hand, I firmly believe that the Committee on Appropriations has irresponsibly turned its back on a program essential to the furtherance of medical research. I urged the committee to insert in the budget an item to



provide funds for a moderate continuation of the heart research construction program. The committee saw fit to ignore my proposal.

In my judgment \$4,000,000 in contract authority—two-thirds of the appropriation for this purpose in 1950 and one-seventh of the firm, justified, and screened requests now in hand—is the absolute minimum required for this program. I offer an amendment to this effect.

(b) Cancer research facilities: I turn now from the field of heart to the field of cancer research.

Cancer research is more extensive than that in heart. The Nation-wide mobilization of men and money for cancer research undertaken with the aid of both private and governmental agencies has proceeded to the point where there is an extensive network of laboratories and scientists at work on the problem. Since the cancer research program is a few years ahead of the heart program, the problem of research facilities was encountered earlier.

The first funds for Federal aid in construction of cancer research facilities were provided by Congress in the appropriation for fiscal year 1948. Subsequent appropriations for fiscal years 1949 and 1950 have enabled 44 institutions in 26 States and the District of Columbia to expand both their clinical and laboratory cancer research facilities. In total, \$16,303,000 has been provided for this purpose by the Congress—see appendix B. I shall submit for the record a list of these grants.

This program has been in operation long enough so that its value can be assessed.

The funds have been used to expand existing cancer research centers, as well as to help establish facilities needed for the creation of new research programs. In most cases, the Federal funds have supplemented funds from local sources. We can confidently predict that all research construction funds will stimulate and supplement local efforts to raise funds, rather than to replace these efforts.

It is clear that the construction grant procedures enlarge rather than limit the freedom of hospitals and schools to conduct cancer research.

Each individual application has been studied in order to determine how best to provide the working space which will facilitate the development of well-balanced programs of fundamental and clinical research. In some cases, laboratories were adequate and additional clinical facilities were needed to complement these laboratories. In other cases, good clinical facilities were available but laboratories were needed to make more effective the work that is being carried on in the clinical programs. In some instances, needed space for both clinical and laboratory research has been provided through the grant. This same realistic adjustment of facilities to needs can be expected under all the construction grant programs.

Finally, the construction grants have been an important factor in resolving

another key problem—the shortage of trained cancer investigators.

Although none of the funds has been allocated to provide facilities for training, the training programs of the grantee institutions have benefited by the improved research facilities. They have enabled research institutions to train medical and graduate students, internes, resident physicians, and additional personnel in research. They have resulted in an improvement in the teaching of cancer as well as related scientific fields. Because of the additional facilities for research, these institutions have been able to attract and keep better qualified personnel for both research and for teaching. The same valuable byproducts will come from research construction grants in other fields if they are not arbitrarily stopped.

As in the case of heart research construction grants, the Committee on Appropriations saw fit to ignore my request that the program continue. There is not a dime in the Public Health Service budget for construction of additional cancer research facilities.

This refusal was in the face of requests for funds from 23 institutions in 15 States and the District of Columbia. The requests total almost \$12,000,000—see appendix E.

As is true in the case of heart research construction, I do not believe that Congress should appropriate funds for fiscal year 1951 sufficient to meet all these requests. In view of the sums already expended, the state of the Federal budget, and in view of the progress already made, I think that the program should be less extensive in fiscal year 1951 than in fiscal year 1950.

In fiscal year 1950, \$4,175,000 was appropriated in cash and \$6,000,000 was provided in contract authority.

But the complete cessation of aid for construction of cancer research facilities proposed by the Committee on Appropriations reflects little credit upon either the vision or the understanding of that group.

I therefore urge that the 1951 appropriation to the Public Health Service be amended to provide \$3,000,000 in contract authority for aid in construction of cancer research facilities. This would cover less than a third of the requests on hand, and is less than a third of the cash appropriation and contract authority allowed for fiscal year 1950.

(c) Mental health research facilities: Finally, I wish to discuss the need for research facilities in the field of mental disorders. The care of those hospitalized in Federal, State, and private institutions by mental illness costs the people of this country about \$400,000,000 per year—over \$1,000,000 every day. The loss in production, income taxes, and other less tangible factors is easily twice the direct burden of hospital costs.

There is only one way of reducing this burden in the future without depressing still further the deplorable standards that exist in most of the Nation's mental hospitals.

Only a well-balanced mental-health program which places proper emphasis

on research into the cause, prevention, and cure of mental illness can relieve taxpayers of an appreciable part of this economic burden and reduce the wretched misery and suffering that are now the lot of mental patients and their immediate families.

We have the machinery for an expanded research program in the National Institute of Mental Health. Appropriations, modest in terms of the certain gains that would come from a heavier investment, have been made.

But, as is true in cancer and heart disease, facilities are lacking. We need more research centers not only to work toward the findings that will enable us to conquer mental illness, but also to serve as training centers. The shortage of trained people in this field cannot be relieved until the research centers in which they must pursue advanced work are made more adequate.

These centers should concentrate upon various aspects of psychiatry and neurology, but they must be closely linked with other medical specialties, such as pediatrics and internal medicine, and with basic medical departments, such as physiology and pathology.

New centers should be established in areas where none now exists. The pressures and strains that lead to mental illness vary throughout the country, and problems peculiar to different localities should be studied by people fully familiar with the communities in which they work. Moreover, we should avoid concentration in a few centers that will have a tendency to forestall the free development of ideas essential in an area where most problems are as yet unsolved.

It is a shocking fact that there are fewer than 20 such research and teaching centers in the field of mental disorders. Almost all of our money is going into the care of those already afflicted. A pittance is being devoted to the expansion of research that alone can prevent the burden of care from becoming steadily more onerous as the years go by.

In my opinion, the country would be well served by a 10-year program designed to double the number of research centers for mental health, and to strengthen the existing centers. Carefully thought out plans have reached the stage where \$2,500,000 could be profitably committed during 1951 as a start on this program.

I attempted to persuade the Committee on Appropriations that failure to adopt a program of this nature is inviting—in fact, making certain—the imposition of hospital costs many times \$2,500,000 per year for the indefinite future. I had no success.

I, therefore, propose that the 1951 budget of the Public Health Service be increased by \$2,500,000 to permit aid in construction of these mental-health research facilities.

Mr. Chairman, I tell you it is about time we begin to think of the people here in America and their needs instead of planning to build hospitals and furnish unemployment relief and sanitation

projects and septic pools and so on all over the world. I am not one who is going to sit idly by and see the known needs of millions of Americans denied, frustrated, and destroyed, and at the same time vote billions of dollars to provide facilities even in the countries that are occupied and controlled by those who were our former enemies.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. The gentleman from Wisconsin has brought to bear in his discussion of this bill a rich store of knowledge and rich experience, and his great ability. I wish to commend him on the magnificent manner in which he has acquitted himself.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank my good friend for his fine statement.

What did the committee do? We had witness after witness come before that committee giving us the benefit of their advice and their experience from all over America. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee was not there at a single hearing when this matter was discussed, yet he came before the subcommittee when the bill was marked up and insisted on cutting this program right square in two and putting it back to the \$75,000,000, after this Congress had sent the word out to the people of America that they could depend upon the Congress of the United States to assist them to the extent of \$150,000,000 in hospital construction.

I have the facts and figures here. I shall not attempt to read them now, but if anybody attempts to challenge them they will be in the RECORD.

There are hundreds of communities in the United States that have issued bonds for the building of hospitals, depending upon the allocation of funds that was set up under this amendment of last August raising the amount to \$150,000,000. There are hundreds of communities in this Nation in which public-spirited citizens have put on drives and the people have literally contributed their own money to provide the sponsor's share to build hospitals in various communities throughout the Nation.

If the action of the subcommittee of this Congress and the full Appropriations Committee—and I may say we did not raise any question about it in the full committee. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and I were so humiliated to think that the program we had spent our time developing and supporting by proofs and testimony could be so recklessly and wantonly slashed and knocked out under the guise that they were saving money for the people, only to vote a few days later to spend \$2,700,000,000 on foreign aid, and take it out of the hides and the welfare of the people of the United States of America. As far as I am concerned, I did not and I will not do it. You will have an opportunity to express yourselves on this question when it comes up. The chairman of the subcommittee is here on the floor, and I am certain he will agree with and substantiate every

statement I have made here this afternoon.

Something very unusual has happened in this Congress on this question. I was advised by members of the committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that after the action of the Committee on Appropriations became known to them they called a meeting of their committee and by unanimous vote of that great committee sponsoring this legislation they agreed to stand behind the action of the gentleman who is now addressing you and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], seeking the restoration of these funds. I asked the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]: Is that not the fact?

Mr. PRIEST. That is the position taken by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at a special meeting.

Mr. KEEFE. They have given study to this program the same as we have. They know the implications involved. You cannot arbitrarily, in a moment of emotional attitude in a committee, without any knowledge of the facts and without any hearing of the evidence just ruthlessly slash a program which is so vital to the welfare and interest of the people of America.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. TACKETT. Is it not further a fact that the people of this country relying upon the Congress have gone so far as to have blueprints drawn up and engineering work carried on for the purpose of building hospitals and now they find that partially completed hospitals are going to be lost as a result of the action of the committee which in one breath has told the American people it does not make any difference about serving humanity in America, and then in the next breath giving \$2,700,000,000 to be used in any way that is seen fit on foreign soil to be sure that those people are cared for better than our own people?

