

## By Mr. LOVRE:

H. Res. 600. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare new plans and specifications for the establishment of research facilities for the study of foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to their Senate Resolution No. 58, relating to retirement pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the investigation of the Katyn Forest massacre, so-called; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of Massachusetts Legislature relative to the investigation of the Katyn Forest massacre, so-called; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HESELTON: Memorial of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress relative to the investigation of the Katyn Forest massacre, so-called; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress relative to the investigation of the Katyn Forest massacre, so-called; 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. ANFUSO:

H. R. 7435. A bill for the relief of Gabriele Pontillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7436. A bill for the relief of Albino Bergamasco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 7437. A bill for the relief of Mr. Jio Botta Podesta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 7438. A bill for the relief of Domenico Manzella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 7439. A bill for the relief of Antoni Rajkowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## By Mr. McMULLEN:

H. R. 7440. A bill for the relief of Henry Hauri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 7441. A bill for the relief of Keiko Shikata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 7442. A bill for the relief of Apostolos Savvas Vassiliadis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

## Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

668. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Association of the Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia, Washington, D. C., relative to having the Senate restore the amount of \$12,000,000 to the pending District of Columbia appropriation bill, as provided in the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947; to the Committee on Appropriations.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 8, 1952

(*Legislative day of Wednesday, April 2, 1952*)

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 Lord our God, whose sheltering wings protect Thy children, whose service is perfect freedom; we remember with gratitude the cloud of witnesses about us, the glorious company who in other times that tried men's souls have served the Nation faithfully and well. They have bequeathed to us the heritage of freedom. As in these decisive days we carry the torch of enlightenment or wear the cloak of privilege or stand in places of honor, may our purposes be ribbed with steel to dedicate our enlightenment, our privilege, and our honors to the welfare of all mankind.

Forgive us the broken vow, the unkept promise, the unfulfilled purpose. And, when the shadows fall and evening comes, may we greet the unseen with a cheer, knowing that we have kept the faith. In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McCLELLAN, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 7, 1952, was dispensed with.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 147) designating April 9, 1952, as Bataan Day.

## JOINT COMMITTEE ON INAUGURAL ARRANGEMENTS OF THE PRESIDENT-ELECT OF THE UNITED STATES

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to the provisions of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 69) authorizing the appointment of a joint committee to arrange for the inauguration of the President-elect of the United States on January 20, 1953, the Chair appoints the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] members of the joint committee on the part of the Senate.

## LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. THYE was excused from attendance upon the sessions of the Senate tomorrow and Thursday, in order to attend a tax hearing to be conducted by the Small Business Committee at Birmingham, Ala.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SPARKMAN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate tomorrow and the remainder of the week.

## TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD and to transact other routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## RESOLUTIONS AND LIST OF OFFICERS OF WISCONSIN DAIRYMEN'S ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a series of vital resolutions adopted at the annual meeting of the Wisconsin Dairymen's Association and sent to me by B. R. Dugdale, association secretary. The resolutions were adopted on March 26, 1952, at the session at Fort Atkinson.

They bear the views of Badger State dairying on such important issues as: (a) the need for continued emphasis on American dairying; (b) the importance of accelerated research into crop and livestock diseases; (c) the significance of an adequate farm manpower deferment program; and (d) the importance of serving butter in school-lunch programs.

I wholeheartedly endorse the sentiments expressed in these resolutions and have personally spoken on all these topics on the Senate floor.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions, together with a list of the able officers and directors of the Wisconsin Dairymen's Association, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the resolutions and list of officers will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The resolutions were referred as follows:

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"1952 ANNUAL MEETING, WISCONSIN DAIRYMEN'S ASSOCIATION

## "RESOLUTION ON IMPORTANCE OF DAIRYING

"Next to the air we breathe and the water we drink comes food as man's greatest life essential. It must be remembered that leading the food parade are milk and dairy products as first in the life needs of civilized man. Recently there has been a tendency to change from dairying to other types of farming, due to a price differential unfavorable to dairying. However, in the long run, no phase of agriculture offers a more reliable economic standard as does dairying. No

kind of production is more conducive to the much-needed concept of soil-erosion prevention and soil-fertility building as does dairy farm operations.

"The physical structure of the dairy cow is conducive to the most efficient utilization of good forage, hay, pasture, and grassland products in general. Wisconsin is favored by climatic conditions that make our State a national hay and grassland center. This favorable situation gives us a natural advantage that, if further developed, gives us an ideal production advantage.

"Therefore, we believe it is paramount now to reaffirm our faith in the dependability and future of dairy farming. We are convinced that in the long run the stability of rural life and endeavor in Wisconsin lies in the building and improving of our great dairy enterprises."

#### "RESOLUTION ON DISEASE CONTROL

"Diseases of dairy cattle continue to cause serious losses to dairy farmers. We urge our College of Agriculture, through its experiment station work, to take full advantage of the funds available under the Hope-Flanagan Act, to conduct intensive research on dairy cattle disease, particularly mastitis, brucellosis, vibriosis, and other new diseases that are being found to infect dairy cattle. Hoof-and-mouth disease is a constant threat to the livestock industry of the Nation. Millions of dollars have been spent to stop it, but to no avail. We have had a law passed by Congress, in 1948, which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to build a research laboratory to study ways of developing a vaccine to control the dreaded disease. However, no appropriation was made to build such a laboratory. We urge immediate action by the Appropriations Committee of Congress to provide funds for laboratory and research on this dreaded disease, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Congressmen. We also urge that embargoes be continued on all Mexican and Canadian livestock and livestock products until such time as all danger of transmitting the disease has ceased."

#### "RESOLUTION ON SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

"We continue to support the properly administered hot-lunch programs for school children, but we deplore the serving of butter substitutes in school lunches and ask that only butter be provided."

To the Committee on Armed Services:

#### "RESOLUTION ON MANPOWER AND THE DAIRY INDUSTRY

"No phase of agriculture employs labor more completely and consistently throughout the year than the dairy industry. Our dairy industry has suffered greatly from loss of manpower recruited by industry and also by the military services. With 4,000,000 less cows in the United States at the present time and with a reduction of more than 200,000 dairy cows in Wisconsin alone, a serious curtailment in milk production has taken place.

"We believe that mobilization of manpower in America should mean utilization of manpower for the greatest total national well-being. It is our feeling that this should mean no unquestioned priority on manpower favoring any group and that careful consideration should be given to the total problem of manpower mobilization so that neither industry, agriculture, nor the military will suffer, on one hand, or enjoy priority, on the other.

"We recommend that a system of per man production of farm products be established on the basis of actual farm products produced. We feel that such a system should be applied as soon as possible. Its application should result in greater uniformity of policy in the various selective-service boards.

It would also help to emphasize the importance of milk production to the whole program of national well-being."

The list of officers of the Wisconsin Dairymen's Association is as follows:

#### WISCONSIN DAIRYMEN'S ASSOCIATION

##### OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

##### Officers

President: P. N. Steffanus, Delavan. Vice president: John D. Wuethrich, Greenwood. Secretary and treasurer: B. R. Dugdale, Madison.

##### Directors

District I: Russell Fox, Waterloo. District II: Clarence Sheridan, Fond du Lac. District III: William Curtis, Mauston. District IV: John D. Wuethrich, Greenwood. District V: R. I. Dimick, Almena.

##### At large

V. E. Nylin, Platteville: J. F. Magnus, Appleton.

##### Directors representing State dairy breed associations

Ayrshire: Lawrence Blank, Ripon. Brown Swiss: Willard Evans, Waukesha. Guernsey: Otto Kline, Waukesha. Jersey: P. N. Steffanus, Delavan. Holstein: Frank Case, Oconomowoc. Milking shorthorn: Robert Traynor, Milton Junction.

#### COMPULSORY HEALTH INSURANCE—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference eight resolutions adopted by the Pitt County (N. C.) Medical Auxiliary and other prominent organizations in North Carolina, protesting against the enactment of legislation to provide compulsory health insurance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be received and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

#### MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS—RESOLUTION OF COUNCIL OF SEATTLE, WASH.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, under date of March 28, 1952, the Council of the City of Seattle adopted a resolution in support of Senate bill 940, to confirm and establish the title of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, which was passed last week by the Senate. A copy of the resolution of the City Council of Seattle reached me on April 7. Because the proposed so-called tidelands legislation is presently in conference between both Houses of the Congress, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution adopted by the Seattle City Council be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### Resolution 16006

A resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to adopt legislation confirming and establishing the title of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources

Whereas there is pending in the Eighty-second Congress of the United States S. 940

entitled "A bill to confirm and establish the title of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources" and H. R. 4484 entitled "A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries," and under the provisions of each of said bills, the United States would recognize, confirm, establish, and vest in the respective States, including the State of Washington, their grantees and successors in interest, title, ownership, and control of all lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and in and to all natural resources within such lands and waters; and to approve and confirm the boundaries of the several coastal States as extending, at least, three geographical miles seaward of the coast line and outside inland waters, and the boundaries of the several States on the Great Lakes to extend to the international boundaries of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the City Council of the City of Seattle:*

That the city of Seattle by and through its city council, concurred in by its mayor, does hereby petition the Congress of the United States to act favorably upon and adopt S. 940 or H. R. 4484 pending in the Eighty-second Congress or similar legislation, designed to accomplish the objects and purposes aforesaid; and

That the Congress of the United States is urged to reject and defeat any legislation which by its provisions will authorize any Federal department or agency to grant leases on or exercise any proprietary right in or to the aforesaid lands lying beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the States or in and to the natural resources within such lands and waters; and

That the city clerk forward a certified copy of this resolution to the respective clerks of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to each Senator and Member of Congress from the State of Washington.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. 1835. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the participation of certain Provinces of the Dominion of Canada in the Northeastern Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1405).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1324. A bill for the relief of Dr. Nicola M. Melucci (Rept. No. 1406);

S. 1776. A bill for the relief of Sister Stanislaus (Rept. No. 1407);

S. 2561. A bill for the relief of Susan Patricia Manchester (Rept. No. 1408);

S. 2696. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of The Cuban-American Sugar Co. against the United States (Rept. No. 1409);

S. 2805. A bill for the relief of Susan Jeanne Kerr (Rept. No. 1410);

H. R. 755. A bill for the relief of Dr. Eleftheria Paidoussi (Rept. No. 1411);

H. R. 836. A bill for the relief of Harumi China Cairns (Rept. No. 1412);

H. R. 1968. A bill for the relief of Senta Ziegler (Rept. No. 1413);  
 H. R. 1969. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edith Abrahamovic (Rept. No. 1414);  
 H. R. 2355. A bill for the relief of Nobuko Hiramoto (Rept. No. 1415);  
 H. R. 2676. A bill for the relief of Andrijana Bradicic (Rept. No. 1416);  
 H. R. 3136. A bill for the relief of May Quan Wong (also known as Quan Shee Wong) (Rept. No. 1417);  
 H. R. 3271. A bill for the relief of Toshiaki Shimada (Rept. No. 1418);  
 H. R. 3524. A bill for the relief of Jan Yee Young (Rept. No. 1419);  
 H. R. 3598. A bill for the relief of Lydia Daisy Jessie Greene (Rept. No. 1420);  
 H. R. 4220. A bill for the relief of Hazel Sau Fong Hee (Rept. No. 1421);  
 H. R. 4397. A bill for the relief of Minglean Hammerling (Rept. No. 1422);  
 H. R. 4535. A bill for the relief of Nigel C. S. Salter-Mathieson (Rept. No. 1423);  
 H. R. 4772. A bill for the relief of Patricia Ann Harris (Rept. No. 1424);  
 H. R. 4788. A bill for the relief of Yoko Takeuchi (Rept. No. 1425);  
 H. R. 4911. A bill for the relief of Lieselotte Maria Kuebler (Rept. No. 1426);  
 H. R. 5187. A bill for the relief of Rodney Drew Lawrence (Rept. No. 1427);  
 H. R. 5437. A bill for the relief of Motoko Sakurada (Rept. No. 1428);  
 H. R. 5590. A bill for the relief of Marc Stefan Alexenzo (Rept. No. 1429);  
 H. R. 5922. A bill for the relief of Karin Riccardo (Rept. No. 1430);  
 H. R. 5931. A bill for the relief of Holly Prindle Goodman (Rept. No. 1431);  
 H. R. 5936. A bill for the relief of Kunio Itoh (Rept. No. 1432);  
 H. R. 6012. A bill for the relief of Gylda Raydel Wagner (Rept. No. 1433);  
 H. R. 6055. A bill for the relief of Anne de Baillet-Latour (Rept. No. 1434);  
 H. R. 6088. A bill for the relief of Hisako Suzuki (Rept. No. 1435);  
 H. R. 6172. A bill for the relief of Manami Tago (Rept. No. 1436);  
 H. R. 6480. A bill for the relief of Elaine Irving Hedley (Rept. No. 1437); and  
 H. R. 6561. A bill for the relief of Monika Waltraud Fecht (Rept. No. 1438).  
 By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:  
 S. 997. A bill for the relief of Paula Slucki (Slucki) and Ariel Slucki (Rept. No. 1439);  
 S. 1363. A bill for the relief of Ceasar J. (Raaum) Syquia (Rept. No. 1440);  
 S. 1537. A bill to amend the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the extension of the term of certain patents of persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II" (Rept. No. 1441);  
 S. 1606. A bill for the relief of Sachio Kanashiro (Rept. No. 1442);  
 S. 1903. A bill for the relief of Toshiko Minowa (Rept. No. 1443);  
 S. 2498. A bill for the relief of Brenda Marie Gray (Akemi) (Rept. No. 1444);  
 S. 2546. A bill to provide for attorneys' liens in proceedings before the courts or other departments and agencies of the United States (Rept. No. 1445);  
 S. 2706. A bill for the relief of Sister Julie Schuler (Rept. No. 1446); and  
 H. R. 5185. A bill for the relief of Epifania Giaccone (Rept. No. 1447).  
 By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:  
 S. 1360. A bill for the relief of John J. Snoke (Rept. No. 1448);  
 S. 2256. A bill for the relief of certain persons who, while serving as members of the Army Nurse Corps, were commissioned as officers in the Army of the United States but were not paid the full amounts of pay and allowances payable to officers of their grade and length of service (Rept. No. 1449); and  
 S. 2334. A bill for the relief of Miguel Narciso Ossario (Rept. No. 1450).

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF CERTAIN EMERGENCY POWERS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably an original joint resolution to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until July 1, 1952, and I submit a report (No. 1451) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 148) to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until July 1, 1952, reported by Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably, an original concurrent resolution, favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 1452) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 72) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),* That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months: A-5500365, Aria, Giuseppe or Joe Ross or Jim Ross or Vincenzo Rosso.

A-3523625, Au, Tai Yuen or Au Fook.

A-6979681, Ball, William Walter.

A-5712357, Barendsz, Fytse or Sidney.

A-7197065, Baron, Judith.

A-4464783, Bedyneck, Joseph, or Richard Jensen.

A-7991493, Bernard, Monica Mary Brooks (nee Monica Mary Brooks).

A-1547901, Bernardo, Ralph Ciddio or Raffaele Ciddio Bernardo or Ciddio Raffaele Salvadore Bernardo.

A-4951559, Bettaglio, Antonio.

A-7293023, Bhacca, Nari Sarosh or Norman Sarosh Bhacca.

A-2935597, Brunetti, Margherita.

A-7350065, Bryant, Marie Margaret or Margaret Marie Bryant or Margaret M. Glass or Marie Margaret Glass or Marie Margaret Smith or Marie Margaret McDonald.

A-7687528, Buchanan, Mollie Macie.

A-5460611, Capela, Manuel Esteves.

A-1979014, Carriere, John Cyprien or Jack Carriere or Jack Currie.

A-4872936, Cazes, Albert Ascher.

A-3486718, Cereceró, Maxima vda. De Duran or Maxima Cereceró Vda. De Reina.

A-7241654, Chan, Annie Maria Siu (nee Annie Maria Siu).

A-1669099, Chang, Tun Yin.

A-7476974, Chang, Wang Kuo or James Kuo-Chang Wang.

A-7457090, Wang, Tsai-Lu Wang or Janie Tsai-Lu Chang.

A-9655778, Cheng, Tim Chee or Tim Chen Cheng or Ting Chin Cheng.

A-5371509, Chivers, Oswald.

A-5891452, Chun, Gordon.

A-4816198, Clarke, Archibald.

A-1223634, Cominsky, Jacob.

A-4121674, Cominsky, Rose.

A-1269971, Sharkey, Betty or Sharky or Sharkansky (nee Claff) also known as Betty Clark or Cummings.

A-2025705, Coris, Costas or Gust Coris or Constantinos Kalouris.

A-1890635, Cosenza, Maria (nee La Verde).

A-6039091, Cruz-Valencia Ramon.

A-3483694, Czarov, Alexander Ivanovich.

A-2445361, Daniele, Peter or Peter Daniel or Vito Pietro Daniels.

A-5709219, De Duran, Dolores Gutierrez.

A-4825320, De Garcia Florentina Gonzalez.

A-7948714, De Vela, Consuela Salas.

A-4568398, Diaccumakos, Demetrius Thomas or James Thomas Dimaxos.

A-6840142, Dimmick, Mary Jane or Mary Jane Murphy or Patricia Schooley.

A-6808021, Murphy, Terence Noel.

A-3852013, Dong, Tung or Wing Tong.

A-4588886, Dugack, Teodoska (nee Fedorka).

A-7427979, Ehrenberg, Arthur formerly Arnold Otto Paul Czabbeck.

A-4666503, Eng, Eleuteria Suarez-de.

A-3893284, Essa, Louis or Louis Essa Douhy.

A-5257777, Fernandez, Luis Antonio or Luis Antonio Fernandes.

A-2128182, Fladigo, Manual Gonsalves.

A-3298393, Flannery, Michael Joseph.

A-3564513, Florinchi, Todor or Theodore Florinchi.

A-5012501, Florinchi, Savetta (nee Savetta Varge) formerly Savetta Fontu or Stella Fantu or Elizabeth Florinchi.

A-6774195, Florinchi, Valeria.

A-4720344, Ganczarski, Mary (nee Juwa).

A-6016094, Garcia-Gomez, Pedro Manuel or Peter M. Garcia.

A-7890141, Gardner, Gordon Terence.

A-6744391, Garza-Moreno, Nicholas.

A-6861972, Gaudillat, Josiane Francoise.

A-4674943, Goldberg, Nathan Bernard.

A-5718309, Gomez, Ana or Ana Gomez Ontiveros.

A-6057420, Guerrero-Uballe, Juan.

A-7140234, Han, Yu Shan.

A-5388854, Heeren, Arthur.

A-1297509, Hing, Chow Ling or Chow Shee or Wong Chow Ling Hing or Mrs. Junng Tai Wong.

A-3210708, Hosaki, Totaro.

A-7140241, How, Louie or How Louie.

A-6694208, Hsu, Yao Tung Wu.

A-6509198, Hurtado, Felipe Dominguez or Felipe Dominguez.

A-4692608, Iacovides, Theodosios.

A-5082127, Isbell, Gertrude Hedwig Martha (nee Breuer) or Gertrude Hedwig Martha Adams.

A-6435652, Jio-Gonzalez, Ruben or Ruben Gio or Ruben Puio or Ruben Guion.

A-4187777, John, Hugo Paul.

A-5906641, John, Marcel Jean.

A-5907429, Johnson, Norma Laurine (nee Norma Laurine Shannon) formerly Norma Woofinden or Norma Arthur.

A-4649510, Kajiwara, Utako.

A-6309614, Kalisher, David.

A-7205704, Karjanis, Lee (nee Sio Lien San).

A-7991497, Kasaper, Kiyork Nabet.

A-3880753, Kerim, Demir or Damir Kerim or Dayan Dalep or Beyram Dalip.

A-7240409, Kidd, Uirike Amalie Hofer.

A-5055926, Klein, Johann.

A-1283526, Kokkolis, Panagiotis or Pete Kokkolis.

A-4978555, Krenn, Tony.

A-5974267, Kutting, Mossa.

A-7594525, Kwoh, Sih-Ung or Edwin Sih-Ung Kwon.

A-6905015, Landa, Samuel.

A-8021645, Larkin, Joyce Muriel.

A-7469583, Laudadio, Rocco.

A-7835225, Lawther, Werner Krethe formerly Werner Krethe.

A-6474031, Le Borous, Valma May.

A-4050394, Lekakis, Helen E. or Helen Leandris (nee Thibiganos Helen Gus Leandris).

A-3612342, Lee, Kok Sing.

A-7193918, Lemacks, Gisele Gabrielle formerly Lhirondelle.

A-5408671, Locher, Adolf or Adolph Paul Locher.  
 A-5379238, Locher, Emma Maria.  
 A-7044048, Lulic, Victor Benjamin or Victor B. Lulic.  
 A-6859251, Luna-Luna, Hector or Hector Salazar.  
 A-2893543, Mac Lean, James Fulton.  
 A-3018255, Madonis, Barashos Antoin or Peter Madonis Parshos or Barashos Mandonis.  
 A-7056866, Manesiots, Maria Nina, formerly Marusopoulos.  
 A-6780705, Markowitz, Irene (nee Neufeld).  
 A-1009811, Mavrogiannis, Angelos or Giannis.  
 A-9021476, Mawro, Krist Grgo or Mavro.  
 A-1627117, Mazzulla, Gertrude Barnet (nee Black).  
 A-2452703, McCord, William Samuel.  
 A-5970774, McEachon, Mary Ann (nee Williams).  
 A-4665414, Medford, Eric George.  
 A-1319482, Michaud, Dirk or Dick.  
 A-5877467, Mininni, Luigi.  
 A-1883042, Molas, Angelos, or Spyroevangelas Malataras.  
 A-7962241, Monroe, Henry Charles.  
 A-7980333, Montoya-Ramirez, Carmen.  
 A-7980332, Montoya-Ramirez, Gonzalo.  
 A-5470657, Moreno, Guadalupe vda. De Martinez.  
 A-4617917, Nakao, Mataichi.  
 A-7371653, Nalbandian, Frederik (nee Martin).  
 A-2672460, Navarreta, Salvatore, or Rocco Mollaro.  
 A-5210566, Neukum, Konrad.  
 A-5612607, Neukum, Helen.  
 A-7130886, Neukum, Elizabeth Victoria.  
 A-5640210, Niksich, Mile John.  
 A-6019389, Niles, Lyra (nee Penn).  
 A-7483180, Niphoratos, Spiros, or Spiros Nifotatos.  
 A-4685358, Norrgran, Lydia Ranghild.  
 A-4927772, Papaionnou Epaninondas Konstantine, or Pappas.  
 A-5273178, Paquette, Marie Alberta.  
 A-2792231, Pentarakionos, Markos or Markos Bentarakianos or Marcus Thomas or Marcos Thomas.  
 A-5720965, Phelan, Clara Ann (nee McCarthy) or Clara Ann Gerard.  
 A-4550272, Ponte, Severino Rilo.  
 A-3508958, Promichlansky, Klara.  
 A-4183890, Quan, Kwan Hung or Kwan Lai Hung or Kwan Yee Sun.  
 A-8001109, Quon, Chin or Charlie Chin or Chin Shew Yiou.  
 A-7864679, Raschke, Irmgard Helen Harriett.  
 A-5385101, Richter, Hans Edwin or Edwin Richter or Johannes Richter.  
 A-5111744, Robert, Balere.  
 A-2924233, Robin, Jeanette or Jennie Robnowitz.  
 A-6898531, Rojas, Melquiades Romero.  
 A-3784905, Rondini, Carmela or Carmella Camilucci Rondini.  
 A-7387531, Rubalcaba-Gutierrez, Zenaido or Epolito Reza-Gonzalez.  
 A-3715561, Sanchez, Juan.  
 A-8031686, Shay, Evelyn, Mavis.  
 A-4288667, Simko, Michael or Michael Yovnas.  
 A-5770761, Smith, Arthur Wellesley.  
 A-5282778, Smith, William Wallace Ellis.  
 A-3857451, Spangberg, Carl Arvid.  
 A-4718938, Sprovieri, Salvatore or John Sam Perri.  
 A-1305125, Stefan, Petru.  
 A-6798840, Steinberg, Lila (nee Kruszewska).  
 A-7177877, Stoll, Pamela.  
 A-4523882, Tai, Gong Hing or Gong Shee or Mrs. Hing Tai Shing.  
 A-6085947, Young Shum.  
 A-4377216, Thomas, Ethelbert Elias.  
 A-7039534, Thomasova, Donata Christina.  
 A-5764453, Tong, Lee.  
 A-3627969, Too, Sing Samm.

A-3554845, Toriihara, Fumiko or Fumiko Hirai.  
 A-4630985, Tsurudome, Hiroshi.  
 A-3404541, Tsurudome, Yaye or Yae (nee Yunoni).  
 A-3341977, Valles-Alvarez, Agustin.  
 A-4310944, Veilleux, Magloire Armida.  
 A-5918260, Vianello, Domenico Sperindeo or Domenico Vianello.  
 A-4832140, Vine, Marie Louis Benson or Mrs. Reginald Sommers or Summers.  
 A-3246562, Virgili, Andrea.  
 A-7826091, Voyce, Christine Evelyn.  
 A-5418284, Wada, Iwao.  
 A-7879632, Wang, Gung Hsing.  
 A-3870264, Wilson, Wilhelmina Anna (nee Mehner).  
 A-3199565, Wing, Choken Raise.  
 A-4684757, Wolfgarten, Johann or John Wolfgang.  
 A-7491368, Wong, Kim Tong.  
 A-3357787, Wong, Shiu Yiu.  
 A-5344488, Wright, George Fred Henry or Harry Wright.  
 A-6709273, Yu, Jung-Chien.  
 A-5374158, Zachara, Stanislaw or Stanley.  
 A-6569477, Alexas, Hariklea George.  
 A-5533704, Arnold, Arthur.  
 A-2396445, Ayala-Cortes, Froylan.  
 A-8001562, Bachman, Ada Alson or Ada Alson Tight.  
 A-8001561, Bachman, John Francis or John Tight.  
 A-5725345, Barles, Ann.  
 A-5695788, Beilin, Sonia.  
 A-4305632, Bianchi, Gaetano Carmelo.  
 A-4134714, Bires, George.  
 A-2139426, Bousoulas, John or John Evangelos or Ioannis Bousoulas.  
 A-1482700, Brander, Vera nee Jadwiga Galiski or Virginia Brander.  
 A-7847331, Brantley, Elizabeth Lucien.  
 A-2303919, Breen, Michael or Melville Borsuk.  
 A-7476981, Briones-Barrientos, Martin.  
 A-7476151, Briones Frances Hernandez de.  
 A-7999439, Bryan, Henry Tolenard.  
 A-4399177, Buttner, Harry Herbert Oscar.  
 A-4509405, Busch, Julius.  
 A-5113474, Cacciola, Giovanni.  
 A-3629914, Caravela, Manuel.  
 A-7274292, Castro, Wilfredo.  
 A-7364864, Castro, Maria Elena.  
 A-7365873, Castro, Francisca.  
 A-5954837, Cavallas, Ionnis Demetrios or John Gavalas.  
 A-7450290, Cela, Sali or Amarra Sila or Charles Schiller.  
 A-6918458, Chang, Raymond Lu Yu.  
 A-7415094, Chang, Regina Marie.  
 A-2651635, Chiang, Hwang Yung.  
 A-6420096, Chung, Ki-Kwan or Ki-Kwee Chun.  
 A-4657808, Creque, Elvin Augustus or Elwin Creque.  
 A-5998288, Creque, Idalia Sylvanita.  
 A-5653239, Dangl, Karl or Charles Denny.  
 A-3561532, De Durazo, Esperanza Diega Tyler-Chavez or Esperanza Diega Tyler de Traslavina.  
 A-5641241, De Gonzalez, Maria Salas.  
 A-7978775, De Gutierrez, Elodia Morales or Elodia Morales de Mosa or Elodia Morales de Garibay.  
 A-4787642, Dell, Susanna (nee Vogel).  
 A-5272520, De Lopez, Juana Concepcion Acost Vda.  
 A-6919715, De Lugo, Damiana Concepcion Montez.  
 A-7469556, De Medina, Amalia Martinez or Molly Martinez Medina.  
 A-7983505, De Rascon, Sofia Perez.  
 A-3446280, De Romero, Carmen Trejo-Saenz or Carmen Saenz de Romero.  
 A-7640419, De Sierra, Carina Mancebo or Carina Sierra.  
 A-4268177, De Vallejo, Jesusa Hinojosa.  
 A-2697484, Dos Santos, Jose or Joseph Santos or Dos Santos.  
 A-7463596, Eldridge, Claudi'a Tour.  
 A-4019727, Elmer, Harty Laurier.

A-6949324, Ergun, Sabri.  
 A-3834739, Ericsson, Thor Gustav.  
 A-7372121, Falter, Christel or Christel Mueller.  
 A-3273354, Felactos, Nick S.  
 A-7389936, Francone, Frank.  
 A-1134757, Friedman, Alice (nee Gold).  
 A-3195130, Fung, Jan.  
 A-7273938, Galanakis, Catina Jean.  
 A-4146757, Ganz, Valentine or Wally Ganz.  
 A-7130271, George, Peter or Panagiotis Georgiou Iosif or Panagiotis Georgiou.  
 A-3043291, Gettinger, Rifka (nee Weinrib).  
 A-5049631, Godfryd, Violet (nee Stuart).  
 A-6069444, Goodden, Alexandra or Alexandra Dickerson.  
 A-7927395, Graves, Margaret Isobel.  
 A-7978840, Greenberg, Jack.  
 A-4074268, Grinberg, Dora or Greenberg.  
 A-2474659, Grossman, Miriam.  
 A-4863957, Gutierrez-Roca, Ruben Oscar.  
 A-5505419, Gutierrez, Maria Josefa Morales de.  
 A-7445427, Habig, Frank Peter Michael.  
 A-7277540, Hamel, Marie Therese Ghislaine.  
 A-5222326, Hannivig, Linda (nee Linda Louise Phillips) alias Rose Carroll.  
 A-5476760, Huang, Paul Chang-Chih.  
 A-9671986, Hunter, Hugh Howard.  
 A-7915552, Infante, Giuseppe.  
 A-4972756, Jamieson, Lillian Edeline (Edna) Ruth.  
 A-5416948, Jansch, Karl Ernest.  
 A-4557518, Jensen, Alice Erna (nee Shawcross) or Alice Erna Shawcross Panette.  
 A-7982541, Joe, Barbara Pao-Ying Chan or Barbara Pao-Ying Chan or Barbara Chan.  
 A-2241075, Johansson, Hedvig Elisabet.  
 A-7450417, Judice, Elvira.  
 A-4538554, Kampetsis, George.  
 A-5541308, Kelemecky, Mary or Marishka Kelemecky (nee Zwillinger).  
 A-8001105, Kincaid, Robert George alias Hanns George Stahl.  
 A-1283525, Kokolis, Androgianos Soterios or Androgianos Sam Kokolis.  
 A-3525155, Kosciow, George.  
 A-5794313, Kostelac, Nilola.  
 A-3483906, Krause Sonia (nee Globerson) or Sonia Krutchik.  
 A-3482042, Krause, Herman or Krutchik.  
 A-1419929, Laes, Eleonore Juliane, formerly Tiisma (nee Eleonore Juliane Randorf).  
 A-3439242, LaVega, Lolita De alias Dolores Bravo Yanez.  
 A-3484114, La Vega, Jose De or Jose De La Vega Ruiz.  
 A-7367020, Lee, Chi Yuan.  
 A-7193917, Lemacks, Jackie Pierre formerly Lhironnelle.  
 A-5280689, Lenetsky, Fred or Fred Lenett.  
 A-7982152, Leonard, Henry Osborne.  
 A-7957312, Leung, Dot alias Leung King Do.  
 A-4447058, Lipkus, Lena (nee Libka Puszefsky) alias Libko Richefsky.  
 A-5054348, Lowe, Mary (nee Jansa).  
 A-5054349, Lowe, Thomas Walker.  
 A-7031238, Lowe, Vivian Valerie.  
 A-6054492, Lucido-Aguilar, Angel Francisco.  
 A-8015826, Lui, Coon alias Goon Lui alias Chong Louie.  
 A-2736882, Madsen, Robert Angelov.  
 A-5369683, Marketos, Angelos Haralambos.  
 A-5435529, Marshall, George Henry.  
 A-9825369, McCormick, James Hilbert.  
 A-5801734, McLellan, Daniel.  
 A-4597364, McLellan, Mary.  
 A-4346684, Michalovic, Fantizek alias Frank Michalovic.  
 A-7267742, Miranda, Nelson.  
 A-3323703, Morais, Duarte Seabra.  
 A-3561589, Morett, Angelina Eva (nee Trasilvina).  
 A-7821135, Muratis, John Stylianios.  
 A-6739614, Nadeau, Christiane Helena or Christiane Spingaerd Nadeau.  
 A-4054890, Naeyaert, Marguerite.

A-3373711, Nelson, Egil Hans.  
 A-2474658, Nemoy, Margery.  
 A-4002895, Nicholas, Athanasios Nicholaos.  
 A-2747140, Omachi, Tsuku.  
 A-7367024, Ortega-Rodriguez, Rafael.  
 A-3759192, Pardo, Henry Vasquez or Enrique Vasquez-Pablo.  
 A-4701047, Peillini, Attilio.  
 A-7978974, Pennington, Adolphus Barry alias Barry Pennington.  
 A-4439971, Perfetti, Marco Michael alias Caspare Corsi.  
 A-3179978, Perez, Ursula Monica.  
 A-7984786, Perez, Juana Francisca Gonzalez De.  
 A-8017514, Perez-Castillo, Maximino.  
 A-7984763, Perez-Gonzalez, Felipe.  
 A-5693987, Pineda, Maurilio or Maurilio Pineda Sanchez.  
 A-4399528, Polydor, Charlie J. or Theophilus Jerry Polydoros.  
 A-4622799, Prehn, Anna (nee Kettner) formerly Strauss.  
 A-7140739, Puskaritz, Justina alias Mary Angela Marcks.  
 A-2310519, Radosevich, Charles Joseph alias Joseph Charles Radosevich.  
 A-6389821, Rao, Sanadi Dattatreya.  
 A-7115201, Reid, Dorothy Ann.  
 A-5082673, Reid, Joseph Francis.  
 A-7178066, Rios-Pena, Andres.  
 A-5421022, Rodriguez-Benites, Jenadio.  
 A-4707387, Rubin, Esther.  
 A-8015271, Russell, Brenda Valeria.  
 A-3359625, Sakihara, Ikuromi alias John Sakihara.  
 A-1416420, Sakur, Samat Pary.  
 A-7358559, Sankey, Orville David Joseph.  
 A-4528629, Senesi, John or Jan or Josef or Jozef Senesi.  
 A-7948706, Sham, Kung.  
 A-7438930, Shepard, Wolfram Werner or Wolfram Werner Schlicht.  
 A-7115200, Sheppard, Rebecca Cohen.  
 A-5393248, Silva, Augusto Luz.  
 A-5404553, Srimmimo, Frances Donahue.  
 A-4188714, Smith, Vera alias Glekeria Kit-sul alias Vera Cossack alias Vera Kitzul alias Vera Kitsel.  
 A-5597753, Spaulding, Myrta Louise.  
 A-4870986, Strassman, Hirsch.  
 A-4940039, Suarez Juan De Dios Alvarez.  
 A-4367483, Sumampow, Philip or Hassan Bin Sumampow or Hassan Bin Sambang.  
 A-2949357, Tai, Suekichi.  
 A-2948231, Teixeira, Augusto Martins.  
 A-8021681, Thomas, Randolph.  
 A-7962124, Trejo, Vicenta.  
 A-7962125, Trejo, Maria Ausilio Haro.  
 A-5876019, Tzetzias, Epamindondas Dimitrios alias Paul Georgis.  
 A-4863022, Valdez-Nuncio, Raymunda.  
 A-7476651, Valerino, Vincenza Parelio.  
 A-4268179, Vallejo-Hernandez, Antonio.  
 A-4679896, Vaz, Francisco Maria alias Juan Antonio Carranone.  
 A-2772267, Veis, Hassim alias Sam Veis alias Assim Veis alias Hassim Bekolli Veis.  
 A-3256738, Vlisdides, Nicholas Zanne or Polites.  
 A-7848405, Vogt, George.  
 A-6576413, Voutyras, Kyriakos Constantine.  
 A-9764898, Vurgun, Hasan Hayri or Bill Hayri or Bill Vurgun or Hayri Vurgun.  
 A-7128707, Watson, June Eileen.  
 A-6972998, Way, Huie Tai.  
 A-5461080, Webster, Felicia Grace (nee Hoffman) formerly O'Neill.  
 A-8021499, Westerman, Elsie Josephine alias Elsie J. Chapman.  
 A-4598119, White, Anna Julian.  
 A-3863628, White, Gladstone Joseph, alias Ziggy White.  
 A-9767795, Wilk, John Hilmar.  
 A-1558566, Williams, Rafael Torsten, alias Rafael Torsten Lindquist.  
 A-7821930, Wilson, Brian Douglas, formerly Maurice Guilmont.  
 A-7983226, Woo, Carole Kwan.  
 A-8021646, Wright, Florence Louise Wright (nee Kilpatrick).

A-7283661, Xydias, Maria Emmanuel (nee Chryssakis) (Hrisakis).  
 A-8039500, Yee, Frank Hung Jen.  
 A-7222512, Yu, Thomas Ho-Lung.  
 A-5395963, Zutshi, Triloki Nath, alias Nath Zutshi Tirloki.  
 A-3855823, Amourgis, Christos or Christ Amour.  
 A-5464060, De Zavadski, Joseph or Giuseppe.  
 A-2423555, Spigai, Attilio Oreste or Apigai Attilio.  
 A-5056170, Embiricos, Andrew Michael.  
 A-550963, Katzenmayer, Jacob.  
 A-5500964, Katzenmayer, Katherine (nee Stricel).  
 A-6682185, Schulgasser, Lew or Lew Shulgasser.  
 A-6675072, Schulgasser, Luba or Luba Schulgasser (nee Golante).  
 A-5205272, Embericos, Ecaterina Mihail or Catherine Nina Embiricos.  
 A-9764776, Xydias, Peter or Panagiotes Xideas or Panagiotis Xydias.  
 A-7203946, Croy, Frances Ada or Frances Morton or Frances Manning or Anna Hall.  
 A-3450155, Stolz, Margaret Lily or Margaret Egerer (nee Margaret Karner).  
 A-5238396, Kopsinis, Peter or Panagiots Kopsinis.  
 A-6359300, Fong, Rosa An (nee Rosa An Gonzalez).  
 A-6535699, Hadjipateras, Constantin John or Constantinos Hadjipateras or Costis Ioannis Hadjipateras.  
 A-6897748, Lentakis, John Elias or Jean Elie Lentakis.  
 A-6005501, Chu, Florence Chien-Hwa.  
 A-6994582, Tung, Pao Chi or Percy Pacchi Tung.  
 A-5357472, Grosara, Antonio or Nino Criman.  
 A-7802711, Lisotto, Vittorio Americo.

#### REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation four lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2984. A bill to amend subdivision (b) of section 61 of the National Defense Act to extend its provisions until December 31, 1954, and to permit the States at any time during that period to organize and maintain military forces at cadre strengths in addition to the National Guard, even if no part of the National Guard is in active Federal Service; and

S. 2985. A bill to amend the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, with respect to the system of courts-martial for the National Guard and the Air National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. IVES when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 2986. A bill to prohibit the procurement for the Armed Forces of any article produced in, or imported from, Communist controlled countries; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request):

S. 2987. A bill to increase the efficiency of the Federal Government by improving the training of Federal civilian officers and employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 2988. A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act of 1951; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2989. A bill for the relief of Commander John J. O'Donnell, United States Naval Reserve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. J. Res. 148. Joint resolution to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until July 1, 1952; reported by Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCARRAN, when he reported the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

#### MAINTENANCE OF STATE GUARD ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend subdivision (b) of section 61 of the National Defense Act to extend its provisions until December 31, 1954, and to permit the States at any time during that period to organize and maintain military forces at cadre strengths in addition to the National Guard, even if no part of the National Guard is in active Federal service. I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2984) to amend subdivision (b) of section 61 of the National Defense Act to extend its provisions until December 31, 1954, and to permit the States at any time during that period to organize and maintain military forces at cadre strengths in addition to the National Guard, even if no part of the National Guard is in active Federal service, introduced by Mr. IVES was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The statement presented by Mr. IVES is as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES IN CONNECTION WITH A BILL WHICH WOULD EXTEND THE RIGHT OF STATES UNTIL DECEMBER 31, 1954, TO MAINTAIN STATE GUARD ORGANIZATIONS

The bill amends subdivision (b) of section 61 of the National Defense Act, extends its provisions until December 31, 1954, and permits the States at any time during that period to organize and maintain military forces at cadre strengths in addition to the National Guard, even if no part of the National Guard is in active Federal service.

Subsection (b) was added to section 61 of the National Defense Act by Public Law 849, Eighty-first Congress, approved September 27, 1950. It authorized the States to organize and maintain military forces (State guards) other than the National Guard while any part of the National Guard was in active Federal service. It was made effective for 2 years from the date of approval of the act. It therefore expires on September 27, 1952.

As authorized by the act, Governor Dewey reactivated the New York Guard in 1950 and directed that it be organized on a cadre basis pending induction of either one of the major New York National Guard units into active Federal service, i. e., the Twenty-seventh Infantry Division (up-State) and the Forty-second Infantry Division (in New York City and the metropolitan area). Thereafter cadres for 39 internal security and supporting battalions of the New York Guard were organized throughout the State. The total strength of those cadres is now approximately 729 officers and 308 enlisted men.

These men are patriotic citizens and take an active and enthusiastic interest in their military pursuits. They receive no pay or other emoluments. They meet regularly and are capable of rapid expansion to full strength in case of mobilization of the National Guard.

While the likelihood of such mobilization is not quite so acute at the present time as it appeared to be in 1950, there is no assurance that the situation will not worsen in the future. Certainly, the authority to maintain these forces should be continued for at least two more years. The next Congress can reappraise the situation in 1954.

Subsection (b) of section 61 authorizes the maintenance of the State guard only while any part of the National Guard of the particular State is in active Federal service. Roughly 20 percent of the New York National Guard is now in Federal service but the terms of active service of the bulk of these men will expire before December 31, 1954. If all of the National Guard are returned from Federal service, a strict interpretation of the Federal statute might require the New York Guard cadres to be disbanded.

The loyal and devoted services of the members of these cadres should not be treated like a faucet to be turned on and off at will. If they are disbanded and thereafter a new emergency arises, an appeal would have to be made to them to return to service again.

This is not only unfair to them, but the international situation has not improved to the extent that such a disbandment is wise, even if the entire National Guard has returned to State service.

During the next 2 years at least, or until December 31, 1954, which is what the bill provides, authority should be given to the States to maintain their State guards in cadre strength, even if no part of their National Guard remains in active Federal service.

#### COURTS MARTIAL FOR NATIONAL GUARD AND AIR NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, with respect to the system of courts martial for the National Guard and the Air National Guard. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me explaining the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2985) to amend the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, with respect to the system of courts martial for the National Guard and the Air National Guard, introduced by Mr. IVES, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The statement presented by Mr. IVES is as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES IN CONNECTION WITH A BILL TO AMEND THE NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT OF JUNE 3, 1916, WITH RESPECT TO THE SYSTEM OF COURTS MARTIAL FOR THE NATIONAL GUARD AND THE AIR NATIONAL GUARD

The bill to amend sections 102-108 of the National Defense Act relating to National Guard courts martial is intended to remove all doubt as to the legality of a State code of military justice.

It was the intent of the founding fathers that the National and State Governments should work together in making the organized militia a national force as well as a State force—in other words, exactly what it is—a dual status force. In fact—the militia clause of the Constitution is unique in that it is the only clause in the Constitution which imposes a dual responsibility on State and Nation to work together. It is up to the Federal authorities to do their part to make it work and it is up to the States to make sure that they do their share. One way for the States to do this is to see that their military court system functions along the lines of the Federal Code and manual with such changes as may be necessary to adapt it to State needs. The State of New York is doing this in its proposed new State code of military justice.

Practically all the States have court-martial systems under State codes or laws which follow closely the Federal system and which carry out the general intent of the National Defense Act as to punishments even though some States such as Missouri prescribe punishments not specified in the National Defense Act. The intent of the Federal law is that for offenses committed by National Guard men in their armory drill status, they should suffer limited punishments, the maximum fine and jail sentence under the act being \$200 fine or 200 days in jail.

Unfortunately, the National Defense Act would seem to authorize National Guard courts at all times, i. e., in an armory drill or field training status as well as on active State duty, to try all offenses including the heinous crimes which are also offenses under civil law, such as murder, manslaughter, etc. Accordingly, if the National Defense Act provisions are followed literally, a National Guard man could be tried by court martial for manslaughter committed during an armory drill or during summer camp, when he is still essentially a civilian, drilling only 2 hours per week and attending camp for 2 weeks during the summer. He should be subject to trial for military offenses only, and not heinous crimes, when he is in armory drill or summer training status.

On the other hand, when he is on active State duty with his unit under orders of the Governor in case of invasion, insurrection, disaster, etc., the National Guard man should be subject to trial for all crimes and offenses including murder, manslaughter, and the rest, the same as a soldier on active Federal duty. But the National Defense Act gives the same limited punishments, which were obviously meant to apply only to military offenses, for heinous crimes. The result is that a National Guard man could be convicted by court martial of manslaughter and receive a \$200 fine or 200 days in jail, whereas in a civil court and under the Federal Uniform Code of Military Justice he could receive a sentence of 10 to 20 years.

A new State code of military justice has been proposed for New York and has been introduced in the legislature. The new code follows the outline of the Federal Uniform Code of Military Justice but adapts it to the needs of the State's military forces. Some of the language of the Federal Code is not applicable to the State or the State's forces;

yet, the present New York military law incorporates into State law by reference all the provisions of the Federal Code except those relating to punishments and except any which conflict with State law. This is hardly a satisfactory way to establish the jurisdiction of military courts or to write a penal statute into law whereunder men can be sentenced to jail among other punishments. The offenses for which a National Guard man can be tried by court martial and the other aspects of the jurisdiction and procedure of State courts martial should be spelled out in State law so that a person can read it all there, without reference to any Federal statute or regulations.

This has been done in the bill introduced in the New York Legislature. The provisions of the Federal Code which heretofore have been interpreted by State administrative regulations to be applicable to the State's forces have been clearly spelled out and written into the proposed new State code.

The new State code does not go off on a sharp tangent from the Federal Code at any point. In the interest of uniformity which is proper, the State code follows closely, section by section, the articles of the Federal Code. It varies only where the Federal Code is obviously inapplicable to the State's forces. For example, there is no need for a State court of military appeals as provided in the Federal Code. In lieu of this, a review or appeal procedure from State court-martial sentences has been set up. It would be virtually impossible to make the language of the Federal Code fit the State's needs in this regard. Henceforth, all provisions pertaining to military justice will be spelled out in the State law, instead of relying on interpretations made by virtue of an incorporation by reference of the Federal Code.

This would be the end of the matter, except for another factor. It is that the National Defense Act of 1916 (secs. 102-108; 32 U. S. C. 92-98) contains provisions specifically relating to National Guard courts martial.

These provisions were not brought up to date when the Federal Uniform Code of Military Justice was adopted in 1950. For example, they do not include authority to general and special courts martial to impose a bad-conduct discharge in addition to a dishonorable discharge. There are other points where the National Defense Act provisions are out of date. If these provisions are construed to be constitutionally binding upon the States, it would be incumbent upon the State to follow the letter of the National Defense Act provisions, particularly as to punishments. Many States, however, look upon these provisions of the National Defense Act as unconstitutional and contend that National Guard courts martial when the National Guard is not in Federal service are State courts, whose jurisdiction cannot be prescribed by Congress. New York State does not go along with that contention.

It is apparent that the National Defense Act provisions were not well thought out back in 1916. New York State, which did have proper distinctions in its military law prior to that time based on whether the National Guard man was in a drill status or on active full-time State duty, merely followed blindly the National Defense Act provisions when that law was enacted by Congress.

The State's military justice system should not continue in the days to come to rest upon such a shaky foundation. The proposed State code helps to remedy the condition, but the job will not be complete until the National Defense Act provisions are amended to remove any question of conflict between Federal law and State law.

The proposed State code takes away the jurisdiction of State courts martial to try men for certain heinous crimes committed while in an armory drill or summer-camp

status. It retains the jurisdiction of said courts to try men for such offenses committed while on active State duty under orders of the governor, and also retains the limited punishments contained in the National Defense Act of a maximum \$200 fine or 200 days in jail. To be consistent, it should permit such courts to impose the same scale of punishments for offenses committed on active State duty that are imposed by Federal courts martial.

However, the new State code, while correcting certain variances between the Federal Code and the National Defense Act provisions (e. g., by giving general and special courts martial the right to impose a bad-conduct discharge) does not go so far as to increase the jail sentences for offenses committed while on active State duty to those imposed under the Federal Code.

This, it was felt, had better await amendment of the National Defense Act. This bill and its companion measure, H. R. 6592, introduced in the House by Congressman RADWAN, are intended to make such action possible, and generally to remove all doubt as to the legality of all the provisions of the new State code.

The simplest way to accomplish the desired end, and the method adopted in this bill and H. R. 6592, is to amend section 102, N. D. A. (32 U. S. C. 92) to permit any State or Territory to adopt its own code or law pertaining to military justice the provisions of which would be controlling. This avoids any constitutional debate with those States which have adopted their own code. If any State has not adopted a code or law on this subject the National Defense Act provisions would control. They also should remain on the books as a guide to what Congress deems desirable in the interest of uniformity especially with respect to punishments to be meted out for offenses committed while in an armory-drill or field-training status.

There is no need to fear lack of cooperation by the States in this regard. As stated earlier, practically all of them have followed faithfully the forms and modes of procedure of and the jurisdiction given to Federal courts martial. Substantial uniformity prevails throughout the States. Their codes should not be open to question because of possible conflict with the National Defense Act.

#### ACCEPTANCE OF STATUES OF DR. JOHN MCLOUGHLIN AND REV. JASON LEE FROM STATE OF OREGON

Mr. MORSE submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 70), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),* That the statues of Dr. John McLoughlin and the Reverend Jason Lee, presented by the State of Oregon, one to be placed in Statuary Hall, are accepted in the name of the United States, and that the thanks of the Congress be tendered said State for the contribution of the statues of two of its most eminent citizens, Dr. McLoughlin, illustrious as a great humanitarian, and first to govern the Oregon Country, who often is called the Father of Oregon, and Rev. Lee, illustrious as the first missionary and colonizer in the Oregon Country; and be it further

*Resolved,* That a copy of these resolutions, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, be transmitted to the Governor of Oregon.

#### TEMPORARY PLACEMENT IN ROTUNDA OF STATUES OF DR. JOHN MCLOUGHLIN AND REV. JASON LEE, OF OREGON

Mr. MORSE submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. 71), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),* That the Oregon Statuary Committee is hereby authorized to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol the statues of the late Dr. John McLoughlin and the Reverend Jason Lee, of Oregon, and to hold ceremonies in the rotunda on said occasion; and the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to make the necessary arrangements therefor; and be it further

*Resolved,* That one statue shall be permanently located in Statuary Hall.

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM FOR STUDY OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the recent outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Canada has again focused the attention of Americans to the great potential threat that this disease poses to our national food supply. An epidemic in our own land would be a disaster, not only from an economic standpoint but also from the standpoint of our relative defense posture.

So far the only means we have found for controlling the spread of this disease has been the isolation of disease areas and the destruction of affected animals. We know from long experience that such isolation is, at best, a tenuous protection.

The only real measure of protection from foot-and-mouth disease would be the discovery of methods whereby the disease itself can be prevented. Science has made giant strides in all branches, and it is reasonable to believe that the establishment of research facilities for the study of foot-and-mouth disease would be the best means of developing the kind of protective measures we need.

I send to the desk for appropriate reference a resolution which would authorize the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to examine the problem and to submit to the Senate by June 1, 1952, a coordinated plan for the establishment, administration, and financing of a foot-and-mouth laboratory. Although authority exists under law for the establishment of such a facility by the Secretary of Agriculture, I believe the matter should be made more specific by law. No body is better qualified to prepare such a plan than is the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The resolution (S. Res. 301), submitted by Mr. CAIN, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Whereas outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease among cattle have repeatedly posed a great threat to the animal-raising industry of the United States; and

Whereas this threat is again exemplified by the recent outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Canada; and

Whereas the attempt to isolate disease-stricken areas is, at best, a difficult and uncertain protection; and

Whereas the best remedy for the problem is the establishment of research facilities looking toward a scientific preventative or cure of foot-and-mouth disease: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation and study for the purpose of determining what legislation would be needed to establish and finance a Federal program, together with any needed research facilities, for the study of foot-and-mouth disease for the purpose of finding preventatives or cures for such disease.

*Sec. 2.* The committee shall report its findings together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable to the Senate not later than June 1, 1952.

*Sec. 3.* For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$ , shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

#### RULES FOR OPERATION OF IRREGULAR COMMON CARRIERS BY MOTOR VEHICLE—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2358) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act by establishing certain rules for the operation of irregular common carriers by motor vehicle, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

#### ANNUITY TO WIDOWS OF JUDGES—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 16) to provide for payment of an annuity to widows of judges, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

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

H. R. 156. An act to repeal the Alaska railroads tax;

H. R. 5998. An act to amend the excise tax on photographic apparatus;

H. R. 7188. An act to provide that the additional tax imposed by section 2470 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code shall not apply in respect of coconut oil produced in, or produced from materials grown in, the Territory of the Pacific Islands; and

H. R. 7189. An act to amend the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which relate to machine guns and short-barreled firearms, so as to impose a tax on the making of sawed-off shotguns and to extend such provisions to Alaska and Hawaii, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 4764. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the participation of certain Provinces of the Dominion of Canada in the Northeastern Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact, and for other purposes; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

**PRINTING OF MONOGRAPH ON THE FORESTS OF WYOMING (S. DOC. NO. 117)**

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have consulted the majority leader, the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND]; the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]; and the minority leader, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], in respect to the monograph I have before me, on the forests of the State of Wyoming. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed as a Senate document. It is less than 50 pages in length, and therefore comes within the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

**NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ERNEST A. TOLIN TO BE DISTRICT JUDGE FOR SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, April 17, 1952, at 9 a. m., in room 229, in the Federal Building, Los Angeles, Calif., upon the nomination of Hon. Ernest A. Tolin, of California, to be United States district judge for the southern district of California. Judge Tolin is now serving under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

**ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX**

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. KILGORE:

Text of radio interview conducted by him with Dr. Hugh H. Bennett on the subject Soil Conservation and West Virginia Farm Prosperity.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address entitled "Immigration and Freedom," delivered by him in New York City, April 5, 1952, before a forum sponsored by the National Democratic Club.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

Personal report to the people of North Dakota, written by Senator YOUNG, dated April 2, 1952.

By Mr. TOBEY:

Statement by Cassius M. Clay to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, regarding RFC loans to the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad.

By Mr. AIKEN:

Article entitled "Youth Makes World of Friendship," written by Robert Terry, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of April 7, 1952.

By Mr. IVES:

Editorial entitled "Eisenhower as a Military Man," published in the Washington Post of April 8, 1952.

Article entitled "Fiasco," written by Walter Lippmann, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of April 7, 1952.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

Article entitled "Cost of Government Exceeds Savings," published in the Life Insurance Courant of April 1952.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Editorial entitled "The People Couldn't Lose," published in the Charlottesville (Va.) Daily Progress.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Article entitled "The Foreign Aid Bill," reprinted in the Christian Science Monitor from Business Week.

Article entitled "I Appeal to 531 Modern Kings—Help Save World Peace," written by Clarence Poe, president and editor of the Progressive Farmer.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

Speech delivered by Senator GILLETTE before the District Democratic Club on April 6, 1952.

By Mr. CAIN:

Address on the subject America's Position on the International Front—As I See It, delivered by Hugh G. Grant, at the annual meeting of the Georgia Press Institute, at the University of Georgia, February 21, 1951.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

Letter addressed to him by Anna M. Rosenberg, Assistant Secretary of Defense, concerning alcoholism among soldiers in Germany.

By Mr. TOBEY:

Copies of correspondence between himself and the attorney general of California and members of certain medical associations.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

Editorial entitled "Anticlimax," relating to the Truman-McGrath conflict, published in the Washington Post April 6, 1952.

By Mr. MORSE:

Address by Miss Dolores M. Gottfried, of Salem, Oreg., winner of Oregon Voice of Democracy Contest, and a newspaper article announcing her award.

Poem entitled "In re the Bryson-Kefauver Juke-Box Bill," written by Miss Flora E. Breck, of Portland, Oreg.

**NAVAL RECRUIT TRAINING**

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address the Senate for not exceeding 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Maryland is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Last Saturday I had the privilege of being the reviewing officer in the graduation exercises at the United States Naval Training Center, Bainbridge, Md. During the course of the exercises, I saw men and women who 10 weeks ago were civilians execute most difficult drill maneuvers and demonstrate other military attainments. I think that is a great tribute to the commandant of the Fifth Naval Dis-

trict, and also to the commanding officer of the training center, which during the year it has been operating has graduated 33,000 persons.

I wish to take this opportunity to say that I believe Capt. R. H. Smith, United States Navy, commander, naval training center, and Capt. F. Wolsieffer, United States Navy, commanding officer, recruit training command, and all those associated with them, deserve great credit for the fine work they are doing for our young men and young women at that station, and I heartily commend them.

**EVALUATION OF FISCAL REQUIREMENTS OF EXECUTIVE AGENCIES—AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946**

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 913) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for the more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute to Senate bill 913.

Mr. STENNIS obtained the floor.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief observation, inasmuch as I am chairman of the committee and in charge of the bill.

So far as I am able to ascertain, there will be only two or three general speeches this afternoon in favor of the bill. We should be able to start voting on amendments within an hour on such a matter, and then proceed to a final vote on the bill today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no amendment pending except a committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. A number of amendments have been printed and are lying on the table, but they have not actually been offered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understand that they will be offered. I thought it well to make the announcement that we expect to conclude consideration of the bill this afternoon.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I read in the press that the Senator from Arkansas intended to accept a couple of amendments to the bill. I was wondering what they may be.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am going to accept the amendment of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], which strikes out the paragraph designated "(j)" on page 16.

Mr. AIKEN. Would that still leave in the bill the provision that the membership of the proposed committee shall consist of members from the four committees to which reference has been made?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Vermont that since the committee approved the bill in that form, as chairman of the committee I should not feel at liberty to accept an amendment making any change in that respect. That is a matter which will have to address itself to the Senate. I prefer that the Senate take action. As I pointed out yesterday, and as the Senator will observe from the original bill, I introduced the bill with the provision that membership on the proposed joint committee should consist of members of the Appropriations Committees only. However, since my committee reported the bill with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, of course, I feel obligated to support the position of the committee.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator's first idea was undoubtedly best, and would lead to considerably less confusion and duplication.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I assume that such an amendment will have to be voted on by the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. I hope the Senate will make the change suggested.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I believe that the proper name for the bill under consideration would be "the necessary congressional working tool." I am supporting Senate bill 913 because of my experiences growing out of my connection with the Appropriations Committee. Even though I have never been a member of that great committee, I have been an ex officio member of one of its subcommittees, namely, the Subcommittee on Army Civil Functions.

Before I proceed further I wish to pay special tribute to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] for his long, faithful, diligent, and conscientious work on this subject as he tried to cope with one of the practical problems confronting the Congress. I think he has brought forth a bill the reasonable operation of which would go a long way toward meeting the practical conditions which we must combat.

I shall support Senate bill 913, to create a Joint Committee on the Budget. During the time I have been in the Congress I have been greatly impressed by the almost impossible task which confronts the Appropriations Committees in their consideration of the thousands of items of detailed expenditures of more than 60 agencies comprising the executive branch of the Federal Government. It has not been my privilege to be a regular member of the Appropriations Committee, but I have served for more than 3 years as an ex officio member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Army Civil Functions. I know from direct observation that it is absolutely impossible for the 21 Senators who com-

prise the Appropriations Committee to give adequate and appropriate attention to a \$80,000,000,000 budget. It simply cannot be done under the present system, even if these 21 Senators give these matters their entire attention night and day. Incidentally, the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee labor long and faithfully and endlessly, trying to cover the innumerable responsibilities of their stupendous task. I happen to know that last year in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill alone, there were 1,863 separate activities for consideration. Indicating the vast range of programs involved, I understand the Treasury Department has 5,000 major accounts against which more than 300,000,000 checks are drawn each year.

#### BUDGET GROWTH

The budget has grown in the last 30 years from less than \$4,000,000,000 for the fiscal year 1923 to more than \$85,000,000,000 during the fiscal year 1953, and the budget document itself has grown to where it now consists of 1,786 printed pages. It is now larger than the average metropolitan telephone book and consists of thousands of detailed budget items.

The Congress has provided the executive branch with adequate machinery to evaluate its programs and to prepare and submit budget estimates to the legislative branch for action, but it has woefully neglected to establish a corresponding agency to serve its own needs.

In 1921 the General Accounting Office was created completely independent of the executive branch so that the Congress would have some agency to check on expenditures of the Federal Government after they had been made. There were then a total of seven employees on the staff of each of the Committees on Appropriations to check on the allocation of funds before they were spent.

The Congress also granted to the President on June 10, 1921, authority to submit an annual budget to the Congress, together with his estimates of receipts, expenditures, and other budgetary data. This act created the Bureau of the Budget, which was then located in the Department of the Treasury, under the direction of the President. Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1939 transferred the Bureau of the Budget from the Treasury Department to the Executive Office of the President. Today the Bureau of the Budget consists of approximately 500 trained and experienced fiscal personnel who provide the President with the essential information he needs to properly and adequately present the fiscal aspects of programs administered by the executive branch of the Government to the Congress in support of his annual appropriation requests.

In addition to these legislative steps, the Congress has taken other important steps to improve the fiscal structure of the executive branch. In 1950 it approved the Budget and Accounting Procedure Act, the Post Office Financial Control Act, and acts improving the financial operations of the Department of Defense and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. Some of these enact-

ments were in line with recommendations of the Hoover Commission, and as I understand have improved and supplemented previous enactments, which have resulted in vastly improved financial controls in the executive branch of Government.

#### CONGRESS NEEDS AID

I feel that the Congress must have the necessary working tools to develop the facts that pertain to the needs and operations of various governmental programs and that these facts should be developed from the viewpoint of the Congress, which carries the full responsibilities in our form of government in matters of taxation and appropriations. This bill, S. 913, before the Senate today is not the complete answer of course, but it is certainly a step in the right direction and a necessary step. There is another remedy, and perhaps this is the only certain remedy, and this will be a taxpayers revolution; and this is exactly what is going to happen unless we make these appropriation reductions in a systematic way that will retain the necessary and essential parts of the governmental programs on a sound basis. This revolution of which I speak will follow orderly processes, the principal step of which will be to sweep a Congress out of office which does not use every diligent effort to eliminate unnecessary expenditures.

There are some who believe that the Congress should merely appropriate the money for the use of the executive branch, and that they should be permitted to administer and spend these funds where and how they may determine without interference, guidance, or control. This thinking has largely grown out of the fact that the Congress has failed to carry out its constitutional authority over the control of the purse. With the tremendous increases in taxes that have become necessary incident to the World Wars and the present defense effort, Congress must reestablish its position as the guardian of the public purse. The people of this country have a right to expect each member they elect to the Senate or the House of Representatives to use every possible diligence in eliminating unnecessary expenditures so that every possible tax dollar may be utilized in the defense effort which is so essential to the welfare of the Nation at this time. The people want their government to function, but they do not want to pay \$2 in tax money when \$1 will do.

