Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation, as well as a list of the persons involved; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. CANNON: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 512. Joint resolution making further temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1951, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2748). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee of conference. S. 2655. An act for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn M. Hryniak; without amendment (Rept. No. 2749). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BIEMILLER: Committee of conference. S. 2591. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in arthritis and rheumatism, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy, epilepsy and blindness, and other diseases, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2750). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. S. 3380. A bill to amend the act of August 9, 1939, to redefine the term "contraband article" with respect to narcotic drugs, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2751). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 7891. A bill to amend section 3224 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to the transportation of narcotic drugs; with amendment (Rept. No. 2752). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 8992. A bill to eliminate the additional internal-revenue taxes on coconut oil coming from the trust territory of the Pacific islands, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2753). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BRYSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9229. A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1941, to authorize the waiving of the requirement of performance and payment bonds in connection with certain Coast Guard contracts; without amendment (Rept. No. 2754). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORAND: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 3278. A bill to amend section 22 (d) (6) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to involuntary liquidation and replacement of inventory; with amendment (Rept. No. 2756). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 8945. A bill to give effect to the Convention for the Establishment of an International Commission for the Scientific Investigation of Tuna, signed at Mexico City January 25, 1949, by the United States of America and the United Mexican States, and the Convention for the Establishment of an Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, signed at Washington May 31, 1949, by the United States of America and the Republic of Costa Rica, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2757). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HART: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 8847. A bill to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2758). 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. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 734. Resolution for the relief of Otho F. Hipkins, individually, and Otho F. Hipkins; Cecil Clyde Squier; Conrad Reid; J. Thomas C. Hopkins, Jr.; and Isaiah Lawrence Paxton, as trustees of the Hipkins Traction Device Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2755). 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. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 9259. A bill to permit members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and their dependents, to occupy substandard quarters on a rental basis without loss of basic allowance for quarters; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 9260. A bill to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 9261. A bill to amend paragraph 1615 (g) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 9262. A bill to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted members of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McGUIRE:

H. R. 9263. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 9264. A bill to provide for the receipt and adjudication of the claims of survivors of members of the Armed Forces of the United States who, as prisoners of war, were illegally killed in the Korean theater; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 9265. A bill to assure the repair of vessels in the national defense reserve; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 9266. A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 10 of the act of June 26, 1884, as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 599 (b)); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. J. Res. 512. Joint resolution making further temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1951, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. J. Res. 513. Joint resolution to authorize the burial in the national cemetery at Nashville, Tenn., the bodies of members of the Tennessee Air National Guard killed in a plane crash near Myrtle Beach, S. C., July 23, 1950; to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

By Mr. GUILL:

H. J. Res. 514. Joint resolution creating a bipartisan advisory committee to study agricultural problems and make recommendations for the establishment of a sound farm program; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. J. Res. 515. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment by the President of a Mobilization Production Board and a Food Conservation Agency; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. Res. 737. Resolution to investigate rent increases granted by the Office of the Housing Expediter; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BREHM:

H. Res. 738. Resolution to authorize the Committee on House Administration to investigate the subject of guides for visitors to the Capitol; 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. BREHM:

H. R. 9267. A bill for the relief of Kiyoko Matsuo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 9268. A bill for the relief of Miss Florida Giusti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 9269. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mabel Monroe Bonds; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 9270. A bill for the relief of Velio Lucarini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

2290. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Hubert M. Harrison, East Texas Chamber of Commerce, Longview, Tex., "urging the enactment of legislation which will remove this cloud on titles to State-owned and privately owned properties and which will end this threat of their being taken without compensation," etc., which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JULY 28, 1950

(Legislative day of Thursday, July 20, 1950)

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

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of all races and nations, who hast made of one blood all men to dwell upon the face of the earth, send out Thy light and Thy truth; let them lead us, let them bring us to Thy holy hill.

We are grateful for the mutual feeling of amity and good will that is in our hearts as we gladly extend the hand of fellowship to representatives of a great eastern nation, as today we declare friendship in this Chamber where once was declared war. Cleanse us, we beseech Thee, from secret faults which

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

may mar our public service, knowing that we cannot call mankind to put aside the weapons of carnage and destruction if our own lives are arsenals of hatred, of prejudice, and of a selfish passion to rule. Make us vividly conscious of some freedoms which we may not exercise, the freedom to be self-indulgent; the freedom to satisfy our greed and leave others in need; the freedom to be soft, cynical, and selfish; the freedom to criticize others without accepting change in ourselves. May Thy kingdom of love and righteousness come within us that we may contribute worthily to mankind's abiding peace. We ask it in the Name that is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 27, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

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

On July 26, 1950:

S. 3609. An act to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949;

S. 2277. An act for the relief of George A. Voregarethsos (George Spiro Chatmos);

S. 2296. An act for the relief of Maria Cicerelli; and

S. 2676. An act for the relief of Kimie Yamada Ina and her daughter, Ritsuko Ina.

On July 27, 1950:

S. 382. An act for the relief of Wong Suey Wing;

S. 841. An act for the relief of Michele Bartolomeo Marchisio;

S. 976. An act for the relief of Vartan Chamsarian;

S. 1262. An act for the relief of Juliana Mendiola Alastra; and

S. 3937. An act to authorize the President to extend enlistments in the Armed Forces of the United States.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. DONNELL was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate following the conclusion of today's session until Thursday next.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CORDON was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate for the remainder of the afternoon.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. WILEY was excused from attendance upon the sessions of the Senate until next Tuesday.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Brewster	Hayden	Maybank
Bricker	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Murray
Butler	Hill	Myers
Byrd	Hoey	Neely
Capehart	Holland	O'Conor
Chapman	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Hunt	Pepper
Connally	Ives	Robertson
Cordon	Jenner	Russell
Donnell	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Kefauver	Sparkman
Eastland	Kem	Stennis
Ecton	Langer	Taft
Ellender	Lehman	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Lodge	Thye
Flanders	Lucas	Tydings
Frear	McCarran	Watkins
Fulbright	McCarthy	Wherry
George	McClellan	Wiley
Gillette	McFarland	Williams
Graham	McKellar	Young
Green	Magnuson	
Gurney	Malone	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON and Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LEAHY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF MEMBERS OF THE JAPANESE DIET AND OTHER PROMINENT JAPANESE CITIZENS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to announce that some distinguished guests from Japan who are visiting the city are now in the Capitol. Six of them are members of the Japanese Diet, and under our rules are entitled to the privilege of the floor of the Senate. The other members of the delegation are seated in the gallery. The Chair will ask the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] to escort the members of the Japanese Diet into the Chamber.

The visiting members of the Japanese Diet, consisting of Mr. Chojiro Kuriyama, representing the Liberal Party; Mr. Tokutaro Kitamura, representing the Democratic Party; Mr. Kinjiro Kawashima, representing the Socialist Party; Mr. Tokuyasu Fukuda, representing the Liberal Party; Mr. Yasuhiru Nakasone, representing the Democratic Party; and Mr. Shinichi Hayakawa, Independent member of the House of Councilors, escorted by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], entered the Chamber and were greeted by applause, Senators rising.

The members of the Japanese Diet took the seats assigned them on the Republican side of the aisle.

The following is a list of the distinguished members of the Japanese group seated in the gallery:

Mr. Bunzo Akama, Governor of Osaka.

Mr. Sachio Kishida, Governor of Hyogo Prefecture.

Mrs. Kishida.

Mr. Tsunei Kusunose, Governor of Hiroshima Prefecture.

Mr. Sojiro Sugiyama, Governor of Nagasaki Prefecture.

Mrs. Sugiyama.

Mr. Torao Hayashi, Governor of Nagano Prefecture.

Mr. Iwakichi Hattori, Governor of Shiga Prefecture.

Mr. Osamu Aoki, Governor of Mie Prefecture.

Mrs. Shinichi Hayakawa.

Mr. Kiyomaru Kamei, president, Osaka Prefectural Assembly.

Mr. Heiichiro Yamada, president, Hyogo Prefectural Assembly.

Mr. Torazo Inouye, vice president Hyogo Prefectural Assembly.

Mr. Rokuro Yamada, member, Hyogo Prefectural Assembly.

Mr. Shinso Hamai, mayor of Hiroshima.

Mr. Hiroshi Ohashi, mayor of Nagasaki.

Mr. Chujiro Haraguchi, mayor of Kobe.

Mr. Kuzaemon Matsuhashi, mayor of Nagano.

Mr. Seiichi Kawamoto, chairman, Hiroshima city council.

Mr. Shoshichi Mochizuki, chairman, Nagasaki city council.

Mr. Eiji Suzuki, chief, Osaka metropolitan police bureau.

Mrs. Suzuki.

Mr. Koichiro Murata, chairman, Shiga Prefectural educational board.

Mr. Taizo Ishizaka, president, Tokyo Shibaura Electric Co. (largest in Japan).

Mr. Naokazu Ishiguro, chief, public relations department, Tokyo Shibaura Electric Co.

Mr. Ko Suzuki, president, Osaka bank.

Mrs. Suzuki.

Mr. Toraichi Ijuin, managing director, Tokyo bank.

Mr. Gen Hirose, president, Japan Life Insurance Co.

Mr. Harue Yamane, president, Taisho Marine and Fire Insurance Co.

Mr. Soichiro Ohara, president, Kurashiki Rayon Co.

Mr. Yuichi Yuasa, president, Yuasa Battery Co.

Mr. Kiyoshi Ichimura, president, Sanai Department Store.

Mr. Yasutane Sohma, president, Koshin Co.

Mrs. Sohma, daughter of Mr. Yukio Ozaki, former mayor of Tokyo.

Mr. Shoichi Enami, managing director, Kobe Management Association.

Mr. Daiji Ioka, chairman, Osaka municipal workers' union.

Mr. Nishiki Kato, representative, labor unions of Kyushu.

Mr. Katsuji Nakajima, executive, Nagano metal workers' union.

Mr. Junichi Wada, Shiga Prefecture employees' union.

Mr. Marumichi Shimotaka, metal workers' union.

Mr. Yoshiyuki Kanagawa, chief, general affairs section, Japan Broadcasting Corp.

Mr. Yoshio Takahara, special adviser, national resources section, GHQ, SCAP.

Mr. Sen Nishiyama, special adviser, civil communications section, GHQ, SCAP.

Mr. Takasumi Mitsui, chairman, Mitsui Foundation.

Mrs. Mitsui.

Mr. Takayori Mitsui, youth representative.

The distinguished visitors from Japan were accompanied to the Senate by—

Mr. Jack K. McFall, Assistant Secretary of State, and Mr. Horace Smith, Senate liaison officer, State Department; Mr. H. Kenaston Twitchell, Mr. Basil R. Entwistle, and Mr. Albert H. Ely.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As the Chair has previously announced, six members of the Japanese Diet and a large delegation of prominent citizens of Japan are now on a trip around the world to study economic, political, social, and other conditions in the various countries which they have visited and will visit, in order that they may take back to their own country any lessons they may learn from their associations and visits which may be of help to the Japanese people.

Until the recent World War II the relationship between the Japanese Government and the Government of the United States was most amicable and peaceful. Unfortunately that status was interrupted during World War II. We sincerely hope—and we trust it is likewise the hope of the Japanese people and the Japanese Government—that we may resume our peaceful relations with the Japanese people and the Japanese Government, and that the friendship and comity which existed for nearly a whole century may not only be resumed but may be the permanent status of association and cooperation between the Japanese Government and the Government of the United States, and the Japanese people and the people of the United States, to the end that there may be brought about friendly cooperation among all nations and a permanent peace that will be just and fair to all peoples and all nations.

It is in that spirit that we welcome to the Senate of the United States not only the members of the Japanese Diet but also their colleagues on this mission around the world of investigation and study. We hope that what they observe and learn among our people and throughout the world may strengthen their desire for peace and strengthen their hand in bringing about prosperity and rehabilitation among the Japanese people and a firmer cooperation and association between them and their Government and our people and our Government, and all peoples and all governments, in behalf of peace, justice, happiness, and contentment among the peoples of the world.

In that spirit as President of the Senate the Chair is happy to welcome the distinguished guests into our Chamber. [Applause.]

The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is a great privilege for me to introduce to my colleagues in the Senate the distinguished representatives of the Japanese Government and those who are traveling with them. It was my privilege last fall to visit the Far East and to make a study of the Japanese situation there on the ground, as well as the situation in other countries.

This group with us today is made up of some fifty or more leaders of Japanese thought and Japanese action. In addition to these eminent members of the Japanese Diet, the group includes the mayors of a number of cities in Japan, the governors of a number of prefectures in Japan, and some leaders of industry and some labor-union leaders.

I note especially that in this group are the mayors and the governors of the prefectures of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and members of the councils of those cities. That is an evidence of good will on the part of Japan toward the United States, and it lays the foundation of the friendship which we all believe must be established from now on, as the Vice President has so aptly said, between our country and Japan.

Beyond that, Mr. President, it seems to me that Japan today, with its new approach to world conditions, its new attempt to find out what is going on in the world, and the place it has in the world very significantly symbolizes what I found when I was in the Far East, namely, a yearning for freedom and a yearning for peace. War is not wanted, but roads to peace are what the people seek.

The people of the Far East desire to express their individuality, they wish to express the ability of the people to take care of themselves, the idea of having people free, not under the control of a dictatorship, not under the control of colonialism or imperialism, but imbued with a spirit of freedom. Here we have a group representing those ideals and entertaining the earnest desire to explore what is going on in the world.

The first stop of this group in their trip from Tokyo was in Switzerland, where they attended the Moral Rearmament Assembly at Caux and got a picture of the spiritual foundations of and the spiritual approach to world peace.

They went from there to Germany, where they studied conditions in Germany itself, a country in many ways comparable with their own, which had been at war with us, and where the people also are trying to find peace.

They went from Germany to France and England, and then came to the United States. They visited the United Nations, where Ambassador Austin received them at Lake Success. The Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. Trygve Lie, also received them, and they had an opportunity to see the United Nations at work.

It is very fitting, therefore, that we should open our hearts in welcome to them, as they come here to discover in what way the world can be reorganized and established in the ways of permanent peace.

Mr. President, I am very happy indeed to be able on this occasion to say this word of welcome to these distinguished guests. [Applause.]

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I cordially associate myself with the sentiments expressed by the Vice President and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. We are very happy to have with us the distinguished members of the Japanese Diet, and the prominent citizens and representatives of industry, labor, education, and other activities of Japan.

It will be recalled that about 100 years ago the United States was instrumental in aiding the people of Japan to form contacts with the outside world. That was the beginning of her great advance and career as a powerful and industrial nation playing an important part in the economy not only of the East but of the world.

It is true that we have recently been involved in a bitter and terrible war. I pray God that the people of Japan, like the people of America, will want peace and will strive for it; that they will want to do away with the rule of the materialists and of military masters, and will desire to set up and maintain governments devoted to democracy and to the rule of the people. I have great hope that Japan will heartily and in entire earnestness turn her attention toward democratic government, toward government controlled by the people, toward freedom and toward enlightened international cooperation, to the end that in the future wars may be prevented and the course of the nation may be charted along the roadway of peace, and thus contribute to the welfare and happiness of all the people of the world. It was that particular idea I wanted to leave with our distinguished visitors on this occasion.

We hope the people of Japan will realize that the United States in the last war had no ambitions for territory, no desire for conquest, no wish to conquer other peoples to bring them under the rule of the United States. We had no materialistic desires. We never dreamed of imperialism. We fought simply to defend the things for which we have stood since the United States was first established, for democracy, for peace, for all the fine attributes that go with peaceful, democratic ways of life.

We are happy to have you visit us. We are glad you have visited other countries. We feel sure that your contacts on your journey will enable you to return to Japan with new concepts of the life of the world, and with the firm belief that the United States wants nothing from you except justice and fairness and cooperation in the world's efforts to achieve peace and to live under peaceful

conditions. We welcome you. We wish your country well. We hope you can rehabilitate your broken enterprises and turn them all into the pathway of cooperation and peace in behalf of all the peoples of the world. [Applause.]

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to join in the words of welcome to our friends from Japan. It particularly interests me that they have been concerning themselves with the spiritual basis of peace. That is a field which we have not yet fully explored. It is something which it is necessary that we should explore.

It is a conviction of mine that wars, civil tumults, and all the ills which afflict mankind come from disobedience to the moral laws of the universe. We in America have to examine ourselves, you in Japan have to examine yourselves, all the nations of the world have to examine themselves, to see whether they are working in accordance with the moral laws of the universe, under which alone can peace be attained and maintained.

I am particularly glad that you ladies and gentlemen from across the Pacific Ocean have been concerning yourselves with the troubles in which the world today finds itself. (Applause.)

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, some months ago we were honored by a visit of distinguished representatives of the Parliament of West Germany. On that occasion the Senate extended to our visitors a warm and cordial welcome.

It gives me pleasure today to join my colleagues in extending the same kind of welcome to these distinguished representatives of Japan. I hope that as they leave here they will feel that this welcome on our part is a sincere one.

We told our friends from Western Germany that we welcomed them as allies in our present efforts to preserve the peace of the world. We welcome the people of Japan in the same world-wide effort.

When I visited Japan in 1935, I met a number of outstanding Japanese who expressed warm friendship for the American people and for the United States of America. On that visit I also met some of the war lords, who were not friendly toward the United States. I think it is only fair to say that, in my opinion, events have proved that they were not friendly to their own people. They believed in a caste system; they believed in imperialism; and they had no objection at all to seeing the rank and file of the Japanese people occupy the status of peasants.

Since General MacArthur has been in Japan, I think the Japanese people have come to realize that our chief aim in the present occupation there is to protect the Japanese people from the type of government which led them into war and kept down the average man from achieving the status in life to which we feel every citizen should be entitled.

Mr. President, we are very happy to know that the Japanese people have adopted a constitution which gives more rights to the working people and gives more rights to the women of that country and gives more self-government to the people of Japan.

This delegation comes to us at a critical period, but we are very glad they are here.

Mr. President, I simply wish that the parliament of Russia would send a delegation here and would give us a chance to address them. As a matter of fact, if they did not wish to do that, I wish they would invite us to go over there. If they would do that, I believe every Member of the Senate would accept the invitation provided they would promise that each one of us would be permitted to speak for as long as 5 minutes to the Russian people and let them know what our real aims are.

Again, Mr. President, I wish to assure our friends from Japan that we are sincere in telling them that we believe in the brotherhood of man, that we wish to cooperate with all friendly and peace-loving people of the world in striving to avoid another conflict which might destroy civilization, and that we wish to join with all other peoples in building up the nations of the world to the point where all may have a better opportunity to enjoy the kind of liberty and freedom which we in this country have been privileged to enjoy for many years.

(Applause.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. After these expressions by Members of the Senate of their feeling of good will and their greetings to this distinguished delegation, the Chair wishes to state that he has been advised that one of the members of the delegation from the Japanese Diet, who is a member of the Liberal Party of Japan, a close friend and associate of Prime Minister Yoshida, and a representative of the Government of Japan on this mission around the world, desires to express briefly a response to the generous welcome which has been accorded to them.

By unanimous consent, the Chair will recognize the Honorable Chojiro Kuriyama, a member of the Diet of Japan, to express his sentiments.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. KURIYAMA. Mr. President, honorable Members of the United States Senate: We are deeply grateful for the courtesy extended us today by the United States Senate. It is our sincere regret that Japan has broken almost a century-old friendship between the two countries. In spite of this big mistake on our part, the magnanimous forgiveness and generosity of America not only have allowed Japan to survive, but are helping her recovery.

It is gratifying to know that the leadership of America is rooted in Christianity.

The lawless aggression in Korea is again involving America in terrible sacrifices. We Japanese wholeheartedly support the action taken by the United Nations; and if you will permit us to do so, we pay highest respect to the courageous leadership of President Truman in this matter. [Applause.] I hope that Japan will be shown ways in which she can be of assistance in cooperation with the United States.

Mr. President, as some of the distinguished Members of this Senate have said, we went to Caux, Switzerland, in search of the true content of democracy. We found the ideology which will feed democracy in Japan, and at the same time which is the powerful answer to communism.

Now here we are to study the true heritage of great America. I feel that it will be a source of the greatest happiness to the people in Japan if we Japanese can rebuild and reconstruct our nation on the same principles that you in America have followed.

Although we have many things for which to thank America and Americans, on this occasion we just briefly express our sincere gratitude to the United States of America for its help and guidance.

Mr. President, honorable Members of the United States Senate, thank you again for your courtesy and kindness.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will say to the six members of the Japanese Diet who have been received on the Senate floor, that they are welcome to remain here as long as their convenience may dictate.

The Senate will now resume the consideration of legislative business.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the 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.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on July 11 the Senate proceeded to consider 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, which is the unfinished business of the Senate. I realize that a number of important extraneous matters were necessarily submitted to the Senate, and that long debates have taken place thereon. However, it seems to me that we ought to expedite consideration of the appropriation bill. As I understand, there remain practically only two or three amendments which are highly controversial. We are almost through reading the bill itself for committee amendments, and I should hope we might proceed to the point where we could vote, perhaps this afternoon, on at least one of these controversial amendments.

Everyone knows that with the new one-package approach to the annual appropriations, some time will be required in conference before the conferees agree. The quicker we get the appropriation bill into conference, the sooner we may be able to take at least some 3-day recesses for the benefit of the Senate as a whole. I sincerely hope that we shall expedite the appropriation bill, stay on the bill itself, and eliminate, so far as possible, speeches dealing with matters other than the appropriation bill. If we do that, and if we remain in session rather late this evening, until, say, 7 or 8 or 9 o'clock, we may accomplish quite a little in connection with the bill. I appeal to Senators on both sides of the aisle to cooperate to the end that we may get along with the bill as rapidly as possible.

I am not blaming anyone for the delay at all. I am only attempting to

make a very sincere appeal for the expedition of business, in order that the appropriation bill may go to conference as soon as possible.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wish to call the attention of the distinguished majority leader to the fact that the Banking and Currency Committee hope to have the new defense production bill ready for action on the floor of the Senate next Monday. We plan to work all of today and tomorrow, and we hope to finish it by tomorrow evening or tomorrow night.

The majority leader, of course, knows that there will be many items of difference between the House and Senate in regard to the appropriation bill, which, in its omnibus form, represents a new procedure, and that we do not yet know just how the conferees will be appointed and how they will act, whether there will be subcommittee conferees, and whether the various parts will then have to be consolidated. But in any event it will be quite a task to reach an agreement on this bill.

The majority leader knows there will be controversial matters in the defense production bill, he knows we have got to pass a tax bill, and he knows that everyone would like to get out of here by Labor Day. So it seems to me that, since we have been on the appropriation bill for so long and have spent so much time on extraneous and irrelevant matters, we could well afford to consider the three items that are before us now, which come under the head of general military measures. Certainly there will not be any amendment seriously pressed to cut down the appropriation for the Defense Department. We shall then have ECA and several other matters, including the point 4 program and the so-called Bridges-Byrd amendment, which will have to be considered. All those matters could be handled today, if each Senator who wishes to speak on an amendment would confine himself to the amendments and try to condense his remarks to not exceeding 10 minutes.

I hope very much that the Senate will cooperate with the plea of the majority leader to finish consideration of the pending bill either today or in a night session tonight.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Virginia for the statement he has made, especially in view of the fact that he advises the Senate that the Committee on Banking and Currency will work tomorrow in order to expedite consideration of the measure now before them dealing with the war situation which exists in Korea. I am also glad that he agrees that we should move along.

I do not want it understood that I am saying that the Senate of the United States or the Congress is anxious to adjourn. We are going to stay here as long as there is anything important to do, and we are going to do whatever is necessary with respect to the implementation of the effort dealing with the unusual Korean situation. However, it seems to me that probably after we move along with the appropriation bill, the conference reports upon social security and other matters, as well as the legislation implementing our effort to deal with the Korean situation, we may at that time be able to take recesses of 3 days at a time, always ready to return at a moment's notice if the President or the Congress so desires. There is not a Member of the Senate who cannot be here within from 24 to 48 hours, irrespective of where he may be in the United States.

RESUMPTION OF WORK ON THE SENATE CHAMBER

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in view of the statement made by the majority leader, I conclude, as chairman of the committee of the Senate which has charge of the remodeling of the Senate Chamber, that we might as well notify the interested parties that, so far as this particular year is concerned, the Senate will be here possibly every third day—and I would agree to that.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I think the Senator's conclusion is correct. I have not discussed this other than in a cursory way, with certain Members of the Senate, but I do not believe anyone wants to move back into the old Supreme Court Chamber.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I would not want the work on remodeling the Senate Chamber resumed, I may say to the Senator from Illinois, unless it were expected that we would be gone for a substantial length of time. On the other hand, I should not want to interfere with the work of the Senate, which probably would result, if it should appear likely that we would have to meet at least every 3 days.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator knows that we are operating more or less on a day-to-day basis with the world situation before us.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Neither the Senator from Illinois nor any other Senator can reach a definite conclusion as to what will be done. It seems to me, as a result of having talked with members of the Democratic Policy Committee and with Members on the Republican side of the aisle that we might probably take 3-day recesses for a short while, and in that way to give Senators an opportunity to return to their homes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The point I had in mind was that before the Korean situation came up, it had been intended that when Congress adjourned, the contractors would continue work on the Senate Chamber. But as I see the situation at the moment, I think we had better postpone it for a while.

Mr. LUCAS. Conditions are so indefinite and the contingencies are so great as to what may or may not happen, I think it is advisable for the Senator to proceed along the line which the Senator from New Mexico has suggested.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to submit petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and present routine matters for the RECORD, without debate.

Mr. TAFT. I object.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator from Ohio objects, I withdraw the request.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, that does not foreclose each individual Senator from asking unanimous consent.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 2253. An act for the relief of Dr. In Sung Kwak;

S. 3098. An act to amend section 104 of title 28 of the United States Code so as to create a Greenville division in the northern district of Mississippi, with terms of court to be held at Greenville;

S. 3585. An act for the relief of Dodge County, Wis.;

S. 3652. An act to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of certain deceased civilian officers and employees of the Government;

S. 3653. An act to provide for financing the operations of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

S. 3832. An act to approve a contract negotiated with the Ogden River Water Users' Association, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes;

S. 3833. An act to approve a contract negotiated with the South Cache Water Users' Association, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution giving the consent of Congress to an agreement between the State of Missouri and the State of Kansas establishing a boundary between said States.

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

S. 4. An act authorizing the advanced training in aeronautics of technical personnel of the Civil Aeronautics Administration;

S. 2018. An act to authorize advancements to and the reimbursement of certain agencies of the Treasury Department for services performed for other Government agencies, and for other purposes; and

S. 3921. An act for the temporary appointment of referees in bankruptcy, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 2863. An act to provide for the expansion and disposition of certain national cemeteries; and

S. 3859. An act to authorize the President to control the anchorage and movement of foreign-flag vessels in waters of the United States when the national security of the United States is endangered, and for other purposes.