Mr. KEEFE. I was a Member of the Eightieth Congress. I supported the Marshall plan and I supported aid to Greece and Turkey. I supported the GARIOA program. I supported every one of those programs until this year when they tacked on titles II and III to the bill which I felt had no place in the bill. I will be accountable to the people I represent for my action in voting against that bill. But regardless of that I cannot sit here and in good conscience as a Member of this great body, see the things which I know are needed cast aside when witness after witness from California to Massachusetts in this great field of public health—not bureaucrats, not public-health people employed by the Government, but men of the character of Dr. Paul White, the world's greatest authority on cardiovascular diseases and men of that type—like Dr. Rhodes, head of the Sloan-Kettering Clinic, the greatest cancer research specialist in this country, in my opinion—man after man of that type from

Missouri, from California, from Minnesota, from Ohio, from all over the country, came before the committee and testified. It is a liberal education to read that hearing. We have the national advisory councils in the heart program and in the cancer program, and the mental health program, composed of the finest businessmen in America who are giving their time and attention and money to this problem.

Under the inspiration of the chairman of the full committee that has been completely wiped out. The construction of clinical facilities which we started, and which is so vital if we are to carry on the fight against these dread diseases, the killers and cripples of mankind, has been completely stopped.

I will tell you more about it when we get into the bill. I will offer some amendments to put some of these funds back to carry on that program.

The chairman of the subcommittee knows as well as I do that we are not seeking to override the budget. We have not overridden the budget. We made very substantial cuts in the appropriations. We did so with a distinct understanding between the chairman and myself that in the mark-up of that bill of the money which we cut from the public health bill for certain purposes, amounting to some \$26,000,000, eight or nine million dollars could be taken to carry on the clinical hospital construction program which is growing throughout the country and which offers the greatest hope we have for the solution of these diseases, such as cancer, heart disease, and many other diseases.

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

Mr. KEEFE. Just let me finish this thought. After we had made those cuts, we not only lost those items but we were unable to transfer those funds into the activities that we wanted them to be transferred to. Again, the chairman of the committee, without hearing a single witness in the hearings, was able, by his force and drive, to do that. It is small wonder that his own subcommittee chairman refused to go along with him, and will take the floor at the proper time in complete support of the position which I am presenting to you this afternoon. I take my hat off to JOHN FOGARTY, who has some vision, who has some courage to stand up and fight for the things he knows are right and not be driven into a position of trying to stimulate false economy by taking it out of the hides of the American people.

I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REGAN. I have been impressed with the gentleman's remarks. I am sorry I did not hear all that he had to say, but would not this cut have the effect of discouraging those communities who have drawn plans and prepared their sites for these hospitals and have them under construction? Would it not be a move toward pushing on to us socialized medicine, if this program were not completed?

Mr. KEEFE. My friends, if you are interested in socialization of medicine, if that is what you want to see come, you



follow the attitude of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and you will get it. That is what will bring it about. But if you carry on the program that the chairman of the subcommittee and the gentleman from Wisconsin, who is now addressing you, have tried to put into force over the last number of years—I have been a member of that committee for 10 years, working for this objective. To do what? To get more hospitals, get more doctors, get more nurses, get more research, and get more applied research into the hands of more people in America, and do it under the American plan. That is the only way it can be done. It is the only way it can be done, and it is being done with a very small expenditure of money. If I had the time to show you the economical aspects of this situation, I could demonstrate to you where every dollar you are spending on this program will ultimately save many, many dollars to the people of America as a result of the application of the research that is going on. If you only knew how hard we had to fight to get into this bill some money to carry on the research of acth and compound E, that promises to completely revolutionize the medical practice throughout the world, and will be the greatest boon to humanity since the discovery made by Pasteur, and perhaps much greater. The stories that were told to us by these leading scientists throughout the country are what we might look forward to when a complete synthesis of these drugs is made known, and when the sources of cortisone can be discovered, so as to make it available, as penicillin is now made available, the amount of money we are asking—and we had to beg and plead to get that amount of money in this bill—my God, have you ever taken penicillin? Think of the millions of people whose lives have been saved and whose productivity has been saved in the use of that remarkable drug. My friends, the work of the National Institute of Health alone in developing the

type of serum that was used during this last war saved more in money and lives than all the money the Federal Government has ever spent in the field of research.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has consumed an hour. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be allowed to proceed for five additional minutes, and yield him five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I went over the country impressed with the need for the development and stimulation of the cancer program, the heart-research program, the poliomyelitis program, and many others. I talked to researcher after researcher in institution after institution throughout the country. I asked: "What is the bottleneck?" They said: "It is clinical facilities. We have to rely on rats, guinea pigs, monkeys, or chimpanzees. The latter are tremendously expensive, but we have not the human material available to whom we can give the very best of medical science and the best of care and treatment, whose progress we can observe and record in connection with the research programs that are going on throughout the country."

We came back to this Congress and we asked you to relieve that bottleneck. You did so practically unanimously. What is the result? This great clinical hospital that is being built out here at Bethesda, which is hooked up with all other clinical hospitals that are being built throughout this country and with the centers of research throughout the country. You did it; the Congress did it almost without opposition of any kind. Thus, there has been a correlation of all this research; all of the research is being correlated and funneled into this central research institution out here where the

research findings will be evaluated and will in turn be transferred to other centers of research to avert duplication. It has been accepted by the great research scientists of this country as one of the greatest forward steps that has ever been taken in the field of research. If the attitude of the committee is maintained, that program is stopped far short of its goal. I, for one, do not propose to see it die if I can help it by the expenditure of a few measly dollars, seven or eight millions; and I shall offer amendments at the proper time to take care of it. I will demonstrate to the Congress where we can effectuate savings and where we have effectuated savings that will offset this budget increase suggested, two and a half times.

This one activity means something to me. Oh, it does not mean anything to me politically. Very few of the people in my district know anything about the work that I have done here; but I tell you it means something to human beings, and I have had experiences in my own family that impressed upon me its importance. Because of my position in this field, I was able to bring to my little grandson the best that there was in America to cure him of devastating rheumatic fever. I tell you that so far as I am concerned I am going to make those same services available, if it is possible, to every kid in America that is struck down with that dread disease. You ask me why I am interested in it? Because I have seen what these people have done in the field of cancer, in the field of rheumatism, in the field of arthritis, in the field of heart disease; I know what great accomplishments the future has in store for us. I want to make those facilities and those research findings available to all the people of America. How any man who professes to have his heart beat in sympathy with the common people of this country can think otherwise is beyond my wildest imagination.

#### APPENDIX A

Approved heart research construction grants (alphabetical by States, as of Oct. 29, 1949)

State and institution	Grant number	Amount requested	Amount recommended	Amount awarded	State and institution	Grant number	Amount requested	Amount recommended	Amount awarded
California: University of Southern California.....	HC-504...	\$1,000,000	\$500,000	\$485,000	Massachusetts—Continued				
Colorado: University of Colorado.....	HC-285...	254,540	254,000	246,380	Massachusetts General Hospital.....	HC-267...	\$1,120,000	\$500,000	\$485,000
Georgia:					Peter Bent Brigham Hospital.....	HC-298...	250,000	250,000	242,500
University of Georgia.....	HC-535...	58,000	58,000	58,000	Minnesota: University of Minnesota.....	HC-259...	1,659,000	500,000	485,000
Grady Memorial Hospital.....	HC-7010...	15,000	15,000	15,000	Mississippi: University of Mississippi.....	HC-536...	4,435	4,435	4,435
Illinois:					New York:				
University of Chicago.....	HC-265...	750,000	500,000	485,000	New York University.....	HC-268R...	1,625,500	500,000	485,000
Michael Reese Hospital.....	HC-7007...	10,000	10,000	10,000	Syracuse University.....	HC-7004...	1,145,000	145,000	140,650
Northwestern University.....	HC-264...	50,000	50,000	50,000	Oklahoma: Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation.....	HC-246...	325,000	325,000	100,000
Kansas: University of Kansas.....	HC-270...	100,000	100,000	100,000	Pennsylvania:				
Louisiana: Tulane University.....	HC-533...	1,010,500	500,000	485,000	Children's Hospital, Philadelphia.....	HC-291...	385,000	385,000	373,450
Maryland: Johns Hopkins University.....	HC-255...	1,266,928	500,000	485,000	University of Pennsylvania.....	HC-254...	500,000	330,000	320,100
Massachusetts:					Tennessee: Meharry Medical College.....	HC-503...	177,660	177,000	172,330
Beth Israel Hospital.....	HC-573...	190,000	190,000	184,300	Utah: University of Utah.....	HC-251...	60,000	60,000	60,000
Harvard School of Public Health.....	HC-7001...	82,500	82,500	82,500	Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin.....	HC-225...	300,000	300,000	291,000
House of Good Samaritan <sup>1</sup> .....	HC-7006...	235,000	175,000	169,750	Total.....		12,574,063	6,395,935	6,015,395

<sup>1</sup> Informal application.

Total of 25 grants in 25 institutions, representing 16 States.