There are a total of 29 persons presently employed on the staff of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, including 8 on its "watchdog subcommittee," and 36 on the staff of the House Committee on Appropriations.

In other words, Mr. President, 65 employees of the two committees guide Congress, and Congress has the sole responsibility for the expenditure of the \$85,000,000,000. Only 65 employees help Members of Congress say grace over an \$85,000,000,000 budget. It is not within the realm of human capability to perform such a task.

#### CONTRAST IN STAFFS

Thus, it is seen that while the tremendous demands on Government have in-

creased to the extent that it requires a staff of 500 trained and experienced personnel working 12 months in the year, regarding the budget as prepared by the executive department of the Government, we have increased the staff of the Appropriations Committee during this same period of time from 14 employees to 57, some of whom are on a temporary loan basis from the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. President, let me make doubly clear that there is certainly no reflection on the ability or the capacity of any member of the present staffs of these committees. According to my actual observation of staff members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I do not believe persons can be found who would do superior work; they do a remarkable job far beyond the call of duty and are highly efficient. There are no clock watchers among them. However, they do not have the time, the facilities, nor the opportunity to cover the field work that I think is absolutely essential if the Congress is to perform its proper functions in appropriating money.

Let us daily remember, Mr. President, that the Constitution of the United States puts the sole responsibility for the laying of taxes and the making of appropriations on the Congress, thus placing the representatives of the people in control of the Government by controlling the purse strings. The responsibility rests solely with the Congress.

Mr. President, I emphasize that point because I know we are feeling the tremendous impact of the huge defense spending program. We must not lull ourselves into the feeling that, after all, we are not responsible for this money, that it must go for defense, and we therefore do not have to look at these appropriations as closely as we otherwise would.

As a practical matter, however, the Congress has in part lost the control of its own fiscal affairs because of the immensity of the governmental operations and the present lack of facilities to cope with the conditions that confront us in making appropriations.

We are now into the fourth month of the session that is scheduled to end near the 1st of July. Appropriation bills are being sent over from the House of Representatives which carry reductions below the budget estimates amounting to hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars. Naturally the heads of various departments and bureaus will defend their departments before the Senate Appropriations Committee and testify ably in behalf of a restoration of these funds. This will be virtually all the testimony that the Senate Appropriations Committee will have on the subject except in isolated instances. The committee will not have the benefit of trained field men who have on-the-ground knowledge of the programs gained and presented as representatives of the committee. In other words, so far as the testimony in the case is concerned, Congress will not be represented and it is too late now to send personnel into the field to determine the actual facts.

Mr. President, I remember that one year when I was a member of the sub-

committee 454 witnesses appeared before the subcommittee either in person or by submitting statements. Four hundred and fifty-three of those witnesses testified in favor of increased appropriations. Only one witness was opposed to an increase in the appropriations. That is a fair indication of the trend of testimony before the committees, and such testimony is all that is available to the committees and the Congress unless Congress develops a staff of its own, sufficiently large in size and with sufficient training and ability to be able to obtain the facts from the standpoint of the Congress and to have an on-the-ground knowledge of the facts. If Congress obtains the facts, it will be able to arrive at fair judgment regarding the action it should take.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Has it not been the observation of the Senator from Mississippi that, in the natural course of events, those who want appropriations made are the ones who interest themselves in such matters and take the time and trouble to come before the committees to plead for appropriations, whereas the average citizen relies upon his representatives in Congress to obtain the necessary information and to act judiciously on the basis of it?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Arkansas is eminently correct. At the present time those of us who serve in Congress are without the tools we need if we are properly to represent the public in these matters.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to permit me to ask another question?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; I am very glad to yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yesterday the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], expressed some doubt about the bill, implying that he entertained some fears that the bill, when enacted, might detract from the prestige, influence, or responsibility of the Appropriations Committees as they now are constituted. I know that is not the intent of the bill; and I wonder whether the Senator from Mississippi, who has studied the bill, can read into it anything which in any way would impair the effectiveness of the Appropriations Committees; or does the Senator from Mississippi find that, instead of impairing their effectiveness and importance, the bill would augment, fortify, and strengthen the power, effectiveness, and importance of the Appropriations Committees?

Mr. STENNIS. I am certain in my own mind that the bill, when enacted, will facilitate the performance by the Appropriations Committees of their highly important duties. The proposed joint committee would be a subordinate working tool of the Appropriations Committees, and is designed as such, and the bill is drawn up on that basis. I am sure that will be the practical effect of the bill when it is in operation.

Mr. President, the present condition illustrates with great emphasis the absolute necessity for trained personnel employed the year around in developing at the ground level the facts with reference to these programs. Another practical illustration comes to mind: Last year authorization bills for one of the armed services carried items for permanent barracks in the United States, costing from \$2,000 to \$2,400 per unit. Each member of the committee thought that was far too much, but there was no evidence to offset the figures and not time enough to investigate the question. As I understand it, the Appropriations Committee had the same experience in regard to that matter, and the figures were never reduced.

#### EVALUATE PROGRAMS

This bill would require the staff of the proposed Joint Committee on the Budget to evaluate programs authorized by the Congress and to report to the appropriate committees whether such programs were being carried out as directed under the enabling legislation. The staff would further be required to report to the appropriate committees any duplications that might result from new enactments, and to suggest the repeal or amendment of acts which authorize programs in conflict with new concepts of Federal operations. This phase of the Joint Committee's operations alone should effectuate the saving of many millions of dollars. Too often the Congress, in following recommendations of its committees, establishes a long-term program and then piles program after program upon the original authorization without in any way determining how the basic act is operating or how it should be changed to conform to the new programs. Under the pending bill, the staff would be authorized and directed continually to inform the substantive committees dealing with program authorizations relative to duplication of activities or the lack of need of Federal programs previously authorized by such committees.

The bill would also require each of the committees, in approving legislation, not only to fully apprise the Congress itself of the initial cost of any program authorization, but to submit estimates as to the extended cost of such programs over a period of 5 years. This provision of the bill is something that Congress has long needed for its own guidance, and should result in a better and more complete appraisal of proposed legislation involving the expenditure of Federal funds. This section of the bill will also provide the Congress with the means of obtaining necessary information for placing adequate restrictions and limitations on departmental operations, so as to insure conformance to the intent of the Congress with respect to the funds approved for specific Federal projects.

#### FOSTER JOINT ACTION

Finally, the bill, while not setting forth any rigid requirement therefor, would encourage the holding of joint hearings in the initial stages of the money bills. This has long been a need

which the Congress has for various reasons heretofore failed to adopt. Operation of this section, as contemplated by the bill, would eliminate the need for extensive, duplicating hearings requiring the attendance of Members of the House and the Senate to hear practically the same presentation of basic facts relative to each of the departmental and agency programs.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. I take it that the Senator from Mississippi is strongly in favor of the bill now before the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; I am supporting the bill, but I am also supporting some of the amendments proposed to it.

Mr. LONG. One point which occurs to me is that the Armed Services Committee has the function of passing on proposed authorizations for the military budget, which now is more than half of the total budget; in fact, it is perhaps 75 percent of the total. I notice that the bill does not contain a provision that one or more members of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate or the Armed Services Committee of the House shall serve on the proposed joint committee. It has seemed to me that the Armed Services Committee was not sufficiently staffed to send one of its members to review the need for vast expenditures for bases and installations, as well as materials, authorizations for which were being requested by the Armed Services. I wonder whether the Senator from Mississippi feels that, therefore, perhaps the Armed Services Committee should be represented on the proposed joint committee.

Mr. STENNIS. I feel that no committee other than the Appropriations Committee should be represented on the joint committee. I take that position inasmuch as the Appropriations Committee has the final responsibility of recommending to Congress how much money shall be appropriated and spent for the various projects.

I believe we can either follow the course of having all the committees have their own staffs of sufficient size and training to be able to examine the field of operations coming within the purview of the respective committees, or we can center and build up that work around the Appropriations Committee. I think the bill strikes the best course, and I shall support an amendment providing that no committee other than the Appropriations Committee shall be represented on the joint committee.

I believe the Armed Services Committee will have to do some work of its own. However, I think we must center this investigatory work somewhere, and I believe it should revolve around the Appropriations Committee.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HUNT. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Mississippi whether he does not think it might be quite appropriate if the services of this

joint committee were made available to the various committees? Provision might be made for its members to appear before various committees to advise them, for example, in the case of the Armed Services Committee with reference to the findings of the joint committee regarding authorizations for the armed services.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Wyoming has made an excellent point. As I see it, he has suggested what will be one of the primary functions of the joint congressional budget committee. The view which the junior Senator from Mississippi takes is that it is not to be of service to the Appropriations Committee, alone, but it is to be of service to all of us. I think, however, it should be centered around and built around the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses, working together.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, if I may ask one further question, does the Senator from Mississippi look upon the work of the proposed joint committee as being in the nature of a preaudit of expenditures which are to be made?

Mr. STENNIS. In part, yes; a preaudit—that is a good way to express it—to determine what expenditures are justified, and to ascertain the basic facts. That is to be done in the field by agents representing the Congress—not by someone else; not by the departments, not by the executive branch, but by Representatives of the Congress, which carries the responsibility. It should be a preaudit and a preappraisal of the facts.

Mr. HUNT. One more question: Is there any doubt in the mind of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi that the entire membership of the Senate, and especially the members of the Appropriations Committee, will be far better informed on the question of what the money they are appropriating will be spent for than has ever been the case in the Senate heretofore?

Mr. STENNIS. I think the Senator from Wyoming is correct. I emphasize that this is a necessary step, that something of this nature is absolutely required before Senators, as human beings, can cope adequately with the problems which are placed before them from day to day.

It is my understanding that S. 913 has been endorsed by more than 30 State taxpayers' associations affiliated with the National Conference of State Taxpayers Associations, by the National Association of Manufacturers, and by outstanding political scientists. Officials and members of these great organizations are persons who have to deal with fiscal problems in their everyday operations. They know the importance of attaining economy and efficiency in fiscal affairs, if they are to realize profits in the operation of their businesses. They have, by supporting this bill, clearly indicated that they also recognize the deficiencies in the fiscal operations of the Federal Government, and endorse the objective of the pending bill as being essential to the utilization of tax dollars which they, their employees, and their stockholders pay into the Federal Treas-

ury. I think it is not only appropriate that these groups interest themselves in this type of legislation, but I feel it should carry weight with the Congress itself that these leaders of industry have urged us, as their representatives and spokesmen in tax matters, to take the necessary action to insure more efficiency and economy in the operations of the Federal Government.

The largest single private industry, the General Motors Corp., has an income of approximately one-tenth that of the Federal Government. I am sure that the board of directors of the General Motors Corp., or any other large industry, would not tolerate the lack of fiscal controls within that great corporation comparable to the present fiscal structure of the legislative branch.

Mr. President, I desire to emphasize that picture. Imagine a private corporation, with 10 times the income of General Motors Corp., spending such a sum as \$80,000,000,000 through its board of directors, we will say, and doing it upon the information and advice of only 57 men, who would constitute the only staff they would have to advise them as to what the facts were which justified the expenditure of the \$80,000,000. It is unthinkable. In the practical affairs of life it is beyond imagination to think that an average businessman, much less one who is up to date, would consider embarking on such a venture as spending that much money with no more guidance and advice at his command than that of only 57 men.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Speaking of the amount of money involved and the tremendous job the Members of the Senate have, of passing on appropriations, I made a check last year, when this bill was being considered by the committee. I may say to the able Senator from Mississippi that we discussed eight of the largest corporations in the country, namely, General Motors, A. T. & T., Atlantic & Pacific, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, United States Steel, Sears Roebuck, Swift & Co., and Chrysler. The total of the annual expenditures by those companies, comprising eight of the largest corporations in the United States, was but \$27,000,000,000, or about one-third of the budget we are called upon to consider annually for the National Government.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the Senator's contribution of those facts, particularly at this point, because it emphasizes what I was trying to point out by way of comparison between the system under which we are operating in the Senate and the system which is employed by modern business firms.

Any modern business firm would want to know where and how its income was being expanded, and where reductions could properly be made in order to increase its services to the public and realize greater profits in its operations. It is my view that the Federal Government could well follow the example of some of our larger corporations in providing itself with a proper and adequate fiscal

structure to deal with its activities which extend not only into the operations of industry, but into the lives of every citizen of these United States.

FACTS FOR ALL

With such a joint committee and its staff functioning on a continuous basis, studying and reviewing budget requests and program expenditures beginning at the end of each fiscal year, and projecting its surveillance on through until the budget document is submitted in January of each year, the Appropriations Committees and individual Members of Congress would have ready access to any specific budget item. Not only would this bring about a complete understanding of the operations of each and every project, but would enable the Congress to effect scientific cuts in appropriations based on the facts and not by the meat-tax process. Members of Congress would know where cuts could be made and how much, without interfering with the operations of programs approved by the Congress in the public interest.

Under such a program, with full information already developed on all important budget items, action could be expedited, and the appropriation bills approved early in the year well ahead of the end of the current fiscal year period. There would be less need for drastic adjustments in conferences, since decisions would be based on the same basic facts and staff reports, and eliminate many differences that develop between the two Houses under the present policies. This would permit Members of Congress to devote more time to other legislative matters and to the interests of their constituents.

Mr. President, I conclude with the same thought and the same theory that I mentioned in the first sentence, namely, that the practical title of this bill should be "Necessary Congressional Working Tool."

I yield the floor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, during the very able address of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi on the pending measure, I discovered in my file a very interesting article which appeared in Real Estate News Letter of July 30, 1951, entitled "Lasso the Wild Mare."

I ask unanimous consent that this article may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

LASSO THE WILD MARE  
(By Herb Nelson)

Runaway Government spending and waste in Washington today is beyond the ability of any one person to estimate or comprehend. Nothing like it has ever been known before.

If you take the eight largest corporations in our country—General Motors, A. T. & T.; Atlantic & Pacific; Standard Oil of New Jersey; United States Steel; Sears, Roebuck; Swift & Co.; and Chrysler—and add up their total income, it would be \$27,000,000,000, or about half of what Congress is now appropriating. These companies employ 1,920,000 people, while the Government has 2,390,000 civilian employees and 3,250,000 in the armed services. Such figures are cited in a

report by Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Democrat, Arkansas, on fiscal matters.

Last January NAREB's directors adopted a resolution asking that Congress create a special commission of Members of the Senate and House to review constantly and to hold continuous hearings with respect to expenditures of Government.

President Summer in his speeches has urged this plan to create an emergency commission of the House and Senate with full power to review expenditures item by item.

Worried Members of the Senate and House, faced with defense spending of a billion a week and with forecasts of a \$100,000,000,000 budget, are coming to similar conclusions.

It is good news that the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, headed by Senator McCLELLAN, has unanimously produced a bill, S. 913, to create such a joint commission of the House and Senate as President Summer has urged.

The bill provides for a "watchdog committee" on the budget composed of 18 members, 9 from the Senate and 9 from the House, drawn from the two Committees on Appropriations and on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. This committee would function constantly, holding hearings whether or not Congress is in session. It would review every penny of the vast budgetary requests that are made, which now require a volume as big as a telephone book just to list.

The committee would have a staff of experts, giving full time to the task of analyzing the budget and making recommendation for the elimination of unnecessary spending or waste.

Harried members of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations have tried to do their job through a score of subcommittees, covering different departments and activities. When it is considered that some of the departments are bigger than any single corporation, it is easy to see that a Member of the House and Senate cannot master fiscal problems and approve its budget as an incidental part-time activity.

Encouraging and necessary, bill S. 913 in the Senate is an amendment to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. It has not yet been introduced in the House, but that will undoubtedly come soon. It is a fine bill and will give the taxpayer at least some assurance that there will be a disinterested expert to cast a quizzical eye on some of the fantastic demands of the departments and bureaus for indefinite and continued expenditure.

The French people have always been saving, but their Government has spent and spent. The French franc, once worth 20 cents, is now worth only one-seventieth as much, and Government threatens to dissolve into impotence and futility. The point is nations can go bankrupt. It isn't true that debt doesn't matter as long as we owe it to ourselves.

Give President Al Summer a lift on this vital part of his program. Help save yourself some money. Take your fountain pen in hand and drop a note to both of your Senators and to your Representative, asking them to read and to support S. 913, to create a "watchdog committee" of the Congress on executive expenditures.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, returned to the Senate in compliance with its request, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to

provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

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

H. R. 156. An act to repeal the Alaska railroads tax;

H. R. 4764. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the participation of certain Provinces of the Dominion of Canada in the Northeastern Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5998. An act to amend the excise tax on photographic apparatus;

H. R. 7188. An act to provide that the additional tax imposed by section 2470 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code shall not apply in respect of coconut oil produced in, or produced from materials grown in, the territory of the Pacific Islands; and

H. R. 7189. An act to amend the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which relate to machine guns and short-barreled firearms, so as to impose a tax on the making of sawed-off shotguns and to extend such provisions to Alaska and Hawaii, and for other purposes.

AFFAIRS IN TUNISIA—ROLE OF UNITED NATIONS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am not among those whose daily exercise consists in throwing stones at the foreign policy of the United States as it is administered by the President and Secretary of State. When the history of this era comes to be written, the courageous statesmanship of this administration in supporting the principles of peace and collective security under the charter of the United Nations will stand forth in true perspective. Korea will be remembered in world history as Concord is remembered in American history. The Uniting for Peace Resolution sponsored by our Government in the General Assembly in 1950 will stand as an eternal reminder that no nation can veto the aggregate sentiments of mankind.

It is just because our record in support of United Nations principles is so outstanding that I feel impelled to give warning concerning a situation which now confronts us in the United Nations.

There is now being debated in the Security Council of the United Nations a matter which so far has attracted little attention in this country. But it is a matter which may profoundly affect the position and influence of the United States throughout the world, particularly in Africa and throughout the Near, Middle, and Far East.

There is trouble in Tunisia—trouble between the French authorities and the Bey of Tunis, trouble between the French authorities and Tunisian political leaders who were until recently members of the Tunisian Government but who have been replaced and jailed by the French authorities.

The matter has been brought before the Security Council by the Government of Pakistan as one which might lead to international friction, and which, if not resolved, is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security. Nearly every state throughout the Near and Middle East has evinced an interest in the situation.

The question at the present moment is not how the Security Council should deal with this situation, but whether it should take notice of the situation, whether it should put the question of Tunisia on its agenda.

The case will become in the eyes of the peoples of the Near and Middle East a test case, a test case to determine whether in the future the United Nations can be relied upon even to discuss a case involving the principle of self-determination when that principle clashes with colonialism and the interest of colonial powers.

Until recently I thought that there was no question where the United States stood or ought to stand in this matter. I had thought that we had accepted the United Nations as the cornerstone of our foreign policy and had made clear that all defensive arrangements like NATO were to be in support of the principles of the United Nations and not in the defense of the special interests of one group of states to the detriment of the legitimate rights of any other group of states or peoples.

I had thought that we had taken a firm stand that all matters affecting peace and security should be open to discussion in the appropriate organs of the United Nations. I recall that at the time of the San Francisco Conference President Truman sent Mr. Hopkins to tell Generalissimo Stalin that we could not allow any state the right to veto the discussion of a question affecting peace and security in the Security Council. We stood against any arbitrary limitation on the right to discuss matters affecting peace and security.

But now we are told that the United States is going to abstain from voting on the question whether the Tunisian case should be put on the agenda for discussion. If the United States abdicates its leadership and fails to vote, it seems unlikely that the seven votes required to put the case on the agenda will be secured. The small nations on the Council, some of which are dependent on our power and generosity, will hesitate to vote when the great United States does not take an open stand.

Our failure to take an open stand, Mr. President, would be, in my judgment, a negation of the principles of free discussion in the United Nations for which we have heretofore fought. Our failure to permit issues to come before the United Nations when they are embarrassing to our allies does not dispel or banish those issues. They remain, but our ability to deal with them, our ability to play a conciliatory and honorable part in their solution, is weakened by our own action in denying debate.

Our refusal to vote to put the Tunisian question on the agenda in the Security Council will not help our friend and ally, France. It will not help NATO or the NATO members. On the contrary, it will weaken NATO and cast suspicion and distrust on NATO and its basic purposes.

We must not let the mistaken notion spread that NATO supports colonialism against self-determination; that the NATO powers are concerned to use the United Nations only for their own pur-

poses rather than to uphold the purposes of the United Nations.

The late Senator Vandenberg and others of us in the Senate wisely insisted that NATO should be linked with the purposes and principles of the United Nations so that it would never become a mere power alliance. Let us be careful not to scrap, by our action or non-action in the United Nations, the very principles we insisted upon writing into the Atlantic Pact.

No one realizes more than I do, Mr. President, the important strategic interests we have in North Africa and the Near East, but those interests can only be imperiled and not helped by neglecting and negating the principles of the United Nations.

If we adhere to the proposition on which NATO was founded, that NATO exists to strengthen the United Nations, we will have the friends and allies outside the NATO countries whom we need to maintain the strength and unity of the free world. If we forsake the principles of the United Nations, we will not help NATO, but we will destroy the unity of the free world.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In substance, what the Senator has been saying is that the United States should take a position at this time, either pro or con, in order to get ahead of the game and not allow the situation to come to a crisis and have the United States or NATO called upon to solve the difficulty.

Mr. HILL. The United States should forthrightly take a position in favor of putting the Tunisian question on the agenda for discussion in the Security Council of the United Nations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not true that some of the criticism of the present administration is that it gets ahead of itself, so to speak, and does not plan far enough in advance? What the Senator is now saying is that we should be sufficiently forewarned—

Mr. HILL. We must be forewarned; we must anticipate; we must stand squarely by the principles of the United Nations and let there be no question about our standing in favor of the self-determination of all nations. As the Senator has suggested, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. I thank the Senator.

#### THE THREATENED STEEL STRIKE

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, last week there was placed on the desk of each Senator a report from the Office of the Director of Defense Mobilization. This report, by and large, was very encouraging. It showed the growing strength of this country militarily, industrially, and economically in a very practical and clear-cut way. It told of the mobilization pattern, of military production, industrial expansion, material supplies and allocations, agriculture, manpower, and economic stabilization. From this report we got the understanding that the program in this country under the production act has been going

along very constructively and that it has operated effectively. Many new materials have been furnished for industrial production. Allocation of steel to domestic concerns was increasing. The Army had adequate supplies of steel, as had the Navy and the Air Force, to take care of their needs. The same was true of aluminum and copper. The rubber supply is adequate to our needs and to any emergency we might anticipate. Industrial production generally has been on the increase, making the things which the people in this country want to buy, and at the same time keeping an adequate defense program for immediate needs and in anticipation of any further emergency.

We also note that prices were declining rather generally, that costs were down on most products for domestic use. The prices of a great portion of them were below ceiling prices, not only in the soft goods and consumer goods, but likewise in agricultural products. The price of meat was coming down; the price of beef was at or below ceiling; the price of pork was below ceiling. Many prices were below the parity figure, production was constantly going up, and inventories in the country generally were high.

With adequate production of the needs for war and industry, with prices declining, indicating that inflationary pressures were beginning to lessen, and that prices were finally going down, much encouragement was given to the people of our country. We finally felt that we had solved, or were solving and soon might solve, not only the question of production, but likewise the problem of abnormally high prices resulting from an undersupply of goods and an oversupply of money and credit.

Of course, there still existed the constant threat of an unbalanced budget that might again, unless Congress made adequate reductions in appropriations so that they would come within the income of the country, exert a pressure which would result in again increased prices.

Then we noted with considerable alarm that Mr. Wilson had resigned his position. He had come into the Government service from industry, with a fine background, a very constructive approach, and a sincere, patriotic devotion to his duty, and he personally assumed the full responsibility of the office to which he had been appointed.

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial entitled "Mr. Wilson Resigns," published in the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch of Tuesday, April 1, 1952.

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

It is extremely unlikely that any businessman, no matter how aware he may be of the deviousness of politics, can ever successfully play a politician's game with other politicians.

It is especially unlikely that he can ever do this successfully if, into the bargain, he is compelled to play under the rules of the professional politician and on the grounds chosen by the politician.

Charles E. Wilson, the recently resigned mobilization director, is the latest example of what can happen to a patriotic citizen who in all good faith answers the call to public service with a sincere determination to help his country.

Mr. Wilson has had to quit because he thought all along that the Government's attempt to avert the threatened steel strike was what it seemed to be. What he forgot in his sacrificial effort to be helpful is that the Government's interference in the steel dispute was not for the purpose of settling it fairly, but was for the purpose of wringing some political advantage from seeming to step into the breach—a breach that could have been far more effectively filled by the process of free collective bargaining between the steel makers and the steel unions—and forcing a settlement which, of course, could be advantageously seized upon at an opportune moment during the coming campaign.

A part of this political maneuvering was the deliberate way in which Mr. Wilson, himself, was set up as a straw man and then mowed down.

He had conferred only a few days before the Wage Stabilization Board's recommendations with the President on the probable terms of a steel strike settlement, and made it clear then that in his opinion any settlement which would set off another Government-supported wage-price spiral would dangerously injure the whole defense effort because of its inflationary results.

He was satisfied in his own mind at that meeting that the Government agreed with him. What must have been his amazement when he learned that not only had the Wage Stabilization Board deliberately ignored this logical and sensible advice, but that almost simultaneously the CIO let loose a devastating blast at him, and this after its representatives, too, had had a private confab with the President.

The hint that he, Mr. Wilson, was off on the wrong foot entirely in trying for a settlement which fitted into the Government's so-called anti-inflationary control policies was strong enough.

The mobilization director awakened too late to the fact that the whole control program is not primarily for the purpose of controls, but is simply a political device for the purpose of interfering, where such interference can be politically advantageous, in behalf of certain political ends and political personalities.

Mobilizer Wilson is only one of many such American businessmen who have given up the security of privacy of their important and constructive business careers to answer the call of public service, only to find that they have been called not for the purpose of serving their country but for the purpose of lending respectability to some of the more questionable activities of the politicians.

The shameful political sacrifice of Mr. Wilson now makes an amicable settlement of the steel labor-management differences more remote than ever. He could hardly do anything else than resign, in view of the circumstances, excepting, of course, as an enlightened and practical businessman he could have refused in the first place to have anything to do with a Government agency whose purposes are economically unsound to begin with.

But that is aside from the point of this discussion. The important thing here is that another lesson has been written in the history of Government control organizations for all to see. And the public, generally, and businessmen, specifically, can learn a great deal by committing it to memory if they only will.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, it seems that the resignation of Mr. Wilson resulted from a difference of opinion between himself and the President of

the United States, and also from the confusion caused by events subsequent to the understanding Mr. Wilson claims he had with the President before he returned to Washington.

The report of the Wage Stabilization Board proposed to give employees of the steel industry the largest increase in wages that has ever been given in the history of our country. In an attempt to adjust the proposed increases with prices of the products of steel companies, Mr. Wilson found himself absolutely frustrated because of the changed position of the President, and so he resigned. I think the resignation of Mr. Wilson was a blow not only to the whole production program of the Nation, but also to the prospects of holding the line against inflation.

I do not know all the details by which the Wage Stabilization Board arrived at its ultimate conclusion, but I know there was a great deal of confusion and dispute as to the reasonableness of their report. Certainly the Wage Stabilization Board in its report went into fields which were never contemplated at the time the Defense Production Act was passed by Congress, and certainly were never in the mind of any member of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency or of the conference committee on which I had the duty of serving.

Before the Senate at present is a bill to extend provisions of the Defense Production Act under which Mr. Wilson was serving, and under which the Wage Stabilization Board was created by order of the President. The bill would have been reported to the Senate almost 2 weeks ago had it not been for confusion in the administration resulting from activities of the Wage Stabilization Board, not only within its proper field of consideration and determination of questions of fact, but particularly in its invasion of other fields, its consideration of matters that were never deemed to be within the province of the Wage Stabilization Board in any way, shape, or form.

In the press last night, in contrast with what I mentioned a moment ago from the report of Mr. Wilson, regarding a reduction of prices and an increasing supply of goods, there was this headline: "All civilian supplies"—and that means steel—"put under freeze; 650,000 ready to quit posts."

A steel strike at this time would be disastrous to our whole domestic production program. Likewise, it might become disastrous to our defense program. Although there is an adequate amount of steel at the present time to take care of military needs under the present program, how long that situation will last will depend entirely on the length of the strike and the destructive results flowing from it.

If the proposed increase in wages goes into effect there will inevitably be a tremendous increase in inflationary pressure throughout the country, because the effect will flow down through all channels of trade. Certainly those workers in industry who are engaged in fabricating steel are entitled to consideration. All across the board there will

be constant and increasing demands for higher wages, which ultimately—and perhaps immediately—will result in higher prices to the consuming public. Such higher prices will not only affect the ordinary consumer in our domestic economy, but they will have a dangerous effect upon the whole defense production program, requiring increased appropriations to take care of increased costs.

So as a result of the strike everyone will suffer. The war effort will suffer. We shall give encouragement to the enemies of our country and of freedom, and the Government will lose a great deal in the form of taxes. To such a program will ultimately increase the general tax burden to the ordinary tax-paying citizen of the United States.

Out of every dollar that the steel companies make within the excess profits range, 82 percent goes to the Government. Of every dollar in these higher brackets which the steel companies lose because of their inability to make up in prices for increased cost, the Government will lose 82 cents. Of every dollar in lower brackets which the steel companies lose because of the squeeze between costs and prices, the Government will lose 70 cents. The loss will run into hundreds of millions of dollars, at a time when the budget is already threatened with imbalance, and the taxpayers have to make up the difference. The inflationary pressure will come not only from decreased production, and from increased purchasing power from the higher wages paid, but also from a sharply increased deficit in the Government budget.

I think Mr. Wilson's resignation has had disastrous repercussions. He should have been encouraged, and supported in negotiations in an attempt to settle this rather sensitive situation between industry and labor. He should have had the full support of the Administration in doing so. He might have been able to avoid what now seems to be an imminent and unavoidable strike.

That leads me to a consideration of the panel board, which is called the Wage Stabilization Board, created under the Defense Production Act. It is made up of so many members representing industry, so many representing labor, and so many representing the public. Their appointments were not confirmed by the Senate. They constitute an interim board, appointed by the President of the United States. So far as the law is concerned, their recommendations and reports are not binding. The only power they have is to recommend. As I stated a moment ago, their recommendations have been accepted by labor as binding upon the Government. Labor insists these recommendations be binding upon management.

That raises a question within the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate must face very soon, namely, the question as to whether or not this board shall be continued, whether or not it shall be permitted to invade the province of the National Labor Relations Board, and whether it shall be permitted to go into matters which it was never intended to consider. The Committee on Banking

and Currency must also consider the very nature of the Board itself. I for one, at the time the other bill was under consideration, opposed a tripartite panel board of this kind. I believe that every member of every board of this kind, if the board is to have any substance at all, or if its recommendations are to be given any credit, ought to represent the public. I believe that in this instance so serious are the results flowing from its considerations that the Senate ought to have the responsibility of approving the membership. If the President wants to appoint someone from the field of labor who understands the problems of labor, and someone from the field of business who understands the problems of business, well and good. However, there ought to be a paramount public responsibility, and the members of such a board should not be answerable to any segment of our society which must be less than the whole public interest.

This impending strike, following the recommendations of the Wage Stabilization Board, which, as I have said, dealt with many matters not within its province, has discredited the whole wage and price control program. When this program was under consideration many of us felt that it might be politically administered and as a result would ultimately break down. It seems to be breaking down at the present time.

Much credit is claimed for the control of prices by comparing them with prices a few months previous to the time the regulatory authorities were instituted and began operating. The fact is that there is no adequate comparison. The scare buying after Korea is no standard of comparison. No one can prove whether or not the whole price stabilization program has been effective in holding down prices. In the judgment of the Senator from Ohio it is very doubtful if any prices have been held down by the operations of the price control authority. Certainly the first formula which was fixed by the wage stabilization authority has been pierced many, many times, and now I think is made completely useless by the last finding of the Wage Stabilization Board. So we must now again consider whether the whole wage and price stabilization program is operating effectively in the public interest, or whether it is attacking only the consequences of inflation. Certainly the Price Stabilization Agency can take no credit for prices which, as I suggested a while ago, are far below the ceiling at the present time. The price stabilizers have done nothing in regard to those prices, and cannot honestly take credit for the reductions.

For example, the New York market reports that cotton cloth sells for from 15 to 35 percent below the ceiling. Men's suits are down. Women's dresses are down. A larger midwestern retailer estimates that furniture prices are from 10 to 15 percent below ceilings at the present time. These all enter into the calculations of the price stabilization authorities who attempt to take credit for reduced and declining prices.

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

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it not true that there is a general slump in all mercantile business? There are a large number of vacant storerooms in various places in the Nation, which indicates a lowering of prices.

Mr. BRICKER. There is a general lowering of prices and a softening all through our economy at the present time. Many prices are below the ceiling prices. I remember the first order that was issued with respect to edible fats and oils. Within only a few weeks or months subsequent to the issuance of the order fats and oils were selling at half the ceiling prices. But these results did not stem from the order. They were caused by the play of supply and demand upon the price structure.

Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, I do not know what actuated the Wage Stabilization Board in its findings. I do know that it was in confusion and that it had under consideration many things that were not within its province. The recommendations have led directly to the strike which is imminent and likely to be called tonight, and to all the disastrous effects that will flow from it.

Mr. President, if we had had no wage and price-control program under the Production Act—and I certainly voted in favor of the bill so far as the Government's securing adequate supplies for the defense program was concerned—I am confident that by collective bargaining between industry and labor, and with the proper functioning of the Labor Relations Board, there would not have been the increases in wages which have come about, and there would have been as great a decrease in prices as has been experienced under the influence of OPS.

Mr. President, OPS employs many thousands of employees throughout the country, many of whom are paid high salaries. There have been placed in the RECORD from time to time reports from various States with respect to the number of OPS employees and the salaries they are paid.

OPS has issued orders, unlimited in number and confusing in detail. Some of them are unintelligible to the average businessman or to the lawyers practicing in the various communities. Many of them are completely meaningless. However, in addition to that, for every employee of OPS there are an estimated 10 people throughout the economy generally who study and understand, if they can, and put into effect the rules, regulations, and orders.

Mr. President, I daresay that if those persons who are employed by the Government, and required of business, had been put into productive enterprise the effect upon prices would have been just as great as that which has been claimed as a result of the rules and regulations and orders which have been issued by OPS.

We have reached the point discussed in an editorial printed in yesterday's Washington Post. It brings us to the question of the remedy for the present difficult situation. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

#### TALK OF STEEL SEIZURE

The current talk about governmental seizure of the steel industry is in striking contrast to President Truman's assertion 2 years ago, when the coal miners refused to obey a court injunction, that he had no authority to seize the mines. It appears that the presidential power in this sphere blooms and withers in accord with the political sympathies of the White House in the dispute. In our opinion, however, the President was right when he told the press that he lacked power to seize the mines in an emergency. And we know of no law that has since given him power to take over steel plants because of a strike or potential strike.

During the Second World War, President Roosevelt enforced the orders of the War Labor Board, when employers refused to comply, by seizing their plants. That action was widely criticized at the time. Even after Congress passed the War Labor Disputes Act authorizing the seizure of plants made idle by labor disputes, if such plants were producing for the war effort, F. D. R. took over the Montgomery Ward retail store in Chicago, presumably acting under vague "war powers." The most that can be said for this high-handed invasion of property rights is that it was done under the pressure of wartime emotions. Today there would be no excuse for repetition of those errors.

The War Labor Disputes Act is no longer on the books, and the law most frequently cited as giving some color of authority to a possible seizure of the steel industry is the Selective Service Act. Under its provisions, the President may compel steel producers to furnish defense contractors with steel needed to fill Government orders. It is scarcely conceivable that Congress intended to conceal in this grant of authority to control the flow of materials the power to seize plants made idle by labor disputes.

Some emphasis is also being given to an opinion of Attorney General (now Justice) Tom Clark a few years ago. It was to the effect that "the inherent power of the President to deal with emergencies that affect the health, safety, and welfare of the entire Nation is exceedingly great." Mr. Clark produced this opinion in an effort to justify the administration's proposal to strike out of the Taft-Hartley Act the provision authorizing 80-day injunctions in labor disputes threatening a national emergency. This newspaper said at the time that reliance upon vague claims to constitutional power to cope with national emergencies of this sort "would be the negation of orderly government. Such a surrender of Congress to executive policy making in this sphere would probably be as great an evil as the paralyzing strikes themselves."

There is good reason, of course, why President Truman would hesitate to invoke the Taft-Hartley Act if the steelworkers strike. That would place the Government in the position of cracking down on the union because of a strike to obtain the benefits recommended by a governmental agency—the Wage Stabilization Board. But even a Taft-Hartley injunction to meet a national emergency, if the strike now ordered should be prolonged, would be less obnoxious than a seizure of steel plants without authority.

This newspaper has often urged that the President be given seizure powers for use against recalcitrant employers in cases of national emergency. In these times the Government should be able to avert paralysis of our economy by either management or labor. If no settlement can be effected, President Truman might well go to Congress with a powerful argument for amendment of the Taft-Hartley Act to include authority for temporary governmental operation of a

struck plant whose continuous operation is essential to the national safety. But the talk of seizing power to seize the steel industry has already gone too far. Officials should not need to be reminded that ours is a Government of limited powers.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, what is the proper remedy for the situation? There is at least grave doubt in the minds of lawyers generally as to whether or not the President of the United States has the power to seize the steel plants. It was certainly never intended by those who took part in the drafting and enactment of the Defense Production Act that such power be given to the President except in instances where it was necessary to requisition an individual plant which was producing materials of war needed in the defense effort.

Nevertheless, under that act or under the Draft Act, we see an effort—at least it is suggested in the public press—by the President to seize this great segment of American industry, with all the attendant confusion and slowing down of our expansion program. We cannot disregard the billions of dollars which are going into the expansion program from private industry. More damage will follow the turn-back.

The problem arises as to whether or not the Government, having taken over the steel plants, and having entered into negotiations with the unions to give them the wages recommended by the Wage Stabilization Board, will be able then to turn the properties back to the steel companies.

There are other remedies, of course, which are available to the President.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CAIN. If by way of argument we assume that the Government does seize the steel industry, what are the Government's qualifications and capacity for administering and managing that great segment of America's economy?

Mr. BRICKER. I know of none at all. I do not know of anyone the Government could get, except the persons who now operate the steel business, who could move into the picture and operate the business.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Ohio seems to be suggesting that if, for a considerable period of time, the Government attempts to manage and operate the steel industry the net result is likely to be a serious dislocation of that industry, from which it will take many years to recover.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator from Washington is exactly right. Any taking over will result in deterioration and a breakdown in good management. More serious than that, however, would be the loss of the production we would otherwise get both for the war effort and for the domestic consumers throughout the country. Nothing but confusion or loss can come from a seizure of the plants by the Government.

Mr. CAIN. It seems to me that there is a very real likelihood that the result of Government seizure of the steel industry might be the first concrete step in the direction of the future nationalization of the American steel industry.

Does the Senator from Ohio share my fear to any extent?

Mr. BRICKER. I certainly do. That fear is prompted, I believe, by some of the suggestions which have been made by members of the administration. The President, in addressing Congress, made the suggestion that he should be empowered under the production program to go into the steel business, by building steel plants. Of course, the response of the steel business in building new production facilities almost beyond what anybody would have thought possible has negatived any response to that request.

Still, in the minds of the planners, in the minds of the many controllers, and in the minds of many big Government officials, the high taxers and those who believe in a centralized government, the Senator from Ohio sees a determination to break down private enterprise and to give to the Government a reason for moving into the field of heavy industry.

It is a part of the whole socialization program which many people have dreamed about for a long time. I do not charge the administration with it, but some of those connected with the administration help to bring about the confusion and to lay out the pattern as of this hour in order to make necessary the Government's moving into this field, in the hope that as a result there will come the socialization of the steel industry and heavy industry generally.

Mr. CAIN. It is my conviction that if, whatever the reasons for it might be, the Government either manages the steel industry for a long time or nationalizes it, the workers themselves will suffer most in the long run.

Mr. BRICKER. There is no doubt in my mind that that will be the ultimate outcome of this whole program. There is only one source of wealth, and that lies in labor and the utilization of natural resources. If we unbalance our economy and interfere with our productive capacity the workers will be the ones who will suffer ultimately the most.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his responses, which in my view ought to be carefully thought about and considered by the workers themselves in America's largest industry.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I have been very much interested in the colloquy between the distinguished Senator from Ohio and the distinguished Senator from Washington relative to the step to nationalize this great segment of American industry.

Of course, the Senator from Ohio recalls that in World War I the Federal Government took over the operation of the railroads, whereas in World War II the railroads were operated by their own management. The Senator also recalls, I am sure, that in World War I the operation of the railroads was most inefficient; and there was a large deficit, and no taxes were paid by the railroads

to the Federal Government. On the other hand, in World War II very large taxes were paid by the railroads to the Federal Government, and the railroads were much more efficiently operated; the wages paid by the railroads were higher, and they also paid dividends.

Is not that a good example of what we can expect if the Federal Government takes over the steel industry?

Mr. BRICKER. I think it is the best example of what the effect would be, and the same results will come always from Government ownership or Government operation of any great industrial segment of our society.

Mr. President, to return to the suggestion made a moment ago by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], let me say that, of course, the first place the social planners strike is in the very basic industries; and steel is a basic industry. Of course, the experience in the First World War taught a lesson which was observed by those who were in control in the Second World War, and they were wise enough not to follow the precedent which had been set in the first war. However, the same result will come from the Government's meddling at this time in the operation of private enterprise.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield at this point?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. In the present economy in the United States, steel probably enters into more manufactured articles than does any other commodity. Will not a steel strike and a stoppage of the production of steel have a tendency to discommode the people generally and to interfere with the national economy probably to a greater extent than would happen if any other segment of our industrial life were to be taken over by the Federal Government?

Mr. BRICKER. I believe the only other one which could compare today would be agriculture, and it is so largely diversified and so expensive that no one could hope to have Government operation of it.

However, there is concentration in the steel industry. A considerable amount of it is in the State of the Senator from Pennsylvania, and a considerable amount of it is in my own State. That concentration of industry is available for experimentation, and many of the persons to whom I have referred would like to have an opportunity to experiment in that field.

As I said a moment ago, I do not charge the administration, Mr. Wilson, or others like him, with making that effort. However, in my judgment, there are those who are trying to lay the plans and fix the program to that end.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, if the able Senator from Ohio will yield further, let me say that I think we owe the American people the duty of discussing these matters very minutely on the floor of the Senate. Similarly, they should be discussed very minutely on the floor of the House of Representatives. I make that statement because, as was suggested a moment ago by the Senator from Washington, the persons who probably will suffer more than any others

will be the men and women who work in the various steel plants.

Mr. BRICKER. I think the Senator from Pennsylvania is entirely correct.

I should like to suggest, in response to the questions asked by the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Pennsylvania, that in my judgment the workers in the steel industry do not want to strike. I do not think the laborers in the steel plants want to quit; I do not believe they want to go out on strike tonight. If they are out any great length of time, it will be a long, long time before they will be able to make up the personal loss they will sustain. In a strike situation such as this one, every one loses: The Government loses taxes; the production program loses; and the fabricators lose because they cannot get the steel they need. It is impossible to manufacture automobiles, radios, refrigerators, and many other articles which are made of steel, if there is a shortage of steel. Furthermore, the defense production program is bound to suffer. In fact, not only is there suffering in our country, but great encouragement is given to the enemies of freedom, those who are trying to undermine our economy. If there is anything in the world that old Joe Stalin is afraid of today, it is the productive capacity of free enterprise in the United States. I can conceive of no better way to strengthen him and to weaken ourselves than to undermine the American free enterprise system and its great productive capacity. When control of that system is taken out of the hands of labor and management and is placed into the hands of Government, along with such irritants the Government has put into the present situation, the result is bound to undermine that productive capacity.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the statement the Senator from Ohio is making is a very sound one, and it is unfortunate that it cannot be heard by every American.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. If the present armistice talks in Korea break down, and if that war is enlarged, what is the result likely to be if the steel workers of the United States are out on strike and the steel industry is not producing any steel?

Mr. BRICKER. Of course, the public generally will not tolerate such a situation for very long; we simply cannot afford to do so. Then the full power of government will have to be used in the situation, and the Government will have to obtain an injunction against the strike or take similar action. If the strike is not solved by the efforts of the parties concerned in it, the Government will move very quickly to solve a strike of this kind. It can be solved, and it would have been solved if it had not been for the meddling of the Wage Stabilization Board created by the President, in going into things into which it had no business to go. That is the cause of the strike. The strike would have been settled if the matter had not been taken out of the hands of the management and the workers. However, the action taken by the Board in this case

amounts to an invitation for an adamant stand by one of the parties. That itself is an invitation to the threatened strike; it is a perversion and a distortion of the Defense Production Act, and is contrary to every intent and purpose of the Congress in enacting that measure and in creating a Wage Stabilization Board.

Mr. CAIN. Even at this late hour, is there not some way by which the controversy between management and labor can be resolved, short of Government seizure?

Mr. BRICKER. I think there would be no question about it if the President were willing to act under the Taft-Hartley Act. However, evidently because of political reasons he is not willing to take action under it. If he were to act under that measure, he could enjoin the parties from engaging in a strike, and there then would be 80 days for negotiation.

I say confidently that if management and labor were able to sit down and negotiate this problem, without Government interference, and especially without the report the Wage Stabilization Board has issued, the strike situation would surely soon be settled or possibly would have been settled before now; it could well be solved within the 80-day period, and production would not cease, and the Government would not have to take over the steel industry.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. So, Mr. President, as a result of the political manipulation of the wage-and-price and production programs authorized by the Congress, today we are faced with a destructive strike in a basic segment of industry, a strike because of which everyone ultimately will suffer. Labor will suffer; the public will suffer; the steel industry will suffer; the production program will suffer; the consumers will not get the products which otherwise they would get; and if the strike continues for very long, the war program will likewise suffer. Our security is imperiled.

No one wants this strike. I do not think the Government wants it, or that labor wants it, or that management wants it. I know the public does not want a strike at this time. Certainly the Defense Establishment does not want a strike which ultimately will seriously affect both the program for the production of the needed materials of war, and the price of those products to the Government.

So, Mr. President, as the result of political manipulation and interference with free enterprise in the United States and interference with proper negotiation between management and labor, today we are face to face with a very destructive strike. That situation has developed because of the Government's failure to approach this problem properly in the public interest.

The strike should never happen. Every action should be taken to prevent it.

Mr. President, in the next few weeks we shall be confronted with the need for the passage of a new defense production bill. I, for one, believe that if it is to be administered as the Defense Production

Act has been administered up to this time, particularly with regard to the steel industry, a continuance of the wage-and-price-control program will not be in the public interest.

It is a costly program. It has not worked effectively. It has been politically manipulated. It has been a curb on production in many respects, and I do not think it has reduced prices. It has not held down wages. It has not touched the basic causes of inflation, namely, the production of goods and a decrease in purchasing power. Those are the real causes of inflation, and they are matters completely outside the province of this program.

All that the wage and price stabilization program could possibly affect would be the symptoms of inflation; and not very long would they be able to effectuate anything in the public interest in that line, unless the Government itself is willing to curb the expansion of money and credit. But the most effective way to do so would be to balance the budget, so it would not be necessary to have further deficit financing. The Government could encourage the production of industry by taking its hand off the neck of industry. Labor and industry should be free to negotiate properly the things within their province. Greatest encouragement to production would follow a lessened burden of taxes.

So Government interference, and the failure to operate under the price and wage stabilization law in the public interest, have brought us to the brink of a very destructive strike in a basic segment of our industry.

#### MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS—CHANGE OF CONFEREES

During the delivery of Mr. BRICKER's speech,

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be laid before the Senate the motion I entered to reconsider the vote by which the Senate appointed conferees yesterday on Senate Joint Resolution 20, the so-called tidelands measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Is there objection to the Senator from Ohio yielding to the Senator from Louisiana without losing the floor? The Chair hears none.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I trust that the request of the Senator from Louisiana will be granted. When the conferees were appointed yesterday morning on the submerged-lands measure the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], the majority leader, a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, was named as one of the conferees. He has since notified me that he would not be available for service on the conference committee, and has asked to be excused. The next two Senators who, in the order of seniority, would be appointed, are the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and

the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. Both those Senators, like the chairman of the committee, were opposed to the amendment in the nature of a substitute which was added in the Senate to the joint resolution, and both have asked to be excused from service upon the conference committee.

The next Senator in order, therefore, is the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and I ask that his name may be substituted as a Senate conferee in the place of that of the Senator from Arizona, who asks to be excused.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to express my great appreciation for the kind and courteous handling of this matter by the Senator from Wyoming, and also my appreciation of the very proper and wholly fair attitude of the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from New York.

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

The motion to reconsider the vote is withdrawn by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I believe the motion to reconsider will have to be agreed to in order that the substitution may be made.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent was given to the request for a change in the conferees.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That being the case, the result is the same.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands, the motion to reconsider is withdrawn.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Did the Chair appoint the Senator from Louisiana to the conference in the place of the Senator from Arizona?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understood, and it was so announced. The Senator from Arizona was excused by unanimous consent, and the Senator from Louisiana was appointed. By unanimous consent, all these remarks will appear at the end of the address of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio, and also the Senator from Wyoming.

#### EVALUATION OF FISCAL REQUIREMENTS OF EXECUTIVE AGENCIES—AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 913) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for the more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the pending bill, Senate bill 913, as reported from the Committee on Government Operations, under the sponsorship of our chairman, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. Senate bill 913, which has been explained at some length by the distinguished chairman

of the committee and by other members of the committee, proposes to establish a joint budget committee and staff to provide the two Houses of Congress with badly needed improvements in the legislative consideration of the annual fiscal requirements of the executive agencies. I am proud to be a cosponsor of the bill, and I trust that it will be enacted into law within a very short time.

Mr. President, I shall comment only briefly concerning the many and difficult aspects of Federal budgeting. This is a subject which would require an expert, one who had had many years of experience, to discuss fully and adequately the intricate details of the budgeting process. But we all know that we are dealing with problems of fiscal control involving a myriad of far-flung activities of present-day government.

Way back in relatively simple Victorian days, before the turn of the century, Prime Minister Gladstone was already insisting that "national budgets are not merely affairs of arithmetic, but in a thousand ways go to the root of prosperity of individuals, the relation of classes, and the strength of kingdoms." Imagine how much more true that statement is today as a result of the enormously expanded Federal operations of the United States during the past half of a century.

Mr. President, I think it fair to point out that while we in the Congress spend a good portion of our time and energy in discussing the Federal budget, and occasionally making some rather unkind remarks about its size, and then shifting the burden over to the executive branch, the fact still remains as a constitutional obligation and duty, that the appropriations for the operations of the Government, must come from the Congress. What I am saying is that the President of the United States and the Bureau of the Budget may submit to the Congress a budget, but at best it is but a recommendation. It has become in recent years more than a recommendation, not because of the strength of the executive branch, but unfortunately because of the weakness of the fiscal-control processes of the Congress of the United States. I remind my colleagues and the public that the Constitution places the burden for all taxation and all appropriations upon the two Houses of the United States Congress. No matter how much we may want to shift this burden to someone else, it still remains with us, and it must be our responsibility to organize our legislative processes so that we may properly handle this budget.

I shall develop only one or two of many possible arguments in support of Senate bill 913 during the short time during which I shall speak today. As an introduction to those arguments, let me summarize briefly six major features of S. 913 as covered by the Committee on Government Operations in its brief but cogent Senate Report No. 576, dated July 25, 1951:

Major feature No. 1: The bill repeals section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, which set up the joint committee which has failed repeat-

edly to develop an annual ceiling on total expenditures. Instead, S. 913 sets up a new bipartisan joint budget committee of 18 members—5 each from the 2 Appropriations Committees, and 4 each from the 2 Expenditures Committees of the 2 Houses of Congress.

Major feature No. 2: Under existing law the present joint committee has failed to recommend the maximum total amount to be appropriated annually. Instead, the new joint budget committee is directed (a) to make recommendations to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees which would hold expenditures to the minimum consistent with the requirements of Government operations and national security, (b) to summarize annually the estimated costs of all new legislative authorizations which have been voted by the Congress, (c) to assist standing committees by reporting on actions by executive agencies which violate basic legislative authorizations, and (d) to propose checks or cut-backs which should be made in the legislative authorizations of prior years.

In other words, Mr. President, the proposed joint budget committee would serve not only as a technical and a staff agency for the Appropriations Committees of the Congress but also would perform the function of a watchdog committee, particularly over the authorizations which have been agreed to by the Congress.

Major feature No. 3: The new joint committee is directed to hire an experienced staff, members of which shall be assigned within their areas of special training and assignment to assist the several subcommittees of the House and Senate Appropriations Subcommittees in turn as appropriation bills move from inception to final passage. Then such staff members will return to the control and the direct service of the joint committee. This joint staff of possibly 50 or more well-trained specialists will supplement the small, separate staffs serving the House and Senate Appropriations Committees who cannot now do more than take care of the many clerical duties placed upon them. It is felt that providing such a large new staff for each of the committees would be a wasteful duplication of manpower and conducive to clashing staff opinions which ought to be kept at a minimum. Moreover, a single professional joint staff would be more likely to achieve intimate and valuable working arrangements with the Budget Bureau during its preparation of annual budget recommendations.

Mr. President, this is the key provision of this bill. Instead of having two separate staffs, one for the Senate and one for the House, there will be one joint staff which, at the time of the preparation of the budget and its consideration by the committees of the Congress, will serve these two committees as technical and trained specialists.

If the Congress of the United States will equip itself with sufficient staff and personnel, it can have some control over the budget; but if the Congress of the United States is going to live in the year 1952 but employ the budget methods of the time of Andrew Jackson, it is not going to be able to control the budget.

What the Congress needs is less griping about the budget and more positive action in order to be able to understand it; to have less complaining about what the executive agencies are doing, and to equip ourselves properly to do our own tasks.

The executive branch is as powerful as it is because the legislative branch has not maintained an adequate and modern staff. Senate bill 913 should have the support of the Congress and the public because it gives to the Congress of the United States the tools, the specialists, the equipment, and the staff properly to manage and control and understand an executive budget which is sent to us for the purpose of our consideration.

**Major feature No. 4:** Our bill requires that appropriate staff of the Bureau of the Budget shall attend House and Senate Appropriations Subcommittee sessions when so requested, to explain and defend the budget proposals of the President which are contained in the appropriation bills pending before the subcommittees.

This is a very important feature, in the sense that here, again, is a sharing of responsibility between the legislative and executive branches. I said in a committee meeting this morning that while the Constitution provides for the separation of powers, it does not lower an iron curtain between 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue and the Congress of the United States on the Hill. There is no reason why we should not be able to cooperate. We are reaching a point where we almost have three governments—a government by the judiciary, a government by the Congress, and a government by the executive. The pending bill provides for meshing of the talents of the legislative branch and the executive branch, which means the maximum utilization of trained manpower.

**Mr. McCLELLAN.** Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

**Mr. HUMPHREY.** I am happy to yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

**Mr. McCLELLAN.** I am very much interested in the point the Senator is making at this time in support of the pending bill. I may say that it was most gratifying to me when I read on the news ticker yesterday that the majority leader, immediately following a conference with the President of the United States, stated that the President favored the bill, subject to one amendment, which amendment I have considered and which I think is a good amendment and which I intend to accept. It is a source of gratification to me, and I think it should be to the whole country, to know that the legislative branch and the executive branch are conscientiously trying to find a way to eliminate waste and extravagance in Federal expenditures.

**Mr. HUMPHREY.** I want to say to the chairman of the committee that his perseverance through the last session of the Congress and this session is the kind of concrete evidence that should meet the complaints or the criticisms of anyone as to the desire of the Congress to do a better job in connection with the budget. It was certainly refreshing to me to see that the President and the executive

agencies have taken a kindly view of the particular proposal, because it does amount to a better control over the fiscal and budgetary policies of the Government of the United States.

**Mr. McCLELLAN.** If my colleague from Minnesota will yield further, I should like to state that the Director of the Budget, as I interpret his testimony before our committee, also favors the bill, subject to the one amendment to which I referred a moment ago. I think it is encouraging to all of us that there is that spirit of, first, a recognition of the problem, and, second, that the executive branch and the legislative branch are trying to take some action about it.

**Mr. HUMPHREY.** I thank the distinguished chairman of our committee.

I may say that while this proposed legislation surely does not have any of what we might call the political sex appeal that some other bills have, it is one of the most significant pieces of proposed legislation, because it gets at the heart of the problem, which is of a fiscal and budgetary nature, a problem of ever-growing appropriations and a fear and anxiety that the budget is getting out of control. No one knows where to put his finger upon it. If by such a measure as this, with the authority it confers, we can do a better job, if we can make some substantial improvement in budgetary control and in the preparation of budgets and their consideration, we shall have made a great forward step.

**Major feature No. 5:** Senate bill 913 requires that all committee reports on proposed authorizations of new projects which will require appropriations, must include estimates of probable costs thereof over the next five fiscal years.

**Major feature No. 6:** The bill as reported also includes a provision authorizing subcommittees of the two Appropriations Committees to hold joint hearings to cut down the wasted time and attention of members of congressional committees, members of the executive branch, and interested groups throughout the country. This provision in no way affects the full freedom of the separate subcommittees then to hold additional separate hearings if they decide to do so.

In my opinion it is very important that we bring together, on occasion, the Members of the House and of the Senate in joint hearings, so that we may save not only the time of citizens who come before Congress to give their testimony, but the time of the representatives of the executive agencies. But, even more important, such joint hearings bring about an exchange of views of Members of the two Houses of Congress. They both get the same story, at the same time in the same place from the same witness. It would indeed be refreshing to have one record as to what the testimony is.

**Mr. McCLELLAN.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

**Mr. HUMPHREY.** I yield.

**Mr. McCLELLAN.** Does not the Senator think that as to many of the hearings on appropriation bills, if they were held jointly, it would tend to eliminate much conflict and friction between the two Houses in conferences?

**Mr. HUMPHREY.** The Senator from Arkansas has surely cited a very important consideration in the pending measure, because it is true that time after time the two Houses get into prolonged arguments simply because there have been two separate sets of hearings and two sets of conclusions which have been drawn from the hearings on separate occasions. Here is an opportunity to get the evidence directed at one common budget, and the testimony brought to the attention of the House and the Senate, so that when Members go into conference there can be no argument about what was said, because it was said to the same persons at the same place at the same time. I think it will have a very excellent effect upon accelerating the consideration of certain measures on the basis of facts presented in the testimony.

These six features seem to me, Mr. President, to reflect the most important aspects of S. 913, as reported. To them I should add, however, a further provision for an alternate balanced budget which was contained in the original version of S. 913 as introduced, but which was omitted from S. 913 as reported. That important provision is approved in the report of the Expenditures Committee on S. 913, which recommends, however, that it be considered as a separate amendment so that the rather special considerations which are involved may be debated and voted upon. Its success or defeat will thereby be kept apart from action on the bill as a whole.

This alternate budget amendment proposes that the President accompany his annual budget presentation in budget deficit years with a second set of figures showing a balanced condition of total estimated receipts and expenditures for the budget year. Realistic information on the possibilities of budget balancing will then be forthcoming for all interested groups. With such detailed data it is possible then to reach a much more informed decision than at present as to (a) what degree of cuts should be made in anticipated expenditures, (b) how much of the deficit should be met by new taxes, and (c) how much of the deficit should be met by borrowing because of war or other emergency conditions.

Mr. President, before I discuss briefly some aspects of these half-dozen major features of S. 913 as reported by the Senate committee, let me state that this bill does in the expenditure field exactly what the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation has been doing on the revenue side for 25 years.

Believe me, Mr. President, we need the utmost help in meeting both the immensity and the technical difficulties of the annual budget.

I shall digress for a moment to say that those who frequently write to us about the budget would possibly do both themselves and the country a service if they would once study the budget. The budget does not happen to be a small document of eight or nine pages. It makes the Sears, Roebuck catalog look like a very small pamphlet. It is a major instrument. It represents much more than facts and figures. It repre-

sents political policy and economic policy; it represents a program; it represents capital expenditures; it represents the defense, the health, and the welfare of the country.

As to immensity of the budget, I refer the Members of the Senate to the striking table and chart in Senate Report No. 576, comparing the financial scope and employment of private and public enterprises in the United States. That material demonstrates that Federal expenditures last year were twice the dollar volume of business of the eight largest business corporations in the United States. Let me repeat that almost unbelievable fact, Mr. President. Last year Uncle Sam spent more than twice as much as all eight of the largest American corporations.

Most of us stand in awe of the great size of any one of those giant enterprises, Mr. President. Let me call the roll: General Motors, the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., the Atlantic & Pacific, the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, United States Steel Corp., Sears, Roebuck & Co., Swift & Co., and the Chrysler Corporation.

Mr. President, these corporations, with all their business actually represented a small part of the total Federal expenditures for the past fiscal year.

I submit, Mr. President, that the companies I have named represent a truly impressive, an overwhelming collection of business enterprises. And, yet when the dollar volume of annual business is added together for all eight of these largest of America's business corporations, the total is less than half of the \$71,000,000,000 of estimated Federal expenditure for the fiscal year 1952, at the beginning of which the defense effort had not yet developed a real head of steam.

Paralleling this story in the field of dollar volume of activity, the committee report on S. 913 shows that the number of persons employed by the Federal Government presents a similar striking comparison. Thus the eight giant corporations I have named hire a little under 2,000,000 employees a year. In contrast, the Federal Government employed 2,400,000 civilian employees last year, along with another 3,200,000 military employees, or in excess in each category of the number of employees in the private business companies I have mentioned.

Mr. President, it is not enough to say that we should reduce the number of employees of the Federal Government, unless we can show by actual scientific tests, and analysis of the budget, that by so cutting we will not jeopardize the very security of the country or the essential services of the Government.

I am confident the American people want a dollar-for-dollar return for Government expenditures. They want a dollar's worth of service for a dollar's worth of expenditure. But the only way in which that can be accomplished is to have the Congress of the United States improve its machinery for fiscal budget control. The sooner we begin to do that, the happier and the sounder the country will be.

The problem of the Federal budget goes far beyond the size of Federal op-

erations, incredibly large as these overall totals show them to be. Thus, I can thoroughly sympathize with the confession of despair voiced by the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] in his able report on the huge military appropriation bill a year ago. With the help of but one staff member, he said that, as a civilian, he lacked the capacity to sit in judgment as to the proper share of our economy which should be allocated to our military effort.

How many letters have I received about the military budget? I would not want to bring them all here, because they would literally start to fill up the Senate Chamber. Everybody writes to Senators and Representatives about the military budget and how to cut it. Yet when the last military appropriations bill was considered by the Senate, according to the testimony of the chairman, the subcommittee had but one staff expert to help consider a budget of \$52,000,000,000. I submit that if one operates a fourth-class post office or a filling station, he needs at least one person to help him.

The distinguished and able Senator from Wyoming, a man of experience who knows budgets, came before the Senate—and his statement is a matter of public information in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—and made a confession, as he said, of despair over the fact that he had the help of but one staff member. He said he lacked the capacity, as a civilian, to sit in judgment as to the proper share of our economy which should be allocated to our military effort.