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

H. R. 544. An act to provide for terms of court to be held at West Palm Beach, and at Fort Myers, in the southern district of Florida;

H. R. 651. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Paul E. Queneau;

H. R. 1662. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to acquire on behalf of the United States Government all property and facilities of the Rainier National Park Co.;

H. R. 1749. An act for the relief of the town of Mount Desert, Maine;

H. R. 1860. An act for the relief of Kenji Takumi;

H. R. 2401. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the State of California;

H. R. 3012. An act for the relief of the Wyoming National Bank of Wilkes-Barre;

H. R. 3314. An act for the relief of the estate of the late Eulogio Reyes Suarez;

H. R. 4192. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, section 220, relating to receipt of commissions or gifts for procuring loans;

H. R. 4256. An act for the relief of James A. G. Martindale;

H. R. 4530. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna L. De Angelis;

H. R. 4579. An act to amend section 333 of title 28 of the United States Code to provide for the attendance at judicial conferences of their respective circuits of the district judges in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the Canal Zone, Hawaii, and Alaska;

H. R. 4600. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Janet Judith Kceninger, a minor;

H. R. 4629. An act for the relief of the Sonoma County Farmers' Mutual Fire Insurance Co.;

H. R. 4891. An act for the relief of Albert E. Scheflen:

H. R. 4915. An act to amend the act of December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1086; 43 U. S. C., sec. 36b), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands or interest in lands for the Geological Survey";

H. R. 5083. An act for the relief of Sister Maria Emelia (Anna Bohn);

H. R. 5244. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles J. Trees, Army of the United States;

H. R. 5810. An act relating to the furnishing of accommodations at Klamath Falls, Oreg., for the United States District Court for the District of Oregon;

H. R. 6195. An act for the relief of Carlo de Luca;

H. R. 6228. An act for the relief of Dr. Chao-Jen Chen, Dr. Janet Wang Chen, and Eleanor Chen;

H. R. 6242. An act to prevent the entry of certain giant snails into the United States;

H. R. 6409. An act for the relief of Mrs. Grace A. Olson;

H. R. 6522. An act for the relief of Louis R. Chadbourne;

H. R. 6537. An act to provide funds for cooperation with the Territorial school authorities of Nome, Alaska, in the construction, extension, improvement, and equipment of school facilities, to be available to both native and nonnative children;

H. R. 6640. An act to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the disposition of public lands of the United States situated in the State of Oklahoma between the Cimarron base line and the north boundary of the State of Texas," approved August 7, 1946, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6909. An act for the relief of Floyd E. Dotson;

H. R. 6929. An act to authorize the acquisition by the United States of the remaining non-Federal lands within Big Bend National Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6959. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to William Watt;

H. R. 6960. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to James Wilbur Watt;

H. R. 6961. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mary E. White Watt;

H. R. 6962. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Minnie M. Watt Kopac;

H. R. 6992. An act for the relief of Kirocor Haladjian, Tacouhi Haladjian, Gulunia Haladjian, and Virginie Haladjian;

H. R. 7019. An act for the relief of Aenny Blank;

H. R. 7336. An act for the relief of Mrs. Fumie Ishibashi Akimoto;

H. R. 7342. An act to provide for boundary adjustments of the Badlands National Monument, in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7371. An act for the relief of John Fleckstein;

H. R. 7390. An act for the relief of Erika Kuebart and her minor son;

H. R. 7393. An act for the relief of Francisco Blanco and Mrs. Celine Smith;

H. R. 7451. An act for the relief of Sumiko Fujita;

H. R. 7454. An act for the relief of Robert C. Watters, Mrs. Martha L. Watters, C. E. Nivens, E. O. Nivens, and the estate of J. W. Gillum, deceased;

H. R. 7630. An act for the relief of Mrs. Wha Sook Lee Hong;

H. R. 7631. An act for the relief of Ottavia De Gaspare and Sandra De Gaspare;

H. R. 7641. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land in the District of Columbia to the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church;

H. R. 7733. An act for the relief of Sisters Rita Pinto de Carvalho, Maria Leite da Silva, Carmelinda Lopes de Aguiar, Maria Adozinda da Fonseca Melo, Joaquine de Jesus, and Maria Luisa Pinto Carvalho;

H. R. 7773. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted land on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, S. Dak.;

H. R. 7856. An act for the relief of Mrs. Teruko Tominaga Ikeuchi;

H. R. 7869. An act to provide for the furnishing of quarters at Newman, Ga., for the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia;

H. R. 7964. An act for the relief of the estate of Francis A. Waldron;

H. R. 8062. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Charles Spiller and Glenn T. Spiller, minors;

H. R. 8118. An act for the relief of the estate of the late Ismael Miranda;

H. R. 8144. An act to authorize the sale of a small tract of land at Great Falls, Mont.;

H. R. 8158. An act to repeal certain laws as they affect the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 8184. An act for the relief of Michiyo Takada and her minor daughter, Michiko;

H. R. 8258. An act for the relief of Il Nai Che;

H. R. 8315. An act for the relief of Joseph F. Gallagher;

H. R. 8384. An act for the relief of Setsuko Hori;

H. R. 8401. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maurice N. Gcss;

H. R. 8452. An act for the relief of Ronald Mow and Angeline Cecilia Mow;

H. R. 8463. An act to authorize the sale of certain small tracts of Indian land lying to the south and east of the Tongue River in the State of Montana;

H. R. 8523. An act for the relief of Marianna Gantschnigg and Merle Richard Gantschnigg;

H. R. 8533. An act for the relief of Emiko Nishimura;

H. R. 8561. An act for the relief of Harriet T. Johnston;

H. R. 8562. An act for the relief of Yukie Yabe and her son;

H. R. 8576. An act to provide reimbursement of expenses incurred in connection with the burial of those who served in the military forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while such forces were in the armed forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States, dated July 26, 1941;

H. R. 8597. An act to permit national banks to give security in the form required by State law for deposits of funds by local public agencies and officers;

H. R. 8598. An act for the relief of Mrs. Chisako Shimizu Sheldahl and Ryoichi Shimizu Sheldahl;

H. R. 8641. An act for the relief of Clyde L. Watson, Jr., and Laverne F. Andrews;

H. R. 8686. An act for the relief of the Overseas Navigation Corp.;

H. R. 8718. An act for the relief of Fred Hess;

H. R. 8769. An act for the relief of Annmarie Stritter and her minor daughter;

H. R. 8829. An act for the relief of Sisters Pasqualina Bova, Rosa Pellanda, Emilia Del Rossi, Speranza Zoia, and Domenica Lapadula;

H. R. 8863. An act for the relief of Sachiko Mitoma;

H. R. 8874. An act to authorize the sale of lands to the city of Flagstaff, Ariz.;

H. R. 8887. An act to declare that the United States holds certain lands for the Seminole Tribe of Florida;

H. R. 8901. An act for the relief of Mrs. Asako Ikeda Heaney;

H. R. 8902. An act for the relief of Satoko Matsushima Hoglund;

H. R. 8906. An act to repeal certain legislation relating to the Gallup Durango Highway and the Gallup-Window Rock Highway at the Navajo Indian Reservation;

H. R. 8944. An act authorizing the Ogdensburg Bridge Authority, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near the city of Ogdensburg, N. Y.;

H. R. 8971. An act for the relief of Gertrude Hell;

H. R. 8979. An act to provide for the transfer or quitclaim of title to certain lands in Florida;

H. R. 8987. An act for the relief of Setsuko Kato;

H. R. 9002. An act to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system in view of the increased cost of living;

H. R. 9023. An act to amend the Hatch Act;

H. R. 9044. An act for the relief of Mrs. Kayoko Suzuki Jensen;

H. R. 9055. An act for the relief of Cynthia Anne Kane;

H. R. 9062. An act for the relief of Mrs. Willie G. Heath;

H. R. 9074. An act to amend chapter 61 (relating to lotteries) of title 18, United States Code, to make clear that such chapter does not apply to nonprofit contests wherein prizes are awarded for the specie, size, weight, or quality of fish caught by the contestant;

H. R. 9086. An act for the relief of Maria Luisa Mercado;

H. R. 9087. An act for the relief of H. Dale Madison;

H. R. 9143. An act for the relief of Humi Nagano and her child;

H. R. 9145. An act for the relief of Tomoko Yamaya;

H. R. 9166. An act for the relief of Louis J. T. Hendrickx;

H. J. Res. 490. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the respective tribes, bands, and groups of Indians under his jurisdiction to determine their qualifications to manage their own affairs without supervision and control by the Federal Government; and

H. J. Res. 510. Joint resolution to exempt certain counsel employed by committee from certain Federal laws under Special Committee on Campaign Expenditures, 1950.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

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

resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 702. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ethel N. Plunkett;

H. R. 1022. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the district of Delaware to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Alvin Smith, of New Castle, Del., arising out of the damage sustained by him as a result of the construction and maintenance of the New Castle United States Army Air Base, New Castle, Del.;

H. R. 1095. An act for the relief of Pittsburgh DuBois Co.;

H. R. 1626. An act for the relief of Mrs. A. H. Hill;

H. R. 1697. An act for the relief of Mildred Smith Butler;

H. R. 1854. An act for the relief of Kenneth Everard Hadfield;

H. R. 2196. An act to authorize the elimination of lands from the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana;

H. R. 2264. An act for the relief of C. H. Bolling;

H. R. 2462. An act for the relief of Miju Iseri Tsuda;

H. R. 2535. An act for the relief of Samuel J. D. Marshall;

H. R. 2588. An act to confirm title in V. LeBlanc and C. Riccard to certain lands in West Baton Rouge Parish, La.;

H. R. 2753. An act to amend section 2 of the act of April 28, 1904 (33 Stat. 527; 43 U. S. C., sec. 213), relating to additional homestead entries;

H. R. 2808. An act for the relief of Grace G. Walker;

H. R. 2851. An act for the relief of Carl L. Sexauer;

H. R. 3169. An act granting permanent residence to certain Spanish physicians residing in Puerto Rico;

H. R. 3284. An act to authorize grantees of recreational demonstration project lands to make land exchanges relating to such properties, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3305. An act for the relief of the estate of José Salgado Santos;

H. R. 3316. An act for the relief of the estate of the late Francisco J. Córdova;

H. R. 3330. An act for the relief of Therese Hohman;

H. R. 3535. An act for the relief of William A. Cross;

H. R. 3906. An act to amend the Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Act, as amended;

H. R. 3994. An act for the relief of John D. Lange;

H. R. 4041. An act for the relief of Parish Bros.;

H. R. 4141. An act for the relief of Edwin F. Shockley;

H. R. 4309. An act for the relief of Mrs. Nellie K. Marlowe;

H. R. 4343. An act for the relief of J. P. Acker;

H. R. 4364. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ruth B. Moore; John Robert Lusk III; John R. Lusk, Sr.; Mrs. Minnie P. Pruitt; and Mrs. Billie John Bickle;

H. R. 4386. An act to amend section 2 (a) and section 7 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, to make failure of registration a continuing offense, and to continue the obligation of officers, directors, and persons acting as such, to comply with the act despite dissolution of a foreign agent;

H. R. 4601. An act for the relief of Jeannette Passayanni-Capodistria;

H. R. 5003. An act to provide for the exchange between the United States and the State of New York of certain lands and interests in lands at Manhattan Beach, Kings County, N. Y.;

H. R. 5110. An act for the relief of Janos (John Treber and Mrs. Katalin (Katherine) Treber;

H. R. 5221. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Grazia Riccio DiPietro;

H. R. 5252. An act for the relief of W. M. Tindal;

H. R. 5470. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Haddad;

H. R. 5526. An act to authorize the President to provide for the performance of certain functions of the President by other officers of the Government, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5628. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land to the State of Rhode Island;

H. R. 5799. An act for the relief of the Acme Finance Co.;

H. R. 5849. An act for the relief of Samuel M. Kornegay;

H. R. 5947. An act for the relief of Alfio Batelli;

H. R. 5990. An act to provide for the construction, development, administration, and maintenance of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway in the State of Maryland and its extension into the District of Columbia as a part of the park system of the District of Columbia and its environs by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6013. An act to amend an act fixing the price of copies of records furnished by the Department of the Interior;

H. R. 6018. An act for the relief of Lubomir Mikulik and Viliam Krajcirovic;

H. R. 6198. An act for the relief of the First National Bank in Richmond, Calif.;

H. R. 6247. An act authorizing transfer of land and improvements thereon by the Secretary of the Interior to New Mexico State Fair;

H. R. 6270. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted inherited land on the Winnebago Indian Reservation, Nebr.;

H. R. 6292. An act to provide that payments to States under the Oil Land Leasing Act of 1920 shall be made biannually;

H. R. 6482. An act for the relief of Antonio Artolozaga Euscola;

H. R. 6644. An act for the relief of Edwin F. Rounds;

H. R. 6697. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Howard H. Moran;

H. R. 6699. An act to authorize the sale of certain land on the Rosebud Indian Reservation, S. Dak.; allotted to Susan Eagle Dog;

H. R. 6703. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted inherited land on the Rosebud Indian Reservation, S. Dak.;

H. R. 6709. An act for the relief of Ed Howard Russell;

H. R. 6969. An act for the relief of Ralph E. Brown;

H. R. 6971. An act to authorize the transfer of funds allocated for expenditure in cooperation with the New Jersey State Highway Department on State Highway Route No. 100 to State Parkway Route No. 4;

H. R. 6994. An act for the relief of Karen R. McAndrews;

H. R. 7016. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret O'Donnell and Mrs. Arlene R. Shannon;

H. R. 7046. An act for the relief of C. W. Jacobs;

H. R. 7072. An act for the relief of Mrs. Young Ja Kim;

H. R. 7074. An act for the relief of Hiroko Fujiwara Matsuoka and Mimiyo Matsuoka;

H. R. 7078. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eiko Yamada Nagatoshi, Edward Takeo Nagatoshi, and Frances Yoko Nagatoshi;

H. R. 7079. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gin Shibasaki Okafuji;

H. R. 7204. An act for the relief of Maria Cristina D'Angelo;

H. R. 7219. An act to authorize acquisition by the Administrator of General Services of certain land and the improvements thereon in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 7260. An act to provide for the holding of court and the furnishing of quarters at Rock Island for the United States District Court for the Southern District, Northern Division of Illinois;

H. R. 7314. An act for the relief of Yukie Nishimura Okubo;

H. R. 7339. An act to abolish the Holy Cross National Monument, in the State of Colorado, and to provide for the administration of the lands contained therein as a part of the national forest within which such national monument is situated, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7392. An act for the relief of Columbus Finley;

H. R. 7414. An act for the relief of Teresa Gentile and Galliano Gentile;

H. R. 7428. An act to admit Mrs. Erna Tvedt to the United States for permanent residence;

H. R. 7564. An act for the relief of Maria Margareta Ries and Konrad Horst Wilhelm Ries;

H. R. 7608. An act for the relief of Mitsuko Morita;

H. R. 7629. An act for the relief of Fumiko Arakawa and her child Rie;

H. R. 7667. An act directing the transfer to the Department of the Interior by the General Services Administration of certain property in Boise Barracks, Boise, Idaho;

H. R. 7675. An act to authorize the addition of certain land to Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, in the State of Tennessee;

H. R. 7706. An act for the relief of Ayako Kurihara;

H. R. 7779. An act for the relief of Mrs. Stamatia Lymberopoulos and Leonidas Stavrou Limperopoulos;

H. R. 7783. An act for the relief of Mrs. Donald Rafter;

H. R. 7810. An act for the relief of M. S. Davis;

H. R. 7815. An act for the relief of John Yee Horn;

H. R. 7820. An act for the relief of Keiko Uchida Doane and her minor child;

H. R. 7899. An act for the relief of Mrs. Michiko Nogami Cotter and Katsumi Cotter;

H. R. 7916. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to execute an oil and gas lease on a certain tract of land in Park County, Wyo.;

H. R. 7944. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Albert Chandler;

H. R. 7961. An act for the relief of Chiyoko Yano;

H. R. 7970. An act for the relief of Mrs. Regina Anderson and her minor child;

H. R. 7977. An act to authorize the city of Buffalo, Wyo., to make additional uses of certain lands, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7982. An act to abolish the Wheeler National Monument, in the State of Colorado, and to provide for the administration of the lands contained therein as a part of the national forest within which such national monument is situated and for other purposes;

H. R. 8055. An act relating to the collection, payment, and dishonor of demand items, and to the revocation of credit for, and payment of, such items, by banks in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 8067. An act for the relief of Mrs. Yup Boon (Joan) Kim Skanes;

H. R. 8098. An act for the relief of Teruko Ishikawa;

H. R. 8119. An act for the relief of Midori Ohta (also known as Mary Stephen);

H. R. 8125. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hisae Kawauchi Kelly;

H. R. 8155. An act for the relief of Chiyo Furumura Yoshida;

H. R. 8180. An act for the relief of Parue K. Tsugami;

H. R. 8183. An act for the relief of Asako Tsuchida;

H. R. 8287. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue duplicate of William Gerard's script certificate numbered 2, subdivision 13, to Lucy P. Crowell;

H. R. 8289. An act for the relief of Yee Balche Yee;

H. R. 8361. An act for the relief of Toshiko Murai;

H. R. 8381. An act for the relief of Mrs. Joseph G. Grant;

H. R. 8382. An act for the relief of Mrs. Misao Hatanaka Deskins;

H. R. 8451. An act for the relief of Yoshie Nozawa;

H. R. 8500. An act for the relief of Hatsuko Torikai;

H. R. 8514. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for exemption from duty of certain sound recordings imported by the Department of State, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8519. An act for the relief of the estate of Archer C. Gunter;

H. R. 8581. An act for the relief of Yasuko Higuchi Thomson;

H. R. 8583. An act for the relief of Hisako Shimizu;

H. R. 8600. An act for the relief of Yuriko Aoyama;

H. R. 8604. An act to provide for the conveyance of the Percy Jones General Hospital Gull Lake Annex, Gull Lake, Mich., to the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.;

H. R. 8617. An act to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard";

H. R. 8709. An act to change the designations of Health Officer and Assistant Health Officer of the District of Columbia, respectively, to Director of Public Health and Assistant Director of Public Health;

H. R. 8722. An act for the relief of Jun Hin Lum;

H. R. 8958. An act relating to the policing of the buildings and grounds of the Library of Congress; and

H. J. Res. 461. Joint resolution to provide that South Parkersburg, W. Va., shall for the purposes of the Seventeenth Decennial Census be treated as a part of Parkersburg, W. Va.

REPORT ON LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

This is the thirty-first report to Congress on lend-lease operations, for the period ending March 31, 1950, furnished in accordance with section 5, subsection (b), of the act of March 11, 1941 (55 Stat. 32; 22 U. S. C., sec. 414 (b)).

The Government of Chile, in February 1950, arranged to pay the entire balance on its lend-lease accounts, thus providing for settlement in full of its lend-lease obligations. Efforts have been continued to complete the negotiation of settlements with the few countries which have not entered into final agreements for lend-lease, and to dispose of various claims, accounts, and other residual problems.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 28, 1950.*

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Resolutions adopted by the Townsend Clubs of St. Petersburg, and Townsend Club, No. 2, of Orange County, Orlando, both in the State of Florida, favoring the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan, providing old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

ASSISTANCE FOR UNEMPLOYED TURTLE MOUNTAIN BAND OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the governing body of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians, relating to assistance for the unemployed Indians in that band.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE TURTLE MOUNTAIN BAND OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS (AN UNINCORPORATED TRIBE)

Whereas this unincorporated tribe is an Indian organization as defined under the act of July 12, 1943 (Public Law 120, 78th Cong., 1st sess.); and

Whereas the advisory committee is endeavoring to seek employment and assistance for their members, but find that many of their members are having difficulties in securing employment in the Red River Valley due to flood and lateness of the spring, and will be unable to earn enough money for winter subsistence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the governing body of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians urges and requests the Congress and Indian Office to set up projects on the reservation to provide employment for the unemployed able-bodied Indian men for the fall and winter month. Projects needed are graveling of all reservation roads, building of concrete culverts, clearing of land, drainage of swamps and sloughs, planting of trees, building of log homes, etc. These projects would be beneficial to the reservation and would also serve to provide work and subsistence for the employable that need assistance, and further, these projects would not cost much more than the usual cost of relief during the winter months; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Area Director, United States Congressman of North Dakota, and the Governor of the State.

CERTIFICATION

I, the undersigned, secretary of the advisory committee of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians, an unincorporated tribe, hereby certify that the advisory committee is composed of eight (8) members, of whom five constituting a quorum, were present at a meeting thereof duly and regularly called, noticed, covened, and held this 5th day of June 1950; that the foregoing resolution was duly adopted at such meeting by the affirmative vote of five members; and that the said resolution has not been rescinded or amended in any way.

Dated this 5th day of June 1950.

HENRY R. LAFOUNTAIN,
Secretary of the Advisory Committee.

Attest:

NORBERT DAVIS,
Chairman of the Advisory Committee.

Recommended for approval:

C. H. BEITZEL,
Superintendent, Turtle Mountain Consolidated Agency.

CONSERVATION AND VALLEY AUTHORITY LEGISLATION—RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN SOCIETY FOR ORNITHOLOGY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received this morning a resolution from the Wisconsin Society for Ornithology rightly opposing valley authority legislation as tending to weaken the administration and management of the fish and wildlife resources of our country by the respective States.

I very definitely agree in opposition to further efforts to set up these superstates like the Columbia Valley Authority which has been proposed. The president of the Wisconsin Society is Charles Nelson, of Waukesha, Wis., the vice president is John L. Diedrich, and the treasurer is Carl P. Frister, both of Milwaukee.

The editor of the magazine of the society is N. R. Barger, of Madison, associate editor is Rev. Samuel D. Robbins, Jr., of Mazomanie, Wis.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be appropriately referred and printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WISCONSIN SOCIETY
FOR ORNITHOLOGY,
July 25, 1950.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the annual convention of the Wisconsin Society for Ornithology, held at Two Rivers, Wis., from May 5 to 7, the following resolution was passed with reference to the reallocation of Federal responsibilities in conservation:

"Whereas the reorganization of Federal conservation activities into valley authorities will critically weaken the administration and management of the fish and wildlife resources of the United States; and

"Whereas we strongly oppose the delegation of these conservation activities to autonomous agencies responsible only to the President: Be it

"*Resolved,* That the Wisconsin Society for Ornithology record the wholehearted opposition of its membership to bills H. R. 894 and S. 1645 in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress; and that a copy of this resolution be sent to our delegates in the House of Representatives and the Senate."

Respectfully submitted.

MARY DONALD,
Secretary.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION—TELEGRAM FROM WISCONSIN ASSOCIATION OF REAL ESTATE BROKERS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we are all aware that the most significant legislation which we are to shortly consider is S. 3936, the Defense Production Act—now being reviewed by our colleagues in the Senate Banking Committee. All those of us who are not members of that committee are following its work with closest attention, reviewing all of the elements in the controversy between those who contend that the bill goes much too far in regimenting our civilian economy and those who complain that it does not go far enough.

Already many groups in our population have expressed their grave concern to me and to my colleagues that the Korean emergency, while requiring tremendous support for our fighting troops, does not require the type of stringent dictatorial controls such as have been recommended by the President.

My Republican associates and I feel that the Korean emergency should definitely not be used as a pretext to slip

over on us totalitarian controls which may not be necessary.

VOLUNTARY SELF-DISCIPLINE ESSENTIAL

To the greatest extent possible, we want to encourage the voluntary self-discipline and cooperation of our patriotic American people—cooperation to prevent runaway prices.

The real estate profession of my State has been particularly concerned about title 4 of S. 3936, which it feels is discriminating against them. As an indication of its judgment, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD the text of a telegram which I have just received from Mr. Alfred E. Trenkamp, president of the Wisconsin Association of Real Estate Brokers, located in Milwaukee. Mr. Trenkamp rightly points out the need for Federal economy—cutting down on nonessential spending. I thoroughly agree, but just yesterday when we attempted to do this, our economy forces were defeated 28 for economy to 47 against. Obviously, Congress has not yet awakened to the need for economy in nonessential spending.

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

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *July 27, 1950.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Wisconsin Association of Real Estate Brokers urges you to vote against title IV of Senate bill 3936 and companion House bill 9176 which we understand will control by Federal regulation all sales, values, leases, home sales, and real-estate transactions of all kinds and which authorizes Federal licensing of all real-estate transactions, etc. We object as a State professional group to being singled out for Federal control—if state of national emergency requires this step then it would seem apparent that all prices, wages, and all phases of our economy should be likewise restricted as a serious war emergency only with automatic provision repealing controls as soon as shooting stops. Likewise, it would seem rational that if such measures are necessary for defense that all Federal Government grants and aids to States and cities be suspended and withheld during emergency as such spending only serves to absorb scarce wartime materials and labor creating additional shortages. Urge your considered judgment.

ALFRED E. TRENKAMP,
President, Wisconsin Association of Real Estate Brokers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 210. A bill to authorize the conveyance of a portion of the United States military reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., to the State of New York for use as a maritime school, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2180).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 7303. A bill to amend section 120 of the Internal Revenue Code; with amendments (Rept. No. 2181).

By Mr. FREAR, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 3263. A bill to amend Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to certain mothers of veterans; with amendments (Rept. No. 2184).

By Mr. WILLIAMS, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 3960. A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 10 of the act of June 26, 1884, as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 599 (b)); without amendment (Rept. No. 2185).

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, to which was referred the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. WATKINS (for himself, Mr. MCCARRAN, and Mr. KERR) to 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, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report (No. 2182) thereon; and the amendment was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. CAPEHART introduced a bill (S. 3989) for the relief of Robert O. Overton, Marjorie C. Overton, and the legal guardian of Sally Eitel, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BRIDGES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to 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, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. WHERRY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 7786, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. KEM, and Mr. WILLIAMS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 7786, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. LODGE (for himself, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. NEELY, Mr. FREAR, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. IVES, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. HENDRICKSON, and Mr. TOBEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 7941, to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 544. An act to provide for terms of court to be held at West Palm Beach, and at Fort Myers, in the southern district of Florida;

H. R. 651. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Paul E. Queneau;

H. R. 1749. An act for the relief of the town of Mount Desert, Maine;

H. R. 1860. An act for the relief of Kenji Takumi;

H. R. 2401. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the State of California;

H. R. 3012. An act for the relief of the Wyoming National Bank of Wilkes-Barre;

H. R. 3314. An act for the relief of the estate of the late Eulogio Reyes Suarez;

H. R. 4192. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, section 220, relating to receipt of commissions or gifts for procuring loans;

H. R. 4256. An act for the relief of James A. G. Martindale;

H. R. 4530. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna L. De Angelis;

H. R. 4579. An act to amend section 333 of title 28 of the United States Code to provide for the attendance at judicial conferences of their respective circuits of the district judges in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the Canal Zone, Hawaii, and Alaska;

H. R. 4600. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Janet Judith Koeninger, a minor;

H. R. 4629. An act for the relief of the Sonoma County Farmers' Mutual Fire Insurance Co.;

H. R. 4891. An act for the relief of Albert E. Scheflen;

H. R. 5083. An act for the relief of Sister Maria Emelia (Anna Bohn);

H. R. 5244. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles J. Trees, Army of the United States;

H. R. 5810. An act relating to the furnishing of accommodations at Klamath Falls, Oreg., for the United States District Court for the District of Oregon;

H. R. 6195. An act for the relief of Carlo de Luca;

H. R. 6228. An act for the relief of Dr. Chao-Jen Chen, Dr. Janet Wang Chen, and Eleanor Chen;

H. R. 6409. An act for the relief of Mrs. Grace A. Olson;

H. R. 6522. An act for the relief of Louis R. Chadbourne;

H. R. 6909. An act for the relief of Floyd E. Dotson;

H. R. 6992. An act for the relief of Kirocor Haladjian, Tacouhi Haladjian, Gulunia Haladjian, and Virginie Haladjian;

H. R. 7019. An act for the relief of Aenny Blank;

H. R. 7336. An act for the relief of Mrs. Fumie Ishibashi Akimoto;

H. R. 7371. An act for the relief of John Fleckstein;

H. R. 7390. An act for the relief of Erika Kuebart and her minor son;

H. R. 7393. An act for the relief of Francisco Blanco and Mrs. Celine Smith;

H. R. 7451. An act for the relief of Sumiko Fujita;

H. R. 7454. An act for the relief of Robert C. Watters, Mrs. Martha L. Watters, C. E. Nivens, E. O. Nivens, and the estate of J. W. Gillum, deceased;

H. R. 7630. An act for the relief of Mrs. Wha Sook Lee Hong;

H. R. 7631. An act for the relief of Ottavia De Gaspare and Sandra De Gaspare;

H. R. 7733. An act for the relief of Sisters Rita Pinto de Carvalho, Maria Leite da Silva, Carmelinda Lopes de Aguiar, Maria Adozinda da Fonseca Melo, Joaquine de Jesus, and Maria Luisa Pinto Carvalho;

H. R. 7856. An act for the relief of Mrs. Teruko Tominaga Ikeuchi;

H. R. 7869. An act to provide for the furnishing of quarters at Newnan, Ga., for the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia;

H. R. 7964. An act for the relief of the estate of Francis A. Waldron;

H. R. 8062. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Charles Spiller and Glenn T. Spiller, minors;

H. R. 8118. An act for the relief of the estate of the late Ismael Miranda;

H. R. 8184. An act for the relief of Michiyo Takada and her minor daughter, Michiko;

H. R. 8258. An act for the relief of Il Nai Che;

H. R. 8315. An act for the relief of Joseph F. Gallagher;

H. R. 8384. An act for the relief of Setsuko Hori;

H. R. 8401. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maurice N. Goss;

H. R. 8452. An act for the relief of Ronald Mow and Angeline Cecilia Mow;

H. R. 8523. An act for the relief of Marianna Gantschnigg and Merle Richard Gantschnigg;

H. R. 8533. An act for the relief of Emiko Nishimura;

H. R. 8561. An act for the relief of Harriet T. Johnston;

H. R. 8562. An act for the relief of Yukie Yabe and her son;

H. R. 8598. An act for the relief of Mrs. Chicako Shimizu Sheldahl and Ryoichi Shimizu Sheldahl;

H. R. 8641. An act for the relief of Clyde L. Watson, Jr., and Laverne F. Andrews;

H. R. 8686. An act for the relief of the Overseas Navigation Corp.;

H. R. 8718. An act for the relief of Fred Hess;

H. R. 8769. An act for the relief of Annmarie Stritter and her minor daughter;

H. R. 8829. An act for the relief of Sisters Pasqualina Bova, Rosa Pellanda, Emilia Dei Rossi, Speranza Zoia, and Domenica Lapadula;

H. R. 8863. An act for the relief of Sachiko Mitoma;

H. R. 8901. An act for the relief of Mrs. Asako Ikeda Heaney;

H. R. 8902. An act for the relief of Satoko Matsushima Hoglund;

H. R. 8971. An act for the relief of Gertrude Hell;

H. R. 8987. An act for the relief of Setsuko Kato;

H. R. 9044. An act for the relief of Mrs. Kayoko Suzuki Jensen;

H. R. 9055. An act for the relief of Cynthia Anne Kane;

H. R. 9062. An act for the relief of Mrs. Willie G. Heath;

H. R. 9074. An act to amend chapter 61 (relating to lotteries) of title 18, United States Code, to make clear that such chapter does not apply to nonprofit contests wherein prizes are awarded for the specie, size, weight, or quality of fish caught by the contestant;

H. R. 9086. An act for the relief of Maria Luisa Mercado;

H. R. 9087. An act for the relief of H. Dale Madison;

H. R. 9143. An act for the relief of Humi Nagano and her child;

H. R. 9145. An act for the relief of Tomoko Yamaya;

H. R. 9166. An act for the relief of Louis J. T. Hendrick; and

H. J. Res. 510. Joint resolution to exempt certain counsel employed by committee from certain Federal laws under Special Committee on Campaign Expenditures, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1662. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to acquire on behalf of the United States Government all property and facilities of the Rainier National Park Co.;

H. R. 4915. An act to amend the act of December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1086; 43 U. S. C., sec. 36b), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands or interest in lands for the Geological Survey";

H. R. 6537. An act to provide funds for cooperation with the Territorial school authorities of Nome, Alaska, in the construction, extension, improvement, and equipment of school facilities, to be available to both native and nonnative children;

H. R. 6640. An act to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the disposition of public lands of the United States situated in the State of Oklahoma between the Cimarron base line and the north boundary of the State of Texas", approved August 7, 1946, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6929. An act to authorize the acquisition by the United States of the remaining non-Federal lands within Big Bend National Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6959. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to William Watt;

H. R. 6960. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to James Wilbur Watt;

H. R. 6961. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mary E. White Watt;

H. R. 6962. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Minnie M. Watt Kopac;

H. R. 7342. An act to provide for boundary adjustments of the Badlands National Monument, in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7641. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land in the District of Columbia to the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church;

H. R. 7773. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted land on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, S. Dak.;

H. R. 8144. An act to authorize the sale of a small tract of land at Great Falls, Mont.;

H. R. 8158. An act to repeal certain laws as they affect the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 8463. An act to authorize the sale of certain small tracts of Indian land lying to the south and east of the Tongue River, in the State of Montana;

H. R. 8874. An act to authorize the sale of lands to the city of Flagstaff, Ariz.;

H. R. 8887. An act to declare that the United States holds certain lands for the Seminole Tribe of Florida;

H. R. 8906. An act to repeal certain legislation relating to the Gallup-Durango Highway and the Gallup-Window Rock Highway at the Navajo Indian Reservation;

H. R. 8979. An act to provide for the transfer or quitclaim of title to certain lands in Florida; and

H. J. Res. 490. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the respective tribes, bands, and groups of Indians under his jurisdiction to determine their qualifications to manage their own affairs without supervision and control by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6242. An act to prevent the entry of certain giant snails into the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 8576. An act to provide reimbursement of expenses incurred in connection with the burial of those who served in the military forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while such forces were in the Armed Forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States, dated July 26, 1941; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 8597. An act to permit national banks to give security in the form required by State law for deposits of funds by local public agencies and officers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 8944. An act authorizing the Ogdensburg Bridge Authority, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near the city of Ogdensburg, N. Y.; and

H. R. 9002. An act to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system in view of the increased cost of living; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H. R. 9023. An act to amend the Hatch Act; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

OUR QUEST FOR PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CAPEHART

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject, Our Quest for Peace, delivered by him over radio station WGN, Chicago, Ill., on July 22, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROBLEMS CONFRONTING MILK AND DAIRY PRODUCTS MARKETING—STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by him before the Subcommittee on Milk and Milk Products of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which appears in the Appendix.]