## APPENDIX B

Pending requests for cardiovascular research construction grants (Jan. 13, 1950)

State and institution	Grant number	Amount of pending request
Alabama: Medical College of Alabama	HC-540	\$416,931
California: University of California Medical School	HC-548	1,250,000
University of California Medical School, Los Angeles	HC-252	884,736
University of Southern California	HC-504	1,515,000
District of Columbia: Georgetown University	HC-525	909,960
Georgia: Emory University	HC-541	500,000
Illinois: University of Chicago	HC-265	1,265,000
University of Illinois	HC-299	2,350,000
Loyola University	HC-349	116,000
Michael Reese Hospital	HC-258	2,647,950
Kentucky: University of Louisville	(HC-7003)	285,000
Louisiana: Tulane University	HC-533	1,525,500
Maryland: Johns Hopkins University	HC-255	781,928
Massachusetts: Children's Medical Center, Boston	HC-7009	450,000
House of the Good Samaritan <sup>1</sup>	HC-7006	1,175,000

See footnotes at end of table.

## APPENDIX B—Continued

State and institution	Grant number	Amount of pending request
Massachusetts—Continued		
Massachusetts General Hospital	HC-267	1,635,000
New England Center Hospital	HC-7000	220,000
Michigan: Wayne University	HC-571	377,226
Minnesota: University of Minnesota	HC-259	1,174,000
Missouri: Washington University School of Medicine	HC-7002	200,000
New York: Bellevue Hospital (New York City) <sup>2</sup>		150,000
University of Buffalo	HC-295	335,000
Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons	HC-224 (R)	1,000,000
Cornell University	HC-346	200,000
Montefiore Hospital (New York)	HC-527	418,700
Mount Sinai Hospital	HC-7005	300,000
New York Hospital	HC-345	800,000
New York University	HC-268 (R)	1,140,500
University of Rochester	HC-350	414,368
Syracuse University	HC-7004	1,004,350
North Carolina: Bowman Gray School of Medicine of Wake Forest College	HC-343	848,900
Duke University	HC-256	1,347,000
University of North Carolina	HC-263	516,800

See footnotes at end of table.

## APPENDIX B—Continued

State and institution	Grant number	Amount of pending request
Ohio: Western Reserve University <sup>3</sup>		\$275,000
Oklahoma: Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation	HC-246	1,225,000
Oregon: University of Oregon	HC-272	230,000
Pennsylvania: Jefferson Medical College (Philadelphia)	HC-598	1,000,000
University of Pittsburgh	HC-7008	400,000
University of Pennsylvania	HC-254	179,500
Temple University Hospital and Medical School	HC-342	900,000
Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania	HC-248	169,645
Tennessee: University of Tennessee	HC-223	468,000
Texas: Southwestern Medical college (Dallas) <sup>3</sup>		500,000
Washington: University of Washington (Seattle)	HC-301	500,000
West Virginia: University of West Virginia	HC-289	5,860
Total		28,008,854

<sup>1</sup> Requested over and above present active grant.

<sup>2</sup> Application HC-7003 withdrawn. New application to come.

<sup>3</sup> Informal application.

Total 45 institutions. Representing 21 States and the District of Columbia.

## APPENDIX C

Expressed intent to apply for heart research facilities construction grants (as of Feb. 10, 1950)

State and institution	Estimated request (if given)	Individual contacted
California: University of California (Donner Laboratory), Berkeley	No estimate	John H. Lawrence.
Has pending: HC-548, Medical School, San Francisco, \$1,250,000		Francis S. Smyth, dean.
Has pending: HC-252, Medical School, Los Angeles, \$884,736		Stafford L. Warren, dean.
District of Columbia: George Washington University Hospital	No estimate	Brian Blades.
Indiana: Indiana University School of Dentistry, Indianapolis	do.	Maynard K. Hine, dean.
Massachusetts: HC-7015, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge	\$250,000	J. R. Killian, Jr., president.
New York: Helen Hay Whitney Foundation, New York City	No estimate	T. Duckett Jones, medical director.
Albany Medical College (Un. on University), Albany	do.	Harold C. Wiggers.
Ohio: Division of City Hospitals, Department of Public Health and Welfare, Cleveland	do.	Mr. Stanley A. Fergus, commissioner-superintendent.
South Carolina: Medical College of the State of South Carolina, Charleston	do.	John A. Boone.
Tennessee: University of Tennessee, Knoxville (has pending: HC-223, \$468,600 for Medical School at Memphis)	do.	C. E. Brehm, president.
Texas: Baylor University College of Medicine, Houston	do.	O. W. Hyman.
Vermont: University of Vermont, Burlington	\$200,000	Warren T. Brown, associate dean.
Virginia: Medical College of Virginia, Richmond	No estimate	W. T. Sanger, president.
University of Virginia, Charlottesville	do.	J. Edwin Wood, Jr.
Canada: Montreal General Hospital, Montreal	do.	E. A. Stewart Reid.
	\$450,000	

Total: 11 States, District of Columbia, and Canada—17 institutions. 15 institutions in 10 States, District of Columbia, and Canada have given no estimate. 2 institutions in 2 States have given an estimate of \$450,000.

## APPENDIX D

Active cancer research construction grants by State (as of Oct. 29, 1949)

State and institution	Number of grants	Institution total	State total	State and institution	Number of grants	Institution total	State total
Alabama: Medical College of Alabama and the Jefferson County Health Department	1	\$47,280	\$47,280	Maryland: Johns Hopkins University	1	\$750,000	\$750,000
California: University of California Medical School, San Francisco	1	1,000,000		Massachusetts: Boston University School of Medicine	1	49,900	
University of California, Los Angeles	1	700,000		Massachusetts General Hospital	1	700,000	
Los Angeles County Hospital	1	35,255	2,035,255	New England Deaconess Hospital	1	400,000	1,368,422
University of Southern California	1	200,000		Do.	1	85,000	
Stanford University	1	100,000		Tufts College Medical School	1	133,522	
Colorado: University of Colorado	1	400,000	400,000	Michigan: Wayne University College of Medicine	1	150,000	150,000
Connecticut: Yale University	1	250,000	250,000	Detroit Institute of Cancer Research	1	150,000	
District of Columbia: George Washington University	1	200,000		Minnesota: University of Minnesota	1	543,550	
Do.	1	50,000	398,500	Do.	1	135,888	879,433
Georgetown University Medical School	1	148,500		Do.	1	200,000	
Georgia: Emory University	1	500,000	500,000	Missouri: Washington University	1	450,000	
Illinois: University of Chicago	1	450,000		Do.	1	250,000	1,325,000
Do.	1	240,000	890,000	St. Louis University	1	625,000	
Loyola University: Stritch School of Medicine	1	200,000		New York: Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons	1	1,000,000	
Kansas: University of Kansas	1	200,000	200,000	Memorial Center for Cancer and Allied Diseases	1	250,000	
Maine: Jackson Memorial Laboratory	1	250,000		New York University-Bellevue Hospital	1	575,000	2,259,368
Do.	1	100,000	350,000	University of Rochester	1	434,368	
				North Carolina: Duke University	1	200,000	200,000



## APPENDIX D—Continued

State and institution	Number of grants	Institution total	State total	State and institution	Number of grants	Institution total	State total
Ohio:				Tennessee:			
Ohio State University.....	1	\$300,000	\$600,000	Meharry Medical College <sup>1</sup> .....	1	\$20,000	\$541,969
University hospitals of Cleveland, Western Reserve University.....	1	300,000		Do.....	1	30,385	
Oklahoma: Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation.....	1	125,000	125,000	University of Tennessee.....	1	491,584	
Oregon: University of Oregon Medical School.....	1	10,000	10,000	Texas:			
Pennsylvania:				University of Texas.....	1	200,000	300,000
Institute for Cancer Research.....	1	149,000	654,676	Do.....	1	100,000	
Do.....	1	49,468		Utah: University of Utah School of Medicine.....	1	416,404	416,404
University of Pennsylvania.....	1	56,208		Virginia:			
Do.....	1	200,000		Medical College of Virginia <sup>1</sup> .....	1	10,588	85,588
University of Pittsburgh.....	1	200,000		University of Virginia School of Medicine.....	1	75,000	
South Carolina: Medical College of the State of South Carolina.....	1	16,000	16,000	Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Medical School.....	1	975,000	975,000
				Total (56).....			15,727,900

<sup>1</sup> Construction has been completed.

Total of 55 grants in 44 institutions.

Representing 25 States and the District of Columbia.

**NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE,  
GRANTS AND FELLOWSHIPS BRANCH,  
February 17, 1950.**

*Approved research construction grants, National Advisory Cancer Council meeting of February 16 and 17, 1950*

CC-979: University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, Dr. W. R. Berryhill—construction of a cancer research division, university hospital and medical school..... \$200,000

CC-1022 (R): Beth Israel Hospital, Boston, Mass., Dr. C. F. Wilinsky construction of animal farm, cancer research..... 50,000

CC-1033 (S): Wayne University College of Medicine and Detroit Institute of Cancer Research, Detroit, Dr. William L. Simpson, Dr. G. H. Scott—construction grants-in-aid..... \$100,000

CC-7015 (S): Boston University School of Medicine, Dr. James M. Faulkner—construction of facilities for care of animals required in cancer research at Boston University School of Medicine..... 12,850

CC-7017 (R): Medical College of the State of South Carolina, Charleston, S. C., Dr. Kenneth M. Lynch—building construction to provide facilities for cancer re-

search, including clinical investigation..... \$100,000

CC-7021: State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Dr. Titus C. Evans—modification of laboratory facilities for research on cancer using radioisotopes (for cancer research facilities)..... 12,250

CC-7024: The Children's Medical Center, Boston, Dr. Sidney Farber—permanent equipment for the new research building about to be erected by the Children's Cancer Research Foundation at the Children's Medical Center..... 100,000

Total approved (7)..... 575,100

## APPENDIX E

## List of pending construction grant applications (as of Mar. 15, 1950)

State and institution	CC grant No.	Amount of pending request	Individual contact	State and institution	CC grant No.	Amount of pending request	Individual contact
California:				Ohio:			
University of Southern California.....	7011 (S)...	\$550,000	Dr. B. O. Raulston.	Ohio State University.....	851 (S)....	\$1,200,000	Dr. Charles A. Doan.
Stanford University.....	772 (RS)...	400,000	L. R. Chandler.	Western Reserve University.....	7010 (S)....	350,000	Dr. J. T. Wearn.
Connecticut: Yale University.....	750,000		Dr. George B. Darling.	Oregon: University of Oregon Medical School.....	7013 <sup>1</sup> ....	900,000	Dr. Frank B. Queen.
District of Columbia: George Washington University.....	7016 (S)...	400,000	Dr. Walter A. Bloedorn.	Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh.....	7006 (S)...	200,000	Dr. Wm. S. McElroy.
Florida: Dade County Cancer Society.....		75,000	J. Gerald Lewis, president.	South Dakota: University of South Dakota School of Medicine.....	7019.....	120,000	Dr. Donald Slaughter.
Illinois:				Tennessee:			
Loyola University (Stritch).....	7008 (S)...	255,000	Dr. John F. Sheehan.	Baroness Erlanger Hospital.....		250,000	Dr. S. S. Marchbanks.
Michael Reese Hospital.....	7022.....	542,000	Dr. Albert Tannenbaum.	Vanderbilt University.....	7023.....	551,000	Dr. Howard J. Curtis.
Indiana: Indiana University Medical Center.....	7018.....	485,920	Dr. Edwin A. Lawrence.	Washington:			
Massachusetts:				University of Washington.....	7003.....	900,000	Dr. Stuart W. Lippincott.
Harvard University.....		300,000	Dr. James S. Simmons.	Northwest Cancer Foundation.....	7009.....	738,000	Dr. Simeon T. Cantril.
Jewish Memorial Hospital.....	7020.....	182,500	Dr. Wilburt C. Davison.	Wisconsin: Marquette University School of Medicine.....	7007.....	300,000	Dr. John S. Hirschboeck.
North Carolina: Duke University.....	840 (S)....	1,100,000					
New York:				Total (15 States and District of Columbia, 23 institutions).		11,641,820	
Mount Sinai Hospital.....	7002.....	300,000	Dr. George Baehr.				
Montefiore Hospital.....	7004.....	418,700	Dr. Daniel Laszlo.				
Do.....	7005.....	373,700	Dr. H. M. Zimmerman.				

<sup>1</sup> Informal application.

(S) Requested over and above present active grant.

## Institutions which have expressed their intent to apply

State and institution	Individual contact
Alabama: Muscle Shoals Heart and Cancer Research Clinic.....	Mr. M. A. J. Phillips.
Arizona: Pima County Medical Society.....	Dr. L. Lindberg.
California:	
Cedars of Lebanon Hospital.....	Dr. N. B. Friedman.
College of Medical Evangelists.....	Dr. W. F. Norwood.
Mount Zion Hospital.....	Dr. G. R. Biskind.
Florida: Florida State Board of Health.....	Dr. R. F. Sondag.
Illinois: Brokaw Hospital.....	Mr. L. F. Shepard.
Indiana:	
University of Notre Dame.....	R. H. Sweeney, C. S. C.
Protestant Deaconess Hospital.....	Mr. A. G. Hahn.

## Institutions which have expressed their intent to apply—Continued

State and institution	Individual contact
Louisiana:	
Louisiana State University.....	Dr. William W. Frye.
Tulane University of Louisiana.....	Dr. M. E. Lapham.
Minnesota: University of Minnesota.....	
New York:	
Albany Medical College.....	Dr. L. W. Gorham.
Syracuse University.....	Dr. Allan D. Bass.
North Carolina: Wake Forest College.....	Dr. C. C. Carpenter.
Pennsylvania:	
The American Oncologic Hospital.....	Mr. V. H. Frazier.
Wills Hospital.....	Dr. Louis Lehrfeld.
Tennessee: University of Tennessee.....	Dr. C. E. Brehm.
Texas: Baylor University.....	Dr. Warren T. Brown.

## Institutions which have expressed their intent to apply—Continued

State and institution	Individual contact
Vermont:	
The Mary Fletcher Hospital.....	L. E. Richwagon, Supt.
The University of Vermont.....	Dr. W. E. Brown.
Virginia: The Memorial Hospital, Danville.....	Dr. T. J. Moran.
West Virginia: Alderson Broaddus College.....	Dr. Joseph Peary.
San Juan, P. I.: San Juan City Hospital.....	Dr. Robert J. Jimenez Lopez.

Total of 17 States and 1 foreign country and 23 institutions represented.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, for the reason that the matter I wish to discuss deals with a situation which might affect any of us, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed out of order for this period of 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the people of our country have great confidence in news reporting by the people of the press and the radio. This confidence that our people have in our news mediums is well earned. It is earned by a long period of accuracy and integrity. Accuracy first with reference to facts is fundamental in reporting and the accuracy of our press and radio on fact reporting is excellent. But even more important I think than accuracy in handling facts by press and radio reporters is the handling of quotations by public figures, yes, even by Members of Congress. Last week a radio-news-broadcaster not only misquoted a written statement made by me but reversed the meaning of what I said. I recite the story of this incident here and I put it in the permanent RECORD because I feel that such a misquote, whether it was unintentional or whether it was a matter of error, is something that undermines public confidence and, certainly, as in my own case, it somewhat personally damaged me.

Here are the circumstances. On last Thursday evening a news broadcaster by the name of Frank Edwards, broadcast over a Nation-wide hook-up of radio stations covering perhaps 200 stations. He was broadcasting for a sponsor. He was paid for the broadcast. I am told the sponsor of his broadcasts is the American Federation of Labor and that the program which costs the sponsor many hundreds of thousands of dollars annually is paid for by 8,000,000 members of the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. Edwards in his broadcast had been talking about a Member of the other body and certain charges that a Senator had made and then Mr. Edwards said:

McCARTHY is under fire from his own party for his actions, too. Representative HARRIS ELLSWORTH, Republican from Oregon, said today:

"So far as I am concerned, I believe the State Department is reasonably pure and McCARTHY's charges constitute merely a partisan outburst without much basis in fact."

Mr. Chairman, that is exactly the opposite of the statement I did make in a letter which I send out each week as a public service to the newspapers of the congressional district I serve. Here is the statement made in the letter to which undoubtedly the reporter had access in the radio gallery, since I send a copy of my letter there as a courtesy:

So far as I am concerned, I would like to believe that the State Department is practically pure and that the charges constitute merely a partisan outburst without much basis in fact. Unfortunately, the attitude of the President and State Department officials has convinced me that there must be a great

deal of very damaging truth in what Senator McCARTHY has said. If there is nothing to hide, if there is nothing to be ashamed of, or if there is nothing dangerous to our security in the records of anybody employed by our Government, let the President and the Department come clean on the whole thing and allow the Senate committee to have access to all information on this subject. As this is written they are looking as guilty as the boy with his face covered with jam.

That is the complete paragraph in the statement in my weekly letter. The news broadcaster, whether through accident or design, or for the purpose of furthering his own cause altered the wording and the meaning of it. When the broadcaster made his statement he completely reversed the meaning of what I had said. The broadcast went not only into the congressional district I serve, but throughout the Nation, completely misrepresenting me. As I said at the beginning of these remarks, this can happen to any of you. It is bad reporting, it is inaccurate, it should be frowned upon by the members of the Press Gallery and the Radio Gallery. I certainly hope that such misrepresentations or distortions of quotations will be avoided in the future. As a matter of fact, this sort of thing has occurred very seldom. I sincerely regret this instance and my having to take the floor for this purpose.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 hour to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, as I said a few moments ago, I will, at the proper time, offer an amendment to restore the cut that has been made in appropriations for the construction of hospitals under the so-called Hill-Burton Act. I believe it is essential that this program be continued in full force.

In order that this amendment not increase the over-all amount of the appropriation, I will offer or support amendments to reduce other less essential items in the bill by far more than the 75 million additional appropriation provided by this amendment.

Moreover, this money will not be used unless actually needed for construction of hospitals, and cannot be wasted.

The hospital construction program is a necessary step toward a sound answer to the need for adequate medical care, particularly in the small towns and rural communities of the United States. That problem presses for an answer.

The hospital is today the workshop of not only advanced medical science but also of the best diagnostics and present-day specialized medical care.