Let me say to the American people that when Congress really equips itself to do the job, this sorry sort of situation will not continue to exist. We spend our time saying that Federal executive offices have too many employees. I am not going to say whether they have too many or too few. I have not been able to make a head count, but I know that the Congress of the United States has been penny-wise and dollar-foolish in the terms of equipping committees of Congress with trained technical staffs that know how to handle a large volume of legislation. Particularly is this true in the field of appropriations.

The Government is no small business, and I do not think we appear very intelligent, nor do I think we set a pattern for good judgment, if we go home and tell our constituents that we have cut the legislative budget because we have eliminated some employees. That is like dismissing a heart specialist in an effort to save money when one is dying of a heart attack. Our job here should not be to see whether we can dismiss or get by with one or two fewer employees on the staffs. Our job is to get competent persons who know something about the budget and can make it a full-time business, 365 days of the year. They must start with the budget on the day the very first idea of a new item is thought of and follow it through until the time it comes up and is acted on in the Senate and the House of Representatives. It means going out and making spot checks. Headlines are not going to save the Government money—headlines about the price of shoes, the price of toothpaste, the

price of oyster forks, or whether some admiral got too many spoons. The important question is as to what the facts are, not the allegations, the charges, and the countercharges. The important thing is to know how much was purchased, at what price, and whether the job was done efficiently and well.

How will that be determined? Not by getting hold of a reporter in the President's room outside the Senate Chamber. It will be ascertained by assigning to the field agents who will dig out the facts.

If the detective bureaus of the respective police departments of cities of the United States, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, were no more accurate, no more detailed, or no more conscientious or persistent in finding out who was the culprit than we are about learning what is wrong with the budget, this country would be in the throes of a crime wave.

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover and his associates do not dare just guess. They must have evidence and facts. We, too, need evidence and facts in our work. The job of checking the budget is the biggest task before Congress. In fact, during this session Congress will spend more than 90 percent of its time upon this one aspect of government—the handling of the Federal budget as sent here by the President in his budget message, through the Bureau of the Budget.

I have remarked about the statement made by the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the tremendous difficulties he had when he worked upon the military budget. I certainly would not criticize him. After all, I am in much the same boat. So are we all on matters such as the hydrogen bomb. I remind Senators of the statement by President Conant of Harvard University. He is quoted in the New York Times as stating that the United States at midcentury had not yet devised "even the first approximation to a satisfactory procedure for evaluating technical judgment on matters connected with the national defense."

I must point out with great force that such a condition is wrong, and that we must take steps to correct it if we are to continue the important and sound doctrine of civilian control over military affairs in our basic plan of government.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Minnesota is making some very important points concerning the need for closer supervision of the budget, particularly the need for studying some of the proposed expenditures before they are authorized. The Appropriations Committee has no tools to work with to prove that perhaps all the money requested is not needed.

It occurs to the junior Senator from Louisiana, however, that we might be in the same situation all over again, even if this bill were enacted, by reason of not having a sufficient staff to do the job. This Congress and previous Congresses have been very reticent about asking for sufficient staffs or sufficient funds to do

the job. At least that is the impression of the junior Senator from Louisiana.

It is my understanding that in the beginning it is contemplated that the proposed joint committee shall have a staff of perhaps 18 assistants to work on this problem. The budget amounts to more than \$80,000,000,000, if I recall correctly. So, on the average each member of the staff would have the task of looking into the expenditure of about \$3,500,000,000 to see if there was waste, or to see where reductions could be made. That would be like one man trying to tell the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., which stretches from one end of America to the other, where it could save some money in all its stores. It seems to me that we ought to have at least one man to try to find the waste in \$1,000,000,000 of expenditures.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say to my very fine friend from Louisiana, who is one of the most able Members of this body, that he has made one mistake in his comment. The 18 members about whom he is speaking are the 18 members of the joint committee. The staff would consist of more than 18 members. We were speaking of a minimum of approximately 50 technically trained, competent persons, recruited not on the basis of whether or not we like them or whether they come from our State, or whether we are good friends of theirs, but on the basis of their knowledge of particular aspects of the budget. I grant that even if we had a staff of 50 members, possibly that would not be a sufficient number. However, I believe that it would be a decided improvement, particularly when we are able to tie in, under the terms of the bill, members of the Bureau of the Budget, from the executive agency, in a cooperative relationship with the staff of the Joint Committee on the Budget, which, in turn, would be working with the staffs of the Appropriations Committees. What we are attempting to do is to harness the mental power of competent, able and experienced technicians, bringing them together and putting them to work on a particular project, all at one time.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Perhaps 50 staff assistants may be visualized; but the answer which the junior Senator from Louisiana obtained from the chairman of the committee, who is handling this measure, was to the effect that he visualized perhaps 18 staff assistants in the beginning. If that is what is contemplated, the junior Senator from Louisiana thinks that the proposal is still inadequate. As a rule of thumb, it seems to the junior Senator from Louisiana that it is rather hopeless to think that one man can effectively study more than \$1,000,000,000 of expenditures. In fact, I believe that probably \$1,000,000,000 is more than one man could become a specialist on. But to go beyond that point and expect him to master any more than that would seem to be almost hopeless.

It has been pointed out that the Bureau of the Budget has approximately 500 employees. That represents perhaps one employee for every \$160,000,000

which the Federal Government spends. Even if that were true, we must recognize that not all those employees are experts on expenditures. Probably three-fourths of them are stenographers, assistants, or messengers. Only about 1 in 10 would be regarded as an expert on the expenditures involved in the budget. Therefore, it seems to the junior Senator from Louisiana that a larger staff is needed to make a study of this question than is presently contemplated.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say to the Senator from Louisiana that the bill provides no ceiling on the number of technicians. That would be a matter of legislative appropriation. My feeling is very much the same as that of the Senator from Louisiana, namely, that the important committees which deal with the budget and with appropriations should be adequately equipped. This is one area in which we receive a great deal of comment from the folks back home. This subject justly disturbs the American people. It is my belief that the committees should equip themselves, through the joint committee effort provided for in the bill, with the staffs necessary to do the job. I do not believe that we can justify a situation such as that which existed a year ago in connection with the military budget of more than \$50,000,000,000. That budget was debated on the floor of the Senate. The able and distinguished chairman of the subcommittee had assigned to him one staff member to be of assistance to him. That seems outside the realm of plausibility. It does not amount to good management.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is eminently correct. At this point we get into a difficult situation. The Armed Services Committee makes a study of the authorizations for the military budget, but it has an inadequate staff to make such a study, and by and large, it must accept the judgment of the military. Then when the question comes before the Appropriations Committee for consideration of the appropriation, the Appropriations Committee does not have the necessary staff to question any of the proposed expenditures. The impression of the junior Senator from Louisiana, who has sat in hearings involving military establishments, is that every one of such establishments could be pared down substantially. Surely the military authorities would like to have more money. They would like to have things more convenient. They would like to see the military establishments adequate in all respects for war. But there are a great number of projects which could be postponed, or perhaps never built at all, if there were someone to go over the items of appropriation and ascertain the need and the facts. Certain projects could be postponed for many years, or perhaps never authorized in the first place. I am sure that the same thing is true of all branches of the Government.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The excellent work of the Johnson preparedness subcommittee, with the staff it has, and as a result of the efforts of the members of that subcommittee, has saved the Government of the United States billions of dollars. That is one subcommittee of the Congress which has directed its ef-

forts toward improvement of the operating efficiency of the Military Establishment. It has checked into waste and duplication. It has looked into the rubber program, the tin program, the lead program, the wool program, and others. By reason of the efforts of that one subcommittee—not merely its members, but also the technical staff assigned to it—billions of dollars have been saved to the American people. It is a good investment to expend some public funds for trained and competent personnel who can work with capable and able Senators who are making an honest attempt to save their Government money without at the same time weakening national security.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is correct; but, of course, he must realize the inadequacy of that subcommittee, because while it is uncovering waste and extravagance and taking remedial measures so far as four or five North African air bases are concerned, and finding out too late about waste, perhaps, in an air base on Greenland, at the same time expenditures are going on in perhaps hundreds of other installations elsewhere, which the committee simply cannot get around to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. One way to check on possible waste and extravagance is to exercise sufficient control of the purse strings and know what is in the budget. We cannot waste too much if we must produce something within the limits of the dollars which are appropriated. I do not in any respect feel that those who are in the executive branch of the Government are any more desirous of waste than are Members of Congress. I am confident that they think they are doing what they ought to do. But there is definitely serious danger when we are dealing with expenditures in terms of billions of dollars for one particular part of the Government, namely, the Military Establishment. There is bound to be some waste in such large expenditures. It is inevitable. There is waste in the family budget of a man with a \$5,000-a-year income. If anyone doubts that, let him look in the garbage can or in the attic. There is always some waste. Our job is to minimize it. We cannot wholly eradicate it.

I believe the Congress of the United States has an obligation to equip itself for modern government. That is one problem which we are very hesitant about meeting. We are hesitant about installing modern mechanical equipment in the Senate. We should have a loud-speaker system, and 101 other things to improve our performance. I think it is time for us to get down to the business of equipping the legislative branch of the Government with the equipment, manpower, and skills required for twentieth century government.

Everyone talks about how big the budgets are. It is said that we spend more in 1 year than the Government used to spend in 100 years; and we spend it with just about the same-sized staff. Our job is to equip ourselves with an auditing, accounting, and scientific analysis system to deal with appropriations, so that we can go back to our peo-

ple and say that at least we have made every effort in our power to attempt to solve the problem.

Mr. President, there is one other point I should like to mention. Years ago every Member of Congress could be an expert in one particular field. Years ago, of course, a Member of Congress received perhaps 10 letters a day. One of the greatest problems with which we are confronted in Congress today arises from the great volume of mail that each of us receives.

How does anyone find the time today to become an expert on any subject? We are supposed to be experts on everything from insecticides to atom bombs, from the hoof-and-mouth disease to cancer research, and from reclamation and public power to the Children's Bureau. It is an impossible task for any one of us to become an expert on any subject. It is necessary, therefore, to rely for advice upon people who are experts within certain fields. It is necessary to have such experts available so that we may go to them and say, "I want you to track down this particular budget item all the way from the beginning and to the very day when we will have to vote on it. I want you to spot check the offices of this particular agency in the field, not merely in Washington. I want you to see whether or not we are getting dollar for dollar of value, or at least whether a substantial improvement is being made along that line."

Mr. President, the pending bill provides at least the mechanism for improvement. It is a forward step. It is a good approach. It does not represent the millennium by any means. It will not resolve every problem. But I guarantee that it will provide a much better mechanism than we have at the present time. Any improvement at this stage, when we are considering a budget of \$85,000,000,000, is an improvement well worth making.

I shall say no more except that I encourage the passage of the bill. I, for one, have been distressed by the many items in the budget. I have refused many times to vote for a 10-percent cut, and I shall continue to do so. I have refused to vote for a 20-percent cut or even a 5-percent cut across the board, because I believe that by so doing the innocent as well as the guilty are penalized. In fact, the person who has been conscientious within a bureau or a unit of our Government would be penalized much more than would one who has not been conscientious. We would probably penalize a conscientious man more than one who has not been conscientious, because the latter may have included some fat in his request on the expectation that some of it would be boiled off anyway. On the other hand, if we cut 10 percent from the request of a bureau whose estimates have been worked down to the point where there is not a single bit of surplus or excess fat, we take the chance of wrecking that agency. We came very close to doing that with respect to the meat inspection service and other matters.

We must try to equip the committees of Congress with expert personnel who

can pick and choose and dissect every item.

Mr. President, when the American public finds out that we have not been doing just that, perhaps they will rise in rightful wrath and let it fall on us.

I am not complaining about the work of the Committee on Appropriations. But if the members of the committee were as wise as the wise men of old, if they had all the intellectual brilliance of an Einstein, they could not possibly know all that is contained in the budget, and certainly could not find out what was in it in the length of time they have to work on it. With the help of many technicians and competent staff work, the job of budget making would be within the realm of reason.

Mr. President, I encourage support of the pending measure.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I offer an amendment for myself and on behalf of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 14, beginning with line 22, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 11 on page 15, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(g) The joint committee shall have a staff director, an assistant staff director, and such other professional, technical, clerical, and other employees, temporary or permanent, as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the joint committee. Such employees shall be employed without regard to the civil-service laws, and their compensation shall be fixed without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The staff director shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the majority party on the joint committee and the assistant staff director shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the minority party on the joint committee. Of the other employees of the joint committee, one group shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the majority party on the joint committee and the other group shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the minority party on the joint committee. The number in each such group shall be determined on the basis of the proportionate representation on the joint committee of the majority and minority parties. No person shall be employed by the joint committee unless the members appointing him have favorable considered the data with respect to him submitted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation after a thorough investigation of his loyalty and security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] for himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], to the committee amendment, the committee amendment being a complete substitute for the original text of the bill.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Bricker	Byrd
Anderson	Bridges	Cain
Benton	Butler, Md.	Capehart
Brewster	Butler, Nebr.	Carlson

Case	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Clements	Ives	Robertson
Cordon	Jenner	Russell
Douglas	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Dworschak	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppe
Eastland	Kilgore	Seaton
Ecton	Langer	Smathers
Ellender	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Ferguson	Long	Smith, N. J.
Flanders	Magnuson	Smith, N. C.
Frear	Martin	Sparkman
George	Maybank	Stennis
Gillette	McCarran	Taft
Green	McClellan	Thye
Hayden	McKellar	Tobey
Hendrickson	McMahon	Watkins
Hickenlooper	Monroney	Wiley
Hill	Moody	Williams
Hoey	Morse	Young
Holland	Murray	
Humphrey	Neely	

Mr. McCLELLAN. I announce that the Senators from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and Mr. JOHNSON, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFFI], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I should like to announce that it is the intention of the majority to remain in session this evening until this bill is passed. I hope we may reach a vote on final passage within an hour or such a matter, or within 2 hours. There are few amendments, and I do not think much time will be required on any of them. I make this announcement so that Senators may govern themselves accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator who is handling the pending bill has told the Senate that we shall be in session until the bill is passed. Let us cooperate by letting Senators speak, who desire to do so, and let us make progress.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in my judgment, Senate bill 913 is long overdue. It is for the purpose of improving

the facilities of the Congress in exercising its responsibilities in connection with its control of the purse strings. The facilities of the Congress in providing appropriations for the expenditures of the Government have not kept pace with the progress of the country. We are attempting to deal with a budget of tremendous size, in an oxcart manner, but in a jet-engine age, stated simply. When I came to the Senate 16 years ago, the Federal Budget of the United States was approximately \$7,000,000,000. The Federal Budget today is \$85,000,000,000-plus. From \$7,000,000,000 to \$85,000,000 within 16 short years represents a tremendous increase in the problems of the Congress.

When the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 was passed, it established the principle of the legislative budget. I do not wish to throw rocks at anyone, but I may say that in 1947 and 1948, when my party was in control of the Congress, we made an honest attempt to meet the legislative requirements of the legislative budget, and, no matter what happened, let us remember that those were the only 2 years within the past 20 years that the Federal Budget was balanced, when there was something paid on the public debt, when recessions were made to the extent of \$11,000,000,000, and when taxes were reduced. All of that occurred within the 2-year period, 1947 and 1948, when the Republicans were in control of the Congress.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senate is not in order. We are unable to hear what is said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The present occupant of the Chair would be one of the last ones to try to tell any Member of the Senate what he should do, and, therefore, what he must do. But if the speakers are going to be heard, all other Senators will have to be quiet. If the speakers are to be shown proper respect, all other Senators are going to have to have to defer to them more than they did to me this morning, and to other Senators. Under those circumstances, the Chair feels it is his duty to endeavor to enforce the rules which apply to all Members of the Senate. The Senator from New Hampshire may proceed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, merely to show the burden of the present tremendous budget, I have some very interesting and late figures, as of April 4. From 1789 to the day when the present President of the United States took office there had been collected in taxes from the American people \$244,200,000,000. From the day Mr. Truman took the oath of office in April 1945 to the present day, or until April 4, which was last Friday, there have been collected in taxes, within that brief period of time, \$310,463,056-589.59, contrasted to the taxes collected during all administrations in our history, from the day George Washington took the oath of office to the time when Harry Truman took the oath of office as President of the United States, during which period, as I have said, taxes were collected from the American people in the amount of \$244,000,000,000 plus. We are today confronted with a budget of \$85,-

600,000,000. The Congress of the United States has inadequate means and methods of dealing with that problem. It is a pitiful thing, with the inadequate facilities at hand, to sit day after day, week after week, and month after month on the Appropriations Committee of the United States Senate and to be confronted with thousands of experts from the executive branch of the Federal Government, presenting their case. The thousands of witnesses have ability to call upon tens of thousands more to assist in the preparation of figures to justify their position. Under such circumstances, the Appropriations Committee can at best do but a superficial job. I wonder that it does that job as well as it does.

If we are now in a jet-engine age, if we are now in a position where we must deal with such enormous appropriations, then we must have facilities with which to perform our work.

There is some question about the bill introduced by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], but I think that he and his committee have done an excellent job. They have brought to the Senate a sound over-all approach to this problem. In the main, I certainly favor the bill. It is one of the long-range constructive measures which I have seen brought forth in this session of the Congress. I believe that, with certain minor amendments, the bill should be supported by Members of both political parties.

Let us remember that at the first of the year we are always confronted with a budget. This year it consists of 1,316 pages and weighs 5 3/4 pounds. The great bulk of the expenditure proposed is for the executive branch of the Federal Government. Let us bear in mind, for example, that the legislative cost of the Government of the United States, compared to the total budget, is probably less than one-twentieth of 1 percent. The budget for the judiciary and legislative branches together is practically insignificant compared with the total budget. Therefore, in considering the budget, we are dealing almost entirely with the expenditures of the executive branch of the Government. Of the 2,500,000 employees in the Federal Government today, approximately 2,470,000 are in the executive branch. Nineteen million Americans are receiving monthly some form of payment from the Federal Government, whether it be a pension, a salary, a subsidy, or something of that kind.

Mr. President, I think the bill as reported, with some minor amendments, may be one of the answers to the situation. Prior to this time, what have we had? We have had an Appropriations Committee which has been inadequately staffed, an Appropriations Committee which, at best, could do but a superficial job. In addition, Mr. President, we have a joint committee headed by the able Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. With a very, very small budget that committee has rendered able and distinguished service. I take my hat off to the Senator from Virginia for the great contribution he

has made through the medium of that committee in connection with the elimination of waste and duplication in the Federal budget.

Mr. President, the Reorganization Act provided for a legislative budget. As I previously stated, when the Republicans were in control there was, at least, an attempt made to carry out the provisions of the Reorganization Act. In 1947 and 1948 the Republican Congress attempted to do the job. Some people may say one thing and some may say another thing, but it is a fact that 1947 and 1948 were the only 2 years in the past two decades when the Federal budget was balanced and when something was paid on the national debt.

Apparently those who are now responsible for the conduct of the Congress have seen fit to ignore the legislative budget. That is their responsibility, and I am not quarreling with them, but, nevertheless, that is true.

Mr. President, I can remember making a speech in the city of Manchester, in the State of New Hampshire, many years ago, and talking about Government spending. A man in the audience stood up and said, "Why cry about spending by the Government? Only the rich pay taxes."

We know whether that is true today, Mr. President. Of course, it is not true. From the day that Harry Truman took the oath of office to the present time we have collected approximately \$56,000,000,000 more in taxes than we collected from the day George Washington took the oath of office to the day when Franklin D. Roosevelt died.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the Senator realize that if all the taxes from persons having an income of \$6,000 or more a year were collected, the whole amount would operate the Federal Government only 3 1/2 weeks, and that any additional taxes would have to come from the lower-income brackets?

Mr. BRIDGES. I realized that that was the general situation. I thank the Senator for his comment on the subject.

Mr. President, we are approaching the first two appropriation bills which are ready for a mark-up by the committee. I do not think there is a Senator who would not be glad to act on all the appropriation bills and get away in the early summer. But if we are to do that, Mr. President, we can only do a superficial job. We can only scratch the surface.

As I understand the bill reported by the distinguished and able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], it will provide a service organization to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House, just as the Joint Committee on Taxation provides a service for the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Ways and Means. I do not know whether the bill can get through the House, but I hope that it will pass the Senate. It affords an opportunity to improve the working facilities of the Congress. I hope the bill will pass, but first, I ask for a vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr.

FERGUSON and myself which provides for a division of the staff between the two political parties, based upon the number of members of the minority and majority parties composing the committee. In other words, the members of the staff will be responsible to their respective parties so that they will not have any divided loyalties in whatever is done. I know the Senator from Arkansas is extremely fair, but, nevertheless, we have had some experiences in other places which make me hope that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I fully appreciate the purpose of the amendment, but, frankly, I cannot understand how it will work under all circumstances. The amendment provides for the appointment of a staff director by the majority party and an assistant staff director by the minority party, with a division of clerical and staff hire at lower levels in proportion to the membership of the majority and minority parties. However, it is conceivable, and it might readily happen, that there would be in the Senate a majority of Democrats, as is the case today, and in the House a majority of Republicans. This is a joint committee and a joint staff, and if we happen to have that kind of a division in the two Houses, I cannot understand how the division called for by the amendment could be made. We would have a majority of Democrats in the Senate sitting with a majority of Republicans in the House, appointing a staff director, and a minority of Republicans in the Senate joining a majority of Republicans in the House and appointing an assistant staff director, with a proportionate share of the staff hire. It looks like an impossible situation. I hope the Senator will help me to understand the amendment by indicating how such a situation could be handled.

Mr. BRIDGES. Answering the Senator from Oregon, I have no pride of authorship, and I do not think the Senator from Michigan has, either. I cannot see how there would be any interference, because if there should be a majority of Republicans in the House and a minority of Republicans in the Senate, the worst that could happen would be that the joint committee and its staff would be evenly divided. If the Senator can suggest an improvement, I would welcome it, but it was the only method or means of procedure it seemed possible to suggest.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon cannot suggest a method by which the end sought could be attained.

Mr. President, I feel it might be well to try the plan contemplated in the bill as it was reported, to have a nonpartisan or bipartisan staff, with a director, assistant director, or what have you, and attempt, in a bipartisan operation, to limit the committee or staff to the field of fact finding only. I recognize that one might be naive in believing that such a plan could work, but I should like to see it tried, at least once, before we frankly split the group and confess that what we have are two partisan groups,

working separately, with separate policies, and answerable to separate bosses.

I have joined with my colleagues in the minority in seeking to have certain members of the staff of the Committee on Appropriations responsible to the minority. I think it has been a good arrangement. I hope we shall continue to follow that practice. But when we go beyond that, there is a doubt in my mind whether the approach is proper.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished minority leader for his favorable comments on the bill, and for his enthusiastic support of it, to the end that the objectives we seek to attain may be given congressional approval.

I have no serious objection to the amendment suggested except for one point. My reason for saying I have no serious objection is that I do not know who will be the chairman of the joint committee, and I do not know which members of other committees will compose the joint committee.

However, I may say that so far as the senior Senator from Arkansas is concerned, I am seeking every way and means to eliminate as much partisanship in the deliberations of the proposed joint committee and of Congress as it is possible to eliminate, particularly when we are undertaking to deal with a matter so vital as the national budget by means of a bill which I think should have the support and energetic efforts of all Americans, including all Members of Congress, irrespective of party.

I happen to be chairman of the committee which reported the bill. I succeeded the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who was chairman of the committee during the Eightieth Congress. I was ranking member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments when the Congress was reorganized and the committee was reestablished under the Reorganization Act. I may say that while I was ranking minority member, the distinguished Senator from Vermont conferred with me about every selection that was made for the staff, and we agreed upon it. I have continued that policy since that time, and with the exception of one person, the staff the able Senator from Vermont had developed during his chairmanship of the committee has been retained. That includes the clerical staff, and the professional staff as well. My instructions to every member of the staff has been to serve every member of the committee irrespective of party. Every member of the committee is as free to go to a member of the staff and ask for service as I am.

There is one serious question incident to the proposal of the Senator from New Hampshire. If the proposed joint committee is to meet with the fullest success, the staff should be a truly professional and nonpartisan staff. If instructions were given to serve every member who may compose the joint committee, I do not think there would be a bit of trouble. If the pro-

posed amendment were adopted, every time there was a change in administration, we should probably lose about one-third of the professional staff. They would be cut off, because the other party would step in to select a majority.

The pending bill was reported unanimously. It is not a partisan measure. It is not a Republican bill or a Democratic bill. Members of the committee on both sides have unanimously supported it. I wish to express my personal appreciation to Members on the other side of the aisle who have supported the bill. I anticipate that a very large majority of Members on this side will support the bill on final passage.

I hope we can try what is proposed in the measure as it is now before the Senate. I believe those who will compose the joint committee, certainly those on the Senate side, will have no problem in obtaining members of a staff who will be directed to serve all members of the joint committee, both the majority and the minority.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Would the difficulty suggested by the Senator from Oregon be overcome by providing that in case the Senate should happen to have a Republican majority and the House a Democratic majority, then the majority party within the meaning of the amendment would be the party of which the occupant of the White House was a member.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say to the Senator that that could be one way of solving the difficult.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. A nonpartisan President might happen to be in the White House.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say to the Senator from North Dakota that there has not yet been that kind of President in the White House, and I think the time when there will be is a good while off. The Senator may be correct if he is speaking of some far distant time.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the point raised by the Senator from Oregon simply means that there would be a staff composed half of Democrats and half of Republicans. That is what it would amount to, because if the staff were composed of 18, 12, 10, or whatever number was finally decided on, the result would be that half would be Republicans and half would be Democrats. The staff would be divided half and half. I think that is the way the question would be resolved. It would not be a question of who was in the White House or who was not, because the bill refers to the membership of the committee, not to the occupant of the White House.

Mr. BRIDGES. In connection with the troublesome points which have been raised by the Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Arkansas, and other Senators, would it not be well to take such a proposed amendment to conference? The House has still to act on the bill. Between what the Senate does and what

the House does the conference committee could certainly work out a proper plan.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from New Hampshire, that I have no objection if the Senate cares to follow the course suggested. Then we would know that the minority would have some control over the situation. If the amendment could be limited to providing that the staff director should be under the control of the majority and the assistant staff director under the control of the minority, the minority could then be assured of whatever necessary services it might think should be rendered to it. That is as far as I think I could go. In other words, if the minority wants to have one or two staff members set aside to do work for the minority, I see no objection to it, but I believe it is a mistake to propose an amendment which undertakes a partisan division.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the Senator from Arkansas has made a good suggestion. If the staff director were under the control of the majority, and if the majority in the House were of one party and the majority in the Senate of the other party, there would not be a division on an even basis so that a majority of both Houses would control the staff director, but the assistant staff director would be under the control of the minority.

When the appointments are made I think matters could be worked out so as to provide for a bipartisan staff. I am satisfied that by having a bipartisan staff, the people would feel that they were represented and that all facts were being brought out. The only purpose of this kind of bill is to be sure to get all the facts, not only facts about the administration in power, but the minority ought to be satisfied that they are getting all the facts, so that when the budget comes to Congress and is considered by the Appropriations Committees, their decisions will be based upon facts rather than upon what one side or the other side may want to present.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I can appreciate that perhaps the minority would like to have one such representative as a contact man, to keep the minority advised as to what is going on. If there were nothing written into the law on this subject, I would be in favor of handling the situation in that manner, or having the staff director available to both sides. I am anxious to try to accommodate the minority. Certainly if I were in charge of the committee I would never use the majority position to restrict or hamper the minority in the full expression of its views, or in obtaining full information.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Arkansas understands that there is a different philosophy in the two parties.

Therefore, if both sides were represented, we would be sure to get the facts as they have a bearing on the philosophies of the two respective parties.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If there were a difference of opinion, the minority would be entitled to have staff advice relating to its position, and expert assistance in making its report. For that reason I should have no objection to the minority naming the assistant staff director. Of course, it should be remembered that the staff director would be the director of the entire staff.

Mr. FERGUSON. But if there were an assistant, he would at least know what was going on, and he could advise the minority.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the minority wishes to have an assistant director as a contact man, personally I have no objection.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I shall modify my amendment to meet with the approval of the Senator from Arkansas. I modify the amendment so as to read as follows:

The joint committee shall have a staff director, an—

I shall change the next word, "assistant" to "associate."

The joint committee shall have a staff director, an associate staff director, and such other professional, technical, clerical, and other employees, temporary or permanent, as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the joint committee. Such employees shall be employed without regard to the civil-service laws, and their compensation shall be fixed without regard to the Classification Act of 1919, as amended. The staff director shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the majority party on the joint committee and the associate staff director shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the minority party on the joint committee.

Then I shall eliminate the following language, down to the period in line 10 on page 2. The remaining language is as follows:

No person shall be employed by the joint committee unless the members appointing him have favorably considered the data with respect to him submitted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation after a thorough investigation of his loyalty and security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is modified accordingly.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I cannot understand how it is to be determined which is the majority party and which is the minority party, if the parties are evenly divided in numerical strength. On this side of the aisle the designation would be that of Republican majority and Democratic minority. On the other side of the aisle it would be a Democratic majority and a Republican minority. Which would be the majority?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon, with his shrewd legal mind, which he brings to the forefront frequently, is probably looking at the situation a little differently than I am. During all the time I have been a Member of the Senate, with the exception of 2 years, the Republicans were in the minority. When I came to the Senate there were only 16 Republican Sen-

ators. So perhaps I did not fully appreciate the problem. However, I think a solution could be found.

Mr. CORDON. Did not President Hoover confront such a situation in the late 1920's? Such a situation would be bound to arise sooner or later. It seems to me that it is not wise to approach the problem legislatively in this manner.

Mr. BRIDGES. We could add a provision that in the event of an even division of the two political parties the director and the associate director should alternate each year during the Congressional session.

Mr. President, I know that many Senators think I am technical, but I have been through the mill in connection with some of these questions. I have known occasions upon which I have asked members of a staff to help me, and they did not dare to do so. Sometimes I was told that they would have to take the work home and do it on Sunday, because they did not dare to do it in the committee room. Other Senators have faced similar situations. What we want is to have someone upon whom we can count, someone who dares to do what he is asked to do.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. We know from personal experience that on occasion a member of the staff of a committee has advised some member of the minority, and has been criticized by the chairman of the committee for doing so. Let us be realistic about this matter. Do we not find at times that a member of the staff of a committee, if he gives advice to a minority member, is criticized in the committee for giving such advice, or for making a suggestion to a witness on the witness stand?

If this job is to be done right, both sides must be represented, so that all the facts may be developed. The situation which I have described may happen only rarely, but it can happen.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Michigan has made an argument which might well be directed against the passage of the bill; but it certainly cannot be directed in support of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] for himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President—

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish the floor in my own right.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, before the Senator from New Hampshire yields the floor, let me suggest that I believe it would be advisable further to modify the amendment, so as to substitute the Civil Service Commission in place of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In view of the bill which has recently been passed, it seems that the Civil Service Commission is the agency

to do the investigating in these cases. Personally I have no objection to the Federal Bureau of Investigation making the investigation.

Mr. BRIDGES. What the Senator says may be true; but so far as I am concerned, when legislative representatives are investigated, I want the investigation to be conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and not by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Personally, I have no objection to the Federal Bureau of Investigation making the investigation. I was merely trying to make the amendment conform to the facts of the situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield the floor?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the amendment and in opposition to the bill.

Only a short time ago we heard the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire make the very same argument, almost word for word, which he made today. It was at the time we were considering the La Follette-Monroney bill. If only every Senator could have a legislative assistant; if only every committee could have a little more help, everything would be fine. We were going to save the Government millions of dollars.

Now we have such a situation. I have seen a great many political appointments made. I have seen such employees working in campaigns for the reelection of their Senators.

Mr. President, we have a good committee, a committee which is very familiar with this entire situation. That committee is headed by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. The Senator from Virginia has done an outstanding job for the people of the United States. If the 96 legislative assistants had been turned over to the Senator from Virginia and his committee at the time Congress passed the La Follette-Monroney Act, I believe that that committee would have saved the Government many millions of dollars.

What are we doing here today? Let me read from the bill, on page 14, beginning in line 22:

(g) The joint committee shall, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, employ and fix the compensation of a staff director and such other professional, technical, clerical, and other employees, temporary or permanent, as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the joint committee.

They may hire 10 men, 50 men, or 100 men. They may hire 1,000. I have no objection to providing all the necessary help for a man like the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who, I am satisfied, will be reelected and will be with us for 6 years more. I have no objection to his committee having all the clerical and professional help it needs. It seems to me that when we have a good committee, when we have a going concern which is doing and has done a magnificent job, it would be much wiser for the Congress to turn over to that committee the proposed staff than it would be to enact the proposed legislation which is before us.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words with reference to the pending bill. Many Senators, including the Senator from Michigan, have been advocating for a long time what is attempted to be done by the pending bill.

Having been a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, now the Committee on Government Operations, from which committee this bill was reported, I know of the amount of work that has been done on the bill. We should give due consideration to it. I call particular attention to one provision in which I am very much interested, as is the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and other Members of the Senate. It is a provision to cover which a separate bill was introduced by me on several occasions.

Almost daily, Mr. President, we are confronted in the Committee on Appropriations by requests for funds to meet expenses brought about by an authorization passed by Congress. At the time such an act is passed the cost involved seems insignificant. It is looked upon as only another bill. It may even be passed on the call of the calendar. However, by the time the machinery is set up for the operation of the act a considerable cost is involved. Furthermore, Mr. President, frequently we pass acts which are to be administered not by a department already in existence, such as the Department of Justice, for example, but by agencies created by the acts themselves. Then what happens? Such agencies must be staffed with directors, assistant directors, lawyers, economists, public relations experts, stenographers, and even a certain number of messengers. We are constantly confronted with such situations in the Committee on Appropriations.

On page 17 of the bill an attempt is made to take care of cases of that kind. An attempt is made to carry out the idea of the Senator from Michigan and other Senators. It is an idea they have had in mind for many years, but have never been able to have it enacted into law. Certainly I hope this bill will be passed, if for no other reason than to have in the law this provision, which would make it possible for the Senate to have when it passes on a piece of legislation, an estimate of what it will cost per annum as nearly as it can be ascertained from the Budget Director and from those who are to carry out the provisions of the legislation, as well as an estimate of what it will cost from year to year for a period of 5 years.

I feel certain that if Members of the Senate have such information before them they will pass fewer authorization bills. It is very easy to pass authorization bills. Later in the Committee on Appropriations we find that a supplemental appropriation bill is necessary to carry out the provisions of the authorization bill.

Mr. President, there is now before the Committee on Appropriations a deficiency appropriation bill calling for the appropriation of more than a billion dollars. Practically all of it covers activities which have come into existence since the original appropriation bills

were passed, and most requests are brought about by the fact that we have passed authorization bills which call for the expenditure of the money.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has recommended a cut of \$7,000,000,000 in the budget?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator from Michigan believe that if the Senator from Virginia had a competent staff he would accomplish the same purpose that is sought to be accomplished by the pending bill?

Mr. FERGUSON. I will come to the Byrd committee, of which I am a member. I want to speak about the work of the committee, and I shall praise it as much as the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has praised it. I believe in the committee. What we have in mind is set forth in this provision in this way:

(g) (1) All bills and joint resolutions authorizing appropriations reported from committees of the Senate or the House of Representatives shall be accompanied by reports in writing, which shall be printed; and there shall be included in each such report or in an accompanying document an estimate from the department or other agency of the legislative, executive, or judicial branch of the Government primarily concerned of the probable cost of carrying out the legislation proposed in such bill or resolution over the first 5-year period of its operation or over the period of its operation if such legislation will be effective for less than 5 years.

That would give to the Senate control of the purse strings from day to day. When bills are considered the various committees of Congress will be able to obtain figures as to what the proposed legislation will cost and by how much we will have to increase appropriations.

Mr. President, I wish now to speak with relation to the Byrd committee. As has been stated, the pending bill would create a joint committee on the budget. We are faced with a budget of approximately \$85,000,000,000. No matter how large a staff might be employed it would be busy every day of the year considering the budget.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Michigan knows, for example, that as of January 3, 1952, the Department of Defense begins to make its plans for the 1954 budget, and that at the same time it is preparing its 1953 budget and its supplemental 1952 budget. Therefore, if the joint committee is to have the members of its staff obtaining figures from the Defense Department they will have at any one time three budgets to consider and, therefore, they will be extremely busy.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; they will certainly be extremely busy. That will be a tremendous task. The committee will be busy every day looking into the current budget, the budget that will come

along the following year, and the supplemental appropriation request.

The thought has been expressed that the Byrd committee should be abolished. I have recently been appointed to the Byrd committee, although I have known in the past of its good work and have been familiar with the reports the committee has submitted from time to time. I have before me a report issued by the Byrd committee very recently. It is a report on the amount of the Federal grants-in-aid to the States. It is the first time that Congress has had before it a report on Federal grants-in-aid to the States. It shows the amount of money which has been appropriated and the amount of the increases from year to year. It is a very valuable document. Certainly it is worth more than the entire cost of the Byrd committee from the time it was established. The Byrd committee has spent an average of \$15,225 a year. Mr. President, let me emphasize that the Byrd committee, which has been doing such valuable work for the people of the United States, has cost the taxpayers only an average of \$15,225 a year since it was established in 1941.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I wish to commend the Senator from Michigan for his attitude toward the Byrd committee. The Senator from Kansas is a member of the committee which through its distinguished chairman, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] has reported the pending bill.

I have been asked several times, in connection with this measure, whether it would abolish the Byrd committee. It certainly would not abolish the Byrd committee. As a matter of fact, I want unequivocally to go on record, standing with the Senator from Michigan and many other Senators, as saying that the Byrd committee has rendered signal service to the country and that it is a pity that it was not created much earlier than it was. I believe that with the establishment of the joint committee and by keeping the Byrd committee in existence we can do a great deal in keeping the budget down to the point where it is understandable and workable.

I am very glad to hear the Senator from Michigan make the statement he has made.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, at the time when the Eightieth Congress was organized, with a Republican majority, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] was chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-essential Federal Expenditures. At that time when the Republicans were in the majority, no Senator on the Republican side of the aisle even thought of requesting that the chairmanship of that joint committee be changed. The chairman of the joint committee had been and continued to be a Democratic Senator from Virginia. There was no move to have the chairmanship of that committee changed, for it was a joint committee which was looking into facts.

Let me read the purpose of the joint committee:

To make a full and complete study and investigation of all expenditures of the Federal Government, with a view to recommending the elimination or reduction of all such items deemed by the committee to be non-essential.

In other words, that joint committee works not only on the budget, to give advice to the Appropriations Committee, but its job is to work generally on matters relating to unnecessary or non-essential expenditures of the Federal Government.

For instance, let us consider the program of the Byrd committee for the next year. It has discovered that approximately 175,000 civilians—to be exact, I believe the number is 174,612—are on the payroll of the United States Government, employed outside the continental United States. The joint committee makes a survey to determine where such persons are employed, what they are doing in foreign countries, the places in which they are living, and whether they are provided transportation at Government expense.

We know that the Military Establishment pays great sums of money for the transportation expenses of the members of families of persons employed by it. Let me say that not long ago I received a visit from a young man who is employed as an accountant in the Air Corps. He has less than 1 year to remain in the armed services, and at the end of that time he will be discharged. He informed me that he was about to be sent to England, and that he was going to have shipped, to England, at Government expense, his Buick automobile. He told me that a little later his wife would follow there, and that their furniture would also be sent from continental United States to England, even though they were to be there for less than 1 year's time. All those transportation and shipping expenses would be paid by the Federal Government.

So it is wise for the joint committee to determine whether civilians are properly being paid for the transportation of their furniture, their automobiles, and their families. After all, those expenses run literally into the millions of dollars. Those matters should be examined. I think there is a place for post-budget audits while the transactions are occurring.

The joint committee to be established under the provisions of the pending bill will also examine matters relating to cost. However, the so-called Byrd Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures will make surveys. For instance, it has made a survey, consisting of more than 200 pages, of the Federal grants of aid to States. Its report on that subject is very valuable, and should be examined by every Senator.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator from Michigan tell us about anything the proposed joint committee would do that the Byrd joint committee cannot do if it has sufficient money and sufficient staff?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. As a matter of fact, I think it would be well to keep the two joint committees separated, with one of them working solely on the budget and advising the Appropriations Committee. I, for one, believe it would be better for the Senate to adopt the amendment providing that only members of the two Appropriations Committees should serve on the new joint committee. I think that would be a better arrangement, rather than to have members of other committees serve with them on the joint committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If we are to make the new joint committee workable and if we are to make it an effective aid for the Appropriations Committees, is it not really essential to adopt the amendment, which I understand is to be offered by the Senator from Arizona, providing that the new joint committee shall be composed only of members of the two Appropriations Committees?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I believe that is proper.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would hesitate to vote for the bill if that amendment were not adopted.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, I believe it is a good amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield. Mr. AIKEN. While the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRINGES] is on the floor, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Michigan in regard to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, providing that a part of the staff "shall be appointed by and responsible to, the members of the majority party on the joint committee" and a part of the staff "shall be appointed by and responsible to, the members of the minority party on the joint committee." I wonder whether the Senator realizes that such an arrangement might upset majority rule in the Senate. For instance, let us suppose that at some particular time the Senate were composed of 50 Democrats and 46 Republicans. Let us assume that 30 of those Democrats went right down the line with the administration, but that perhaps 20 of the Democrats had more sympathy with the Republican point of view. The amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire provides that the majority of the Democrats on the committee will appoint the chief of staff, the staff director, and a majority of the staff members. Such an arrangement would absolutely prohibit a combination—for, after all, we might as well be practical about this matter—of the Republican Senators on the joint committee and certain Democratic Senators on the joint committee who might see things in the same way the Republican members do, and would place in the hands of the majority members of the joint committee the right to select the most important members of the staff. In that case, assuming that the Democrats were in the majority at the time, 30 Members of the Senate would control the entire staff, in-

stead of having the other 66 Members of the Senate have some voice in the selection of the staff of the joint committee.

So I can foresee some difficulties in that connection. I say that we might as well be practical about this matter. After all, apparently there have been good working arrangements between sympathizers of the Byrd joint committee and a majority of the Republican Senators. We might as well realize that, for that has been the situation.

So, Mr. President, if we provide that a majority of the Democrats on the joint committee shall appoint the potent or most effective and most important staff members, it will be impossible for a combination which might represent the will of the entire Senate to appoint the members of the staff of the joint committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement the Senator from Vermont has made of a hypothetical case.

Mr. AIKEN. It is not hypothetical; it comes very near being a reality.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is not a reality now, at any rate.

I should like to make a suggestion to the Senator from New Hampshire, and I hope the Senator from Arkansas will consider the suggestion, so that there may be worked out what the Senator from Oregon had in mind in the case of a political division between House of Representatives and the Senate, with one having a majority of one political complexion and the other House having a majority of the other political complexion. The amendment provides for the appointment of a chairman and a vice chairman. If the chief of staff of the committee were of the same political faith as the chairman of the committee, and if the bill as enacted provided merely that the associate chief of staff should be a member of the opposite political party, the problem would be solved and there would not be any conflict regarding the political nature of the majority in the House of Representatives and of the majority in the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield for a suggestion on this point?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I have a suggestion which I think will make the arrangement even more automatic than it would be under the suggestion just made by the Senator from Michigan.

I should like to state my suggestion now, if it is of interest to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Arkansas. I am perfectly willing to accept any modification of the suggested language which Senators may wish to propose either on the floor or in conference, for I have merely jotted down the suggested provision on the floor of the Senate, as I have listened to the debate. Nevertheless, I think the principle I have in mind is perfectly clear. I suggest that on page 2 of the amendment, in line 3, after the word "committee," the following language be inserted:

In the event a majority of the Senate are of one party and the majority of the House of Representatives are of another party,

determination of the authority as between the Members of the two major parties to select the staff director and associate staff director shall be by lot, and the selection of other staff members shall be equally divided between the Members of the two major parties of the committee.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Oregon presents an intriguing solution to the problem, I may say.

Mr. MORSE. It is one with which it is impossible to play politics.

Mr. BRIDGES. It is a new method of settling things. The Senator is a distinguished lawyer; I am not.

Mr. MORSE. It is a very old method but a very fair one, and in my opinion, it eliminates any danger of getting this matter tangled up in any political deal. It is perfectly fair. It faces the fact that the two Houses are divided. One gets the director; one gets the associate director. From then on, there is an equal division of the number of men on the staff. I know of no better way of eliminating what I have a suspicion is passing through the minds of many of us, as to the kind of political manipulation which might take place in the event of the Senate's being of one party and the House of another. Why do we not apply a rule which has served pretty well for centuries?

Mr. FERGUSON. Another method which has been suggested is to provide that the majority party shall be considered to be of the same politics as the President of the United States at the time. That would be the majority party, no matter what the division might be in the Senate and House. The minority party would be the opposition party, no matter where the majority was found. I think either of the suggestions would provide a proper method of making the determination. But I hope we shall not attempt today to abolish the Byrd committee. I hope that that committee will continue to function, because it has a real job to do. The committee has an experienced staff; it has an experienced chairman. It can continue to do that particular job, not in an elaborate way, for it cannot do so with, as has been indicated, only \$15,225 a year. The committee does the work with a very small staff. In fact, the Senator from Virginia, I know, aids the committee in its work through the services of his own staff, which is working on this problem for him, personally. They aid the committee in doing its work, because the Senator from Virginia is so anxious to have the work done properly.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I should like to say that I agree thoroughly with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Michigan with reference to the support of this measure. I also agree with him 100 percent in his remarks with reference to continuing the Byrd committee. I have had the honor of being a member of the Byrd com-

mittee for quite a number of years. I know something of the good work which has been done by that committee. It is not a legislative committee, though one measure which had its origin in the so-called Byrd committee is the Corporation Control Act. It has not been mentioned in the debate previously, but Comptroller General Lindsay Warren has made the statement that it was one of the most important pieces of legislation of its kind to have been passed by the Congress within the past 25 years. It had its origin in the Byrd committee. The first witness was Mr. Jesse H. Jones, at that time the distinguished head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

As the distinguished Senator from Michigan has said, the work which has been done by the Byrd committee should not be interfered with as the result of the passage of the pending bill. Later on, after we may have had experience with the new bill, if action is necessary, it could be taken at that time. But I think it would be a great mistake at this time to undertake to abolish that committee by the passage of this bill.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

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

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The amendment to the Bridges amendment which the Senator from Maryland had in mind would be, on page 2, line 3, after the word "committee", to insert a semicolon, and the following:

*Provided, however, in any case where the majority in one House is of a different party than the majority in the other, "the majority party," within the meaning of this amendment, shall be that party of which the President of the United States is a member.*

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I hope that the amendment suggested by the Senator from Maryland will not be adopted, for the reason that I think the Congress ought to determine who the chairman of the committee shall be. I think it would be a mistake if the chairman were of a political faith different from that of the President of the United States, and would have to have as a director one of opposite political faith. I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will adopt the suggestion that the chairman be selected from the majority party, that he appoint the director, and that the assistant staff director be of the opposite party. That would solve the problem.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Could there not be a case in which there would be an absolutely equal division in the committee, when what I have proposed might be a very satisfactory provision?

Mr. FERGUSON. Even though there were an equal division, the chairman must be named under the rules, and the chairman ought to have the right to name the director. If he is of a political faith different from that of the President, he ought to be able to appoint a director from the other party, the minority party.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. If it is the object of the amendment in the first place to avoid political considerations in the proposed joint committee, why would it not be better to adopt this amendment which keeps politics completely out of the picture?

Mr. FERGUSON. It is not the idea to keep political faith out. We want political faith on the part of the joint committee, because we want to be sure that both sides are getting all the facts. If there is any way by which to get them, it is by having the two political parties represented. The reason Congress does such a good job of investigating is that there is an opposition party, and each side knows that the other is always trying to get the facts as it sees them.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment, that I may ask the Senator from Oregon a question?

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon in connection with the amendment which he proposed, whether there is a basis and precedent in previous laws for determining the matter legally by lot?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair feels constrained to announce that the rule permitting a Senator to yield for a question is the only rule which is applicable in this situation. There are other Members of the Senate who have been waiting a long time to obtain the floor. The Chair feels that he should enforce the rule that a Senator who has the floor may yield for a question only.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in order that there may be no conflict with the rule, I yield the floor.

#### THE PENDING STEEL STRIKE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have enjoyed very much the speech made by the distinguished Senator from Michigan regarding the pending measure, and I have also enjoyed the speeches made by other Senators, including the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. I desire, however, to speak about something which is of far greater importance than the passage of this bill, though the passage of the bill might well be of some real benefit in preventing inflation. I realize that there are many Senators present who know a good deal about inflation and its evil results. I wish to speak about the problem of inflation and the pending steel strike.

Mr. President, because of the pending steel strike, I, as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, have received a great number of inquiries regarding the possible effects of the strike on the action of the Committee on Banking and Currency with respect to the extension of the Defense Production Act.

The Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I have the great privilege of being chairman, has been charged by

this body with the great and difficult responsibility of considering and recommending to it legislative measures which will expand and promote production for our national defense, and measures which, at the same time, will help maintain economic balance in our civilian economy.

The committee, in my opinion, and, I believe, in the opinion of almost every member of this body and the people of the Nation, has discharged its responsibility faithfully and well. The committee recommended the Defense Production Act of 1950 on August 7, and in 1951 recommended its extension. The recommendations of the committee were in the main agreed to by the Congress and enacted into law.

As soon as these were approved they began to accomplish the production and stabilization effects that they were intended to have. Production of critical materials and the construction of critically needed defense plants were greatly expanded by diversion of whatever materials and resources they required. Steel capacity increased from 100,500,000 tons in 1950 to an estimated 109,000,000 this year and can reach a level of 120,000,000 tons by the end of 1953. Aluminum capacity has increased from 735,000,000 pounds to almost 1,000,000,000 pounds this year and can be at a level of 1,500,000,000 pounds at the end of 1953. Electric power stood at 69,000,000 kilowatts in 1950 and is estimated at about 85,000,000 kilowatts this year and can be at a level of 95,000,000 at the end of 1953. Machine tools were delivered at the rate of \$305,000,000 in 1940, and for this year it is estimated that figure will reach \$1,300,000,000 or more than four times as much. Military delivery rose to \$16,000,000,000 annually in 1951 and the rate of \$40,000,000,000 annually today. This was accomplished mainly through the priority, allocation and loan provisions of the Defense Production Act.

After the price features of the act were put into effect on January 26 prices began to level off and since that date the consumer prices have increased only 3 percent, as compared with 8 percent in the 7 months after the Korea conflict began. I was sorry, Mr. President, that the price features were not put into effect immediately.

Wholesale prices have actually declined 3 percent. As of January 15 of this year only 41 percent of the prices of wide general interest were at peak or ceiling, 20 percent were slightly below ceiling, while 39 percent are significantly below the ceiling or peak. I think from all this it is fairly clear that the committee and the Congress have done an excellent job insofar as they were able.

As chairman of the committee that has helped bring about economic stability in these perilous times and who is anxious that the good job of stabilizing our economy that we started be continued, I am deeply disturbed, as are all good citizens, because of the pending strike in the steel industry.

Mr. President, I am disturbed because I know perhaps as well as does any man in this body what inflation means and where it can lead.

My knowledge about it comes from some tough personal experience with it. I think this experience might be interesting and illustrate in a concrete way what inflation can mean, if it gets out of hand.

Let me give the Senate a little of the personal background, if I may. I regret to refer to any personal experiences I have had. I think they might be of some interest and illustrate in a concrete way that inflation can mean.

I came back from the war in 1919 full of enthusiasm and with a desire to get going in the business world. I had some ideas and thought I knew enough to make some real headway. I had been offered an opportunity to go to Oxford, in fact, but chose instead to go through with my business plans. In short, I did well for myself, and I managed to accumulate a little money.

As one piece of evidence, I hold in my hand a duplicate check for the sum of 100,000 marks which I drew from my account in May 22, 1922, at the Seaboard National Bank and deposited with my banker in Germany.

Let me include in the RECORD a letter acknowledging what was considered a substantial deposit, from my banker, B. Ehrhardt:

B. EHRHARDT & Co.,  
August 7, 1922.

Mr. BURNET R. MAYBANK,  
Charleston, S. C.

DEAR MR. MAYBANK: I beg to acknowledge receipt of your favor of the 12th ultimo, enclosing check for 100,000 marks, which amount we placed to your credit on our books and which we hold at your disposal at any time you wish to draw same out again.

Many thanks for your kind wishes, which I heartily reciprocate. Mrs. Ehrhardt wishes to be remembered to you.

Always at your disposal, I beg to remain,  
Sincerely yours,

B. EHRHARDT.

Mr. President, I want to say that I was in business in Germany in 1920, 1922, 1924, 1926, and 1930, and I saw what happened to Germany. I saw the destruction of the Hindenburg government. I saw the Hitler government spreading into communism.

Now let me read some personal economic history:

B. EHRHARDT & Co.,  
Bremen, December 8, 1923.  
Mr. BURNET MAYBANK,  
Charleston, S. C.

MY DEAR MR. MAYBANK: On July 27, 1922, you deposited through my firm in the bank 100,000 marks, but unfortunately the value of the mark has depreciated so much, that the 100,000 marks are practically worth nothing; and, therefore, it is useless to carry such a small amount on our books any longer.

I am exceedingly sorry that your speculation has turned out unprofitable this time and I sincerely wish that your future enterprises in this line will turn out more lucky.

Enclosed I beg to return the 100,000 marks with compound interest and perhaps it will be a pleasure to you to have a souvenir of your first speculation in the shape of an enclosed bill of 1,000,000,000 marks.

This amount sounds like a tremendous profit on an investment of 100,000 marks, but even the billions do not count much in our country any more, which is already seen by the poor paper, that is used for the bill.

The losses, which I suffered, are in the same proportion as yours, but we all have to

make the best of it and we must hope that the next year will be more prosperous to us than the last 10 years.

If you find time, drop me a line and acknowledge receipt of this letter.

I regret very much, that your firm has not thought well of consigning me the cotton, which your uncle promised to consign, when I visited him last spring. From Messrs. Tarrer, Steele & Co. we had a good deal of consignments and we are selling same without any trouble on cash terms. I do not see any danger for the American shippers in making consignments to Bremen, as we have a democratic government in Bremen and everything is as quiet and peaceful in Bremen as it is in Charleston and I hope that your firm will soon be convinced of this fact and make us some consignments, especially 9's and special 9's before the season is over.

Wishing you a Merry Xmas and a Happy New Year, I am with kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

B. EHRHARDT.

Under date of December 19, 1923, I received another letter, as follows:

B. EHRHARDT & Co.,  
Bremen, December 19, 1923.

Mr. BURNET R. MAYBANK,

Charleston, S. C.

MY DEAR MR. MAYBANK: Your favor of the 30th ultimo just received. If you want to know today's real value of the 100,000 marks calculated into American money, I must call to your attention the fact that 1 dollar or 100 cents equals 4,200,000,000,000 marks. This means that 100,000 marks are equal to 0.0000025 cent, which is a very small fraction of 1 cent, and you can book your investment of 100,000 marks as a total loss.

When on the 8th instant I sent you the paper money, it was merely a matter of book-keeping for my office and in order to straighten out the account on the books, I sent you the paper marks.

Even the bill of 1,000,000,000 marks, which I sent you, is practically worth only 25 cents, but I thought, it might please you to own a billion marks.

My family wishes to be remembered to you and with best wishes from all of us, I am,

Sincerely yours,

B. EBERHARDT.

Mr. President, I could weather that storm, but there are many workingmen in this country who cannot weather the storm if inflation should return. We could have a round of increased wages, a round of increased prices, and a round of strikes as we had once before. People may think they are going to get a big increase in wages, but the price of steel will be raised, as will the price of other commodities, and farm parties will go up. When they receive their money they will be the losers.

I only hope and pray that the working people and the businessmen of the country will realize the road down which they are going.

I saw what happened to the steel works in Duesseldorf, in Germany, when I was in the cotton business for several years, a few months at a time. I saw what happened to cotton merchants and to the German farmers. I remember that I had a secretary to whom I paid a pretty good salary. I paid him at the end of each month. He asked me on one occasion if I would not pay him half as much at the beginning of the month rather than the full amount at the end of the month, because inflationary forces were so great that at the beginning of the month half of his salary

was worth more in terms of what he could buy on the first of the month than at the end of the month.

I have long been acquainted with growing cotton, buying cotton, selling cotton, and shipping cotton.

I know what will happen if there is a steel strike. As surely as I stand here, there will be another round of wage increases, price increases, and so forth. We cannot overlook the historical background.

There was a conservative government in Germany in 1922 under President Ebert. By indirection, that government put the Communists in power. I was in Berlin in 1924 as a businessman when the first row occurred between the Germans and the Russians. When I say I am disturbed by what is happening in this country today, Senators will understand why, from my experience and from observing what has come to pass in the past three decades, I am disturbed. What happened in Germany can happen here if we do not wake up and act intelligently and consistently in accordance with our own best interests. Believe me, I did not think it would happen in Germany in 1922. Neither did other businessmen, nor did most of the people of Germany.

Everyone suffered—businessmen and wage earners. In fact, the wage earner suffered most. The German workers suffered, and suffered bitterly. I do not want American wage earners to suffer, and I do not want American businessmen to suffer. Nor do I want America—my country, our country—to suffer.

But because I am disturbed, Mr. President, and because I know so well what a strike can mean in terms of production for defense, what it can mean in terms of what the workingman's wages will buy, and what it can mean in terms of maintaining our cherished freedom, yes the very existence of our country, I shall not permit myself to be, and I am confident that the committee will not be, affected by passion or the hysteria of the times, and act hastily or unwisely.

If ever there is a time for careful, considered, and most deliberate action on the question of defense production and economic stability, now is the time. A steel strike will make our job a tremendously more difficult one. It can easily undo all our good work to date. But because it can have such a tremendous effect on our economy in terms of production and prices, so much more the reason for objective and dispassionate consideration by our committee.

I shall not address myself to the equities or the issues involved in the steel dispute—they are difficult and complicated ones, I know. But for the sake of our country, for the sake of all our citizens, for the sake of our sacred heritages, for the sake of Almighty God, for your own sake, I appeal to the good men both management and labor in the steel industry, to settle your differences—you will have to do so sooner or later—do not permit the strike to take place.

For my part, as Chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, I do not intend to do anything that will add to the confusion, difficulties and prob-

lems that already exist. Rather, I shall attempt, with the cooperation of the committee, to act calmly, objectively, and intelligently toward the end of maintaining our defense production and our economic stability, come what may.

Mr. President, tomorrow morning at 10:30 the committee will hold the executive session which was scheduled a week ago.

In conclusion, I wish to say that I hope and pray that the workers, management, and all the people of the country realize what will be the result if the workers and management in the steel industry cannot settle their own differences and begin a big strike. Another round of strikes and another round of wage increases will be started in other industries. All of us will find that our dollars will buy much less, prices will go up and up, and we could have an inflationary spiral which would make the 1950 spiral look like nothing.

I hope and pray for guidance to those who will conduct the deliberations in this matter at a most serious moment in our national life and during a critical period in our Nation's defense. I pray that they will act calmly, intelligently, and patriotically. Certainly the Committee on Banking and Currency will act in that way.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate but a minute. I wish to say only that I am happy to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency for his very constructive and statesmanlike address.

Like the chairman, I am not familiar with all the merits and detailed questions involved in the threatened steel strike. However, it is my very sincere hope and prayer that a strike will be avoided.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am very grateful for the Senator's expressing his appreciation for the few short remarks I have made. No one knows better than the distinguished former Governor of New York and present Senator from New York, by reason of his vast experience with and knowledge of business, especially the banking business, what inflation means and can do.

Mr. LEHMAN. I know that further inflation would be dangerous to our country and the world. I know also that any cessation of operations by the great steel mills, on which we must rely so heavily, would mean not only a very substantial loss to everybody involved, but would inevitably lead to a curtailment in the greatly needed supplies of a product which is already in critically short supply.

A strike at this time, when we are straining every effort to bring about an increase in our Defense Establishment, and are trying to make ourselves and our allies so strong that the Communist powers will not dare attack us, or if they do attack us, that they can be repelled, would be a tragedy that we must do our best to avoid.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to say that the junior Senator from New York and the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives] about 2 weeks ago helped solve the difficulties of the building trades in New York which grew out of the operating of our defense program and its administration. Since there was a relatively good production of materials available, the solution was made less difficult.

If there is another strike, no one knows what will happen—whether there will be enough materials for defense, let alone building construction, important as it is.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from South Carolina is very correct in his statement. The inevitable result of a strike at this time would not only be a drastic curtailment of very vitally needed supplies for defense, but such a strike would also greatly affect civilian employment, because we know that steel is needed in every industry throughout the country.

I say again that I am not familiar with all the details of the dispute, or, indeed, with all the basic factors involved in it, but I join in the hope and prayer that the threatened strike will be averted, and that employers and workers may get together in good faith and reach agreement and thus avoid what I believe would be a tragic disaster for the country.

#### EVALUATION OF FISCAL REQUIREMENTS OF EXECUTIVE AGENCIES—AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 913) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for the more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Would my proposed amendment, which I announced on the floor a few minutes ago, starting after the word "committee," on page 2, line 3, of the amendment as modified by the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], be in order at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment would be in order. The Chair had not understood that the Senator had as yet offered an amendment to the amendment offered a while ago by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MORSE. The Chair is correct. I have spoken to the Senator from New Hampshire, and I understand that he and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] have had the question under advisement.

I am interested only in presenting something which will be available to the conference committee. I do not offer the amendment with any idea in mind

that only the language in which it is framed should be accepted by the conference committee. At least my amendment provides a vehicle for the conference committee in the adoption of whatever language may be agreed upon in settling the problem that would exist if the majority of the House were of one party and the majority of the Senate were of another party. Therefore, I offer my amendment, which reads as follows:

In the event a majority of the Senate are of one party and the majority of the House of Representatives are of another party the determination of the authority as between the members of the two major parties to select the staff director and associate staff director shall be determined by lot and the selection of other staff members shall be equally divided between the members of the two major parties on the committee.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Oregon a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has the Senator from Oregon yielded the floor?

Mr. MORSE. I have yielded the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Are the members of the committee going to flip a coin or draw straws, or just how is the question to be decided?

Mr. MORSE. It will be up to the parties to decide what vehicle or medium they wish to select in order to make the decision by lot.

A while ago the Senator from New Hampshire asked me if I was certain as to the legality of this proposal. I told him that I was. I wish to assure him that I have talked with the Legislative Counsel, who bears out my curbstone opinion. The last time a similar proposal came before the Senate was when the Senate bill providing for universal military training was submitted to the Senate, not so long ago. I read from page 30, line 7, of that bill:

*Provided*, That the selection of persons for training in the corps shall be by lot until the President shall have determined that the training program is operating at full implementation.

I am having citations brought over, but the Senator can take my word for it that there is plenty of legal precedent for the proposal which the Senator from Oregon makes in this instance.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I desire to have placed in the RECORD, following my previous discussion, a passage from the law on Rule By Lot, which is in 58 Statutes at Large. I quote from chapter 478, which is the surplus property law. The act begins at page 765. I shall quote from page 779, as one of many precedents cited in support of a legal provision in a statute for rule by lot:

The Board shall provide for the selection of the purchaser of each unit by lot from among the applicants for the unit.

We can also find in our election laws similar provisions for rule by lot.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] for himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire for himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, inasmuch as the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to my amendment has been rejected, I wish further to modify my amendment by inserting the following language:

The staff director shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the party of which the chairman of the joint committee is a member and the associate staff director shall be appointed by and be responsible to the members of the opposition party.