WE CAN'T SELL OUR IDEALS ABROAD IF THEY DIE AT HOME—EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Can't Sell Our Ideals Abroad If They Die at Home," published in the Saturday Evening Post of July 29, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOUTH DAKOTA REPUBLICAN PLATFORM TEXT

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the Republican Platform text adopted at the South Dakota Republican Party Convention in Pierre, S. Dak., as published in the Daily Argus-Leader, Sioux Falls, S. Dak., which appears in the Appendix.]

PAID FARMERS TO HEAR BRANNAN—ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Paid Farmers To Hear Brannan," which was published in the Times-Herald of July 27, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

DECLARATION OF WAR AGAINST THE GANGSTERS IN THE KREMLIN—EDITORIAL FROM THE ASHLAND (WIS.) DAILY PRESS

[Mr. McCARTHY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Time for a Formal Declaration of War Against the Gangsters in the Kremlin," which was published in the Ashland Daily Press, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TYDINGS SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. McCARTHY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials commenting on the Tydings subcommittee report, one from the Monroe Times of July 21, 1950, and one from the Green Bay Press-Gazette of July 22, 1950, which appear in the Appendix.]

ELIMINATION OF GAMBLING AND RACKETS—ARTICLE BY JOHN WYNGAARD

]Mr. McCARTHY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Wisconsin Could Be Guide to Nation for Elimination of Gambling and Rackets," written by John Wyngaard, and published in the Appleton Post-Crescent, of Appleton, Wis., which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT ARE OUR AIMS?—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW HAMPSHIRE SUNDAY NEWS

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "What Are Our Aims?" published in the New Hampshire Sunday News of July 23, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR TOBEY RAPS ADMINISTRATION—ARTICLE FROM THE MANCHESTER (N. H.) UNION

[Mr. FLANDERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Senator TOBEY Raps Administration," published in the Manchester (N. H.) Union of July 26, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ENDORSEMENT OF REELECTION OF SENATOR WILEY—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. FLANDERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Reelect WILEY," published in Hillsboro (Wis.) Sentry-Enterprise on July 20, 1950, and an editorial entitled "Senator WILEY," published in the Palmira (Wis.) Enterprise, on July 27, 1950, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION—STATEMENT AND RESOLUTION OF THE MARYLAND STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement and resolution of the Maryland State Bar Association relating to the genocide convention, which appear in the Appendix.]

CONGRATULATIONS TO SENATOR TOBEY FROM LLOYD C. DOUGLAS

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the text of a letter recently received by our colleague, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], from the distinguished author, Lloyd C. Douglas, one of our great contemporary novelists, who has written such books as The Robe and Magnificent Obsession. After listening to the Senator's remarks over a recent broadcast of Meet the Press, Mr. Douglas wrote this letter, which is so unusual and represents so well the apprehension which is felt in the country today over the way the administration has been conducting national affairs that it merits inclusion in the RECORD.

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

LOS ANGELES, *June 17, 1950.*

MY DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: The writer, unknown to you, is in semiretirement because of age and frail health. There is almost nothing that I can do for my country at present (aside from the payment of very high taxes) but to applaud the minority group of fearless and honest men who speak and act for us at the Capitol.

Last night I heard you speak on the Meet the Press radio program.

It must have given you much satisfaction to be able to face your inquisitors—and the whole Nation—with the reckless, 2-o'clock-in-the-morning courage that no man can afford to exhibit unless he comes to the altar with clean hands and a pure heart.

You gave me a misty-eyed glow of pride that we are of the same race.

Gratefully yours,

LLOYD C. DOUGLAS.

SURVEY OF THE MERRIMACK AND CONNECTICUT RIVERS AND OTHER STREAMS IN NEW ENGLAND

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1950, which passed the Eighty-first Congress, was signed by President Truman and is now Public Law 516, contains the essential provisions of the Lodge-Furcolo bill calling for a survey of the Merrimack and Connecticut Rivers and other streams in New England. This section is, of course, an authorization and in order to be effective requires the appropriation of funds. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, my colleague, Senator SALTONSTALL, addressed a written inquiry to the Acting Chief of Engineers and received from him a reply containing assurance that there is in the omnibus appropriation bill sufficient funds to commence the work. In fact, the letter contains an assurance that "the Corps of Engineers will allocate funds to this investigation from whatever appropriation is provided." In view of the fact that the figure of $6,500,000 is included in the bill, there is reason to believe that, in the words of the Acting Chief of Engineers, "good progress can be made on the New England investigation." I ask unanimous consent that the letter of the Acting Chief of Engineers to Senator SALTONSTALL be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, July 17, 1950.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: Reference is made to your letter of July 13, 1950, in which you inquire whether the funds contained in the omnibus appropriation bill recently reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee are sufficient to provide for the survey of the Merrimack and Connecticut Rivers and other streams in New England as authorized in section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1950, Public Law 516, Eighty-first Congress.

As provided in section 205 of the 1950 Flood Control Act, the survey of the New England rivers is to be financed from the regular appropriations made to the Corps of Engineers for carrying on authorized preliminary examinations and surveys for flood control and allied purposes. The amount which can be made available for the New England investigation will be allocated from the total amount contained in our appropriations for preliminary examinations and surveys. The budget estimate for preliminary examinations and surveys for fiscal year 1951 was $6,500,000. The appropriation passed by the House of Representatives reduced this amount to $3,500,000. The Senate committee action restored the item to the full amount of $6,500,000 as shown on page 264 of the Senate Committee Report No. 1941.

I can assure you that the Corps of Engineers will allocate funds to this investigation from whatever appropriation is provided in the act as finally enacted. The exact amount will depend, of course, upon the amount finally appropriated inasmuch as all of the preliminary examinations and surveys throughout the country must be financed from this item. If the amount recommended by the Senate committee is appropriated, good progress can be made on the New England investigation. If the appropriation is substantially less than the $6,500,000 recommended by the Senate committee, the progress of the investigation will necessarily be somewhat limited; but even in that event, we will make every effort to proceed as rapidly as possible.

Sincerely yours,

J. S. BRAGDON,
Brigadier General, Acting Chief of Engineers.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the 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.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, when page 364 of the pending bill was reached late in the afternoon, I was necessarily absent from the floor. I had pending an amendment, which I wanted to call up at that time, to reduce the appropriation provided for in line 2, page 364, by $100,000. The committee amendment provides the sum of $221,244,500 for civil functions of the Corps of Engineers. The purpose of my amendment is to reduce that amount by $100,000, and to eliminate the item for planning the Dover Dam, which is found in the committee report at page 237, as follows:

Dover Lock and Dam, Cumberland River $100,000

Mr. President, I think my amendment should be agreed to, and I hope it may be considered at this time. There are now pending in the Senate and in the House of Representatives bills to include the development of the Cumberland River in the TVA system. The matter has not been brought up for consideration at this session, because the TVA is making a report, upon instructions of the President. In addition, certain information will have to be furnished by the Corps of Engineers. These reports will all be in before the beginning of the Eighty-second Congress, so early in the next session we should be able to get action one way or another to determine whether the Cumberland River will be further developed by the TVA or by the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. President, it is usually conceded that if the lower part of the Cumberland River is developed by the Tennessee Valley Authority, it would not build the dam which this $100,000 would be used to plan. Below Nashville, between the Cheatham locks and the mouth of the Cumberland River near its confluence with the Ohio River, the Corps of Engineers originally planned one high dam, but later changed the plan so as to have two low dams: the Dover Dam, and a dam near the mouth of the Cumberland River. The TVA plan would follow the original intention of the Corps of Engineers with only one dam near the mouth of the Cumberland. The Dover Dam would be between the Cheatham lock and the mouth of the Cumberland. That dam would not be built if the development were taken over by the TVA. This $100,000 is for planning. The dam could not be constructed within the next 3 or 4 years, at least in the present emergency. There would be no substantial

delay if Congress decided that the Corps of Engineers should build the Dover Dam; and I feel that the spending of this money should be delayed in order to give us an opportunity in the next session of Congress to act upon the bill to determine whether the futher development of the Cumberland River should be undertaken by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

That is all I have to say in explanation, Mr. President. We can save $100,000 until the determination can be made, or we can run the risk of wasting $100,000 for plans which may never be used.

I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to be reconsidered in order that I may offer the amendment for consideration and action by the Senate.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am obliged to object. The matter came up yesterday and it was voted to continue the plan now established by which the engineers build the dam on the Cumberland River and the TVA distributes the power. In my judgment, that has been found to be a very excellent way of building up the valley. Several dams have already been constructed and TVA transmission lines have been built and the power is being distributed within the area.

I hope the Senator will withdraw his amendment because it would interfere with the plans which have been carried out for many years. I have been living with the matter for 25 or 30 years. It started with the building of the dam at Muscle Shoals and it has progressed very well.

My friend from Tennessee has a plan to turn the building of the dams on the Cumberland over to the TVA. TVA would have to start an entirely new program. It would be very much more costly to the American people. It would not be so efficiently done by the TVA as it would be done by the Corps of Engineers, who have done it so well in the past. In addition to that, this item has already been passed upon, and the Senator's motion is not in order.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield for a question.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to say that my motion would not be determinative. Is it not correct to say that whether this dam is to be built by the TVA or the Corps of Engineers would be determined in the bill itself? In other words, would we not merely be delaying the matter of the expenditure of the money until the next appropriation bill? Is not that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. The committee passed on the matter at least 2 months ago. They are familiar with it. They reported it to the Senate. Now, on the floor of the Senate, like my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] yesterday, my friend from Tennessee has a plan of his own which he wants to work out. Why should a new proposal of this kind be started? That is something I cannot understand. I really cannot understand the reason or motive for it. What is the reason? Does the Senator from Tennessee object because of his antipathy, if I may so express it, to the Corps of Engineers? Have the engineers failed, in the opinion of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Of course I have no antipathy toward the Corps of Engineers. I have always supported the Corps of Engineers, as the senior Senator from Tennessee well knows.

Mr. McKELLAR. But the Senator does not want the Corps of Engineers to continue with this particular work.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have very high respect for the Corps of Engineers. Since the electricity which is generated at the dams on the Cumberland is sold to the TVA, which has charge of the distribution of it, and the two rivers run almost parallel and both empty into the Ohio no more than 10 miles apart; therefore, from the viewpoint of flood control, the development of that section of the South, and the operation of our electrical systems, greater efficiency in operation would be gained if one organization operated both. That is no reflection or criticism on the Corps of Engineers. However, that issue would have to be settled when the pending bill is considered on the basis of the reports of the Corps of Engineers, the TVA, and also other evidence which will be brought before the committee. All I am asking in this amendment is that the expenditure of $100,000 for the planning of a dam, which the Corps of Engineers did not want to build, under the first report years ago, and which would not be built if the Cumberland is turned over to the TVA, be delayed until we have had an opportunity to have the other bill considered. That is no reflection upon the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. McKELLAR. This matter affects Tennessee, Kentucky, and the adjoining States of Alabama, Mississippi, and possibly also Georgia. It seems to me to be a very expensive route to take. It seems to be an experiment, whereas the present situation by which the engineers build a dam and then turn it over to the TVA to sell the power and collect the money and put it in the Treasury of the United States is a very much better way of handling the matter. It has been quite a successful method, and I hope it will not be interfered with. It is true that one of our newspapers is very much in favor of making the change, although I have not been able to ascertain the reason for it. The Senate voted on the amendment yesterday. The Senator had ample opportunity. He was not taken by surprise. It was considered yesterday. He was present in the Chamber all day except at the time the vote was taken. I see no reason why we should give unanimous consent now. I shall object to the unanimous consent being given, and I hope the Chair will sustain my objection that the motion is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Tennessee objects to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which it agreed to the amendment on page 364, line 2, in order that I may offer an amendment to reduce the appropriation by $100,000 for the purposes which I have stated.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is the motion of the Senator in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to reconsider is in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well. Does the Senator wish to make a statement?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have made my statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. I appeal to the Members of the Senate not to interfere with this provision of the bill, which has already been passed. It has been reported by a committee which heard all the evidence with reference to the matter. Every opportunity was given to be heard on the matter. I hope the Senate will stand by the committee and by what has been done heretofore by the Senate. The Corps of Engineers is one of our best organizations. I do not see why we should turn them down because someone has another plan which he thinks is better than the plan now in existence.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Brewster	Hayden	Maybank
Bricker	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Murray
Butler	Hill	Myers
Byrd	Hoey	Neely
Capehart	Holland	O'Conor
Chapman	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Hunt	Pepper
Connally	Ives	Robertson
Cordon	Jenner	Russell
Donnell	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Kefauver	Sparkman
Eastland	Kem	Stennis
Ecton	Langer	Taft
Ellender	Lehman	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Lodge	Thye
Flanders	Lucas	Tydings
Frear	McCarran	Watkins
Fulbright	McCarthy	Wherry
George	McClellan	Wiley
Gillette	McFarland	Williams
Graham	McKellar	Young
Green	Magnuson	
Gurney	Malone	

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

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment on page 364, line 2, was adopted.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, for the benefit of any Members of the Senate who were not present when the original colloquy occurred with reference to this matter, let me say that the purpose of the motion to reconsider is to permit me to offer an amendment to the committee amendment on page 364, in line 2, so as to reduce the figure "$221,244,500" by the sum of $100,000. The $100,000 has to do with funds appropriated for planning for the building of Dover lock and dam on the Cumberland River.

Mr. President, there has been considerable agitation in regard to this matter. Originally the Corps of Engineers wanted

to build one dam on the Cumberland River, near where it empties into the Ohio River. That would have been a rather high dam. There was some objection to the building of the dam, because of some bottom land which might be flooded. Thereupon the Corps of Engineers changed its plan, and decided that instead of building the one high dam near the junction of the Ohio and Cumberland Rivers, to build a comparatively low dam there, and also to build a dam between the Cheatham lock and dam and the dam near the Ohio. Of course, we do not know whether the Corps of Engineers will again change its plans in that regard.

It is obvious that the $100,000 for the planning of the dam may never be used, because the dam may never be built. Even if the right to make the decision remains with the Corps of Engineers, it may return to the original plan, because there is a greater need for electricity. The one high dam would furnish more electricity than could be developed at the two low dams.

There has been quite a change in sentiment, in my opinion, among the people of the Cumberland Valley and among the people of Tennessee and Kentucky in regard to this matter. In my opinion, the great majority of the people who are interested in it wish to have only the one high dam built, and they wish to have the Cumberland developed by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. President, there is now pending in the House and also in the Senate a bill for the inclusion of the Cumberland Basin in the TVA system. The President of the United States has asked the Tennessee Valley Authority for a report in regard to the development of the Cumberland. An interim report has already been submitted; and within the next 6 weeks or 2 months we expect the final report to be submitted.

It is anticipated and generally stated that the TVA will recommend that, instead of building the two low dams, only the one high dam be built, as originally planned by the Corps of Engineers. If that is done, this $100,000 for planning would be utterly wasted, because it would represent money for plans for a dam which would never be built.

The reason for the change of attitude on the part of the business people and the citizens of this area is that with the industrial development of this section; with the development of the Arnold air-engineering development center at Tullahoma, on the former site of Camp Forrest; and the development of other defense plants, a great amount of electricity must be developed on the Cumberland. The industrialization of that section of the country requires more electricity, and these defense plants require adequate amounts of electricity.

Even Mr. Harry Dyer, who is chairman of the Nashville Chamber of Commerce's Cumberland River committee, and who formerly favored the building of the two low dams by the Corps of Engineers, now has made a speech in which he has said that he favors the inclusion of this project in the Tennessee Valley Authority system. The sentiment has developed all through that section in like manner.

Mr. President, this matter was submitted by the Secretary of the Interior, in a letter dated July 14, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. The Secretary of the Interior recommends that the proposed legislation be approved and that the Cumberland be developed by the TVA. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of his letter may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., July 14, 1950.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: This is in response to your request for a report on S. 338, Eighty-first Congress, first session, entitled: "A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, so as to include thereunder the Cumberland River and Cumberland River Basin."

I recommend the passage of the bill with the following amendments:

1. To insert the following language at the end of section 2 of the bill:

"All reservoir projects constructed, under construction, or authorized to be constructed in the Cumberland River Basin by or on behalf of the United States, and all use, control, and operation of such projects, together with all property, books, papers, data, contracts, equipment, and unexpended balances of appropriations, appertaining to these projects, and their appurtenant works, shall be transferred to the corporation, together with such personnel as may be agreeable to the Corporation and to the Secretary of the Army."

2. To strike sections 4 and 5 of the bill.

The following is in explanation of these recommendations:

1. The transfer of the Cumberland Basin projects to the Tennesee Valley Authority would eliminate unnecessary expense and insure continuity in the operation of the projects and the sale of low-cost power to ultimate consumers.

(a) By prior acts of Congress, eight reservoir projects have been authorized to be constructed in the Cumberland River Basin. Of these, one reservoir project (Dale Hollow) has already been constructed and is in operation; two projects (Center Hill and Wolf Creek) are still under construction; the construction of the remaining five projects (Three Islands, Stewart's Ferry, Old Hickory, Carthage, and Celina) has not yet started.

Under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 887, 890; 16 U. S. C. 825), the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to sell or dispose of "electric power and energy generated at reservoir projects under the control of the Department of the Army and in the opinion of the Secretary of the Army not required in the operation of such projects." The statute requires that, in the sale of such surplus power, preference be given to public bodies and cooperatives; that the power be sold at rates fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, and approved and confirmed by the Federal Power Commission, which would have regard to the recovery of the cost of producing and transmitting such electric energy, including the amortization of the investment allocated to power over a reasonable number of years; and that the transmission or disposition of the surplus power shall be in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles.

(b) Acting pursuant to these directions, the Secretary of the Interior entered into negotiations with the Tennessee Valley Authority for the sale of the surplus power from the Dale Hollow, Center Hill, and Wolf Creek projects, and in anticipation of this sale the Tennessee Valley Authority constructed a transmission line which made possible the sale of Dale Hollow power at the bus bar and will provide such facilities as the other plants begin operation. This was the most practicable way of disposing of the surplus power to be generated at the Cumberland projects in conformity with the requirements above stated, especially since (1) approximately 70 percent of the Cumberland River Basin lies within the area now served with electricity produced at TVA plants, (2) approximately 80 percent of the electric-power requirements of the Cumberland Basin is being supplied by TVA, and (3) in its resource development program, which includes the widespread distribution of power at low cost to consumers, TVA needs additional sources of electric power in order to supply adequately the growing needs for electricity in its existing area, including that portion of the service area which lies within the Cumberland Basin.

Because of the geographic position of TVA's power system, both the Department of the Interior and the Tennessee Valley Authority considered that the existing Cumberland projects and any additional projects to be constructed in the Cumberland Basin would contribute most effectively to the purposes of the Flood Control Act of 1944, if the entire power output of these projects were sold to the Tennessee Valley Authority and marketed over its system. Thus, the sale of power from Dale Hollow, Center Hill, and Wolf Creek was intended as the initial step in the development of arrangements for the sale of power by the Department to the TVA. It was contemplated that, as additional projects would be constructed in the Cumberland Basin, the Department and the TVA would work out such amendments to the presently negotiated agreement as might be required to include the sale of power from such additional projects.

(c) In conformity with the requirement that the disposition of power shall be such that the ultimate consumers might benefit by the lowest possible rates "consistent with sound business principles," the Department has taken the view that all matters leading up to the disposition of the power be conducted in accordance with sound business principles and practices. Accordingly the negotiations with the TVA were conducted, so far as practicable, at arms' length, and with due regard to the statutory standards, with the consequent expenditure of such time and effort as would be warranted by a transaction involving a sale of power at an average amount of $3,500,000 per year over a period of 20 years, or a total of $70,000,000. The rates arrived at were based on the full utilization of an unregulated annual stream flow; the average of $3,500,000 for the entire power output of the projects, with a total installed capacity of 441,000 kilowatts, was based upon the normal or average flow as indicated by the long-time stream-flow records; and the variations in the annual payments were based upon deviations from the average stream flow. Prior to the execution of the contract these rates were informally submitted to the Federal Power Commission for confirmation and approval, and considerable attention was given to these rates by the Federal Power Commission, as well as by the staff in the Department of the Interior.

(d) The reason for the informal submission of the rates to the Federal Power Commission, and also the reason for the delay in

the execution of the contract between the TVA and the Department was that the agreement was conditioned upon a satisfactory arrangement or operating agreement to be entered into between the TVA and the Department of the Army for the scheduling operations of these projects. This latter agreement has been completed. Without a satisfactory operating agreement, the contract for the sale of power would have had to be terminated, thus leaving the Department with a great amount of generating capacity to be disposed of otherwise, and leaving the TVA with a costly transmission line, but without the power and energy to be transmitted from these projects.

(e) In the last analysis, all the work done by the Department of the Army, the Department of the Interior, the Federal Power Commission, and the TVA in the sale or disposition of the surplus power from the Cumberland projects, centered about a bookkeeping transaction, in which the United States, through one of its agencies, generates power which is turned over to a second agency which delivers the power to a third agency at rates to be approved by a fourth agency, which power is to be accounted for by the third to the second agency, and by the second to a fifth agency, the Treasury of the United States. All this labor and consequent expense would have been avoided, and any future labor and expense will be avoided, if the power from the Cumberland projects is made available to the TVA to be accounted for in accordance with the provisions of the TVA Act.

(f) It is the view of this Department that further economies and greater benefits can be effected, if not only the surplus power but also the projects were turned over to the Tennessee Valley Authority, especially since this agency is in a position and is qualified to operate the projects for navigation and flood control, as well as for power purposes, under the policies of the TVA Act which are fully adequate to protect the public interest. If this is done there will be no division of authority between the TVA and the Army, and no need for operating agreements the requirements for which may from time to time introduce uncertainty concerning the success of the entire undertaking. In addition, the people of the Cumberland River Basin would be in a position to benefit from all the activities of the TVA in the same manner as the people in the basin of the Tennessee River and its tributaries.

(g) The transfer of these projects to the TVA is undoubtedly intended by this bill (S. 338). I recommend, however, that this intention be expressly stated, and therefore suggest the above stated amendment to section 2, although upon the enactment of this provision without the suggested amendment, the President may, under section 7 (b) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (48 Stat. 63, 16 U. S. C. 831f) exercises his authority to transfer this property to the corporation.

2. It is not necessary to increase the board from three to five members, and there is no need for a saving clause in this bill.

(a) I believe that the functions and undertakings of the corporation have been carried out in a most commendable and efficient manner by the three-man board of directors. I do not see that anything would be gained by an increase of the board by two additional members. Therefore I suggest that section 4 of the bill be eliminated.

(b) An examination of the bill suggests that there is no likelihood of any substantial constitutional questions arising out of this enactment, and therefore there is no need of a saving clause. This is especially so, since this bill would merely amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, and the provisions would become part of the more comprehensive statute which already has a saving clause. Therefore, I recommend that the bill be further amended by eliminating section 5 thereof.

I am informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of this report to your committee. However, the Bureau of the Budget also informs me that pending a further report, to be submitted by the Tennessee Valley Authority, bringing up to date its previous report on the relationship between the Tennessee and the Cumberland Rivers (H. Doc. No. 107, 79th Cong., 1st sess.), it is not in a position to inform me on the relationship of the proposed legislation to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the report of the Secretary of the Interior points out that at least 70 percent of the area of the Cumberland Basin is served by the TVA; that the electricity is sold by the Corps of Engineers at the bus bar to the Department of the Interior; and that the Department of the Interior, in turn, negotiates with the TVA for the sale of the power. So the negotiations go through that circuitous and wasteful route.

The Secretary of the Interior points out—and it is quite generally conceded—that in operations for flood-control purposes, and for the development of the greatest possible amount of electricity, these two river basins should be operated as a unit. Water can be stored for flood-control purposes in the Cumberland Basin at the same time that water is needed for hydroelectric purposes in the Tennessee Basin. As both these rivers are in the same electrical system, more prime power can be produced if both rivers are operated as a unit.

The elimination of this $100,000 would not decide the issue as to which agency will have charge of the further development of the Cumberland. The Eighty-second Congress will have to decide that question on the merits of and in line with the recommendations of the various agencies.

All that the amendment which I propose to offer would do would be to defer the spending of this $100,000 for planning until the next appropriation bill comes along, by which time we hope this issue will be decided.

Mr. President, I find that this item of $100,000 was not included in the bill as it was passed by the House of Representatives. It is true that it is covered in the table which appears on page 237 of the report made by the Appropriations Committee to the Senate. However, in examining the testimony which has been presented to the Appropriations Committee, I find that even the representative of the Corps of Engineers, when he appeared before the committee, failed to request the money for the planning of the Dover Dam at this time. Colonel Potter testified before the committee, but he did not refer to the Dover Lock and Dam or to the $100,000 here involved.

So it appears that even the Corps of Engineers would not be greatly upset if this matter were deferred until this larger issue can be determined. Colonel Potter's testimony is to be found at page 770 of the report on the civil functions appropriations, Department of the Army.