The high degree of specialization, the need for and benefit from costly apparatus and highly skilled technologists to operate these instruments of precision and to perform complicated laboratory procedures, have made hospitals absolutely necessary for adequate medical care. Most physicians, overworked as they are, have found it not only impossible to encompass all the required specialized knowledge but also economically impossible to finance the necessary equipment and technical personnel to provide patients with the full benefits of modern-day medical science.

This makes hospital construction particularly in rural community centers positively imperative.

Large cities have been able to cope with this problem fairly well but small towns and rural counties have been almost unanimously unable to do so. This is why Congress enacted and inaugurated this program.

The program is an example of cooperation between the Federal Government, State governments, counties, cities and individual citizens. It is good. The States, counties and cities have made definite plans on the basis of the act of last year. We should continue the program according to schedule.

Though vital and necessary, hospital construction alone is but the first step in solving the problems of adequate modern-day medical care. This is true in the Nation, and particularly in my home State of Tennessee.

Unless we have a trained and working team of doctors, nurses, and technicians in connection with hospitals constructed under this program, they will become mere works of brick and mortar.

How to provide an adequate quality and quantity of health service at a price that can be paid is the essence of our problem. The problem has three different parts: First, inadequate hospitals; second, shortage of doctors; and third, high cost of medical treatment and hospitalization.

Many people of good will seek a solution to this growing social problem. None are more diligently seeking satisfactory answers than enlightened physicians themselves. Theirs is not only a humane interest but also a very personal one.

In seeking a solution, we can profit by the mistakes of others. We now see the difficulties of the British system, about to bog down not only in costs that have gotten out of hand but also with inferior medical service. Surely the United States can provide a better answer to the problem.

Efficient service to the patient—not politics—should be the ultimate goal of all hospitals, medical training, research and practice, prevention, diagnosis, and treatment. In other words, our goal must be to give maximum quality and quantity of health service to those who need it and at a price which either our economy and society or the individual patient can stand.

This goal, we have it from no less an authority than Dr. Paul B. Magnuson, chief medical director of the Veterans' Administration, is not the fruit of so-called socialized medicine. He says:

Wherever the compulsory health scheme has been adopted, the results have been poor as regards the medical care given to the individual, and poor as regards medical research.

Yes; we must avoid the regimentation of both patient and doctor, the boundless cost, the inefficiencies and politics of socialized medicine.

But positive action—not just negative complaining and criticism, is necessary to meet this growing problem.

The second step, public welfare demands the training of more doctors.



The shortage of physicians results from three main causes:

First. Artificial restrictions on the number of students admitted to medical colleges.

Second. An inadequate number of colleges offering medical training.

Third. The tremendous cost of obtaining a medical education.

The doctor shortage is particularly acute in rural areas. Inadequate hospital facilities not only partly cause the dearth of doctors in rural areas but aggravate otherwise the health problems of such areas.

In the State of Tennessee, for example, the records of the American Medical Association show that there were approximately the same number of recognized doctors in 1948 as in 1921. There were 3,328 in 1921; 3,255 in 1948.

I emphasize this because our population has not only greatly increased, but the number of things which doctors can do for people, and, therefore, the need for same, has greatly multiplied since 1921.

Here is another need for cooperation between the Federal Government, the State, counties, and citizens. We need a vigorous State and Federal aid program for giving medical training to more young men. This, too, I support. Action by this Congress is needed. Action by the States is needed.

Then, the cost of medical care is becoming more expensive rather than less. For one thing, there are constantly more and more health services that can be administered to people—preventative, ameliorative and curative. How can we as a free society ease the shock of ever more expensive health services and long periods of hospitalization? Is compulsory health insurance the answer? I believe there are better ways. Indeed, we have already made rapid advances in voluntary health insurance programs such as the Blue Cross plan and the health insurance program sponsored by the various State medical societies. I think we should encourage such programs and give them a full and fair trial.

Surely it would not be the part of wisdom quickly to throw overboard a system which has brought medical science in the United States to a world peak of achievement and efficiency. Unless the need is reasonably met by building on the present system, another will knock at our door more loudly.

I think we should preserve the fruits of our experience and benefit from the enthusiasm and accomplishment of private initiative. And improve upon it. Improve we must. The challenge is real.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. COOPER, 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. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### THE LATE EVERETT BURGESS HOWARD

Mr. ALBERT. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. GILMER], it becomes my sad duty to advise the House of Representatives of the death of one of his predecessors, a former Member of this House, the late Honorable Everett Burgess Howard. Word of Mr. Howard's death on yesterday was received from his son by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REGAN]. Mr. Howard served with distinction in the Sixty-sixth, Sixty-eighth, and Seventieth Congresses. Prior to that time he had served our State as a member of the State board of public affairs and as State auditor. He was an outstanding public servant and a great American. Oklahoma mourns his loss. I extend my deepest personal sympathies to his loved ones.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to address the House tomorrow for 40 minutes at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to transfer to tomorrow the special order she had been granted to address the House for 5 minutes today.

#### PUBLIC ENEMY NO. 1 IS STILL STALIN, NOT McCARTHY

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the April 1, 1950, issue of the New Leader has an article by Eugene Lyons, contributing editor of that paper in which he cuts through the dust being thrown so vigorously in the air by those seeking to defend Government officials whose voluntary choice of leftist causes and organizations has properly caused either their political views or their judgment, or both, to be suspect. The New Leader as the organ of the Liberal Party cannot be accused of playing Republican politics. From their former association with the American Labor Party, the Liberal Party leaders are wiser regarding the wiles and ways of Communists and fellow travelers than either Republicans or Democrats, so many of whom are so frequently taken in.

A citizen has the right to join whatever he wishes, but other citizens have an equal right to draw conclusions about him by observing what he chooses to

join and the causes he supports. Senator McCARTHY is not the one who discredited Dr. Philip Jessup, for example. He merely reported what Jessup had done to discredit himself.

Are we so hard up that out of 150,000,000 Americans, the State Department cannot find qualified persons to plan and conduct policy in the future except those who have been so naive or so easily misled in the past? How can we have confidence that they are any more hard-headed now?

The article deserves reading by all:

#### COMMUNISTS LUCKY TO BE INVESTIGATED BY DIES, McCARTHY

(By Eugene Lyons)

The luck of the Communists put a Martin Dies, then a Rankin and a Thomas, in the chair of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. That luck held good when Senator JOSEPH McCARTHY was cast in the role of Hercules cleaning the Augean stables of the State Department.

I imply no slur on the Wisconsin Republican. He undertook the mighty task through a series of accidents and could not have been fully prepared for it. His knowledge of Communist skulduggery—a complex subject bristling with booby traps—was apparently sketchy. Certainly he betrayed strategic limitation in choosing Judge Dorothy Kenyon as his initial exhibit.

But the hooting and whistling in the press and on the air should not be permitted to drown out the facts that those stables need cleaning.

The circumstance that Alger Hiss worked and prospered in the Department for more than a decade, in the face of repeated warnings from outside and inside, tells a melancholy story.

So does the collapse of China, in large part engineered by a State Department clique that counted, along with Alger Hiss, men like John P. Davies, Jr., John Stewart Service, John Carter Vincent, Walter Butterworth, Owen Lattimore, Philip C. Jessup.

It is not without significance that the Department's plans for the postwar period, elaborated up to 1946, did not even grant the possibility that the Kremlin might not collaborate for a peaceful and democratic "one world."

Such consistent miscalculation cannot be explained entirely in terms of stupidity. The country has a right to wonder how much shrewd malice entered into the equations.

Observers in Washington with a trained nose for Muscovite aromas have long known that the odor was especially acrid in the State Department. They find it hard to forget how Bullitt, Berle, Grew, and others who took a relatively realistic view of Soviet Russia were driven out by pro-Stalinist elements. They recall the distressing facts of the Amerasia espionage scandal, still visible through the coats of whitewash. When Acheson refuses to "turn his back" on a convicted Soviet agent, they are reminded of an earlier occasion when the same Acheson, then Assistant Secretary of State, refused to turn his back on one Harold Glasser, who resigned under fire and was subsequently named by Elizabeth Bentley as a member of her Soviet "apparatus."

As a matter of fact, we have the official word of the Department itself that hundreds of its employees have been flushed out as security risks. The flushing operation, alas, was no bright idea of the State Department but forced on it by pressures from outside.

Too much is at stake in foreign policy just now to justify smugness, against this distressing background, on the issue of Kremlin infiltration of the State Department. The motives and manners and skills of a Senator are utterly irrelevant to that basic menace.

Whatever the Tydings inquiry reveals or conceals we should not permit the problem itself to be shoved out of sight. The kind of comment that limits itself to derogation of McCarthy is mischievously shallow.

To judge from the catcalls McCarthy was pulling names at random out of Who's Who when he named people like Miss Kenyon and Dr. Jessup. Actually both of them, by the record and by their own admissions, have had a peculiar weakness for joining crypto-Communist causes.

Even granting that they were innocents and suckers, they have remarkable gall in insulting a legislator who alludes to their undisputed fellow-traveling proclivities. His mistake in supposing that they are friends of Stalin is minor compared to their mistake in supposing that the Communist fronts were liberal parlor games.

Listening to their howls of outraged innocence, one would suppose that the associations charged against Kenyon and Jessup were mythical. At the very least, they have shown a dangerous inability to recognize camouflaged Communist fronts.