To bring this question to a head, inasmuch as the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to my amendment was rejected—

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I assure the Senator from New Hampshire that the modification he is now proposing is a proposal which I would gladly have supported in the first instance. I gained the idea that that proposal had been informally rejected on the floor of the Senate, and that the Senator was looking for some alternative. I proposed an alternative. I am happy to support the proposal the Senator is now offering.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the Senator from Oregon made a real contribution by the amendment which he proposed; but inasmuch as it was not adopted, I offer this modification. In the amendment which I have previously offered on behalf of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and myself, on page 2, line 3, after the word "committee" and the period, I propose to strike out the language down to and including the word "parties" in line 10, and substitute the language which I have read.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I understand, the amendment the Senator is now offering is a modification of the original amendment which was read at the desk. If I am correctly informed, the following changes are made:

On page 1, at the beginning of line 2, the word "assistant" is stricken, and the word "associate" is inserted in lieu thereof.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. On page 2, line 1, the word "assistant" is stricken, and the word "associate" is inserted in lieu thereof. The Senator strikes out the language beginning in line 3, after the word "committee" and the period, down to and including the word "parties" in line 10, and substitutes the language which he has just read.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the language proposed to be inserted be stated by the clerk.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 3, of the Bridges amendment, after the

word "committee" and the period, it is proposed to strike out down to and including the word "parties" in line 10, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

The staff director shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the party of which the chairman of the joint committee is a member and the associate staff director shall be appointed by and be responsible to the members of the opposition party.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the further modified amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] on behalf of himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

**MR. GEORGE.** Mr. President, if the proposed joint committee is to function at all, I do not think we could make a worse mistake than to try to organize it on a partisan basis, extending down into the staff. I think it would be a serious error.

This proposed committee is to aid the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. Presumably the majority of the committee itself will represent the majority on the committee. But to carry partisanship down to the staff and say that the director of the staff shall represent the majority party makes the whole effort a bit ridiculous.

We have a Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. We have had such a committee for a great many years. The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation works in this manner: It is a bipartisan committee within itself, when it sits, and three Members of the Senate are from the majority party, two Members of the Senate being from the minority party. The same proportion applies to the Members of the House. Under the regulations and rules we have adopted, the chairmanship of that committee alternates annually. The chairman of the Senate Finance Committee is chairman for 1 year, and the following year the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee is chairman of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. That would be the case regardless of whether the Senate might be Republican or Democratic, or whether the House might be Republican or Democratic.

There has never been the slightest suggestion of partisanship on that committee. I am now speaking of the staff. There has never been the slightest suggestion of partisanship extending down to the staff. If there were, it would be utterly no good to the taxing committees of the two Houses. It would be of no service on earth to the House Ways and Means Committee or to the Senate Committee on Finance. The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation is a committee in which we must have implicit confidence and faith.

My recollection is that in the Eightieth Congress the chief of the staff, Mr. Stam, remained in that position. He served under a Republican House and a Republican Senate. It is true that theoretically the majority members of the Finance Committee can select the staff, that is, the chief and all the technicians on the staff; but that is not the way it is done at all. When I was chairman of the

Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and when the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] was chairman, Mr. Stam acted as the chief of the staff. When there were vacancies on the staff he would report that fact to me, if I were the chairman of the committee. I would then ask him to prepare his recommendations and to make suggestions as to who should fill the vacancy. When he presented a name to me I would say, "Clear it with the minority party." That is, I would ask him to clear it with the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. The same course was followed with respect to the House Members. It would be cleared with both sides.

There has been no partisanship in the appointment of the staff of the joint committee. I do not know how many members of that staff today are Republicans and how many of them are Democrats. I dare say that most of them have no political affiliation. They believe they have a nonpartisan job to do.

What is it proposed to do, Mr. President? It is proposed to have a staff to aid the Committee on Appropriations. It is going to be a subcommittee, so to speak, or a joint committee of the two Appropriations Committees. The joint committee will have a staff to aid it in its work. If the majority of the staff is going to aid the majority party, and the minority of the staff is going to aid the minority party, we will have a partisan question injected into appropriations.

Certainly that is not what we are looking for. That is not desirable at all. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. I believe his concept is a good one. Let us have the joint committee. Let the joint committee, when it is organized, select its own staff members. When it has selected its chief of staff, let the chief of staff recommend to the committee whom it should select as members of the staff. Let him make recommendations of men who he thinks will do the work. I remember many years ago, before Mr. Stam was made chief of staff of the joint committee, the then chief of staff came to me one day, when I was acting as chairman of the Committee on Finance, and he said to me, "We have a couple of people on our staff who are good men but who won't work. They are lazy, and we cannot depend on them to do the work."

I said, "Get rid of them. Let them go. Give them notice. I will take it up before the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. They will O. K. it." They did.

That has been the way it has always worked. I do not know who is on Mr. Stam's staff. I dare say that if the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] were in the Chamber he would not be able to say who is on that staff. He may know a few of them. I am sure that he would not know some of them either by sight or by name. However, anyone on the Republican side of the committee or on the Democratic side of the committee, as well as any Republican Member of the Senate or any Democratic Member of the Senate, can call on the committee

for any information he wants, and he will get it. If he does not get it, a single complaint will correct any shortcomings on the part of the staff.

I think that we would make a great error if we tried to make of the proposed new committee a partisan committee, and I believe that would be the result if the amendment should be adopted.

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

**MR. GEORGE.** I yield.

**MR. MORSE.** The observations of the Senator from Georgia make horse sense to me. I think it is the ideal way to have the committee staff organized. I can only speak from my experience on the Committee on Armed Services. That is the way the Armed Services Committee functions.

I do not believe any member of the Committee on Armed Services knows the political affiliations of the members of our staff. I do not know what their political affiliations are, if they have any. We have selected professional staff members, and they have served under different chairmen of the committee. If the committee is to select its staff on the basis of a committee conference after the committee has been organized, I do not believe the machinery provided by the amendment would be needed. In view of what we have been confronted with on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, we would get the bill into conference with a provision for conference discussion. However, I would much prefer the proposal made by the Senator from Georgia.

**MR. GEORGE.** I thank the Senator. That has been my experience.

**MR. McCLELLAN.** Mr. President, the bill as reported by the committee does just what the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] have suggested. The amendment, as now modified, makes no division of the staff, except that the director shall be of the majority party and the associate director shall be of the minority party. That would give one man on the staff, the associate director, definitely to the minority. However, the better course to follow is that which has prevailed in the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, now the Committee on Government Operations. In selecting its staff both under the distinguished chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and since I have been its chairman, no one has ever been employed who has been asked a question with respect to party affiliation. The members of the staff have been selected solely on the basis of their performance.

**MR. AIKEN.** Mr. President, although there have been some abuses under the present method of selecting staff members on a strictly nonpartisan basis, I do not think this is the time to start selecting a committee staff on a partisan basis and dividing the staff membership between the parties.

I can think of only one instance off-hand in which selections were made on that basis in this body. In that case the ranking minority members of the professional staff were selected by the

chairman, with the approval of the full committee—and I may say that it was all done legally enough—and in that particular instance the minority members were not assigned any particular work to do.

I should hate to see that become the custom, and I am afraid that is what it would lead up to, namely, that the staff members selected by the minority, even in the case of the associate director, would not be given the authority to which they would be otherwise entitled.

As the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] has said, when I was chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and when he was the ranking minority member of it, we never chose staff members unless we were in full accord on them. Neither he nor I ever knew what the political affiliation of a staff member was. All members of the committee felt free to go to any staff member at any time for information, and the information was always given. To this day I do not know what the political affiliations of the staff members were, and I know that the Senator from Arkansas has retained most of the staff members, or at least those who wanted to remain with the committee. I do not think that we ought to make such a change at this time.

I see on the floor of the Senate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. We are quite frugal on that committee. We have only one professional staff member. I do not know what his political affiliation is, and I am equally sure that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] does not know what his political affiliation is. We know that he is an efficient staff member.

Mr. President, let us not start changing the practice. If we change it in the case of the proposed new joint committee we may succumb later and set up other committee staffs on the same basis. It would not make for good legislative procedure.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the distinguished acting majority leader, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. Perhaps I misunderstood his modified amendment. As I understand, all the modified amendment would do would be to provide that the chief of staff shall be of one party and the associate chief of staff shall be of the other party.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Not of a party. The minority would select the associate director.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It would not apply through the rest of the staff.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It would not apply, as the amendment is now modified, through the staff at all.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my understanding. Therefore, if, as the distinguished Senator from Georgia has stated, the majority party were to become the minority party, or vice versa, if the two men, the chief of staff and the associate chief of staff, were persons in whom everyone had confidence and were doing a good job, they would not lose their positions in the event of a change

in the majority or minority status of a party. It would merely mean that the associate chief of staff might become the chief of staff, and the chief of staff might become the associate chief of staff, and that would be the only change that would take place.

Such an arrangement would be similar to the one by which the Secretary of the Senate is appointed. For instance, at the present time the Secretary of the Senate is Mr. Biffle, and the secretary for the minority is Mr. Trice. However, if there were a change in the control of the Senate, the latter would take over the duties of the former. That is the way I visualize this matter.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, with the modification suggested, I was agreeing to accept the amendment and take it to conference. However, as I said earlier in my remarks, I think it would be a serious mistake to try to inject partisanship all the way through the staff of the joint committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator from Arkansas. I was trying to decide to vote for the amendment as modified, in the form in which the Senator from Arkansas has accepted it. I was prepared to vote for the modified amendment on the basis I have stated.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I agree. Regardless of how the other members of the joint committee's staff might be appointed, the staff would be under the staff director.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I might add that I think it has been customary for the chief of the clerical staff to be close to the chairman of the committee, regardless of whether they are of the same political party. The chief of the clerical staff is customarily a person in whom the chairman of the committee has full confidence. Similarly, the assistant chief clerk has usually been close to the ranking minority member of the committee. I think that arrangement has worked out satisfactorily.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in order to make progress, I am willing to accept the amendment in its present form and take it to conference, because it does not destroy the integrity of the staff of the joint committee, that is to say, under the amendment, as modified, the other members of the joint committee's staff certainly would be dissociated from politics.

Mr. AIKEN. But I would not apply that arrangement to the professional staff members.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Arkansas. Can the distinguished Senator give the Senate any idea about how many new employees will be hired?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not know, but I can give the Senator this idea: If the provisions now proposed will not accomplish the desired result, this effort will have been in vain. If every dollar spent

for the operation of the new joint committee will not result in the saving of at least \$100, then I think this effort will have been a futile one.

Mr. LANGER. May I suggest that such an effort was made in connection with the La Follette-Monroney Act?

Mr. McCLELLAN. But I did not make it.

Mr. LANGER. And that act has not been successful, at least insofar as the budget is concerned.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If this measure, when enacted, does not work satisfactorily and properly, it can and should be repealed.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator from Arkansas suggest that the corresponding portion of the La Follette-Monroney Act be repealed?

Mr. McCLELLAN. No. I am suggesting that if this section of the pending bill does not work satisfactorily, it should be repealed.

If the Senator from North Dakota wishes to introduce a bill providing for the abolishment of administrative assistants, let him introduce such a bill separately. Perhaps he is correct about that matter. However, for goodness' sake, let us not inject that controversy into our consideration of the pending bill. The need for the enactment of the pending bill definitely exists, so let us try to pass the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator from Arkansas give us some idea about the number of new employees who will be required? Will 100 or 1,000 or 5,000 new employees be required?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not think so. As I said yesterday, the building of this staff should be done slowly, with care in the selection of the staff members. They should be selected on a professional basis and on the basis of qualification, disregarding party affiliation. The staff should be built slowly. As experience is gained, additions should be made in cases in which particular talent is needed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield further?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. I am concerned with whether we are going to set up another committee staff on which a number of consultants, to be paid \$50 a day, can be placed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. No.

Mr. LANGER. If we are to have another big galaxy of professional men receiving such pay, I am opposed to it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is not the philosophy of the author of the pending bill, and I do not believe the Senator from North Dakota will find that the new joint committee will be inclined to employ unnecessary help, any more than the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], for himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. [Putting the question.]

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The amendment, as modified, proposed by Mr. BRIDGES, for himself and Mr. FERGUSON, is as follows:

On page 14, beginning with line 22, strike out all down to and including line 11 on page 15, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(g) The joint committee shall have a staff director, an associate staff director, and such other professional, technical, clerical, and other employees, temporary or permanent, as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the joint committee. Such employees shall be employed without regard to the civil-service laws, and their compensation shall be fixed without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The staff director shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the party of which the chairman of the joint committee is a member, and the associate staff director shall be appointed by and be responsible to the members of the opposition party. No person shall be employed by the joint committee unless the members appointing him have favorably considered the data with respect to him submitted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation after a thorough investigation of his loyalty and security."

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, in line 25, and on page 16, in line 1, it is proposed to strike out the words "reports, and estimates of budget requirements," and to insert in lieu thereof the words "and reports."

On page 16, in lines 3 to 9, it is proposed to strike out the words:

(j) It shall be the duty of each agency of the Government to supply to the joint committee any copies of any budgetary request submitted to the Bureau of the Budget which the joint committee or any subcommittee thereof may request, either for regular or supplemental appropriations required for each fiscal year, with the detailed justifications in support thereof.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have conferred with the Senator from Arizona in regard to the amendment. I have reached the conclusion that, in particular, paragraph (j) should be stricken from the bill. I believe it would be an invasion of the province of the executive branch of the Government and certainly of the prerogatives of the Chief Executive. Therefore, I believe that paragraph should be stricken from the bill; and the proposed modification of paragraph (i) is acceptable.

Therefore, Mr. President, on behalf of the committee I accept the amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I discussed another amendment with the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Arizona. I should like to offer it either as a substitute amendment or, if that is not in order because of the amendment of this section, as an amendment to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Arizona, namely, on page 16, in line 2, after the words "District of Columbia," to add: "and data related to proposed appropriations incorporated in the annual budget transmitted by the President."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think it would be more appropriate for that amendment to be offered separately, because it provides for the insertion of certain words between paragraph (i) and paragraph (j).

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I accept the suggestion of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry or two, to determine the parliamentary situation. I understood that an amendment was offered to strike out paragraph (j) on page 16 of the bill. Has there been a proposal to substitute anything for it?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; the amendment would simply strike it from the bill.

Mr. CORDON. Has action been taken on that amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the Chair has not put the question.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I wish to discuss the amendment.

I am in entire disagreement with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who offers the amendment, and with the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], who is ready to accept it. If we are going to have any kind of an agency accessory to and a workhorse for the Appropriations Committees, that agency should have before it all the information which can be made available to it. I cannot conceive that there is any right of any kind or character in the executive branch of the Government to maintain inviolate or in confidence the request of an administrative agency for appropriations. It makes no difference whether the request is made to the Bureau of the Budget, to the President, to the head of the particular agency, or to anyone else; in the end it is a claim by an administrative agency, and so many dollars will have to be taken from the pockets of the taxpayers in order to meet it.

One of the basic comparisons we need to make at all times is as to the difference between the opinion of the person who makes the first claim or request for an appropriation and the opinion of the President's group which finally shaves down the claim and offers it to the Congress as a proposed budgetary item. When we receive the proposed budget, it is not a mere total of all the budgetary requests made by the heads of the various executive agencies. They are not the ones who prepare the budget which we receive. The budget we receive is the result of the decision of the President's Bureau of the Budget in regard to the appropriations which it believes should be made by Congress for the various executive agencies.

In other words, the Bureau of the Budget properly attempts to gather into one place, for one consideration, all the agency requests for appropriations. That is done with the thought that by having all of them totaled, the Budget Bureau can at least give some consideration to the major question, which is how much of the total amount the President feels he may properly request of the Congress.

That is a proper proceeding; I do not question that. But I say the Congress,

when it comes to consider the appropriation, is entitled to know what was the original judgment of the administrative officer who was charged with the duty of doing the job, and who ought to know how much would be required. If we have that information, then we are in a better position to perform our function. I believe that subsection (j) ought to remain in the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I offered this amendment based upon this fact: When we had before the Committee on Rules and Administration Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 5, which also related to a budgetary plan, as the Senator will remember, I asked for a report from the Director of the Budget with respect to that resolution and its relationship also to the bill which is now pending. I should like to read to the Senator from Oregon the reply which I received from the Director of the Budget, because I think it summarizes the matter in very few words:

Subsection (j) still contains a requirement making it the duty of each agency to supply to the joint committee copies of preliminary budget requests and justifications in support thereof. As I explained in my earlier letters and in my testimony of May 17, these requests are in the nature of preliminary advice to the President, and they are not the official budget estimates which are later presented to the Congress. The Budget and Accounting Act establishes the concept of an executive budget and places the responsibility squarely upon the President for presenting to the Congress a well-considered, comprehensive, and cohesive budget which can serve as the basis for congressional review, modification, and enactment. If a congressional committee is to receive copies of the suggestions which an agency makes which lead to the exercise of a judgment that has been conferred upon the President, it would be difficult to maintain the concept of an executive budget and of Presidential responsibility for that budget. Furthermore, it might be destructive of the normal relationships which our system of government establishes between the President and the subordinate officials of the executive branch. For these reasons, I firmly believe that subsection (j) should be stricken from the bill.

That is the point of view of the Bureau of the Budget. My view—and I insist it is sound—is that the budget is actually made over the course of a year. Until an over-all ceiling is imposed on the budget, followed, so to speak, by subceilings with respect to the various departments and agencies of government, none of them knows exactly what it may ask for. In order to get information at a preliminary stage, when a department has not evaluated the different items which should properly come within its ceiling, it is naturally to be expected that each bureau or each agency will ask for a great many things it would like to have. But when it is confronted with the fact that it can only have so much money, the evaluation then takes place.

We have the right, in the Appropriations Committee, and we exercise it on all occasions when we so desire, to inquire of any agency of the Government, "How much did you ask of the budget?" We can obtain detailed information in

regard to it. But while the budget is in the making, I think we have no right to do that, and such action is entirely improper. As I have previously stated on the floor of the Senate, if I were President of the United States I would not permit anyone to interfere with the process of enabling me to make up my mind as to what kind of budget I would submit to the Congress; as, for example, by having agents of the Congress seek information while preparation of the budget was in process. We have no right to demand that, and I am sure that if this provision remains in the bill, the bill will be vetoed by the President; and properly so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I believe I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. Yes; for a question. I have yielded now until I have almost lost the thread of my discourse; but I am happy to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts. I hope the Senator will not get me any further off my course, if possible.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I certainly have never been able to get the Senator from Oregon off his course. I believe that the amendment of the Senator from Arizona, with the language which, when he has concluded I wish to add, subparagraph "i" gives exactly the information which the Senator from Oregon has requested as covered by subparagraph "j."

I desire to read my suggested amendment to the Senator, and then ask him whether it does not cover what he has in mind. If the Senator has the bill in front of him, the amendment would be on page 16, line 2, after the words "District of Columbia," and would add the words, "and data related to proposed appropriations incorporated in the annual budget transmitted by the President".

The Senator will note if he will refer to page 5, that we would then have the right "to examine the fiscal books, documents, papers, and reports," and also the data on which the budget is made up. It seems to me we would have all the information we could possibly get under subsection (j). Does the Senator agree with me?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon takes the view that the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts would undo what the amendment of the Senator from Arizona is designed to accomplish.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; not at all.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this point?

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to express my views. I do not think we are so much in disagreement, except in this respect: How much time would be needed, and how long could we wait, to go over the preliminary estimates which are submitted and refigured and sent back dur-

ing the time the budget is being prepared? For example, there might be a request for \$100,000,000, and the budget would finally come to us with a request for but \$10,000,000. Why should we have wasted our time on the first request, since it is the budget we are going to consider—not what a particular department or agency thought it wanted, not what its first estimate was, not what it sought but did not get. We are going to work from the budget, and the purpose of this bill is to try to discover ways of reducing the budget which is finally submitted to the Congress.

Furthermore, I am of opinion that the President has the first right of passing upon the requests. The agencies submit their requests first to the President, not to the Congress. After the President has put his stamp of approval upon the requests, by approving the budget, the budget comes to the Congress for its consideration.

We are endeavoring to find ways of reducing expenditures, and if the President has reduced them to the level which he recommends, my first impression would be something like that of the Senator from Oregon. I thought it might be well to inquire into everything relating to the budget, but it seems to me we would indulge in a great deal of lost motion by going into the papers and calculations which had been made and discarded. We would eventually reach the final estimate which had been submitted by the Bureau of the Budget. We would go to work on it, and probably we could reduce it.

Mr. CORDON. I am sorry I am unable to agree with my colleagues in this matter. It seems to me that if this new adventure in budgetary control and correction is to have any chance at all of success, if it is to be worth a continental, if it is not merely going to slow up the appropriate process and confuse the issue, it will be because the proposed new committee can keep itself currently advised as to what is being done with the money of the taxpayers every day in the year. If we cannot have more information than we can get from the budget which is handed to us, there is no reason to establish a committee of this kind. We now have all the information contained in the budget. We have it at hand.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, there is nothing to prevent the proposed committee and its staff from examining into expenditures as they are being made, and following them through. But do we want to create a situation requiring the consideration of a great many calculations which have been made in arriving at the budget figure and then thrown away?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, as a practicable proposition, it is not a question of what the joint committee will direct be done; it is a question of what, by statute, it has the right to direct. If it does not have the right to go into the administration of the law—and a part of the administration of the law is the preparation of requests for money with which to pay for the administration of the law—if we are denied that, we are denied a very definite segment of the

information which the staff should have in advance of the time the committee will consider the question.

Mr. President, I am in favor of the approach which this bill makes to the problem. I want to see it work. I know, after 7 years of reasonably diligent effort as a member of the Appropriations Committee, we must have something like this if we are going to have any intelligent approach to the problem of appropriations or any basis upon which we can advise the people of the country as to where their money is going. I am for the bill itself. I believe, however, that we should not short-change ourselves with respect to our right to secure information.

The Senator from Arizona says we can always ask an agency that comes before us, "How much did you ask of the Bureau of the Budget?" Of course we can, but when we get the information it is then too late to do anything with it. The time to use the information is when there is being prepared and evaluated the data we need to have in advance.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me suggest a hypothetical case. The staff of the committee finds out from a department of the Government that one segment of the department will ask for a certain sum of money, and it reports that fact to the committee. The committee does not think it is sufficient, or it thinks it is too much. The next thing to do, having acquired that information, is for some member of the committee to go to see the President and say, "Mr. President, we understand that in making up your budget a certain agency will ask for a certain amount of money. I want to suggest now that when you get to that point you handle it in a certain way."

The President of the United States can very properly say, "I represent all the people of the United States. You represent a State, or you represent a congressional district. Under those circumstances I do not feel that I should take your advice, because I must act in behalf of all the people, and I shall make up my budget in the way I please. When I send it up to you, it is on your doorstep and you can either starve it or feed it and make it fat; but that is your business. My business is to coordinate the whole budget and to determine how much money we can afford to expend in one fiscal year, hoping, of course, to have a balanced budget. In doing that I have reduced the amounts requested by certain agencies, and I have done the things which I think are necessary."

I think the President would have a perfect right to say, "I do not want you to interfere with me in the process of making up my mind as to what kind of a budget I should submit."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] proposed that after the budget reaches the Senate, if we want any data from any agency of Government indicating how a figure was arrived at, it is perfectly proper to ask for it after the President has made up his mind. That would not be interfering with him in any way in the duty he is

called upon to perform in connection with the budget.

Mr. CORDON. No one but a fool would interfere with him, anyway. There has been suggested no argument which strikes me as having any pertinence or any force whatever. We can do the things the Senator suggests, and if we do, the President could answer as the Senator suggests. That should kill it, and we should not attempt to do it a second time. That ends that idea.

Mr. President, if we must have the skeleton out in the open, I would just as soon rattle a few bones myself this afternoon. I happen to know that there are those within the confidence of the President who have been able to get information which has been denied some of the rest of us. It may be said, "Well, the President has a perfect right to release the information to whomsoever he desires." Those who want to follow that philosophy, so far as I am concerned, may do so, but it is not for me. I believe, Mr. President, that there is a certain right that goes with an office in the legislative branch of the Government. I believe there are certain powers which rest wholly within the legislative branch, and we have already surrendered far too many of them. I am not going to be a party to surrendering any more. If I can recoup some of those that are gone, I want to do that.

In this case, Mr. President, I say that if we have the power to make the inquiry, I want the right to do it provided in the statute, granted not to the Congress, but by the Congress to the committee which we seek to establish. Once that committee has the power, it would be up to the committee to use it or not to use it, as the circumstances indicate to be advisable. That is the reason why I think paragraph (j) should remain in the bill.

If the President wants to veto the bill, the Constitution gives him that right, and I am perfectly willing that he should veto it. I certainly would not suggest to him what he should do. If the President feels that it is a transgression upon his power, he has two ways to handle it: one is to veto the bill, and the other is to direct his department to refuse to give certain information, at which time Congress can determine whether that department shall have any further entree into the Treasury. Those questions can be determined as the event indicates.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. May I suggest to the Senator that I basically disagree with him with respect to the power of Congress to pry into the executive branch of the Government at a time when the Executive is making up his mind as to what he shall recommend to Congress in the way of appropriations?

Mr. CORDON. I disagree with the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. The present President will not be in the White House next January.

Mr. CORDON. I am not directing any of my remarks to the present President or to any future President.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] or the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] or the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] or perhaps the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] should be occupying the White House and looking into what his duty may be with respect to defending the right of the Executive to manage the executive business in accordance with the division of powers between the legislative branch and the executive branch, he would insist that we stay on our side of the line, and he would conduct his business in his own way.

Mr. CORDON. I fully appreciate the fact that the Senator and I approach the question from wholly opposite directions. I believe in the supremacy of the legislative branch with respect to the power of the purse. I think the Senator from Arizona believes in the supremacy of the executive department.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. Judging by the Senator's vigorous statement on this section of the bill, I suppose he is in favor of having the staff go into the question.

Mr. CORDON. Certainly.

Mr. MOODY. Would it not be better, since virtually the same point the Senator from Arizona has raised is covered by the preceding section, to accept the amendment than to run the risk of having the entire bill destroyed by an argument between the White House and the Congress over what is, after all, a somewhat technical point?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I have no time for any philosophy of fear. I believe that the thing for the legislative branch of the Government to do is that which it thinks it should do. I do not believe we should court vetoes; neither do I believe we should duck them. I think we should pass what, in our judgment, is sound legislation, let the chips fall where they may.

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

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MOODY. I agree with that statement, but I should like to remind the Senator from Oregon that, as the Senator from Arizona has suggested, almost the same authority is given in the preceding section. Therefore, it seems to me to be straining a point to insist upon having included in the bill language which we have been warned will result in the destruction of legislation which both the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Michigan are anxious to have written on the books.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I have not been warned. Again, I seem not to be in the confidence of Mr. Big. Because I believe it is a sound provision, I shall vote to retain it in the bill. It will not worry me if the bill happens to pass and is then vetoed. My own judgment is that the bill will not be enacted at this session of Congress anyway. Even so, I am happy the bill is before the Senate, and I shall be happy to have it passed. I believe this kind of debate is most helpful. I think it would have been far bet-

ter had we been able to have it earlier in the session, when there would have been time to think about it.

Mr. President, I undertake to say that, as to 90 percent of the legislation we pass, our great trouble is that there is not one out of ten who knows much more about the measures than the titles or the numbers. I include myself among those who seldom know. It is something I do not like to admit. However, it is a confession.

I should like to see the time come when bills will be considered, discussed, and then put into refrigeration, so to speak, for a week or two, while we think about them. We would have better legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15 in the amendment of the committee, line 25, it is proposed to strike out the words "reports and estimates of budget requirements" and insert in lieu thereof the words "and reports." On page 16, lines 3 to 9, inclusive, to strike out paragraph (j), reading as follows:

(j) It shall be the duty of each agency of the Government to supply to the joint committee any copies of any budgetary request submitted to the Bureau of the Budget which the joint committee or any subcommittee thereof may request, either for regular or supplemental appropriations required for each fiscal year, with the detailed justifications in support thereof.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I now offer a very brief amendment which I understand is agreeable to the Senator from Arkansas. It comes in on page 16, line 2, after the words "District of Columbia," and proposes to strike out the period and insert a comma and the words "and data related to proposed appropriations incorporated in the annual budget transmitted by the President."

This is merely an effort to make clear that after the budget is submitted to the Congress, the committee will have a right to obtain data on which the budget was prepared. In my opinion, the proposed amendment completes the section.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I interpret the amendment, it means simply that if a budget of \$100,000,000 for a specific purpose is presented, we will be enabled to see how the figure of \$100,000,000 was arrived at.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It does not cover discarded requests, or what may be called waste paper. It means merely that we could ask how the department arrived at its figures, how it supports them, how it sustains them. We would simply ask, "How is this budget for \$100,000,000 arrived at?"

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my interpretation of it, and a logical conclusion is reached with the words on the previous page, which have just been read.

Mr. CORDON. I shall not oppose the amendment. I shall vote for it. I merely wish to call attention to the fact that it seeks to recapture the horse after he has been let out of the stable. The data might be valuable to the staff if it could be obtained in time to evaluate it and do something with it. We might never be able to get it, so we provide for obtaining it by including a provision for it in the bill. However, that is a little morsel. I am going to vote in favor of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I propose an amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, in the committee amendment, beginning with line 21, it is proposed to strike out down to and including line 24, and through line 4 on page 10. In lines 8 and 9, on page 10, it is proposed to strike out the words "and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments", and on page 10, line 23, after the word "Appropriations" it is proposed to strike out "or the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments."

Mr. HAYDEN. As has been stated a number of times, the object of the amendment is to strike from the bill any reference to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and to provide that the joint committee shall consist of none but members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by reason of action by our committee, I feel I shall have to oppose the amendment. When I introduced the bill originally, it provided that the joint committee should be composed only of members of the Committees on Appropriations.

A majority of the members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, which was the title of the committee at that time, offered and adopted an amendment which would add to the joint committee members of the Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the two Houses.

I do not believe that adding those members would in any way defeat the purposes of the bill. To some extent, it may injure to the benefit of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments by enabling them to obtain information they would not otherwise get. However, I can appreciate the fact that members of the Committee on Appropriations feel that this is an appropriations job and that, therefore, we should not encumber the joint committee with members of other committees.

Since the joint committee is actually to be a service committee to the Committees on Appropriations, it was thought that the joint committee, or service committee, which is what it

amounts to, should be composed only of members of the two Committees on Appropriations.

There are on the floor of the Senate now other members of the Committee on Government Operations who remember the discussion about the matter when the bill was marked up. I should like to hear from them, if any of them have serious objection to the amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I remember well that this point was discussed at rather great length, as the distinguished Senator from Arkansas said. It is my recollection that it came up late in our consideration of the bill.

I certainly agree with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration [Mr. HAYDEN], who is also a member of the Committee on Appropriations, that we should not try to intermingle the two committees on this point. If the proposed joint committee is to function, it ought to function for the Appropriations Committees.

Although I should like to see my committee receive the prestige, I believe that rivalry or the difficulty arising from intermingling members of the Committee on Government Operations with members of the Appropriations Committees would not be conducive to the effective working of the proposed law.

To make it work the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses must be as enthusiastic about making it work as we are in passing the bill. Then we shall gain real economy. I wish to join the senior Senator from Arizona in this amendment, because I think it is the only way the bill will work properly after it is passed.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I wish to support what the Senator from Oklahoma has said. Personally I should like to see the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Arizona adopted. I do not think it would be detrimental at all, and I believe that it would be very appropriate.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Oklahoma is quite right. As all members of the committee will remember, this was not a part of the bill until the very last couple of sessions when we were discussing it, and it was advanced rather strongly by one or two members of the committee. We were all trying to obtain a unanimous agreement on the bill. Therefore it was included in the bill. However, I think the chairman of the committee and the Senator from Oklahoma are quite right, and I hope the Senate will accept this amendment.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, as has been stated, it was late in the discussion of the bill, before it was finally reported, that this phase was injected. I am sure that all members of the committee will remember that it was injected into the measure by reason of the overall authority of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to examine into expenditures in all branches of the executive department. I concur in the general feeling that we should keep the joint committee in the appropriations field, in view of the objection which is now being offered. While I voted to require that the Com-

mittee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments have representation, I will say that I was not overly enthusiastic about it. In view of the objection, I see no reason why that provision should not be removed from the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in view of the expressions from other members of the committee, I find that there is no objection to the amendment. The sponsor of the original proposal is not present. Therefore I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] on page 9, line 21.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the chairman of the committee to one further matter. If he will examine the bill, he will see that the language on page 12, paragraph (e) (1) (A) provides as follows:

(e) It shall be the duty of the joint committee—

(1) (A) to inform itself on all matters relating to the annual budget of the agencies of the United States Government, including analytical, investigative, audit, and other reports on Federal operations prepared by the General Accounting Office pursuant to section 312 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, the Government Corporation Control Act, and section 206 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and by other Federal agencies.

In the letter commenting on the bill which I received from the Director of the Budget I find the following:

Subsection (e) includes a direction to the Joint Committee to inform itself on "reports on Federal operations prepared by the General Accounting Office \* \* \* and by other Federal agencies." While it is entirely appropriate that congressional committees have complete access to the reports prepared by the General Accounting Office, I would suggest that the reference to reports prepared by "other Federal agencies" be stricken. While I am sure that it is not the intent of the bill to direct the joint committee to take over confidential reports which might be prepared for the President, the wording might lead to that misinterpretation. The reports of the General Accounting Office under the various authorities cited in the bill should give the committee a relatively complete coverage of the material needed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of course it is not the intent to go into secret documents; but I feel that the committee should certainly have the authority to examine the reports of any agency with reference to determining what expenditures should be made. I do not feel that I can yield on that point.

Mr. HAYDEN. I wanted to obtain an expression of the intent of the committee. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget expresses the same idea. He is sure that it is not intended to seek authority to obtain confidential documents or to use the words "and other Federal agencies" as a lever to pry into something which otherwise the committee could not obtain. If it related only to appropriations, it would be a very different matter.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is certainly not the purpose of the committee to obtain top-secret documents, or anything of the kind. However, any public reports of an agency should be considered. I think we are becoming a little technical.

Mr. HAYDEN. I merely wished to have an expression of the intent.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I think it is material that we get all the reports possible, so that we can form a proper judgment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, having stated the view of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and having heard expressed by the chairman the intent of the committee, I shall not offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair invites the attention of Senators to page 9, line 12. The word "eighteen" occurs in that line.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in view of the adoption of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], I offer the following perfecting amendments:

On page 9, line 12, strike out the word "eighteen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "fourteen."

On page 9, line 13, strike out the word "Five" and insert the word "Seven."

On page 9, line 14, strike out the word "three" and insert in lieu thereof the word "four."

On page 9, line 15, strike out the word "two" and insert in lieu thereof the word "three."

On page 9, line 17, strike out the word "Five" and insert the word "Seven."

On page 9, line 19, strike out the word "three" and insert the word "four"; and in the same line, strike out the word "two" and insert in lieu thereof the word "three."

The purpose of these amendments is to make the bill conform to our action in striking out reference to the members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and to increase the membership of the joint committee to 14, instead of 10, which would be the number left after omitting reference to the members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The amendment also provides that four shall be from the majority party and three from the minority party. I believe that the committee should have a personnel of at least 14 members.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to considering the amendments en bloc?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. Has he proposed to change the figure on page 15, line 7?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am coming to that next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to considering the amendments en bloc? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the amendments of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] are agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I move, on page 15, line 7, to strike out the word "eleven" and insert in lieu thereof the word "nine."

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would it not be helpful to strike out the entire sentence? It seems to me that the provision that a member of the committee staff shall be relieved of his work only if a certain number of the committee approve such a course would perhaps lead to unpleasantness. It might lead to differences of opinion in the committee. It might lead to a situation in which a man might be dismissed under circumstances which would cause friction. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] referred to a case in which two employees of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation were dismissed because they did not do their work. Such a provision as this might lead to unfortunate publicity for the employee. It seems to me that that question should be left to the committee itself. While I shall not make much of a point of it, I should like to see that language stricken.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I had that in mind before the Bridges amendment was adopted. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire has eliminated that part of the bill, so I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I offer a perfecting amendment. On page 17, line 8, I propose to strike out the word "second" and insert the word "first"; on line 9, to strike out the word "Eighty-second," and insert the word "Eighty-third." The amendment refers to the Congress when the law would become effective.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President —

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, may I inquire whether the Senator from Massachusetts desires to offer an amendment?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to offer an amendment, which I have taken up with the chairman of the committee. I understand that it is agreeable to him. It is merely a technical amendment. I offer an amendment on page 15, and I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15 it is proposed to amend lines 12 to 21, to read as follows:

(h) The joint committee shall make available members of its staff to assist the staffs of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and of the Senate and the several subcommittees thereof during the periods when appropriation bills are pending.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, there is no objection to the amendment. I am happy to accept the amendment. I believe it is a good amendment and carries out the intent of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is agreed to.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am directed by the committee to offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

I know that Senators wish to hurry along. I may say to the Senate that the majority of the members of the committee who were present at the time the bill was reported from the committee voted in favor of offering this amendment on the floor of the Senate. Previously I have supported the principle which is contained in the amendment, namely, to require the President to submit a balanced budget along with any budget he may send to Congress. I still believe in the principle involved. However, I hope that the Senate will not adopt the amendment. I am presenting the amendment now so that the Senate may pass on it. The bill as now amended is a good bill. If we were to agree to the amendment which I am now offering, and if the President were to comply with its provisions, in a time of war or in a time of huge appropriations for national defense he would merely have to say, "If you require me to send a balanced budget instead of sending a budget for \$85,000,000,000"—as he is doing this year—"I will just take \$14,000,000,000 or \$10,000,000,000 off the national defense appropriations." It would be an empty gesture.

In times of peace, when we are trying to live within our income, I might be in favor of such an amendment. I have heretofore offered such an amendment. I offered it once as a rider to a bill, and the Senate adopted it. I believe that was in 1949. It was eliminated in conference. I favor the principle involved. However, at the present time, to place the amendment in this bill may very well mean that the bill would be vetoed, and we would thus lose ground. Certainly we would not gain anything if we were to include it in the bill. In my judgment, all that the President would have to do would be to reduce the figure for national defense, and we would not gain anything.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new section:

Sec. 4. In the event the budget transmitted to Congress by the President under section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended, for any fiscal year is not a balanced budget, the President shall transmit to Congress, with such budget, a balanced budget for such fiscal year, which shall set forth in summary and in detail (1) estimates of the receipts of the Government during such fiscal year under laws existing at the time such budget is transmitted, and (2) estimates of expenditures, not in excess of such receipts, for the support of the Government for such fiscal year under laws so existing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I know of no further amendments to be offered. Before we vote on the bill I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a

copy of a telegram sent to me by Mr. Rowland Jones, Jr., president of the American Retail Federation, representing 22 national retail trade associations and 32 State retail associations in support of the passage of this bill.

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

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 8, 1952.

Hon. JOHN L. McCLELLAN,  
United States Senator,

Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of the 22 national retail trade associations, 32 State retail associations comprising the membership of the American Retail Federation I wish to strongly endorse the principles embodied in S. 913. Economy and efficiency in Government can only be attained by providing the legislative branch of our Government with proper tools in the form of expert full-time personnel to accomplish the financial needs of Government, the expenditure of Government funds and to check excessive and wasteful operations. Only through full knowledge of the above operations can the Congress intelligently and effectively approach the problem of a reduction of Government expenditures and increased efficiency.

ROWLAND JONES, Jr.,  
President, American Retail Federation.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	George	Moody
Anderson	Green	Morse
Bricker	Hayden	Murray
Bridges	Hendrickson	Neely
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Butler, Nebr.	Hill	Robertson
Byrd	Hoey	Russell
Cain	Holland	Saltonstall
Capehart	Humphrey	Schoeppel
Carlson	Ives	Seaton
Case	Jenner	Smathers
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Dworschak	Lehman	Stennis
Eastland	Long	Taft
Ecton	Magnuson	Tobey
Ellender	Martin	Watkins
Ferguson	Maybank	Wiley
Flanders	McClellan	Williams
Frear	Monroney	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

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

By unanimous consent, the committee amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on the question of final passage, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly against what I consider to be a very bad bill. By this bill we are proposing to create another new committee and a brand new staff. As all Senators know, the Senate Committee on Appropriations already has a staff. There is no claim that it is not adequate. No bill has been introduced to increase the size of that staff.

Likewise, in the House of Representatives there is an Appropriations Committee, and it has a staff. So there are two staffs.

In addition, the Byrd Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures has a staff. In addition to that, the Senate Committee on Government Operations, formerly the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, has a staff.

Now we have this monstrosity before us. Senators say they want to have a new joint committee. It would be made up of seven members of the House Appropriations Committee and seven members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and by them a brand new staff would be selected and would be appointed. Why not go on and on and on and let three or four members, and so forth, select more and more committees and staff members to report to them-selves.

The distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], when I asked him about this on the floor a few moments ago, did not know whether the staff of the new joint committee would consist of 10 persons, 100 persons, or 1,000 persons. He did not know how many lawyers would be needed for the staff of the new joint committee, or how many technical or professional men would be needed, or what clerical hire would be needed. As a matter of fact, he said he knew nothing about that matter.

We do not know whether this bill is going to cost \$100,000, \$1,000,000, or \$10,000,000. There is but one thing of which we are certain. That is, that if we once establish this new committee with its staff, we are going to have it for years and years and years to come at the expense of the already suffering taxpayers.

Mr. President, I am one of those who believe that we ought to be cutting down the number of Federal employees, instead of hiring more and more and more of them. Sometimes when we go into the corridors we find them crowded with employees, whose number is being added to each day. Now Senators come along and want more and more and more employees, although they yell for economy. I simply submit, Mr. President, that the time of the Senate ought to be spent in doing something for the relief of the taxpayers of the country, instead of passing a bill the cost of which no one knows, as no one knows how many employees will be required. I submit that it is bad legislation, and that the taxpayers want no more new boards, or bureaus, or commissions. Let us reduce, not add to the 2,500,000 Government employees we already have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays having been ordered on the question of the passage of the bill, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senators from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT and Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator

from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] are absent because of illness.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON and Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are detained on official business.

If present and voting the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 8, as follows:

YEAS—55

Aiken	George	Morse
Anderson	Green	Neely
Bricker	Hayden	O'Conor
Bridges	Hendrickson	Russell
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Butler, Nebr.	Hill	Schoeppel
Byrd	Hoey	Seaton
Cain	Holland	Smathers
Capehart	Humphrey	Smith, Maine
Carlson	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Case	Jenner	Smith, N. C.
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Stennis
Cordon	Lehman	Taft
Douglas	Long	Watkins
Dworschak	Magnuson	Wiley
Eastland	Martin	Williams
Ferguson	McClellan	Young
Flanders	Monroney	Young
Frear	Moody	

## NAYS—8

Ecton	Langer	Robertson
Ellender	Maybank	Tobey
Kilgore	Murray	

## NOT VOTING—33

Bennett	Johnson, Tex.	McKellar
Benton	Johnston, S. C.	McMahon
Brewster	Kefauver	Millikin
Chavez	Kem	Mundt
Connally	Kerr	Nixon
Dirksen	Knowland	O'Mahoney
Duff	Lodge	Pastore
Fulbright	Malone	Sparkman
Gillette	McCarran	Thye
Hennings	McCarthy	Underwood
Hunt	McFarland	Welker

So the bill (S. 913) was passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—EN-  
ROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION  
SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 147) designating April 9, 1952, as Bataan Day, and it was signed by the Vice President.

PROPOSED DISCHARGE OF COM-  
MITTEE ON RULES AND ADMIN-  
ISTRATION FROM FURTHER CON-  
SIDERATION OF SENATE RESOLU-  
TION 187

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], members of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I submit a resolution to discharge the Committee on Rules and Administration from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 187. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution lie over under the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and the resolution will be received and lie over under the rule.

The resolution (S. Res. 300), submitted by Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and other Senators), was ordered to lie over under the rule, as follows:

Whereas Senate Resolution 187, to further investigate the participation of Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY in the Maryland 1950 senatorial campaign and other acts, to determine whether expulsion proceedings should be instituted against him, was introduced in the Senate by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] on August 6, 1951, and was referred by the Senate to the Committee on Rules and Administration; and

Whereas on August 8, 1951, said resolution was referred by the Committee on Rules and Administration to its Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections; and

Whereas, in a series of communications addressed to the chairman of said subcommittee during the period between December 6, 1951, and January 4, 1952, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] charged that the subcommittee lacked jurisdiction to investigate such acts of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] as were not connected with election campaigns and attacked the honesty of the members of the subcommittee, charging that, in their investigation

of such other acts, the members were improperly motivated and were "guilty of stealing just as clearly as though the members engaged in picking the pockets of the taxpayers"; and

Whereas on March 5, 1952, the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections adopted the following motion as the most expeditious parliamentary method of obtaining an affirmation by the Senate of its jurisdiction in this matter and a vote on the honesty of its members:

"That the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration request Senator McCARTHY, of Wisconsin, to raise the question of the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections and of the integrity of the members thereof in connection with its consideration of Senate Resolution 187 by making a formal motion on the floor of the Senate to discharge the committee; and that Senator McCARTHY be advised by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration that if he does not take the requested action in a period of time to be fixed by stipulation between Senator McCARTHY and the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, that the committee—acting through the chairman of the Standing Committee or the chairman of the subcommittee—will itself present such motion to discharge for the purpose of affirming the jurisdiction of the subcommittee and the integrity of its members in its consideration of the aforesaid resolution;" and

Whereas on March 6, 1952, the said motion was also adopted by the Committee on Rules and Administration and the chairman of said committee submitted to the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. McCARTHY, a copy of the above-stated motion; and

Whereas by letter dated March 21, 1952, the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. McCARTHY, in effect declined to take the action called for by the above-stated motion, repeating his charge that the subcommittee has been guilty of "a completely dishonest handling of taxpayers' money," referring to a preliminary and confidential report of its staff as "scurrilous" and consisting of "cleverly twisted and distorted facts": Now, therefore, to determine the proper jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration and to express the confidence of the Senate in its committee in their consideration of Senate Resolution 187, it being understood that the following motion is made solely for this test and that the adoption of the resolution is opposed by the members on whose behalf it is submitted, be it

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Rules and Administration be and it hereby is discharged from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 187.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point certain precedents of the Senate relating to expulsion, exclusion, and censure cases unconnected with elections, from 1871 to 1951.

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

SENATE EXPULSION, EXCLUSION, AND CENSURE  
CASES UNCONNECTED WITH ELECTIONS (1871-  
1951)PROPOSITIONS OF LAW RELATING TO THE JURIS-  
DICTION AND PROCEDURE OF THE SUBCOMMIT-  
TEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

*I. The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on  
Privileges is not limited to election mat-  
ters, but extends to expulsion, exclusion,  
and censure cases totally unconnected with  
the conduct of a Senator in an election*

The present source of jurisdiction of the standing committees of the Senate is rule

XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (sec. 102 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946). Under section 1 (o) (1) (D) of this rule, the Congress has granted jurisdiction to the Committee on Rules and Administration in the following matters: Election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress; corrupt practices; contested elections; credentials and qualifications; Federal elections generally; Presidential succession.

The category "credentials and qualifications" authorizes the Committee on Rules and Administration and its subagent, the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, to investigate alleged misconduct of a Senator with a view toward exclusion, expulsion, or punishment. This conclusion is based upon the history of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the precedents of the old standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, and the general policy of the Reorganization Act against special committees.

(a) The history of the legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 indicates that the precedents of the old standing Committee on Privileges and Elections are relevant in defining the jurisdiction of the present subcommittee.

The history of the act in relation to the Rules Committee indicates that its only purpose was to consolidate six committees, Audit and Control of the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, Library, Privileges and Elections, Rules, Printing, and Enrolled Bills into the single Committee on Rules and Administration (S. Rept. No. 1400, 79th Cong., 2d sess., table II, pp. 12-17). See also Senate hearings, volume 762, page 244, incorporating the remarks of Senator La Follette upon his resolution providing for reorganization of Senate committees. There is no indication that, in the process of consolidation, the functions of the old committee were added to, whittled away, or transferred to other new committees. Hence, the precedents established by the old standing Committee on Privileges and Elections between 1871 and 1947 are relevant in defining the jurisdiction of the present Rules Committee and its Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections.

(b) These precedents establish that the old Committee on Privileges and Elections possessed jurisdiction in expulsion, exclusion, and censure cases totally unconnected with the conduct of a Senator in an election.

Since 1871, when the standing Committee on Privileges and Elections was first organized, there have been eight cases of expulsion or exclusion proceedings based on grounds totally unconnected with the election of a Senator. There have also been three cases of censure unrelated to election conduct. These 11 cases are digested in the appendix, with emphasis on the procedure employed in each case. Similar data are also presented in tabular form.

These cases indicate that the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and no other standing committee, was presumed to have jurisdiction in expulsion and exclusion cases, even though the matters involved were unconnected with conduct of an election. The Patterson case in 1873 was the only case among the 11 which was considered by some other committee. This was a select rather than a standing committee. However, even in the Patterson case, debate on the floor makes it apparent that the Committee on Privileges and Elections, although considered the proper committee, preferred to relinquish jurisdiction to a select committee because it was then preoccupied with other matters.

In addition to the Patterson case, four of the cases were expulsion cases: William N. Roach of North Dakota (1893); John H. Mitchell of Oregon (1905); Joseph R. Burton of Kansas (1906); and Robert M. La Follette (1917-19).

In the Roach case, the Senate debated but did not vote upon resolutions directing the Committee on Privileges and Elections to investigate charges of preelection embezzlement.

Mitchell, indicted for selling his influence, answered the charges against him on the Senate floor, withdrew from the Senate, and died before the Senate took any action.

In the Burton case, the Senate by unanimous consent passed a resolution directing the Committee on Privileges and Elections to examine into the legal effect of a final judgment of conviction of a Senator who had received compensation for services rendered before a Government department; Burton, however, resigned before the committee took any action.

The La Follette case was instituted by the presentation to the Senate of the petition of the Minnesota Commission of Public Safety calling for the expulsion of La Follette for an allegedly disloyal speech. The petition was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which held hearings and finally exonerated La Follette.

The appendix describes three exclusion proceedings where the alleged grounds were unconnected with misconduct in an election: Reed Smoot of Utah (1903-1907); Arthur R. Gould of Maine (1926); and William Langer of North Dakota (1941).

The Smoot and Langer cases might be categorized as expulsion cases, inasmuch as the Senate superimposed the requirement that exclusion be by two-thirds. The Committee on Privileges and Elections, after considering each case, exonerated Gould, but recommended the exclusion of Smoot and LANGER. The Senate, however, voted that Smoot and LANGER were entitled to their seats.

It is significant that while the jurisdiction of the Senate to inquire into a Senator's conduct before his election was challenged in these cases, reference of the matters to the Committee on Privileges and Elections was not questioned.

Finally, there were three censure cases since the founding of the old Committee on Privileges and Elections: Senators Tillman and McLaurin of South Carolina (1902) and Hiram Bingham of Connecticut (1929).

Tillman provoked McLaurin into the use of unparliamentary language; whereupon

Tillman left his seat and assaulted McLaurin. It was the Committee on Privileges and Elections to which the matter was referred. The committee reported a resolution of censure, which the Senate adopted.

In the Bingham case, a Judiciary subcommittee investigating lobbies reported that Senator Bingham had appointed an official of a manufacturers' association to his staff and had taken him into a confidential committee meeting considering a tariff bill. The subcommittee, however, did not suggest action against Bingham. The question of punishment was raised on the floor by Senator Norris, who offered a resolution of censure. This resolution was debated, amended, and approved by the Senate.

(c) The language and policy of the Reorganization Act opposed jurisdiction in any other standing committee or in a select committee.

Rule XXV contains no language which would support jurisdiction in expulsion matters in any standing committee other than the Rules Committee. Furthermore, the history of the Reorganization Act indicates that the draftsmen were motivated by a policy against select committees (S. Rept. No. 1011, 79th Cong., 2d sess., p. 6), and the Senate bill (S. 2177, sec. 126) contained a prohibition of special or select committees. Although the House eliminated the flat ban on select committees in the final version of the Reorganization Act, it was apparently the hope of the draftsmen of rule XXV that its language would cover the whole field of senatorial action, with the result that any bill, resolution, or memorial could be referred to the appropriate standing committee. Thus, the history and language of the legislative Reorganization Act affirmatively support the jurisdiction of the Rules Committee in expulsion cases and oppose the jurisdiction of any other standing committee or of a select committee.

*II. The Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections possesses legal authority to make investigation of charges of alleged misconduct by a Senator, to hold public hearings, and to report to the Rules Committee a resolution of expulsion, censure, or exoneration.*

(a) Section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act provides: "Each standing

committee of the Senate, including any subcommittee of any such committee, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpens or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to take such testimony and to make such expenditures (not in excess of \$10,000 for each committee during any Congress) as it deems advisable. Each such committee may make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, may report such hearings as may be had by it, and may employ stenographic assistance at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman."

Thus, if it is conceded that the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections possesses jurisdiction in expulsion cases, it follows from section 134 (a) that the subcommittee has the power to make investigations and hold hearings in an expulsion case without obtaining specific authorization from the Senate or from the Rules Committee.

(b) The precedents of the old standing committee indicate that investigations have been commenced both with and without specific Senate authorization or direction.

The old Committee on Privileges and Elections was presented with five cases of expulsion or exclusion unconnected with an election. In three of these cases, those of Smoot, Burton, and Gould, the Senate adopted resolutions directing an investigation of the charges against the respective Senators. In the other two cases, those of La Follette and LANGER, the petitions and protests of private citizens were referred by the presiding officer to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which then conducted investigations without obtaining resolutions of authorization from the Senate.

These precedents indicate that the legal power of the subcommittee to conduct investigations of its own motion is not subject to question; and, also, that the subcommittee may act under a resolution formally adopted by the Senate.

Name of Senator	Nature of proceeding	Alleged misconduct	How instituted	Committee proposed for reference	Did Senate adopt resolution directing inquiry?	Committee action	Senate action
James W. Patterson (1873).	Expulsion.....	Participation in Credit Mobilier.	Transmission by House of Representatives of copy of evidence.	Select Committee.	Yes (unanimous consent).	Resolution of expulsion.	Debate. Term ended before resolution considered.
William N. Roach (1893).	do.....	Preelection bank embezzlement.	Introduction of resolutions directing inquiry.	Privileges and Elections.	No.....	None.....	Debate, but no vote on resolutions.
John H. Mitchell (1905).	do.....	Indictment for selling influence.	Mitchell answered indictment on floor and withdrew.	None.....	do.....	do.....	Mitchell died before case warranted action.
Reed Smoot (1903-07).	Exclusion (but with two-thirds requirement).	Encouraging polygamy; supporting union of church and state.	Memorials of Utah citizens protesting admission.	Privileges and Elections.	Yes (unanimous consent).	Resolution that Smoot not entitled to seat.	Added two-third requirement and voted resolution down.
Joseph R. Burton (1906).	Expulsion.....	Conviction of statute forbidding compensation for senatorial services.	Resolution directing inquiry.	do.....	do.....	Burton resigned before committee or Senate took any action.	
Robert M. LaFollette (1917-19).	do.....	Disloyal speech.....	Petition of Minnesota Commission of Public Safety.	Privileges and Elections (petition so referred).	No resolution offered.	Resolution dismissing petition.	Adopted committee resolution.
Arthur R. Gould (1926).	Exclusion.....	Bribery committed 14 years before election.	Introduction of resolution.	Privileges and Elections.	Yes, after debate and vote.	Resolution of exonerated.	No action.
William Langer (1941).	Exclusion (with two-thirds requirement).	Misconduct as Governor, attorney general, and attorney.	Protest by citizens of North Dakota.	Privileges and Elections (protest so referred).	No resolution offered.	Resolution that Langer not entitled to be Senator.	Added two-thirds requirement and voted resolution down.
Tillman and McLaurin (1902).	Censure.....	Unparliamentary language by McLaurin and assault by Tillman.	Resolution directing report by Privileges and Elections.	Privileges and Elections.	Yes.....	Resolution of censure.	After debate, passed committee's resolution.
Hiram Bingham (1929).	do.....	Employment of lobbyist in confidential committee conference.	Introduction of resolution of censure.	None.....	No.....	None.....	After debate, passed resolution of censure.

APPENDIX OF EXPULSION, EXCLUSION, AND CENSURE CASES SINCE THE ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

1. JAMES W. PATTERSON, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, FROM MARCH 4, 1867, UNTIL MARCH 3, 1873

On February 4, 1873, the House of Representatives transmitted to the Senate a copy of evidence reported by a select investigating committee which investigated certain Members of the Senate in the Crédit Mobilier bribery scandal.

It was then moved and resolved by unanimous consent to appoint a select investigating committee for referral of the House message, the committee to possess the subpoena power.

On February 27, 1873, the select committee submitted a report (No. 519) accompanied by the following resolution: "Resolved, That James W. Patterson be, and he is hereby expelled from his seat as a member of the Senate."

On March 1 and 3, 1873, the Senate debated the question of taking up the report of the committee for consideration, but adjourned without actually considering the resolution.

Mr. Patterson's term then ended, and he did not return to the Senate.

At a special session in March of 1873 the Senate agreed to a resolution which pointed out that it was impossible to consider the expulsion resolution at the previous session and that it was questionable whether it was competent for the Senate to consider the same after Mr. Patterson had ceased to be a Member. It therefore merely resolved to print Mr. Patterson's pamphlet, *Observations on the Report of the Committee of the Senate of the United States Respecting the Crédit Mobilier of America*.

(Citations: Senate Election Cases, vol. I, pp. 1209-1211; Senate Journal, 42d Cong., 3d sess.; S. Rept. 519, 42d Cong., 3d sess.; debate on appointment of investigating committee, Congressional Globe, pt. 2, 42d Cong., 3d sess., p. 1099; debate on taking up report of committee for consideration, Congressional Globe, pt. 3, 42d Cong., 3d sess., pp. 2068, 2069, 2184, 2185; debate in special session on resolution to print report and Patterson's pamphlet, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 1, pp. 193-197, 204.)

2. WILLIAM N. ROACH, OF NORTH DAKOTA, SPECIAL SESSION OF THE SENATE, MARCH 4, 1893

On March 28, 1893, Senator Hoar introduced a resolution that "the Committee on Privileges and Elections be directed to investigate the allegations recently extensively made in the public press, charging William N. Roach, a Senator from the State of North Dakota, with the offense of criminal embezzlement, to report the facts of the transactions referred to, and further to report what is the duty of the Senate in regard thereto."

This resolution was followed on April 10, 1893, by a substitute by Mr. Hoar, which added the fact that the alleged criminal embezzlement took place while Mr. Roach was an officer of a bank in the city of Washington.

Still another substitute was introduced on April 14, 1893, asking that "the Committee on Privileges and Elections be directed to inquire and consider the question whether the Senate has authority or jurisdiction to investigate charges made against a Senator as to conduct or offenses occurring or committed prior to his election, not relating to his duty as Senator or affecting the integrity of his election."

Each resolution was ordered to lie over and be printed.

The resolutions were the subject of debate in the Senate April 14 and 15, 1893, but no vote was taken thereon.

(Citations: Senate Election Cases, vol. I, pp. 809-811; Senator Hoar's first resolution, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 25, p. 37; Senator Hoar's substitute resolution, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 25, pp. 111, 112; third resolution, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 25, pp. 137, 138; debate on the three resolutions, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 25, pp. 134, 138, 140-154, 155-159, 160-164.)

3. JOHN H. MITCHELL, OF OREGON, JANUARY 17, 1905

Mr. Mitchell, rising to a question of personal privilege on January 17, 1905, gave his answers to an indictment for receiving \$2,000 to use his influence as a Senator in a conspiracy to defraud the United States out of a portion of its public lands. He then concluded: "Now, having said this much in explanation of and in answer to the charges against me, and thanking you all sincerely for your courteous attention, I will not further intrude on your presence." Mr. Mitchell died before his case assumed such a phase as to call for action by the Senate.

(Citation (not in Senate Election Cases): Hinds' Precedents of the House of Representatives, vol. 2, 1907; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 2d sess., 58th Cong., pp. 959-963.)

4. REED SMOOT, OF UTAH, 1903-7

On February 23, 1905, the credentials of Reed Smoot were read and filed. On the same day Senator Burrows presented a memorial of citizens of Utah, remonstrating against the admission of Reed Smoot to a seat in the Senate; this memorial was placed on file. On March 5, 1903, Mr. Smoot was sworn in, his credentials being in order.

On January 16, 1904, a preliminary hearing was held before the Committee on Privileges and Elections at which counsel appeared for the memorialists and at which Mr. Smoot also appeared in person and by counsel. Statements were made by counsel for the respective parties, stating, in a general way, what they expected to prove and what their claims were as to the legal aspects of the case. (Senate Election Cases, vol. II, p. 956.)

On January 25, 1904, Mr. Burrows, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, reported the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections of the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized and directed to investigate the right and title of Reed Smoot to a seat in the Senate as a Senator from the State of Utah; and said committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit during the sessions of the Senate and during the recess of Congress, to employ a stenographer, to send for persons and papers, and to administer oaths; and that the expense of the inquiry shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the committee."

The Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate reported this resolution with a minor amendment.

The Senate proceeded by unanimous consent to consider the resolution, and agreed to it as amended.

Voluminous testimony was taken by the committee for over a year.

On June 2, 1906, Mr. Burrows, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, stated that the committee was divided on the question of the nature of the resolution which was to follow the acceptance by the Senate of the committee report; whether it should be one to expel the Senator, or whether a declaration that he was not entitled to his seat would be sufficient.

On June 11, 1906, Mr. Burrows submitted the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections (No. 4253), accompanied by the following resolution:

"Resolved, That Reed Smoot is not entitled to a seat as a Senator of the United States from the State of Utah."

The report concluded that Mr. Smoot was a member of the First Presidency and Twelve Apostles of the Mormon Church, which had encouraged the practice of polygamy contrary to law and had brought about a union of church and State in Utah contrary to the Constitution of Utah and the Constitution of the United States; consequently, Mr. Reed Smoot came to the Senate, not as the accredited representative of the State of Utah in the Senate of the United States, but as the choice of the hierarchy which controls the church and has usurped the functions of the State in said State of Utah.

A minority report of five members of the Committee found that the evidence did not sustain the charges against Smoot.

The Senate debated the resolution in December of 1906 and in January and February of 1907.

It was voted that the resolution be amended as follows: "Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein."

But on February 20, 1907, the resolution as amended was defeated by a vote of 28 yeas and 42 nays.

(Citations: Senate Election Cases, vol. I, pp. 928-936; presentation of memorial of citizens of Utah, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 36, pp. 2496, 2689; swearing in of Smoot, and postponement of contest on qualifications, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 37, p. 1; resolution authorizing and directing investigation of the right and title of Smoot, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 38, p. 1100; reporting of resolution by Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 38, p. 1239; report by Mr. Burrows that Smoot was not entitled to his seat, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 40, p. 7715; submission of majority and minority reports, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 40, p. 8218; contains citations to the Senate debate on the Smoot Resolution, Senate Election Cases, vol. I, p. 985; votes on the resolution and amendments, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 41, pp. 3428-3430.)

5. JOSEPH R. BURTON, OF KANSAS (1906)

Senator Burton was convicted of violating the Federal statute forbidding Senators or Representatives from receiving compensation for services rendered before any department of the United States Government.

On May 22, 1906, Senator Hale introduced the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections be, and are hereby, directed to examine into the legal effect of the late decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Joseph R. Burton, a Senator from the State of Kansas, and, as soon as may be, to report their recommendation as to what action, if any, shall be taken by the Senate."