Of course, Mr. President, we are looking for places where we can economize. It is true that the amount which is the subject of the amendment I wish to propose is not a comparatively large amount, but if the Corps of Engineers changes its mind in regard to whether to build one high dam, instead of two low dams, then this $100,000 will be wasted. If the Cumberland is to be developed by the Tennessee Valley Authority—in other words, if the bill which we hope will be brought up at the next session is passed—this $100,000 will be wasted, thrown away, and I do not want to throw away $100,000 of the taxpayers' money if I can prevent it.

This item was not included in the bill by the House of Representatives. So far as I can find from the testimony, the Corps of Engineers have not said they need this sum, or at least have not urged the appropriation of any money for the planning of the Dover Dam.

The President has asked all the agencies involved to submit a report in the interest of the orderly development of the Cumberland to assure that the water power potential of the Cumberland, particularly in respect to the development of hydroelectric power, is made available most fully for the greatest benefit of that area and of the Nation.

Therefore, Mr. President, it seems to me that my motion for the reconsideration of the vote by which the committee amendment on page 364 in line 2 was adopted should be agreed to, and that the item of $100,000 should be eliminated and not subject to the risk of wanton waste.

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

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator have in mind extending the jurisdiction of TVA to the Cumberland Valley? Is that the plan favored by the Senator?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is the purpose of my bill which is now pending before the Public Works Committee.

Mr. KEM. And is that the purpose of the Senator's motion?

Mr. KEFAUVER. No. The purpose of the motion is to defer this $100,000 for planning until the next session of Congress, when it can be brought up in the next appropriation bill, to give Congress an opportunity to decide how it wants the Cumberland developed. This is no decision, one way or other, on how it is going to be developed in my motion.

Mr. KEM. But the extension of the jurisdiction of TVA to the Cumberland Valley is the ultimate objective which the Senator has in mind, is it not?

Mr. KEFAUVER. There is such a bill pending. The objective we have in mind now is to see that the Cumberland is properly developed. The TVA does not want the job particularly; its directors have not asked for it. Our first objective is to see that the Cumberland is developed properly. The Corps of Engineers originally in its plan did not want to build this project. It wanted to build only one dam, to be located near

the point at which the Cumberland empties into the Ohio. It has changed its plans.

In view of the great need of and increased demand for electricity, it is entirely reasonable that they may again change their plans. In any event, if either that contingency happens or if it were turned over to the TVA, this money would of course be wasted. I can see no harm to be done by delaying the planning of this dam or by delaying the appropriation of money for the dam, until the next appropriation bill.

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

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that as a general policy the Corps of Army Engineers in building dams tends to favor low dams which do not generate much power?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That, I understand, has been the general policy in the past. I think that more recently the engineers have been building dams for the purpose of generating more electricity than they did heretofore. It is everywhere recognized that the building of the one dam, instead of two, would furnish a great deal more electricity for a section of the country which is growing rapidly, and which has several very important defense projects, including the Arnold Air Engineering Development Center at Tullahoma. Huge amounts of electricty are needed there. I think if Congress decides this river is to be developed by the Army Corps of Engineers, it may later decide to build only the one dam, and not the Dover Dam. I am reasonably sure Dover Dam will not be built if the TVA should be authorized to develop the Cumberland.

Mr. President, I hope the motion will be agreed to and that this amendment may be adopted. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee to reconsider the vote by which the amendment on page 364, line 2, was agreed to. Upon that question the yeas and nays have been requested.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, was the request for the yeas and nays not sufficiently seconded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was not. It requires 10, and there were but 5. The demand was not sufficiently seconded. The question now is upon agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee to reconsider.

The motion was rejected.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Has any amendment been agreed to as yet in chapter X of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No amendment has as yet been agreed to in chapter X.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I offer an amendment to the first committee amendment, on page 374, and ask that the amendment be stated.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 374, line 19, after the word "diem", the committee proposes to insert "and contracts with not to exceed 23 such individuals may be renewed for 1 year."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma desire to offer an amendment to that committee amendment?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I offer a clarifying amendment to the committee amendment on page 374, line 19, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 374, line 20, it is proposed to strike out "such individuals" and insert "temporary or part-time employees."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma to the committee amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, just a word generally about the bill before I discuss the amendment. Chapter X was considered by the House before the Korean crisis developed. The bill then came to the Senate. The Senate committee considered the bill, chapter X, before the crisis in Korea became acute. So it may be said that what the Senate committee did was to prepare this bill for peacetime activities. More recently, the military authorities have submitted to the Senate a supplemental budget. That budget was cut to fit the bill as recommended by the Senate committee. So when the military authorities considered this chapter, they submitted three clarifying amendments, and they then submitted their supplemental budget to fit the remainder of the bill. Therefore, if the Senate should see fit to pass the bill as reported by the committee, it would be exactly as the authorities expect the bill to be passed by the Congress.

Their supplemental budget would then fit into this bill. The first amendment, the one I have suggested, was requested by the military authorities and was authorized by the committee.

This amendment will follow the intent of the committee in its amendment in allowing for the renewal of contracts with temporary or part-time employees for 1 year and at the same time will allow the National Security Resources Board to continue to hire intermittent employees in accordance with present law.

There are approximately 23 temporary and 75 intermittent employees working for the Board. As the amendment is presented the words "such individuals" applies to both temporary and intermittent employees. Since the renewal of contracts has application to temporary employees, the corrective amendment is needed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma to the committee amendment is agreed to, and without objection, the committee amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 375, line 11, after the word "conclusive", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$3,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

FURTHER TEMPORARY APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as we all know, the pending appropriation bill cannot become the law by the 1st of August. We have already had to pass a continuing joint resolution in order to keep the Government going during the month of July. The House has passed a further continuing joint resolution for the month of August, and yesterday it was referred to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, which today ordered it reported. From the Committee on Appropriations, I report favorably, without amendment, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 512) making further temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1951, and for other purposes, and I submit in connection therewith a report (No. 2183).

I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution.

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

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 512) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the 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 PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Department of Defense—Office of the Secretary of Defense—Salaries and expenses," on page 376, line 2, after the word "conclusive", to strike out "$11,000,000" and insert "$11,300,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—Department of the Army—Office of the Secretary of the Army—Contingencies of the Army," on page 378, line 2, after the word "purposes", to strike out "$51,978,000" and insert "$51,878,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General Staff Corps—Field exercises," on page 378, line 16, after the word "property", to strike out "$5,500,000" and insert "$5,350,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Finance Department—Finance Service, Army—Pay of the Army," on page 380, line 7, after the word "enlistment", to strike out "$1,448,660,000" and insert "$1,447,660,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Travel of the Army," on page 381, line 23, after the word "personnel", to strike out "$75,000,000" and insert "$76,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Finance Service," on page 382, line 22, after "(61 Stat. 493)", to strike out "$28,410,000" and insert "$29,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Quartermaster Corps—Quartermaster Service, Army—Welfare of enlisted men," on page 383, line 16, after the word "personnel", to strike out "$8,000,000" and insert "$8,362.500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Subsistence of the Army," on page 385, line 6, after the word "prices", to insert "and without unduly increasing future United States market prices"; and in line 9, after the word "of", to insert "highly."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Regular Supplies of the Army," on page 386, line 5, after the word "irrigation", to strike out "$100,000,000" and insert "$107,247,258."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Clothing and equipage," on page 387, line 8, after the word "internment", to strike out "$90,000,000" and insert "$93,853,365."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Incidental expenses of the Army," on page 388, line 3, after the word "sites", to strike out "$95,000,000" and insert "$101,998,313."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Transportation Corps—Transportation Service, Army," on page 388, line 17, after the word "activities", to strike out "$290,000,000" and insert "$289,960,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Signal Corps—Signal Service of the Army," on page 391, line 3, after the word "thereof", to strike out $157,500,000" and insert "$158,248,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Medical Department—Medical and Hospital Department," on page 392, line 19, after the word "institutions", to strike out "$54,913,000" and insert "$54,883,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Corps of Engineers—Engineer Service, Army," on page 393, line 20, after the word "for" to strike out "$300,176,000" and insert "$304,187,500"; and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That the sum of $2,000,000 of the appropriation 'Engineer Service, Army,' fiscal year 1947, shall remain available until June 30, 1951, for the payment of obligations incurred under contracts executed thereunder prior to July 1, 1947."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 394, to insert:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

For construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, and facilities for the Army, as authorized by the act of June 17, 1950 (Public Law 564, 81st Cong.), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; $95,318,585, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That not to exceed $661,400 of the funds appropriated under this head in the Military Functions Appropriations Act, 1949, are hereby made available for construction authorized by the act of October 27, 1949 (Public Law 414).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Ordnance Department—Ordnance Service and supplies, Army," on page 395, line 8, after the word "Office", to strike out "$621,559,000" and insert "$647,327,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Chemical Corps—Chemical Service, Army," on page 396, line 10, after the word "ranges", to strike out "$36,000,000" and insert "$37,300,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Army training," on page 396, line 21, after the word "for", to strike out "$7,930,000" and insert "$7,830,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "United States Military Academy—Maintenance and operation," on page 398, line 4, after the words "in all", to strike out "$5,200,000" and insert "$5,120,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Civilian components—Army National Guard," on page 400, line 3, after the word "supplies", to strike out "$212,400,000" and insert "$210,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Organized Reserves," on page 401, line 11, after the word "stocks", to strike out "$115,000,000" and insert "$114,525,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps," on page 402, line 14, after the numerals "1952", to strike out "$25,000,000" and insert "$24,900,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Departmental salaries and expenses—Salaries, Department of the Army," on page 405, line 8, after the word "services", to strike out "$3,265,000" and insert "$3,368,271."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 405, line 9, after "Office of Chief of Staff", to strike out "$6,354,700" and insert "$6,576,293."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 405, line 10, after "Adjutant General's Office", to strike out "$9,477,400" and insert "$9,777,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 405, line 11, after "Office of Inspector General", to strike out "$197,600" and insert "$203,880."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 405, line 12, after "Office of the Judge Advocate General", to strike out "$577,100" and insert "$595,375."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 405, line 14, after "Office of the Chief of Finance", to strike out "$1,437,800" and insert "$1,483,202."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 405, line 15, after "Office of the Quartermaster General", to strike out "$6,767,400" and insert "$6,981,504."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 405, line 17, after "Office of the Chief of Transportation", to strike out "$2,850,000" and insert "$2,940,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 405, line 19, after "Office of the Chief Signal Officer", to strike out "$2,379,600" and insert "$2,455,821."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 405, line 21, after "Office of Chief of Special Services", to strike out "$56,800" and insert "$58,636."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 405, line 22, after "Office of the Provost Marshal General", to strike out "$112,500" and insert "$116,038."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 405, line 24, after "Office of the Surgeon General", to strike out "$2,400,000" and insert $2,475,873."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 405, line 25, after "Office of Chief of Engineers", to strike out "$3,636,200" and insert "$3,751,026."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 406, line 1, after "Office of Chief of Ordnance", to strike out "$3,776,400" and insert "$4,137,696."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 406, line 2, after "Office of Chief, Chemical Corps", to strike out "$792,700" and insert "$817,707."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 406, line 3, after "Office of Chief of Chaplains", to strike out "$131,100" and insert "$128,478."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses, Department of the Army," on page 406, line 6, after "government", to strike out "$9,000,000" and insert "$9,970,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—Department of the Navy—Navy Personnel, general expenses," on page 407, line 24, after the word "salaries", to strike out "$60,000,000" and insert "$60,533,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Military personnel, Marine Corps," on page 408, line 8, after the

word "training", to strike out "$200,301,-700" and insert "$200,923,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Marine Corps troops and facilities," on page 409, line 6, after the word "salaries", to strike out "$80,699,-000" and insert "$82,354,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Aircraft and facilities," on page 409, line 17, after the word "salaries", to strike out "$536,226,000" and insert "$532,226,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Ships and facilities," on page 411, line 14, after the word "salaries", to strike out "$415,282,000" and insert "$411,782,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Ordnance and facilities," on page 412, line 16, after the word "salaries", to strike out "$177,088,000" and insert "$181,665,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Medical care," on page 413, line 24, after the word "salaries", to strike out "$38,212,000" and insert "$37,862,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Civil engineering," on page 414, line 10, after the word "salaries", to strike out "$35,178,000" and insert "$34,778,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 414, after line 11, to insert:

PUBLIC WORKS

For construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, and facilities for the Navy, as authorized by the act of June 16, 1948 (62 Stat. 459), and the act of June 17, 1950 (Public Law 564, 81st Cong.); major repairs and improvements to the Davisville pier, Naval Base, Newport, R. I.; furniture for public quarters; personnel in the Bureau of Yards and Docks and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation; and engineering and architectural services as authorized by section 3 of the act of April 25, 1939 (34 U. S. C. 556); $62,928,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, to the committee amendment I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma to the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 414, line 24, after the word "expended" and before the period, it is proposed to insert the following: "*Provided*, That the funds appropriated by the act of June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 1027), for construction of two new storehouses at Adak, Alaska, may be used for the conversion of existing facilities, if the Secretary of the Navy determines such action would result in a savings to the Government."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I am informed that this amendment will save the Government over $4,500,000. Public Law 653 of the Eightieth Congress authorized the Navy to construct two storehouses at a cost of $6,000,000. The first increment of $1,-300,000 has been appropriated. Since then it has been determined that surplus Army transit sheds could be converted to provide the needed storehouses. The Facilities Review Board and the Comptroller General indicated that additional authorization would be required for the Navy to utilize its funds for the conversion of the sheds. The amendment would do this. The Navy estimates that the $1,300,000 already appropriated would be sufficient to take care of the entire matter, making a saving of $4,500,000 in estimated costs.

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

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

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

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Research," on page 415, line 11, after the word "expended", to strike out "$43,383,000" and insert "$43,083,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Service-wide supply and finance," on page 416, line 8, after the word "salaries", to strike out "$200,000,-000" and insert "$209,292,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Service-wide operations," on page 417, line 1, after the word "salaries", to strike out "$94,261,000" and insert "$100,281,000."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, to the committee amendment I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated, and I also have an amendment to offer to the next committee amendment. After action on the amendments I shall explain their effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma to the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 417, line 2, it is proposed to strike out "$100,-281,000" and insert "$99,281,000."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Island governments," on page 417, line 6, after the word "Islands", to strike out "$1,500,000" and insert "$785,-000."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, to that amendment I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 417, line 6, it is proposed to strike out "$785,-000", and insert "$1,785,000."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the effect of the two amendments to the committee amendments just agreed to is to reduce the appropriations for service-wide operations by $1,000,000, and to increase the appropriations for island governments by the same amount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title V—Department of the Air Force—Acquisition and construction of real property," on page 419, after line 12, to strike out:

For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted under this head in the "Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950," or authorized to be transferred to this head by the "National Military Establishment Appropriation Act, 1950," to remain available until expended, $25,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 419, after line 18, to insert:

For construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, and facilities for the Air Force, as authorized by the act of March 30, 1949 (Public Law 30, 81st Cong.), the act of October 27, 1949 (Public Law 415, 81st Cong.), the act of May 11, 1949 (Public Law 60, 81st Cong.), and the act of June 17, 1950 (Public Law 564, 81st Cong.), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, to remain available until expended, $164,784,000, of which $25,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, or authorized to be transferred to this head by the National Military Establishment Appropriation Act, 1950.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Maintenance and operations," on page 422, line 4, after the word "otherwise", to strike out "$1,010,000,000" and insert "$1,027,662,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Air National Guard," on page 426, line 16, after the word "owned", to insert "or State-owned"; in line 17, after the word "any", to strike out "State or"; and in the same line, after the word "subdivision", to strike out "thereof" and insert "of a State."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and expenses, administration," on page 427, line 18, after the word "station", to strike out "$55,-620,000" and insert "$58,545,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title I—General provisions," on page 441, after line 23, to strike out:

SEC. 626. No payment shall be made from appropriations in this chapter to any officer on the retired lists of the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular Marine Corps, or Regular Air Force, who for himself, or for others is engaged in the selling of, or contracting

for the sale of, or negotiating for the sale of, to any agency of the Department of Defense, any war materials or supplies.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 442, line 6, to change the section number from "627" to "626."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 442, line 10, to change the section number from "628" to "627."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 442, line 22, to change the section number from "629" to "628."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 443, line 3, to change the section number from "630" to "629."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we have now finished, I think, the chapter which we have been considering this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That was the last committee amendment in chapter X.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I believe most people will agree that the best way to reduce expenditures is to reduce individual items. A general across-the-board percentage cut hits all agencies affected equally even though there is bound to be more fat in some agencies than in others. This method is called a meat-ax approach because the cutting is done with a broad blade and the actual severing is accomplished by brute force. You cannot trim off excess fat with a meat ax—it cuts in a straight line across the lean as well as the fat.

CUTTING APPROPRIATIONS SHOULD BE DONE CAREFULLY—WITH A SURGEON'S KNIFE

Trimming selected items more closely resembles the use of a surgeon's knife. A surgeon's knife is extremely sharp and fat can be trimmed neatly without cutting into the lean. Thus the fat in an individual bureau can be cut back without harming the bureau itself.

The surgeon's knife method is the one I have been trying to use. In trying to be selective, I have made 68 separate proposals for reductions so far. The amounts of these cuts have ranged from $1 to $263,483,000. When added together they would have made a total reduction of three-fourths of a billion dollars below the amounts in the bill before us and nearly a billion below the budget. I have not finished these efforts to make selective cuts. I will have a great many more proposals before we finish this bill. And yet almost every time I start to apply the knife, sharp and delicate though it is, the Senate has gently but no less definitely placed a sheath over the blade. "Put that thing down," they say, "you're liable to hurt somebody."

First, may I say that I blame myself most of all for my failure to get the Senate to accept the many selective cuts which I have proposed. The cause, I think, has been a good one but there has apparently been something in my manner and methods which has offended many of my colleagues. If I have shown any smug self-righteousness, may I assure the Senate that it was unintentional and I most sincerely beg the pardon of my colleagues. I happen to dislike self-righteousness most of all, because it shuts off the possibility of growth and is essentially uncharitable to others and if I have sinned in this respect, as some of my colleagues obviously think, I shall try to rid myself of this fault in the future.

I can only wish that abler, better, more conciliatory, and more experienced men than I had taken up this battle who could have carried it through with greater success and who would not have aroused the hard feelings which I apparently have done. There are very many such men in the Senate, but, unfortunately, they have not come forward in this instance. As is too often the case, the team has had to depend on a scrub and second-rater who has failed to do justice to the cause which he tried to represent. I only hope that the burden will be assumed next year by better men and then I shall be glad to step back and let them take the lead and serve myself only as a dishwasher and possibly a factual hod-carrier for their efforts. I would do this all the more gladly because it has been extremely unpleasant for me to get up again and again to move a reduction in appropriations and to feel that I was incurring the displeasure of colleagues whom I respect.

But while I wish to take my full share of the blame for the failure of our body to make selective economies, I am inclined to believe that the causes for this failure lie far deeper than my own personal faults, real though these are.

ORGANIZATION OF SENATE MAKES SELECTIVE CUTS DIFFICULT

In the first place, it is clear that the very organization of the Senate makes selective economies difficult, if not impossible. For the members of the Appropriations Committee, having thrashed these issues out and having arrived at a recommendation, feel bound in loyalty to each other to defend the items for which big appropriations are being asked. We have seen many times ranking minority members of the Appropriations Subcommittees rising to defend specific figures and insisting that the appropriations cannot be cut by a single dollar. Then I have also noticed that the Senators who are interested in the appropriations under a given chapter in the bill are generally on the floor in force when that chapter is up for consideration. Thus, the Senators from the farming States were present in large numbers when the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, chapter VI, came up and overwhelmingly defeated my proposal to reduce these appropriations. I was similarly bowled over as I tried to reduce specific items for roads by $100,000,000 in this time of great stress. Similarly, when the appropriations for the Interior Department, chapter VII, were under consideration and I tried to cut $90,000,000 for reclamation and reduce other items, I saw large numbers of Senators on the floor from the mountain and semiarid States who naturally resisted these cuts. When the rivers and harbors section, chapter IX, which is euphoniously referred to as the civil functions of the Army appropriation came up, I looked about me and saw the serried ranks of the Senators from the regions of the Gulf, the lower Mississippi, the Missouri, and the Arkansas Rivers. These men believe in all good faith in the projects which would benefit their communities and were strong in their support of the recommended appropriations.

On the other hand, the Senators whose interests were not immediately involved in the making of the specific appropriations, and whose interests were only general in that they primarily represented taxpayers tended not to be on the floor—with many honorable exceptions, of course—when these items came up for consideration. This was perfectly natural, excusable, and perhaps inevitable. For them to have stayed on the floor and joined in the fight item by item would have required not only many hours but actually may days of dull, dreary work, besides the weeks of study and preparation required. In the meantime, they would have had to miss many vital committee meetings, fall behind on their heavy correspondence, arouse the ire of constituents by not seeing them when they called, and go through a very unpleasant process to no apparent avail. The special interests were therefore concentrated and determined, while the general interests were scattered, diffused, and unorganized. It is small wonder, therefore, that no cuts were made.

Secondly, our procedures in the Senate make it very difficult for us to consider an appropriations bill intelligently on the floor. For again and again, while we were considering specific chapters, Senators would rise and speak at length for hours on some perfectly extraneous subject. This wore out and discouraged many who were anxious to take part. I would humbly suggest—and as a new Member I do so humbly—that we would make more progress if we were to accept a rule of germaneness so that up to a given hour, say 5 o'clock, we would only consider and speak upon the subject before the House and then after that hour, let any Senator speak on any subject about which he felt a concern, whether that question be sex perverts in the Government, Formosa, Kamchatka, or Timbuctoo. We would get infinitely more work done under such a rule and yet Senators would still have the right of free and unlimited debate.

Finally—and I say this with timidity—I have come to suspect that those who urge the superiority of selective cuts to the meat-ax method of general cuts tend to lose some of their enthusiasm for the selective method when it is actually employed. The suspicion occurs to me also that possibly one reason why some Senators prefer the method of general cuts is because if they vote for specific cuts, they incur the wrath of special interest groups while if they vote for general cuts, they get popular credit for standing for economy and thus compel the President and the executive departments to bear the popular opprobrium of making the specific economies

to carry out the broad sweeping and indefinite reductions of 10 percent, 15 percent, or 20 percent, for which the swingers of the meat ax have voted. If I am uncharitable in these surmises, I hope that my colleagues and the public will pardon me.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a list of the proposals for reductions which I have proposed, their amounts, and references to their explanations.

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

Itemized reductions in omnibus appropriations bill (H. R. 7786) proposed by Senator Douglas

Department, agency, and purpose of funds	Appropriation for fiscal year 1950	Amount voted by House	Amount in Senate bill	Budget estimate	Proposed reduction		For reasons see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. No. —
					Below Senate bill	Below budget	
Legislative branch: New Senate Office Bldg	None	None	$10,000,000	$10,000,000	$10,000,000	$10,000,000	10096
Department of State:							
Salaries and expenses	$78,152,000	$77,300,000	78,300,000	78,731,000	1,000,000	1,431,000	(1)
Institute of Inter-American Affairs:							
Expenses:							
Cash	4,751,600	5,500,000	5,000,000	6,500,000	500,000	2,000,000	10221
Contract authorization	None	None	7,000,000	14,000,000	2,000,000	9,000,000	10221
Department of Commerce:							
Civil Aeronautics Administration: Salaries, expenses	94,402,000	97,000,000	99,775,000	104,250,000	2,775,000	7,250,000	10222
Civil Aeronautics Board	3,620,500	3,400,000	4,000,000	4,323,000	600,000	923,000	10223
Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce: Salaries and expenses	4,923,500	5,000,000	5,300,000	5,620,000	300,000	620,000	10224
Field Office Service	2,079,500	2,050,000	2,155,000	2,155,000	105,000	105,000	10224
Patent Office: Salaries and expenses	10,825,000	11,300,000	11,530,000	11,760,000	230,000	460,000	10224
Bureau of Public Roads: Postwar highways	385,000,000	405,000,000	385,000,000	426,000,000	100,000,000	141,000,000	10225
Weather Bureau: Salaries and expenses	24,179,000	24,447,000	24,897,000	26,100,000	450,000	1,653,000	10234
Department of Treasury:							
Office of Administrative Services: Salaries	1,150,000	1,160,000	1,207,000	1,207,000	47,000	47,000	10298
Bureau of Accounts: Salaries and expenses	1,725,000	1,875,000	2,029,000	2,029,000	154,000	334,000	10299
Bureau of Customs: Salaries and expenses	35,150,000	36,500,000	36,806,360	36,973,000	306,360	473,300	10299
Bureau of Narcotics: Salaries and expenses	1,610,000	1,750,000	1,908,000	1,933,000	158,000	183,000	10299
Bureau of Engraving and Printing: Salaries and expenses	15,660,000	15,500,000	16,835,000	16,935,000	1,335,000	1,435,000	10300
Reconstruction Finance Corporation: Salaries and expenses	25,775,000	26,000,000	26,700,000	27,100,000	6,700,000	7,100,000	10323
Federal Security Agency, Office of Education: Salaries and expenses	1,900,000	1,900,000	2,023,420	2,168,000	123,420	268,000	11012
Public Health Service, Hospital Construction Service: Salaries and expenses	1,132,257	1,357,000	2,107,000	2,807,000	750,000	1,450,000	11013
Bureau of Federal Credit Union: General fund appropriation	200,000	200,000	300,000	375,000	100,000	175,000	11013
General Counsel: Salaries and expenses	455,068	511,100	535,100	567,100	24,000	56,000	11014
Department of Agriculture:							
Bureau of Agriculture Economics (economy investigation)	2,621,000	2,600,000	2,720,000	2,915,600	120,000	315,600	10534
Crop and livestock estimate and data on farm construction	2,817,900	2,725,000	2,904,000	3,378,000	179,000	653,000	10534
Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics: Salaries and expenses	1,749,200	1,500,000	1,763,200	2,217,200	263,200	717,200	10536
Bureau of Animal Husbandry: Salaries and expenses	2,248,200	2,250,000	2,319,000	2,519,700	69,000	269,700	10536
Bureau of Dairy Industry	1,613,300	1,600,000	1,735,000	1,899,300	135,000	299,300	10538
Bureau of Agriculture and Industrial Chemistry	8,395,625	7,750,000	8,500,000	8,818,800	750,000	1,068,800	10539
Forest development: Roads and trails	10,348,000	10,348,000	12,000,000	12,465,000	6,000,000	6,465,000	10541
Flood control	9,500,000	10,750,000	9,880,000	11,700,000	1,000,000	2,820,000	10541
Sugar Act	60,000,000	60,000,000	63,750,000	67,500,000	3,750,000	7,500,000	10542
Bureau of Plant Industry: Field crops	3,446,800	3,400,000	3,475,000	3,638,300	75,000	238,300	10539
Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine: Insect and plant disease control	4,651,000	4,185,900	4,651,000	4,752,000	465,100	566,100	(1)
Forest Service: Protection and management	26,300,000	26,890,000	29,320,500	30,270,500	2,430,500	3,380,500	(1)
Forest Service: Acquisition of land	401,000	100,000	401,000	700,000	301,000	600,000	(1)
Marketing Service: News service	1,900,000	2,050,000	2,187,000	2,274,300	137,000	224,300	(1)
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: Operating and administrative expenses	5,054,000	6,854,000	7,204,000	7,450,000	350,000	596,000	(1)
Commodity Credit Corporation: Administrative expenses	15,000,000	16,000,000	16,350,000	16,750,000	350,000	750,000	(1)
Farmers Home Administration: Salaries and expenses	26,149,000	27,700,000	29,000,000	30,000,000	1,300,000	2,300,000	[1] 10547
Office of Solicitor	2,364,000	2,450,000	2,675,000	3,070,000	225,000	620,000	10549
Department of Interior:							
Bureau of Land Management: Management of land	6,215,200	6,756,800	7,127,810	8,650,000	371,010	1,893,200	10665
Construction	[2] 200,000	600,000	800,000	[3] 1,000,000	200,000	[3] 200,000	10666
Bureau of Indian Affairs: Welfare	32,535,906	37,929,000	40,252,328	40,483,975	2,323,328	2,554,975	10667
Bureau of Reclamation: General investigations	4,950,000	5,150,000	6,500,000	7,800,000	2,150,000	3,500,000	10732ff.
Construction	[4] 333,961,638	297,467,000	[5] 294,713,000	325,966,500	90,713,000	121,966,500	10737ff.
Bureau of Reclamation: General administrative expenses	4,300,000	7,000,000	7,400,000	7,800,000	400,000	800,000	11008
National Park Service: Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities	6,990,262	7,250,000	7,448,100	7,470,000	198,100	220,000	11009
Construction	14,595,813	20,542,000	19,667,000	22,767,000	4,667,000	7,767,000	11009
Fish and Wildlife Service: Investigation of resources	3,324,200	3,900,000	4,125,000	3,900,000	800,000	575,000	11000
Construction	1,797,100	2,401,000	2,423,450	2,376,000	623,450	576,000	11010
Executive Office, Bureau of Budget: Salaries and expenses	3,300,000	3,386,000	3,412,000	3,486,000	26,000	100,000	11159
Philippine Alien Property Administration: Salaries and expenses	250,000	160,000	215,000	215,000	55,000	55,000	11159
Civil Service Commission: Salaries and expenses	16,000,000	15,261,913	15,761,913	16,560,000	500,000	1,298,087	11159
General Services Administration:							
Advance, planning of public works, contract authority	17,000,000	32,000,000	27,000,000	40,000,000	10,000,000	23,000,000	11159
Operating expenses		76,500,000	82,725,000	84,725,000	6,225,000	8,225,000	11159
Interstate Commerce Commission: General expenses	9,600,000	9,889,600	10,002,600	10,002,600	113,000	113,000	11159
Securities and Exchange Commission: Salaries and expenses	5,750,000	6,130,000	6,330,000	6,425,000	200,000	295,000	11159
Smithsonian Institution: Salaries and expenses	2,300,000	2,606,490	2,770,000	2,770,000	163,510	163,510	11159
Maritime Commission: Ship-construction subsidies (contract authority)	(6)	(6)	64,875,000	(7)	41,100,000	[8] 41,000,000	11160
Operating differential subsidies		[9] 26,450,000	[9] 30,108,000	93,380,000	3,658,000	11,721,000	11159
Rivers, harbors, and flood control and navigation projects: Limitation on additional technical expenses	(7)	1,450,000	1,600,000	(7)	960,000	(7)	11360

[1] Motion for reconsideration pending.
[2] Contract authorization.
[3] Plus $300,000 in contract authorizations.
[4] Plus $8,339,700 in contract authorizations.
[5] Plus $3,000,000 in contract authorizations.
[6] Extended contract authority.
[7] No comparable figure.
[8] Approximate—no comparable figure.
[9] Plus $55,209,000 in reappropriations.