Suppose that Miss Kenyon some years ago had joined the German-American Bund, the Christian Front, and 20 more crypto-Fascist outfits. Suppose that some Senator had then made this fact public. Would our liberals have been so tolerantly forgiving? Would not the State Department have been asked to explain why the lady had been assigned to a sensitive post notwithstanding?

But because the subversive organizations and causes were Communist, not Fascist, she is allowed to get away with her comedy of hurt feelings. A woman of tougher moral fiber would have said, "Yes, Mr. McCarthy, up to such and such a time I was a push-over for Kremlin conspirators. Since I am not a political cretin, I shall not pretend that I was sleepwalking—after all, I had forfeited my amateur standing as an innocent sucker by the time I reached my twentieth Stalinist seduction. But thank God, I have been fully cured and assure you that now I can be trusted to distinguish between a totalitarian and a hole in the ground."

Perhaps she could not, psychologically, make such a forthright declaration because in her heart she knows that the cure is far from complete. As recently as January 16 of this year, Miss Kenyon, speaking in Troy, N. Y., declared:

"Alger Hiss is a perfect example of sacrifice to the hysteria created by the Un-American Activities Committee. . . . Not one shred of evidence was introduced that Hiss did what he is said to have done. . . . He will be lucky to get a hung jury at his second trial."

These quotes, she conceded when questioned by Senator HICKENLOOPER, were substantially correct. This, of course, does not mean that she is still a fellow traveler. It does mean that she is muddled—and muddled in a way useful to the Hiss breed. No; the Wisconsin Senator did not pull her name out of a hat.

Nor Jessup's. Standing alone, the fact that Dr. Jessup testified in behalf of Hiss at both trials might mean merely that he is a bad judge of character. Unhappily the fact must be, and has been, appraised in relation to a lot of other facts. The press and radio, if not public opinions, have given this man such a clern bill of health that a closer look at his record is rather shocking. When he was chosen by Acheson to draft a new policy for the Far East, after the tragic bankruptcy of his old policy, the New York World-Telegram wrote editorially:

"Over a period of years, Dr. Jessup held various positions in the Institute of Pacific Relations, including the chairmanship of its American and Pacific councils. In these capacities he was in close association with such well-known left-wingers as Anna Louise

Strong, Guenther Stein, Harriet Lucy Moore, E. C. Carter, Thomas A. Blisson, Andrew Grajdanzew, and Frederick Vanderbilt Field.

"While the Institute's publication, The Far Eastern Survey, was under Dr. Jessup's direction, it began a campaign against National China. Referring to what it called the two Chinas, it said, in an article signed by Mr. Blisson: 'One is now generally called Kuomintang China, the other is called Communist China. However, these are only party labels. To be more descriptive, the one might be called feudal China, the other democratic China.'"

The good doctor may proclaim his pride in the Institute of Pacific Relations. But why should he be so damned proud of the fact that under his leadership, in the course of 14 years, the Institute was notoriously a channel for party-line propaganda; that it published books and articles by people like James S. Allen, Abraham Chapman, Frederick V. Field, Philip Jaffe, Israel Epstein, to mention only a few on the crimson roster?

In explaining his sponsorship of an American Russian Institute dinner in October 1944, Dr. Jessup made the point that this organization had not yet been officially designated as subversive. The notion that Communist fronts were kosher before being officially tagged is fantastic. At that time the Communist Party had not yet been labeled subversive either. Other Americans might have had some excuse for mistaking the nature of the organization, but not a specialist in foreign affairs.

Is there no limit to naïveté? And are men of such boundless naïveté good security risks in the area of foreign affairs? Assuredly we have a right to judge Dr. Jessup's ideological affinities by his tolerance for the party liners in and around his institute, by his support of Communist fronts, by his readiness in 1946 to dump our bombs and fissionable products into the ocean.

I am not asserting that he has ever been a fellow traveler nor denying his right to join any organization he pleases. But I submit that Senator McCarthy is not shooting wild in aiming at Dr. Jessup.

I hold no brief for reckless charges. At the same time I submit that those who play with Communist pitch have no cause to complain if some of it sticks to their record. A citizen can't exercise his right to join but reject all moral responsibility for what he joins, whether it is the Ku Klux Klan, or a Nazi bund, or a Communist bund. Communism in America is essentially a fifth column, a conspiracy. Its agents and stooges do not carry neon signs announcing their association. The public has no alternative but to identify them on the basis of their conduct, the company they keep, the movements and causes they champion.

Too many commentators and editorial writers seem to have forgotten that public enemy No. 1 is still Stalin, and not McCarthy.

#### PARLIAMENTARIAN OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 537) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That effective April 1, 1950, the salary of the Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives shall be at the gross annual rate of \$12,500, and there is hereby authorized to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided by law the necessary additional amount to equalize the Parliamentarian's present gross salary with that of his new gross rate as provided herein.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

#### ROUTE UNITED STATES PURCHASING TO JOBLESS AREAS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, more workers than jobs, and the gulf between the two is widening in New England.

This is a realistic fact, and a challenge that cannot be ignored.

The State unemployment compensation funds in Massachusetts and Rhode Island are shrinking rapidly.

Thousands of people have not only exhausted the benefits due them but will be ineligible for any compensation in the new benefit year that began on April 1, 1950.

The problems of the unemployed will not be solved by pointing out to them that the employed are prospering.

The one and only solution is to create productive jobs for the jobless.

When industry for any number of reasons is unable to do this, Government should step into the breach. The Government can help to provide jobs, without a revival of WPA and without turning our economy up side down, by awarding a larger share of its purchases to those areas where the labor surplus is critical.

That is the purpose of the bill which I now bring to your attention:

That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: "If proposals are submitted by responsible persons whose delivery of the articles or performance of the service would have the result of increasing or maintaining employment in an area of very substantial labor surplus (as defined by the Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor), the most advantageous proposal which is submitted by such a person, and which does not exceed by more than 5 percent the most advantageous proposal submitted by a person whose delivery or performance would not have such a result, shall be accepted."

Sec. 2. Subsection (b) of section 3 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 is hereby amended by striking out the colon immediately preceding the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "except that if bids are submitted by responsible bidders whose delivery of supplies or performance of services would have the result of increasing or maintaining employment in an area of very substantial labor surplus (as defined by the Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor), the most advantageous bid which is submitted by such a bidder, and which does not exceed by more than 5 percent the most advantageous bid submitted by a bidder whose delivery or performance would not have such a result, shall be accepted."

There is a depressive core of chronic unemployment in some one-industry communities, particularly in New England.

In such communities, some elements deplore the unfavorable publicity regarding the numbers out of work. They maintain that outside creditors are scared into curtailing the credit extended to local merchants. The fact remains that the problems of the unemployed are not solved by refusing to recognize that such unemployment exists.



It does not get to the root of the problem.

Bankers, merchants, and city officials are correct, however, when they assert that the Government's present program to channel orders to depressed areas is a promise that falls short in accomplishment.

As you give it the once-over, New England's economic health looks good.

You think twice, however, when you read the study made by the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, published in January 1950. You wonder why employment in the textile industry dropped from 478,000 in 1919 to an average of only 244,000 in the first 10 months of 1949. In the shoe and leather industry, another downward trend is revealed. Employment decreased from 158,000 in 1919, to an average of 104,000 in the first 10 months of last year.

Even though the population has gone up in the same 30-year span, there has been a definite displacement of workers in the textile, shoe, and leather industries.

What happens to workers whose jobs have vanished? A few have been saved by openings in new or expanding industries. The other side of the mill-town picture shows too many for whom there are no jobs to go to.

From an article by Lawrence G. Weiss, under date of March 27, 1950, in that conservative newspaper, the Boston Herald, I quote the following paragraphs:

Despite the growth of its other industries, New Bedford, Mass., can only look upon the postwar closings of 70 New England textile mills, 33 in Massachusetts, as a danger signal for itself. Five of its own mills have been among those that have closed.

New Bedford has been going down hill because its mills, like those of the rest in the northern textile industry, have been having difficulty competing with the South.

To which the New Bedford Standard-Times replied editorially on March 30, 1949:

When it established an industrial development commission, the city came to grips with the problem that faced it.

The current policy of the Federal Government is to award contracts to low bidders from E areas—where unemployment is 12 percent or more of the total labor force—over other low bidders. This has channeled a disappointingly low volume of orders to needy areas because, due to higher labor standards and other cost factors, manufacturers in E areas cannot qualify with rock-bottom bids.

Some Federal contracts may be negotiated with administrative discretion, but these are limited to highly specialized or experimental facilities. The FHA gives priority consideration to applications for new low-rent public housing units from E areas. The RFC does likewise, on applications for Government loans.

Relief afforded under existing Federal directives and authorizations is not enough. Recent issues of the Labor Market, published by the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, point up the advisability of establishing State and local full

employment committees. They would promote ways and means to—

First. Sustain established industries.

Second. Attract new ones.

Third. Procure Government contracts.

Fourth. Push for highway construction for United States and State public works.

Fifth. Plan for local public improvements.

Sixth. Provide for more housing.

Seventh. Find a solution to the problem of providing ample funds for relief.

Eighth. Aid small business.

In summation it advises that individual community efforts to stimulate new employment opportunities offer the most important and effective means of alleviating unemployment.