The Vice President then asked: "Does the Senator from Maine desire the present consideration of the resolution just read?"

Mr. HALE. "It is simply directing the committee to investigate. There is no objection, I suppose, to the resolution."

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

On June 5, 1906, the Vice President laid before the Senate the following telegram, which was read and ordered to lie on the table:

"TOPEKA, KANS., June 4, 1906.

"Hon. CHARLES W. FAIRBANKS,

"Vice President of the United States

"Washington, D. C.:

"Hon. J. R. Burton has this day tendered his resignation as United States Senator from Kansas, and I have accepted the same."

No report was ever made to the Senate on the resolution.

(Citations: Senate Election Cases, vol. I, p. 995; submission of resolution, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 40, p. 7211; telegram concerning resignation, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 40, p. 7821.)

## 6. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, OF WISCONSIN (1917-19)

On September 29, 1917, the Minnesota Commission of Public Safety presented a petition to the United States Senate in the form of a resolution, whose resolving clause was as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Minnesota Commission of Public Safety respectfully petitions the Senate of the United States to institute proceedings looking to the expulsion of the said Robert M. La Follette from the Senate, as a teacher of disloyalty and sedition, giving aid and comfort to our enemies, and hindering the Government in the conduct of the war."

This petition resulted from a speech of alleged disloyal nature delivered by Senator La Follette in St. Paul, Minn., on September 20, 1917.

Mr. Kellogg presented the petition, and it was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Concerning the referral, Mr. Gilbert E. Roe notes in his brief in behalf of Senator Robert M. La Follette, that "Senator La Follette was temporarily absent from the Senate at the time of this proceeding, in attendance upon a meeting of the Committee on Finance, and had no information concerning the presentation of the resolution or of its references to the Committee on Privileges and Elections until some time thereafter. He had no opportunity, therefore, himself to then move for an investigation of said charges either by special committee or otherwise."

The Committee on Privileges and Elections then adopted a resolution authorizing a subcommittee "to investigate the accuracy of the report of the speech delivered by the Honorable Robert M. La Follette, United States Senator from the State of Wisconsin, September 20, 1917, before the Nonpartisan League at St. Paul; to investigate the accuracy of the statements made by the Honorable Robert M. La Follette in said speech; and to report its findings to the full committee the first day of the next regular session of Congress, in December 1917."

Hearings were conducted by the committee during a 14-month period. Congressional precedents and court decisions were reviewed, but no witnesses testified against La Follette.

The committee on January 17, 1919, submitted a report recommending the adoption of the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That the resolution of the Minnesota Commission of Public Safety petitioning the Senate of the United States to institute proceedings looking to the expulsion of Robert M. La Follette from the Senate because of a speech delivered by him at St. Paul, Minn., on September 20, 1917, be, and the same hereby are, dismissed for the reason that the speech in question does not justify any action by the Senate."

Senator Pomerene submitted his minority views.

The resolution submitted by the majority of the committee to dismiss the petition to eject Senator La Follette was adopted by the Senate after a short debate on January 16, 1919, by a vote of 50 to 21.

(Citations: Senate Election Cases, vol. II, pp. 49-98; hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, pt. 1, 65th Cong., 1st sess.; pt. 2, 65th Cong., 1st sess.; pt. 2, 65th Cong., 2d sess., in Senate Hearings, vol. 188, Senate Library; exchanges of correspondence between the committee and Senator La Follette, Senator La Follette's St. Paul speech, brief in behalf of Senator Robert M. La Follette (filed by his counsel, Gilbert E. Roe (also CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 57, pt. 2, pp. 1506-1522), and Mr. Pomerene's minority views—S. Rept. No. 614, 65th Cong., 3d sess.; Senate vote adopting the committee's resolution, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 57, pt. 2, pp. 1525-1527.)

## 7. ARTHUR B. GOULD, OF MAINE (1926)

On December 6, 1926, the certificate of election of Arthur R. Gould was presented to the Senate. At that time a resolution was introduced, pointing out that the press had reported that in 1911 the chief justice of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick had found in an official opinion that Mr. Gould, "for the purpose of advancing his own interests," had paid a \$100,000 bribe to the Premier of the Province in connection with a railroad venture. The resolving clause read as follows:

*Resolved*, That in that absence of official information concerning the charge thus made, the qualifying oath be administered to the member-elect and that the Committee on Privileges and Elections be, and it hereby is, directed to inquire into the truth of the facts so reported and recited and to report the same at the earliest convenient date to the Senate, with such recommendations touching action by it in the premises as may seem to them warranted."

The resolution was ordered to go over under the rule and the oath was administered to Mr. Gould.

On the next day, the Senate debated the resolution. Three arguments were advanced on behalf of Mr. Gould: That the Senate's authority to investigate the qualifications of Members was limited to questions of age, residence, and citizenship; that it had no jurisdiction to inquire into alleged offenses committed prior to the election of a Senator; and that the people of Maine, though familiar with the charges, had elected Gould by a large majority.

Senator Gould, however, took the floor and stated that he welcomed an investigation because he felt that he would be vindicated by the Senate as a result thereof.

The resolution was adopted and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections by a vote of 70 to 7.

From January 4 to January 27, 1927, hearings were held by the committee.

On March 4, 1927, the Committee on Privileges and Elections submitted Senate Report No. 1715 exonerating Mr. Gould and recommending that "further action in the instant case be not taken, and that the right of the honorable Arthur R. Gould to a seat in the Senate be confirmed."

(Citations: Introduction of resolution calling for investigation of the charges against Gould, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 68, pt. 1, pp. 8, 9; Senate debate on the resolution and adoption of the resolution, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 68, pt. 1, pp. 38-44; hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, 69th Cong., 2d sess., Senate hearings, vol. 290 in Senate Library; S. Rept. No. 1715, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 68, pt. 5, p. 5914.)

## 8. WILLIAM LANGER, OF NORTH DAKOTA (1941)

On January 3, 1941, a protest to the seating of WILLIAM LANGER was filed with the Secretary of the Senate by various citizens. On the same day, Senator LANGER was permitted to take the oath without prejudice, and subject to parliamentary ruling that only a majority of the Senate would be required to pass on the qualifications of the Senator-elect.

Senator BARKLEY asked that the papers, charges, affidavits and other documents which were involved in the protest against Senator LANGER's seating be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. The Vice President then declared: "Without objection, it is so ordered."

Hearings were held before the Committee on Privileges and Elections on January 9, 1941, and on January 16, 1941.

A subcommittee conducted preliminary investigations and filed a report for the use of the committee.

The full committee held hearings November 3 to 18, 1941, and voted by 13 to 3 for the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That WILLIAM LANGER is not entitled to be a Senator of the United States from the State of North Dakota."

The committee recommended that the Senate cast a vote on the proposition that the case "does not fall within the constitutional provisions for expulsion or any punishment by two-thirds vote, because Senator LANGER is neither charged with nor proven to have committed disorderly behavior during his membership in the Senate." The Senate rejected this proposition by a vote of 45 to 37. The Senate then voted 52 to 30 in favor of Senator LANGER's right to a seat.

(Citations: Filing of protest and swearing in of Senator LANGER, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 87, No. 1, pp. 1 and 2; Rept. 1010, 77th Cong., 2d sess.; Senate debate (last 2 days) and vote, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 3, pp. 2959, 2970-2978, 3038-3065.)

## THE THREE CENSURE CASES

## 1 and 2. Senators Tillman and McLaurin, of South Carolina (February 22, 1902)

Tillman charged on the floor that improper influence had been used in changing the vote of McLaurin upon the treaty which ended the Spanish-American War. McLaurin declared on the floor that the statement was a "willful, malicious, and deliberate lie." Tillman jumped forward and struck McLaurin, and they fought till separated.

A resolution was then passed that the two Senators be "declared in contempt of the Senate, and the matter be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections with instructions to report to the Senate what action shall be taken in relation thereto."

The Senate, by a vote of 54 to 12, adopted the recommendation of the committee:

"That it is the judgment of the Senate that the Senators from South Carolina \* \* \* for disorderly behavior and flagrant violation of the rules of the Senate \* \* \* deserve the censure of the Senate, and they are hereby censured for their breach of the privileges and dignity of this body; and from and after the adoption of this resolution, the action adjudging them in contempt of the Senate shall be no longer in force and effect."

(Citations: Hinds' Precedents of the House of Representatives, vol. 2, pp. 1138-1142; description of the encounter, and Senate order of contempt, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 57th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 2087-2090; report of Committee on Privileges and Elections and vote of the Senate approving the committee's resolution of censure, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 57th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 2203-2207.)

## 3. Hiram Bingham, of Connecticut (November 4, 1929)

On September 30, 1929, a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee investigating lobbies reported that Senator Bingham had appointed Charles L. Eyanson, assistant to the president of the Manufacturers Association of Connecticut, as a member of his staff. Eyanson, who was paid \$10,000 by the Connecticut Manufacturers Association, assisted Senator Bingham in connection with the hearings on the tariff bill before the Committee on Finance. Eyanson, whom Bingham had sworn as clerk of the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions, of which Bingham was chairman, came into secret meetings of the Finance Committee. Eyanson turned over his salary as clerk of the Territories Committee to Senator Bingham, who later transmitted a check of \$1,000 to Eyanson when the latter departed from Washington.

Senator Norris introduced a resolution condemning this conduct.

Senator Bingham replied that there was nothing unethical about hiring Eyanson, since his sole purpose was that he "might

better be prepared to present the case of (his) constituents in Connecticut, both employers and employees, both producers and consumers."

After extended debate an amendment disavowing any imputation of corrupt motives was incorporated into Senator Norris' resolution and the resolution was agreed to—yeas 54, nays 22:

*Resolved*, That the action of the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. Bingham, in placing Mr. Charles L. Evans upon the official rolls of the Senate and his use by Senator Bingham at the time and in the manner set forth in the report of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary (Rept. No. 43, 71st Cong., 1st sess.), while not the result of corrupt motives on the part of the Senator from Connecticut, is contrary to good morals and senatorial ethics and tends to bring the Senate into dishonor and disrepute, and such conduct is hereby condemned.

(Citations: CANNON'S Precedents of the House of Representatives, vol. 6, pp. 408-410; report on lobbying, S. Rept. 43, 71st Cong., 1st sess.; Senator Norris' resolution, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 71st Cong., 1st sess., p. 5063; resolution as passed, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 71st Cong., 1st sess., p. 5131.)

Mr. HAYDEN. Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of a letter addressed to me by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and a copy of another letter addressed to me by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MARCH 6, 1952.

Re Senate Resolution 187.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,

*Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: On August 6, 1951, Senate Resolution 187 was introduced in the Senate by Senator WILLIAM BENTON, of Connecticut, and was referred by the President of the Senate to the Committee on Rules and Administration. As you know, the resolution proposes an inquiry to determine whether the Committee on Rules and Administration should initiate action with a view toward the expulsion from the United States Senate of Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY, of Wisconsin. The final clause of the resolution is as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate is authorized and directed to proceed with such consideration of the report of its Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections with respect to the 1950 Maryland senatorial general election, which was made pursuant to S. Res. 250, Eighty-first Congress, April 13, 1950, and to make such further investigation with respect to the participation of Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY in the 1950 senatorial campaign of Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, and such investigation with respect to his other acts since his election to the Senate, as may be appropriate to enable such committee to determine whether or not it should initiate action with a view toward the expulsion from the United States Senate of the said Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY."

On August 8, 1951, as chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, you referred the said resolution to the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections and on Friday, September 28, the subcommittee received in open session an oral statement from Senator BENTON in support of the resolution. An invitation was extended to Senator McCARTHY to attend this public hearing and to appear before the subcommittee to answer

Senator BENTON's charges. However, Senator McCARTHY rejected this invitation by letter dated October 4, 1951, in which he stated:

"Frankly, Guy, I have not and do not intend to even read, much less answer, BENTON's smear attack. I am sure you realize that the Benton type of material can be found in the Daily Worker almost any day of the week and will continue to flow from the mouths and pens of the camp followers as long as I continue my fight against Communists in government."

(A copy of Senator McCARTHY's communication is attached hereto as enclosure A.)

Thereafter, the staff of the subcommittee was ordered to investigate the matters involved. On December 6, 1951, without prior inquiry either to me or to any other member of the subcommittee, Senator McCARTHY falsely and, it must be said, maliciously, accused the committee of "stealing from the pockets of the American taxpayer tens of thousands of dollars" in its handling of this investigation. The scandalous nature of his charges is apparent from the following quotation of them:

"Over the past months, it has been repeatedly brought to my attention that a horde of investigators hired by your committee at a cost of tens of thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money, has been engaged exclusively in trying to dig up on McCARTHY material covering periods of time long before he was even old enough to be a candidate for the Senate—material which can have no conceivable connection with his election or any other election. This is being done in complete disregard of the limited power of your elections subcommittee. The obvious purpose is to dig up campaign material for the Democrat Party for the coming campaign against McCARTHY.

"When your elections subcommittee, without Senate authorization, spends tens of thousands of taxpayers' dollars for the sole purpose of digging up campaign material against McCARTHY, then the committee is guilty of stealing just as clearly as though the Members engaged in picking the pockets of the taxpayers and turning the loot over to the Democratic National Committee.

"If one of the administration lackies were chairman of this committee, I would not waste the time or energy to write and point out the committee's complete dishonesty, but from you, Guy, the Senate and the country expect honest adherence to the rules of the Senate.

"While the actions of BENTON and some of the committee members do not surprise me, I cannot understand your being willing to label GUY GILLETTE as a man who will head a committee which is stealing from the pockets of the American taxpayer tens of thousands of dollars and then using this money to protect the Democrat Party from the political effect of the exposure of Communists in government. To take it upon yourself to hire a horde of investigators and spend tens of thousands of dollars without any authorization to do so from the Senate is labeling your elections subcommittee as even more dishonest than was the Tydings committee."

(A copy of this communication and of my reply, also dated December 6, 1951, are attached hereto as enclosure B.)

The following day, December 7, 1951, Senator McCARTHY addressed to me a further communication requesting information concerning the personnel of the staff of the subcommittee, their salaries, and an explanation of the nature of instructions issued to them. Since Senator McCARTHY was at that time a member of the Rules Committee, I felt that he was entitled to the information he had requested relative to the personnel employed by the subcommittee and by letter dated December 11, 1951, related information to

him concerning their salaries and the length of time they had been employed. (A copy of this communication and of my reply dated December 11, 1951, are attached hereto as enclosure C.)

Again, Mr. Chairman, on December 19, 1951, after having received from me the complete details with respect to the personnel of the subcommittee and the salaries at which they are employed, Senator McCARTHY deliberately, knowing the charge to be false, again vilified the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections with the same extravagant and irresponsible charges, attributing dishonesty and improper motives to its members. In this letter, Senator McCARTHY stated:

"The full committee appointed you chairman of an elections subcommittee, but gave you no power whatsoever to hire investigators and spend vast amounts of money to make investigations having nothing to do with elections. Again may I have an answer to my questions as to why you feel you are entitled to spend the taxpayers' money to do the work of the Democratic National Committee.

"As I have previously stated, you and every member of your subcommittee who is responsible for spending vast amounts of money to hire investigators, pay their traveling expenses, etc., on matters not concerned with elections, is just as dishonest as though he or she picked the pockets of the taxpayers and turned the loot over to the Democratic National Committee."

All of the above intemperate and outrageous accusations were delivered to the public press prior to their submission to me, as I pointed out in a communication to Senator McCARTHY dated December 21, 1951:

"Unfortunately, our previous correspondence concerning these matters found its way into the public press and your letters to me were printed in full in the public press even before I received them. As a former judge you will appreciate, I am sure, the impropriety of discussing matters pertaining to pending litigation in the public press. The Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, having referred the Benton resolution to our subcommittee, has placed us in a quasi-judicial position relative to a matter of outstanding importance involving the expulsion from the Senate of a sitting Member."

In this communication I also extended to Senator McCARTHY an opportunity to confer with me in person rather than continue this exchange of correspondence. With respect to his unwarranted, undignified, and wholly unjustifiable attack upon the integrity of the subcommittee, I said:

"May I again assure you that as far as I am personally concerned, neither the Democratic National Committee nor any other person or group other than an agency of the United States Senate has had or will have any influence whatever as to my duties and actions as a member of the subcommittee, and I am just as confident that no other member of the subcommittee has been or will be so influenced."

(A copy of Senator McCARTHY's letter of December 19, 1951, and of my answer, which I transmitted to Senator McCARTHY on December 21, 1951, are attached hereto as enclosure D.)

The invitation contained in my letter of December 21, 1951, was, however, ignored by Senator McCARTHY, and again on January 4, 1952, he addressed to me a communication charging that the jurisdiction of the subcommittee was restricted to matters having to do with elections and asking whether the investigators were ordered to restrict their investigations to such matters. (A copy of this communication and of my reply dated January 10, 1952, are attached hereto as enclosure E.)

No valid argument can be made that the subcommittee does not possess jurisdiction to enter into a plenary investigation of Senator McCARTHY's qualifications and conduct. The matter has been the subject of careful research by the legal staff of the subcommittee and it is clear that Senator McCARTHY's charge that our jurisdiction is limited to matters pertaining to elections is wholly untenable.

However, because of the fact that a question of jurisdiction has been raised by Senator McCARTHY and because he has undertaken, in addition, to impugn the integrity of the members of the subcommittee in communications which have been widely publicized by him, the subcommittee, in an executive session held on March 5, 1952, adopted the following motion by Senator MONROEY, of Oklahoma:

"That the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration request Senator McCARTHY, of Wisconsin, to raise the question of the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections and of the integrity of the members thereof in connection with its consideration of Senate Resolution 187 by making a formal motion on the floor of the Senate to discharge the committee; and that Senator McCARTHY be advised by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration that if he does not take the requested action in a period of time to be fixed by stipulation between Senator McCARTHY and the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, that the committee (acting through the chairman of the standing committee or the chairman of the subcommittee) will itself present such motion to discharge for the purpose of affirming the jurisdiction of the subcommittee and the integrity of its members in its consideration of the aforesaid resolution."

As chairman of the subcommittee, I transmit this report to you and request that you bring the matter before the Committee on Rules and Administration at its next meeting.

Respectfully,

GUY M. GILLETTE,  
Chairman.

ENCLOSURE A

OCTOBER 4, 1951.

Hon. GUY M. GILLETTE,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GUY: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of October 1 in which you offer me an opportunity to appear before your committee and answer Senator BENTON's charges.

Frankly, Guy, I have not and do not intend to even read, much less answer, BENTON's smear attack. I am sure you realize that the Benton type of material can be found in the Daily Worker almost any day of the week and will continue to flow from the mouths and pens of the camp followers as long as I continue my fight against Communists in government.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

JOE McCARTHY.

ENCLOSURE B

DECEMBER 6, 1951.

Senator GUY GILLETTE,  
Chairman, Elections Subcommittee,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you, of course, know, your Elections Subcommittee has the power and the duty to carefully investigate any valid claims of irregularity or dishonesty in the conduct of campaigns for the United States Senate.

As you and all the members of your subcommittee know or should know, the Elections Subcommittee, unless given further power by the Senate, is restricted to matters having to do with elections. The Senate could, of course, by a majority vote give your subcommittee power to conduct an unlimited investigation of any Senator. Such power was not asked for nor given to your Elections Subcommittee.

However, over the past months it has been repeatedly brought to my attention that a horde of investigators hired by your committee at a cost of tens of thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money has been engaged exclusively in trying to dig up on McCARTHY material covering periods of time long before he was even old enough to be a candidate for the Senate—material which can have no conceivable connection with his election or any other election. This is being done in complete disregard of the limited power of your Elections Subcommittee. The obvious purpose is to dig up campaign material for the Democrat Party for the coming campaign against McCARTHY.

When your Elections Subcommittee, without Senate authorization, spends tens of thousands of taxpayers' dollars for the sole purpose of digging up campaign material against McCARTHY, then the committee is guilty of stealing just as clearly as though the members engaged in picking the pockets of the taxpayers and turning the loot over to the Democrat National Committee.

If one of the administration lackies were chairman of this committee I would not waste the time or energy to write and point out the committee's complete dishonesty, but from you, Guy, the Senate and the country expect honest adherence to the rules of the Senate.

If your committee wanted to dig up campaign material against McCARTHY at the expense of the taxpayers, you were in all honesty bound to first get the power to do so from the Senate, which the Senate had a right to give and might have given. But your committee did not risk asking for such power. Instead, your committee decided to spend tens of thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money to aid BENTON in his smear attack upon McCARTHY.

Does this mean that if a BENTON asks your committee to do so, you will put an unlimited number of investigators at unlimited cost investigating the background of the other 95 Senators so their opponents can use this material next election? Or is this a rule which applies only to him who fights Communists in government? Let's get an answer to this, Guy. The people of America are entitled to your answer.

While the actions of BENTON and some of the committee members do not surprise me, I cannot understand your being willing to label GUY GILLETTE as a man who will head a committee which is stealing from the pockets of the American taxpayer tens of thousands of dollars and then using this money to protect the Democratic Party from the political effect of the exposure of Communists in government. To take it upon yourself to hire a horde of investigators and spend tens of thousands of dollars without any authorization to do so from the Senate is labeling your elections subcommittee as even more dishonest than was the Tydings committee.

Sincerely yours,

JOE McCARTHY.

DECEMBER 6, 1951.  
Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DEAR SENATOR: Your letter dated December 6 and referring to the work of the

Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections in the discharge of its duties relative to Resolution No. 187 has just been received by messenger. This resolution, on its introduction by Senator BENTON, was referred by the Senate to the Committee on Rules and Administration, of which you are a member. This committee, in its turn, referred the resolution to its Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, of which I am the chairman.

Our subcommittee certainly did not seek or welcome the unpleasant task of studying and reporting on a resolution involving charges looking to the ouster of one of our colleagues from the Senate. However, our duty was clear in the task assigned to us and we shall discharge that duty in a spirit of utmost fairness to all concerned and to the Senate. We have ordered our staff to study and report to us on both the legal and factual phases of the resolution. On receiving these reports the subcommittee will then determine its course in the light of its responsibilities and authority.

Your information as to the use of a large staff and the expenditure of a large sum of money in investigations relative to the resolution is, of course, erroneous. May I also assure you that no individuals or groups outside of the subcommittee membership have had or will have any influence whatever in the work assigned to us to do.

With personal greetings, I am,  
Sincerely,

GUY M. GILLETTE.

ENCLOSURE C

DECEMBER 7, 1951.

Senator GUY GILLETTE,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Elections,  
United States Senate, Washington,  
D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: I would very much appreciate receiving the following information:

(1) The number of people employed by the Elections Subcommittee, together with information on their employment background, the salaries they receive, and the length of time they have been employed.

(2) The names of the above individuals who have been working on the investigation of Senator McCARTHY.

(3) Whether they have been instructed to restrict their investigation to matters concerning elections.

(4) If the investigators have been ordered to cover matters other than either my election or any other election in which I took a part then the theory of the law under which you feel an Election Subcommittee is entitled to hire investigators to go into matters other than those concerned with elections.

I am sure that you will agree that I am entitled to this information.

Sincerely yours,

JOE McCARTHY.

DECEMBER 11, 1951.

Hon. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY,

United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DEAR SENATOR: I received your letter dated December 7 in which you make inquiry and request for certain specific information.

As you are a member of the Rules Committee, I feel, as you suggested, that you are entitled to the information relative to the personnel employed by the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections. Your first request is as to the number of people em-

ployed by the Elections Subcommittee, their salaries, and the length of time they have

been employed. The following is the list employed by the subcommittee:

	Employed	Position	Separated (3)	Basic salary
Grace E. Johnson.....	Dec. 19, 1944	Clerk (permanent employee).....		\$4,860.00
Mary K. Yanick.....	Oct. 1, 1951	Stenographer.....		1,280.00
Israel Margolis.....	Aug. 25, 1951	Assistant counsel.....		1,335.47
J. M. Fitzpatrick.....	Oct. 19, 1951	.....do.....	Dec. 6, 1951	1,149.86
Dan G. Buckley.....	Oct. 16, 1951	.....do.....	Dec. 8, 1951	928.37
Robt. L. Shortley.....	Oct. 16, 1951	Investigator.....	Dec. 8, 1951	1,218.86

<sup>1</sup> Per annum.

This completes the list of employees of the subcommittee. Three other employees of the Rules Committee have been performing work for the subcommittee, including Mr. John P. Moore, the chief counsel. You will note that three of the six employees of the subcommittee were taken on in a temporary capacity after the middle of October and completed their assigned work within a few weeks time. These men have done some work in connection with the Ohio Senatorial hearing.

You make further inquiry as to what theory of the law the subcommittee holds in connection with its investigatory work. We are not working under any theory. All the powers that we have derived from delegated responsibilities assigned to us by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. We do not have, and could not have, any power other than so derived as a sub-agency of the standing committee on rules and administration.

Sincerely,

GUY M. GILLETTE.

ENCLOSURE D

DECEMBER 19, 1951.

Senator GUY GILLETTE,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Elections,  
United States Senate, Washington,  
D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: On December 7, I wrote you as follows:

"I would very much appreciate receiving the following information:

"(1) The number of people employed by the Elections Subcommittee, together with information on their employment background, the salaries they receive, and the length of time they have been employed.

"(2) The names of the above individuals who have been working on the investigation of Senator McCARTHY.

"(3) Whether they have been instructed to restrict their investigation to matters concerning elections.

"(4) If the investigators have been ordered to cover matters other than either my election or any other election in which I took part, then the theory of the law under which you feel an Elections Subcommittee is entitled to hire investigators to go into matters other than those concerned with elections.

"I am sure you will agree that I am entitled to this information.

"Sincerely yours,

JOE McCARTHY."

On December 11 you wrote giving me the names of those employed by the subcommittee, stating that two others, whom you did not name, were also doing work for the subcommittee. You did not give me the employment background of the investigators as I requested. Why, Senator, do you refuse to give me the employment background of those individuals?

You also failed to tell me whether the investigators have been instructed to extend their investigations beyond matters having to do with elections.

You state that the only power which your subcommittee has was derived from the full

committee. The full committee appointed you chairman of an Elections Subcommittee but gave you no power whatsoever to hire investigators and spend vast amounts of money to make investigations having nothing to do with elections. Again may I have an answer to my questions as to why you feel you are entitled to spend the taxpayers' money to do the work of the Democratic National Committee.

As I have previously stated, you and every member of your subcommittee who is responsible for spending vast amounts of money to hire investigators, pay their traveling expenses, etc., on matters not concerned with elections, is just as dishonest as though he or she picked the pockets of the taxpayers and turned the loot over to the Democratic National Committee.

I wonder if I might have a frank, honest answer to all the questions covered in my letter of December 7. Certainly as a member of the Rules Committee and as a Member of the Senate, I am entitled to this information. Your failure to give this information highlights the fact that your subcommittee is not concerned with investigating elections, but concerned with dishonestly spending the taxpayers' money and using your subcommittee as an arm of the Democratic National Committee.

Sincerely yours,

JOE McCARTHY.

DECEMBER 21, 1951.

Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Today I received your letter of December 19 quoting former correspondence in which you had asked for some specific information which you feel was not given you in my reply to your former request.

Not only as a member of the Rules Committee, but as a Member of the United States Senate, you were certainly entitled to any factual information relative to the work of our Subcommittee of Rules and Administration or with reference to the members of its staff. I shall be very glad to give you such information as I have or go with you, if you so desire, to the rooms occupied by the subcommittee and aid you in securing any facts that are there available, relative to the employees of the subcommittee or their work.

I am sure you will agree that this is preferable to an attempt to cover matters of this kind through an interchange of correspondence. Unfortunately, our previous correspondence concerning these matters found its way into the public press and your letters to me were printed in full in the public press even before I received them. As a former judge you will appreciate, I am sure, the impropriety of discussing matters pertaining to pending litigation in the public press. The Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, having referred the Benton resolution to our subcommittee, has placed us in a quasi-judicial position relative to a matter of outstanding importance involving the expulsion from the Senate of a sitting Member.

Inquiry has disclosed that it would be impossible for me to call the subcommittee together for further consideration of this resolution and its import before Monday, the 7th of January, and I am calling a meeting for that date at 10 a. m. in my office.

When the Benton resolution was first referred to the subcommittee it developed that there was a difference of opinion among the members as to our responsibility under the reference and the terms of the resolution. The subcommittee ordered its staff to make study and report of the legal phases and precedents pertaining to the questions raised by the resolution and also to report as to certain allegations of fact contained in the resolution. We are awaiting these reports and, on the date of the meeting, which I have called for January 7, it is expected that the subcommittee will make a decision as to what further action, if any, it will take on the resolution.

As I have told you before, if you care to appear before the subcommittee, we should be glad to make the necessary arrangements as to time and place. Your letter and this reply will be made available to the members of the subcommittee by copy and you will be promptly advised as to what action the subcommittee decided to take.

In the meantime, as I have stated above in this letter, I shall be glad to confer with you personally as to matters concerning our staff and its work.

In closing, may I again assure you that as far as I am personally concerned, neither the Democratic National Committee, nor any other person or group other than an agency of the United States Senate has had or will have any influence whatever as to my duties and actions as a member of the subcommittee and I am just as confident that no other member of the subcommittee has been or will be so influenced.

With warm personal greetings and holiday wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

GUY M. GILLETTE.

ENCLOSURE E

JANUARY 4, 1952.

Senator GUY M. GILLETTE,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Elections  
and Privileges, United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: Your letter of December 21 has just been called to my attention. As you know, this was in answer to my letter to you of December 19, in which I asked for certain information.

I can easily understand that you might have some difficulty answering some of my questions without first consulting the other members of the subcommittee—for example, the question as to the theory of the law under which investigators are being hired and money being spent to investigate matters having nothing whatsoever to do with elections. There is, however, one simple question which you could easily answer and I am sure you will agree that I am entitled to the answer. It is the simple question of whether or not you have ordered the investigators to restrict their investigation to matters having to do with elections, or whether their investigations extend into fields having nothing whatsoever to do with either my election or the election of any other Senator.

Sincerely yours,

JOE McCARTHY.

JANUARY 10, 1952.

Senator JOE McCARTHY,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This is an acknowledgment of the receipt of your letter of January

4 which has just been brought to my attention. Your letter makes inquiry as to whether the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections "ordered the investigators to restrict their investigations to matters having to do with elections, or whether their investigations extend into fields having nothing whatever to do with either my election or the election of any other Senator."

In reply, you will recall that the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration received from the Senate the Benton resolution calling for a preliminary investigation relative to ouster proceedings. The Rules Committee referred the resolution to our subcommittee, as any other piece of legislation would be referred to a subcommittee. The subcommittee met and directed its staff to make a preliminary study both of the legal phases and precedents pertaining to this type of action and also a preliminary investigation of the factual matter charged in the resolution. They were instructed to make these preliminary studies and report to us at as early a time as possible. The report on the legal questions has been received by the subcommittee and we advise that the report on the factual charges will be available to us by the end of this week. The subcommittee then would study the reports and determine what action, if any, they wish to take in making their report to the Rules Committee on the resolution.

The above statement covers the question you asked as to what instructions were given to the subcommittee staff relative to the Benton resolution.

Sincerely,

GUY M. GILLETTE.

MARCH 21, 1952.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: Some days ago you handed me a letter from Senator GILLETTE, chairman of the Senate Elections Subcommittee, to you as chairman of the full committee. At that time you informed me that a majority of the full committee had adopted the subcommittee's resolution requesting that I bring to the floor of the Senate a motion to discharge the Elections Subcommittee. You further stated that the purpose of this motion would be to test the jurisdiction and integrity of the members of the subcommittee.

As I stated to you the other day, I feel it would be entirely improper to discharge the Elections Subcommittee at this time for the following reasons:

The Elections Subcommittee unquestionably has the power and when complaint is made, the duty to investigate any improper conduct on the part of McCARTHY or any other Senator in a Senatorial election.

The subcommittee has spent tens of thousands of dollars and nearly a year making the most painstaking investigation of my part in the Maryland election, as well as my campaigns in Wisconsin. The subcommittee's task is not finished until it reports to the Senate the result of that investigation, namely whether they found such misconduct on the part of McCARTHY in either his own campaigns or in the Tydings campaign to warrant his expulsion from the Senate.

I note the subcommittee's request that the integrity of the subcommittee be passed upon. As you know, the sole question of the integrity of the subcommittee concerned its right to spend vast sums of money investigating the life of McCARTHY from birth to date without any authority to do so from the Senate. However, the vote on that question cannot affect the McCarthy investigation, in that the committee for a year has been looking into every possible phase of McCARTHY's life, including an investigation of those who contributed to my unsuccessful 1944 campaign.

As you know, I wrote Senator GILLETTE, chairman of the subcommittee, that I considered this a completely dishonest handling of taxpayers' money. I felt that the Elections Subcommittee had no authority to go into matters other than elections unless the Senate instructed it to do so. However, it is obvious that insofar as McCARTHY is concerned this is now a moot question, because the staff has already painstakingly and diligently investigated every nook and cranny of my life from birth to date. Every possible lead on McCARTHY was investigated. Nothing that could be investigated was left uninvestigated. The staff's scurrilous report, which consisted of cleverly twisted and distorted facts, was then "leaked" to the left-wing elements of the press and blazoned across the Nation in an attempt to further smear McCARTHY.

A vote of confidence in the subcommittee would be a vote on whether or not it had the right, without authority from the Senate, but merely on the request of one Senator (in this case Senator BENTON), to make a thorough and complete investigation of the entire life of another Senator. A vote to uphold the subcommittee would mean that the Senate accepts and approves this precedent and makes it binding on the Elections Subcommittee in the future.

A vote against the subcommittee could not undo what the subcommittee has done in regard to McCARTHY. It would not force the subcommittee members to repay into the Treasury the funds spent on this investigation of McCARTHY. A vote against the subcommittee would merely mean that the Senate disapproves what has already been done insofar as McCARTHY is concerned, and, therefore, disapproves an investigation of other Senators like the one which was made of McCARTHY. While I felt the subcommittee exceeded its authority, now that it has established a precedent in McCARTHY's case, the same rule should apply to every other Senator. If the subcommittee brought up this question before the investigation had been made, I would have voted to discharge it. Now that the deed is done, however, the same rule should apply to the other 95 Senators.

For that reason, I would be forced to vigorously oppose a motion to discharge the Elections Subcommittee at this time.

I hope the Senate agrees with me that it would be highly improper to discharge the Gillette-Monroney subcommittee at this time, thereby, in effect, setting a different rule for the subcommittee to follow in case an investigation is asked of any of the other 95 Senators.

Sincerely yours,

JOE McCARTHY.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR TOMORROW

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader has asked me to make the following announcement:

It is the intention, when the Senate concludes its business this evening, to take a recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow and that in the meantime unanimous consent be granted that the calendar be called tomorrow for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 1276. I request such unanimous consent.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, before the request is granted, I desire to say that, in my opinion, if the calendar is called tomorrow, we should not act on bills which have been reported today,

for example, because we shall not have an opportunity to study them.

Mr. HAYDEN. If they are printed in today's calendar I think they should be considered. If they are not on the calendar until tomorrow, I should say no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that some 60 bills were reported today.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Does the Senator include in the calendar call those bills which by unanimous consent or by order of the Presiding Officer went over at the last call and were included in the next call?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the understanding.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Is it not also the understanding, if the Senator will yield further, that only bills will be considered which are on the calendar as of this date.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understand that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] wishes to have considered a joint resolution having to do with an extension of the War Powers Act.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Is that the only exception?

Mr. HAYDEN. So I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that four bills which went over when the calendar was last called will be included in the call of the calendar tomorrow.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. While we are discussing the calendar, I should like to make the observation that there are some bills which were reported from committees today. I do not think they should be considered tomorrow unless they are accompanied by committee reports so that Members of the Senate can at least read the committee reports.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think there is virtue in that statement. The only bill I know of in that category is the bill extending for 60 days the provisions of the War Powers Act. Other than that, I do not think the bills to which the Senator refers should be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Of course, a Senator can object.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The junior Senator from New Jersey will object unless the bills are accompanied by reports from the committee.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Without a doubt, some Senator will object to the consideration of the extension of the War Powers Act. If that be the case, is it the intention of the majority to bring up the bill by motion, or will it go over until the next day?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have not conferred with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and I do not know what his plan may be. Of course, a majority can do anything.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think many Senators would like to know if that bill will be taken up.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask if the Senator from Arizona will have listed the bills which have been carried over, so that Senators can be aware of them and know what they are.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has a list of them, which the clerk will read for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Calendar 1088, Senate bill 1331, a bill to further implement the full faith and credit clause of the Constitution.

Calendar 1183, House bill 646, an act for the relief of Mrs. Inez B. Copp and George T. Copp.

Calendar 1184, House bill 643, an act for the relief of Mrs. Vivian M. Graham and Herbert H. Graham.

Calendar 1266, House bill 5369, an act to authorize the exchange of certain lands located within and in the vicinity of the Federal Communications Commission's primary monitoring station, Portland, Oreg.

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, on Thursday the plan is to call up for consideration a resolution to discharge the Committee on Rules and Administration from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 187, and then to adjourn until Monday, April 14, with the understanding that on Monday no business will be transacted, but a recess will be taken until April 16, at which time there will be taken up the supplemental appropriation bill, House bill 6947, which is now in the Committee on Appropriations. The committee expects to report the bill during the recess or adjournment. One reason for the announcement of this program is to afford the committee the time between tomorrow and Friday to complete the appropriation bill.

#### ECA OBSERVATIONS IN THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, without my taking time to read and discuss them in detail, I should like to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, three news releases regarding the ECA program in the Philippines, together with an editorial from the Manila Bulletin in respect to the same subjects.

I am asking to have this material placed in the body of the RECORD because Mr. Edward J. Bell, Director of the Agriculture Division of the ECA Special Technical and Economic Mission in the Philippines, is one of the leaders of agriculture in my State. He is a prominent farm leader in Oregon, and has been devoting himself during the past 2 years to the question of foreign technical aid. I am greatly impressed with the views he expresses in portions of this material, and I ask, therefore, that the entire material be published in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

#### ECA OFFICIAL URGES FORMATION OF FREE LABOR UNIONS IN PHILIPPINES

MANILA, January 9.—Valery Burati, Director of the Labor Division of the United States Special Technical and Economic Mission, gave the following address tonight at the Catholic Lay Institute at Assumption Convent:

"Mr. Chairman, members of the institute, it is encouraging to see that groups such as yours are giving increasing attention to the question of labor in the Philippines. As the Nation develops economically it is a question that will come more and more to public light and involve more and more people directly in all walks of life. The great developments in the physical life and thoughts of the human race require constant readjustments in human relations. Labor relations is a specialized branch of human relations. It began when the first employer hired the first worker, but it did not become a social problem until after the industrial revolution had created concentration of industry and of the number of workers employed by individual companies.

"Labor relations in agriculture has been neglected throughout the world, but as mechanization extends to the farm the distinction between industry and agriculture is becoming more and more elusive. Some day it will not even exist, and should not, because human toil is human toil whether expended under neon lights in a factory or under the sun in a field. Here in the Philippines, where large numbers of workers are concentrated on large plantations, labor relations in agriculture is already a problem.

"Man is essentially an orderly creature. He establishes institutions to regulate social or civic conduct and organization. These institutions are usually founded on some basic politico-economic philosophy. In the modern era there are two great schools: Democracy and totalitarianism, including communism and fascism. That branch of mankind which is organized under the great politico-economic philosophy of democracy has established the institution of the free labor union to regulate the complex and often, but not always, conflicting interests between employer and worker. May I call your attention to the fact that I said 'free labor union.' The institution of the labor union exists also in totalitarianism, but not the free labor union. Under totalitarianism labor organizations can exist only as the tool of the domestic or foreign policy of the party in power. Labor unions under dictatorship are not institutions for democracy, they can serve under such conditions only to suppress democracy.

"To the extent that the party in power in any country on earth controls or attempts to control the institution of the labor union except through due process and free processes of democratic action to that extent that country is not democratic.

"The labor union is, of course, a controversial institution. It stands as a participant amid the swirl of the activities of other institutions whose immediate interests may be, or appear to be, contending with its own. To outsiders who do not understand the complex ways of democracy this swirl of activity may appear to be disorderly. Actually it is the only sound and safe way by which men may achieve order and remain free. Democracy is like chemical action; various substances placed in relation to each other react upon, with or against each other in their almost frantic search for equilibrium.

"Strong men will tolerate the inconveniences of democracy, which in point of view of historical time, even at their worst, are temporary. Weak men will rush to embrace the more immediate promise of the totali-

tarians for an orderly society, only to find themselves, like the poor fly, answering the blanishments of the spider with his symmetric web, hopelessly trapped and bereft of liberty and life itself. The strong men of the world are not the Communists who run from the problems of life into the subjective haven of their anemic ideologies, but the men of democracy with their tolerance and flexibility of mind, their impatient patience, their humanitarianism, and their fierce resistance to encroachments upon human rights and liberties.

"In the modern industrial era abuses against social justice are found more and more in industrial life. I am using industry in its broadest sense and mean to include agriculture with the exception of family farming. The realization of social justice is tending more and more to require industrial democracy. The organization of labor is a prerequisite to industrial democracy. In earlier times, or even today, the small forward-looking employer could give individual attention to each of his workers. He could answer their grievances and assure them of equal treatment. The rise of impersonal corporations, some of them gigantic in proportion, has destroyed the personal relationship between employer and worker. The individual worker found himself unable to deal effectively with a corporation. His individual voice was as nothing. Therefore, he joined with his fellow workers to form a union to bargain collectively with the corporation. Alone he had no power. He could petition but, as an individual, he had no means to give force to his demands. If other jobs were plentiful, he could quit and find another job, providing he was not held down by the responsibilities of family, lack of funds, or simply a lack of desire to live anywhere else. Organization into a union, he found, gave him security, and if not an equal, at least an effective voice, in dealing with management on matters relating to the conditions of his employment. This method of dealing with management came to be known as collective bargaining. It is the mode of action of the institution of the labor union. This is a complex procedure upon which I believe the other speakers before this institute have already spoken, or will speak, in detail.

"Within the democracies the institution of the labor union has come to be accepted as the means by which workers insure themselves of a fair share of the fruits of their labors. This is necessary not only for industrial democracy and social justice, but also for economic health in any nation. The history of economics proves that widespread purchasing power is necessary if industry is to prosper. The workers themselves constitute the greatest number of consumers. They cannot buy unless they have adequate purchasing power. Thus, in performing its function in this regard, the labor union contributes to a sound economy.

"Opponents of organized labor complain that it creates class conflict. The truth is that by functioning to bring about conditions more satisfactory to the workers, the institution of the labor union reduces class conflict. In many cases the union is the result, not the cause, of already existing class conflicts. And it is a fact that class consciousness and contentions are far less pronounced in those countries where organized labor is the strongest.

"Statesmanship is necessary for the most effective labor relations—statesmanship on the part of both union and employers. This is an extremely sensitive field of human relations. The union as an organization is subject to all the emotions of an individual man. If it is unduly opposed, it becomes unduly militant. If it is scorned, it becomes either surly and easily provoked or retaliatory. If it is treated condescendingly, it becomes resentful. If it is ostracized, it

becomes antisocial. The union, as an organization, is also like a man in that it desires to be respectable and to have self-respect. Therefore, it should be accepted into the community. A union should be respectable but not docile. By its very nature it must be dynamic, lending its strength to produce a better life for the people, to safeguard their human rights and to impel society forward.

"A part of the ECA program for the Philippines is to give advice and assistance in the formation of free labor unions, and to help develop harmonious relations and collective bargaining between labor and management. In sponsoring free labor unions ECA is acting under the direct mandate of the Congress of the United States. Public Law 165 enacted by the Eighty-second Congress and approved on October 10, 1951, declares it to be the policy of the United States to encourage free enterprise in those countries which receive American aid. And a major point of that policy, to use the words of the American Congress itself, is 'to encourage where suitable the development and strengthening of the free labor movements as the collective bargaining agencies of labor within such countries.'"

#### ECA OFFICIAL SEES FILIPINO YOUTH KEY TO STRONG FREE REPUBLIC

MANILA, January 13.—Edward J. Bell, Director of the Agriculture Division of the ECA Special Technical and Economic Mission, gave the following address today at the installation of officers of the Loyalty chapter of the Order of DeMolay in Manila:

"On December 18, 1949, it was my honor and pleasure to address your chapter at the first public installation of officers. It is no coincidence that I am in your country again. On my first visit to the Philippines 2 years ago, I decided that if we had the opportunity, my family should come over here to get better acquainted with your country and its people.

"We are truly living today in one world. Modern methods of transportation and communication have brought the various parts of this world so closely together that it is not possible for any nation or any individual to live to himself alone. We are all neighbors in a very real sense and it is necessary that we in America have the help and the friendship of folks on this side of the Pacific, just as you need our help and support.

"We, Americans, are and intend to remain a strong, free and independent Nation. No nation in the world today can remain strong, free and independent without the help of strong, free and independent neighbors. Making your country strong, free and independent is important to us but it is primarily the job of every Filipino. It is the responsibility of you young men in this organization and the other young men and women throughout this new, young Republic. I congratulate you for the opportunities that lie ahead for you to build this new country on the solid foundations of freedom, integrity, loyalty, industry, and devotion.

"It is my privilege to be associated for a while, with the joint program of economic development in which Filipinos and Americans are working together to build a stronger nation here. This is known as the ECA program.

"The ECA development program is not a one-sided affair. It is a real partnership job—a partnership in which Filipinos and Americans are working together to achieve a common goal vital to all of us. Furthermore, the important part of this job is being done and will continue to be done by Filipinos. We can help in a neighborly way, but permanent improvement in any country can only be brought about by the people who live there.

"My particular end of this job has to do with agriculture. Other phases have to do

with public health, public works, roads, development of industries, public finance, labor and social welfare. In every instance, the program is being carried out by Filipinos with the Americans acting as advisers. Money is provided in the form of dollars by the United States and in the form of peso counterpart funds appropriated by the Republic of the Philippines. So you can see that this is not just an American undertaking but a partnership between two friendly, independent republics.

"I should like to say just a few words about the agricultural part of this program. No nation can remain strong, free and independent unless it has a stable and productive agriculture; unless the men and women who till the soil and live in farming communities receive the full benefit from their labor; unless rural people believe that their way of life is worth while. All too often in the history of mankind, agriculture has been neglected. When that happens, when the people who live and work on farms become discouraged, when they feel that no one is interested in their welfare, food production declines and the seeds are sown for rebellion and revolution.

"One of the hopeful indications that you can and will develop a successful democracy here is the growing interest in the problems of the farmer and a growing appreciation of his importance to the general welfare of all the people. There are many indications that your nation realizes the importance of a stable, productive and prosperous agriculture. For example, your government has requested the United States to send a number of technical experts to advise and counsel with your agricultural leaders and scientists in making farming in the Philippines more productive and more attractive. These technical assistants are helping your leaders to plan programs to increase yields of farm crops through the use of fertilizer, irrigation pumps, gravity irrigation systems, improved seed varieties, soil conservation practices, and control of insect pests, rodents and plant diseases. Your Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources is also bringing in improved breeding stock so that the quality of the hogs, poultry, and cattle can be improved in every barrio.

"Your government is also developing programs to improve the economic and social condition of farmers through land tenure reform, rural credit facilities, cooperative marketing and purchasing, improving living conditions in rural communities and assisting in the resettlement of undeveloped areas. Americans with experience in these fields have been asked to come over here as advisers, but again we should recognize that the programs themselves will be carried out by Filipinos.

"American dollars are being used to purchase scientific equipment, machinery, fertilizer, irrigation pumps, and other material to get the program started; the hope being that after a few years, a self-generating, self-supporting agriculture can go ahead under its own power.

"In the Philippine agriculture of the future, scientific research and educational work will play an important role. The College of Agriculture of the University of the Philippines at Los Baños is being expanded as a source of trained scientists and agricultural leaders and a central experiment station is located there for fundamental research. An agricultural extension service is being developed in which trained local leaders working with farmers and their families in every barrio will help local people solve their local problems. They will help each farmer to use the findings of modern science in improving production on his farm.

"Modern science and know-how have already shown that your soil and climate can be made to produce abundantly. What remains to be done is to show the people on

the land how to apply this knowledge on their farms; and to make it worthwhile for them to do so; for the whole Nation to recognize the importance of farmers and their work and to give agriculture its proper place as a basic industry and way of life.

"I have spoken at some length about your program of agricultural development because it is essential that the future leaders of your country recognize the importance of farming. Also, what I have said about how your agriculture is being developed applies equally to all the other things that your leaders are doing in order to make democracy successful in the Philippines. You have the resources, you have the ability, you have the courage to do the job that needs to be done. With confidence in yourself and in your country and with a willingness to work together in meeting the great challenge of your generation, we have every confidence that the people of the Philippines can and will build a strong, free and independent nation on this side of the Pacific."

#### FULL IMPACT ECA PROGRAM NOT YET FELT, SAYS MISSION CHIEF

MANILA, January 17.—Dr. Roland R. Renne, Chief of ECA's Special Technical and Economic Mission to the Philippines revealed today that nearly a million dollars has been spent in the Philippines by ECA for technical assistance and that more than \$3,000,000 worth of goods have actually arrived in the country under this United States aid program.

Dr. Renne speaking Thursday before the Manila Rotary Club at its regular meeting in the Manila Hotel cautioned that, "The full effect of the ECA program on the Philippine economy is not yet felt. All of the ECA fifteen million interim aid appropriation and about half of the \$32,000,000 for the current fiscal year has been allocated for the various projects," he said. "More than P8,000,000 have been allocated from the counterpart funds for these projects," he reported, "but to date only about P5,000,000 have actually been expended."

Dr. Renne pointed out that there has been criticism in some circles over "the slowness with which the ECA program has moved forward." "It has been our general policy in the Mission," he pointed out, "to insist upon adequate information, sound and thorough planning, and intelligent budget making. It has not been our major objective to see how much funds we could put in circulation as fast as possible," he emphasized, "rather it is our aim to discover and undertake projects and programs which will do the greatest possible good in improving the Philippine economy with the limited amount of funds available." "ECA wants," he assured his audience, "to move as rapidly as possible, but we are not sacrificing sound and effective projects or programs for more speed of action."

Dr. Renne said that the ECA program is a joint undertaking of two free nations. "What makes the program so promising," the ECA Chief said, "is that the two nations can supplement each other so that a stronger program results than could be possible from either one working alone." "The United States has the advanced technical 'know-how' and the capital; and the Philippines has the natural resources and the labor supply." "The important thing," he pointed out, "is that the projects undertaken not require a total number of pesos greater than that which the Philippine economy can support along with its other commitments and responsibilities, and that each and every project makes a significant contribution to increased production and better living conditions."

Dr. Renne pointed out that in many cases grants of ECA funds for particular projects are made contingent upon specific action by the Philippine Government to increase its

efforts along certain desired lines and to make certain reforms which will assure lasting benefits. "It is our policy," he said, "not to use ECA funds for regular recurring expenditure of the Philippine Government. Our aim is to use ECA funds as completely as possible for capital investment and economic development." "Where such funds are made available during an interim period," he went on, "such funds will not continue unless the Philippine Congress makes substantial effort to accept its responsibilities for regular recurring overhead expenditures for its operations."

"The ECA mission definitely favors industrial development in the Philippines," Dr. Renne said. He pointed out, however, that a sound program of industrial development will necessarily be a gradual, evolutionary growth and not a dramatic, revolutionary development overnight. He said ECA believes that a fundamental prerequisite for a great expansion of industrial development and specialization of labor in the Philippines is increased efficiency in agricultural production. Agricultural production must increase, according to Renne, not only enough to provide an adequate food supply for the Philippines but it must increase exports. Exports are essential to make possible the securing of venture capital and credit for industrial development, he said. "Furthermore, he stated, "increased efficiency in agricultural production will release workers for employment in nonagricultural undertakings."

"It would indeed be shortsighted," Dr. Renne told the Rotarians, "for Americans to take the view that the Philippines should not work toward sound industrial development." "In the interests of mutual security, with the great distances involved we Americans are certainly concerned with strengthening the economy of this and other free countries of southeast Asia so that they are more diversified and more able to meet internal and external crises if and when they develop," he said.

Diversified development of a nation expands the economic horizon of that nation's people with resulting increased demands for varied goods and services obtainable only through international trade, Dr. Renne said.

"Only the future can tell how effective will be this great mutual aid program," Renne concluded. "We should not forget that in the long run the policies and programs developed for sound economic development and the honesty and social responsibility exemplified by our leaders may prove to be of more significance to the ultimate improvement of living levels and the peace and security than the immediate and very urgent mutual defense efforts of the free nations of the world."

The complete text of Dr. Renne's address follows:

"There are many evidences that the Philippines is entering a period of marked economic expansion and growth which will raise the level of living of the average Filipino significantly and make the Islands more secure as a free, democratic nation from perils both from within and from without. The basic soil and mineral resources to support economic expansion and growth are present as well as an abundant labor supply, and coupled with technical assistance and capital, only the determined support and guidance of socially responsible, honest leadership are necessary to assure achievement of the desired results.

"I have been impressed by the extraordinary friendliness, hospitality, and intelligence of the Philippine people, and by the feeling of optimism and growing confidence in the Nation's future and its role among the free nations of the world. I have also been impressed with the realistic appreciation in important government and business circles of the existence of serious economic and social problems which must be solved. This growing confidence and serious realism

together create a climate of clear thinking and intelligent understanding which are essential if sound programs are to be developed and carried out.

"The enthusiastic acceptance and widespread interest in the ECA program by Filipinos is somewhat frightening although heartening to those of us concerned with the execution of the program because in reality, the number of dollars and pesos available is definitely limited and, compared with several other programs of foreign aid both current and previous, the amounts of money are relatively small. For example, American aid to the Philippine economy from VJ-Day to June 30, 1951, exceeded two billion dollars (\$2,056,000,000) of which some \$864 million was for outright grants and relief, principally through the Philippine Rehabilitation Act, and \$600 million was for armed-forces expenditures. In contrast, only \$47 million have thus far been made available for the ECA program in the Philippines—\$15 million for the 1951 fiscal year remaining after the bilateral agreement between the two nations was signed in April, and \$32 million for the current fiscal year ending June 30 next.

"The great hopes placed upon the ECA program must spring from other sources than the number of dollars involved. Perhaps they spring from the conviction that following the great physical and human rehabilitation efforts involving large sums of money immediately after war's end the time is ripe for a period of sound growth and expansion, possible only through the applications of modern science and technology, honest and intelligent leadership, and capital investment. In other words, emphasis and the hopes, rather than being placed on direct payments or grants for consumers' expenditures, are placed upon a joint program or team approach to development in which the technical "know-how" and capital of an older more advanced industrial nation are combined with the rich natural resources and the abundant labor supply of the Philippines.

"The most striking consequence of war is not its physical destruction, but the tremendous acceleration it gives to the spread of ideas, including social concepts and technology. It is said that World War I pushed the technological advance of the world forward some 75 years. Obviously World War II which was more extensive advanced technology perhaps a hundred or a hundred and fifty years forward. It also created in its wake some major revolutions in social and political concepts. I certainly have no intention to advocate war, but merely to point out some of its significant historic consequences. These great changes which emerge from wars are consistent with the basic theory of challenge and response—during wars we are united in near superhuman efforts to overcome perils at hand. These efforts bring forth corresponding sweeping changes and impacts.

"The most striking thing about the last war is that the really great changes occurred not in Europe or Germany, but in Burma, India, Indonesia, and the Philippines where nine new nations were created—the Philippines, Indonesia, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Burma, India, Pakistan, and Ceylon—comprising more than one-fourth of the world's population. Never before have so many new nations involving so many millions of people emerged in so short a time or under such difficult conditions. These new nations are the result partly of events in these countries and partly of events in Britain, Holland and the United States—great psychological events. As the people of the East were groping toward self-determination, so were the people of the West growing more opposed to domination and oppression of one people by another.

"In reality, the people of the West were themselves fighting against the domination of Hitlerism, but many did not at first ap-

preciate the implicit content of their own ideal—the ideal of the freedom and integrity of men and, therefore, of its races, nations, and leaders. In this setting, it is not so difficult to understand why some of the older more fortunate independent nations are desirous of helping new nations become strong and maintain their independence. A truly democratic nation could consistently follow no other course. It is indeed consistent with the Rotary ideal of international service, and as a Rotarian all of us I am sure, are fully aware of the tremendous importance of such ideals in the minds and hearts of men."

#### THE PHILIPPINE PROGRAM

"In the Philippines, the ECA program was developed following the report of the Bell Economic Survey Mission. The Bell Mission analyzed many aspects of the Philippine economy on the invitation of the Philippine Government at a time (the summer of 1950) when economic conditions, particularly in the financial sector, were in a serious state. This analysis was summarized in the Bell Report published in October 1950, which included, in addition to extensive analysis and discussion, seven major recommendations as follows:

"1. That the finances of the Government be placed on a sound basis and to carry out this intention that additional revenues be raised by equitable, efficiently administered taxes and that fiscal policy be established to give support to productive enterprises and to avoid inflation.

"2. That agricultural production be improved and that the agricultural sector of the economy be developed by related measures providing better public services to farmers such as research and extension services, and by undertaking rural credit arrangements, assistance to new settlers, land redistribution, tenancy reform, and similar measures.

"3. That steps be taken to diversify the economy of the country by encouraging new industries, developing adequate power and transportation facilities, exploring natural resources, and examining laws and practices with respect to use of the public domain.

"4. That steps be taken to guard against further deterioration in the international payments position, including a special emergency tax of 25 percent for a period not to exceed 2 years on certain imports and that the present trade agreement be reexamined in the light of the new conditions.

"5. That an adequate program of public health and improved education and housing be undertaken and that the right of workers to organize free trade-unions, protection against unfair labor practices and guarantees of minimum-wage standards be provided by legislation.

"6. That public administration be improved and reorganized and that civil-service salaries be increased. That the United States send a technical mission to assist the Philippine Government in carrying out its agricultural and industrial development, fiscal controls, public administration, and labor and social welfare program.

"7. That the United States Government undertake financial assistance of \$250,000,000 through loans and grants to help carry out a 5-year program of economic development and technical assistance and that this aid be strictly conditioned on steps being taken by the Philippine Government to carry out the recommendations outlined above. It should be noted that the recommended expenditure of approximately \$250,000,000 over a 5-year period included loans and not just grants.

"After the Bell report was published October 9, 1950, with the concurrences of the two Governments, President Truman designated Mr. William C. Foster, Administrator of ECA, to meet with President Quirino to consider the steps which might be taken to

put into effect measures to improve Philippine conditions. This meeting took place in Baguio on November 14, 1950, and resulted in what is known as the Quirino-Foster Agreement. Many of the provisions of this agreement could be carried out only by action of the Philippine Congress. Action taken by the Philippine Congress included the passage of the 17-percent import license law and the minimum wage law, and ratification of the bilateral agreement between the Philippines and the United States. This bilateral agreement is the basic document under which the ECA program operates. Briefly, it provides that the United States shall give assistance in the form of technical experts and materials purchased with United States appropriations. In turn, the Philippines will undertake as priority measures the accomplishments of the major recommendations made in the Bell report. Consequently, the major objectives of the two nations in the ECA program are to accomplish as quickly and as efficiently as possible the measures recommended and the developments envisaged as resulted of the Bell Mission Survey."

#### ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURES

"In October 1951, the United States Congress passed the Mutual Security Act of 1951 establishing the Mutual Security Agency to replace the former Economic Cooperation Administration under which the ECA program operated. This new agency is now headed by W. Averell Harriman who reports directly to the President of the United States. The act brings together under one agency most of the American foreign programs of military, economic, and technical assistance. The act authorizes a Deputy Director to be appointed to have general supervision over the technical and economic assistance phase of the mutual security program.

"We have been authorized to continue to use the ECA symbol, although the name of the agency has been changed from Economic Cooperation Administration to the Mutual Security Agency. The letters ECA are now interpreted to stand for Economic Cooperation with Asia, and the particular mission which I head is referred to as the Special Technical and Economic Mission to the Philippines and abbreviated as STEM.

"The work of our mission is divided into six major functional divisions, each with a director: (1) Agriculture, forestry, and fisheries; (2) fiscal and trade policy; (3) industry and public works; (4) labor and social welfare; (5) public administration and education; and (6) public health.

"In addition, there are administrative divisions, including an office of requirements dealing with specifications, procurement, and supply of essential items; an office of program coordination; an office of controller; and an office of information. In addition to the division heads and strictly administrative personnel, there are 41 technical specialists now on duty in the Philippines. Although these cover all the major categories mentioned, the largest number of specialists are working in the fields of agriculture and fiscal and trade policy. These were requested by the Philippine Government for assignment to government agencies.

"In the Philippine Government, the Philippine Council for United States Aid, known as PHILCUSA, has been established. It is composed of 16 individuals, including members of the executive branch of the government, members of the senate and house of representatives, and other leading citizens from the business and professional world. The chairman of PHILCUSA is Mr. Jose Yulo.

"A professional staff has been set up in PHILCUSA, headed by an Executive Secretary responsible for the day to day activities involved in carrying on the joint program and in providing liaison between public and private agencies in the Philippines and the

ECA Mission. The professional staff is organized to provide counterpart divisions for the major functional divisions of the ECA Mission. Thus a proposed project such as the purchase of boars and bullocks for improving Philippine meat production would first be considered by a representative of the agriculture division of PHILCUSA, a representative of the agriculture division of the ECA Mission, and a representative of the agency concerned in the Philippine Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources. The planning of projects and the formulation of detailed plans and budgets, therefore, involves a three-way participation of PHILCUSA, ECA, and the interested Philippine department, bureau, or agency.

"The Philippine Congress authorized the expenditure of 50,000,000 pesos as the Philippine contribution or counterpart for ECA dollars. No funds may be expended from either the ECA appropriation or the PHILCUSA pesos counterpart funds without the approval both of ECA and PHILCUSA. In other words, the program is strictly a joint program of two free, independent nations in the interests of mutual security and progress.

"Up to the present time, nearly a million dollars has been spent in the Philippines for technical assistance, and more than \$3,000,000 worth of goods have actually arrived in the Philippines. All of the 15,000,000 interim appropriation and approximately half of the 32,000,000 for the current fiscal year have been allocated for various projects, and procurement has been initiated for much of this. More than 8,000,000 pesos have been allocated from counterpart funds for various projects, but to date only approximately 5,000,000 pesos have actually been expended. The full effect of the ECA program on Philippine economy is, consequently, not yet felt. Before 1952 ends, however, the effects on the economy should be more significant.

"There has been considerable criticism, particularly in some circles, over the slowness with which the ECA program has moved forward. Various reasons are ascribed for this slowness, and various Philippine agencies are singled out for criticism. I personally wish to say that I do not feel any one agency is primarily responsible for the delay, and certainly ECA itself has at times contributed to the slowness with which some programs have moved forward. It has been our general policy in the mission here to insist on adequate information, sound and thorough planning, and intelligent budget making. It has not been our major objective to see how much funds we could put in circulation fastest, but to undertake projects and programs that would do the greatest possible good in improving Philippine economy with the limited amount of funds we have available. This has meant disappointing some individuals or groups with particular projects and programs, but we believe that in the long run a sound beginning and insistence upon sound policies and procedures will pay good dividends. We want to assure you that we are anxious to move as rapidly as possible, but we are not sacrificing sound and effective projects or programs for mere speed of action.