Itemized reductions in omnibus appropriations bill (H. R. 7786) proposed by Senator Douglas—Continued

Department, agency, and purpose of funds	Appropriation for fiscal year 1950	Amount voted by House	Amount in Senate bill	Budget estimate	Proposed reduction		For reasons see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. No.—
					Below Senate bill	Below budget	
Rivers and harbors projects	$197,985,690	$185,878,000	$221,244,500	$240,714,000	$130,495,000	$149,964,000	11336–11337 11359–11360 11363–11366
Flood control and navigation projects	366,406,400	341,055,000	436,933,000	478,447,000	263,483,000	304,997,000	11336–11337 11359–11360 11363–11366
Flood control:							
Mississippi River	67,000,000	65,000,000	66,778,000	72,000,000	40,078,000	45,300,000	11336–11337 11359–11360 11363–11366
Sacramento River	3,600,000	2,700,000	2,524,500	2,805,000	1,514,500	1,795,000	11336–11337 11359–11360 11363–11366

On other proposals for limitations, amounts cannot be computed. Total number of items, 68; total amount of proposed reductions below Senate committee recommendations, $746,574,478. Total amount of proposed reductions below budget estimates, $943,426,972.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now, Mr. President, I am well aware of the fact that knives are dangerous. But, with a deficit of $5,000,000,000 facing us even before the Korean situation, a major surgical operation was even then in order. With the present international crisis, which is not a possibility but actually upon us, such an operation is already well under way and, while increasing taxes are needed, we simply must cut civilian expenses as well. For we are confronted with needs far greater than combating inflation. Manpower and resources are needed for our very security, and if we precommit ourselves to huge expenditures for nonessential items, what happens when we find we should have been using these resources to protect our own safety?

MAY HAVE TO RESORT TO A MEAT AX

For this reason, since I have not had what would be called marked success in my attempts to use a surgeons' knife, I shall probably be forced to resort to the good old meat ax.

In my office this morning I looked at a surgeons' scalpel and at a meat ax, and I debated for some time whether I should bring those two instruments to the floor of the Senate. I decided that it would be somewhat undignified to do so. Therefore, following the example of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] I will say that I have them here in a suitcase. If anyone wishes to look at them, I shall be very happy to show them, and admission will be by ticket only.

The use of the surgeon's knife requires great care and I can certainly vouch for its being difficult and time consuming. The meat ax is easy. Just raise it above your head and come down on the bureaus with a resounding whack. But before doing this—being reluctantly pushed into wielding an unscientific meat ax—

A "SHARP MEAT AX WIELDED WITH CARE"

I intend to try one more approach; namely, a very sharp meat ax wielded with care.

I send to the desk an amendment for myself and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] which I shall call "The sharp meat ax wielded with care." It is a substitute for the committee amendment striking out the Thomas-Taber features of the House bill.

Section 1001 of this amendment reads:

Reductions in appropriations contained in this act are hereby made in the sum of $1,000,000,000. Such reductions shall be made in the following manner:

I may say that the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] proposes a reduction of $800,000,000 across the board. Our amendment proposes a reduction of $1,000,000,000, and orders those reductions to be made in selected areas.

This I quote from the first part of this amendment:

(a) Funds appropriated in this act for supplies and materials, for lands and structures, and for Federal aid postwar highways, shall be reduced by $500,000,000: *Provided*, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is empowered to make such reductions among the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government in such a manner as to provide for the most efficient use of the Nation's manpower and resources consistent with prevailing needs for an adequate national defense and a sound national economy.

FIVE-HUNDRED-MILLION-DOLLAR REDUCTION IN CONSTRUCTION ITEMS

Thus, the one-half of the reduction would be made on civilian construction. Most of it, of course, would have to be taken from rivers, harbors, navigation, flood control, reclamation projects, and highways, but not necessarily all of it. Throughout the bill we find a great many construction items which could be reduced. Furthermore, part of these reductions would be made from supplies and materials, most of which go for construction, but by no means all of it.

Paragraph (a) therefore specifically gives to the Bureau of the Budget the power to make these cuts, but it also specifies the areas in which reductions are to be made. Paragraph (a) also charges the Budget Bureau with the responsibility to see that these cuts are made in such a manner as to provide for the most efficient use of the Nation's manpower and resources consistent with prevailing needs for an adequate national defense and a sound national economy.

The total amounts budgeted for construction—and on this point Members of the Senate should consult page 13 of Summary of Obligations by Objects, prepared by the Bureau of the Budget—for nonexempt items, the exemptions being listed in section 1002 of my amendment, is about $1,040,000,000.

Total budgeted amounts for supplies and materials which are nonexempt in my amendment is about $820,000,000. The total amount in the bill for Federal aid postwar highways will be between $405,000,000 and $385,000,000 depending on the final figure adopted in conference. This makes a total of about $2,225,000,000 from which the $500,000,000 reduction provided for in paragraph (a) would be drawn. This is a 22-percent reduction below the budget although since some reductions have already been made in the bill before us, the actual cut would amount to about 25 percent in this area.

FIVE-HUNDRED-MILLION-DOLLAR REDUCTION IN ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE

The rest of the billion-dollar reduction or the other five hundred million is made in pragraph (b), which reads:

(b) Funds appropriated in this act for personal services, travel, transportation of things, communications services, rents and utilities, printing and reproduction, other contractual services, and equipment shall be reduced by $500,000,000 which reduction shall be made among the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government on a pro rata basis: *Provided*, That reductions in personnel shall, where practicable, be made by eliminating a total of 5 percent of the personnel provided for in the President's budget and the filling of a total of not more than one-half of all vacancies which occur by reason of death, resignation, or otherwise: *Provided further*, That the reductions provided for in this subsection among the departments shall be made on a department-wide basis and the secretaries of the departments are empowered by means of transfer and adjustments, to keep the agencies within their respective departments at a maximum of efficiency: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is empowered, by means of transfers and adjustments to administer the reductions provided for in this subsection among the nondepartmental and independent agencies in such a manner as to provide for a maximum of efficiency: *Provided further*, that hereafter, the amount of annual leave for Government employees, including employees of the Postal Service, shall be at the rate of 20 days per year and the amount of sick leave shall be at the rate of 12 days per year for classified and wage-board employees (except that no annual leave nor sick leave shall be granted to any Government employee who has not been in continuous Government service for at least 1 calendar year).

This paragraph apportions a $500,000,000 reduction among the departments and agencies on a pro rata basis. But it specifies the areas where the reductions are to be made so that Congress would not be completely abdicating the power of appropriations.

Paragraph (b) would empower the secretaries of the various departments, however, to maintain a maximum of efficiency by means of transfers and adjustments between the various bureaus within the respective departments. The Bureau of the Budget would have this power with respect to the nondepartmental and independent agencies, some of which may be too small to completely absorb these cuts by themselves while others can absorb more than their prorated share.

The total amounts budgeted for those items in the nonexempt agencies in the categories from which reductions would be made are approximately as follows:

Personnel	$3,560,000,000
Travel	138,000,000
Transportation of things	42,000,000
Communications	35,000,000
Rent and utility services	103,000,000
Printing and reproductions	28,000,000
Other contractual services	347,000,000
Equipment	298,000,000
Total	4,551,000,000

Thus, the $500,000,000 reduction would amount to a cut of about 11 percent of the total amounts budgeted for these purposes. However, since the amounts provided for in the bill before us are somewhat less than the budgeted amounts the actual reduction would be closer to 12 or 12½ percent.

PERSONNEL REDUCTIONS

Reductions in personnel are to be made by eliminating 5 percent and then filling only one-half the vacancies to accomplish further reductions.

This amendment differs very sharply from the Thomas-Taber and the Jensen amendments, because the combination of the Thomas-Taber and Jensen amendments in the House provided for filling only one-tenth of the vacancies, with a cut of 10 percent superimposed upon this. This would mean a reduction in personnel of over 30 percent by the end of the year and an average cut for the year of over 20 percent. My proposal is for a cut of 5 percent, and then for filling only one-half of the vacancies.

I may say that my initial estimate of a cut of 5 percent is built up from two items, first, eliminating the 2 percent of Government employees who are the most inefficient; then, if we cut the leave of classified and wage-board employees from 26 working days to 20, or a cut of from five and a half calendar weeks to four calendar weeks, and reduce sick leave from 3 weeks to 2⅗ weeks, we effect a saving of around 3 percent in the number of governmental employees. So that by dismissing the most inefficient 2 percent, and reducing Government leave, which will save 3 percent, we can effect a personnel reduction of 5 percent, and, in addition to that, fill only half the vacancies which occur.

With increasing needs for manpower in the Defense Establishment and war production, I cannot believe this would work any great hardship on the workers themselves. The displaced workers would be able to find jobs elsewhere. They would be transferred from the departments which are overstaffed into agencies of the national defense or into private jobs which will be understaffed. The net result would be a transfer from places where the employees are less efficient into places where they are more efficient.

This is especially true since only 5 percent are to be subject to a reduction in force while other personnel reductions would be made by filling only one-half of the vacancies which occur because of death, resignation, or otherwise. Personnel turn-over is about 26 percent so that filling one-half of the vacancies which occur during 1 year would amount to about 7 percent.

When this is combined with the 5 percent eliminated by a reduction in force we would have a total over-all reduction for the first year of 12 percent. The paragraph contains the qualifications "insofar as practicable" to allow for exceptional cases where turn-over is at an unusually high rate or where the provision would work a hardship on agencies in keeping staffed with key personnel. Meanwhile, personnel generally is only one of several categories where reductions would be made. It may be that some agencies would prefer to make greater cuts in travel or other categories and less in personnel. This flexibility would operate with respect to all the areas selected for reductions since the location of soft spots may vary from agency to agency.

REDUCE AND EQUALIZE ANNUAL AND SICK LEAVE

While reductions in personnel would ordinarily be made to the extent of 12 percent, actual manpower would be reduced only about 10 percent. This is true because reducing the annual and sick leave of classified and wage-board employees to 20 days would mean that each employee so reduced would put in about 3 percent more actual working time. Since postal workers' leave would be increased, however, the net gain in actual hours worked per employee would be only about 2 percent, which can be subtracted from the cut of 12 percent to make a net manpower reduction in the civilian agencies of 10 percent. Furthermore, the leave provision would apply to all Government employees, whether they work for agencies in the exempt or nonexempt categories. This would increase the manpower in the Defense Establishment and other agencies which are doing work vital to national defense.

I have previously presented the case for setting annual leave at 20 days, and I will not burden the Senate with further arguments on this point. I will simply say that 20 working days, or 1 month with week ends, is long enough for a vacation, and is still very liberal in comparison with that given by private employers. This would still be better than the leave given by 99 44/100 percent of private employers. The present 26 days of leave is excessive, because that number of days, on a basis of a 5-day week, is 5⅕ weeks. When there are added 15 days of sick leave, which makes 41 days, and 8 holidays, making 49 days, plus the other days of leave on the occasions of visits of Brazilian and other Presidents and when the weather is hot, the total leave given to Government workers is much larger than appears on its face. It is unjustified at any time, and certainly in the period which is close to a national emergency.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. I merely wish to ask a question. I did not hear the beginning of the Senator's address. Is the proposal the Senator is now speaking of a general over-all cut in the bill?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. I shall be glad to furnish the Senator a copy of my address.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have it. Does the distinguished Senator set out item by item what he intends to cut?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. In all the chapters?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, no; it is a general cut, but it is to be applied to specific areas. In brief, it calls for a reduction of $500,000,000 on construction, supplies, and materials, and $500,000,000 on transportation, personal services, communications, and so forth. The cuts are divided in that manner. The total cut is $1,000,000,000, or approximately $200,000,000 greater than that provided in the so-called Bridges-Byrd amendment.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want to belabor this matter. I am trying to get the picture. Would the proposed cut apply to all construction projects throughout all the chapters of the bill?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. And the same is true with respect to transportation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Personnel and transportation and other areas. I hope the Senator will be given a copy of my address.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield for one more question, please?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the cut to be made by the department heads, or does the Senator in his amendment provide for the cuts?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Within the departments the personnel and other cuts are to be made by the departments. For the nondepartmental and independent agencies the Bureau of the Budget will make the apportionment of the personnel and other cuts. The Bureau of the Budget will make the cuts for construction materials and supplies. But there are certain standards which we lay down which will direct them in doing this, namely, on the personnel item a 5 percent cut in the number of persons aided by a reduction in annual leave and then filling only one-half of the vacancies which occur.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield for another question.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the head of the department be the one who can use his best judgment as to where the cut is to be applied?

Mr. DOUGLAS. On everything except construction.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I want to know. Does the Senator provide for the cut on construction by items then, or does the department head with respect to each chapter of the bill make the cuts?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Bureau of the Budget makes the construction cut of $500,000,000. The Bureau is directed to cut materials, construction and supplies for the nondefense and the nonexempt agencies $500,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. So the Senator's amendment applies only to appropriations for construction outside of military needs?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, yes. As a matter of fact, the list of exemptions is very similar to that provided for in the so-called Bridges-Byrd amendment, with one or two exceptions which I shall mention later.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand, the Senator's amendment provides for a cut of $500,000,000 in construction, and so forth, and a cut of $500,000,000 on transportation and personal services and so forth.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. So the amendment provides for a total cut of $1,000,000,000?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank my genial friend from Nebraska for his inquiries.

Mr. President, as I said the present 26 days of leave is excessive, because it is not measured by calendar days but by work days. It amounts therefore to 5⅕ weeks. It should be lowered in normal times, but our manpower needs to maintain adequate defense make it especially imperative that we make this change immediately.

The leave provision also increases the postal workers from 15 to 20 days. In the future, the national manpower situation will force postal workers to work harder and I believe it worth while to give them a month's vacation. Leave provisions should be equalized anyway within the Government service.

CONGRESS WOULD DECIDE WHERE TO CUT WHILE ALLOWING ADMINISTRATIVE FLEXIBILITY

The reduction provided by paragraphs (a) and (b) of my amendment are made while providing two safeguards. First. The areas where the rereductions are to be made are determined by Congress. Thus Congress determines where the reductions are to be made. It does not merely turn the problem over to the administrative agencies. Second. Flexibility to allow efficient administration is allowed. I do not assert that this is any final answer. Reducing expenditures should be carried out selectively item by item.

That is what I have been trying to do without much success, but to the best of my ability, during the past two weary weeks. But I assert that this amendment is preferable to an across-the-board percentage cut, and that, if it is a meat ax, it is a sharp meat ax wielded with care.

EXEMPTIONS

The exemptions provided are the obvious ones. They are similar to those provided for in the Bridges-Byrd amendment with a few important exceptions. Foreign aid, which is, in my judgment, a defense expenditure, is exempt. The Post Office is only exempt in its expenditures for railroad transportation of the mail. The Post Office is included except for railway mail transportation. I shall, however, if others of my colleagues do not do so, offer a specific amendment on the question of railway mail transportation costs.

I would also exempt subsidies where the amounts paid are set by law. This will prevent agencies from making their reductions in subsidies and then coming back for deficiency appropriations. I would also exempt the Coast Guard, which is now an agency of war and national defense, and not merely an agency of domestic administration.

I have made no provisions for reducing loans. I am afraid that under the Bridges-Byrd amendment, a department might make its total 10 percent reduction by holding up 2 or 3 large loans such as those given by REA or the Farm Credit Administration. If this were done, no waste would be eliminated at all.

I would, however, urge that all loans be scrutinized very carefully and that only those which will be in the national interest be given.

The Thomas-Taber and Jensen amendments have been thoroughly discussed and I will not burden the Senate with further talk about them. They are both too inflexible and they would be administratively difficult.

In appealing to the Senate favorably to consider my amendment, I ask that Senators read the amendment. I have additional copies at my desk. I shall also be happy to talk to anyone who desires more information and will welcome all who care to join me in sponsoring it. Any Senator who wants to add his name to the amendment will be welcome.

In closing I will simply say that I have spent a great deal of time studying these appropriations, and while the surgeon's knife approach of carefully cutting individual items is best, I believe this amendment, which is a sharp meat ax wielded with care is preferable to a blunt meat ax of an across-the-board percentage cut.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by myself, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered printed as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken on pages 444, 445, and 446 by the committee amendment, insert the following:

"CHAPTER X-A—GENERAL REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 1001. Reductions in appropriations contained in this act are hereby made in the sum of $1,000,000,000. Such reductions shall be made in the following manner:

"(a) Funds appropriated in this act for supplies and materials, for lands and structures, and for Federal aid postwar highways shall be reduced by $500,000,000: *Provided*, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is empowered to make such reductions among the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government in such a manner as to provide for the most efficient use of the Nation's manpower and resources consistent with prevailing needs for an adequate national defense and a sound national economy.

"(b) Funds appropriated in this act for personal services, travel, transportation of things, communications services, rents and utilities, printing and reproduction, other contractual services, and equipment shall be reduced by $500,000,000 which reduction shall be made among the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government on a pro rata basis: *Provided*, That reductions in personnel shall, where practicable, be made by eliminating a total of 5 percent of the personnel provided for in the President's budget and the filling of a total of not more than one-half of all vacancies which occur by reason of death, resignation, or otherwise: *Provided further*, That the reductions provided for in this subsection among the departments shall be made on a department-wide basis and the secretaries of the departments are empowered, by means of transfers and adjustments, to keep the agencies within their respective departments at a maximum of efficiency: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is empowered, by means of transfers and adjustments to administer the reductions provided for in this subsection among the nondepartmental and independent agencies in such a manner as to provide for a maximum of efficiency: *Provided further*, That hereafter, the amount of annual leave for Government employees, including employees of the postal service, shall be at the rate of 20 days per year and the amount of sick leave shall be at the rate of 12 days per year for classified and wage-board employees (except that no annual leave nor sick leave shall be granted to any Government employee who has not been in continuous Government service for at least one calendar year).

"SEC. 1002. The reductions provided for in this chapter shall not apply to the following (except that the annual- and sick-leave provisos shall apply to all classified and wage-board employees and postal workers).

"(a) Chapter X, chapter X-B and the amount appropriated to the General Services Administration for carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act of July 23, 1946;

"(b) Appropriations in title I of chapter VIII for the Executive Office of the President under the headlines "Compensation of the President," "The White House Office," "Emergency Fund for the President," and "Executive Mansion and Grounds."

"(c) Appropriations for the atomic-energy program;

"(d) Trust funds;

"(e) Funds of Government corporations excluding those made available in this act (1) for administrative expenses and (2) by appropriation from the general fund of the Treasury;

"(f) Amounts (other than under the Veterans' Administration) for furnishing medical and hospital services and domiciliary care, excluding (1) administrative expenses not directly connected with the operation of a specific hospital, dispensary, or clinic, and (2) expenses for employee health service programs;

"(g) Amounts provided in this act for payment of obligations incurred under prior appropriations or authorizations, and obligated balances of reappropriations;

"(h) Appropriations of, or measured by, receipts;

"(i) Amounts appropriated by this act for the operation of law-enforcement agencies, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Bureau of Customs, Immigration and Naturalization Services, and the Secret Service; or for the payment of compensation and expenses of agents and auditors of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and such other officers and employees of other agencies whose duties primarily pertain to intelligence operations (including funds transferred pursuant to section 6 (a) of the act of June 20, 1949; 63 Stat. 211), or to the investigation, apprehension, prosecution, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the criminal laws of the United States;

"(j) Amounts provided for any program of the Veterans' Administration, excluding (1) administrative expenses not directly connected with the operation of a specific hospital, dispensary, clinic, or facility, and (2) expenses for employee health service programs;

"(k) Grants (other than those for Federal-aid postwar highways), subsidies, and contributions where amounts are determined by laws;

"(l) Amounts provided to make payment of or contributions toward pensions, retirement and disability annuities and benefits, employee's death or injury benefits, or other items of a similar nature;

"(m) Appropriations for refunds, awards, and indemnities.

"(n) Appropriations for the Coast Guard, and

"(o) The amount appropriated to the Post Office Department for railroad transportation of the mail."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move to insert in lieu of the matter stricken by the committee amendment on pages 444, 445, and 446, an amendment which I have sent to the desk, which I now ask to have read and made the order of business.

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

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry first, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Is unanimous consent required to have the amendment made the pending business in view of the fact that the amendment runs into another chapter?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; it would be out of order to consider the amendment in its present form, because it relates both to the chapter which we are just finishing and the following chapter, which has not been stated and is not before the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. I have no objection to the amendment being printed and to have it lie on the table to be offered at the proper time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The proper time will come in just about a fraction of a second.

Mr. WHERRY. I make the point of order, Mr. President, that the amendment is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment would not be in order as a portion of it relates to the next chapter, which is not now before the Senate.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. KEM. I should like to associate myself with what the Senator from Illinois has stated about the necessity of reducing the nonmilitary expenses of the Government. I have voted for most, if not all, of the selective amendments proposed by him. In my opinion, the Senator from Illinois has performed a fine public service in his effort to make a selective reduction in the appropriation bill. I think he has some qualms about the results to some of his colleagues of what he has done, but I wish to say that, in my judgment, the way in which he has used the scalpel has been so skillful that it has left no scars. I think there can be no doubt about that. So I hope he will continue his efforts. I believe that time will show the great necessity for the Congress to do what the junior Senator from Illinois is seeking to have done.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent——

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

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have the floor; and in order that the Senator may propound a parliamentary inquiry, I have to yield first.

Mr. President, no chapter of the appropriations bill is now before the Senate at this time, I believe. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate pass over chapter X-A and proceed to the consideration of chapter X-B.

I shall be glad to yield now to the Senator from Illinois for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me inquire why the Senator wishes to pass over chapter X-A, which logically would come before the Senate at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. I am merely asking that it be passed over temporarily.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would it not be well to consider chapter X-A now?

Mr. WHERRY. The reason why I think the subject matter of chapter X-A or the subject matter the Senator from Illinois, himself, has been discussing should properly be taken up by us at the end of the bill is that before an amendment such as the Bridges-Byrd amendment or the so-called Douglas amendment is considered by the Senate it seems to me the Senate should proceed to consider the foreign-aid section of the bill, and should see whether a cut is to be made in that section of the bill. Then we can consider as the last chapter, the one to which, really, either the so-called Douglas amendment or the Bridges-Byrd amendment would apply.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the foreign-aid section of the bill can be dealt with by means of amendments offered either to chapter X-A or chapter X-B.

I may say that I am very much pleased with what the Senator from Missouri has said. Unless I am abusing his compliments, I wish to say that I think the amendment should not be known solely as mine, but should be known as the Kem-Williams-Douglas amendment. Then we shall have awaiting our consideration both the Bridges-Byrd amendment and the Kem-Williams-Douglas amendment—thus indicating that a fine spirit of nonpartisanship urge for economy pervades this Chamber.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in that spirit, I ask unanimous consent that chapter X-A of the bill be passed over temporarily, for the reasons already stated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am not satisfied in my own mind that that would be the proper course. It pains me very much to have to object, but I am afraid I shall have to object.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think my request is an absolutely constructive one. There are many Members of the Senate who would like to have all the chapters of the bill considered before the amendment now known, as the Senator from Illinois has said, as the Douglas-Kem amendment or before the Bridges-Byrd amendment is considered and adopted, if one of them is adopted, depending upon whichever one is considered by the Senate to have merit.

It seems to me that the proper time to consider them is after the bill has been amended in all other respects, at which time we shall have before us the bill in its entirety, and then we can consider whether to make an over-all cut.

Mr. President, if I am not able to obtain unanimous consent for the purpose I have requested, I shall move that the Senate temporarily pass over chapter X-A of the bill, and proceed to the consideration of the chapter X-B. I suppose that I must include in the motion a date, so as to provide that chapter X-A be taken up at a time certain.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Arizona, if he wishes to propose a modification of my request or make a motion.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I hope the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois will not object to the request that we temporarily pass over chapter X-A of the bill, because before we pass upon the amendments calling for over-all reductions, I believe we should know just what other provisions the bill is going to contain.

So, Mr. President, personally I think we should take up the ECA chapter of the bill, and then should proceed to consider the amendment which the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has proposed, and should dispose of it. After having done that, and after we know what other provisions the bill is going to contain, we shall be better able to pass upon other amendments which may be offered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have the floor. I yielded to the Senator, did I not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois, if I may do so without prejudice to my right to the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois is certainly welcome.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I think I should state what is the real issue behind this parliamentary maneuvering: We are really jockeying to see whether the Bridges-Byrd amendment shall be acted on first or whether the Kem-Douglas amendment shall be acted on first.

I have no personal feeling about this matter, but I have going on within me a real mental and ethical struggle, which I wish to have resolved in the easiest manner possible.

I regard the Bridges-Byrd amendment as the worst possible way in which to cut the budget. However, the need for cutting the budget is so great that if all other methods fail, then, with certain qualifications, I shall be compelled to vote for the Bridges-Byrd amendment. But I do not wish to do so unless first we have exhausted every other alternative.

I am approaching the Bridges-Byrd amendment with the same alacrity that a cat exhibits when it is grabbed by the tail and is pulled backward across a thick rug, at which it claws energetically, doing its utmost to resist. In short, as each amendment is defeated, I find myself nearer and nearer the rapids and nearer and nearer the Bridges-Byrd amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, Mr. President——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska permit me to continue?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator for not imposing the guillotine upon me; I thank him for his characteristic courtesy. The point I want to make is this: I have tried selective cuts and have not been successful. However, I think a blunt, meat-ax approach like the Bridges-Byrd amendment is wrong. With reservations, however, I will be forced to vote for it if we fail in all other attempts to reduce expenditures. But before voting for it I would like to present my general amendment which calls for a larger cut, and which specifies the areas where the cuts are to be made. That is why I wish to have my amendment called up first. I think it is a much better way for Congress to make reductions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair state to the Senator from Illinois that if the unanimous-consent request is agreed to, the amendment of the Senator from Illinois will occupy exactly the same position which it will occupy otherwise.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would it be the first to be acted upon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the first to be acted upon——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, that is the whole issue. If that is the case, I am satisfied.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no, Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In order for the amendment of the Senator from Illinois to be first considered, the Senator from Illinois would have to be the first Senator to obtain the floor at that time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, that is a very important point. So the question will be which Senator obtains the floor first.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have the floor, have I not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. If my motion is acted upon favorably, that will mean that the Senate will proceed to take up the ECA chapter of the bill. So the amendment of the Senator from Illinois will not be prejudiced in that case. In such event he will be just as well off at the time when he wishes to present his amendment as he is now. He does not have the floor now. If he agrees to the unanimous-consent request, then it will simply be a question of which amendment comes up first. If the Bridges-Byrd amendment is offered first, the Senator from Illinois can move to strike out the language of the amendment and insert the language of the Douglas-Kem amendment; or if the Douglas-Kem amendment is offered first, the Bridges-Byrd amendment could be offered as a substitute for it.