Some of the approaches to the problem of unemployment, as referred to above, are concerned with the long-range solution to the economic difficulties confronting one-industry communities.

You and I must cope with the necessity of providing immediate help. A corporation can defer some of its obligations. A human being with no employment or income or credit cannot postpone his need for food, shelter and clothing.

To those who say that the unemployed must wait for "things to pick up," I say that those who are out of work will not condone such moral and economic bankruptcy. They expect constructive action to stimulate employment.

Because, in any event, business itself pays for unemployment through loss of customers and higher taxes, I see no reason for opposition to this bill. It will steer orders to those firms which are temporarily most in need of them, and at the same time, will put many of the unemployed back to work.

And it will do these things by the production of goods which will cost the Government but a small percentage more than the price quoted by the very lowest bidder.

One textile city in New England is spending for public welfare and soldier's relief at the rate of \$600,000 this year. Last year its outlay was \$324,000, or little more than one-half of the current rate. Bear in mind that this does not include those unemployed who are being helped from other sources.

As of March 1, 1950, it is reliably reported that the Secretary of Labor told the President:

Unemployment is greater than at any time since 1939. In 27 areas, more than 12 percent of the workers are jobless. In eight areas, one out of every five workers is unemployed. Close to 1,000,000 jobless have exhausted their unemployment-compensation benefits.

Business—Nation-wide—is good, but the slowly rising total of those without work is causing concern. It is not unlikely that the President may soon call for action to halt this trend. Although some interim improvement is expected over the next few months, a relapse is expected in 1951.

I move, therefore, that we apply remedies at once.

The legislation I propose is not charity. It will pump the lifeblood of demand into anemic industries so that they will quicken with full productive life again.

The Government will secure the supplies that it needs and—simultaneously—will assist investors, management, and labor in those industries which are also in need.

The long-term cure is up to the industries themselves and the communities that depend upon them.

But first-aid, on a constructive basis, is the least that the Federal Government can do to tide them over a critical phase.

Cancer, when diagnosed promptly and treated promptly, can be cured. Unemployment on a large scale, which could kill our economic system, can also be checked and eliminated before it spreads by the application of corrective remedies where a labor-surplus appears and continues for more than a seasonal period.

At the close of 1949, Massachusetts had one of the two lowest unemployment compensation reserves in the Nation. This is a measure, not only of the help this State is giving to its unemployed, but reveals that unemployment for an ever-larger number of people in the Bay State is not frictional and is not due to cyclical or seasonal dips in business activity.

Creeping idleness, side by side, with high production? "Sounds like a contradiction," you say.

It is not.

Each year the potential work force is growing as hundreds of thousands of young people over and above the national death rate come into the market. While the population is on the up-grade, better machines and better methods are doing the same job with less human help.

Business is good, but it cannot stand still.

It must expand to provide more openings.

Either that, or, the Federal Government will have to make work through a public building program, revival of the civilian Conservation Corps and by other measures. It will have to tax more and spend more in order to take up the employment slack.

We shall do this only as a last resort because it will concentrate too much power in Government and tend to curb those freedoms which have been responsible for the great development of our country.

In the words of the March 1950 edition of Labor's Monthly Survey, published by the A. F. of L.:

In this Nation-wide task of restoring full employment local initiative is the main-spring. If in our local communities we sit on our hands and hope someone else will rescue us we may expect the tide of unemployment to go on rising. A free-enterprise society functions when people put their own shoulders to the wheel.

The CIO, also aware of the dangerous trend, is exerting vigorous leadership to remedy the situation.

There are many complex factors responsible for the displacement of workers, such as increased competition from abroad, and the obsolete factory buildings, such as those in New England, for instance, which place some manufacturers under a competitive handicap. High taxes and the lack of abundant, low-cost hydroelectric power which our rivers

could supply if utilized in the public interest, withhold nourishment from the growth possibilities in our economy.

Over the long haul, each community will have to pick itself up by its own boot straps. Local get-up-and-go, whereby unions, business groups, farmers, schools, veterans' organizations, churches, Government agencies, and the general public unite; that is the self-starting answer. Not to steal industries away from other cities or towns, but to pioneer new enterprises, is the self-reliant and successful way to cure the blight of unemployment.

The jobless cannot wait for next year.

They need and want productive work here and now.

As they have said to me: "I've got to get out of my house and stay out of it as long as I can. Even rapping on doors where 'No help wanted' signs are posted is better than brooding at home. I've got to do something, anything, even if it's just walking the streets, or I'll go nuts."

Is their Federal Government going to let these priceless human resources rot, as if these men were so many surplus potatoes?

Because it wanted them so desperately a few short years ago—in the armed forces, on the farms, and in defense plants—it cannot, in conscience, reject them now.

These men and women are Americans.

They do not begrudge the sacrifices they are making to help the unfortunate in other nations, but they do believe that, in the process, their Government should have a little, just a little consideration for its own people.

They are not begging for hand-outs. They merely ask for the chance to earn their daily bread in a land that assures freedom of opportunity to every person.

There is one method, among others, to create jobs for them. It is so simple, however, that it may confuse some people in positions of responsibility who lean backward in the name of caution and are thereby inclined to do nothing.

The Federal Government is authorized to spend huge sums for materials, supplies, and services. No one has questioned the constitutionality of this, and no one, as yet, has accused the need of these supplies as being subversive.

The sole question is how can these essential purchases be made in a manner that will at the same time relieve unemployment in labor-surplus areas?

It is my sincere belief that we can do this by immediate passage of the bill I have introduced to provide for the award of certain public contracts to bidders from areas of very substantial labor surplus where their bids do not exceed by more than 5 percent the most advantageous bids submitted from other areas.

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

Mr. LANE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to congratulate my distinguished colleague and valued friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] whose district adjoins mine, for the bill he has introduced and for the able presentation he has just made in support of his bill. The

gentleman represents a great industrial area, an area composed of people who thoroughly appreciate the outstanding services that my friend has rendered to them during the years he has served in this body.

I value very much not only the friendship of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] but I thoroughly respect him for the outstanding service he is rendering his people. I know that his people, like the colleagues of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE], appreciate not only his ability, his sincerity and devotion to duty but the courage he displays in representing his people.

Again I congratulate the gentleman for introducing the bill and for the marked contribution he has made to a challenging problem of the day as evidenced by his very forcible and logical address just made to the House.

Mr. LANE. I thank the majority leader for his statement. The gentleman has always been very kind and considerate of me and I appreciate his statement very much.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

#### JOINT COMMISSION ON SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the statement made by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] in the other body suggesting a joint commission on subversive activities instead of the current practice both in this House and in the other body to deal with this question by standing committees is of the greatest interest and the greatest importance. The suggestion made by our colleague is almost the same approach which I have taken here with respect to similar activities of the Un-American Activities Committee. It is essential that we hold a balance between the investigatory powers of the Congress to examine into movements of the extreme left and extreme right and the capability to destroy reputations and means of livelihood of innocent persons inherent in the making public of drastic unproven charges in the first instance as far as the affected persons are concerned. I do not believe that it is necessary to weaken and impair our constitutional guaranties and our freedoms here at home in order to root out subversives from our midst or to fight the cold war. So distinguished an organization as the Association of the Bar of the City of New York has suggested rules of procedure for congressional committees engaged in investigations of this character. I have incorporated these rules and the idea of inquiry by a joint committee organized expressly for that purpose rather than standing legislative committees in House Joint Resolution 20, introduced January 3, 1949.

Determined opposition to Communists and all they stand for, evidenced by my support of United States foreign policy in the European recovery program, the mutual defense assistance pact, the Greek-Turkish aid program, the At-

lantic Pact and similar efforts is entirely consistent with a vigorous defense of the procedures by which we assure our freedoms at home.

My distinguished colleague in the other body who is the author of the suggestion for a joint commission has emphasized a point which it is well for us all to recall. He said:

But the repercussions from the present investigation into disloyalty charges are such that it would not be right for me to disregard the mounting damage which is being inflicted on the position of the United States abroad and on the respect here at home for the justice and efficacy of our institutions.

We are fighting a cold war in the sense that we are fighting to persuade the minds of men, hundreds of millions of men, who have had no experience with our institutions. These hundreds of millions are patiently watching everything that we do here with great care for they have a right to assume that we practice most ably and effectively the things we preach. The suggestion for a joint commission made by my colleague in the other body and proposed by me in House Joint Resolution 20, which I am appending here, are designed to bring about a thorough, complete and vigorous inquiry into all the people and movements whether from the extreme left or extreme right that seek to subvert our institutions, but to do this in a way which to all the world will be clearly consistent with those institutions. We are convinced that it can be done this way even more effectively than it is being done now. If confirmation be needed, the experience of the Canadian Royal Commission on the Canadian spy inquiry, which did such an extraordinary job in this very field, should be ample to prove that not only in theory but in practice the course we are suggesting is the right one.

#### House Joint Resolution 20

Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on National and International Movements, and regulations for the conduct of hearings and activities of congressional committees

*Resolved, etc.,* That there is hereby created a joint committee of seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker and seven Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, one of whom shall be designated by the committee as chairman. The committee shall be known as the Joint Committee on National and International Movements in the United States.