"We have set up certain criteria for evaluating projects and proposals in relation to the over-all goal of strengthening Philippine economy and improving living conditions. These criteria include:

1. Will the effect be achieved increase agricultural and industrial production?

2. To what extent will the benefits of the project be spread among a great number of people?

3. How readily available from any free nation source are the materials and equipment required for the proposed projects?

"Unless these three criteria are kept constantly in mind, the limited dollars and pesos available for the joint program of economic development could easily be frittered away

and lose their effectiveness in making a major contribution through capital investment and application of science and technology to increase production and achieve higher living levels. Our emphasis has, therefore, been throughout on staff well trained in sound economics and engineering in order to achieve these goals.

"The fact that the ECA program is a joint undertaking of two free nations does not necessarily mean that each nation must put in an equal amount of funds. As a matter of fact, in a program such as this a factor which makes the program so promising is that the two nations can supplement each other so that together a stronger program results than would be possible from either one working alone. The United States has the technical 'know-how' and the capital, and the Philippines has the resources and the labor supply. If the United States appropriates a total of \$32,000,000 which it has allocated for the current fiscal year, it does not mean necessarily that the Philippine Government should put in 64,000,000 pesos. Some projects have much less peso requirements than a 2 to 1 ratio of dollars, and some have a much higher requirement. The important thing is that the projects undertaken not require a total number of pesos greater than which the Philippine economy can support along with its other commitments and responsibilities, and that each and every project make a significant contribution to increased production and better living conditions.

"Funds for the P50,000,000 counterpart account are created in part by expenditure of ECA dollars themselves. For example, when fertilizer or rubber tires or some other essential commodities are bought with ECA dollars and sold to individual farmers or through commercial channels, pesos which are secured for the goods, less necessary operating expenses, go into the counterpart fund. About \$10,000,000 of the current \$32,000,000 allocated to the Philippines has been earmarked for the purchase of essential commodities in short supply, these items to be procured and sold through commercial channels. Consequently, in the neighborhood of P20,000,000 will be created for the counterpart fund by these dollars and will reduce correspondingly the demands made upon Philippine funds for the counterpart. Also, since counterpart funds do not revert to the general fund at the end of each fiscal year but are a continuing fund, pesos from the sale of irrigation pumps or other capital improvements on a 5- or 10-year contract period will result in counterpart funds being available for economic development perhaps several years after the formal ECA program has ended."

#### MAJOR POLICIES

"The ECA program is designed to present a balanced approach to sound economic development and expansion. It is not merely a program of providing technical assistance alone. It is rather a means of assisting to create the kind of an environment—economical, social, and political—within which a sound program of economic expansion can develop and grow. Such an environment necessitates existence of satisfactory economic conditions, a rather stable medium of exchange, and an honest, efficient public administration. Because of the ravages of war and peculiar trade situation of the Philippines, the ECA program provides for making considerable sums available to supplement the dollar exchange of the central bank to maintain the peso on an even keel. For example, making dollars available for the purchase of essential commodities in short supply relieves the pressure on the national budget and helps to supplement the limited dollars of exchange built up through export-import trade balances.

"A significant drop in the prices of Philippine export commodities such as occurred

during the past summer and extensive destruction to a major export crop such as occurred in the case of sugar by Typhoon Amy can upset the best-laid plans of honest and able Government fiscal experts. The amount of import exchange for the first 6 months of 1952 recently released by the central bank shows a drop from the preceding period of \$32,000,000. Oddly enough, this just happens to be the exact amount currently available for the total ECA program. However, only one-third of this sum will be used for the purchase of essential commodities in short supply to supplement Philippine exchange and bolster the stability of the peso. While the ECA dollars amount to only a small percentage of the total exchange available for imports, their marginal effect in reducing the inflationary pressure on the economy is much more significant.

"In many cases, grants of ECA funds for particular projects are made contingent upon specific action by the Philippine Government to increase its efforts along certain desired lines and to make certain reforms which will assure lasting benefits through the programs undertaken. Consequently, in addition to the technical know-how which is made available through technical specialists, certain fundamental improvements and basic changes are achieved as a result of the joint undertaking and the mutual agreement of the two countries. For example, recently ECA approved more than \$1,700,000 for equipment and educational and demonstration aids for the Philippine Extension Service with a proviso that legislation be enacted during the coming Congress to centralize all agricultural extension activities in a central extension service in the department of agriculture and natural resources. ECA has made funds available for equipment, laboratories, and library at the Los Banos Agricultural College and for interim educational staff to take care of the increased student load with the understanding that the Philippine Government will take steps to more adequately meet its responsibilities for the regular operating expenses and overhead for the institution.

"It is our policy not to use ECA funds for regular recurring expenditures of the Philippine Government. Our aim is to use ECA funds as completely as possible for capital investment and economic development. Where funds are made available during an interim period to meet certain critical situations, such funds will not continue to be made available unless the Philippine Congress makes substantial effort to accept its responsibilities for regular recurring overhead expenditures of its operations.

"The ECA mission definitely favors industrial development in the Philippines. It believes, however, that a sound program of industrial development will necessarily be a gradual, evolutionary growth and not a dramatic, revolutionary development overnight. We believe that a fundamental prerequisite for a great expansion of industrial development and specialization of labor in the Philippines is increased efficiency in agricultural production which will not only provide a more adequate food supply for the population but will increase exports, making possible the securing of venture capital and credit for industrial development and will release workers for employment in non-agricultural undertakings. A very important part of the ECA program is, therefore, directed toward increasing agricultural production and agricultural efficiency. This explains our interest in and our efforts in increasing agricultural research facilities, particularly at Los Banos, the agricultural extension service effectiveness, the land settlement and development program in Mindanao, the abacá and coconut-disease research and control programs, the improvement of meat production through importation of high-quality breeding stock, increased yields

through provision of commercial fertilizer, more adequate water supply through provisions of irrigation pumps and gravity irrigation systems, and improvement of basic seed stocks of food plants.

"It would indeed be short-sighted for Americans to take the view that the Philippines should not work toward sound industrial development. In the interests of mutual security with the great distances involved from our western shores to this spot in the Pacific, we are certainly concerned with strengthening the economy of this country so that it is more diversified and more able to meet internal and external crises that may develop. But aside from the military security aspects, we are also concerned with a more diversified development of the agricultural and industrial resources of this Nation because diversified development of a nation expands the economic horizon of its people with resulting increased demands for varied goods and services attainable only through international trade.

"It is significant that the Mutual Security Act specified that at least 10 percent of the economic aid funds made available must be spent in the form of loans. There are several rather promising industrial development projects which are now being considered for possible loans and, in addition, the Export-Import Bank has indicated an interest in making a loan of twenty-five to thirty million dollars for the Ambuclo hydroelectric power project. These developments speak well for significant industrial expansion in the years ahead.

"The Mutual Security Act also provides guarantees to cover risks which foreign private investors must assume. These investment guarantee provisions will prevent major losses to investors because of major changes in exchange rates or economic decline within a nation. Also, the ECA is concerned with and responsible for assistance to the Philippines in processing requests for priorities and other types of defense orders for materials which are scarce because of the defense needs in the United States. ECA is also directly concerned with projects now underway providing for mineral surveys, industrial surveys, and technical assistance to industry. I emphasize these at this time in order to indicate that while a very important part of our ECA program is devoted to the improvement of agricultural production and land settlement, we are, nevertheless, very much interested in and anxious to assist with sound industrial development.

"Time does not permit analyzing each of the programs which are being undertaken in the other major fields such as public health, transportation, education, and public administration. Briefly, in the field of public health we are making major efforts in malaria control which is a serious bar to the development of virgin lands in Mindanao and some other islands. We also have a large school health program directed toward curing remediable children's diseases, primarily intestinal, as well as emphasizing the health education of the children and, through them, their families. We have a sanitary water supply project for rural barrios, and are supporting projects for rehabilitation of laboratories and to strengthen efforts in reduction of tuberculosis and nutritional diseases, establish rural health centers, and rehabilitate hospitals.

"In the transportation field, a major effort is being made to purchase road construction and maintenance equipment to establish adequate maintenance and service centers, and to provide technical specialists to advise and work with the bureau of public works highway officials.

"In the field of education, our efforts are concentrated upon the rehabilitation of vocational schools and colleges, particularly for vocational agriculture training and training in trades and industries vocations. Funds

are also being made available to establish a forestry-products laboratory and provide more adequate facilities for the engineering, medical, and nursing schools of the University of the Philippines.

"In the field of public administration, our staff members are working with Philippine officials to improve the revenue collection and administration procedures, the classifications of the Civil Service Register, more adequate salaries for public servants, and other means to improve the general efficiency of the government service."

#### THE FUTURE

"Appropriations for operation of the ECA program in the second half of fiscal year 1952 have, of course, not yet been made either by the United States Government or the Philippine Congress. Undoubtedly, the level of appropriations will be determined not only for the coming fiscal year beginning July 1 but in future years by three major factors:

"1. Progress of the Philippine economy, including the maintenance of strong, democratic institutions and efficient public administration, as well as increased production efficiency and expanded export trade balance;

"2. United States economic and fiscal conditions, and

"3. World developments.

"The Bell mission suggested loans and grants totaling \$250,000,000 over a period of 5 years, or an average of some \$50,000,000 annually. With the prospective Export-Import Bank loan to Ambuclo and our current appropriations, we are about on schedule. However, there is no firm commitment to make these sums available—they were strictly suggestive. Certainly if the economic development program is effective in bringing about its avowed goals there will be an increase in production, an expansion of the gross national income, and an increase in taxable property so that the Philippine Government will be able to support a major development program and thus set in motion the foundations for a still greater production of goods and services and resulting higher levels of living.

"In closing I would like to add one warning comment. Many people ask me from time to time, 'When is the ECA going to start building roads in Mindanao?' or 'When is the ECA going to do this or going to do that?' The ECA program in the Philippines as in other countries does not provide for direct United States participation in actual operations. ECA is not a road-building agency. The roads will be built by the Bureau of Public Works. It is our responsibility, under the terms of the bilateral agreement, to work with Philippine officials from the first stages of planning through the many stages leading to the end results in an advisory capacity, but not in an actual operating capacity. We do have authority to approve or to refuse approval of undertakings in which ECA programs are involved, both dollars and counterpart pesos, and in turn PHILCUSA has corresponding authority, but the initiative and the effort required to carry out the programs agreed upon must come largely from the Filipinos. ECA's role is to provide the technical assistance needed to initiate legislative or administrative measures to help in the planning and operation of the projects, to provide some of the financial means whereby needed materials can be imported, and to provide the control over the use of United States funds which the law requires. Beyond this, it is in every sense of the word a Philippine program.

"We have faith in the Philippines, and a special interest in making this cooperative undertaking work, because of the special ties that bind our two free republics in close friendship, mutual respect and understanding. Only the future can tell how effective will be this mutual aid program, and important as are the immediate military defense

considerations, and large as are the appropriations for this important phase of our mutual-security program, we should not forget that in the long run the policies and programs developed for sound economic development and the honesty and social responsibility exemplified by our leaders will be of more significance to the ultimate improvement of living levels and the maintenance of peace and security than the immediate and very urgent defense efforts."

[From the Manila Bulletin]

#### A WORD ON ECA

The ECA program in the Philippines, or rather the MSA program—Mutual Security Agency—needed explaining and bringing to life with words in order to have it mean something more than a vaguely beneficial and probably experimental effort on the part of the United States to help this country.

This function Dr. Roland R. Renne, head of the ECA mission here, undertook yesterday in a well-integrated talk with a representative group of international businessmen. He got down to fundamentals, opened up a lot of potential sore spots for close inspection, and explained in detail ECA's relationship to the local government. We are printing the address in full today because of its importance to every individual who will take the pains to read it.

These global assistance efforts have a way of becoming so complicated in terminology that they cause general confusion. The local ECA is no exception. Its name has been changed as indicated above in accordance with a law passed in the last Congress to MSA, but the original "ECA" has become so well established here that the local mission sought and obtained permission to retain it, only now it means "Economic Cooperation with Asia" rather than "Economic Cooperation Administration." But ECA is all you have to remember. Even Dr. Renne's mission, the Special Technical and Economic Mission to the Philippines (STEM) will always be known to Filipinos as "ECA."

Dr. Renne left an important impression. It was that the efforts and accomplishments of his mission cannot properly be measured in dollars and cents, or pesos and centavos. It is the uses to which local pesos and foreign dollars are put that really counts in the long run. Double the amount of dollars put to work on behalf of the Philippines, and if it were poured in too fast without being applied to the right things, the results might be very much less effective than with wise usage, even damaging.

Another thing was apparent from what Dr. Renne said. The ECA program is not being fabricated in Washington and plastered on the Philippines, take-it-or-leave-it fashion. It is being worked out step by step as it goes along, and every step has to be approved both by the local mission and by PHILCUSA, the Philippine governmental counterpart, before any money can be spent. That is what makes it a partnership effort.

There is good reason to believe ECA is on the right track, both from the Philippine viewpoint and the viewpoint of the American taxpayer who foots the United States end of the bill. Editorials appearing in American newspapers indicate satisfaction that sensible control is being exercised over the way money shall be spent in the Philippines, and this area has been held up as something of a model in contrast to some of the lavish spending in Europe.

#### DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR WALLACE H. WHITE, OF MAINE

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a resolution

adopted by the Federal Communications Commission upon the death of former Senator Wallace H. White, Jr., of Maine.

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

#### RESOLUTION ON THE DEATH OF FORMER UNITED STATES SENATOR WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.

The following resolution was adopted by the Federal Communications Commission at its meeting today:

"The Commission notes with deep regret the death on March 31, 1952, of former United States Senator Wallace H. White, Jr., at his home in Auburn, Maine.

"As coauthor of the Radio Act of 1927, Senator White exercised profound influence on the legislative foundation of the American system of broadcasting.

"At the time this act was being considered chaos reigned on the air waves. The utility of this great instrument of mass communications was being effectively frustrated.

"Senator White, on the basis of searching, sympathetic study, played a leading role in determining the broad base for the regulation of broadcasting in the public interest. He planned and fought for the maximum freedom of the broadcaster consistent with the unique technical requirements of orderly radio transmission.

"Although technological improvements have been made since 1927, his basic premise that broadcasting must operate in the public interest endures as a sound and vital principle. It has met the test of the years and has not been found wanting.

"The Nation's far-flung and flourishing system of broadcasting encompassing 3,000 aural stations is a living tribute to the foresight of the distinguished legislator.

"Senator White also performed outstanding services to his Nation as her representative at important international conferences on radio.

"Be it resolved, That a copy of this expression of the Commission's sorrow on the death of Senator White be entered in the permanent minutes of the Commission and that a copy be sent to his family."

Adopted April 3, 1952.

#### THE THREATENED STEEL STRIKE

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, today on the floor of the Senate two distinguished Senators spoke with reference to the impending steel strike. I wish to say that I agree thoroughly with what was said by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

The Washington Star of April 3, 1952, published an article by the distinguished columnist, David Lawrence, which states in the headline: "United States moving toward economic crash worse than in 1929; first steps in cycle certain to come with a steel strike."

Mr. President, I ask that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

#### DECISION NOW UP TO THE WHITE HOUSE—UNITED STATES MOVING TOWARD ECONOMIC CRASH WORSE THAN IN 1929; FIRST STEPS IN CYCLE CERTAIN TO COME WITH A STEEL STRIKE

(By David Lawrence)

America is moving slowly toward an economic catastrophe which may be worse than the one that was ushered in back in 1929.

The decision whether such a disaster shall be averted rests with White House action in

the next few days. The 10-year repression period—1929 to 1939—started with very little warning. At least, the Nation was not prepared for it.

The next crash will come in a matter of months—not years—if the White House persists in driving to the edge of the precipice. The Nation will be able to see the cycle start. No one will be able to say this time that no warning note was sounded.

The first steps in the cycle of disintegration will come with a steel strike. This is due to start next week. Then will come seizure of the steel companies by the Government.

Immediately after seizure, the Government will surrender to the unions by ordering the recommendations of the Truman stabilization board to be put into effect at once.

The financial structure of the steel companies thus will be sabotaged. Their stockholders will interpret this to mean that from now on the Government intends to allow unlimited wages to union workers but will refuse to pay fair wages to the investors.

When this happens, it is the beginning of the end of the free-enterprise system. Investors generally will lose confidence. For the same pattern followed in steel will be exhibited to all industries—higher and higher wages will have to be paid or seizure will be the penalty.

With a rising wage level and no offsetting of costs through higher prices, it is only a question of a few months before the backbone of the entire defense program in America—the steel industry—will have its back to the wall. Stalin could hope for nothing more useful to his purpose.

President Truman is being advised that he must not permit any price increase in steel and that the companies must absorb all wage increases out of current profits. Actually there is a basis for compromise in a modest wage increase and a moderate increase in prices.

What Mr. Truman may do this very week, therefore, is to set the wage levels for the lean years that must come when the defense program tapers off. Peace is always a possibility, and any decided turn for the better in the international situation can catch the American economy in a trap.

High wage levels cannot be deflated. Instead of allowing the steel companies to build a reserve and to accumulate funds now to buy new machinery so as to operate more efficiently and to reduce prices, especially for future construction needs, the President is being told by Economic Adviser Leon Keyserling that he now can boost the wage levels to unprecedented heights. It was Mr. Keyserling who upset the applecart on Mr. Truman's return from Key West by telling him the steel companies could pay the wage increases based on "normal profits" and "normal operations." His reasoning has not been divulged, but it is not in accord with facts put in evidence at the recent hearings.

The Keyserling formula means that the Government will lose hundreds of millions in tax money. Other sources of revenue will have to be found. The stockholders in steel will face a wage cut. It means, moreover, that such a high level of wages will have been forced upon the steel industry that, with the slightest contraction of defense orders, there will be extensive casualties among the marginal steel companies. This will result in widespread unemployment and further loss of tax money.

The design for an economic crash is being made this very week in Washington. The 1929 debacle was the result of overspeculation by private citizens, but the crash that lies ahead will be Government-made. It is doubtful how much of the wreckage a new administration taking office in 1953 can possibly repair. The momentum of a downward cycle is hard to arrest. It can be stopped in its tracks now if Mr. Truman will allow an

impartial group of economists to study the facts for him.

If the Government, under the guise of an international emergency which it is believed will last another decade anyway, is to set up a permanent system whereby wages are to be increased whenever the labor unions demand it, but no price increases are to be permitted to compensate the producers, then the collapse of the major industries becomes a realistic threat.

Mr. Truman says he is not a candidate to succeed himself, but he wants to see a Democratic Party victory. Hence Trumanism becomes the issue. The campaign debate may determine how far Trumanism has tended to coincide with State socialism in depriving those who save their money from receiving a fair return on their investments.

Inflation is slowly depreciating fixed investments. Trumanism is now about to impair the only hedge the investor has had—the opportunity of equity stocks to rise. But, with Government seizure and with Government dictation, there can be no hope of reasonable dividends.

There are more wage earners than stockholders, so on a political basis Trumanism holds to the false premise that it is politically sound to increase wages no matter what happens to the financial position of the companies.

The crash that will result from such a misguided policy will do the workers of America more harm than any wage increase can do them good, for, if private enterprise is crucified, if incentive is impaired, and if efficiency is retarded, the end result is Government control and then operation of all major enterprises. This was the instinctive purpose of the New Deal and it is the obvious purpose of the so-called Fair Deal. The political crisis of 1952 will have a direct bearing on the economic crisis that is certain to come if Trumanism is to be the dominant philosophy of the Nation in economics as well as in politics.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, undoubtedly other Members of the Senate, like myself, have received numerous letters from persons who are very much concerned about what is called the steel strike. The fires in the steel mills are being banked.

We hear talk about statesmanship. There are three areas which call for statesmanship now, one among the labor leaders, one among the management of the great steel industry, and the third one at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. The public interest is the large interest which should be considered. Selfish interests should be set aside for the promotion of the general welfare.

The common, average citizen realizes that if, through failure of responsible leaders to see and adopt the proper course, a spiral is started, it will mean the beginning of what is referred to in the editorial written by David Lawrence which was just inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. President, this is a momentous hour in our economic history, and thinking men and women are more greatly concerned about the present situation than they have been about the war in the East and in Europe.

I say to the President of the United States, therefore, "Get the best advisers you can gather. You have indicated that you no longer want the office of President. Therefore there is no need to cater to any particular interest or any particular segment. There is need, however, to look at what is best for America and the general welfare."

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McCLELLAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of James O'Connor Roberts, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

James O'Connor Roberts, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board;

William Joseph Fleniken, Sr., of Louisiana, to be United States attorney for the western district of Louisiana, vice Harvey L. Carey, resigned;

Philip A. Hart, of Michigan, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Michigan, vice Edward T. Kane, resigned; and

Edward C. Boyle, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the western district of Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

#### SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Clarence H. Adams to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask that this nomination be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

#### UNITED NATIONS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Stuart A. Rice to be a representative of the United States of America on the Statistical Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Arthur J. Altmeyer to be a Representative of the United States of America on the Social Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward F. Bartelt to be a Representative of the United States of America

on the Fiscal Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Henry A. Byroade to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

#### RECESS

Mr. McCLELLAN. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 9, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate April 8 (legislative day of April 2, 1952):

##### SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

James O'Connor Roberts, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for a term of 2 years.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 8 (legislative day of April 2), 1952:

##### UNITED NATIONS

Stuart A. Rice, of Virginia, to be representative of the United States of America on the Statistical Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term expiring December 31, 1954.

Arthur J. Altmeyer, of Wisconsin, to be representative of the United States of America on the Social Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term expiring December 31, 1954.

Edward F. Bartelt, of Illinois, to be representative of the United States of America on the Fiscal Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term expiring December 31, 1954.

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Henry A. Byroade, of Indiana, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

George P. Shaw, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Paraguay.

## ROUTINE APPOINTMENTS

## To be consul general

Willard Galbraith

## To be consuls

Henry L. Coster	Arthur S. Alberts
Joseph F. McFarland	Bryan R. Frisbie
Robert S. Hoard	Stephen N. Sestano
Robert J. Jantzen	vich

## To be vice consuls

Miss Ellen Gavrishoff
William D. Killea
Eugene D. Sawyer

## To be secretaries in the diplomatic service

Teg C. Grondahl	Roy L. Wade
John A. Loftus	Lester Ziffren
Norman P. Seagrave	

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 8, 1952

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.  
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast entrusted us with the high vocation of public service, grant that we may know how to discern and interpret rightly Thy wise and gracious purpose for all mankind.

May we bear calm and courageous testimony to a steadfast and unwavering confidence in that divine wisdom which never errs and that divine strength which will never fail.

We pray that we may seek to be used by Thee and our beloved country in lifting the shadow of fear from human hearts everywhere and in leading them into the joy and liberty of the Son of God.

At the close of each day may we receive the benediction of peace which Thou dost bestow upon all who live by faith, labor faithfully, and walk humbly with the Lord.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carroll, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution designating April 9, 1952, as Bataan Day.

## RIGHT OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO BRING SUIT AGAINST STATES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, April 4, during the consideration of

H. R. 7289, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Commerce, and Justice, and the judiciary, the House, to the surprise and disgust of at least some of the Members, amended the bill to take from the Government of the United States the right to bring suit in its own courts against any State of the Union. The amendment adopted reads, in part, as follows:

On page 29, after line 4, insert the following:

"Sec. 207. None of the funds appropriated by this title may be used in the preparation or prosecution of any suit or proceeding in any court by or on behalf of the United States (1) against a State of the Union."

It must not have occurred to the good Congressman that such powers are guaranteed to the Federal courts by the Constitution of the United States and that it was an effort to limit and destroy not only the constitutional authority and jurisdiction of the courts of the United States as well as a limitation and destruction of the sovereign and necessary powers of our Government.

The admitted purpose and intent of this amendment is to prevent the Federal Government from ever suing a State of the Union.

I feel certain that if my good friends had realized the danger and futility of such legislation, they would not have lent their aid to such an absurd move.

We must remember the powers of the legislative branch of the Government are not granted to Congress, but they are vested in Congress by the Constitution. This is also true of the executive powers, and the judicial powers of the Supreme Court as well as all courts created by Congress. Congress has no inherent sovereign process in the realm of domestic legislation—*Kansas v. Col.* (206 U. S. 46).

In 1818 it was argued, as it was last Friday in the House, that the United States be denied the right to sue a State without an act of Congress, but the Court said there was no doubt about the jurisdiction of the Federal courts to do so—*Dugan v. U. S.* (3 Wheat. 172).

The Supreme Court has jurisdiction of a suit in equity by the United States against a State to determine boundaries.

In *Marbury v. Madison* (174 2 L. Ed. 60) the Court held:

If Congress remains at liberty to give the Supreme Court appellate jurisdiction where the Constitution has declared their jurisdiction shall be original, where the Constitution has declared it shall be appellate, the distribution of jurisdiction made in the Constitution is form without substance.

The Constitution itself, in article III, section 2, provides the judicial powers of the United States extend to all cases in law and equity arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States and to controversies to which the United States shall be a party, whether that party be a State or an individual.

## SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, after the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

## BATAAN DAY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the Members of the House to join with me in recalling Bataan, when tomorrow we commemorate the tenth anniversary of the fight which we waged against the forces that would overwhelm democracy and freedom. In that fight we had the valiant support of our Filipino friends and allies.

We cannot, we should not, forget Bataan. In that besieged peninsula, the United States showed to the world what a benevolent and friendly attitude toward another people can do to win that people's loyalty and allegiance. The Filipinos fought to the death side by side with our American boys because they knew they were fighting for a cause that was also theirs, because during our association with them we made them feel that liberty is their heritage as well as it is ours.

I take pride in saying that many of those who fought and fell on Bataan hailed from the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts. In their memory, and in the memory of the other American boys who fought for us in America's darkest hour in the Pacific; in grateful appreciation of the loyalty of the Filipino people who risked their everything when to do so meant for them unspeakable agony, torture, and death, I have the honor to propose the following joint resolution (S. J. Res. 147) designating April 9, 1952, as Bataan Day, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas April 9 of this year marks the tenth anniversary of the end of the epic struggle of American and Filipino forces on Bataan; and

Whereas this common sacrifice more solidly forged the traditional friendship of the United States and the Philippines and between the peoples of the two countries; and

Whereas Bataan symbolizes the spirit which moves men of different races and different creeds to fight shoulder to shoulder for their freedom; and

Whereas the rallying of the people of the Philippines to the side of the United States and the other United Nations in the current struggle in Korea is a further expression of American-Filipino unity; and

Whereas the people of the Philippines have demonstrated to all other nations in the Asian sphere the fact that mutual friendship and mutual security are common goals and the role of the United States in Asia is that of a friend of peoples; regardless of race; and

Whereas President Elpidio Quirino has designated April 9 as Bataan Day in the Philippines: Therefore be it

*Resolved, etc.*, That April 9, the tenth anniversary of the fall of Bataan, should be observed as Bataan Day and that the Congress recommends that on that day the flags of the United States and the Republic of the Philippines be flown, and that encouragement be given to the holding of appropriate services in schools and churches and in other gatherings.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this provide for an additional holiday for public employees?

Mr. McCORMACK. No. It is not a holiday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And it costs no money?

Mr. McCORMACK. It costs no money.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Furthermore, it must be passed today, if it is going to be passed, as the anniversary is tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

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

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

Mr. RANKIN. Is it just a temporary proposition?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is a proclamation in relation to tomorrow, the tenth anniversary.

Mr. RANKIN. But it does not set it up as a permanent proposition?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, no.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 54]

Anfuso	Halleck	Philbin
Armstrong	Hand	Pickett
Barrett	Hart	Poulson
Battle	Hedrick	Powell
Beall	Heffernan	Price
Belcher	Heller	Rains
Blackney	Hinshaw	Reed, Ill.
Bolling	Hoffman, Ill.	Rhodes
Boykin	Holifield	Robeson
Buckley	Hope	Sabath
Burnside	Hull	St. George
Bush	Jackson, Wash.	Sasscer
Butler	James	Scott, Hardie
Canfield	Johnson	Shaefer
Carlyle	Jonas	Sheehan
Carrigg	Kennedy	Shelley
Case	Kersten, Wisc.	Simpson, Pa.
Celler	King, Pa.	Smith, Kans.
Chiperfield	Klein	Springer
Chudoff	Kluczynski	Stockman
Combs	Larcade	Taylor
Corbett	Lyle	Thompson,
Davis, Tenn.	McDonough	Tex.
Dawson	McGrath	Vail
Deane	McKinnon	Veide
Dingell	McVey	Welch
Dollinger	Mack, Ill.	Wharton
Donovan	Mason	Wheeler
Doyle	Miller, Calif.	Widnall
Eaton	Morano	Wood, Ga.
Fine	Morgan	Yates
Flood	Murdock	
Golden	Murphy	
Gordon	Murray, Wis.	
Hall	O'Brien, Ill.	
Edwin Arthur O'Konski		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 330 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

#### THE LATE HONORABLE DAVID DELANO GLOVER

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. NORRELL. I know that you, Mr. Speaker, as well as I was, will be grieved to learn of the passing of Hon. David Delano Glover who formerly represented the Sixth District of Arkansas which I now have the honor to represent in the United States House of Representatives. He passed away last Saturday afternoon, April 5 after a brief illness, concluding a long and useful life. He had been State legislator, prosecuting attorney, and Congressman. He was also a very able lawyer. He was a Mason and a Baptist. For the past 30 years he had served as a member of the board of trustees of the Ouachita College. He is survived by his widow, Mrs. Roberta Glover. They were married on December 24, 1891, and, therefore, recently they celebrated their sixtieth wedding anniversary.

He leaves behind him his widow, six sons and three daughters, a number of close relatives and a host of friends who mourn his passing.

Mr. Speaker, I had known Mr. D. D. Glover for about 25 years. He was 84 years of age at the time of his passing. He had spent these years in being a good, useful, patriotic and Christian gentleman. He has been a great and kind and a loving husband and father. He was an able public official. He was highly respected by all who knew him. Certainly he had used his 84 years in living a useful and honorable life. America is greater today because Mr. Glover has lived. He will be missed not only by his bereaved widow and children but by his relatives, and friends. Malvern, his home town, will miss him. Arkansas will miss him.

I extend my very kindest sympathy to his family and friends.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the right to extend their remarks in the RECORD regarding the passing of our late colleague, Mr. Glover.

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7391) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the fur-

ther consideration of the bill H. R. 7391, with Mr. FORAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the agreement of yesterday, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, the \$51,000,000,000 defense bill we are considering here today has been reduced by the committee to about \$47,000,000,000 for defense. Let me point out there is nothing in this bill to finance the Korean war for this fiscal year, which has been costing about \$5,000,000,000 annually; it does not include \$3,500,000,000 in military public works to be requested later by the President; it does not provide for a billion dollars in pay raises, and it does not cover allowances for increased cost of defense. These added to the \$47,000,000,000 in the bill before us should raise the cost \$7,000,000,000 to a total of \$54,000,000,000 for the coming fiscal year. This does not include a few billions more we will be called upon to appropriate for the Atlantic Pact nations.

We have a carry-over in appropriations for the fiscal year closing July 1, 1952, of \$58,000,000,000, most of it contracted but none of it spent. This \$58,000,000,000 carry-over plus the \$54,000,000,000 we are appropriating for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1952, and ending July 1, 1953, will give the military and the administration which they can spend in the next 14 months, \$112,000,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, if we provide all the appropriations for the fiscal year contained in this bill before us and the two subsequent bills to which I have referred, we will make available, up to July 1, 1953, \$113,000,000,000 to be expended for national defense. They know they cannot spend that much because the administration and the military says we will have a carry-over on July 1, 1953, of \$56,000,000,000 for defense for 1954.

Mr. Chairman, I have advocated for months that we should cut this military bill by \$10,000,000,000. I will vote for any amendments offered during the debate that will help to reduce this bill to that amount, and when I vote for such reductions I will not be voting against the national defense of our country but I will be voting to make the national defense of our country stronger.

#### BALANCE THE BUDGET

If we reduce this bill by \$10,000,000,000 with the other cuts we are making on appropriation bills, it would bring the total cuts in the \$85,000,000,000 budget

up to \$15,000,000,000 which will balance the budget.

Mr. Chairman, if we have the courage and wisdom to take such action, we will strengthen the financial solvency of our Government which is our first line of defense. We will contribute to the defense of our country by making such reductions.

Would it not be the part of wisdom to follow such a course which is endorsed by the national chamber of commerce and which is generally endorsed by the best economists of the Nation. If we will strike out boldly for economy, not only in this bill but in all appropriation bills we will cut back the cost of Government to about \$71,000,000,000 which it is estimated will be the amount of revenue the Government takes in this year. That is what we mean by balancing the budget.

A vote to cut back the cost of Government in times of peace to equal or less than the receipts of Government is a vote to stop inflation, stop the decline of the purchasing power of the dollar which is now down to about 50 cents. It will be a vote to start the purchasing power of the dollar up, raise the purchasing power of the bonds the people are holding by loaning their money to the Government, it will be a vote to reduce the high cost of living, and a vote that will strengthen the economic and industrial power of our Nation.

If we strengthen the financial solvency of our Nation and the industrial and economic power of our Nation by reducing the expenditures of Government as I have suggested, we are voting not against national defense but are voting for national defense, voting to strengthen our country for any eventualities that may threaten it either from without or from within.

#### WASTE OF MANPOWER

Every investigation that has been made points up the fact that the heads of the military and this administration are wasting manpower in every department of the military and the Government. The military continues to draft hundreds of thousands of men who are badly needed on the farms, in business, and in many walks of life, many of whom are crowding the camps of the Nation with nothing to do but wait at the expense of the Government and contribute to the military's constant waste of manpower. The military will waste manpower alone over \$5,000,000,000 which is about the amount of the cut that the committee made before it brought this bill to the floor of the House.

Mr. Chairman, then again every committee that has been investigating production and procurement in the military has uncovered waste running into the many millions of dollars. Sworn testimony in the building of one air base in northern Africa tends to show a waste of between fifty to one hundred million dollars caused by connivance and criminality in some instances. This is only one isolated spot. Whenever large expenditures are being made there is unnecessary waste on the part of those who have the responsibility in the military.

Mr. Chairman, I pointed out many months ago in speaking on the floor of the House that the Appropriations Committees are understaffed, and advocated that it was the responsibility and the duty of the Congress to authorize the spending of a few million dollars to hire a staff of investigators and certified public accountants who would work the year around under the direction of the Appropriations Committees of the Congress to determine just how much money is needed in military appropriations and to constantly investigate how the money was being spent after it was appropriated.

I also suggested that businessmen in civilian life who had had much experience in merchandising should be employed to work with the military officers in procurement or purchasing necessary in spending the \$40,000,000,000 that would likely be appropriated this year for national defense.

I pointed out that the Congress should have these committees working directly under its supervision so that the Congress could legislate in the light instead of legislating in the dark as we too often are compelled to do because our committees do not have sufficient staffs to determine the funds necessary, and a sufficient staff of investigators to constantly watch and check on the spending of this money to prevent waste.

I said at that time, as I say again today, that efficiency has too long been neglected on the part of the Congress and for too many years we have been locking the barn after the horse has been stolen. Anyone should know that men who have been educated in the military and who have been taught to pay little attention to the spending of money but to accomplish their military mission, are generally not qualified to go into the public market and purchase billions of dollars of merchandise whether it is clothing for the troops or steel or heavy material of any kind. For that reason I urged a year ago, as I urge the Congress again today that we ought to have more civilian control in the purchasing and procurement while spending these vast billions of dollars, and that we should take from industry and business, men who would be glad to serve as a patriotic duty to their country and under whose supervision we could save billions of dollars.

Mr. Chairman, if we would reduce the amount carried in this bill by \$10,000,000,000, and the Congress would set up such a business organization as I have suggested, there is little doubt that such an organization could save over \$10,000,000,000 and we would be on the road to greater efficiency and the application of better business policies in government for the future.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that later an amendment will be introduced which, in my judgment, is of great importance to the Congress and to the general welfare of the people.

That amendment is an effort to give the Congress a closer grip on the purse strings of governmental expense. The amendment will impose a ceiling on total

military spending for the coming fiscal year. It follows the principle of House Joint Resolution 371, which would prevent the Government from spending more than it takes in in governmental receipts.

I hope a majority of the House will support this amendment when it is offered.

Mr. Chairman, when this Government was set up under our Constitution in 1787 its purpose was to give the people control of their Government. Big Government today, and those in charge of big Government, seem to have lost sight of the fact that it belongs to the people and not to the President, the Cabinet, the heads of the bureaus, or to the Members of Congress.

The Constitution provided that the people should control this Government through their elected representatives. I think that was a wise provision, and it has worked well in building the greatest Nation in the world up to the last few years.

I am old-fashioned enough to believe we should try to carry out the wishes of our people. They are demanding we reduce spending, in the hope some time by so doing, they, the people, can look for a decrease in their present almost unbearable taxes. They want us to cut spending and preserve the financial solvency of our Nation. This bill offers an opportunity to do it, and I hope we can make further substantial reductions in this bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, it seems more than passing strange that we have only a matter of 30 minutes to discuss a \$14,000,000,000 request for Army spending. Perhaps the demands of time require it.

We are here today to discuss, as far as I am concerned, the 1953 request for the Army of the United States. During the hearings I pointed out to one of the witnesses that one of the most difficult things for a human being to do was to admit that he had made a mistake. All of us make mistakes, and all of us hate to admit it. Perhaps the Subcommittee on Army Appropriations has made some mistakes. It probably has. Perhaps in some places we have reduced the request too much; in other places perhaps we are permitting the Army to have more than they actually need.

I will say, in all frankness, that if there is any Member of the House who can point out any place where a further reduction should be made, I will be glad to help them make that reduction. But to cut a military budget in the unsteady and unstable situation the world faces today is indeed a ticklish business.

It is an old trite saying, but we are between the devil and the deep blue sea; if we cut too much and a greater war than we are now in should break out, we have hurt the national defense; on the other hand, if some of the dire predictions that have been made do not come to pass there will be some money spent that will never be needed. National defense is just like insurance; in the first place, it is expen-

sive; and, in the second place, if you do not have it when you need it, it is too late to get it.

Now, going through the Army requests, the subcommittee of which I am a member and of which the chairman is the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], with two other members sitting alternately, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOR], and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY], have been working on this for 3 months. When at last we reached our final figures we found that we had reduced the Army's request by 11.8 percent. We reduced their request from \$14,800,000,000 down to a little over \$12,500,000,000.

One of the reductions which was made was in the request for reserve components, the National Guard and the Organized Reserve. This was not a blind cut at all. If you will turn to your hearings beginning at p. 543 you will see that we went fully into that matter. We found that when they presented the 1952 request for funds they had set their goal at a greater number of personnel. They failed to reach it by far. This year they have set another goal. We studied the present law, what they had achieved and what they hoped to have and we determined in our own minds that they could not possibly by any stretch of the imagination have as many men in either the National Guard or the Organized Reserve as they said they needed to have. We provide for 300,000 in the National Guard and 273,000 for the Reserves. The larger cut was made in both the Reserves and the National Guard is what we normally have called the "dual year" financing; in other words, in the last 2 years it has been impossible for the military to get the budget up to us and for us to get the bill passed by the first of July. Both the Reserves and the National Guard have summer encampments stretching over the entire summer, some beginning in June, going into July, and some as late as September. There have been funds provided for the summer camps being held in the following fiscal year. For instance, last year fiscal 1952 we provided funds for summer camps which will be held in this summer after the first of July, fiscal year 1953.

We face this situation where we now have this bill for fiscal 1953 in shape. It will be through the Senate and become law long before July 1. We therefore determined that there was no need for carrying over funds for the summer camps in this calendar year 1954. For that reason we took off approximately \$33,000,000 from these two appropriations. It will not interfere in any way with any of the National Guard or Reserve summer training camps or field activities. The supplemental explanatory notes fully explain this situation on page 5.

You have all heard why it is necessary to make huge sums available today. There has been a great deal of question as to why it is necessary to authorize this \$50,000,000,000 now when there are many billions unobligated and much unspent.

What we are now doing is just what you would do if you were going to build a building. First, you determine what kind of building you are going to have; then you talk to your engineers, to your bankers, and finally decide that you are going to have an 11-story building and it is going to take 2 or 3 years to complete. You enter into your agreement, you make your promissory note, which is substantially what these appropriations authorize. It is to enable the Army to make a promissory note to some builder to build tanks, guns, ammunition, trucks, and other weapons of war. So the promissory note is for the entire cost of building. The spending comes in when it is necessary to pay him as the program progresses. We pay the manufacturers when they deliver the tanks, guns, ships, and planes to us. And of course some of these items for which we appropriate money will not be delivered until Christmas 1954. Then is when the money comes out of the Treasury.

You could, as some have suggested, have contract authority, but that would be false economy. As a matter of fact, in this very bill you are providing millions of dollars to pay for contract authorizations that were issued during World War II and subsequent years. In my opinion, as cumbersome as this is in the bookkeeping of the Army and in keeping records, authorization and obligation is the simplest and most effective business way of doing it. Mr. Chairman, there is no question but what the Appropriations Committee does not have an adequate staff of experts.

If you could sit in our little committee rooms and see the heads of these technical services come in with their staffs, each one of them with 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, all supporting him in his presentation, you see what we are up against. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOR] and I sat in these hearings, assisted only by Mr. Orescan and Mr. Pfleger, both of whom did a magnificent job. Certainly we have to have more help. We had it in the Eightieth Congress and we were able to save billions of dollars. If you would give it to us again we would save some more money.

The attitude of our subcommittee was that we were not the defendant on trial. We took the position more or less of a court listening to a plaintiff trying to prove his case. The entire burden of proving the need for these dollars is upon the military, and there they did not prove their case, where they could not prove their need for what they asked, we did not give it to them. If they came up short because of failure on their part, that is their fault, not ours. Certainly they had enough help.

There has been some question raised as to how much is going to be spent. Now, Mr. Chairman, if you will hark back, you will find that is not the province of Congress; that is a matter for the administration; and if we could write laws which put some common sense and economy into the heads of those who administer this program, we would gladly do so. That is impossible. They are

either economical-minded or they are not. Of course, there has been some criticism of waste, and there has been waste, but that is a matter of administration from the President, the Commander in Chief, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and all the rest of them. The gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] pointed out a situation which took place in Camp Stoneman. That is not the responsibility of Congress; that is the responsibility of the man there on the ground spending the money. If he does not know how to spend it properly, he should not be there.

We have some magnificent military leaders. As field soldiers and in leading troops in the field, they are without peer, but they have never been trained to be businessmen or to administer a big business like this. What do we have? You have a lot of young men coming into the service from schools which have had ROTC training. There will be 7,000 of them called into service this coming fiscal year. They have had education in business administration. They have gone to schools throughout the country. When they come into the service, do you suppose they will be put in any place where they will be administering these funds or doing a job for which they were trained? Oh, no. Most of them will be second lieutenants and I will guarantee you that 95 percent of them will be assigned to combat units, artillery, infantry, tanks, and others. That is one of the faults of the military which it should correct itself. It should put businessmen in spots that call for business judgment. I know a lot of these men and you know them; you know their war records; they are down at the Pentagon trying to do a good job. They know they are not capable of doing it. They know their background and their experience does not fit them for it, and they are probably more unhappy about their assignment than either you or I. Here, again, we come down to the question of do they need it? Do they need 1,550,000 men in the Army? Somebody said, "Well, we will have men sitting around camps that are not doing anything; they have been trained; they are combat soldiers, but they are not fighting. They are not doing anything." Well, I can point out to you that in every community in the country we have a lot of firemen sitting around fire stations, in uniform, and not doing anything either, but as soon as the bell rings they are there ready to go. That is what we are doing here—have a fighting force ready to go if the flames of war break out.

Perhaps we might be able to cut the Army below the requested and suggested 1,550,000. Then, again, perhaps, we could not. Seven hundred thousand of the 1,562,000 in the Army today are going out of the service in 1953. That means almost half of them. You have got to replace them and retrain them to take the places left by those discharged. That training takes time; that takes money; that takes manpower.

Now the question was asked me day before yesterday: How do you arrive at the cuts you made? You have heard

justifications mentioned. Here is a book of justifications. It contains 200 or more pages and on the committee table is a pile of 12 others. These are mimeographed sheets which give all of the detailed information. For instance, I open the book here. Now these are secret, and I will not give you the figures at all. But, for instance, we learn about types of artillery and guns that we are going to buy; we are told about the type of mortars they need; here is reference to the recoilless rifles we are going to procure. These justification sheets inform us about many of these things, howitzers, guided missiles, trucks and tanks. Here we are told about exactly how many the Army figures they must have during the current year. We are told exactly how much they anticipate each one will cost, and then that is multiplied and you get a request. Included in the secret sheets are the numbers of rounds of ammunition of all kinds that the Army is going to have to have. We are going to have 105-millimeter shells and 155-millimeter shells. We are going to have anti-aircraft shells; we are going to have .30-caliber cartridges; we are going to have 60-millimeter mortar shells. We must have all of those things, and they have set out in here the number that they anticipate. The same thing was done for the number of sheets and shirts and shorts and socks and shoes and everything else.

Now we were not quite satisfied just to take their statement as fact. In years past we have always asked the military, How did you reach this conclusion? They would come up and say, "We know how many troops we will have, how many pieces of equipment, travel, and so forth, will be required, and that is it." That did not satisfy us. So, we required more. This year they came up with a form 519-B. On this form they name the item, whether it is ammunition, whether it is trucks, whether it is tanks, whatever it will be. They tell us how many they have on hand. Then they tell us what they anticipate—the consumption, either combat or peacetime training during the fiscal year, will be. They tell us how many will be required in the pipeline, the lead time to go from the factory up to the line or out to the troops. They tell us how many will be needed in training, how many will be needed for the National Guard and the Reserves. They tell us how much they will want for a mobilization reserve. They then get down to the total, the gross figure. They deduct the inventory, and then they tell us how many of the total requirement they want to procure with 1953 funds. Some of the assumption they operate on is not quite precise. Next year they will have some changes made in this form which will give us a more factual picture. If the assumptions they used are wrong, of course, their conclusion is wrong.

As to ammunition, they had one item of ammunition upon which they set out on the Form 519-B. In looking over that form I found that they had anticipated eight times as much consumption in 1953 as there was in 1952. Well, now, that did not stand to reason. I looked at some more and found that others

called for three times and four times as much as they consumed in 1952. Then we found that some of the estimates had been made up in July and August when the heavy shooting was still going on in Korea, without any regard to peace talks. The 1952 consumption could not be nearly as great as it was anticipated, and, therefore, carrying on the same tempo 1953 could not be as great either. The result was that we required the military to go back and get a sharper pencil and do some refiguring. They admitted that a mistake had been made in the items that I had pointed out. We asked them to recompute 32 major items of procurement in ammunition. They came back with a recompilation, and \$156,000,000 less was asked for, and is reflected in reduced appropriations. We just do not have the time, and we do not have the staff, and do not have the help necessary to go through that process on every item. But, we did review thousands of major items. This subcommittee, I believe, can justify every cut that we made in the Army's budget totaling, as I said, 11.8 percent, \$1,680,000,000.

There has been some reference to research and development. Research and development is this study of new things yet to come. General Collins said that the Army always hates to give up the old stuff, but is always looking for something new. In research and development we are looking for something new. We are getting something new. All of the guided missiles, better radios, better tanks, better trucks, and other things have come out of the expenditure of money for research and development. The Army requested this year \$30,000,000 more than they had asked for last year. Perhaps \$1,000,000 spent in research and development can save us hundreds of millions of dollars, and save some lives later on, if they can just get their finger on some of the things that we need to have. We could have possibly cut the figure back to last year's figure, and held them where they were, but I suppose the Tass representative is up in the Press Gallery as they usually are when this bill is being presented so that we cannot talk as frankly as we would like to talk. Maybe there is too much printed in the hearings and in the reports. The requested increase was for classified or secret research and development activities. We did not feel it would be proper to deny them those funds. We tried to earmark certain funds. We do not succeed very well. There again it comes to the thing which was condemned on the floor of the House all day yesterday—poor administration, poor business, poor economy. They come up to us each year and they said, in effect, "Well, now, Mr. SIKES, Mr. SCRIVNER, Mr. FLOOD, we want so many millions of dollars to buy so many hundreds of this, that, or the other thing." We cross-examine quite thoroughly, and we are finally convinced that perhaps they need a thousand or two thousand items that they ask for. We multiply it out by the anticipated cost, and then provide \$200,000,000 for that program. But next year, when they come back for money for the fiscal year 1954, we will

say, "Last year you asked us for money for this item. We gave you \$200,000,000 for 2,000 of them. How many did you buy?" And they reply, "Well, we only got 500." We will ask, "What happened to the other \$150,000,000 which you did not spend for that item?" They answer, "Well, we transferred that to another program. We decided that something else was more important." But, Mr. Chairman, we do not learn about the changed program until after it is all done. That is not right. We do not have the control that we should have.

Perhaps the performance budget about which those of us on the Committee on Appropriations have heard so much is not the success that we were told it would be. As a matter of fact, I think it is a failure. I think that the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations loses almost entire control of earmarking funds for the military.

We had one item which we thought last year was absolutely earmarked. It involved a matter of \$1,100,000,000 for expediting production. That means getting their plants in order and getting lines all set up and getting machine tools installed, and all those things. We noticed that there were \$400,000,000 of that which had not been allocated, and we thought maybe we were going to be able to report a rescission of \$400,000,000 on that item. But lo and behold we found that when they got through telling us the story of production and procurement, that they were transferring \$400,000,000 of expediting production money over to the actual purchasing of end items. So our earmarking did not work. Oh, it looks good on paper. They come in with a reduced request for procurement, but they are going to transfer \$400,000,000 over to this other activity.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, we are probably shadow-boxing here today. Perhaps these cuts that we have made are fooling nobody but ourselves. It stands to reason, as has been stated several times in the last 4 or 5 days, that if the steel strike goes on, and if wages are raised, and if the price of steel is raised proportionately, all of the savings that we have made in our months of work will be completely wiped out by the increased costs of everything the military requires. Either that or we will have to appropriate more money to get the same number of items that we have provided here for what the Army needs, or we are going to find that the money we have appropriated for 10 tanks will only buy 9 tanks. That goes clear on across the board because the Army today is the biggest buyer in the world. That increase started in steel will go clear across the board because once it starts there, the cycle of inflation goes on and everything else is going to be increased, too.

Somebody said, "Why did that happen?"

One reason is because this administration and no one in high places of leadership has faced up to the actual reality that we are in war. They call it everything else under the sun—a constabulary action, a police action, a conflict, aggression in Korea, everything under the sun except war. Yet we have had almost 107,000 battle casualties and 400,000 non-

battle casualties. If you do not think that is war talk to the mothers of these men who are now serving in Korea. Talk to the men who have returned or are still in Korea. Certainly it is war. Congress did not declare it, but this country has been in it for almost 2 years, and the cost will run into billions and billions of dollars. Today the Korean war is eating up some of the materials we wanted to set aside so we could have some things on hand if a greater war broke out. If the leaders, including the President, would say to the entire country, including not just labor but the producers and public as well, that we are at war, you would find an entirely different response to the request for them to keep on working, to keep on producing, even greater and greater amounts at lower and lower costs. But, until that fact is brought home, we can expect more of this strife.

Secretary Kimball finally admitted in response to one of my questions that it was a hell of a war, and that was an understatement. A recent report by the Secretary of Defense went on for many pages, and never once referred to war in Korea. Mr. Chairman, that war in Korea calls for accolade and commendation from Congress to the Reserve forces that are fighting there—and those that have done so well. Oh, I know when it started out in June 1950, it was pretty much the Regular Army that felt the brunt because most of the forces in the Far East were Regular Army. But see what the figures are now. As was pointed out in the hearings—page 199 and the following—62,000 of the first 83,000 casualties were Regular Army casualties. They were over there. They had to be thrown in to war in Korea without any notice that they were expected to go into a war in the Far East. The Korean war came overnight. MacArthur did not have the troops, he did not have the supplies, he did not have the landing craft, he did not have the ships, or the tanks, the artillery and all the things necessary or the time to plan an invasion. It had to be done now. The 83,000 casualties resulted, on a large part, because of lack of time to prepare for an invasion of Korea. When the Korean war started out the greater number of them in the Far East were Regular Army, both enlisted and officers. Take the date November 30, 1951. At that time one-third of the enlisted strength in Korea was Regular Army and two-thirds was other than Regular; in other words, 2 out of 3 were draftees and members of the National Guard and Reserves. When you come to officers, November 30, 1951, there were four times as many non-Regular officers, Reserve officers, as there were Regular Army officers.

A few months later—and probably now—10 out of each 11 officers on duty in Korea are Reserves.

As a matter of fact, the latest report showed that only 1,500 of the more than 23,000 Regular officers were on duty in Korea. Fighting wars is the Regulars' profession—but figures show that it is being done by Reserves—many of them in combat again after glorious services in World War II, where they carried the load.

Mr. Chairman, too much credit cannot be given our civilian soldiers, enlisted men and officers.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion as I said earlier, if any mistakes this subcommittee has made are clearly pointed out, we help correct them. We feel we have done a businesslike, reasonable job of reducing these requests. We hope the House agrees.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, in expressing my deep appreciation for the very fine and conscientious job performed by the members of the Subcommittee on Armed Forces in the Department of Defense appropriation bill for 1953, H. R. 7391, I am somewhat disappointed, as are many others throughout the country, in the elimination of the funds requested for the promotion of rifle practice, namely, \$130,000. As the committee in its wisdom stated, this action is based on (a) that the program neither accomplishes nor is required to interest our youth in the handling of small arms, (b) that it does not add to the effectiveness of our defenses, and (c) that if it is to be continued, considerably larger sums would be required to supply ammunition with no real benefit to the Nation as a whole.

Let me give to the House my own feelings on this matter. It was the 1903 Congress, on recommendation of President Theodore Roosevelt and Secretary of War Elihu Root, that established the National Board for Promotion of Rifle Practice. Since that year, nearly a half-century ago, it has been the traditional and consistent policy of Congress to encourage rifle marksmanship training for American boys and for all able-bodied male citizens capable of bearing arms in time of war or national emergency.

In the National Defense Act of 1916, Congress not only reiterated this policy but set up authorities and procedures for the building and maintenance of ranges, issuing of arms, and the provision of competent instructors.

In 1924, Congress implemented its previous policy by detailed legislation authorizing (a) sale to patriotic citizens at cost of arms, ammunition, targets, and range equipment; (b) the free issue to approved rifle clubs of ammunition and targets; (c) the loan of arms and range equipment to approved rifle clubs and secondary.

Since the first money appropriation in 1904, Congress has never failed to appropriate some money each year for the promotion of civilian marksmanship. The average annual appropriation since World War I has been in the vicinity of \$300,000.

In fiscal year 1950 the appropriation was \$272,500.

In fiscal year 1951 the appropriation was \$160,000.

In fiscal year 1952 the appropriation was \$130,000.

For fiscal year 1953 the appropriation of \$130,000 was approved and recommended by the Bureau of the Budget but has now been eliminated entirely by the Committee on Appropriations.

The appropriation item of \$130,000 recommended by the Defense Department and approved by the Bureau of the Budget does not give away one penny's worth of ammunition. This figure does not supply any ammunition, arms, or equipment gratis. But this money does provide for the funds required to account for the \$2,000,000 worth of arms, target frames, and range equipment now on loan to civilian rifle clubs and secondary schools and for the handling of the sale of spare parts, target materials, and similar items, amounting to almost a million dollars annually, to such clubs and patriotic individuals who believe that rifle marksmanship is a necessary adjunct of national defense.

In the limited time allotted to me I do not propose to argue the merits of Government encouragement of rifle marksmanship. I will only remind this House that congressional encouragement of civilian rifle practice was initiated upon the wise counsel and recommendation of such national leaders as Theodore Roosevelt and Elihu Root. It has been supported by such military leaders as Gen. John J. Pershing, Gen. George C. Marshall and Gen. Omar Bradley. It has been the policy of the Congress for nearly half a century.

If Congress has been wrong all these years, or if new weapons and new methods of warfare have outmoded the rifleman and the Infantry, then we should reverse our policy. If, for any reason, the civilian training of our youth in rifle marksmanship is unnecessary, or wasteful, then we should amend the National Defense Act of 1916 and the Cognate Acts of 1924, and we should do away with the Director of Civilian Marksmanship and the National Board for Promotion of Rifle Practice.

Such action, however, should not be taken hurriedly or without due consideration of its effects. It is a matter which should be investigated by the Committee on Armed Services with a view toward recommending such remedial and amendatory legislation to this House as their investigation may find necessary. We should not, without careful consideration, destroy the whole system of our traditional civilian marksmanship program by mere failure to appropriate.

Although we have in the interests of economy reduced the appropriation for the National Board for Promotion of Rifle Practice which such reduction seemed necessary, we have never yet destroyed the National Board or eliminated the Director of Civilian Marksmanship by a total failure of appropriation. Further, if we refuse any appropriation whatsoever, there will be no machinery by which any rifle club, any patriotic male citizen of the United States, any of the small cadet corps and

secondary schools, can purchase ammunition or target materials from the Government for rifle practice. We would also be unable to loan any arms or equipment to such individuals or organizations. The cost of recalling the equipment already in their hands is estimated to be at least a half-million dollars, an amount several times in excess of the \$130,000 recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. The failure to appropriate this sum will affect thousands of individuals living in every State of the Union.

It is my well-considered judgment that we leave this small item of \$130,000 in the \$51,000,000,000 budget until the Armed Services Committee of this House can examine the whole proposition. We should not lightly destroy a Federal organization and reverse a policy which has had the support of the Congress for nearly half a century.

The failure of the Congress to provide any funds for the promotion of rifle practice, for the year 1953, will have the effect of the discontinuance of the issuance of rifles, ammunition, targets, and other accessories for marksmanship practice to 3,200 civilian rifle clubs and 34 schools, with a total membership of over 150,000. It also means the discontinuance of marksmanship practice by the majority of the above clubs and individuals. It means the return of all ordnance equipment issued by the Government to clubs on loan, and secured by bonds executed by the clubs. It means the lack of any funds for the personnel in the Office of the Director of Civilian Marksmanship necessary to administer the return and accounting for Government property by clubs, and probable loss to the Government thereby. It means the financial loss to many clubs due to expenditures previously made by them in the securing of bonds, the leasing or rental of range sites, the construction of ranges and other facilities, and the expense of returning ordnance equipment to arsenals, and other expenses in connection with the operation of their clubs. It means the discontinuance of the sale of ammunition, targets, and other supplies for marksmanship practice to civilians from ordnance arsenals as an aid to marksmanship practice. And, finally, its effect on morale of civilian clubs and the unfavorable civilian reaction to the discontinuance of a program authorized in the National Defense Act and subsequent acts of Congress, as a contribution to national defense, and supported by appropriations for many years.

In conclusion, I wish to offer the following summary of statistics:

*Original request of Defense Department, fiscal year 1953*

For issue of .30-caliber ammunition	\$600,000
For issue of .22-caliber ammunition	69,000
Total original ammunition request	669,000

The above \$669,000 item was eliminated by the Bureau of the Budget.

Fiscal year 1951, there were 2,056 senior rifle clubs totaling 98,817 members. There were 1,200 junior rifle clubs totaling 51,114 members.

In 1951, 44 percent of firing members were in age group 12 to 17; 26 percent of firing members were in age group 17 to 35; 70 percent firing members in present or future military-age groups.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, before yielding to the next speaker on the Democratic side, I should like to make a few remarks and then insert certain information in the RECORD.

On yesterday I undertook to make some general references to the Air Force part of the pending bill. The gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], the vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of the Navy, discussed the Navy portion of the bill. The gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] has long been an authority in the field of military appropriations. He has courageously supported the cause of national preparedness throughout his career in Congress and, in my judgment, he has done a good job for the Nation in his service here.

I regret very much that there seems to be no way whereby Members who work such long hours on a month-in-and-month-out basis on military appropriations to receive the thanks which, in my judgment, they deserve. I am not speaking just of the Democrats on this committee. I am also speaking of the Republican side, headed by our beloved friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. We have worked on the military budget in a nonpartisan way, and I want to pay tribute to each and every one of the members of the subcommittee for their devoted attention to this important task. Every member

of the committee is economy-minded. He wants to do everything in his power to help preserve the economic stability of this country, but he does not want to do anything that would jeopardize the security of the Nation. In other words, each member has had foremost in his mind the matter of national defense and the public welfare. I hope we have done a good job. We certainly undertook to do our best.

Now, I should like to ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point, and to insert certain details in regard to the pending \$46,000,000 Department of Defense appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1953

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the Department of Defense appropriation bill for 1953, H. R. 7391, carries the regular annual appropriations for all activities under the control of the National Security Council; National Security Resources Board; National Security Training Commission; Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Armed Forces Policy Council; the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Staff, the Munitions Board, and the Research and Development Board; the Department of the Army; the Department of the Navy; and the Department of the Air Force. The various items in the bill have been separated into five titles for convenience of consideration.

The following table is a summary statement, by departments and agencies, of appropriations and estimates compared with comparable appropriations for 1952:

Department or agency	Appropriations, 1952 <sup>1</sup>	Estimates, 1953	Recommended in bill for 1953	Bill compared with—	
				1952 appropriations	1953 estimates
National Security Council	\$160,000	\$168,000	\$150,000	-\$10,000	-\$36,000
National Security Resources Board	1,630,000	1,780,000	1,500,000	-130,000	-280,000
National Security Training Commission	185,000	111,000	75,000	-110,000	-36,000
Office of the Secretary of Defense	529,100,000	466,265,000	414,562,500	-114,537,500	-51,702,500
Department of the Army	10,839,668,330	14,200,000,000	12,520,000,000	-7,319,668,330	-1,680,000,000
Department of the Navy	15,845,330,392	13,822,302,000	12,815,918,000	-3,029,412,392	-1,006,384,000
Department of the Air Force	20,540,485,000	22,430,378,770	20,928,178,770	+387,693,770	-1,502,200,000
Total	56,756,558,722	56,921,022,770	46,680,384,270	-10,076,174,452	-4,210,638,500

<sup>1</sup> Includes funds for pay act increases in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952.

The category breakdown of the estimates indicates that military personnel costs will approximate \$10,933,000,000, or 22 percent of the total request; maintenance and operation, \$12,223,000,000, or 25 percent of the total request; major procurement of such items as aircraft, ships, tanks, guided missiles, ammunition, etc., \$21,807,000,000, or 45 percent of the total request; civilian components, \$852,000,000, or 2 percent of the total request; research and development, \$1,711,000,000, or 4 percent of the total re-

quest; industrial mobilization, \$81,000,000; and establishment-wide activities, \$959,000,000, or 2 percent of the total request. No request is contained in the bill for new acquisition or construction of real property, but there is a request for \$45,334,770 for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority heretofore granted to the Air Force. The President's budget indicates that \$3,500,000,000 will be requested of the Congress at a later date for acquisition and construction of real property.

## FUNDS AVAILABLE, EXPENDITURES, CARRY-OVERS

The following tabulation sets forth the most accurate information obtainable of funds available for expenditure during the periods indicated, expenditures for the same periods, and the carry-over of funds into the succeeding period:

## OBLIGATIONS

A review of the funds provided for obligations by the three services indicates that for fiscal year 1951 there was available for obligation \$48,355,000,000. Of this amount \$44,448,000,000 was obligated and \$203,000,000 lapsed, leaving \$3,704,000,000 of unobligated funds for carry-over into the fiscal year 1952.

For fiscal year 1952, funds in the amount of \$58,422,000,000 were made available for obligation. This amount, together with the carry-over, gave the three services a total of \$62,126,000,000 available for obligation. It is estimated that as of June 30, 1952, the end of the current fiscal year, there will have been obligated from these funds \$59,980,000,000; that \$83,000,000 will lapse, and that \$2,063,000,000 will be carried over into fiscal year 1953. The availability of these carry-over funds has been taken into consideration in evaluating present requirements.