So, Mr. President, I hope the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois will not object to the requested unanimous-consent agreement, for he is always charitable and courteous, and wishes to go along in a good bipartisan spirit.

However, the motion already has been made to postpone until Wednesday of next week, for final consideration, chapter X-A of the bill.

So far as the handling of the amendments is concerned, that will depend on which Senator obtains the floor and which amendment prevails, either the so-called Douglas-Kem amendment or the Bridges-Byrd amendment.

Mr. President, I have made the motion.

Now I shall be glad to yield for a question.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the acting majority leader. Let me say now that if I may obtain unanimous consent, I shall withdraw the motion.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not wish to be classified as associated with any jockeying in favor of one side or another side, so far as the amendments are concerned. I did not have that in mind. I supported the course suggested by the Senator from Nebraska because I thought it was the most orderly way to proceed.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. Although I favor temporarily laying aside chapter X, I certainly would resist a motion to take it up at a definite time. I do not think that would be the proper procedure.

I think we should lay it aside temorarily, and then proceed.

Of course, the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois is just about as quick on the jump as is the minority leader——

Mr. WHERRY. He is better, Mr. President. [Laughter.]

Mr. McFARLAND. In other words, the Senator from Illinois should be able to obtain the floor.

So I hope the Senator from Illinois will agree to the request to temporarily lay aside this chapter of the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to be very obliging. I have a very cooperative mood at all times, and particularly this afternoon.

If we can reach a unanimous-consent agreement that when we take up chapter X-A of the bill, my amendment will be the first order of business, I shall be very glad, indeed, to agree to the requested unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. President, I believe I have the floor now——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have the floor; I yielded for a question or, if there was no objection, for a comment. Do I not have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I wish to be fair——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to be fair to the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, why do not both Senators be fair to me, and yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield once again to the junior Senator from Illinois, providing I do not prejudice my rights to the floor. I ask unanimous consent that I may do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. LANGER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Washington for a question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As the Senator knows, there are two very important amendments pending.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As to those amendments, it was generally understood we would finish the committee amendments and would then consider the two amendments because they are in the nature of new matter. They are probably the two most important amendments, and I was wondering whether, under this arrangement, we would go on with the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, certainly.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And finish the committee amendments?

Mr. WHERRY. My motion is to temporarily pass over chapter X-A, and I feel that the majority leader should then bring up the so-called Douglas-Kem amendment, at the conclusion of the bill, for the reasons I have already stated—that if cuts are made in the ECA items, it will then be necessary to adjust the so-called over-all cut amendment, whichever one prevails.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It makes a difference.

Mr. WHERRY. The only time that could be done would be following the conclusion of the bill, at which time each

and every Senator will have his right to the floor. I have to make a motion, however, to postpone it to a day certain. I did so Wednesday. I should like to modify that motion to, say, Monday, and when Monday comes, if we are not ready for it, we shall have to modify it, I presume, and extend it for a longer period. I do not want to delay passage of the pending bill, but the motion necessitates a day certain. I shall make the motion on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator first want to let the Chair put the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois objected to it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I desire to be thoroughly obliging, thoroughly cooperative in all respects on these matters, and I am willing to withdraw my objection.

Mr. WHERRY. That is fine.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But I hope that the Chair or whoever may be occupying the chair, will cast his glance all around the Chamber when it comes time to recognize Senators, when this matter comes up.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I withdraw the motion I made, and I thank the Senator from Illinois for his cooperation. But I do not want the glancing part of the argument to prevail upon the occupant of the chair when the time comes to consider chapter X–A.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I merely said I hoped the eyes of the Presiding Officer would describe a semicircle—an arc, so to speak, and that he would not ignore the junior Senator from Illinois when the proper time came.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Chapter X–A will be passed over.

CONTROL OF ANCHORAGE AND MOVEMENT OF FOREIGN-FLAG VESSELS IN UNITED STATES WATERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3859) to authorize the President to control the anchorage and movement of foreign-flag vessels in waters of the United States when the national security of the United States is endangered, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 1 of title II of the act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 217; U. S. C., title 50, sec. 191), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Whenever the President finds that the security of the United States is endangered by reason of actual or threatened war, or invasion, or insurrection, or subversive activity, or of disturbances or threatened disturbances of the international relations of the United States, the President is authorized to institute such measures and issue such rules and regulations—

"(a) to govern the anchorage and movement of any foreign-flag vessels in the territorial waters of the United States, to inspect such vessels at any time, to place guards thereon, and, if necessary in his opinion in order to secure such vessels from damage or injury, or to prevent damage or injury to any harbor or waters of the United States, or to secure the observance of rights and obligations of the United States, may take for such purposes full possession and control of such vessels and remove therefrom the officers and crew thereof, and all other persons not especially authorized by him to go or remain on board thereof;

"(b) to safeguard against destruction, loss, or injury from sabotage or other subversive acts, accidents, or other causes of similar nature, vessels, harbors, ports, and waterfront facilities in the United States, the Canal Zone, and all territory and water, continental or insular, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

Any appropriation available to any of the executive departments shall be available to carry out the provisions of this title."

SEC. 2. Section 4 of title II of the act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 220; U. S. C., title 50, sec. 194), is amended to read as follows:

"The President may employ such departments, agencies, officers, or instrumentalities of the United States as he may deem necessary to carry out the purpose of this title."

SEC. 3. Section 2 of title II of the act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 220; U. S. C., title 50, sec. 192), as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(a) If any other person knowingly fails to comply with any regulation or rule issued or order given under the provisions of this title, or knowingly obstructs or interferes with the exercise of any power conferred by this title, he shall be punished by imprisonment for one more than 10 years and may, at the discretion of the court, be fined not more than $10,000."

SEC. 4. The provisions of this act shall expire on such date as may be specified by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wonder whether I might impose upon the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the minority and majority leaders long enough for a brief statement.

Last Friday we passed a piece of highly emergent legislation pertaining to waterfront security of the United States. The bill went to the House, and the House has passed it with two minor clarifying amendments. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to consideration of the bill (S. 3859) and I move that the Senate agree to the House amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am not going to object to the unanimous-consent request, because I have already talked to the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], about this matter.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let us take action on the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent is not required. The House action is laid before the Senate as a matter of right.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is this a conference report?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is an amendment of the House transmitted by message. The question is on agreeing to the House amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, that is what I wanted to have explained. I wanted to know what the House amendment was.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I shall explain the House amendment. The House has added two clarifying amendments. The only one of any importance is the following on page 1:

Whenever the President finds that the security of the United States is endangered by reason of actual or threatened war, or invasion, or insurrection, or subversive activity, or of disturbances or threatened disturbances of the international relations of the United States, the President is authorized to institute such measures and issue such rules and regulations—

In other words, the President is then authorized to do certain things for the protection of the water front. The House added "or insurrection, or subversive activity." I think it makes the bill much stronger.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, to the bill as passed by the Senate, the House has made this additional amendment, which I think is a good one.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It makes the bill stronger.

Mr. WHERRY. For that reason, I hope the House amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I merely want to say as a matter of information for the RECORD that I do not know whether the President will exercise this authority. I understand that if the bill is passed by the Senate today, as I am sure it will be, the President will sign the bill immediately, and that will give him authority to proceed at once on our water fronts. This is not a national emergency measure; it is only a limited emergency measure to take care of the water front security of the Nation. It is to prevent the entry into our ports of foreign-flag ships without notice either to the Coast Guard or the FBI, and enable them to make a search of the ships before they reach our territorial waters, in case they might have in their holds something which might be destructive.

It also has this purpose, which I think is a good one: As I have said before, the last stronghold of subversive activity in this country, in my opinion, or at least the last concentrated stronghold, has been around our water fronts. It would be impossible for destruction to come to any great port of the United States, of which there are many, as the result of a ship coming into port with an atomic bomb or with biological or other destructive agency, without some liaison ashore. This would give authority to the President to instruct the FBI, in cooperation with the Coast Guard, the Navy, or any other appropriate governmental agency, to go to our water fronts and pick out people who might be subversives or security risks to this country. I think it goes a long way toward taking care of the domestic situation, as related to this subject, particularly in view of the large amount of talk we have had in the Senate within the past few days about Communists. The bill also protects that last loophole which is left, by which there might be some actual destruction along the shores of the United States. It also includes the Territories of the United States. I am thinking in particular of the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, into whose ports many foreign-flag ships

enter and from which they leave. I am sure that the Senate and House, in acting with due speed on this measure, have done a really fine job in adding to the security of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] to the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

THE KOREAN WAR MADE A POLITICAL ISSUE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have just obtained a copy of the Washington Evening Star of today. I was horrified to find on page 1 the following headlines: "Democratic pamphlet makes Korean war major election issue—Kirwan group charges GOP obstructionism hastened Red aggression."

I want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that across page 1 of the Evening Star is the screaming headline, "Reds pressing all-out attack in Korea." Under that headline is another headline, "Decisive battle on, MacArthur aide declares." Over the two adjacent columns on page 1 is the headline, "100,000-man draft expected to mean 505 quota for District of Columbia."

Next to that, Mr. President, it says, "News on Korea still expected to get worse."

So, Mr. President, at the very time thousands and thousands of our boys are over there dying or getting wounded, we find the Democratic National Committee issuing a pamphlet attacking the Republican Party. Mr. President, to my mind, the issuing of this pamphlet is so contemptible, so out of place in a country such as ours, in time of danger and crisis, that I want to read the article to show what men will stoop to in politics at the very time when our boys are in Korea fighting for their very lives.

The article is by Gould Lincoln, one of our best newspapermen, and it reads as follows:

The Korean war today was thrust officially into the coming congressional campaign as a major issue.

The Democratic congressional committee, headed by Representative KIRWAN, of Ohio, put out a 17-page memorandum, entitled "Background Information on Korea," to be used by Democratic candidates for the House. In it the committee charged the Red attack on southern Korea had been hastened by Republican opposition to the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949 and to the Economic Assistance for Korea Act of 1949. The memorandum is being placed in the hands of each Democratic candidate.

Chairman KIRWAN said the committee was forced into taking this action by attacks on President Truman by Republicans in Congress and by the Republican National Committee, in connection with the Korean war.

I invite attention to the fact, Mr. President, that the vote supporting the President of the United States when we got into trouble in the Korean matter was unanimous on this side. I continue reading from the article:

PARTISAN SPEECHES CHARGED

"It has been the hope of responsible Democratic leaders," Mr. KIRWAN said, "that the Korean war and the emergency it has brought in the affairs of our Government would not be approached within the framework of partisan politics. However, Republican leaders in both Houses have made partisan speeches on the Korean war, in some cases even going so far as to blame the administration for the results of their own obstruction; and the Republican National Committee has issued a bitter partisan attack on our President in connection with the Korean war, notable chiefly in that it follows the line of the Daily Worker, in some instances word for word."

The background information memorandum asserts that, since the close of World War II, a strong isolationist bloc in Congress has refused to accept the sound principle that political partisanship should stop at the water's edge. It charges this has done harm to international cooperation.

"The Democratic Party adheres to the principles of a bipartisan foreign policy," the memorandum continues, "and although the Democratic Party is justly proud of its record on the Korean aid bills, we do not wish to negate the bipartisan principle by starting a political fight over Korea. On the other hand, it is important to keep the record straight, if our party is subjected to isolationist attack because of Korea."

RECORD SINCE 1943

The record of the United States policy toward Korea since 1943 is set down. It begins when at Cairo, when the postwar independence of Korea was guaranteed by the United States, Britain, and China. At Potsdam, in 1945, Russia joined in this guaranty. The memorandum recites the manner in which the United States and Russia joined in liberating Korea from Japanese rulers, and continues:

"The present division of Korea along the thirty-eighth parallel was never intended by the United States; and after Japanese forces had been disarmed, this country sought to restore the unity of Korea," but was blocked by Russia's refusal. This opposition by Russia has been responsible for the continued division of the country up to the present, the statement says. It recites, too, the fact that the Soviet Government had organized a North Korean Army and equipped it with Russian material.

In detail the millions of dollars contributed by this country for Korean aid is set forth in the memorandum—$356,000,000 for economic assistance for the years 1946 through 1949. Military assistance to Korea was included in the Mutual Defense Act of 1949, when that country shared $27,640,000 with Iran and the Philippines.

GOP OPPOSITION CITED

This Mutual Defense Act was opposed, the memorandum said, by many Republicans, who supported crippling amendments, and voted against its passage.

President Truman proposed, it adds, a little ECA for Korea in 1949, and that, too, was fought by Republicans. The bill for this purpose was defeated in the House by a vote of 192 to 191, although a Korean aid measure subsequently was passed.

The memorandum insists, however, that the first vote in the House was a great blow to South Korea and that "the Communists logically concluded that, if the United States was so unwilling to grant aid to democratic Korea with money, it certainly would never provide aid with men."

I invite attention again to the fact, Mr. President, that in the House it was defeated by a vote of 192 to 191. The article continues as follows:

PARTIES SPLIT ON VOTE

It points out that Republican opponents of the program said "that any aid to the Democratic Government of South Korea was 'pouring money down a rat hole,'" and that the Communist radio so quoted them.

The first vote in the House on the Korean economic aid bill showed 130 Republicans and 61 Democrats voting against, and 21 Republicans and 170 Democrats voting for it. The sole American Labor Party vote was cast against the bill, by Representative MARCANTONIO, of New York, who, the memorandum says, follows the Communist line.

In other words, Mr. President, at this very crucial time, we find the Democrats sending out such a pamphlet squarely dividing the House by a vote of 192 to 191, and creating an untold amount of trouble. I continue reading:

The Democrats' memorandum brought quick response from the Republicans.

Representative HALL, of New York, chairman of the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee, declared in a statement:

"It will take a lot more than 18 pages of distortion and misrepresentation by the Democratic Congressional Committee to convince the American people that Mr. Truman, Mr. Acheson, and the Democratic Party could condone Communist conquest of Asia for five long years and then cancel out that colossal blunder by sending American soldiers unprepared into Korea."

RED HERRINGS NOT EXHAUSTED

"No amount of alibiing and lint-picking will cause the American people to forget that it has been the Republicans both in and out of Congress who have opposed this policy."

The Republican National Committee said in a separate statement:

"The Democrats haven't exhausted their supply of red herrings. The latest one won't deceive the people, who know that the Republican Party has led the fight against Communists at home as well as abroad. Look at the record."

A top Republican strategist in the House, asking not to be identified by name, made clear that Republicans won't hesitate to use Mr. KIRWAN's weapon in local political campaigns against the 61 Democrats who voted against the Korean measure.

"If it's good enough to use against Republicans," he said, "it ought to be good enough to use against Democrats."

Mr. President, at this very crucial time we find a fight is on between Republicans and Democrats, started by the Democrats, who are looking for votes to get into Congress, and as a result, they create a great deal of misery and strife among the people of this country, whose sons in the last analysis must do the fighting. While I am on the subject, Mr. President, and as a Republican, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate a very important bill which I introduced. It was defeated by the people now in power, by the administration. It was Senate bill 761. I introduced it on February 3, 1949. I want every Senator to note this carefully. The bill provided for the admission into the United States of a few persons of the Korean race. It would have made them racially eligible for naturalization. When I introduced the bill, and at various other times, I said that although we may have nations sitting around one table, as in the United Nations, where we may find India, China, Pakistan, and other countries, we say to them, "Our people can go to your countries, but you cannot come to ours."

Mr. President, I remember the fight we had here only 5 years ago, to admit perhaps no more than 3,500 West Indians, some of whom had lived in this country since 1917 and whose sons had fought in our Armed Forces. I remember how

hard we had to fight to get a law through Congress to give them the opportunity of becoming naturalized. Up to that time those men and women, who had lived here, could not even get a driver's license to drive an automobile, get married, own land, or testify in court. In 1924, the Supreme Court, in a decision written by Justice Sutherland, said that they were neither Caucasian nor Negroid, and they were absolutely ineligible to become citizens of the United States. After some 3 years of good hard work we finally got the law through Congress. Over in the House the fight was led by Congressman CELLER, a Democrat from New York, and Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, a Republican. I led the fight in the Senate. Mr. President, that was only a beginning. Anyone who has read the book The Gentlemen Talk of Peace, written by William Ziff, must have known how very important it was a concession of some kind should be made so that people living in Asia would have a chance to receive some kind of recognition—even token recognition—by being allowed to come over to this country under our naturalization and immigration laws.

When I introduced the bill to provide for admission into the United States of persons of the Korean race, I received some letters. I have one letter in my hand, dated March 5, 1949, on the stationery of the Korean Immigration and Naturalization Committee, Post Office Box 1706, Washington, D. C. I shall ask unanimous consent to introduce the letter in evidence, because it shows that the full committee of Koreans wanted the measure passed. The letter reads:

KOREAN IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., March 5, 1949.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: On March 1, 1949, by a majority vote the House passed H. R. 199 (Judd bill) and it is now in the Senate. No doubt it will reach the Senate subcommittee, of which Senator PAT MCCARRAN is chairman.

Our committee is of the opinion that your past interest for Korea and her people will bear rich fruit when the Judd bill comes to the Senate Judiciary Committee and the floor of the Senate. And we further believe the recent passage of the Judd bill was due to serious considerations given by the Members of the United States Congresses. Our first Korean bill was introduced by Delegate JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON from Hawaii on June 1944. In all there were 12 Korean immigration and naturalization bills in various Congresses including the 6, 3 each in the Senate and House, introduced in the present Eighty-first Congress. Because of such introductions heretofore, Members of Congress felt the urgent need of repealing and amending some of the present unpleasant features in the immigration and naturalization laws. Therefore, our committee knows that your efforts were not in vain.

Our committee urges upon you to continue your interest for Korea by supporting the Judd bill in the Senate subcommittee and in the Senate itself. We wish to go on record as such and hope you will continue to enjoy good health and with best regards.

Very sincerely yours,
WALTER JHUNG.

In a moment I shall show what became of that bill. I want to discuss first what happened to the bill that I introduced. I introduced a bill on February 3, 1949. On February 6 I received the following letter from the Korean Immigration and Naturalization Committee dated March 22, 1949:

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: We wish to sincerely thank you for introducing your Senate bill 761 on February 3, 1949, in behalf of our committee. Koreans everywhere will watch your bill with the greatest of anxieties.

Without any doubt, successful legislation of your bill as well as the ones now under consideration in the House Judiciary Committee will have tremendous moral uplifting of the people in Korea. It will act as a shock absorber for the rough-going on the highway to full democracy in Korea. That highway is now filled with Communists' propaganda and falsifications.

As soon as we have finished with our new brief on Korea we will present to you a copy along with other pertinent materials on that country and its people.

Thanking you again, we are,
Respectfully yours,
WALTER JHUNG.

On March 22, 6 weeks after I introduced the bill, I got a letter from the Korean National Association from Honolulu, T. H., dated March 22, 1949. In Honolulu they were watching what was happening to the bill I had introduced in behalf of these people. On March 22 they wrote:

DEAR SIR: It is with inexpressible gratitude that we, the officers of the Korean National Association, an Hawaiian eleemosynary corporation, take this means to convey our heartfelt appreciation for your efforts and action by the introduction of your S. 761 to make available unto the thousands of Koreans residing upon American soil the great privilege of becoming American citizens

Although these persons had been living in Hawaii for many years, and their sons had fought in the war, they were held to be ineligible for citizenship in the United States. Mind you, that was at the very time when we sat in the United Nations, but race after race of brown people are still being barred by us. We ask for their cooperation. We send our boys to fight for them, but at the same time we say, "Although you may be good enough to fight for, not one of you can be naturalized as a United States citizen."

What hypocrisy, Mr. President. The letter proceeds:

We are certain that the opening of the door of citizenship to us Koreans will result in not only a further strengthening of the close bond between the new Korean Government and the United States of America but also in the creation of new American citizens who will be a credit and service to your great Government.

Thank you very kindly.
Sincerely yours,
SONG SOON SUR,
President.
WILLIAM K. LEE,
Secretary.

This was from the Korean National Association, with headquarters at Honolulu.

Not only that, Mr. President, but there is here in Washington an organization which is interested in Korea, and their officials came to see me.

My bill was postponed indefinitely by the full committee on the 16th day of May, and I want the record to be indelibly clear that on every committee in the Senate about which I know anything a majority were Democrats. So even as late as May 16, 1949, the committee refused to report out this measure I had introduced. They refused to have anything to do with these Koreans, these people for whom our American youth are now fighting, and in whom they are trying to inculcate the principles of liberty.

Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate a great speech made on Tuesday last on the floor of the House of Representatives by Hon. DEWEY SHORT. It was at a time when we had passed, by suspending the rule at the request of the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], a bill providing for an extension of 1 year of the terms of those who had previously enlisted in the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Mr. SHORT, speaking on Tuesday, said this:

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak a word on this particular measure because I am wholeheartedly in favor of it, as I am the next bill we will consider to lift the ceilings on the personnel of our armed services, and I think practically every Member of this body on both sides of the aisle is. It is a very simple measure, similar to the one we passed, both at the outbreak of World War I and at the outbreak of World War II.

Realizing that there will be approximately 300,000 members of our armed services—the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force—whose enlistments will expire during the next calendar year, our committee, and I am sure the Congress, are thoroughly convinced, that it is imperative and inescapable that we extend the enlistments for the next 12 months.

Again, Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that the vote to extend those enlistments was unanimous. Every Republican who was present voted for the bill, and it comes with ill grace from the National Democratic Congressional Committee to issue such a scurrilous pamphlet attacking the Republican Party, such as that which has been issued.

Representative SHORT continued:

In ordinary peacetimes over 50 percent of those whose enlistments expire would reenlist. They are trained personnel. They are experienced personnel. It is not easy—indeed, it is next to impossible—to supplant them overnight with raw, green recruits. Many of them are now fighting in distant parts of the world, or are stationed for security reasons at different posts all over the globe, and it is exceedingly difficult for us to bring back these men, as their enlistments expire from day to day and week to week and month to month, when a war is raging. So the whole purpose of the bill, S. 3937, a bill to authorize the President to extend the enlistments in the Armed Forces of the United States, is to hold the men who are now in the various branches of the armed services long enough until replacements can be obtained by enlistment, by call of Reserves and the National Guard, or by the draft, and properly trained to take their place.

Mr. President, some Senators criticized me when I introduced a bill a little while ago, shortly before this Korean situation became serious. As I remember now, it was on Wednesday, after the President had ordered the troops to go over to Korea on Monday. I introduced a bill providing that farm boys should not be

taken right away. One of the great isolationist papers attacked not only me, but attacked the State of North Dakota.

How well do I remember, Mr. President, how in World War II almost overnight the Government took boys who were engaged in raising crops, took them away almost without notice, took them before the draft boards were even officially organized. Some of them had herds of cattle, some of them had hundreds and hundreds of acres of wheat and other grains which they could not harvest because they were taken away. Look at the newspapers of those days for the proof.

I went to the heads of the draft boards at that time and said that those boys should be given time to get their affairs in order. Later General Hershey and I gave a joint radio address to the farmers of the country.

This year all over the great Northwest the spring was 5 or 6 weeks late. The result is the crops are going to be 5 or 6 weeks late in maturing and it will be necessary to have the boys out there longer this year than at the time World War II broke out.

For this reason I promptly served notice, by the bill I introduced, and it had a good effect, in that the draft boards, through those in authority in taking the farm boys away from home, are going to take into consideration the fact that the crop is 5 or 6 weeks late.

In view of the fact that those in authority have now considered that matter so carefully, and the further fact that the bill has accomplished its purpose, and because the situation in Korea is 100 times worse, at least 100 times worse, than it was at the time the bill was introduced just a few short days ago, I am withdrawing it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator wish to postpone indefinitely the bill in question?

Mr. LANGER. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator have the number of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. I will give it to the Chair later.

I wish to continue reading the statement of Representative SHORT:

> Now that is all the bill provides for. It is bad policy for the Government to break a contract with any of its citizens. It is tough for a 30-year-old man, fighting in the rice paddies of Korea, his wife and a couple of kids in Japan or back home in the States, to be held on at the expiration of his 3- or 4-year service, particularly when there are some unmarried individuals between the ages of 26 and 30 back home who perhaps are not contributing their full share in this crisis, to the defense of the Nation.
>
> But, ladies and gentlemen, liberty is the first casualty of war. Truth is usually next.

Mr. President, I say the truth usually is the next casualty. That is one reason why I condemn the pamphlet issued by the National Democratic Congressional Committee, issued in the very midst of what may turn out to be one of the most trying periods through which our country has ever passed. Yet, between now and election we are going to see the pamphlet handed out all over the country in an effort by the Democrats to obtain a few more votes for their candidates.

Mr. President, I say it is contemptible, and it ought to lose votes for the Democrats wherever they circulate that kind of scurrilous pamphlet.

Representative SHORT continued:

> When you engage in an armed conflict, freedom is gone. All of us are going to be required to do things we do not want to do. We are going to have our activities curbed. There will be allocations, priorities, rationing, and certain controls, no doubt, if the flames touched off in Korea engulf the world. Painful as that is, it is inescapable. You cannot fight a painless war. It is just impossible.
>
> I want to say one or two things in a general way, aside from this bill, particularly since our distinguished and able chairman took considerable time to talk about the over-all picture.
>
> In order to win a modern, mechanized war, the victor must possess at least three materials. He has to have iron and steel, rubber, and oil. Soviet Russia has secured a lot of iron and steel and industry in Manchuria, a territory twice as large as the State of Texas, which is the industrial heart of all Asia.

Manchuria was turned over to the enemy by the Democrats, Mr. President, by a Democratic administration, which now has the gall, in the midst of the war, to issue that kind of a pamphlet against the Republicans, the majority of whom at least, under the leadership of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] certainly have cooperated with them.

I continue to read:

> And she would not have that steel if the Chinese, after being promised at the Cairo Conference that Manchuria would be returned to them at the end of the war, had not been sold down the river, and Manchuria turned over to Soviet Russia.

Who sold them down the river? Why a Democratic administration, Mr. President. The same kind of an administration which is now circulating this scurrilous pamphlet in time of war.

Representative SHORT continued:

> Who is responsible for that action? Russia has got to have not only iron and steel in Manchuria and the rich metals and minerals of China, that have gone completely under. Everyone knows China is the head, the heart, the bowels, and legs of Asia; and because of the recent weak, indecisive, vacillating, contradictory foreign policy, all China has been lost to Red communism. Who is responsible for that? What Members of the House and Senate have stood and pled week after week, month after month, for a strong far eastern foreign policy? The Republicans, as the record will show. Now that China has gone under, after being told that we should keep hands off until the dust settled; after being told by the Secretary of Defense that it was not our responsibility to defend Korea, or any other spot in the Orient; and after being told by the Secretary of State we will have nothing to do with the defense of Formosa; after the Secretary of Defense told us repeatedly, before our committee and in public addresses during the past 6 months, that if we were attacked at any place at 4 o'clock in the morning we would be ready to answer at 5 o'clock; after being repeatedly told by members of the administration that South Korea was capable of defending herself; after all of these miscalculations and misrepresentations, not only to the American people but to your Committee on Armed Services, we have now completely reversed our foreign policy in Asia, and we have decided to go into the one spot with its tough terrain, with its foul weather, the most difficult place on earth to pit our strength against the force of the ground armies of Soviet Russia, namely, Korea. Russia's strength always has been in her ground forces.
>
> Recently the President of the United States has repeatedly told the American people, at the commencement exercises at the University of Missouri in Columbia last month and at the dedication of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial in St. Louis the following day, that we are closer to peace than any time since the shooting stopped in 1945.
>
> At Korea, a little sort of finger, an appendix of the Asiatic Continent about the size of Illinois, 600 miles long, 135 miles wide, we go in to defend only the south half of it, and defend it with what? Who withdrew Lieutenant General Hodge and his 40,000 American troops from Korea south of the thirty-eighth parallel a year ago last month, in June 1949?
>
> The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and others here with me in 1946 were in Korea. We went up and down that arbitrary thirty-eighth parallel that has no military significance; there is not a mountain range, there is no river, there is nothing geographical about it; it is just a line that was blindly, arbitrarily, and stubbornly drawn so that the Japs north of the thirty-eighth parallel would surrender to the Russians, and the Japs south of the thirty-eighth parallel would surrender to the Americans. General Hodge, with his 40,000 troops, repatriated over 5,000,000 Japanese soldiers, not only from Korea but from Manchuria and China.
>
> When we returned from our trip in October 1946—

I want every Senator to listen carefully to these words of DEWEY SHORT, one of the outstanding men in the House of Representatives—

> we unanimously agreed that the moment we pulled out of Korea the Russians or the Communists would move in. That is what we told the Congress; that is what the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] and I told the American people in a broadcast over a Washington radio, with Ernest K. Lindley acting as moderator.
>
> Oh, yes, Mr. Chairman, we are in for it; for the third time in our generation we are engaged in a bloody and devastating war. Of course, in 1916 an administration was elected to power because it kept us out of war; in 1940 another administration for the third time was returned to power because it promised again, and again, and again, that American boys would not have to fight and die on foreign soil; and now, today for the third time we are engaged in war, and Congress has not declared it.
>
> We are not requested or asked for counsel or advice; but we were told on a half sheet of paper when we were called down to the White House 4 weeks ago on Tuesday, I think it was 4 weeks ago today, that the Chief Executive, the Commander in Chief, had ordered naval and air support for the ground forces in Korea after we had withdrawn our own forces over a year ago. We cannot now debate the legality of constitutionality of the action of the President. The die is cast. The poor southern Koreans, most of them farmers—it is an agricultural section—with bamboo poles and spears trying to stop 50-ton Russian tanks.
>
> Oh, yes; I feel that there will be no peace in our time; there will be intermittent wars the rest of our days. The moment we squelch the war in Korea it will break out in Formosa, it will pop up in Iran; it is just like the measles, you do not know whether they are going to break out around your ankles or your eyes.