Sec. 2. The committee is authorized to conduct the study and investigation of the extent, character, and objectives of propaganda activities in the United States dealing with movements devoted to the growth and development of political ideas and of communism, fascism, nationalism, and similar ideologies, the diffusion within the United States of subversive propaganda or other activities instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin seeking changes in the form of government of the United States by nonconstitutional means or by force, the organizations engaged therein and all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation. The committee shall make interim reports as to the results of its studies and investigations together with such recommendations as to



necessary legislation and such other recommendations as it may deem advisable. Any report submitted when the Congress is not in session may be filed with the Clerk of the House and with the Secretary of the Senate. The committee shall make its final report whenever it deems it advisable and not later than January 3, 1951.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out this resolution, the committee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the continental United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

SEC. 4. The following regulations shall govern the conduct of hearings and investigations by all committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, including standing committees, select committees, and joint committees and duly authorized subcommittees thereof:

(1) The subject of any investigation in connection with which witnesses are summoned shall be clearly stated before the commencement of any hearings, and the evidence sought to be elicited shall be relevant and germane to the subject as so stated. In cases of special investigations authorized by congressional resolution, the subject of the investigation shall be so stated in the resolution, and in the case of investigations initiated by the committee, the subject shall be so stated by the committee and announced before the commencement of the hearings.

(2) Any witness summoned at a public hearing and, unless the committee by a majority vote determines otherwise, any witness before a private hearing, shall have the right to be accompanied by counsel, who shall be permitted to advise the witness while on the witness stand of his rights.

(3) Every witness shall have an opportunity, at the conclusion of the examination by the committee, to supplement the testimony which he has given, by making a written or oral statement, which shall be made part of the record; but such testimony shall be confined to matters with regard to which he has previously been examined.

(4) An accurate stenographic record shall be kept of the testimony of each witness, whether in public or in executive session. In either case, the record of his testimony shall be made available for inspection by the witness or his counsel; and, if given in public session he shall be furnished with a copy thereof if he so requests, and if given in executive session he shall be furnished with a copy thereof in case his testimony is subsequently used or referred to in a public session.

(5) No photographs, moving pictures, television, or radio broadcasting of the proceedings shall be permitted while any witness is testifying.

(6) Any person whose name is mentioned or who is specifically identified and who believes that testimony or other evidence given in a public hearing before any committee or comment made by any member of the committee or its counsel tends to defame him or otherwise adversely affect his reputation, shall be afforded the following privileges:

(a) To file with the committee a sworn statement concerning such testimony, evidence, or comment, which shall be made a part of the record of such hearing.

(b) To appear personally before the committee and testify in his own behalf.

(c) To have the committee secure the appearance of witnesses whose testimony adversely affected him and to cross-examine such witnesses, either personally or by counsel; but such cross-examination shall be limited to one hour as to any one witness unless the committee votes to lengthen the period.

(d) In the discretion of the committee, by a majority vote, to have the committee call a reasonable number of witnesses in his behalf. The extent to which this privilege may be availed of shall be left to the discretion of the committee.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GWINN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from a Brooklyn newspaper.

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. LANE) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, at the time of the untimely death of Congressman Church I was not on the floor of the House but was out of the city. Otherwise I would have paid my tribute to his memory. I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in tribute to the memory of the late Congressman Church.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER (at the request of Mr. COOPER) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. TABER) was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MILLS, for 2 days on account of official business.

To Mr. TACKETT, for 2 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. PLUMLEY (at the request of Mr. MEYER), for 2 days, on account of official business.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 212. An act for the relief of John Joseph McKay; and

S. 2084. An act for the relief of Jackson Riley Holland.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow,

Wednesday, April 5, 1950, 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:

1357. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Public Housing Administration for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1947 and 1948 (H. Doc. No. 541); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1358. A letter from the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, transmitting the Tenth Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, pursuant to section 201 (b) of the Social Security Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### 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. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5863. A bill for refund of customs duties to the Preparatory Commission for the International Refugee Organization; with amendment (Rept. No. 1870). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5920. A bill to provide for payment of amounts due mentally incompetent personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service; with amendment (Rept. No. 1877). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 6820. A bill to authorize the acceptance of foreign decorations for participation in the Berlin airlift; without amendment (Rept. No. 1878). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7341. A bill to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct a bridge over the Anacostia River in the vicinity of East Capitol Street, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1879). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE 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. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 794. An act for the relief of certain contractors employed in connection with the construction of the United States Appraisers Building, San Francisco, Calif.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1866). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5051. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Juan Antonio Rivera, Mrs. Raul Valle Antelo, Mrs. Jorge Diaz Romero, Mrs. Otto Resse, and Mrs. Hugo Soria; without amendment (Rept. No. 1867). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5151. A bill for the relief of the estate of Louridine Livermore

and the estate of Dorothy E. Douglas; with amendment (Rept. No. 1868). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5250. A bill for the relief of J. L. Smelcer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1869). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5972. A bill for the relief of Ivar G. Johnson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1871). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6198. A bill for the relief of the First National Bank in Richmond, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1872). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6449. A bill for the relief of Mrs. L. M. Cox and Mrs. M. R. Nickle; with amendment (Rept. No. 1873). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6969. A bill for the relief of Ralph E. Brown; with amendment (Rept. No. 1874). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7278. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clara M. Fortner; without amendment (Rept. No. 1875). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. S. 621. An act for the relief of Horace J. Fenton; without amendment (Rept. No. 1876). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CAVALCANTE:

H. R. 7993. A bill to regulate interstate commerce in bituminous coal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVENPORT:

H. R. 7994. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code with respect to travel of certain sex offenders in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HARDEN:

H. R. 7995. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, so as to adjust the rates of death compensation paid to certain dependents of veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 7996. A bill to increase the import excise tax on petroleum, fuel oil, and other petroleum derivatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 7997. A bill relating to the fixing of wage rates for per diem employees of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'SULLIVAN:

H. R. 7998. A bill prohibiting the acquiring of United States citizenship, by persons who are not bona fide residents and citizens and actual voters of the Territory of Alaska, solely by virtue of the fact that they were residents of the Territory of Alaska at the time of its admission into the Union as a State of the United States of America; providing for the making up of two copies of the voting rosters of all electors taking part in required specified elections before statehood; providing for the filing of same with designated entities; and further providing penalties for failure to make up and duly file said election rosters and for knowingly placing any ineligible or unauthorized person's name upon any such required election roster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7999. A bill prohibiting the acquiring of United States citizenship, by persons who are not bona fide residents and citizens and actual voters of the Territory of Hawaii, solely by virtue of the fact that they were residents of the Territory of Hawaii at the time of its admission into the Union as a State of the United States of America; providing for the making up of two copies of the voting rosters of all electors taking part in required specified elections before statehood; providing for the filing of same with designated entities; and further providing penalties for failure to make up and duly file said election rosters and for knowingly placing any ineligible or unauthorized person's name upon any such required election roster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 8000. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the naval ammunition depot at Iona Island, N. Y., to the Palisades Interstate Park Commission for use as a public park; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia (by request):

H. R. 8001. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia," approved December 24, 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 8002. A bill to remove an inequity in the service connection of certain disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 8003. A bill to provide for sundry administrative matters affecting the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 8004. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," to provide basic authority for certain activities of the United States Secret Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 8005. A bill to provide for the award of certain public contracts to bidders from areas of very substantial labor surplus where their bids do not exceed by more than 5 percent the most advantageous bids submitted from other areas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TACKETT:

H. R. 8006. A bill to provide for the sale of certain lands in the Ouachita and Ozark National Forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VELDE:

H. R. 8007. A bill to authorize the survey of a proposed Illinois River Parkway for the purpose of determining the feasibility of such a national parkway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 8008. A bill to amend an act approved August 26, 1842 (U. S. C., title I, ch. 2, sec. 25), relating to appropriation acts; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. J. Res. 449. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval of items in general appropriation bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. J. Res. 450. Joint resolution designating the period beginning June 5, 1950, and ending June 10, 1950, as National Holstein Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. Res. 538. Resolution to amend rule XIII of the rules of the House of Representatives with respect to committee reports on bills and joint resolutions authorizing new programs of grants-in-aid; 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. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 8009. A bill for the relief of Enrica Giancoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 8010. A bill for the relief of Carl Parks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAVALCANTE:

H. R. 8011. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Kostas G. Samonas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8012. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Markos M. Perivolaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 8013. A bill for the relief of Pamela Lyn Jogl (Eveline Maria Krenauer); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H. R. 8014. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Akiko Ando Hinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 8015. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Angelina D. Maranto and Maurice A. Maranto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 8016. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bernice de Tuncq; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 8017. A bill for the relief of Jean (John) Plewniak and Anna Piotrowska Plewinak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2048. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Cranston, R. I., City Council, recommending to Congress passage of the bill presented by Senator GREEN and others which would make it possible for States, when hard hit by an unusual impact of unemployment, to be reimbursed out of the vast administrative reserves of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2049. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Bolton N. Hyde, adjutant, Loyal Service Post, McAllen, Tex., expressing resentment that any political group would attempt to use the American Legion to further its questionable politics by condemnation of a law-enforcement agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2050. Also, petition of Philippine Veterans Legion, Manila, P. I., relative to sending a mission to Washington, D. C., to seek passage of the Kearney bill; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 5, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who art behind the shadows and in them, we turn to Thee, in whom there is no darkness at all.