## Obligations, fiscal years 1951, 1952, and 1953

[Billions of dollars]

	Army	Navy	Air	Total
Funds available for obligation, 1951.....	19,461	12,738	16,156	48,355
Deduct:				
Obligations.....	17,259	12,136	15,053	44,448
Lapses.....	.052	.106	.045	.203
Balance unobligated and carried over into 1952.....	2,150	.496	1,058	3,704
New funds made available for obligation, 1952.....	20,839	15,580	22,003	58,422
Total funds available for obligation, 1952.....	1 22,989	1 16,076	1 23,061	1 62,126
Deduct:				
Obligations (estimated) during 1952.....	22,538	15,801	.21 641	59,980
Lapses (estimated) on June 30, 1952.....	0	.017	.066	.083
Balance unobligated and carried over into 1953.....	.451	.258	1,354	2,063

<sup>1</sup> Proposed supplemental of \$1.5 billion, which has not yet been submitted to the Congress, not included in funds available for 1952.

## MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS

The request for funds for maintenance and operations continues to be one of the major requirements representing approximately 25 percent of the budget request or \$12,223,000,000, divided between the services as follows: Army \$4,690,000,000, Navy \$3,008,000,000, and Air Force \$4,525,000,000.

So long as there is a continuing expansion of the military forces, requests under this appropriation will increase as it is from this appropriation that day-to-day operating or recurrent expenses, as distinguished from capital purchases, are made. The present request represents an increase of \$172,000,000 over the appropriation for the current fiscal year. Major reductions were recommended by the committee in maintenance and operation requests for funds which are explained elsewhere.

## MAJOR PROCUREMENT

The purpose of the appropriation requested for major procurement and pro-

The following will show in tabular form the breakdown of funds for obligation between the three services:

## Summary of funds available, expenditures, and carry-overs, fiscal years 1951, 1952, and 1953

	Billion
Funds available in 1951.....	\$57.9
Expenditures in 1951.....	19.7
Unexpended funds carried over into fiscal year 1952.....	38.2
Additional funds for 1952:	
Appropriated.....	\$60.8
Proposed supplemental.....	1.5
	62.3
Total funds available for 1952.....	100.5
Total expenditures for 1952.....	41.4
Estimated lapses.....	.7
	42.1
Unexpended funds carried over into fiscal year 1953.....	58.4
Additional funds for 1953:	
Funds in 1953 bill.....	46.6
Proposed supplemental.....	3.5
	50.1
Total funds for 1953 (estimated).....	108.5
Expenditures (estimated) in 1953.....	52.5
Unexpended funds carried over into fiscal year 1954.....	56.0

to increase its present operating aircraft from some 8,700 to approximately 10,200. It is anticipated that the requested funds will provide the Navy and Air Force with approximately 10,300 new aircraft.

There is a large decrease in the request of the Department of the Army in the procurement area as compared to the \$8,400,000,000 appropriated for the same purposes for fiscal year 1951 and the \$8,700,000,000 appropriated for fiscal year 1952. The reduced request reflects the carry-over from the two preceding fiscal years which does not lapse but will continue to be available. It does not indicate a decrease in the receipt of end items.

There is a lesser decrease in the request on the part of the Navy and Air Force below the amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1952, but a sizable increase in each instance over the amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1951.

Additional obligational authority in the amount of \$1,150,000,000 is requested by the Navy for shipbuilding. The construction of ships requires many months, depending upon the size and complexity of the particular ship under construction, and funds for this purpose are provided each year and made available until expended. The committee was advised that funds in the amount of some \$2,714,000,000 are still unexpended from prior year appropriations which, added to and used in conjunction with the funds herein requested will permit a material increase in the effort devoted to shipbuilding and conversion during fiscal year 1953.

Other requirements for major procurement such as electronic equipment required to complete the modernization of the active fleet, supporting communications and electronics installations ashore, some electronic equipment to modernize the reserve fleet, as well as initial equipment and supply levels for additional forces to be built up during the year, peacetime consumption of the expanded force, and some war reserves including considerable emphasis on ammunition, will be funded from appropriations requested herein and discussed in more detail later herein.

Major procurement accounts for 45 percent of the military budget request but if the procurement costs of subsistence, clothing, fuel for operations and other materials and supplies used in Maintenance and Operations the figure would be far above the 45 percent.

## CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

Under the provisions of Public Law 179, Eighty-first Congress, a civilian personnel ceiling of not to exceed 500,000 full-time graded civilian employees was established. The over-all ceiling for graded and ungraded employees was fixed at 1,369,552. As of January 31, 1952, there was employed in Department of Defense activities approximately 1,290,000 of which 1,230,000 are paid from funds for regular military functions. Approximately 490,000 of these employees are graded. It is anticipated that the June 30, 1952, employment will equal the established ceilings. For fiscal year 1953

duction is to provide for the procurement of such items as aircraft, ships, and harbor craft, tanks, guided missiles, industrial mobilization, modifications to modernize the equipment of the forces, replacement of worn-out or obsolete equipment, ammunition for training, and to accumulate a sufficient reserve of military equipment to support the forces. Some of the funds will be used to recoup equipment and ammunition consumed in Korea during the current fiscal year and to cover normal peacetime attrition of matériel.

The over-all request for major procurement totals \$21,807,000,000, or 45 percent of the budget request and is divided between the services as follows: Army \$3,665,000,000; Navy \$6,106,000,000; and Air Force \$12,036,000,000. Approximately \$14,059,000,000 of the above requested amount will be used for aircraft and related procurement to increase the Air Force from its present strength toward a goal of 143 wings, and to enable the Navy

request is made for an increase over the presently established ceiling for graded employees of 64,640, making the request for the graded employees ceiling 564,640, and an ungraded ceiling of 905,800.

Compensation for the employees requested for fiscal year 1953, and the similar obligations for the numbers estimated for fiscal year 1952 are as follows:

	1952	1953
Army.....	\$1,859,672,452	\$1,922,628,628
Navy.....	1,848,861,754	1,935,988,163
Air Force.....	988,414,357	1,109,426,384
Office, Secretary of Defense.....	11,664,000	11,736,100
	4,708,612,563	5,039,779,265

The committee recommends the retention in the bill of the section limiting full-time graded civilian employees to not to exceed 500,000. The \$4,200,000,000 reduction in the over-all budget request will result in a marked reduction in civilian personnel below the numbers estimated in the fiscal year 1953 budget.

#### MILITARY PERSONNEL

The request submitted for military personnel for fiscal year 1953 contemplates a total end strength of approximately 3,690,000 as of June 30, 1953, divided as follows:

Army.....	1,550,000
Navy.....	835,873
Marines.....	243,730
Air Force.....	1,061,000
Total.....	3,690,603

If the strength is obtained it will be some 220,000 in excess of the strength at the time of the hearings and approximately 100,000 more than the contemplated strength at the end of this fiscal year, June 30, 1952.

To provide such a military strength with pay, allowances, subsistence, clothing, travel, and welfare, and a small amount of clothing and combat rations for mobilization reserves the sum of \$10,933,000,000 is requested, which is about 22 percent of the budget.

#### CIVILIAN COMPONENTS

Appropriations in the amount of \$852,000,000 is requested for the civilian components of the military forces. The fundamental principle behind the civilian-components program is the availability and effectiveness of the trained forces in time of need to furnish forces or units capable of taking the field within a minimum period of time and blend promptly and effectively into the forces in being. There is a continuing requirement for trained individuals and units to bring existing forces up to war strength and to provide qualified replacements to maintain the effective strength of the forces in being. To meet the requirements the Reserve programs provide for combat training, support training, replacement training, specialist training, mobilization-assignment programs, and individual-trainee programs. Under some of the programs 48 drill periods and 15 days' active-duty training per annum are provided, and other programs provide for 24 drill periods and 15 days' active-duty training per annum.

The over-all request for appropriations as presented to the committee calls for \$852,000,000 divided as follows: Army \$418,000,000; Navy \$244,000,000; and the Air Force \$190,000,000. The committee has recommended reductions in these amounts based upon the belief that the goals set by the services are unattainable.

#### RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The purpose of research and development is to provide the best and most advanced weapons to the military forces. It is realized that technical superiority in weapons can mean the difference between victory and defeat. The research and development program is essential to insure that the productive and material resources of the Nation go into weapons and equipment superior in quality and performance to those of any potential enemy or aggressor nation.

Funds requested for research and development total \$1,711,000,000, of which \$1,515,000,000 is for direct costs and \$196,000,000 is for indirect costs.

#### KOREAN COSTS

Appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1952 carried no specific funds for Korean costs. It is anticipated that a fiscal year 1952 supplemental request for funds will be presented to the Congress before long requesting that portion of the Korean costs that could not be absorbed from fiscal year 1952 funds. It is estimated that the amount will approximate \$1,500,000,000. The actual estimated cost of the Korean war for the current fiscal year approximates \$5,000,000,000.

The budget requests for fiscal year 1953 contain no specific funds to support hostilities in Korea beyond June 30, 1952, or for the additional costs generated as a result of the pay-as-you-go policy in Japan. Such additional costs when and if required will be the subject of supplemental consideration.

#### WASTE

During recent months numerous charges of waste and extravagance in the military departments have been given wide publicity. Various committees of the House and Senate, including the House Appropriations Committee, have been at work seeking to ferret out waste and mismanagement and discover areas of saving. These efforts have not been without success.

The committee has been much concerned about critical allegations and revelations, and in the consideration of budgetary requests for the national defense has devoted considerable attention to ascertaining what corrective steps could be taken, either through reductions in appropriations, through recommended legislation, or through changed procedures.

If economy, efficiency, and good management could be achieved by the simple process of reducing appropriations for the Department of Defense, the task of Congress would be relatively simple. The trouble is that a mere reduction in funds in an appropriation bill may in no way increase efficiency in the operation of the Military Establishment. A reduction in funds in some instances might

very easily have the opposite effect of compounding error and mismanagement. It is possible to mismanage a small business on the same basis that a large business may be mismanaged.

Nevertheless, a considerable portion of the \$4,200,000,000 reduction in the current bill has been made with the specific purpose in mind of enforcing a better job of military management and expenditure. Some way must be found to shock the people in the Department of Defense from top to bottom into the full realization that Congress and the American people will not tolerate flagrant waste in money and manpower. What we seek is to get across this idea to all the services from the secretarial level to the very bottom. Budget officers and top officials who appear before the committee could not escape being aware of the congressional demand for economy and efficiency, but vast numbers of military personnel who never come in contact with congressional committees and who do not have to answer personally the criticisms by the press and otherwise, need somehow to be made to realize that this country cannot afford the luxury of vast waste in military operations. The committee applauds efforts being made by the services to bring about cost consciousness.

A reading of the hearings will clearly demonstrate that some progress is being made toward getting value received for the tax dollars by all branches of the service—admitted the job is a difficult one in view of the extensive operations of the Military Establishment.

The Department of Defense is incomparably larger and more far-flung in scope than the combination of a score of our largest corporations. Since the outbreak of the Korean war the Army itself has awarded over 2,500,000 separate contracts, totaling some \$20,000,000,000. Statistics for the Air Force and Navy would be equally impressive. Perfection cannot, of course, be expected in so large an operation. Indeed, there is waste in the operation of private business—little business and big business—running into many millions of dollars annually.

Some of the criticisms which have been leveled at the Department have been greatly exaggerated, but there is no glossing over the fact that there have been considerable areas of waste and mismanagement in our military program. Members who are interested in pursuing discussions of the pros and cons of military waste are referred to the hearings where the problem of waste was a subject of daily discussion.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman who was chairman of the Army subcommittee and who worked with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] in the preparation of this portion of the bill. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is an experienced legislator, who has established himself as a man who knows and loves the cause of national defense and is doing the best he can to serve the public interest. Mr. SIKES.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my earnest and sincere thanks and commendation to the men who served with me in the preparation of this bill: The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER]. The clerks, Mr. Oreskin and Mr. Phleger. All of them made splendid contributions; they worked long hours, and they worked tirelessly. I have never served with men who tried harder to do a good job and to do the right thing.

I want to take a moment to give you the Army picture as it now exists. On March 1, the money available for the Army was \$22,300,000,000; obligations at that time were \$16,300,000,000. It is estimated that at the end of this fiscal year, on June 30, there will be in the Army funds \$17,700,000,000, of which there will be an unobligated balance of only \$451,000,000. In other words, the Army will have placed orders for the equipment it needs, and will be prepared to pay for that equipment when it is delivered.

The number of civilians on the Army payrolls as of June 30, is estimated to be 503,500. The Army requested the right to hire some additional civilians for a total during fiscal year 1953 of 516,500. That will not be possible under the cuts made in the bill.

Military personnel at the end of the fiscal year, it is estimated, will number 1,563,000, or a few more than the number proposed for fiscal 1953. The number proposed for fiscal 1953 is 1,550,000. As the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] pointed out, 700,000 men are getting out of the Army because their enlistment expires during fiscal 1953, and the Army faces the great task of building its forces up again.

Mr. Chairman, let me emphasize, we are talking about the Army at this time; we are talking about the force which held in Korea, the force which held in Korea despite every obstacle and everything that could be thrown against them. This is the force which held, Mr. Chairman, by sheer guts—and a lot of the time in the early days that was about all they had. Korea has shown very clearly that in the type of warfare we have used thus far, only ground forces can stop ground forces. For a long time, we had all the air power; we still have all the sea power, but it was the Army which held on in Korea. Neither air power nor sea power could stop the Reds. I do not in any sense, Mr. Chairman, minimize the importance of the Air Force or of the Navy; they are part of our defense forces and we must have them all to do the defense job; but do not forget, it is on the Army that we shall have to depend to hold a chunk of Europe for the free world if the big war comes.

Since Korea began the Army has doubled the number of its divisions, doubled the number of its regimental combat teams, more than doubled the number of antiaircraft units which are defending this country against possible air attacks, released to production more new items from research and development in 1 year than in the previous 4 years,

strengthened the Army, and this required the training of a million new men; strengthened our forces overseas in all corners of the world, and shipped to our partners under the mutual security program more than 1,000,000 tons of military supplies. At the same time the Army has carried on a conflict 5,000 miles from home and done very well at it. The Eighth Army is the finest Army in the world today.

The Army has done some other things that I think the people back home are interested in, Mr. Chairman. The Army has in the past 12 months conducted a quarter of a million chapel services which were attended by 15,000,000 servicemen and their dependents and others. The Army during the struggle in Korea has reduced, by improvements in medical services, the number of men who die from wounds to a figure less than half the number, percentagewise, who died in World War II from wounds.

During World War II we had the best record in the Armed Forces for care of personnel of any medical service in the world; now it is even better.

In addition to that, the Army is the service that has put on a determined stop-waste campaign. For the first time it is grading men in their efficiency reports on the kind of savings that they make.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say something about the things that the Army requested for this year and what the committee proposes to allow. The Army asked for \$14,200,000,000, of which 26 percent was for production and procurement, 35 percent for maintenance operation and 30 percent for military personnel. We cut that 11.8 percent, and, Mr. Chairman, that, I believe, is the biggest cut inflicted on any military service since Pearl Harbor. By contrast the Air Force and Navy were cut approximately 7 percent.

I want to discuss those cuts briefly. We tried to make proper cuts, we tried to make safe cuts. For instance, we found in our studies on furniture that the services only allow 9 years for the life of a steel desk and 8 years for the life of a wooden desk. That is utterly ridiculous. I have been using one in my office now for 12 years and it will outlast me. So we cut out money for new office furniture.

We cut money for subsistence and clothing. Obviously you and I are not going to be a party to cutting the food and the uniforms that these men actually need. But they estimated their requirements on the basis of last year's prices. This year's prices are a little lower at this time. If they continue to drop we can pick up some more money there. We are gambling that prices are not going to be as high as they were last year. If they are, we will have to put some of this money back. But we believe also that economies in food handling and in uniforms can be made.

We cut out half the money requested for college training of men already in the service.

Obviously there are some activities, such as in electronics and engineering, where men in uniform need to be sent

to college for post-graduate work in order to keep abreast of the rapid development in these fields. But there is a lot of money in here to train lawyers. It seems utterly ridiculous, when there are thousands of men graduating from ROTC schools who have taken a law course and who would like to be in the services to train people in the Army in this field. We cut out half of that money and we have asked the services to apply that cut in the light of the committee's statements.

Then we cut tuition that is paid for men who go to school on their own time at branch universities or at regular universities which are near the Army posts. The Government has been paying half of the tuition for officers and three-quarters of the tuition for enlisted men. We cut that. We cut out all of the tuition for officers and we cut the tuition for enlisted men back to 50 percent. We feel that if these men want to carry on their college training on their own time they should be encouraged to do it, but they ought to want to advance themselves enough to do so without the Government having to pay for it.

Then we cut recruiting. It was pointed out on yesterday that there have been abuses in this respect.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I have an inquiry about that cut from one of the great schools of the country. This school is very fearful that that cut may result in an unfavorable situation. I think they said they had 12 members of their staff serving out in the Caribbean. They are very fearful that the staff will leave the service and return to the school because they can use them back in the school.

I have a very high regard for the gentleman's judgment, and may I ask him, what is his observation in reference to that? Does he think that is going to disrupt the schools for officers who are trying to improve their abilities?

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman is speaking of the men who go to school on their own time?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes. For instance, the University of Maryland has a large contingent, they tell me, in Europe, I believe, and another school has a large contingent in Asia. I am wondering how that cut is going to affect those schools.

Mr. SIKES. It is entirely possible that some of those services will be cut out. In most of those cases there will be extension courses that these men can take. I take the position that if one wants an education badly enough, he should not be unwilling to suffer some sacrifice.

Mr. BROOKS. I am trying to get the gentleman's attitude.

Mr. SIKES. I know the gentleman is sympathetic toward service problems.

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

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I am quite sure that the teachers' staff that the gentleman

from Louisiana is talking about is being used in connection with the information and education service, which are correspondence courses.

Mr. BROOKS. I think that is true.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. I am glad to hear the gentleman from Florida say that he does not believe in sending these officers to law schools, and so forth. I have talked with the gentleman about it and I know how he feels about the situation. I am glad that he brought this up. At the proper time I shall offer an amendment to take away completely all the money for the education of lawyers, and so forth, from this appropriation.

Mr. SIKES. If I may talk about recruiting now, we feel that some money is being wasted in that program. As was pointed out yesterday, in some cities—not all—there are separate recruiting stations for each service. That is unnecessary. One recruiting station could take care of the whole job. We found that in Wyoming, for instance, it is costing \$1,050 a man to get recruits for the service. We think this is an unrealistic situation that the services can do something about. I do not care to cripple the recruiting service, because that is beamed at getting men who are career men, and not 2-year draftees, most of whom want to get out as soon as their time is up, but career men who will be useful to the Government by reason of their training after a long period of time. A modern Army cannot be built around 2-year men.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Is it not a fact that all of these men can volunteer through the Selective Service System?

Mr. SIKES. That is true.

Mr. ALBERT. And is it not a fact that once they reach the first station they are asked whether they want to go into the Regular Army or not?

Mr. SIKES. That is right.

Mr. ALBERT. So are we not duplicating a lot here?

Mr. SIKES. I have stated a more realistic job and a less costly job can be done. We have cut them some, and possibly we could have cut more. But I do not believe recruiting should be eliminated.

Now I want to talk about publicity, because we inflicted a healthy cut there. The publicity cut for Washington was from \$1,250,000 to \$312,500 or 75 percent; over-all from \$11,700,000 to \$5,585,000 or 50 percent. It appears there has been unnecessary grandstanding by some of the services, but I feel the Army is the least guilty of such actions.

Now these cuts are reasonably safe. There are other cuts that may not be as safe. Take the stock fund. The stock fund was cut from \$400,000,000 to \$140,000,000. The stock fund is the money which allows the service to pay for the accumulation of stocks of uniforms, equipment and equipage, a fancy word meaning odds and ends. If we had to

mobilize in a hurry, and build up our forces above the present levels, a serious shortage of uniforms and uniform equipment could develop.

We took a pretty heavy slash at the administrative functions. The Army is relatively the same size it was a year ago and therefore it should be able to carry on its administrative functions for less money. It should be able to increase its economy of operation, but instead of that we find a number of cases where they were trying to build up administrative payrolls. Now for their side let me say that they have more equipment to look after, longer supply lines, and they say these operations require more people. We took the opposite view that they could stand cuts. Now you can cut too much on administration. You can have a headless organization and actually induce inefficiency by cutting too deeply, but we took chances on that.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] has discussed the cuts in the National Guard and the Reserve. We have been constantly appropriating more money for the Reserves than they have been able to use. The Guard has heretofore been able to make good use of the money which we appropriated. Under the new draft act, men coming out of the service go into the Reserves for 2 years, but they do not have to go into an active Reserve. Therefore we feel that the Army objectives for both the National Guard and the Reserves are too high to be realistic. We took a medium point, half way between their present strength and the point that they hope to reach, and that is where we pegged the money figures for them. I, for one, do not want to cut the fund for the Guard and the Reserves below what they need, and if they need more later, I am going to ask somewhere along the line that it be provided.

Here is an item that disturbed us very much, and that is travel money. The services have not, in my opinion, been completely realistic about travel. They seem to send people from one end of the country to the other, and as soon as they get there, it seems they are turned around and sent back. Dependents' travel and furniture shipments are costing a lot of money. The committee has complained and complained about that, and still the services have not stopped abuses. There is in this bill this year total travel for military personnel \$266,000,000, and transportation of things \$467,000,000. We have cut those items 42.8 million, and I do not know whether that is low enough or not, but we have to watch this. We cannot cut so low that we are to stop such things as rotation of troops from Korea. We have to be very careful about that possibility. There is a level below which we cannot safely go in these items. There is a big turn-over of men this year whose enlistments expire, and that is going to create new travel expenses.

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

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

Mr. COLMER. On the over-all picture of economies that are attempted in this bill, I wonder if the distinguished and very able and studious gentleman ad-

dressing the House, a member of this committee, agrees that in order to really effect any economy in here, there has got to be a limitation placed on the expenditures.

Mr. SIKES. I think I will follow the gentleman on that. That is what we tried to do in the bill.

Mr. COLMER. I understand, but with the enormous carry-over that we had from the previous year, unless there is some limitation upon expenditures, the cuts will not amount to a great deal. I think the gentleman agrees with that line of reasoning; does he not?

Mr. SIKES. I cannot follow the gentleman's reasoning with respect to carry-over of funds that are obligated funds. The gentleman realizes that money which is carried over is not available for such things as pay and subsistence, but is money to pay for equipment which is on order.

Mr. COLMER. If the gentleman will permit me, and of course I do not want to usurp his time, we had a carry-over of approximately \$72,000,000,000 from last year. Now forget the obligations for a moment. If we appropriate another \$46,000,000,000 or \$50,000,000,000 here, and that would bring it up somewhere in the neighborhood of \$111,000,000,000—maybe my figures are not exactly correct, I am giving them from memory—there would be a total of approximately \$111,000,000,000 to be expended in those 2 years. We all realize that you cannot or nobody can spend that much money and spend it intelligently, and therefore, unless there is some curb on the expenditures, your cuts will not amount to anything.

Mr. SIKES. Let me say to my friend I have very little time remaining for the many items that I want to discuss. But I will take some time when the bill is being considered under the 5-minute rule, and discuss the obligations picture in detail, if the gentleman will be good enough to permit me to go ahead now.

Mr. COLMER. Will the gentleman agree with me generally?

Mr. SIKES. No; I do not agree.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. COUDERT. First, let me call the attention of the Members of the House to an article which I inserted in the RECORD, in the Appendix at page A2172, by a New York Times reporter who discusses very effectively this question of expenditures versus appropriations.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman two questions. I was somewhat surprised to find in the 80-page report in support of the bill that it is apparently predicated upon the assumption that there is to be an increase of 220,000 military personnel over the current year; is that correct?

Mr. SIKES. There is to be some build-up—not in the Army. There will be no build-up in the Army. I do not have the Air Force and Navy figures. I refer your question to the chairman of those subcommittees.

Mr. MAHON. I am not sure of the exact figure but there is no question the number will go to about 3,700,000 at the end of the next fiscal year.

Mr. SIKES. The build-up would not be in the Army. There is no increase in the Army strength figures. What is the gentleman's other question?

Mr. COUDERT. My other question is: Will the gentleman advise the House, just what is the amount of the cost to the United States of maintaining the military personnel in Europe?

Mr. SIKES. I can only give you the Army's figures. The Air Force has stated to me they do not at this time have a breakdown of their figures. The Navy, of course, has no additional cost. The Army is maintaining six divisions in Europe, plus supporting troops, and they tell me that it is costing \$167,000,000 more by virtue of transportation and station allowances. They may make some savings on the civilian personnel by hiring indigenous personnel overseas that cost only one-third as much as people hired in this country.

Mr. COUDERT. What is the over-all cost of the actual maintenance of troops—the total cost regardless?

Mr. SIKES. One billion three-hundred million dollars.

Mr. COUDERT. And you say the Air Force was unable or unwilling to provide those figures?

Mr. SIKES. They stated to me they did not have them available at this time. They will be available later.

Mr. COUDERT. And the Air Force has very substantial bases, and is growing?

Mr. SIKES. I know of no reason why the Air Force should not provide such figures, and I am confident they will.

Mr. COUDERT. May I say through you to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas, that I hope before the bill is completed, he will be able to get from the Air Force the cost of maintaining our Air Force and their installations in Europe. I think the House of Representatives and the country are entitled to know what all this is costing.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, if I may proceed now, we come to the cuts which actually may be dangerous cuts. We cut \$300,000,000 out of maintenance and operations. When you defer maintenance; resurfacing of roads, and repair of buildings, and reroofing of buildings, care and rebuilding of machinery and equipment, these things sometimes become much more costly than if proper repair and maintenance had been exercised currently. This item also includes training of troops. You cannot cut that too deeply and have a realistic training program.

We took \$918,000,000 out of production and procurement. That is a 25-percent-plus cut. Mr. Chairman, we have tried to limit funds on the long lead-time items on tanks, trucks, electronics, ammunition, and mobilization reserve items; on things where the orders have been built up sufficiently that we hoped the production lines would not stop before the 1954 money can be made available. Some of these are absolutely essential items. Ammunition is a good example and we hope we did not cut them too much. The production lines must continue until 1954 funds become

available or we have dangerous shortages and greater costs. There is serious question in my mind whether we have not cut too deep in some instances. We may have to put some of this money back. In scarce items like tanks we cannot afford to fall too far behind in production.

We must bear in mind that throughout the budget estimates no provision has been made for possible future price increases. Instead the latest contract price experience has been used in setting up anticipated costs. In some instances we counted on dropping prices in the coming months because of a present trend in prices of some items. A steel strike may easily upset those calculations. If there are other factors which cause prices to rise, it obviously will be necessary to reduce or defer the programs contained in this bill or to request more funds to do the same job.

You will have noticed that we did not cut research. We simply cannot compete with Red manpower. They outnumber us many times. We must take advantage of every possible industrial development which will give us greater fire power or more efficient use of our forces if we can do so without getting our people enmeshed in too many gadgets and too much equipment. It is possible to carry mechanization to the point that too many people will be required for the operation and maintenance of equipment and that too few are left for combat units. That is not a present danger. By far the greater danger is that the Reds will get ahead of us in guided missiles, in new special weapons, in radiological warfare and in other highly significant fields of warfare.

Research has contributed a great deal. Before 1952 the medium tank had five different engines; now a single engine goes into five different types of vehicles. This reduces maintenance costs and spare parts inventories. Research developed a new tank turret. It was placed into manufacture without field testing. We took a deliberate gamble in order to save a year in getting a more effective tank into combat. As might have been anticipated it was found that the turret had bugs but those bugs are being eliminated without too much difficulty and we have saved the time and a lot of money by gambling on research.

Finally, I would like to discuss some odds and ends, some of which should be corrected by legislation.

For instance, fluctuating draft calls produce fluctuating requirements for training facilities, barracks space, food and clothing. We could carry on our training program with greater economy if uniform draft calls were issued each month.

Then there is the matter of physical examinations. If these were obtained by draftees at their home towns, it is obvious a considerable saving would result. The present practice is to send them to military induction installations for examination. This is a costly practice.

The greatest source of waste in the present method of operating selective service, however, appears to lie in the failure of the local boards to determine

dependency. At present the draft boards make no attempt to decide dependency matters and send men into military service without regard to family hardship. Once inducted these men are entitled to file for a hardship discharge. Several thousand of them are discharged each year before their basic training is completed. The Government investment in these men is a total loss. Moreover it has wasted time by partially training a man who must now be replaced by another draftee. If the local boards eliminated at least the more obvious cases, this situation could be avoided.

There has been much talk about waste and the necessity for cutting out waste. It is easy to generalize but generalizations on waste are of little help in eliminating it. Across-the-board cuts or straight percentage cuts do not get rid of the fat or the waste and they may cripple essential programs. Nonetheless, we must eliminate waste wherever we best can.

We have a tough problem on our hands. Russia is counting on us to defeat ourselves by blunders or excessive spending fully as much—I think more—than she expects to be able to defeat us by force of arms. Faced with a colossal national debt and enormous defense expenditures which some distinguished authorities have said may last for 20 to 30 years, we must stop waste and reckless squandering wherever it exists or we shall end up in national bankruptcy.

A battlefield is not the only place where we could lose a war. I don't think that has occurred to most of us but it has occurred to Joe Stalin. No matter how strong we may be militarily the American system of democratic government could not survive the destruction of the American free-enterprise system. It can be destroyed by overspending and overtaxing.

The committee recognizes the fact that we cannot afford full mobilization for an indefinite period of time. We have tried to strike a balance. This bill is the result of that attempt for fiscal year 1953.

Many have wondered why American military production apparently is poor in comparison with Communist military production when Congress has provided almost all the funds and all the authority requested by the administration and the Department of Defense.

Let us disregard such factors as slave labor, rigid and complete Government controls of all production and consider only our own side of the case. It takes a long time to set up production lines for the manufacture of complicated modern military equipment. For most of it there is no parallel industry in peacetime which can readily be shifted to military production. We must build the tools that go into the production lines.

But in addition we are at this time bound to the theory that the American people must have their comforts and conveniences until the big war actually strikes. We are not depriving them of any of the things they would enjoy in peacetime. That means factories must be built and workers trained to handle

military production in order not to interfere with civilian production. This policy of guns and butter is very definitely a material contributing factor to lagging American military production. Some day we may rue the risk we take.

In this bill we have done about as well as we could under the very hurried procedure we followed. We in Congress should face the fact that there is need for more clerical help, for a full-time and complete investigating staff. Unfortunately it seems that only Congress can be depended upon to expose and to complain of waste in government. We need more equipment to do the job well. Congressmen at best are only part-time experts on budget operations. We cannot possibly match wits with professionals who spend all of their time and even all their lives in budget operations and who are flanked with staffs of many experts when they come to the Capitol. Congressmen cannot buck budget problems and do all of the other things now expected of them.

In writing this bill we have fought waste. But the fact remains that all war is waste and much of the preparation for war is waste. Haste makes waste and we are building defense in a hurry.

Despite all that we can do in this bill or in later bills the greatest savings will come through a genuine consciousness of the importance of savings by the members of the Armed Forces. A more realistic training program within the services toward that end is essential.

War may come next fall or next year, or we may be faced with a long pull in which war never comes. Whatever happens we cannot disregard the capabilities of the enemy—militarily or diplomatically. We have already been guilty of that. Too long have we underestimated what the Russians can do. We in politics should know that it is never safe to underestimate an opponent. We do not know when or where Joe Stalin will pull the trigger. We are trying to be as near ready as we can under the rules set out for us by the people who make the policies. In voting on a bill like this each of us must sleep with his own conscience on his contribution to the Nation's defense.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Security Council, including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not in excess of \$50 per diem for individuals; acceptance and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services; and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with work related to the activity of the Council; \$150,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I know of no spending legislation that has come before this House of Representatives in the last 3 years amid more confusion or attended with less justification than the pending measure calling for the spending of nearly \$50,000,000,000.

At the outset I want to put in the RECORD again part of the statement to be found on page 15 of the committee print. Listen to this:

In a number of instances witnesses were not sufficiently familiar with their programs to explain clearly what had been done with funds granted in prior years, or what was to be done with the 1953 request \* \* \* in many instances such information became available too late to have a bearing on the issues involved.

Again, on page 7 of the committee print we find this statement:

Some way must be found to shock the people in the Department of Defense from top to bottom into the full realization that Congress and the American people will not tolerate flagrant waste in money and manpower \* \* \* vast numbers of military personnel who never come in contact with congressional committees \* \* \* need somehow to be made to realize that this country cannot afford the luxury of vast waste in military operations.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that until there are courts martial and imprisonment of military personnel and civil prosecution and imprisonment of civilian personnel guilty of maladministration, waste, inefficiency and plain dishonesty there will be no end to the situation about which the committee and others have complained so bitterly.

Yesterday, the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee [Mr. VINSON] appeared in the well of the House and insisted that the cut of \$4,000,000,000 in this bill represented a cut to the very bone. The gentleman from Georgia was followed a little later into the well of the House by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. CANNON], who told how the chairman of the Armed Services Committee had buttonholed him in the cloak room and waylaid him in the corridors insisting that this bill be cut \$6,000,000,000.

Then, when the bill was ready for House consideration, carrying a \$4,200,000,000 cut, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] said he was astonished when the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], came to him and, despite previous insistence that a six billion cut was in order, protested that a cut of slightly more than four billion was too much.

Just how much confusion can be heaped on a piece of legislation such as this with the expectation that the Members of this House will swallow it—hook, line, and sinker?

It is unfortunate that all Members of the House were not present yesterday afternoon to hear the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], call attention to the dismal failure of the so-called unification of the Armed Forces.

He charged that his committee found no semblance of a unified command in Alaska; the Air Force and the Army fighting over control of the supply system in Japan, and paralleling supply systems being constructed in France and Germany.

Is there any question that General Eisenhower supported the unification act? Yet, under his very nose, in France and Germany, the spirit if not the letter

of this law is being violated with millions upon millions of dollars of waste to the taxpayers of America. The gentleman from North Carolina asserted there is no secret about this duplicating supply system. The warehouses, depots, and everything else, he says, are there for anyone to see. The intimation here is that anyone and everyone but Eisenhower can see them.

All this points up the appalling failure of the office of Secretary of Defense to fulfill the statutory responsibility of unification and which is out under the terms of this bill to grab nearly another half billion dollars.

But the failure of the unification act should be no surprise to anyone. For all effective purposes, it was scuttled in the fall of 1949 with the purging of Admiral Denfeld. In complete violation of that provision of the unification act, which provides that a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff may testify before a congressional committee on his own volition and be protected in his right to do so, Admiral Denfeld was crucified by President Truman and the arrogant military hierarchy created under the framework of the so-called unification act.

Is it any wonder that Members of Congress and committees of this House find it most difficult if not impossible to obtain the information necessary to justify many of the spending items in this bill or compel a following of the plain mandates of Congress? After the brutal treatment accorded Admiral Denfeld is it to be expected that men will testify freely and frankly, knowing the fate that awaits them?

Without fear of successful contradiction, I say that more than the groundwork has been laid for the establishment of a military dictatorship in this country.

This bill ought to be recommitted and brought back to the House after the Easter recess, and after justifications have been made for all expenditures. Moreover, it would be most healthy if Members talked with their constituents during the Easter recess.

In justice to all the people of this Nation, Congress must no longer carry on its work in a vacuum of ignorance, contradiction, and confusion.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Security Resources Board; including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess of \$50 per diem and contracts with temporary or part-time employees may be renewed annually; expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the National Security Resources Board; hire of passenger motor vehicles; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services for protection of confidential files; not to exceed \$8,000 for newspapers and periodicals; and not to exceed \$5,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses, to be expended under the direction of the Chairman for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive; \$1,500,000.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BONNER: Page 2, line 25, strike out "\$1,500,000" and insert "\$500,000."

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I approach amendments to this bill with care and thought, for I realize as I said yesterday that we are dealing here with serious legislation, dealing here with legislation that affects the safety of this whole Nation. Not only the Members of this House and those in the gallery, but those in the country at large are vitally interested.

I find an almost complete overlapping and duplication between the functions of the Office of Defense Mobilization and the National Security Resources Board. I will read you the functions of these two civilian agencies and the functions of the Munitions Board in the Department of Defense. You will see that all three of them are working in exactly the same fields:

Office of Defense Mobilization directs, controls, and coordinates all mobilization activities of the Executive Branch of the Government.

National Security Resources Board advises the President on coordination of military, industrial, and civilian mobilization.

Munitions Board has the responsibility for coordination within the Department of Defense and with the civilian agencies.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the function of all three of the boards is production and procurement.

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

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. And also on those boards there is a group of Cabinet officers who are members of all the boards?

Mr. BONNER. I will get to that. Mr. Chairman, there are other functions that duplicate throughout the three boards.

It has been represented to the Congress that, whereas the Office of Defense Mobilization is busy in all these fields I have named, the National Security Resources Board is busy in the same fields from a long-range point of view.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, by my amendment I am not crippling the National Security Resources Board for I am leaving it with \$500,000 to keep its personnel together and to keep up their necessary operations. It must be borne in mind that they have been superceded by two emergency agencies. As the gentleman from California points out, this board with the exception of the chairman is composed of the Secretaries of State, Treasury, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor. All of these individuals are on the Defense Mobilization Board and are, of course, in the President's Cabinet. They can take care of

resources planning without the need of a separate NSRB.

The legislative duties of the NSRB coincide so closely with those of the Munitions Board and the Defense Mobilization Board that there has been much jealousy and friction between the agencies. Their duties are similar to agencies in other Government departments of similar character, namely, Agriculture, Interior, Commerce, and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, this has been one of the most useless of all Federal agencies. It has never operated as intended by the Congress. It has been run by an Acting Chairman much of the time since it was created in 1947.

National Security Board Chairmen: Arthur M. Hill, September 26, 1947, to December 15, 1948.

Acting Chairman John R. Steelman, December 15, 1948, to April 26, 1950.

W. Stuart Symington, April 26, 1950, to May 4, 1951.

Jack Gorrie, Acting Chairman, May 4, 1951, to October 28, 1951.

Chairman, October 29, 1951, to date.

It has been represented to the Congress that, whereas the Office of Defense Mobilization is busy in all these fields I have named, the National Security Resources Board is busy in the same fields from a longer-range point of view. They are taking a long look into the future and supplying the long-range balance and perspective, and they say that they are working through all of the other agencies that we have in the Government. They say they have men of wide experience in all the different fields, men that can talk the language of industry and the other departments and agencies.

Therefore, I am leaving a sufficient amount, and in my opinion, an over-sufficiency, to take care of the men they seem to think they should retain.

Mr. Chairman, I can hardly see how the splendid membership of this committee, who I believe are conscientiously seeking a way to cut down the expenses of this great and necessary octopus we are dealing with today, can do other than accept this amendment, for I assure you this amendment will not cripple in any way, shape, or form the functions that are set forth under their directive or the directive of the two other boards. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I hope that the committee will see fit to accept this amendment. As I said in the beginning, I considered at first to cut the full amount, but I did not want to be too drastic, for I realized that this function is created under an act of Congress, and it was the intent of Congress that they do certain things. But, it has gone so far that other agencies have been created who have moved into their functions, so this is merely a means of advising them to cut down the expenses and saving this little drop in the bucket, of this first you see it and then you do not see it and then disappearing in money, because it is going to disappear very rapidly when the bill becomes a law.

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

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BROWNSON. I want to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee, a committee on which I have the honor to serve, for the splendid statement he made and also to congratulate him for the hours he has spent trying to unravel this duplication which our subcommittee has been confronted with. I certainly hope that his amendment will be accepted.

Mr. BONNER. I appreciate very much the gentleman's contribution and his personal reference, and I want to say that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON] has been one of the most able and diligent workers on the Expenditures Committee subcommittee which has looked into this matter. You cannot put your finger on these things; they are hidden, and it takes a great deal of time to try to find out where you can save a few dollars in this tremendous bill.

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

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I want to say to the gentleman that I think we all appreciate the fine work that he and his subcommittee have done. I want to say further that what we need is more of the same. I do not know of any abler group in the House than the group handling the present bill, but I will say with all due deference to them, in all the months they have put in this bill, they could well use somebody to check the huge amount of money that is involved in this bill to a greater extent than it is humanly possible for them to do. I want to say again that we all appreciate the work that the gentleman from North Carolina has done in a very able manner and the support that he has brought to the subcommittee. I think we would all do well to follow him.

Mr. BONNER. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution. I want it fully understood that in the work of this committee there is no personal feeling on the part of any member of the committee against the personnel of the Air Force. Our targets have been aimed at the Air Force, but I admire them, and the great feats that they have performed in World War II have thrilled me as much as they have thrilled school children.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, perhaps as good a summation of the activities of this outfit as could be given was made by the chairman of the subcommittee in one of his first statements on page 31 of the hearing:

It always occurs to me there is so much duplication in this business.

Now, that is just it, and yet with all that duplication of last year, with the enormous staff that the National Production Authority had of economists,

with the Leon Keyserling set-up, with 8 or 10 other set-ups, the allotment of steel was refused on all sorts of school construction and on all sorts of private business.

The people were deprived of employment in the automobile industry, and it got to the point that we had such a surplus of steel floating around that they had to withdraw some of these restrictions. The whole thing was not planned at all. They had so many planners working at cross purposes that they did not get anywhere.

Now, you have another illustration of that. They went into the market and boosted the price of raw rubber way up out of sight. It was very largely because those people were advising the Munitions Board and those who were stockpiling the articles thought the shortage was such that they needed to go out and buy all that rubber. They have warehouse after warehouse filled up with rubber in such a way that it is almost absolutely impossible for them to make the turn-over of the rubber often enough to keep the rubber good.

This outfit is not doing the job. It is being done by the other agencies, and by the Department of Defense itself. Really, the gentleman from North Carolina could have moved to abolish the set-up and wiped the whole appropriation out and never hurt the national defense effort a bit, but rather put it on a sounder basis so that the folks and the agencies who would be left would have something to do, and they might really do something. After they had boosted the price of rubber way up, the bottom dropped out of the market.

They cut the same caper on wool, and after they boosted the price of wool way up out of sight, the bottom dropped out of the wool market.

Mr. Chairman, that is economic planning. Frankly, I do not want any more of that kind of economic planning. I want this business to be run on a real business basis. If you cut these fellows down, the \$500,000 that the gentleman from North Carolina has left there gives them plenty to operate on, and maybe they will go to work and do something. The information I get is that this whole outfit is not doing a blooming thing, and I do not think we should be bashful in the least about adopting this amendment.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I call attention to page 50 of the committee hearings on the Department of Defense and related independent agencies, from which I quote:

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I note on page 3 you have a breakdown of your divisions (and I refer to each and every one of them specifically). It is a fact—is it not—that one or more other Government agencies are actively engaged in each one of those fields of work?

Mr. DICKINSON. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield my time to the gentleman from New York.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. To continue reading from the hearings:

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. To the extent information is available in any one of those agencies, your function is to correlate and supplement insofar as is necessary the information from other sources; is that it?

Mr. DICKINSON. That is correct.

Mr. TABER. If we had a little better planning, and if we did business on a more businesslike basis, and did not have so many of these fellows kicking around so that they are in each other's way, we would be getting along better. The more supernumeraries you have around, the less business you will get done. A man told me last Saturday about going into a factory in Texas where they were not getting their production out. This man was there as an expert, and was sent down there to try to make the production of airplanes get up to schedule. What did he do? He went to the manager of that factory, and told him the way to get production up, and to get some kind of business into the set-up, was to get rid of 10,000 employees. The manager said, "That will get rid of half of my employees. I cannot do it." The expert said, "Well, you have got to do it." They got rid of half of them and production went up instead of down to the point that the Government had set for airplanes. That is the kind of situation you have got with these economists. They are doing a half-baked job because we have got so many agencies operating it. If we do not stop it, it is just too bad.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, a reduction of more than two-thirds of the budget estimate on a small item nevertheless involves about \$1,000,000. Some might think that perhaps we should not talk too much about \$1,000,000 on a \$46,000,000,000 bill. But this happens to be a tremendously important thing. The National Security Resources Board is an arm of the President. The Eightieth Congress, in its wisdom, set up the National Security Resources Board for the purpose of advising the President on long-range planning for the security of this country. It established the functions of the Board to advise the President concerning the coordination of the military, industrial, and civilian mobilization, including such things as policies for establishing adequate reserves of strategic and critical material, and for the conservation of those reserves.

On this Board are the members of the President's Cabinet, with the exception of the Attorney General and the Postmaster General. It is a very important Board. It is their job to concern themselves with the day-to-day operations of the Government, but more especially insofar as the Board is concerned, with long-range planning.

We would not think of a big business in America that would spend so little in this field as we propose to spend here.

Do you recall that the assets of the Department of Defense are \$140,000,000,000—more than half the national debt? That includes their assets, real estate, and what not. And here is the National Security Resources Board to work with the President in trying to work out long-range plans.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] knows we need planning in the Military Establishment, and we need planning in the over-all picture, and the gentleman knows that if, there ever was a time it was needed it is now. Shall we go up on our military planning, or shall we go down? After all, how many resources do we have?

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

Mr. MAHON. Not at this time.

Since we have at this time this very critical problem of what to do about this situation, here is a Board which is to cost us \$1,500,000 to run. We had already cut it by \$280,000. I certainly do not want to touch that nerve center. I think plans and decisions may be made there in advising the President and the new President, whoever he may be, that may mean multiplied millions and perhaps billions of dollars to the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. BONNER. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will make it brief. The opposition has had 14 minutes and I have only 6.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman mentioned my name.

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. I wish you would explain to the House the duplication of the boards, and tell the House how many times this Board has met recently.

Mr. MAHON. I will be glad to tell the gentleman that the Office of Defense Mobilization works with the day-to-day problems of industry, while these people work with the over-all picture of planning. This is not duplication. These people advise the President of the United States, and we will have a new one, who will probably be somewhat inexperienced, and this million and a half is for the purpose of assisting the President and the Nation. When the Eightieth Congress controlled the Appropriations Committee, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from New York, it established this board in the first place, and then in the first session of the Eightieth Congress it provided about \$1,000,000 for this board; and in the second session of the Eightieth Congress, the gentleman from New York brought in an appropriation bill that carried an item for about \$3,000,000 for this board which we are now trying to strike out. So it seems to me there is some faulty thinking here in connection with this National Security Resources Board. Of course, if we just want to cut blindly here is a chance to cut, but if we want to cut effectively we should have more time in which to think and plan.

I do not believe the committee should accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired; all time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the Committee for taking up this time after you had just adopted this amendment, but in order that you may know some things about the operation of some of the agencies included here as well as the departmental action, I do; and I regret that I could not get sufficient time to present this information before the vote was taken.

We are all in sympathy with what is desired by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], but I want to give you a little experience I had with the National Security Resources Board. After we had spent millions on the guayule rubber program during the war years without any substantial results, and after it had been eliminated except for research, the National Security Resources Board allocated around \$500,000 to start all over again on a guayule rubber program to cost millions and millions of dollars. This program had been tried and found wanting. There was a record. We had been into it and the figures did not stand up at all. After the half a million had been allocated the continuance of the expenditures came before my committee. I invited the official of the National Security Resources Board who had signed the allotment to come over and tell us why they had allocated this money in view of the record. We invited him; he did not come, and then we invited him again. Then he called me and said: "I do not remember signing that thing for half a million dollars." I talked to him over the telephone. He said he was not going to come unless we summoned him. He said: "I do not know anything about it, apparently you do. I relied upon representations made to me and since I have no personal knowledge I do not know of anything I can contribute."

We got the man over here who handled it. I asked him why he had requested it—and he was one of the top officials of the Munitions Board. He said: "I was not aware of the prior experience or failures of this program. Someone told me this guayule rubber could be used to make truck tires that would not run hot." I said: "Get me that statement." He was unable to come up with such evidence though he was perfectly honest and was simply grabbing nearly anything to carry out his specific assignment.

The point I make is that you talk to these gentlemen, you bring them in, and they are all fine gentlemen, but many times they do not know their subject; they are looking for this, for that, or the other thing, and they waste many millions of dollars unintentionally because of lack of coordination and check-up of the records.

If there is one place in the world where we can cut waste in expenditures of government without damage, it is well informed cuts in this bill. I will not burden you again as I did last year with

the details of the Elk Hills contract of the Navy, entered into without an opinion from the Department of Justice as to its legality and which we got set aside, or the details of the use or lack of use of vacated facilities by the services, all of which appears in last year's record on this subject. But those cases prove that this is a ripe field for checking up on representations and budgets. In saying that, I want you to know that in my opinion, there is not a finer group of men in Congress than the group handling this bill, from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], chairman of the subcommittee, throughout the membership. But when you are handling \$46,000,000,000 it is just humanly impossible to have all the information that you need.

For 3 years I have been trying to get an official check-up of the figures that are in this national defense bill without success, and all I can do is to cite the few isolated instances that I do know about as being representative of what happens in many places here. I was invited by several of my colleagues to head a move to try to cut this bill by another billion and a half dollars. I cannot do it; I do not know the facts. You cannot cut national defense substantially unless you do know the facts and can support your action with proof, and the only way to know is to have a sufficient number of investigators to check on these figures before the bill gets here.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. I am very much astonished to hear the gentleman say that he ever needed information that he did not get. If he needed information of any character the only reason he did not get it is because he did not ask for it.

The Committee on Appropriations has the finest force of operators, an unlimited corps of the best trained investigators in the world. And I make that statement advisedly because they are trained by FBI. Any subcommittee may ask for any information at any time—and will get it promptly. It has never failed. It has been in operation something like 8 years and no subcommittee has ever found its reports inadequate or unreliable. Sometimes the subcommittee has sent back for further details, but the data furnished has always been complete and dependable. We have investigators out in the field continuously. Their work during vacation of Congress is particularly valuable. If the gentleman has not received any information he wanted, it is because he has not asked for the information.

Mr. WHITTEN. I want to say I made this same point last year and the year before and the gentleman made the same answer. I do wish to say each year I have asked for such investigations of the Department of Agriculture which is handled by the committee I have the honor to head and I may say for the information of the gentleman that every time that I have dug into such matters I have come up with real meat and I do believe the Agriculture Department is the best run of the several departments I have dealt with. But, frankly, I am not

a member of this subcommittee handling this bill. If you do not think I have asked for such investigations read the record before the House of Representatives of last year, and the year before, and the year before that. I cannot speak for the members of this subcommittee.

Mr. CANNON. But the gentleman has never filed a request. If he had he would have the information.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am like the candidate for office in my district who was told by one of the electorate that he, the candidate, had never asked him to vote for him. The fellow running for office replied, "If you don't think I have asked you before, I am asking you now." So that the gentleman may have no further misunderstanding as to what I have asked for for years, I am asking for it now.

Mr. CANNON. Very well; write out requisition for it and you will get it. It is to be regretted the gentleman has slept on his rights all this time. Some of the most successful investigation our force has made were made under requisition of the subcommittee of which the gentleman is chairman. They resulted in the correction of gross irregularities and have saved substantial sums of money. I hope the gentleman will not grow weary of well doing.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION  
Salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses of the National Security Training Commission, including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess of \$50 per diem; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; hire of passenger motor vehicles; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; rental of office space in the District of Columbia; and purchase and installation of air-conditioning equipment without regard to the provisions of the act of October 26, 1942, as amended (40 U. S. C. 317); \$75,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHEPPARD: Page 3, lines 1 through 13, strike out the following:

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION  
Salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses of the National Security Training Commission, including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess of \$50 per diem; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; hire of passenger motor vehicles; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; rental of office space in the District of Columbia; and purchase and installation of air-conditioning equipment without regard to the provisions of the act of October 26, 1942, as amended (40 U. S. C. 317); \$75,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, originally this particular request was for \$111,000. It was reduced by \$36,000, which leaves the present figure of \$75,000.

As will be noted since the hearings originated in the committee the so-called universal military training bill has been

quietly laid to rest; therefore, there is no reason why the \$75,000 should be appropriated at this time. If you are desirous of saving money, let us save it where it will not hurt.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. Chairman, the House referred the UMT bill back to the committee with instructions to further study it. Let us be fair. Let us not try to whittle away at UMT in this way. Let us follow the instructions of the House.

Now, what has happened? There have been submitted by Mr. Wadsworth's Commission proposed amendments, and the Commission has reported back their views. We have been trying to work out other things. We are going to comply with the mandate of the House to study this matter and I am hoping that it can be brought back to the House at the very earliest possible opportunity for further consideration.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Did I understand the gentleman to say that this amendment, if adopted, would kill UMT?

Mr. VINSON. No; it would not kill UMT. But let us face the problem in a different way; let us not take away the funds for the Commission until the matter has been settled one way or the other.

Mr. JENSEN. May I say that if the effect of this amendment would do that, I would be for it 100 percent.

Mr. VINSON. But the effect of the amendment is not as the gentleman suggests.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Is the House to understand, and is the country to understand, that we are to have UMT back on this floor for decision?

Mr. VINSON. Whenever the House sends a bill back to committee, it is the duty of that committee to carry out the mandate of the House to study further the proposition that has been referred back to it. That is exactly what the Committee on Armed Services is proposing to do and what it is doing right today.

Mr. DONDERO. Will that be in this session?

Mr. VINSON. Let us talk about appropriating the money. Mr. Wadsworth is in charge of the Commission. I want to show you what kind of administration Mr. Wadsworth has had in effect over there. Last year his Commission received \$185,000, he spent \$160,000 and turned back into the Treasury \$25,000. This year he asked for \$111,000 and you reduced that amount to \$75,000.

They have only 11 employees. We all recognize the fact that today Mr. Wadsworth is a very sick man. But he is the head of this Commission that is charged with this responsibility. Now, to come in here after less than 1 year and say that we are going to abolish it for all practical purposes when less than a month ago you sent this bill back to

the Armed Services Committee, is not the proper thing to do. Now let me answer the question asked by the gentleman from Michigan. I think at the proper time after all these studies have been made by the Committee on Armed Services the House will have an opportunity to pass directly on the measure. Every man can express his opinion then. I say it would be almost a reflection upon the House today, a little less than 6 months after you passed the law, to come back in here now and eliminate the funds for the Commission that it set up.

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

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. So now, let us not get the issue of UMT in this bill. If you want to try to say you killed UMT that way, you will be badly disappointed, because the Committee on Armed Services will continue the study. It has the authority under the law to bring it back irrespective of the Commission.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. For what purpose would you use this \$75,000?

Mr. VINSON. Well, I would use the \$75,000 to carry on the studies by the little group that Mr. Wadsworth is making the study with; that is all it is doing. Now, if the \$75,000 is too much, make it \$25,000, but do not eliminate completely the funds for the Commission. The amendment offered by the gentleman from California does not merely cut out the amount, but it also abolishes the Commission, for all practical purposes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take 5 minutes. I would like simply to point out to the House that this Commission was set up to do a job, to make a report to the House, and to submit a proposed bill for UMT. Had a UMT program been put into effect, it logically would follow that the Commission would supervise it. Since the House, at least for the time being, has rejected the UMT program, this committee amendment—and it is a committee amendment—would simply suspend the operation of the committee until such time as it would have something to do. In the opinion of the committee the amendment does not enter into the merits of UMT; it certainly does not reflect on the personnel of the Commission; it merely suspends it until the Congress decides there is to be a UMT program to administer, and to supervise. The Commission has done the job which it was set up to do and there appears to be no need for it until such time as there is a UMT program.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I guess I should apologize for trying to cut \$75,000 off of a \$46,000,000,000 bill, but I thought maybe in this way we would help the gentle-

man from Georgia realize his proposed \$6,000,000,000 cut if we keep nibbling at it. Now I do not understand any of this funny work to kill bills, because I have seen gentlemen operate in this House a long time and I have never seen anybody go to jail yet for using parliamentary rules to handle a bill. If they are against it, why they come in right handy sometimes, and if they are for it, sometimes they are right convenient. May I add that I have not heard the gentleman from Georgia move to abolish any of the rules that govern this House. The committee has offered this amendment, and it is perfectly justified. On page 378 of the hearings you will find a very frank statement by Mr. Wadsworth as to what they had done. They prepared their report in detail; they went before the committees of the House and the Senate. They presented their data, and on the top of page 379, after relating all of those things the Commission had done, he says:

That job has been finished. We are now back to what might be termed normal.

So, they eliminated most of their typists and stenographic staff and other people. Those statements were made when they were expecting to have a job to do. This appropriation was justified when they were expecting to have a big job to do. They do not have one thing on earth to do now; not one job on earth do they have to do. No one would venture a statement to the contrary. So here are \$75,000 that we are going to throw up in the air with no earthly objective to accomplish. I think the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], is to be congratulated, and the committee is to be congratulated for offering the amendment to strike it out. It is absolutely justifiable, and I hope the House will take appropriate action.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment eliminates the \$75,000 appropriation for the so-called National Security Training Commission, which is actually the Universal Military Conscription Commission.

There is no valid reason for continuing this Commission to the tune of \$75,000 or any other amount, much less to provide that Commission, as the bill does, with air conditioning, guard service, limousines, expenses, and job patronage paying as much as \$50 per day per job.

This free-spending Commission was created about a year ago for the alleged purpose of preparing recommendations on universal military conscription—recommendations which were then to be considered by Congress. The report was written and presented to Congress in October of 1951, and, as the Appropriations Committee print says on page 11, "consideration has been had and the bill recommitted."

The Commission Chairman, James W. Wadsworth, said it even clearer on page

379 of the hearings. He said, "That job has been finished."

As every Member of this House knows, the American people made it plain that they do not want universal military conscription. The House recognized this fact by recommitting the conscription bill. The people do not want this Conscription Commission, either, so let us, today, logically follow through by providing the last rites. Adopt this amendment and the Commission will have no alternative but to liquidate, and it has at its disposal \$25,000 to complete that job by the end of next June.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Claims*

For payment of claims by the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Army (except as provided in appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army), Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 946; 28 U. S. C. 2672; 31 U. S. C. 222c, 222e, 223b, 223d, 224d; 35 U. S. C. 91; 39 U. S. C. 135; 46 U. S. C. 797; act of November 15, 1945, 59 Stat. 582; act of October 20, 1951, 65 Stat. 572); claims (not to exceed \$1,000 in any one case) for damages to or loss of private property incident to the operation of Army and Air National Guard camps of instruction, either during the stay of units of said organizations at such camps or while en route thereto or therefrom; claims, as authorized by law, for damage to property of railroads under training contracts; and repayment of amounts determined by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force, or officers designated by them, to have been erroneously collected from military and civilian personnel of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force or from States, Territories, or the District of Columbia, or members of National Guard units thereof; \$5,000,000.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question but that our country is stronger now than it was in January of 1951, and that we made great progress during 1951.

However, our country must make greater progress for defense during 1952.

The testimony of General Vandenberg, Chief of our Air Force, shows that the Soviet Union has an air advantage over us, that its aerial strength is well ahead of ours at the moment.

We had better remove that Soviet advantage as soon as possible.

There is no reason why the Soviet Union should outproduce us in any of the plane categories.

We have the potential capacity. It should be developed into actual production.

Anyone who predicts that the Soviet Union will not strike, if at all, for 3 years is taking chances. Assuming they honestly feel that way, those in responsibility are not justified in acting that way. Those in command of our forces at Pearl Harbor did not think the Japs would attack. They could feel that way, but they should yet have prepared for such attack.

The next surprise attack will probably be right in continental United States.

I cannot subscribe to the reasoning of some persons that the Soviet Union, if it feels it is stronger now or in the immediate future, is going to wait until we and our allies arrive at our maximum strength before striking. I do not have to be a military man to form, with confidence, that opinion.

As I view the situation, this very year, and particularly between July 1 and the end of the year, is the crucial period.

We had better be constantly on our guard; not relax our vigilance for one moment, and this particularly applies to our Army and Navy commanders. They should not for one moment forget Pearl Harbor. No matter what their personal views may be, as leaders of our forces, they should expect and always be on their guard against another sneak attack.

This observation of mine should not be necessary to any Army or Navy commander for him and his officers and men to be constantly on their guard, but the pain of Pearl Harbor and the trying years of World War II has subsided in the minds of many persons.

Anyone in command cannot afford to take a chance for even one moment.

The remainder of this year will be a most crucial period in this era of the world's history.

And what I have said also applies to the intelligence forces of our country.

When Stalin talks softly that is the time to be ever watchful and on our guard. It is also the time to increase our strength as rapidly as we can.

For, as I have said frequently, there is only one thing the Communist world respects, and that is what it fears—power greater than it possesses.

We must go forward as rapidly as possible in our present defense build-up, and this also applies to other peoples and other nations who want to be free of Communist domination.

In a report made by Charles E. Wilson on April 1, he said, in part:

While nobody can be sure of the military production rates in the Soviet Union, I personally believe that we are reducing the margin that exists between their quantity of production and ours.

Mark that language. He says:

I personally believe that we are reducing the margin which exists between their quantity of production and ours.

That statement is vague and uncertain. It is not one that instills confidence in us.

It would seem to me that through our intelligence and other means we should be able to find out with some fair degree of accuracy the approximate strength of the Soviet Union.

Furthermore, we are supposed to have a production capacity of 3 to 1, and with our allies, 4½ to 1 over the Soviet Union and its satellites.

Those responsible should unify their efforts and get the desired results as quickly as possible, and with special emphasis during the remainder of this year.

For if we are going to receive another sneak attack, it would seem to me, it will come when our potential enemy thinks, in comparison with them, our actual strength is the weakest. I cannot believe that if they intend to attack they

are going to wait until we whittle down sharply whatever advantage they think they may have over us.

It may be all right to talk about a theoretical date of greatest danger ahead for which preparations must be made, but it will be safer for our country if our actual production and over-all preparations are made long before that theoretical date is set.

While we must do all we can to assist other countries to resist Communist aggression, imperialism, and enslavement, we must also be sure that our defenses in continental United States are strong.

In conclusion, I thoroughly agree with the remarks made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] yesterday when he said that the best journey, the best road to peace, is for America to be strong—in the world of today the best insurance for safety, the best insurance for protection, and the best insurance for preservation.

While I like to read what some people say, that there be no war for 3 years—and I hope and pray that will be so—we have got to be prepared for any eventuality, and prepared now and prepared in the future. If we are short in the air, if we are short in military equipment, if we are short in the increase of our production, that increase should be made just as rapidly as possible, because each and every one of us loves our country, each and every one of us is determined to do everything that we can possibly do to preserve our country. By appropriation bills in the past and by this very appropriation bill we are giving to our Armed Forces and to those in the executive branches of the Government the power to produce. We expect them to do so.

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

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I do not quite know why the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] chose this particular moment to take the floor unless he thought that the House was beginning to exercise some measure of reason and was beginning to throw off the old mantle of fear with which the Truman administration and the majority leadership so often approaches these problems. Perhaps he thinks if he can throw a war scare and fear into us some more, we will abdicate our duties here, and we will cease to view this bill and this enormous appropriation with open eyes.

Perhaps we will continue to blindly follow the self-interested judgment of the professional soldiers, who are obviously interested in large forces. The larger the forces the better off they are. The more soldiers in the Army, the more sailors in the Navy, the more generals, and the more admirals, the more stars and the more brass hats there will be.