Mr. President, I wish to say that in introducing my bill to exempt from the draft the young men all over the Northwest, I did so because, as I have said before, I remember so well what happened in World War II, when this body debated time and time again, day after day, the question of whether the boys who were drafted should have a year's training before they were sent over the water, or whether they should have 8 months' training or 10 months' training. That question arose when it was discovered by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] that the son of one of his neighbors in Ohio had been killed after he had been in the service only 8 weeks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair inform the Senator from North Dakota that the number of the bill to which he has referred is S. 3880.

Without objection, the Committee on Armed Services will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 3880) to provide deferment from training and service under the Selective Service Act of persons engaged in raising agricultural food crops, and the bill will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a book written by the great military expert for the New York Times, Hanson W. Baldwin. Mr. Baldwin received a Pulitzer prize for his reporting of World War II, and is today considered a leading authority on the politics and technology of modern warfare. He attended the second atom bomb test at Bikini, and has recently inspected guided missile and rocket-launching installations throughout the Nation. His last book, The Price of Power, an analysis of American security and international obligations, won the highest praise from both political and military sources. The New York Herald Tribune said that "it well exemplifies Mr. Baldwin's outstanding virtues of courage, intellectual toughness, and honesty." The Chattanooga Times called it "required reading for anyone interested in our Nation's future."

Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to what Mr. Baldwin has to say about the situation in Asia; at this time I refer to his book entitled Great Mistakes of the War, and I turn to page 77, where we find a subhead, "Appeasement in Asia."

Mr. President, I wish to call attention again and again to the fact that for all these years all of us have been under a Democratic administration, including the men who now have the audacity to issue this pamphlet against the Republican Party—a pamphlet which, I repeat, is one of the most out-of-place pamphlets which has ever been published in a long, long time in the midst of a war.

Mr. President, Mr. Baldwin, who received a Pulitzer prize for his reporting, and who is the military expert for the New York Times, in his book really discusses the record of the Democratic Party in dealing with Asia.

He says:

2. APPEASEMENT IN ASIA

Perhaps the saddest chapter in the long history of political futility which the war recorded was the Yalta Conference of February 1945. As former Secretary of War Stimson writes, "much of the policy of the United States toward Russia, from Tehran to Potsdam, was dominated by the eagerness of the Americans to secure a firm Russian commitment to enter the Pacific war." This eagerness was first manifest at Tehran when Russia's need for warm-water ports was discussed and Roosevelt suggested the establishment of Dairen in Manchuria as an international free port. It reached its crescendo at Yalta, where we attempted to pin down prior elusive Soviet promises to take up arms against Japan. The negotiations about future action against the Japanese were interspersed with discussions of the peace settlement and the German question in Europe, and their political implications were made secondary to the President's prime objective at Yalta—"the brave new world," the establishment of the basic framework of the United Nations.

For all these reasons—and because of a fundamental military as well as political misconception—Russia held the whip hand, and the United States representatives placed themselves in the amazing position of "giving away" territories which did not belong to us, and of undertaking to secure concessions which impaired the sovereignty of a friendly Allied state. The political misconception, so obvious now, should have been apparent then; it was not to our interest, or the interests of China or of the world, to make Russia a Pacific power; it was not to our interest to beg or barter for Russia's entry into the Pacific war.

Nor should military considerations have affected this political judgment. At the time of Yalta, Japan was already beaten—not by the atomic bomb, which had not yet been perfected, not by conventional bombing, then just starting, but by attrition and blockade. The home islands were severed from the Empire by our conquest of the Philippines and the Marianas, and the submarine and surface blockade already had brought the pinch of hunger and the stress of severe raw material shortages to Japan. Even before the first bomb was dropped by our B-29's on the Japanese home islands, the enemy aircraft industry was disrupted and on the decline; shortages due to the blockade and a chaotic program of decentralization, dispersion, and underground development, badly carried out, already had reduced severely the output of Japanese factories. The full seriousness of the Japanese plight was not then, of course, completely understood. Our military men were preoccupied and concerned with the fierceness of the Japanese defense; the tactical situation obscured the hopeless strategic position of Japan, and some of our commanders took, therefore, far too pessimistic a view. Mistakes in intelligence, or rather in evaluation, also contributed to an erroneous assessment of Japanese intentions and capabilities. We feared that even after the main Japanese islands had been conquered, the enemy resistance would continue on the continent of Asia with the much-vaunted Kwantung Manchurian Army as its core.

Yet, our intelligence officers in Washington and throughout the Pacific for months had been identifying units of the Kwantung Army and of its air support which had been transferred from that quiet area to various battle sectors.

By late 1944 it was—or should have been—apparent that what remained of the Kwantung Army was largely composed of green conscripts and second-rate troops, with virtually no air support, incapable of a prolonged campaign; it had been bled white to provide reinforcements for other fronts. We also confused Japanese capabilities with Japanese intentions. We believed the Japanese would resist to the last man, no matter how hopelessly beaten.

These beliefs, which were completely erroneous—

Mr. President, whose beliefs were erroneous? Those of the Democratic Party, which has just issued the scurrilous sheet to which I have referred. We provided them with money enough. Heaven knows, there were hundreds of millions of dollars available to them. But apparently, as this military expert says, the Democratic administration knew nothing of the results of that terrible situation which arose, which gave Russia a part of Manchuria and turned over to Russia the Kurile Islands and North Korea. I continue:

These beliefs, which were completely erroneous, influenced materially the politico-military approach made at Yalta. They were not held, at the time, by all our experts; but they were, unfortunately, the controlling opinions.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LANGER. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator recall that but 2 or 3 weeks ago on the floor of the Senate, when the Senate was discussing military assistance to Korea, it was brought out that last year the Senate voted an appropriation of $10,600,000 for a military mission to Korea, and that not one dime of it had been spent all last year, and that after the investigation was started the startling information was brought forth that $200 had been charged against the account and that the $200 was for the purpose of rehabilitating $30,000 worth of signal wire that was to be shipped to Korea, which has not even yet reached Korea? The $200 represents the complete history of what this administration spent in Korea during the last fiscal year. Does the Senator know that?

Mr. LANGER. I know it only too well. It is one of the great tragedies of our time. In my reading, Mr. President, I now want to skip over a little and come to another part of this book, written by the military expert for the New York Times, who received the Pulitzer prize, Hanson W. Baldwin. I want to indicate the division among those high in authority in the United States for the purpose of showing that while our boys were dying the men appointed under this Democratic administration could not even agree among themselves. At page 82, Mr. Baldwin says:

General Marshall was then convinced that an invasion of the Japanese main islands was essential, and he insisted that help from Russia on the mainland of Asia was necessary. Admiral King seemed to share this view. But there were divergences of opinion as to the necessity of this operation; Admiral William D. Leahy, who feared the cost in casualties of invasion, and who correctly assessed the crippling effect of the blockade on Japan, opposed the invasion. The compromise eventually reached—a sensible one—was to prepare for invasion, but in the meantime to utilize the blockade and air bombardment to the utmost to bring Japan to her knees.

These strategic differences—and a failure to appreciate fully the hopeless strategical position of Japan—colored the military thinking at Yalta and helped to lead to indefensible political arrangements.

There you have it, Mr. President. That is the kind of leadership our Government had at that time. I continue:

"Certainly," as the Washington Post has commented, "the Chiefs of Staff made a blunder to advise Roosevelt and Churchill at Yalta that Japan would last 18 months after VE-day. Our military men underrated Japan at the beginning of the war, then overrated it, and refused to see the patent fact, obvious to the Navy, that Japan was through even while the brass hats were meeting at Yalta."

Yet at Yalta—and even at the Potsdam Conference in July 1945, when Hitler lay dead and dishonored near the ruins of his bunker in Berlin and the Third Reich was broken and shattered—one month before the surrender of Japan, there were still many Americans who were interested primarily in getting a firm commitment from Russia to enter the Pacific war.

This mistaken policy stemmed in part from the basic political misconceptions outlined at the beginning of this book, in part from strategic misconceptions, some of them based on inadequate logistical planning. As General Deane points out in his book, our planners were obsessed with two ideas—to bring Russia into the Pacific war and to utilize Russian territory as bases for our war effort against Japan. Repeatedly, General Deane and other United States representatives had pressed Soviet leaders long before Yalta for permission to utilize Russian territory as air bases for our attacks on Japan. Yet the cart was put before the horse—we made diplomatic representations for this permission before we had estimated, logistically, the value of such bases to us.

The author then goes on to tell how utterly useless those bases would have been to us. I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of page 84, page 85, and page 86 be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

Our attempts to get firm Soviet commitments about the war against Japan reached a preliminary crisis in October 1944, more than 4 months before Yalta, when Churchill and a British entourage visited Moscow. General Deane describes the resulting conferences which he attended as the principal American military representative. Stalin reiterated his intention, first announced to Cordell Hull at Moscow in October 1943, then more or less formalized at Tehran, of entering the Pacific war, said he needed 3 months after VE-day to stockpile supplies in Siberia, declared that the United States could have air bases and one naval base in the Far East; but added that "if the United States and Great Britain preferred to bring Japan to her knees without Russian participation, he was ready to agree." Furthermore, there was a little item of additional supplies that Russia would require to help her build up a 2 months' reserve in Siberia. All in all, Stalin said the Russians would need more than 1,000,000 tons of cargo, and they must be delivered by June 30, 1945, the deliveries to be in addition to those already being made under the fourth lend-lease protocol. In Moscow, in 1944, Stalin made many glowing promises, but, "despite these promises, the end result was that the Russians got their supplies and the United States got nothing except a belated and last-minute Russian attack against the Japanese."

As the Soviets stalled on their promises and we delivered supplies, the months drew on into the winter of 1944–45; and at Yalta, in February, President Roosevelt, pressed by the United States Chiefs of Staff, again took up the questions of bomber bases in Siberia and the date of Russian entry into the Pacific war. Stalin again agreed in principle, and set the date at 3 months after victory in Europe had been won. He said the United States could establish bases in the Komsomolsk-Nikolaevsk area and eventually in Kamchatka. But he got down in black and white his price: The Curzon line for the eastern border of Poland, the Kurile Islands and controlling economic and strategic concessions in Manchuria. (Stalin's Manchurian price for Russia's entry into the Pacific war had first been broached apparently with no grave objections on our part, at Tehran in December 1943, just a few days after Roosevelt, Churchill, and Chiang Kai-shek had agreed in the Cairo Declaration that Manchuria and Formosa should be restored to China.)

But it was not until the spring, when Germany was at her last gasp and Japan near the end, that, in the words of General Deane, "it was found that the net increase that would result from putting four groups of B-29's in the Amur River district would be 1.39 percent of the total bomb tonnage we could place on Japan without using Russian bases." This was convincing proof, adds Deane, "that the slight increase in our bombing effort and the advantage of an added direction of approach for our bomber formations were not at all commensurate with the logistical effort involved in establishing our forces in Siberia.

A little late—after more than 3 years of United States participation in the war and numerous major concessions to Russia, concessions which were to affect the peace—to be making this ABC logistical discovery. By then Russia had most of the supplies she had demanded; and she had carefully recorded the secret concessions of Yalta.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish now to pay my respects to a Democratic convention. The convention that met and nominated President Roosevelt for a third term. I say that everyone of the delegates at that Democratic convention who voted to break the traditional two terms for the President of the United States should hang his head in shame for having foisted upon this country for a third term a man who ultimately, according to this military expert of the New York Times, brought ruin to the United States of America. Oh, they wanted to win, Mr. President. They said, "We can elect Mr. Roosevelt for a third term." I talked to some of the delegates from North Dakota upon their return home. The substance of what they said to me upon their return was, "Sure, he should not have been nominated. But we want to win. We can win with Roosevelt." In substance they said, "To hell with the Constitution," which does not specifically prohibit it. "To hell with George Washington," who said that two terms were enough. We have got to hold our jobs, and to hold them we will break away from the two-term tradition. So those delegates to the Democratic national convention sold the country in order to gain what little miserable political advantage they could secure by nominating him instead of nominating some other one of the great Democrats who were candidates at that convention and they had many good ones—able, efficient, God-fearing men who would have been good Presidents.

There is one thing I say to the everlasting glory of Jim Farley. If everything else about Jim Farley is forgotten as the years go by, one thing will forever, in my opinion, cause him to be remembered as a patriotic American, namely, that he dared, at the risk of obscurity, which I hope will never come to him, to fight the third term. Of course, after the Democrats had won a third term for Mr. Roosevelt, they wanted him for a fourth term. Why? To protect their jobs. What happened to him in his fourth term? I have here a book written by the great military expert of the New York Times telling what happened to Mr. Roosevelt in his fourth term. Here is what he did. Thousands and thousands of American boys paid with their lives for that un-American democratic convention because the Democrats wanted to win.

I remember, Mr. President, sitting in the House Chamber at the joint session when Mr. Roosevelt came back. I saw him only a few short weeks before he died. Anyone looking at him knew he had only a few short weeks to live.

Here is what the New York Times military expert says:

Russia drove a hard bargain at Yalta. Stalin promised to enter the war against Japan within an estimated 90 days after the end of the war against Germany, but for it he got the Kurile Islands, all of Sakhalin, half interest in the railways in Manchuria, Port Arthur, a Russian-controlled "free port" in Dairen, and thus strategic hegemony in important northeast Asia.

"It is my belief," writes Sherwood—

Mind you, Mr. President, of all the apologists for Mr. Roosevelt, even Sherwood said:

"It is my belief," writes Sherwood, "that Roosevelt would not have agreed to that final firm commitment had it not been that the Yalta Conference was almost at an end and he was tired and anxious to avoid further argument. I believe that he was hopeful that when the time came to notify the Chinese, he would be able to straighten the whole thing out with Chiang Kai-shek—but that hope, of course, was not realized."

Of course the very sick Mr. Roosevelt was "tired."

So, Mr. President, because there were at the Democratic Convention a lot of weak men who wanted to win, who wanted to get a few more votes by nominating Roosevelt for President for a third term, they were willing to take this man and sell out the country. That is why a sick man went to Yalta, a man who, in the absence of the Secretary of State, and without even his knowledge, gave away the countries and the advantages which I have already named. That is why we today have our boys fighting for their lives in Korea—and why our beloved country is facing ruin and destruction.

Mr. President, I do not desire to detain the Senate a long time, but I should like to invite the attention of Senators to the bottom of page 87 of this great book, from which I read the following:

The fault was doubly grievous. We not only hurt our own interests and those of a

friendly ally, but at Yalta—inferentially, at least—we broke our pledged word to that ally. For at Cairo in 1943, before the Tehran conference and after Stalin had told Hull in Moscow that Russia would enter the Pacific war, we promised publicly the restoration of Manchuria to China. And to a pragmatic politician, Russian control of Port Arthur and a half interest in the Manchurian Railways could only mean Soviet strategic hegemony over Manchuria.

Nor was this all. During the discussions, it was suggested by President Roosevelt that perhaps the Russians ought to have a commercial outlet to the Persian Gulf; and maybe the Trans-Iranian Railway, built by American engineers, with the help of American capital, ought to be partially owned by Russia, or at least Russia should have certain transit rights. Fortunately wiser counsel soft-pedaled the proposal, and Stalin, apparently suspicious, showed no interest.

No wonder Stimson wrote that the meeting at Yalta dealt "a good deal in altruism and idealism instead of stark realities."

Yet, Mr. President, with this terrible record staring the Democratic Party in the face, in a time of war, when our boys are dying in Korea, when we are sending thousands of unprepared and untrained boys to Korea, the Democratic National Committee chooses this time, of all times, to issue a political pamphlet which is being circulated all over the country attacking the Republicans. The Democrats come upon this floor and ask for Republican cooperation. They say, "Please, please, Republicans, we have got this country into a hell of a mess, and we need help. Please, please, and please come to our aid and help. Please, please, and please vote for these bills." Within 12 hours after we give them help, Mr. President, they issue a shameful pamphlet, a political pamphlet, published by the Democratic National Committee, misrepresenting and lying about the Republicans.

I suppose that tomorrow or the next day, or the day after that, they will be standing up again in the Halls of Congress asking for the cooperation of the Republicans, and saying, "Do what you can to get us out of this terrible situation which has been brought about because of the fact that the Democratic Party did not have good leadership." And for all of this the people in the last analysis can thank that Democratic convention that broke the second-term tradition—and regretfully think back on "what might have been."

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the 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.

Mr. FLANDERS obtained the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Before the Senator from Vermont proceeds, the clerk will state the first committee amendment in chapter X-B, on page 447 of the bill.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, if the Senate is about to consider a new chapter in the bill, a very important one, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Brewster	Hayden	Maybank
Bricker	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Murray
Butler	Hill	Myers
Byrd	Hoey	Neely
Capehart	Holland	O'Conor
Chapman	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Hunt	Pepper
Connally	Ives	Robertson
Cordon	Jenner	Russell
Donnell	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Kefauver	Sparkman
Eastland	Kem	Stennis
Ecton	Langer	Taft
Ellender	Lehman	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Lodge	Thye
Flanders	Lucas	Tydings
Frear	McCarran	Watkins
Fulbright	McCarthy	Wherry
George	McClellan	Wiley
Gillette	McFarland	Williams
Graham	McKellar	Young
Green	Magnuson	
Gurney	Malone	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in discussing the next chapter and its subdivision marked "X-B," which has to do with foreign aid, being the portion of the bill beginning on page 447, we have more or less reached an agreement to vote on chapter X-B and all amendments thereto on Monday next. So I am going to submit a unanimous-consent request in line with my understanding of what we have been discussing and considering for the last few moments while the quorum call was being had.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that on Monday next, beginning at 2 p. m., the Senate proceed to vote upon chapter X-B, foreign aid, page 447, and all amendments thereto; that following the disposition of that chapter and the amendments thereto, and not later than 3 hours thereafter, the Senate vote upon the amendment, to be offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], involving Spain; that no amendments which are not germane shall be offered; and that under the agreement the right to raise points of order shall not be waived.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, that is the substance of the proposal, and it will be written up by the Parliamentarian.

Mr. KEM and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield first to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Let me call attention to the fact that the Senator from Illinois did not provide for a division of the time.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct. Mr. President, I modify my request by including in it a provision that on Monday next, the time between 12 noon and 2 p. m. shall be divided equally between the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Did the Senator from Illinois mean to include a provision for division of the time available for consideration of the amendment to be offered by the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. LUCAS. I think perhaps the time on the amendment to be offered by the Senator from Nevada should be divided equally between the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May the Chair ask a further question: Did the Senator from Illinois mean to include in his unanimous-consent request a provision in regard to all motions, in addition to all amendments offered or which may be offered?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes, we can include the word "motions," too; that will be perfectly satisfactory.

EIGHT BILLION FROM PEACETIME BUDGET FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE—TOTAL OF $21,545,000,000 FOR DEFENSE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I may say that I have no intention of objecting to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement—if the Senator from Illinois will yield, I should like to ask a question of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose, if I may obtain consent to that effect. I so request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois asks unanimous consent that he be permitted to yield to the Senator from Nevada, to permit him to ask a question of the junior Senator from Nebraska. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INCREASE PROPOSED REDUCTION OF DOMESTIC BUDGET FROM 15 TO 20 PERCENT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the junior Senator from Nebraska whether he would consent to increasing the percentage of the proposed reduction of the peacetime domestic budget, but without any relationship to the $6,080,000,000 for veterans' services and benefits or the $5,625,000,000 for interest and service on the public debt or the $13,545,000,000 for the national defense, but to have it apply to the remaining $17,189,000,000 of the domestic budget. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nebraska whether he will consent to amend his amendment to provide for a 20-percent cut, rather than a 15-percent reduction, in the domestic budget, which is covered in the portion of the bill discussed yesterday.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if I may reply without prejudicing the right of the majority leader to the floor——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Illinois has yielded for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Nevada that what I am sure he is attempting to do is to increase the proposed reduction under the so-called Bridges-Byrd amendment from 15 to 20 percent. That amendment includes all

the exemptions—and a few more, so far as that is concerned—that the Senator from Nevada has just listed or that he would wish to list. However, I am perfectly willing to give the Senate a chance to vote on a proposed 20-percent reduction.

On the other hand, I have already requested that the reduction proposed in the amendment be increased to 15 percent. Therefore, a further amendment, so as to change the percentage from 15 to 20, would constitute an amendment in the second degree.

If the Senator from Nevada will check over the proposed amendments, I am quite sure he will find that the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] proposed an amendment, in his own right, to provide for a 20-percent reduction.

So I shall be glad to join with the two Senators in an amendment to accomplish the same result, but which still will not jeopardize the standing of my amendment.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I am aware of the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Nebraska, and I should like to join with him in sponsoring it with the 5-percent increase—making a total of 20 percent. In fact, I had intended to offer such an amendment myself, but I now want to join the junior Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. MALONE. So we shall join in sponsoring that amendment.

TRANSFER $3,000,000,000 FROM ECA TO NATIONAL DEFENSE FUND

Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will yield further——

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I have intended, and I believe this is the proper place, to offer an amendment to the ECA provision in the appropriation bill. The junior Senator from Nevada is not entirely clear at the moment how the amendment may be made, but it will be worked out. It is an amendment to transfer to the National Defense Fund or at least to dispense with the $3,000,000,000, or approximately $3,000,000,000, now available or being made available to ECA nations.

ECA NATIONS 120 PERCENT RECOVERED

We are, of course, all familiar with the fact that the ECA nations are approximately 120 percent recovered, on the basis of the 1937–38 index of industrial development, and that this is a peacetime development that we have been financing. There may have been some question over the last 3 years as to the necessity, but now there can be none. It is impossible to develop peacetime industry while we are engaged in a wartime development.

The two things are not compatible. I shall propose an amendment which will propose to dispense entirely with the $3,000,000,000 or such an amount as may be available to ECA under this bill. But what the junior Senator from Nevada wants to do is to make that money available, to be included in the $10,000,000,000 defense fund requested by the President of the United States—I do propose such an amendment.

TWENTY-PERCENT REDUCTION—$3,500,000,000—$500,000,000 PUBLIC WORKS FUND

With the 20-percent reduction in the $17,189,000,000 of the domestic budget, this approximately $3,000,000,000 and the $1,150,000,000 for the arming of the Atlantic Pact nations—which should be included in one budget; then add the $500,000,000 appropriated for public works—the additional $8,000,000,000 is available for the national-defense fund. We will give the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] something to really vote for—the amendment will propose to dispense with the public works entirely, of $500,000,000, except such amounts as the President may believe to be really emergency work until this Congress convenes again in January 1951.

It could mean only a few months' delay at most—and by that time the situation should clarify so we will know exactly what is needed.

UNIVERSAL TRAINING

The junior Senator from Nevada joined the senior Senator from Maryland early in 1949 in the introduction of a universal training bill.

This legislation has since been buried in a democratically controlled committee—such legislation is needed to protect this Nation and to protect the boys through better knowing their business and protect themselves in combat.

EIGHT BILLION DOLLARS OF THE PRESIDENT'S TEN BILLION REQUEST

Certainly there will be no public works, except emergency works, during this period, so that with the amount allocated to such works, it adds up to $8,000,000,000 available for the $10,000,000,000 program.

The junior Senator from Nevada hereby offers such amendment. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS obtained the floor.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may I first answer the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, the parliamentary inquiry is, Who has the floor? I believe I have the floor, appearances to the contrary notwithstanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks the Senator from Vermont is correct. The Chair was perhaps in error in recognizing the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. FLANDERS. I gladly yield to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont yielded solely for the purpose stated.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, we have not finished the unanimous-consent agreement yet, and I have been standing here yielding to Senators, hoping we might get it accomplished. I did not think I had lost the floor, otherwise I should have taken my seat.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Vermont will bear with the Chair for a moment, it seems that the consent request can be worked out shortly.

Mr. FLANDERS. I gladly yield for that purpose, with the understanding that I do not lose my position on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will later recognize the Senator from Vermont. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to answer the Senator from Nevada by simply saying that under the parliamentary situation there will be no reason why he cannot offer the kind of amendment he has been discussing, as I understand. Certainly I shall have no objection. What I should like to do is to get the unanimous-consent agreement on its way and have the Senate confirm it.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I do offer such an amendment, to be properly written by the clerk of the Senate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am not going to object to the unanimous consent requested by the Senator from Illinois, but I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. After the Senate concludes work on the ECA chapter, what else will be left in the appropriation bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that there are still some chapters of the appropriation bill that have not been acted on, and that after the consideration of the committee amendments, if any, to those chapters which have not been acted on, the Senate will then take up amendments offered by individual Senators.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I may say to the Senator from Illinois and to the chairman of the committee that what I had in mind was this: Chapter V has been concluded, with the exception of the items of health and cancer research funds, the heart institute, mental hygiene, and dental activities. I was wondering whether it was the intention of the Senator from Illinois, in making his unanimous-consent request, to conclude with the bill on that particular date?

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to finish the bill then, if possible, but that situation is perhaps more or less in the lap of——

Mr. CHAVEZ. The gods?

Mr. LUCAS. It is more or less perhap in the lap of Senators, as to when we shall get through with the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I merely wanted to know in order to get ready for the items in chapter 5 which have not been concluded.

Mr. LUCAS. If we run out of something to do, the Senator can certainly offer amendments at that time.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Reserving the right to object, I find myself in a rather peculiar situation. I had already spoken to the leader on this side of the aisle several days ago. I understood that the final vote would not come up until Tuesday or perhaps Thursday. I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader whether that is true. I am particularly interested in the vote on the 10-percent

over-all reduction, with the exceptions enumerated, and I am interested in the passage of the bill. I had therefore planned to be absent Monday, and to return Tuesday morning. Apparently I shall lose my opportunity to vote on the Spanish loan, which I would favor, because I feel that Spain is decidedly in the world picture. I know of nothing else to be done except to carry out my obligations already incurred. But I should like an answer to this question: Certainly the Senator does not expect a vote on final passage or on the 10-percent cut until Tuesday, at any rate, does he?

Mr. LUCAS. Probably not until Wednesday. I do not know, but we hope we may get a vote on Tuesday, but certainly we shall not vote on it on Monday, I may say to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Therefore, I shall not object.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the clerk please read the unanimous-consent request, as far as we have gone? If he has not been able to reduce it to writing yet, I should like to ask: Did the majority leader request that on amendments pending or which may be offered, 5 minutes be allowed to each side on each amendment? I do not anticipate that any amendments will be offered, but I think the unanimous-consent agreement should contain such a provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That was not included. The Chair will advise the Senator from Nebraska that that was not included in the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. WHERRY. If the majority leader will modify his request to include a provision that on each amendment pending or to be offered, 5 minutes shall be allowed on each amendment to each side, I think it will be satisfactory.

Mr. LUCAS. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is, 5 minutes to each side, on each amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection at this time to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I want to be sure that the last request of the majority leader has nothing to do with the division of time prior to 2 o'clock.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, would the Chair state in substance what the request is?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will endeavor to state his understanding of the unanimous-consent request. It is that on Monday next the time shall be divided from the convening of the Senate until 2 o'clock between the proponents and the opponents, the time to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]; that at 2 o'clock a vote shall be taken upon any amendment pending or that may be offered, or on any motions, with 5 minutes allowed to each side for debate on any such amendments or motions; that the requirements of the unanimous-consent request as proposed are that amendments must be germane, that any right to raise a point of order is not involved or limited by the request; that upon disposition of the matters which will come on for vote at 2 o'clock an additional 3-hour period shall be allowed for debate on the amendment to be offered by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] relating to the giving of aid to Spain.

Mr. LUCAS. May I suggest it is to be not later than 3 hours thereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not later than 3 hours after the vote, which will begin at 2 o'clock, the vote will also begin upon the amendment of the senior Senator from Nevada, and the time will be divided and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] as to that second period of time, and the 5-minute limitation on debate to apply to any amendment proposed thereto.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I understand that the succinct statement made by the Chair relates to chapter X–B and has no reference to any other portion of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Chair intended to state that.

Mr. LUCAS. And we shall not only vote on amendments, but on the chapter itself after we make disposition of the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Monday, July 31, 1950, at the hour of 2 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, except as hereinafter provided, on any amendment or motion that may be pending or that may be offered to the committee amendment beginning on page 447 and extending down to and including page 461, inclusive, being Chapter X–B—Foreign aid, to the bill H. R. 7786, the general appropriation bill for 1951: *Provided*, That no amendment that is not germane to the subject matter shall be in order and that points of order may not be waived under the agreement.

Ordered further, That the time between 12 o'clock noon and 2 o'clock p. m. shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposed to the committee amendment and controlled, respectively, by Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. KEM.

Ordered further, That after said hour of 2 o'clock p. m., debate on any amendment or motion shall be limited to not exceeding 10 minutes, to be equally divided between the mover thereof and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Ordered further, That with reference to the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. McCARRAN, providing that $100,000,000 of the appropriation shall be used for assistance to Spain, debate shall be limited not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. McKELLAR.

Ordered further, That upon the disposition of the amendment proposed by Mr. McCARRAN, the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, upon the committee amendment, whether amended or not.

Ordered further, That after the period for debate on the so-called McCarran amendment has expired, debate upon any amendment thereto shall be limited to not exceeding 10 minutes to be equally divided between the mover thereof and Mr. McCARRAN.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the current chapter of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I agreed to yield to the Senator from Tennessee, provided I may do so without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Vermont may yield for that purpose.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, chapter X–B of the bill appropriates money for foreign aid. This part of the bill probably will give rise to a great deal of discussion as it involves the question of money and aid extended to foreign governments.

Last year we appropriated the enormous sum of $5,513,890,000 for foreign aid. The estimate for this year is about $650,000,000 less and amounts to $4,855,073,729. The House did not pass on these items of foreign aid at all, although the House took the lead in having a unified appropriation bill. We need not inquire as to why the House left out of the bill these huge gifts to foreign countries, but we shall go ahead and keep the foreign-aid chapter in with the other appropriation chapters.

The committee recommends a much smaller sum than the amount authorized for foreign aid for fiscal year 1951. The committee has allowed the sum of $4,522,158,729, which is approximately a billion dollars less than the appropriation for fiscal year 1950, and is $332,915,000 below the budget estimate. The committee thinks that, under all of the circumstances, it is justified in making this reduction.

Mr. President, I shall refer briefly to some of the larger items of foreign aid in this chapter. The largest single appropriation is to the ECA. The budget estimate for ECA is $2,657,700,000 and the committee recommends that the estimate be cut 10 percent to provide an appropriation of $2,391,930,000. This amount is $1,236,450,000 under the 1950 appropriation. The committee also agreed to allow ECA to use the 1950 carry-over funds of approximately $277,000,000. The committee arrived at these recommendations after very careful consideration and I hope the Senate will approve of them.

The next large item in the chapter is for mutual-defense assistance. The committee was unanimous in recommending the full amount of the budget estimate of $1,678,023,729.

On the funds for International Development, commonly referred to as point 4, the committee originally recommended an appropriation of $10,000,000 in this chapter. I would like to make it clear to the Senate that the $10,000,000 recommended is in addition to other funds for point 4 programs carried under

the Department of State appropriations in chapter III.

In the Department of State appropriations under the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, the committee recommends an appropriation of $5,000,000 and in the appropriation for International Information and Educational Activities there is an appropriation of $2,600,000, for point 4 programs.

Since the committee recommended the appropriation of $10,000,000 in this chapter for point 4, I have conferred with the President, and I have also received a letter from the President urging that the appropriation of $10,000,000 be increased to the full amount of the budget estimate of $26,900,000. The President told me that the amount of $10,000,000 was not enough in his opinion as we were at war and more funds would be necessary to carry out the program to the best advantage of our defense. I at once submitted the request to the Appropriations Committee and we have reconsidered it and the committee has voted to allow the President the amount of money he asked for, namely, $26,900,000 for the purpose of carrying out the point 4 program which the President recommended and the Congress has agreed to. We are at war, the President is our Commander in Chief, and the committee thinks that we should leave no stone unturned to back him up. I hope the Senate will agree with our recommendations.

There are several other items in this chapter which I will not explain in detail since they are referred to in our committee report. I do, however, Mr. President, ask unanimous consent to insert in the record a table which I have had prepared by the staff showing the individual appropriation items, the amounts for 1950, the amounts of the budget estimates, and the amounts recommended by the committee.

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

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1950, budget estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1951

	Appropriations, 1950	Budget estimate, 1951	Committee recommendation	Increase (+) or decrease (−) Senate bill compared with—			
				Appropriations, 1950		Budget estimate, 1951	
				Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Funds appropriated to the President:							
Economic Cooperation Administration	[1] $3,628,380,000	[2] $2,657,700,000	$2,391,930,000	−$1,236,450,000	34.1	−$265,770,000	10.0
Assistance to Greece and Turkey	45,000,000			−45,000,000			
Assistance to the Republic of Korea	110,000,000	100,000,000	90,000,000	−20,000,000	18.2	−10,000,000	10.0
International children's welfare work		15,000,000	12,500,000	+12,500,000		−2,500,000	16.7
International development (point IV)		26,900,000	10,000,000	+10,000,000		−16,900,000	62.8
Mutual defense assistance	[3] 814,010,000	[4] 1,678,023,729	[5] 1,678,023,729	+864,013,729	106.1		
Department of Defense, Department of the Army, civil functions: GARIOA	912,500,000	320,000,000	288,000,000	−624,500,000	68.4	−32,000,000	10.0
Department of State:							
Government in occupied areas of Germany	([6])	30,000,000	27,000,000	+27,000,000		−3,000,000	10.0
Aid to Palestine refugees	4,000,000	27,450,000	24,705,000	+20,705,000	517.6	−2,745,000	10.0
Grand total	5,513,890,000	4,855,073,729	4,522,158,729	−991,731,271	17.9	−332,915,000	6.85

[1] In addition, loan authority in the amount of $150,000,000 or a total of $3,778,380,000.
[2] Original submission in H. Doc. No. 479 was in the amount of $2,950,000,000. Revised estimate submitted in S. Doc. 176 in the amount of $2,657,700,000.
[3] In addition, contract authority in the amount of $500,000,000.
[4] Includes $455,523,729 for liquidation of prior-year contract authority, S. Doc. No. 194.
[6] Formerly under "Government and relief in occupied areas."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first committee amendment to chapter X-B.

The first amendment was, at the top of page 447, to insert:

CHAPTER X-B—FOREIGN AID

TITLE I—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Economic cooperation

For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry out the provisons of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended by the act of April 19, 1949 (Public Law 47), and as further amended by the act of June 5, 1950 (Public Law 535), including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation (not to exceed $30,000); hire of passenger motor vehicles; maintenance and operation and hire of aircraft; payment of damage claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); rents in the District of Columbia; transportation of privately owned automobiles; entertainment (not to exceed $20,000); exchange of funds without regard to section 3651 of the Revised Statutes; and loss by exchange; $2,391,930,000, of which not to exceed $50,000 shall be available for expenditures of a confidential character (other than entertainment) under the direction of the Administrator or the Deputy Administrator, who shall make a certificate of the amount of each such expenditure which he may think it advisable not to specify, and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the amount therein specified: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be consolidated and merged with funds heretofore made available for the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and such consolidated appropriation may be used during the fiscal year 1951 within the limitations herein specified: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $15,255,000 of such consolidated appropriation shall be available for administrative expenses during the fiscal year 1951, of which not more than $25,000 shall be available to the Administrator for any further action he may consider advisable to carry out the provisions of section 115 (f) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $600,000,000 shall be available for transfers under section 111 (d) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended in a manner that will permit any of the local currency equivalents, derived therefrom in compliance with section 115 (b) (6) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, to be placed at the disposal of any recipient country so long as any dependent area of such country fails to comply with any treaty to which such dependent area and the United States are parties.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to invite the attention of the Senate, in connection with chapter X-B, to lines 17 to 24, on page 448, commencing with the words "Provided, further." This section relates to the difficulties which have been encountered under the ECA by certain American merchants in Morocco.

Those difficulties stem from treaty interpretations, as I understand, relating to treaties of this country with France and with Morocco and the relations between France and Morocco.

Mr. President, I would object, under any circumstances, to this provision in this chapter of the bill. I would object to anything which used an incident which, however serious, is yet of comparatively small proportions, as a means by which the work of the ECA to support the Republic of France might be removed. It seems to me, from all I can learn, that there are two elements of the situation. One element is that the problem is one which should be solved, if not by negotiation, by international judicial action. Furthermore, I am informed that a modus vivendi has been arranged and is in process of development with some success, and that the situation is improving as time goes on.

Mr. President, the remarks I have made I would make under any circumstances, but at this point I raise a point of order as to the language which I have just defined as commencing with the word "Provided" on line 17 of page 448, through line 24 of the same page. This seems to me to be very clearly legislative material in an appropriation bill, and therefore I raise the question as to whether it belongs in the bill at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont raises a point of order to that portion of chapter X-B of the bill beginning with the third word on line 17 of page 448 and going down to the end of line 24 on the same page. Does any Senator wish to be heard? If not, the present occupant of the chair is prepared to rule.

In the opinion of the Chair, the point of order should lie, and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in connection with this amendment, I ask

unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me and also a memorandum relating to the subject.

There being no objection, Mr. WILEY's statement and the memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

MOROCCAN AMENDMENT MUST BE ENACTED IN GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. President, there is pending before the Senate an amendment written into this bill by the Senate Appropriations Committee in connection with ECA appropriations for the next fiscal year. Under this amendment, which I originally proposed to the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and which he fortunately accepted, provision will be made at long last for protection of American business interests in Morocco.

I have taken the floor on several occasions since early 1949 in order to protest the deplorable discrimination against American business interests in Morocco.

In all this time we have had one long series of exchanges of correspondence and talks with State Department officials. Time after time we have brought to the attention of the Department abuses of the Moroccan Treaty by which French officials have deliberately favored French business interests in direct contradiction with treaties. Time after time we have been given assurances by the State Department that the abuses would come to an end, that legislation would not be essential, and time after time assurances and pious promises have been shown not to be worth the paper they were printed on.

For the fourth time a protective amendment is now before the Senate, and it is my earnest hope that this amendment as written in the Appropriations Committee will be retained on the floor, taken to the conference committee, and thereafter retained in the final conference report.

To do otherwise would be to encourage other countries deliberately to break their treaties with the United States and deliberately to discriminate against American businessmen.

I shall not take the further time to review a history of this situation, but I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point a further memorandum on the problem, reviewing it historically.

MEMORANDUM

The Morocco Treaty violations were brought to the attention of the Foreign Relations Committee by correspondence back in 1947 and 1948. We were told that the Department of State was investigating and would take appropriate steps.

Two representatives of Americans in Morocco called on me early in 1949. They had documentation and other evidence to show that the French had assessed illegal taxes and customs against them, had seized their goods, denied them the right to compete in many businesses, refused them a share in ECA business, and in general tried to force them out. The French had finally placed embargoes on almost all American goods, while giving preferred treatment to Argentina, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and others.

I knew this kind of thing was prevalent in outrightly owned French colonies but Morocco is not a colony, it is an "autonomous country under the rule of a Sultan" (Willard Thorp's affidavit in U. S. District Court, Oct. 4, 1949). I know that our treaties with Morocco guaranteed our citizens and trade equal treatment with those of other countries and that they fixed duties and taxes. I put the representatives of the American group in Morocco in touch with Secretary Acheson in the Foreign Relations Committee Room and he directed Mr. Ernest Gross to investigate and fix the matter up.

At that time at a conference on March 24, 1949, the State Department agreed that illegal taxes and customs overcharges would be refunded and other redress given, that is, that all treaty violations which were not considered by the Department as connected with the dollar shortage would be ended, before acceptance of the embargo decree would be considered.

The President of the American Trade Association of Morocco reported this decision to me and to other members of the Foreign Relations Committee in writing. The arrangement has never been denied by the Department. It was reported to Morocco by a cable cleared with a Department official. Because of these promises, and because the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee told the Senate "We are sending a top man * * * to investigate all these cases, and if there is any discrimination or any violation of fundamental rights of Americans, they will be corrected, and corrected promptly" (Congressional Record, vol. 95, part 3, p. 3870). I am sure that the distinguished chairman was relying on State Department promises when he made that statement—because of all this legislation proposed to end the Moroccan abuses was defeated on this floor on April 5, 1949. As soon as it was defeated the promises were ignored and on June 10, 1949, the State Department gave temporary assent to the Moroccan embargoes with none of its conditions fulfilled.

In August of 1949 this was all repeated. Mr. Ernest Gross, then Assistant Secretary of State, wrote on July 29 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, part 3, p. 10764): "The Department has repeatedly recognized that American businessmen have specific legitimate grievances in French Morocco that should be remedied." He listed "failure to allocate to Americans a reasonable amount of dollar exchange. The employment of delaying tactics in granting import licenses for goods Americans needed for the maintenance of enterprises they were operating * * * the assessment of customs duties on the basis of arbitrary valuations of imports; the assessment of consumption taxes * * * and other matters such as the failure to install telephones, furnish adequate gasoline rations," etc.

Mr. Gross emphasized that the Department's objective is to assure an appropriate measure of protection to these Americans in Morocco. The able Senator from Pennsylvania stated: "At this very time American representatives are engaged with representatives of France in ironing out legitimate complaints which have been made against the French treatment of American businessmen" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, part 3, p. 10820). Legislation was again defeated in the Senate on August 5, 1949. Again, when the chance of action by Congress was past, the Department abandoned its "appropriate measure of protection" and ruled, at a public hearing to investigate the matter on September 27 that both treaty violations and the fact that Americans have been subject to discrimination in the administration of import controls were beyond the scope of the meeting. On December 31, assent for an indefinite period was given to the embargoes and to almost all other violations on the basis of a compromise agreement of September 4, the terms of which were broken as soon as it was signed.

When the ECA authorization was pending this spring, Members of the Senate for the third time considered an amendment to end the campaign against our citizens and our trade in Morocco. Again, the State Department claimed that the situation was being effectively handled. A majority of the Foreign Relations Committee decided that "in view of the arrangements * * * made with the French Government," legislative remedy "was not necessary" (Foreign Relations Committee report, p. 22). Despite this decision, an amendment finally passed the Senate on May 5, 1950. As a member of the Senate-House conference, I was skeptical of the promises made in a reassuring letter dated May 5, 1950, from Administrator Hoffman and a State Department memorandum confirming it, to the effect that consultative machinery had been set up and was operating successfully to handle American complaints. The conference accepted these assurances, decided that the Connally amendment could be invoked in case the consultative machinery failed, and the Morocco amendment was again defeated.

A letter from the president of the American Chamber of Commerce in Morocco, in May, listed 11 specific legitimate grievances, including most of those cited by Mr. Gross a year ago and many others and stated that the situation was worse than ever. He said that "conferences between consular and residency officials involve the same personnel and lead to the same frustrating results even though they are now called deliberations of a mixed commission." The State Department's own opinion of its consultative machinery, which had served to defeat legislation, dwindled once the legislation was defeated. The Department's report of June 5, 1950, to the Appropriations Committee stated:

"Our consul at Rabat has done an excellent and conscientious job in bringing about such solutions as are possible from the consultative meetings. The administrative tactics of the French officials, however, continue to delay the results and to multiply the minor discriminations * * * the consultative machinery has not been successful in solving larger problems touching French policy."

The only excuse which has been offered by the State Department for its failure in Morocco for a year and a half is that the French program is necessitated by Morocco's dollar shortage. Official statistics show that the import and export embargoes have actually raised Morocco's dollar imports by 50 percent, lowered her dollar exports by 30 percent, and brought her trade deficit to an all-time high. They have shifted import profits from independent Americans to French cartels and other favored French interests. They have given preference in trade not only to France but to every nation having a bilateral agreement with France, and that includes Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, etc. While Morocco's total dollar imports are at an all-time high, the United States share of Morocco's trade has decreased. Dollar purchases from non-United States sources have almost doubled. (Moroccan Government Statistical Bulletin, April 15, 1950.)

Of all the treaty violations complained of, only import embargoes are in any way connected with Morocco's dollar position.

Furthermore, the Department of State told the conference that the Hickenlooper amendment, stating that treaties remain in full force until changed with Senate ratification, was not necessary. It has always claimed it was not setting our treaties aside. That same Department's memorandum to the Appropriations Committee (p. 258 of the hearings) states "Some of the complaints that they (Americans) have made appear to be based on the original treaty position rather than on failure of the French to live up to the terms of their agreement with the United States." The clear meaning is that the Department's agreement of December 31, 1949, has set aside the treaties assuring equal rights, on which Americans relied when starting business in Morocco.

Not one tangible result has come from all this State Department shilly-shallying. Not 1 cent has been reimbursed. Moroccan laws

limiting American business activities still are in force. Trade with every nation on earth is preferred to ours.

The Moroccan abuses are before the Senate for the fourth time. The State Department is no longer claiming that it will end them. Instead, it is now trying to quibble about whether the violations which it admitted and protested for almost 2 years are discriminatory. It can stall another 2 years while debating that. If it intended to act under the terms of the Connally amendment it has had nearly 3 months in which to do so. It has stated in its memorandum of July 11 that "it is understood steps are being taken to create a more favorable atmosphere," that action by Congress would be "drastic and inapt" and would damage our relations with France. Just how much further does it wish to go, in our pursuit of a favorable atmosphere? I do not believe that our relations abroad were ever improved by a policy of weakness, which only makes us ridiculous. I think this farce has continued long enough and hope the amendment reported by the Appropriations Committee will be adopted.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on page 447, line 18, I move to strike out "$2,391,930,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$2,450,000,000." This is an amendment in the second degree. The Senator from Missouri, instead of increasing the amount of the appropriation, as I have suggested, desires to decrease it. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that this chapter X-B, for purposes of the amendment, may be considered as a part of the original text of the bill.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, my amendment is pending now. If the Senator from Missouri wishes to offer his amendment now, he may do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into, the amendment of the Senator from Arizona is itself open to amendment.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I shall ask that my amendment be considered on Monday.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Snader, its assistant enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 3859. An act to authorize the President to control the anchorage and movement of foreign-flag vessels in waters of the United States when the national security of the United States is endangered, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 512. Joint resolution making further temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1951, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 28, 1950, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 3859) to authorize the President to control the anchorage and movement of foreign-flag vessels in waters of the United States when the national security of the United States is endangered, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if no other Senator wishes to address the Senate, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Vice Adm. Edward L. Cochrane, United States Navy (retired), to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Paul M. Herzog, of New York, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board; and

Ewan Clague, of Pennsylvania, to be a Commissioner of Labor Statistics.

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Joseph Frederick Green, a graduated cadet of the United States Military Academy, for appointment as second lieutenant in the United States Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

ADVISORY BOARD FOR THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of J. H. Allen, of Florida, to be a member of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to make a few brief remarks with respect to the nomination of Mr. Allen. I know that the Presiding Officer will bear me out when I say that Mr. Allen is one of the outstanding businessmen, not only of Florida, but of the whole country. He is not only competent, but he is devoted to the public interest. I can assure the Senate that Mr. Allen's service in the position to which he has been nominated will be illustrious, distinguished, and in the public interest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The Chair thanks his colleague.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the remaining nominations to the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department be confirmed en bloc.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand that the distinguished Senator from North Dakota desires the nomination of Mr. Morris L. Ernst, of New York, to go over. I move that, with that exception, the other nominations to the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the remaining nominations to the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department, with the exception of the nomination of Morris L. Ernst, of New York, are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc. That completes the Executive Calendar.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the appropriation bill and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, July 31, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate July 28 (legislative day of July 20), 1950:

FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD

Vice Adm. Edward L. Cochrane, United States Navy (retired), to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board for the term expiring June 30, 1952.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 28 (legislative day of July 20), 1950:

ADVISORY BOARD FOR THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

To be members of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department

J. H. Allen, of Florida.
Daniel W. Bell, of the District of Columbia.
Frank M. Folsom, of New York.
Alfred E. Lyon, of New York.
Robert L. Thornton, of Texas.
Charles L. Ward, of Minnesota.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Morris F. Watson, Montevallo.
Jacob L. Slaughter, Pine Hill.

CALIFORNIA

Helen G. Walters, Brockway.
Rita P. Patton, Idyllwild.
Ben B. Rodgers, Milpitas.
Bernard G. Proksch, Pollock Pines.
Betty Jo Gilliam, Sloat.
Sallye F. Bartlow, Valley Center.

COLORADO

Schuyler C. Parker, Durango.

FLORIDA

Luther W. Reel, Eloise.
Edna Gowen Smith, Hilliard.
Wiley Bird, Live Oak.
Lynn H. Thames, Osprey.
Harry Gordon Higel, Sarasota.

GEORGIA

Estelle M. Jacques, Baconton.

HAWAII

Toshihiro Nakagawa, Kunia.
Adolph S. K. Leong, Lahaina.

IDAHO

Ellwood R. Werry, Shoshone.

ILLINOIS

Bruna R. Gherardini, Bulpitt.
Louis J. Frooninckx, Jr., Clifton.

INDIANA

Vernice L. Larkin, Cloverdale.
Richard C. Walker, Granger.
Charles Donald Manaugh, Hanover.
Kenneth E. Romine, Mentone.
Helen M. Cox, Oaklandon.
Thomas M. Gray, Otwell.
Arvil Weilbaker, Palmyra.
Louise W. Broyles, Pittsboro.
John E. Brewer, Summitville.
James L. Wall, Winchester.

IOWA

James Lawrence Klauer, Akron.
Woodrow J. Shearer, Columbus Junction.
Leroy W. Threde, Lake Park.
Fernando Gianni, Melcher.

KANSAS

Carl N. Couch, Atlanta.
Yoland L. Faris, Elmdale.
Charles Dwain Duecy, Galesburg.
John C. Bowman, Garnett.
Ruel Lazarus, Norwich.

KENTUCKY

Austin V. Thompson, Moreland.
William F. Gibson, Whitesburg.

LOUISIANA

Robert W. Gandy, Jr., Tallulah.

MAINE

Irma J. Gott, Southwest Harbor.

MARYLAND

Melvin H. Bowers, Lilypons.
Michael Keehan, Patuxent River.

MASSACHUSETTS

James E. Rogers, East Bridgewater.
Daniel F. Cahill, Lawrence.
Ralph Howard Bryant, South Lancaster.
Edmund L. Hannaford, Wellfleet.

MICHIGAN

Donald M. Brown, Addison.
William Bombyk, Applegate.
William R. Shortridge, Big Bay.
Robert J. Gitersonke, Bridgman.
Gust C. Burandt, Coldwater.
Elmer L. Wittenberg, Constantine.
Merle E. Kinney, Davisburg.
John T. Fahey, Goodells.
Charles R. LaClair, Hemlock.
Leon C. Stewart, Hersey.
Glenn R. Sabourin, Hillman.
Owen H. Austin, Laingsburg.
Robert L. Taylor, Lapeer.
Theodore W. Johnson, Ludington.
Lucile M. Mayer, Merrill.
Vincent E. Boyle, Milford.
Calvin F. McDivitt, Jr., Morrice.
Mary Lee Hawkes, Orchard Lake.
Albert F. Lenart, Smiths Creek.
Hubert A. Marcotte, Wolverine.

MINNESOTA

Royce V. Peterson, Aitkin.
John O. Opheim, Farwell.
Corallen J. Mickelson, Hanley Falls.
George B. Engelmann, Hewitt.
Roy J. Meyer, Jasper.
Hugh J. McCaffery, Lake Hubert.
David R. Wollan, Starbuck.
Delbert W. Brekke, Tamarack.
William P. Horan, Wells.
John A. Stenson, Wright.

MISSOURI

Miller L. Coleman, Aurora.
George L. Adams, Blue Springs.
Lester A. Green, Centerview.
Robert W. Bounds, Centerville.
William D. Compton, Dodson.
Joseph H. Goeke, Greentop.
Myron H. Holloman, Ironton.
Francis B. Bockwinkel, Liguori.
Verne C. Duvall, Lockwood.
Louie M. Griffy, Marston.
Ted L. Muse, Niangua.
Stiefel J. Wilkerson, Novelty.
Noland K. Deaver, Paris.
Charles W. Hyder, Polo.
Harley K. Warren, Richland.
Cecil L. Smith, Smithton.
Dallas D. Hickerson, Wardell.
Harry M. Tarrant, Webb City.

MONTANA

William Watt, Crow Agency.
Howard E. Wagner, Hardin.

NEBRASKA

Ferdinand L. Peisiger, Blue Hill.
William H. Smith, Franklin.
Harry B. Burton, North Platte.
Carl Wells, St. Edward.
Jack M. Latham, Springfield.

NEVADA

James A. Fortune, Mina.
Hugh W. Mildren, Yerington.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Linden E. Sheehan, Pittsfield.
Ina P. Andersen, Rumney.

NEW JERSEY

Calvin G. Piper, Hillsdale.
Florence A. Bailey, Mizpah.
Francis W. Huntley, Port Republic.

NEW MEXICO

Morris L. Dickerson, Fairacres.

NEW YORK

Harry F. Reed, Camden.
Hugh L. Spencer, Canaseraga.
Philip C. Hopson, Churchville.
Eugene P. Smith, Deposit.
Millard Eugene Austin, Rushford.
William L. Farley, Watertown.

NORTH DAKOTA

Walter Gerszewski, Minto.

OHIO

Joseph F. Prosser, Cleveland.
Francis J. Dannemiller, Doylestown.
Mary B. Federspill, Empire.
Julian A. Wierzba, Gypsum.
Raymond W. Wortman, Leipsic.
Carl Edward Fratz, Litchfield.
Robert V. Tracy, Loveland.
Forrest Finley, Malta.
Paul E. Puhl, Maumee.
Arthur Lee Fair, Millersburg.
Howard R. Miller, New Lebanon.
Von D. Spahr, Jr., Ohio City.
Walter K. Billman, Spencer.
Lewis L. Newland, Waynesfield.
James E. Mattox, Westerville.

OKLAHOMA

Don W. Fowler, Boise City.
Seymour Gibson Smith, Duncan.
Myrtle Maxine Friend, Hunter.

OREGON

Alexander Moore Hamilton, Medford.

PENNSYLVANIA

Raymond Maulfair, Grantville.
LaRoy Cleveland Best, Neffs.
Frank A. Kovacs, Schnecksville.

SAMOA

Edward Hunkin, Pago Pago.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Joseph E. Powell, Moncks Corner.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Knute Tennyson, Quinn.
Norman E. Gruenzner, Stickney.

TENNESSEE

Jack G. Frazier, Dayton.
Thomas H. Graham, Jr., Taft.

TEXAS

Wayne G. Watson, Denver City.
Earl M. Cryer, Hamshire.
Harold R. Spain, Haskell.
Maynard C. Watkins, Jarrell.
Reuben S. Morrow, Kaufman.
Ray D. White, Kingsbury.
Joseph M. Tosch, Mesquite.
St. Elmo Murphy, Nixon.

UTAH

Amy H. Esplin, Orderville.

VIRGINIA

Richard D. Collison, Dayton.
Samuel N. Thornhill, Gladstone.
Lloyd N. Doyle, Ridgeway.
Carl L. Campbell, Winchester.

WASHINGTON

Arnold L. Leliefeld, Clayton.
Kenneth W. McNeilly, Colfax.
George E. Wilken, Dryden.
Harry S. Burlingham, Redondo.
Charles J. MacDonald, Sultan.
Elsie P. Tipton, Tillicum.
Albert E. Heric, Walla Walla.

WEST VIRGINIA

Robert Rogers Vanaman, Arthurdale.
Ivory N. Steele, Holden.

WYOMING

Harold E. Wheatley, Encampment.
Otterbine Marcus Phillips, Upton.

SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 31, 1950

(Legislative day of Thursday, July 20, 1950)

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

Rev. F. Norman Van Brunt, assistant minister, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

We would lift our eyes unto the hills eternal, knowing that our help comes from Thee, O God. We would laud and hallow Thee for Thou art good and hast done us good. We have had at Thy hand bountiful benefits all our days. Thy sunlight has made our path daylight. The dark night has had its star; and when our need was great our night has had its sun.

Remembering Thy past benefits, grant us to rely upon Thy sure mercy as we take up the opportunities of this new day. Help us that in all our ways we might acknowledge Thee, knowing that Thou wilt direct our paths.

"Set our feet on lofty places;
Gird our lives, that they may be
Armored with all Christ-like graces
In the fight to keep men free.
Grant us wisdom, grant us courage,
That we fail not man nor Thee."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, July 28, 1950, was dispensed with.