Now, as a matter of fact, for a long time, whenever we have had these appropriation bills involving the military, from the White House down to the very leadership on this floor, we have been treated to warmongering, terror, fear. If we do not pass this bill intact, with every dime in it, we are going to get a crack on the head from a foreign foe. Well, I think the time has come to toss aside that kindergarten stuff and get down to business. Rhetoric, however effective, however flowing, however appealing to the heart, has never been a very successful substitute for reason. If we do not approach our problems, the problems of our beloved United States in a troubled world, we shall lose the cold war and everything else.

I have just been handed a clipping by a very distinguished gentleman, Walter Lippmann, for whose judgment I have a great deal of respect, almost as much as that for my beloved friend from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack], who says that the Truman administration has been announcing the dawn of a new day too often, and catch this—

Threatening the end of the world whenever it needs more money.

Of course, that is what I am talking about. You have a choice here, Mr. Chairman, between the view of the gentleman from Massachusetts and another very distinguished American who has held high public office and who has certainly enjoyed the respect of this House, as to how we should deal with this particular bill and with our fiscal affairs this year. I am referring to former Ambassador Lewis W. Douglas, one-time Director of the Budget, Ambassador to Great Britain at the time the Marshall plan was first brought before this Congress and who certainly played an enormously influential part in bringing us to the support of the Marshall plan, who was Ambassador to Great Britain during the development of NATO, who played a very decisive part in the development, growth, and organization of NATO. Surely there is no man who is more sincerely interested in collective security, which means military strength in the United States as well as foreign aid. The same Lewis Douglas publicly approved a resolution of mine back in January that would have limited public spending to the income that we are expected to receive from tax revenues and that would have allowed not in excess of \$50,000,000,000 for military expenditures and all foreign aid in 1953. So it is perfectly obvious that that gentleman who is one of our leading figures in foreign affairs was not so concerned at that time about—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COUDERT. Certainly that gentleman indicated very clearly that he had finally come to recognize, as have many others with him, that the threat to the economy of the United States is quite

as great a menace to our security as any threat from foreign aggressors. Listen to him in his letter to me which was published at that time:

We should weigh carefully in the scales of prudence the dangers that face us from without and the dangers that inordinately heavy taxes, huge expenditures, controls, and restrictions on our relatively free economic society present to the American scheme of life. We are the last great free community on earth. If it should be unwittingly weakened from within, then it would be the more difficult to defend from attacks from without.

And then he goes on to speak of my resolution with approval.

Mr. Chairman, in this very bill we are contemplating an increase in military personnel of 220,000 men at a time when the NATO targets are being reduced, at a time when the Korean war has been in a state of at least quiescence. Notwithstanding that, we are asked to increase our uniform forces by 200,000 men with all that that costs.

Mr. Chairman, let us not yield to the psychology of fear, let us not close our eyes; let us keep our minds open and working and not let the generals and the admirals have any more money than we think they need, not only in the light of outside dangers, but in the light of American capacity to keep its free economy alive and the American Republic safe at home.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—and I do so only to ascertain what the program for today is—is it the intention to finish this bill today?

Mr. MAHON. I would say it is the will of the Committee that we have full and free debate on this \$46,000,000,000 bill. We want to finish it when the House is ready to finish it, and we want the House to be satisfied at the earliest possible moment. We want them to work their own will, so we cannot foresee the end, but I suspect that we will not finish today.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is the gentleman's best opinion and judgment that we will not finish it today.

Mr. MAHON. My best judgment is that we will not finish today.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, yesterday afternoon there was a serious attack made on the Air Force supply system. I do not think the attack was justified, but it was suggested at that time that there might be an amendment offered here on the floor of the House to do away with the Air Force supply system.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which has been suggested is bad.

It gives no recognition to a supply system which in the Air Force has operated successfully and efficiently for 35

years. Aside from the disruption it would cause in the present systems, it does not prove how any money would be saved for the taxpayer. Many people think that the Air Force established its own supply system when it became a separate military service under the National Security Act of 1947. On the contrary, the Air Force has had a most efficient system since 1917, when the first Air Supply Depot was established at Middletown, Pa. As what was then the Army Air Corps enlarged and expanded its operations, the Air Corps supply system became more complex. It began as a system for distributing the technical air supplies, such as airplane spares, spare parts, and other technical equipment, until now approximately 80 percent of all the items, common and technical, used by the Air Force are distributed through the Air Force supply system. Any system, in order to be most efficient, should be a 100-percent operation, rather than an 80-percent effort.

It has proved both wise and economical for the Air Force to operate its own distributive channels, rather than to attempt to supply itself from one of the other services. This system now includes 16 general or major depots within the United States, plus many other specialized depots and the vast complex of installations overseas. More than a million items are stocked and distributed through the system.

The development of this system over the years has not proceeded in opposition to the authorities of the Army and later the Secretary of Defense. We are led to believe by some that the system which the Air Force has operated over this long period of time has been achieved through some sort of connivance on the part of the Air Force and acquiescence by the other services. On the contrary, all of the supply activities have been in complete accord with national defense policies, including those laid down by the National Security Act.

The fact has never been accepted by some that the National Security Act did create a separate Air Force and, assuming that was the intent of Congress, it makes little sense to have a separate military service if it does not have its own logistical support. One of the basic requirements for any military organization is that those charged with supply and logistical support be subject to the service commanders. We should beware of a fourth service of supply and all its evils, under which the supply officials are, in fact, responsible to no one except higher public authorities. The task of one military service providing for its own supply needs is an extremely complex job of management. To establish a single supply organization similar to the British Ministry of Supply would be to more than triple the red tape and management problems of our present military organizations.

Despite its 35-year history, there is a widespread impression that the Air Force cannot efficiently supply itself. It has done a good job and, as time permits, will become more efficient. Presently the Air Force is handling more

than 80 percent of all the supplies it uses.

The extensive overseas operations of the Air Force system should be noted. In England, North Africa, Greenland, the Philippine Islands, and the Middle East, where Air Force activities are much larger than that of the other services, the Air Force performs all of the distribution functions for the other services. In Panama and Hawaii, the Air Force relies on the Army or the Navy. In Europe, it has been thought that the most efficient plan would be for the services to provide their own distribution support, and plans have been made accordingly.

We should remember that distribution by one service for another does not automatically provide any solution to the problems of management, and efficiency. The distributive arrangement for the various theaters and commands must be determined on the varying conditions existent in each of the localities.

In a very real sense, therefore, the Air Force is doing no more as a separate organization than it was doing as a corps of the Army. We see that even within the Army, it was more efficient for the Air Corps to have its own distribution channels, in view of the inherently different nature of Air Corps supply requirements. Even during the war, at many bases overseas, the so-called common items used by the soldier—shoes, shirts, and underwear—were distributed at the Air Corps bases. At the Air Corps depots there were Army Quartermaster Corps officers and others who would be on detached service from the various Army corps. These officers would supervise the distribution of supplies into Air Corps channels. In substance, it made little difference whether they were Army Quartermaster Corps or Air Corps supply officers.

Until it has been proven that a new proposal is better and more efficient than this long-established system, we should be wary of heeding pat solutions to our military supply problems.

I would now like to refer briefly to Air Force procurement practices. The Air Force has carried on procurementwise in substantially the same manner as existed prior to its establishment as a single service. By and large, the Air Force procures direct from manufacturers only those items which are peculiar to the Air Force basic mission responsibilities, such as complete airplanes, spares, and spare parts. Most of the other items are the subject of either single department procurement assignments, or just procurement. As examples of single service procurement, the Army Ordnance Corps procures all commercial-type technical and combat vehicles. The Navy procures solid fuels, such as coal and coke, for all three services, and the procurement of photographic equipment and supplies is assigned to the Air Force. There are literally hundreds of items which are the subject of single service procurement. The Army, for instance, actually clothes, feeds, and houses Air Force personnel. Under single-service procurement, individual clothing items and most types of food items are procured by the Army Quartermaster Corps, and the Corps of Engineers acts as the

real estate and construction agent for the Department of the Air Force.

I say, therefore, that, just as we can have a more efficient procurement system through the greatest degree of inter-departmental cooperation, so can we have a more efficient distribution system by each service performing its own supply functions. We should not attempt to disrupt in the name of economy a supply system which has been proven in both war and peace and substitute in its place a hasty proposal.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat bewildered. I sat here yesterday and I understood the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] to talk for 5 minutes, at least, condemning—and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] as well—the failure of the forces abroad to comply with what the Congress intended when it wrote the unification bill. That is that there should be one purchasing agent for common items. Now I will ask my colleague from Michigan—I do not see the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] here—was I mistaken about that?

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman is exactly correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Thank you. The gentleman was on the trip with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER]. Then I understood the gentleman over here today [Mr. BROOKS] to be suggesting that each one of these services, the Air Corps, should have its own supply system. Was I right? Is that what you were telling us?

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman will recall—

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS. If the gentleman will give me a chance to answer, I will.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If you cannot or do not care to answer it, by a yes or no, I will withdraw the question.

Mr. BROOKS. I will answer if the gentleman will listen.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Just forget it. I will read it tomorrow.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman does not want an answer, then?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No; if it is going to take you so long I do not want an answer. I decline to yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman can answer that; yes, sir.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I would like to comment on that question.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The answer is this, if the gentleman will listen.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, sir.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The Department of Defense has a directive out saying they are not supposed to set up a separate supply system, so it is contrary to their own orders.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is what I got from my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I just want the

gentleman to know that I am on the floor.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman is here now. Did I understand the gentleman yesterday, or was I correct in understanding, that the gentleman was maybe not complaining, maybe not criticizing, but just mentioning the fact that the armed services abroad were not unifying their purchasing system?

Mr. BONNER. Well, I saw the directive permitting the Air Force to set up their own supply system.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know there is a directive, but what of it? Are they unifying their purchasing system?

Mr. BONNER. Well, I do not think so.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman does not think so?

Mr. BONNER. No. The record does not show it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Everybody seems to have had a couple of minutes extra, so I would like to have a couple, so perhaps I will not have to use this preferential motion and ask for a vote to send the bill back to committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. LANTAFF. In June of 1951, the Air Force in the European theater was directed to proceed to turn over all supplies and technical services in all of the technical service fields, such as ordnance, engineering and chemical warfare service, quartermaster and other related services to the Army Air Force so that the turnover would be completed by July 1 of 1954.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. 1954?

Mr. LANTAFF. That is correct. When the Secretary of Defense found out that his orders had not been completely followed, in fact, that they had been specifically ignored, he did in March of this year, issue an order suspending any further turnover.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, Mr. Chairman, sufficient has been said, I think, by my colleagues to convey the idea that it does not make very much difference what Congress writes in the way of legislation—that the armed services and undoubtedly some of the other departments of Government go ahead in their own sweet way, and as long as there is money available, they spend it. That brings me to the conclusion that the only way to stop the spending of billions of dollars—the waste and unnecessary spending, is to vote against some of these appropriation bills and send them back to committee. I have tried on occasion to follow that course, but I seem to be rather lonesome because they always get millions and billions of dollars more than they can spend. They have gone ahead year after year to my personal knowledge for at least 15 years, and it has not made any difference at all, speaking generally, what we cut

here in the House. They have always had more money and I think the record will verify this statement—they have always had more money, never less, I repeat—billions more than they could spend—always. So what is the use of making cuts—reductions—which still leave the Armed Forces with more than they can spend? Why not cut it off by refraining to approve an appropriation bill until it reflects what is needed?

But, Mr. Chairman, what I really wanted to speak about was what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] was telling us. He spoke about Pearl Harbor. Apparently every time the administration scents a little danger of being defeated at a coming election, we have Pearl Harbor thrown at us. Just as though the Congress rather than the then administration was responsible for that disaster. Time and again I have heard the gentleman from Massachusetts ask how some of us here who voted against the draft—you remember there was a majority of only one or two votes in favor of it—how our consciences let us sleep at night. Mine never bothered me—not for one moment—not on that score—my votes all through that period were cast in an effort to keep us out of war.

If I have ever been worried about anything, it is about the apparent determination on the part of those in authority, as history now shows the administration was determined to get us into war—to keep us in war all the time, so that it would have an excuse to come to Congress to get a law prying more dollars out of the taxpayers' pockets, and at the same time sending men, a million or more, abroad to carry out a policy, the objective of which they have never told us to this day. Always it has been that way. The steady doctrine they have always preached was one of fear. Fear of Hitler, fear of Japan, now fear of Stalin.

Now there is another election coming on. Our real danger is from the wasters of dollars and men, the latter America's irreplaceable safeguard.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] did say one thing which I think is sound. He said we must fight communism abroad, but while fighting communism abroad, we must not ruin ourselves here at home. That was sound common sense advice. Our present foreign policy is the cause of this and similar bills.

But for more than 10 years here in Washington I have noticed this and the preceding administration giving encouragement and protection to well known Communists and followers of the Communists' line. Even today, even today, the left-wing writers and radio commentators who are trying to name the candidates of both parties are telling us that all those, or those at least who are doing the most effective work, who are trying to expose Communists are nothing but liars. They are still standing by Lattimore who recently lied five or six times before the Senate McCarran committee. They are still standing by him. When former Communists testified against Hiss and Lattimore it was the practice of certain columnists and radio

announcers to brand them as liars; that was easy. But what shall be said of this same group who today still, day after day, write and speak in an effort to support Lattimore, to excuse him, when Americans whose loyalty cannot be questioned tell us that as early as April of 1936 Lattimore was urging recognition of the Communist-controlled Mongolian Republic. What of this testimony of William C. Bullitt? If this administration would just, as has been so often suggested, prosecute some of these fellows who have lied and who have perjured themselves, and send them to jail, bills like this, calling for fifty billion would not be necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, have I consumed the additional 2 minutes, which I received?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; the time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, on the advice of the House whip the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDL] I ask unanimous consent for two more minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was somewhat disposed not to ask for these 2 minutes because I thought you might have assumed that because I was given the other 2 minutes that I was not going to make such a request, but you still are 1 minute to the good.

The majority leader, Mr. McCORMACK, further said we must have production. Yes—and our dollars are limited, so we must have production at the least possible cost, must we not? And yet this administration goes into—I would not dare say corrupt, would I—goes into a deal with Phil Murray to boost wages in the steel industry, which must have a wage increase, or they will not work, and that means an increase for organized workers all over the country. That is what it means. The steelworkers first, and then everyone else. If the Republicans did that, made that kind of a political deal, that, in the opinion of the New Deal and its tail of left wingers, would be a vicious, corrupt, political conspiracy to betray the country. But as long as the administration does it it is just a progressive, liberal movement to better the condition of the workers of the country. In reality it is a decree of Phil Murray that the conscripted men abroad—some of whom die each week, shall have weapons to fight if members of his union from whom he collects dues, get what he—not they—say should be paid. First the increase applies only to members of the CIO and the steelworkers. It gives them that special privilege at the expense of all others, that betterment at the expense of all taxpayers whose way of living is made more difficult because of it.

Then gradually the higher wage will sweep all over the country to everyone who works in organized industry, but giving nothing except hardship and higher taxes to all other people, the

old people, the self-employed, the farmer, the clerks, and those who are on annuities or pensions. They will pay the price. Of course, the hope on the part of the administration is that these gentlemen to whom it has surrendered and for whom it gets special benefits will vote the New Deal ticket next November—a corrupt purchase of political support. And in the end those who get this increase in wages will find it purchases them no more than if it were not given them. It will be but fools' gold.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to discuss the bill that is now before us from a somewhat different point of view than that which has heretofore been discussed.

I am a member of the Committee on the Economic Report, which has studied the recommendations of the Board of Economic Advisers, and has recently filed a unanimous report with respect to the financing of the Federal Government. That unanimous report contains a recommendation that the Congress this year balance its expenditures with its income, in order to avoid the danger of an inflationary gap; that is, the spending of more money than we take in.

Furthermore, that report recognizes that there is no chance of additional taxation this year, and that this balancing must be done within the framework of the existing tax system.

Mr. Chairman, the unfortunate but true fact is that Congress has lost control over the expenditures in our Government. Let me explain what I mean by that.

I have before me the Daily Treasury Statement issued every day by the Treasury, showing the various types of balances. The one before me is dated March 27, 1952. On the front page of that statement there is a little footnote. That footnote—which appears every single day in this statement—reads as follows:

The amounts to the credit of the disbursing officers and certain agencies today is \$97,027,028,364.02.

In other words, as of March 27, with only 3 months left in the present fiscal year, the agencies of the Government have \$97,000,000,000 still to disburse.

Now, you have been given certain notes with respect to the bill before you. I do not trust the figures in those notes, in the light of the figure I have quoted. We are spending at this moment at the rate of approximately \$5,000,000,000 a month. If you deduct \$15,000,000,000 from this Treasury figure, it will leave you \$82,000,000,000 of unexpended funds with which we will go into the next fiscal year. Eighty-two billion dollars, more than a full year's budget, of unexpended funds. Who has control of the greater part of those funds? It is the Military Establishment. We have made those appropriations, there is no denying that, but military determines the rate at which expenditures from those appropriations are going to be made.

We have completely lost control of the rate of expenditure, and it is the rate of expenditure, not the total which we are going to put into this bill or the next bill, which determines the inflationary impact of Federal spending on our entire economy. In other words, it is the military which is controlling our whole economy, because that rate of expenditure determines not only the amount that we expend but the amount of raw materials that we use up; it is that rate of expenditure that determines whether or not we need controls, the allocation of raw materials, and so on. And Congress has lost complete control of that by giving this tremendous spending power to the military without having in any way circumscribed it.

Let me just point out roughly what the figures are that the administration has given to us from the point of view of the over-all picture. The administration said that it expected to spend \$85,000,000,000 in the fiscal year 1953. That can be broken down here simply into four groups of spending. No. 1, service on the debt, \$6,000,000,000, roughly; I am just giving rough figures.

Veterans' expenditures, \$4,400,000,000, rough figures.

All expenditures, civilian departments of the Government put together, plus civil functions, \$9,900,000,000, making roughly \$20,000,000,000 in those categories that are outside the military category.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts may proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HERTER. That makes roughly \$20,000,000,000 out of this \$85,000,000,000 and leaves \$65,000,000,000 for military expenditures, atomic energy expenditures, and foreign aid, including the military expenditures for foreign aid.

That \$85,000,000,000 runs roughly \$14,000,000,000 more than we can expect to receive in taxes. The present estimates run about \$71,000,000,000—I think I am correct in that statement. More recent figures with the March 15 returns coming in indicate that that might possibly go to \$73,000,000,000. Just the same, there is a gap in the picture of roughly \$12,000,000,000 to \$15,000,000,000. However, there is another item of receipts in our trust funds, unemployment compensation, social security, and so on. It is expected that we will take in about \$4,000,000,000 more than we will pay out because of the stability of employment today; in other words, the inflationary gap as proposed by the administration is roughly somewhere between ten and fourteen or fifteen billions.

In other words, if we here in Congress are to recapture what we always thought we had but what has completely escaped us, namely, control over the fiscal affairs of the United States, we have got to recapture the rate of expenditure by some method or other.

I am advised that tomorrow an amendment will be offered, an amendment based largely on the resolution that was introduced by my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. COUDERT], but I am told that this amendment will be offered from the other side, and that it will, in effect, make it possible for us to recapture the rate of expenditure and stop this inflationary gap. I hope every Member of this body will vote for that. It has nothing to do with cutting down appropriations. Let us make this crystal clear, we are not talking about any appropriations; we are talking about how much shall be spent in any given fiscal year in order that we have a smooth flow within our economy and not have a sudden great expenditure controlled by the military, which can lead to very serious inflationary effects.

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

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. It should be pointed out that this accumulated stockpile will carry over into 1953 approximately \$82,000,000,000, I think the gentleman stated.

Mr. HERTER. That is about the amount I anticipate will be carried over.

Mr. GAVIN. At any rate, an accumulated stockpile.

Mr. HERTER. Correct.

Mr. GAVIN. Now, if you will cut the budget \$5,000,000,000 this year and bring it down to \$80,000,000,000 for the sake of argument, that would give us \$162,000,000,000 that is available for spending through this coming year. In fact, it could not be spent because the economy of the country is not geared to take that terrific load. So you would be carrying 75 or 80 billion dollars over into 1954, and still we go on.

Mr. HERTER. Except for this one thing: When you talk about a budget for a year it is not a budget at all. Only the administration can control that rate of expenditure. We have nothing to say about it the way things stand at the present time. There is not a single piece of legislation on the books that would prevent the entire \$97,000,000,000 that there is available now being spent tomorrow or in 1 day.

Mr. GAVIN. There will be available for 1953 \$162,000,000,000 to be spent?

Mr. HERTER. About \$10,000,000,000 less.

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

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. The very best example of what this kind of policy leads to is found today in the fact that the pay raise which we granted to the members of the armed services some years ago has been entirely nullified. Their present pay schedule, which was way above the other one, buys less than the other one did due to the inflationary spiral.

Mr. HERTER. I think every Member of this House will agree that we must gage our spending to what is possible in maintaining our economy. If we are going to indulge in inflation we make our defense infinitely more expensive. Not only that, but we are destroying our values. It is only in the last 2 years that the people have begun to worry

about the inflationary trend in this country, and they have a great deal to worry about.

I hope when the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] is brought before the Committee tomorrow that we can really show we have the capacity to recapture our own rate of spending.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I learned yesterday of the proposed amendment which would limit military spending during the next fiscal year. The proposed amendment is a very dangerous and unsound amendment, in my own judgment, yet on the surface I admit it appears quite attractive.

When we enter the next fiscal year on July 1 the Department of Defense will have \$57,000,000,000 of unexpended balances for the procurement of guided missiles, aircraft, ships, and things of that kind that have to be ordered frequently as much as 3 years in advance of delivery. There is no other way to do it. You cannot buy things like that over the counter, unfortunately. If you could buy them over the counter you might say: Here is ten, fifteen, or fifty billion dollars, go out and buy that much this year, but do not buy any more, wait until next year to buy more.

But you cannot do that in this sort of situation. In other words, we have been jumping up and down and pleading with industry to get us more airplanes, so that we will not be inferior in number to the MIG over the Korean battlefield. We want those planes, we pray for them, we have appropriated \$5,000,000,000 to assist industry in expediting production to get, faster than we are getting, those planes as well as other military equipment.

What we are trying to do is to get ready as soon as we can to strike a reasonably safe defense posture, shall I say? The effect of the proposed amendment is, in my opinion, utterly absurd, and I do not see how people could support it if they understand it. Suppose we do get fast production next year, more airplanes, more Sabre jets that will challenge the MIG in the skies over Korea, suppose we do get these guided missiles, ships and all of these things, I repeat, suppose we get those things, the Department would not be able to spend the money which we appropriated to pay for them if the expenditure went beyond a certain figure.

It is utterly ridiculous to cry for speed in the defense build-up and say, "No; do not pay for the stuff; do not get the stuff you are trying to get." That seems to be the objective. That is an unsound approach. It is utterly fantastic, if I may say so.

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

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

Mr. COUDERT. I am very much interested in the gentleman's observation. The military will have \$103,000,000,000 on the 1st of July, if all goes as the gentleman would like it to go. Would he be entirely satisfied and happy if the entire

\$103,000,000,000 was spent for planes and everything else?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman means if we bought all the planes and all the other equipment?

Mr. COUDERT. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. Well, if we acquired such preponderant military strength we could certainly write our ticket in the councils of the nations, because we would really be strong. But, it is utterly impossible to move that rapidly. Let us move as rapidly in getting those Sabre jets to match the Russian jets over there as we can. Let us speed up the program within the bounds of reason.

Mr. COUDERT. Does the gentleman completely ignore the fact that there are two sides to this question: The spending side, and then the economy of the United States? Is the gentleman prepared to let the military completely dominate American life?

Mr. MAHON. Well, I do not know of any part of American life that the military people are dictating. It seems to me that the security of this Nation is the thing that is of the greatest concern. The military people do not speak for me. I am concerned about getting this Nation in a position to defend itself against a greater war than we now have. This is not the program of the military; it is my program, it is your program; it is the program of the American people to become strong, and to get strong as rapidly as we can. You may call that the military or not, but I am speaking about the American people. We do have to think, of course, about the economic side as well as the military side.

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

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. There are two sides to this picture. One theory is that we are going too fast and the other theory is that we are going too slow. But by all means we must maintain our economic stability, and that is the reason we brought in a bill for \$46,000,000,000 rather than a larger sum.

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

Mr. MAHON. Please let me finish. The estimate is that during the fiscal year, which begins on July 1, we will spend for defense \$52,000,000,000.

Mr. COUDERT. The gentleman passes points that are so important and so controversial and so hurriedly that we cannot even discuss them. I think it would be appropriate if we could.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will permit me, we will spend during the fiscal year, which begins on July 1, \$52,000,000. What for? For these airplanes, tanks, guided missiles, and what not. But the gentleman from New York wants us to spend \$46,000,000,000 rather than \$52,000,000,000. He would say to industry, "You have that bomber already and you have to store it here; you

cannot deliver it and secure pay for it until the beginning of next year." The gentleman would say the same thing on other things. I say let us get these essential defense items as rapidly as we can.

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

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

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman feel that the reductions that the committee has made so far and the reductions that will be made in this bill will have no effect upon the spending program? Frankly, I could not agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. MAHON. It will have some effect on the spending program. All the money we are providing for airplanes in this bill will, generally speaking, not be spent in the next fiscal year. The money we appropriated last year and the year before for those airplanes will be spent in the next fiscal year.

Let me now yield again to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. I want to make sure we understand each other.

Mr. MAHON. I think we do.

Mr. COUDERT. The gentleman says there is a program for spending which the military has submitted. Does the gentleman deny that the military is entirely free to spend the entire \$100,000,000 if it wants to? Is there any legal limitation of any kind or character on its spending?

Mr. MAHON. There is no legal limitation. Congress has not written in any legal limitation. Congress has been appealing to the military, saying, "Why don't you get some planes over there in Korea? Why don't you build them faster? Why all this delay?" That is the attitude the Congress has been taking. We could rescind those funds but I think we want defense. The difference between the gentleman from New York and me is that I want to get the planes faster and he wants to slow down the program. I do not know who is right, because we do not know what the future holds.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I want to distinguish between appropriations and expenditures. How much money does the gentleman feel the Department of Defense will spend in the fiscal year 1953, actually spend?

Mr. MAHON. Officials say about \$52,000,000,000 of funds appropriated this year and during the last 2 or 3 years, mostly for long-lead-time items, will be spent in fiscal 1953.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. In other words, there is a total, in the gentleman's opinion, of approximately \$53,000,000,000 in expenditures for fiscal 1953?

Mr. MAHON. That is right, as compared to total expenditure during the current fiscal year of about forty, and as compared to an expenditure in the fiscal year before this one of about \$20,000,000.

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

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

Mr. LANHAM. I wonder if we are not all confused when we use the word "spending"? What does the gentleman mean by it? Does he mean what you actually pay for during the year or what you are obligated for?

Mr. MAHON. We mean what we pay for when we talk about spending. When we talk about obligating ourselves we mean what we contract for. We contract for many items 2 or 3 years before we get them, because you cannot buy these things over the counter.

Mr. LANHAM. It seems to me the gentlemen on the other side have been confusing obligating with spending. Can the gentleman tell us how much money is actually to be paid out during the coming fiscal year?

Mr. MAHON. I have just said about \$52,000,000,000; this year \$40,000,000,000; and last year \$20,000,000,000. That is spending.

Mr. LANHAM. That is actually to be paid out?

Mr. MAHON. That is spending.

When the amendment is voted on, those who want to expedite the defense program and get ready for trouble will vote against it. Those who want to slow it down will vote for it.

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

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

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman a few minutes ago said in answer to a question that if there were \$102,000,000,000 in appropriations available for military expenditures next year, even though it was contemplated that not more than say \$71,000,000,000 would be collected in taxes, leaving a \$31,000,000,000 deficit, the gentleman would be entirely willing in the interest of national defense to have the appropriations all spent. As I understand it, the only control Congress now has on the total of such spending is the debt limitation of \$275,000,000,000 which would prevent a further deficit of \$31,000,000,000. Would the gentleman be willing to waive that debt limitation in order that that expenditure could be made?

Mr. MAHON. I do not think I would. I think it will not be necessary to do so. It was said last year we would be in the red, but we were in the black by \$3,000,000,000. I do not concede at all that we will be in the red in the next fiscal year to the extent predicted.

We are all interested in a stable economy, but this approach of slowing down the defense program and making industry hold on hand and keep in the warehouse that material we order and want and need in our effort to modernize our services, just not allow them to deliver it because we cannot spend more than so much each year, is unsound. I hope the Members will not vote for any such unrealistic proposition.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not true that the only estimate we have about the rate of spending for next year is the estimate of expenditures, which does not constitute a promise or commitment or anything

except an estimate the gentleman's sub-committee has presented to us here?

Mr. MAHON. These estimates are generally about right as to the amount being spent. It was about right last year, it is about right this year, and I think it will be about right next year. However, we are impatient because we are not moving along as rapidly as we wanted to in acquiring these war goods, which we need to strengthen the Voice of America at this time of great world peril.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Just for the sake of accuracy, I think we are about 27.6 percent behind on deliveries this year, and that is why the deficit is not greater than it is.

Mr. MAHON. There is a stretching out of our production and deliveries, which will be good if war does not come soon, and which will be bad if war comes early.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is this not a material factor in the discussion, which the gentleman brought out that as long as industry can produce requirements upon the momentum of which they wish to appropriate funds and expend them, they will be there and available for that purpose.

Mr. MAHON. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. They have every assurance that they will get an increase of that production to the extent of some 22 percent in the coming year.

Mr. MAHON. Yes; and if you make industry hold on to those war goods, and do not let them get their money, and do not let them deliver the goods to our fighting forces, you are going to pay many hundreds of thousands of dollars and perhaps hundreds of millions of dollars more for the defense program, which is costing us enough as it is.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. LANTAFF. Just to straighten this matter out in my own mind; do I understand the gentleman correctly as having stated that the military estimated that they would be able to spend in the fiscal year 1953, \$52,000,000,000?

Mr. MAHON. The estimate of the Bureau of the Budget and fiscal officials is that the sum expended in 1953 for the Department of Defense will be the sum stated.

Mr. LANTAFF. Is it not true that that estimate was made in contemplation that the committee would cut \$4,000,000,000?

Mr. MAHON. I doubt that.

Mr. LANTAFF. But, in order to translate the cut made by the committee into actual dollars and cents, you would have to reduce by \$4,000,000,000 the \$52,000,000,000 estimated.

Mr. MAHON. No, the gentleman is quite decidedly in error because most of the funds appropriated for long lead-time items in this bill will not be spent next year anyway.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. RILEY. Is it not true that the rate of expenditure is measured by the ability of American industry to deliver goods which have been on order by the defense forces?

Mr. MAHON. That is right.

Mr. RILEY. And those goods had to be ordered several years in advance, and the whole thing, as far as expenditures are concerned, is resolved in the ability of American industry to fulfill their contracts?

Mr. MAHON. That is right, the people are jumping up and down saying, "We want more defense production, not less." Now, when we are about to get it, some people are jumping up and down because they do not seem to want what they have been saying they wanted.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. As far as jet airplanes are concerned, I understand that the situation is it takes 2 years to tool up in order to produce the first airplane, and therefore orders put in 2 years ago with a certain company, would just be beginning to come out of the line at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have before me a memorandum submitted by the Department of Defense, and it appears that of the funds that are supplied in this bill, something like \$24,000,000,000 or better than half would be for current procurement and operations. Now does anyone think or have any idea that the cuts that have been made in these items will not have to be reflected in the expenditures of the Armed Services? Let me project another thought, and it is something that I have been trying to do all throughout the debate yesterday and today to get across, and that is, that what deficiencies we have in our production and in the supply of military items to the Armed Services are not due to a lack of money to spend, but due to a lack of decision on the part of the Armed Services themselves, and these experimenters they have as well as the lack of efficiency in construction. Let them put a little more business into the operations. Let them put a little more decision into them. Let them cease to double up on things that ought not to be doubled up on, and we will get production and we would not have to spend such a tremendous sum of money to get results. I do not know how the Congress is ever going to get this financial situation on its feet, get it where we can force the armed services and the Administration to adopt sincere, effective, forceful business administration, unless we speak out and speak out boldly. Frankly, there is not any recourse left us to get results except such an amendment as has been proposed.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman said correctly that one of the main reasons for delay is lack of decision on the part of the military. Nothing can be done until they give orders to put into production a given model. But what the gentleman from South Carolina said is not so in most cases. He said that the rate of production is limited by the capacity of American industry. The fact is that hundreds of factories over our country were ordered to cease production of civilian goods and be ready to convert to the production of military items, but they have not been given the green light to start producing. Workers in such idle factories have been unemployed in the Detroit area for more than six months. Stockpiles of unused materials have built up until OPS is releasing them for civilian use. Orders have not come from the Pentagon to the factory to build a certain tank or plane or other item that is needed, that American industry should produce and could produce at an enormously increased rate if the Pentagon would just decide what it wants them to produce and sign a contract to start producing it.

Mr. TABER. But if you have contracts out and do not have the design of your plane ready to fit the design of the engine, and do not make decisions on such things, you have a great block of employees on the payroll doing nothing, and you get nowhere and the cost piles up and piles up beyond all endurance. That is the kind of thing that I want to see stopped, and I think every right-thinking Member of the House wants to see it stopped.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, of course, I agree with those who have talked about the great waste and the deficiencies that there are in the procurement and other practices. There is not any question but that a great deal of money can be saved if more efficiency is forced upon the armed services.

But by and large I think there is something much more important than that. It is this: The great waste, in my opinion, in the military is not so much in the procurement, wasteful as that is, but it is the waste of manpower that is characteristic of the services. I do not think there is anyone in the entire world, in government, business life, or any place else that is as guilty of the great waste of manpower as our armed services.

You can go to the Navy or the Army or the Air Force, or anywhere else, and you will find that same waste. We can talk all we want to about the great necessity of cutting down here and there and everywhere else, but, basically, every single expenditure that the military makes stems from the military personnel in the Armed Forces.

If this Congress wants to save some money on this budget, or any other budget, it is important that we begin examining into whether or not the military

has need of all the personnel it claims to need.

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

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield.

Mr. COUDERT. I am delighted to hear what the gentleman has just said, because I happen to be wholly in accord with him. Would he be disposed to support an amendment to this bill that would limit the size of the Military Establishment?

Mr. FURCOLO. That is the point I was coming to next. I discussed with the committee whether or not it might be advisable to offer an amendment directing the armed services to cut down on their personnel. It is a grave and a serious responsibility.

I believe very firmly that the military can get by with a great many fewer men than they have now, but I am also frank to say that I do not have the responsibility of running the military and guaranteeing the security of this Nation. It is the military that has that responsibility. That responsibility is upon the military. It is a grave one and if it is not handled properly it is fraught with great danger. I think the military should be forced to look into the possibility of making changes but I do not know whether, on the basis of evidence available to us at this moment we should force the military to cut personnel. If the military does not want to cut personnel, they may make the personnel reductions in the wrong places. Cutting personnel requires the willing co-operation of the military.

Back several weeks ago when the UMT bill was up I said on the floor of this House that the military could not ship overseas more than a million men in 6 months' time with every single means of transportation available to them. I said the military would verify my statement if anyone questioned its accuracy. I pointed out that General Collins has said that you could take a raw, untrained recruit and have him ready for combat in 6 months' time.

I do not say that is necessarily your or my viewpoint, but I do say that the military people said those are the basic facts.

We do know, however, that the military has more men than it can ship overseas. We also know that in World War II the military always had several times the number of men available for duty that it could use or, in fact, even transport. There was and is a waste of manpower.

At times we seek information that the military says is secret or is supposed to be security and be classified. Often, but not always, it is a joke. We all know that much information is not classified, and there is no security about it. However, for that reason I cannot quote too many figures even though I don't think it would do any harm if I did. What I do quote has been cleared.

Back during World War II, to take just one type of craft, a vessel known as an assault transport, the Navy maintained after the war was over that to run that ship they needed so many men. I think it was something like 350 men and 35 officers. They were certain that they needed those men, not for training, not

to be used for combat, not to build up a Navy, but simply because they had to have them just to run the ship. They seriously believed that they could not run such a ship unless they had 350 men and 35 or 40 officers, or roughly that number.

Do you know that that same type of ship or one very similar, at the present time is being run by the merchant marine or the Maritime Commission, and being run efficiently with something like 16 officers and 50 men? If the Navy were running that ship for the very same duty they would have probably 35 officers and 350 men. They would really believe that they could not do it with less than that number.

There might be some excuse for a large crew in time of war either for training, or to build up the Navy, or in case of casualties, and so on. Excess manpower then may be justified, even if actually the Navy could do just as efficient a job with less than that number. But when there is not a world war and when the spending of the military may bankrupt us, then we should look into this question of the utilization of manpower.

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

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. I would like to say to my good friend from Massachusetts and to the membership present that the gentleman addressing you from Massachusetts knows what he is speaking about. I know of the investigations that he has made and that he speaks as a result of study of the subject. I congratulate him for the good work he has done.

Mr. FURCOLO. I thank the gentleman and appreciate his kind words very much. I wish I deserved them.

I know very little about the Navy, but there is no question about this type of vessel I speak of, the assault transport. I served on one; that is one of the few vessels that I do know about. I have also talked with dozens and dozens of other officers who were in the same type of ship. Anyone who is in that service has had the same kind of experience.

I am willing to grant that during wartime they probably had to carry an excess of complement because of casualties. But I am talking about the complement they felt they had to have to run the ship. Yet we have this very same type of vessel efficiently operated with a far lesser number of men.

I know from my own experience that that ship can be run efficiently with a smaller number of men for the task to be done. In fact, the merchant marine proves it by doing it. They prove it, for the job is being done; and the Navy could do it with probably 15 or 20 officers and a hundred men at the most. There are

missions the Navy could accomplish with a ship manned by 15 officers and 75 men, but even there the Navy will use double that number. I am not talking now of tasks where a greater number is actually needed. I am not talking of cases where a ship is overmanned for training, for a build-up of the Navy, or for casualties, and so on. I am talking of a case where those reasons do not exist.

Let me illustrate. If any of you here have ever been on a trip to Panama on either the *Ancon*, the *Cristobal*, or the *Panama*, you can find out how many men they need to run that ship and whether or not it is run efficiently and does the job. They can run a ship like that and do it very well with probably 15 or 16 officers and about 107 men. And of the 107 men, about 70 of them are engaged in taking care of the passengers, such as deck stewards and people like that.

Do you know that if the Navy had one of those three ships transporting troops at the present time they would not have 15 officers and 40 men running the ship? They would have about 35 officers and 300 to 350 men. There is not any question about that.

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

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. In our committee we have been discussing that matter. Does the gentleman think the tables of organization of the services are fallacious or that they could be modified, that you could get a more realistic return with the number of people you have?

Mr. FURCOLO. May I say this, and it is not a new suggestion; I made the suggestion some time ago, probably 3 years ago: The ordinary practice of any congressional committee seeking to get information on the Army, the Navy, or anyone else, is to bring in the generals, the admirals, and high-ranking officers.

There is only one man who can give you a good idea about that, and it is the enlisted man and not the high-ranking officer.

We talk about the empire builders and the fact a man wants to have a good many men under him so he will have a good job and he can hold four stripes instead of two and a half. That is not any enlisted man. He does not want any empire. All he wants is to get out. If you can get the enlisted man's confidence and guarantee his security is going to be protected, the everyday enlisted man will tell you where the waste of manpower is. High-ranking officers can tell us things the enlisted man cannot. They can help us places where the enlisted man cannot. But not on the question of waste of manpower.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman has helped us wonderfully, but can he tell us how we can protect that man who would give us the information?

Mr. FURCOLO. I will tell you what I would do if I had the opportunity. I would love to be on a committee that

had the power to investigate the number of men needed on ships in the Navy. I would do exactly what I did in my own ship in the Navy when I was in it. I went through it, found out what each department needed, and why. I talked to some of the men. Later I had with me a man who was a passenger being returned to the States. He was a merchant marine captain. I said to him, "I have been through this ship. I have made a study. I have talked to the men and the officers. We have 350 men running the ship, including 35 officers."

My own opinion was that we could run the ship with 18 officers and probably 75 enlisted men. In order to protect myself, and to be absolutely sure and to allow myself a leeway, I determined that we could run the ship with a maximum of probably 20 officers and 125 men.

The merchant marine captain, who incidentally had been a graduate of Annapolis at one time, went through it with me. He did not know what my figures were. He came to the conclusion that the ship could be run efficiently if operated by the merchant marine with something like 12 officers and 50 men.

I will tell you of a ship at the present time, and if you have ever been down to Panama on it, and many of you have, the *Ancon*, you will find this is accurate. You can check on this.

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

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. PATTERSON. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Has he allowed for a difference between a merchant marine ship and a combat ship? A combat transport, in my estimation, needs net officers and various small boat officers, right on down the line, whereas a merchant marine ship would only need officers to handle a commercial cargo. How does the gentleman account for the difference?

Mr. FURCOLO. That is true. That is why I prefaced it by saying this: After World War II the Navy had a good many of these assault transports that were amphibious craft. During the war they had to have their crews and their men running the ships. They also had to have amphibious boat crews.

Mr. PATTERSON. The gentleman is talking strictly about peacetimes.

Mr. FURCOLO. No. I will tell you what I mean. In addition to that they had to have an excess of complement because of the possibility of casualties. After the war was over the official policy of the Navy at that time was to use only the number of men that they had to

have in order to run that ship efficiently, on what they called magic-carpet duty, transporting soldiers back home.

I looked into it to find out if they were intentionally keeping men for purposes other than just the duty of manning the ships. For example, to keep some of those men in readiness for training purposes, and what not.

I satisfied myself that they really and honestly were trying to run the ship on as few men as possible. In order to run it with as few men as possible the Navy felt that they had to have, my recollection is, 350 men and 35 officers.

That was not to man the ship for war; that was not to train them or have them in combat readiness, or anything of that kind. Whether we agree with them or not, that was called the official policy of running the ship with as few men as possible. I do not know whether that answers the gentleman's question or not.

Mr. PATTERSON. I just have in mind the gunnery officers or gun crew, the fellows who handle the small boats, ship-to-shore movement, the fellows who handle the winches aboard ship. They have to be supervised by either a petty officer or a commissioned officer.

Mr. FURCOLO. That is right. On the ship I happened to be on during the war, then they had an excess of complement, theoretically because of the possibility of casualties.

Mr. PATTERSON. Now the gentleman is agreeing with me.

Mr. FURCOLO. When the war was over the official policy was to get those people off, and only to keep as many men as they needed to transport them. But even then they had the ship manned by three times the number needed. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. PATTERSON. That is strictly peacetime operation after the war is over. I am talking about right now, about combat ships going to Korea.

Mr. FURCOLO. That is what I am talking about. The Navy felt and honestly believed that in peacetime, in order to run a ship and to carry soldiers back and forth, that they needed 35 or 40 officers and a crew of 350 men. They believed they could not run the ship without them, when the fact of the matter is, and it has been proven, because the merchant marine and the Maritime Commission have done it since, all they really needed was approximately 15 or 16 or 20 officers and maybe 75 or 125 men.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The soundness of the gentleman's argument is demonstrated here every day. There may be a war in Korea, but there is not any here in Washington. But it still takes two Waves and two Wacs to drive an admiral's or a general's car.

Mr. FURCOLO. In reply to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON], there is this point, too, that is in line with what I was saying: The Navy, as I understand it at the present time, has two assault transports that in wartime would take maybe 35 officers and 350 men. At the present time they have

two of those that are not manned for combat duty; they are not manned for amphibious duty. They have 23 officers and 273 men manning each ship for the duty that those 2 ships are on. If those 2 ships were being run by the merchant marine or the Maritime Commission they would actually have about 15 officers and 125 men; there is no question about that. It can be verified. And they would do as good a job and get it done. The Navy could do it, too.

Mr. PATTERSON. I know from experience that during peacetime battleships even cut down their complement.

Mr. FURCOLO. Oh, they cut down on the complement during peacetime; in fact, right now the complement of the APA's in the Atlantic are undoubtedly less than the APA's in the Pacific area, but that is not the point.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate on the bill before us this afternoon, and I think everyone who has spoken has made a very valuable contribution to the subject under discussion.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the chairman of the subcommittee, stated that the Congress had been screaming to the military for production. There is an old saying—put the oil where the squeak is. I hope that in my humble way I may be able to apply a little oil to that squeak, especially as to why we are not getting production.

We are all agreed that we are not getting production, but I doubt if there has been any serious attempt to get into the facts as to why we are not getting it. In my opinion, there are two fundamental reasons for this.

The first is programming. Let me illustrate in this way: In the district I have the honor to represent in Chicago we have the big Ford Motor Co. Aircraft Division. They spent millions and millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money. They took 18 months to tool up to build the gas engines for the B-36 planes. Then, after all that preparation and expenditure of money, and just as they had completed the tests on the first two engines and were ready to start mass production, the Air Force came along with a 75-percent cut-back of the program. That situation is going on every day in every department of the military.

The second reason we are not getting production is the constant changes that are being made in designs. I have no knowledge that it is deliberate sabotage, but will say I do not know of a more clever way of sabotaging our production program than to keep changing the designs on the various planes and tanks and other war matériel. I think the fact is pretty well borne out that, after we have spent months tooling up and getting the production line ready to where we will really get tanks and planes in mass

production, somebody sends down word to hold up while additional changes are being made. If you do not freeze production sometime, we will never get planes and tanks in sufficient quantity.

At this point I ask the distinguished and very able chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. MAHON] to what extent the subcommittee went to determine the lack of production from the planning and programing standpoint and also from the standpoint of the constant changing of design?

Mr. MAHON. The subcommittee gave considerable time to the discussion of the slow-down of our military production. Of course, we are going to take them off the hook if we adopt an amendment which would not permit them to spend enough money to buy what is produced. But actually I think we would all rather they would not produce in quantity an item such as aircraft that will not work in combat. It is true that the best aircraft, the ones that come off the assembly line now, have to be modified before they go into action. We have spent millions on research and development. They are learning new things. When to stop and freeze production is a pretty difficult thing to determine. It is true that they could build airplanes much faster, but they would be defective aircraft in many instances. There are a lot of things involved in electronics and other such things involved in the situation, as the gentleman well knows.

Mr. BUSBEY. With the experience we have had in airplane production, I do not see how there could be so many defective planes. We are supposed to spend \$52,000,000,000 for defense in fiscal 1953. It will make no difference if \$252,000,000,000 is appropriated, you will never get production unless something is done to correct the situation to obtain better programing and stop constant design changes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Contingencies*

For emergencies and extraordinary expenses arising in the Department of Defense, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of Defense and such expenses may be accounted for solely on his certificate that the expenditures were necessary for confidential military purposes, \$25,000,000: *Provided*, That a report of disbursements under this item of appropriation shall be made quarterly to the Appropriations Committees of the Congress.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, or any member of the subcommittee a few questions on some matters which have been disturbing me lately. I have been reading in the press about the tremendous waste, not in production, but in construction on Army bases in Greenland and on Army bases in North Africa, I would like to know what this committee has done to eliminate this tremendous waste which has been occurring, and I would like to know also just what

the answer to the story is. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. I would like to undertake in some way to answer that. Of course, this is not a military public-works bill. The public-works bill will come later. But, various committees of the Congress have conducted investigations of the waste in the North African bases of the Air Force and elsewhere. We have had hearings, and testimony appears in this Record about this waste. There has been waste—unpardonable waste—waste running into several millions of dollars. I believe a lieutenant colonel and a colonel have been transferred from the jobs which they held in North Africa. I say for the Record that it may be necessary for the Military Establishment to cut off heads much higher if we are to get efficiency in our military construction program. I say that the Chief of Engineers cannot escape some responsibility for these wasteful practices in North Africa and elsewhere. Of course, in construction where you are doing a rush job, trying to get ready because you think war is just around the corner, perhaps some waste is inevitable, and there is great extra cost because of overtime. Also civilian workers must be recruited and transported across the seas. But there is too much waste. We are doing everything we can. I think we are going to have to shock some people on a higher level than a colonel and a lieutenant colonel perhaps to get the efficiency we want.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee. But, my question is still not answered. This is not a civil works program. These jobs that the Army engineers are doing in Greenland and North Africa are part of the military security program of this country.

Mr. MAHON. That is right.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I say to the gentleman from Texas that I think your committee has the duty to inquire into this, and I do not think it is just a matter of losing a few million dollars. I think it goes far beyond that, if what I read in the press is in any way near the truth.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct. We are not talking about civil public works, we are talking about military public works, and military public works is not included in this bill. It will be included in a bill which will come later in the year. Then, we can explore these matters more fully in the House of Representatives. Certainly, we have tried to go into these matters—our committee as well as other committees of the Congress, and it is not a good picture. There has been much exaggeration, but nevertheless there has been a great deal of waste.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the chairman answer this question? Is it true that a certain lieutenant colonel's wife in North Africa went out of her way to have the distance between her house and her next neighbor's house extended to 65 feet at a cost of \$1,000,000?

Mr. MAHON. I do not know whether that is true or not. We have asked for all the facts, but if I were the Chief of Engineers I would find out, and I would do something about the matter. There has been unpardonably bad management and the United States engineers and the civilian contractors cannot escape responsibility.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the gentleman agree with me that the best way to handle these officers who have made mistakes, if they did make mistakes, is to remove them from their commands?

Mr. MAHON. It is a matter of better efficiency, the same thing we have been talking about all the time, and better management. We have a \$140,000,000,-000 asset in the entire Department of Defense. We do not have adequate management for such a large enterprise. It is very difficult for the people in the defense establishment to get the people they need. I say for the record that men who are not doing a creditable job should be replaced by people who will.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Why should there be any difficulty in getting the people they need when they have so many people working now? We hear so much talk about the civil service. Where do we find them concentrated—not in the old line organs and agencies of Government, but in the Defense Establishment, and I think it should be looked into. I would like to make this suggestion—I hope the Committee on Appropriations will see to it that a constant watchdog committee check is maintained on these installations that are going up all over the world so that we can be sure that the dollar being spent is being spent well, in the right way and for the right purpose.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is making a valuable contribution. It is necessary that we be alert to this danger of waste. While you cannot avoid some waste, it must be reduced to the minimum, and people have to have reason for their confidence in the Military Establishment. Better management will give them that respect.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

*NAVAL AVIATION AND MILITARY BALANCE*

Mr. Chairman, several times since the end of World War II, I have emphasized to the Members of Congress the necessity for powerful naval air forces. The security of our country depends just as much on naval aviation as it does on any other branch of the armed services. If you will go back and read the testimony of generals and admirals during the hearings on the unification of the armed services, you will observe their emphasis on the necessity for a balance of our armed strength if we were to achieve the maximum of national security. General Eisenhower, and the Air Force generals in particular, time after time stated that a balanced team was absolutely necessary.

Now let us take a quick look at this all-important balance and see just what has happened to it. I direct your attention to aviation—naval aviation and Air Force aviation. According to public information—it is not secret—the Air Force expects to have 143 air bases overseas and over 100 air bases in the United States by June 1953. This is a total of 243 air bases. These bases have been constructed at a cost of billions. To use these bases we have appropriated billions for airplanes and the Air Force has tripled in size. Now do not misunderstand me. I have not said, and will not say, this vast expansion of the Air Force was not necessary. I believe in air power. It is because of my confidence and belief in air power, both land-based and sea-based, that I now want to focus your attention on the sea-based air power of the United States. Sometimes we refer to it as carrier-based air power, and in the Navy it goes by the dignified title of naval aviation.

How many carriers have we constructed since World War II? None. How many billions have we spent on carriers since the war? None. How many carriers have we authorized? Just two. Remember the great carrier—*The United States*? Its keel was laid when the great economic financiers of the Government decided to sink it. Based on costs today, this blundering decision cost this country the price of a new completed carrier. At present there is one carrier under construction. If we are to maintain this balance the generals were telling us was so essential to American security, then instead of one carrier under construction we should be building at least 50. Even then the Air Force would overwhelmingly weigh down its end of the scales. Carriers need replacement just as much as air bases, but certainly not as often. Improvements in aviation affect carriers just as they do air bases. Carriers must be able to meet the necessities of the hour just as much as air bases.

#### FALSE ECONOMY

Now, is it not possible to be realistic? I think it is time we faced the facts and refrained from shouting economy in regard to our security when it is perfectly obvious there is no such thing as economy in insecurity or the lack of security. I want economy too. I think this Government has wasted billions of our national wealth. I want it stopped and it must be stopped and it will be stopped. In deep seriousness, however, I am compelled to say it is penny wise and pound foolish to carve off the flesh of our national security. If you must have a pound of flesh turn your attention to the billions and billions this country gives away annually to other nations and not to the bone and sinew of our military armament upon which the men who carry the fury and burden of battle must depend.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We must keep our determination directed and focused on our objective of invincible security and peace and not on ever-changing vistas of Joe Stalin. I remind the House that Joe Stalin does not scrap his national defense; Joe Stalin is increasing his national defense. In my opinion that is why Joe Stalin today is suggesting peace; he is thoroughly armed and he is thoroughly ready, and nothing would please him more than to have us weaken our national defense. You have authorized billions of dollars for the building of airways in foreign countries. I remind the House—and I know those of the Armed Services Committee agree with me—that it is vital for one reason of many to have the mobile carriers to take the place in case of attack, if the air bases in foreign countries are bombed. I cannot understand why the Armed Services Committee cut out the measly—I call it measly when it applies to our national security—the measly \$209,000,000 for another aircraft carrier. I hope an amendment will be offered to replace the carrier. If no one of the Armed Services Committee does, I shall.

Regardless of Stalin's gestures we know that a weak America means war and that a mighty America means peace.

In view of this determination of ours to make the fortress of freedom perfectly secure we must examine closely and factually the significance of the provisions in the bill under consideration in regard to the construction of another carrier. At the same time we must keep in mind this balance of the Armed Forces our generals insist is so important.

#### THE CARRIER "FORRESTAL" IS AUTHORIZED

One of the most important items for which the pending bill would appropriate the necessary funds is a second large carrier of not more than 60,000 tons displacement. The carrier contemplated would be similar to the carrier authorized last year by Public Law 3 of this Congress. When the late Admiral Sherman testified last year before committees of the Congress in support of that large carrier, he stated that the Navy wished to start one such ship with a view to requesting others when plans for the first had crystallized and the Navy was convinced that it had a workable and satisfactory ship. These plans have now crystallized and the ship is now known to be what is wanted and needed. The keel of this ship, which is to be named the *Forrestal*, is planned to be laid on July 14, 1952.

The record of carrier task force operations in World War II plus the current Korean conflict attests their indispensability in the discharge of basic naval missions. Never in the history of warfare has naval power attained such undisputed offensive capabilities as by the exploitation of naval air power. This has been achieved by an aggressive, orderly development of the best possible

ships, weapons, and aircraft. Modernization of ships has long been a Navy policy and since the year 1946 the Navy has kept pace with the advancement of aircraft of higher speeds, greater weights, and longer ranges by means of conversions. In other words, accomplishments to date have been by the most expeditious and most economical means possible. There is a limit, however, to modernization and today the Navy is faced with a situation whereby it can no longer improve its World War II aircraft carriers to the extent necessary for them to fully meet the needs of future operations. Stated otherwise, the Navy cannot use efficiently and properly a 1938 model carrier when the planes are of the 1955 or 1960 vintage, regardless of how much improvement is made in the carrier. There is at present one large carrier being built under the 1952 appropriation. Funds are now being sought for a second one with the assurance that this type of vessel must become our principal class of aircraft carrier in order that naval aviation may in the future carry out its necessary functions. The reasons why the Navy needs carriers of this size to accomplish its mission are important.

#### THE INCREASED WEIGHT OF AIRCRAFT

The weights of aircraft have been steadily progressing in an upward direction since the *Essex*-type carriers were laid down. The upward trend became even sharper with the introduction of jet aircraft which burn aviation fuel at a rate of over three times the normal reciprocating-engine rates. In order to get any range at all, it has been necessary to put more gasoline in each airplane. In order to carry this additional gasoline, the plane has become larger, thus increasing in weight. A look at airplane weights will show that, if the Navy is to continue the development of aircraft of higher performance at longer range in order to carry out its missions, the carriers must have stronger decks. This can be done in the *Forrestal* class, but otherwise the Navy will be forced to use inferior aircraft since the decks of existing carriers can no longer be improved, particularly the modern-type flight decks of the relatively numerous *Essex* type.

#### THE NEED FOR INCREASED FUEL CAPACITY DUE TO JET PROPULSION

The matter of aviation fuel is important since the introduction of jets has caused these fuel requirements to more than triple. The problem thus produced has been partially solved in conversion by means of fuel blending. This process of fuel blending involves mixing a high-octane gasoline with a low-flash-point type of kerosene which can be carried outside protected stowage. This resulting mixture of aviation fuel can be burned in jet engines. But for this solution of the problem it was necessary to utilize some black-oil stowage which determines the cruising radius of a ship and convert this stowage for carriage of the kerosene. This increased the amount of aviation fuel available but at the expense of cruising radius. Once again, however, the point has been reached where

this improvement is no longer efficient. The cruising radius of carriers has been reduced as low as possible, but by so doing only sufficient aviation fuel has been provided to account for aviation development during the next 2 or 3 years. After this, as jet-fuel consumption further increases, there will be nowhere further to go. The limit with the old ships will have been reached. There will be only one way of getting sufficient fuel and that will be through use of a new type of ship.

The new type of large carrier will have a greatly increased cruising radius. This should allow for future growth in aircraft and it cannot be accomplished by conversions.

#### THE NEED FOR MORE CATAULPTS FOR LAUNCHING MODERN FIGHTERS

All of the Navy's present carriers were designed for an era in which most planes were deck-launched. This permitted shorter intervals between planes than in catapult launchings. Also, up to very recently, air defense has been provided primarily by fighters aloft on 3-hour combat air patrol. In other words, there was a constant covey of defensive fighters always in the air. These fighters were supplemented by launching a smaller number of fighters, which had equal endurance, as enemy raids approached.

By 1954, however, because of the switch to jets, which require longer and longer decks for conventional take-offs, it is planned that catapults will be used for the launching of all fighter-type aircraft. These fighter-type aircraft will be jets which have less endurance. As it will be impossible to launch and recover continuously to maintain a constant air patrol, it will be necessary to rely primarily on the rapid launching of a large number of fast-climbing interceptors as enemy raids develop.

The *Forrestal*-type carrier will excel for operations of this type because of its four catapults. These four catapults would permit the launching of a greatly increased number of interceptors, which might mean the difference between victory or defeat in stopping a raid. In this connection, it is important to realize the impossibility of installing additional catapults on a ship designed for only two. This is true since there is not enough moment or weight compensation and far too little deck area in present carriers, though the installation is entirely feasible in carriers of the *Forrestal* type.

#### THE NEED FOR MORE AVIATION ORDNANCE STOWAGE SPACE

The requirements for aviation ordnance stowage space constitute an additional factor requiring a completely new carrier design. Existing carriers were designed for planes which would carry not over a ton of bombs or rockets. The present single attack-type plane can carry 4½ tons and is regularly carrying 3 tons in Korea today. As a result, present carriers, even when converted, have just barely enough space for the aircraft ordnance needed in 1952. While no further increase in tonnage per plane is anticipated, new weapons are being developed which will require more stow-

age space per ton. These items include atomic weapons, guided missiles, and a new series of conventional bombs with long streamlined shapes which do not stack as efficiently as the blunt end cylindrical types. All the ordnance and all the gasoline compete for space in the armored box of a modern carrier and in existing carriers this box is only so big. It cannot be increased. As a consequence, space is a controlling factor and a larger carrier is a necessity if the situation is to be improved. In the fully converted carriers now at sea, it is barely possible to make enough room for a minimum stock of air-to-air missiles, while in the new large carrier there will be ample room for three times this quantity. Also in the Navy's converted carriers there exists only the minimum amount of 20-millimeter ammunition or rockets over the projected 1954 needs.

In using the converted carriers it is necessary to displace bombs if aerial mines are to be used to mine submarine transit areas, whereas in the new carrier it will be possible because of the additional stowage space provided to carry sizable stocks of mines without displacing needed bombs.

#### THE INCREASED SIZE OF AIRCRAFT

Navy carriers normally operate approximately 100 aircraft each, depending of course on types and sizes. Approximately one-half of these aircraft are stowed in the hangar deck. As the hangar deck is not of sufficient size or the elevators which carry the planes from the flight deck to the hangar deck are not of sufficient capacity and size to accommodate these aircraft, roughly 50 percent of the aircraft complement will be lost. In other words, if the elevators cannot take the airplanes below and the hangar deck does not have sufficient height to accommodate the airplanes, naval aviation will be severely penalized. Up to the present time this has been avoided by means of folding tails, folding wings, kneeling airplanes, and so forth. All of these methods of making sure that the airplane will fit in the hangar deck have an effect upon the design of an aircraft. The major deficiency is hangar height. Since the *Essex* class, all Navy carriers have been built around a 17-foot 6-inch hangar deck. However, as supersonic operation approaches, it has been essential to increase the height of the vertical fin. To do this requires putting a fold in this fin also, thus adding weight to the airplane and again adversely affecting the design. In the new carrier the hangar deck height has been increased to 25 feet, which should permit avoiding most of the expedients which have prevented advancements in design. Another reason why the new type carrier is needed is the increase in aircraft landing speeds.

It appears fairly certain that if fighter performance is to increase, landing speeds must also increase. This becomes quite evident when it is realized that airports are becoming longer and longer to accommodate newer aircraft. While on carriers arresting gear is used, the space in which the aircraft must land will of necessity increase due to the higher landing speed. The new carrier provides for

this growth through increased length and width of the landing area. Furthermore, through the reduction of landing hazards, achieved by the removal of the island and topside obstructions, the pilot's problem has been eased tremendously. The Navy has made exhaustive studies to determine whether it would be possible to remove the islands on existing carriers and has found that the cost of this change would be prohibitive.

#### THE NEED FOR BETTER PROTECTION AGAINST TORPEDOES, BOMBS, AND OTHER WEAPONS

In the Navy's existing carriers, particularly those of the *Essex* type, there is a wooden flight deck which is most susceptible to topside damage. On the other hand, the *Midway* class of carriers has a steel flight deck which is considered by the Navy to provide ample protection from topside damage. This type of flight deck will be installed on the new carriers of the *Forrestal* class. To install a steel flight deck on conversions of *Essex* type carriers would be prohibitive both as to weight and as to cost.

As regards underwater damage, there will be installed on the *Forrestal* class carriers one additional protection which the Navy is very sure can repel any known torpedo.

In brief, the requirement for the large carriers is completely analogous to the problem of airfields—civilian and military. Modern aviation can no longer operate satisfactorily and safely from the airfields which were constructed a few years ago and which were then entirely adequate. As the older airfields have been stretched and improved, so have our present carriers been modernized through conversion. But as airfields reach a limit of elasticity, so is there a limit to the possibilities of carrier conversion. If in the near future naval aviation is to make full use of the weapons at its disposal in carrying out its assigned mission, adequate "airfields"—carriers of the *Forrestal* class—have become an imperative necessity.

The funds which the pending bill would provide for a carrier of this class have been requested by the Navy Department, and this request has been approved by the Secretary of Defense, by the Bureau of the Budget, and by the President. In the interest of the national defense I strongly urge that these funds be appropriated by the Congress. In the interest of military balance I cannot comprehend how you could fail to approve these funds. In the interest of naval air power and the complete control of the seas and the air above, I urge you to make these funds available. In the interest of a mighty America commanding a peaceful world, I plead with you to approve these funds. The appropriation of these funds will greatly strengthen the bulwark of security in a free world.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURDICK: On page 6, line 12, strike out the period, insert a colon and "Provided further, That where an appropriation of funds is made for a specific purpose in national defense no person shall be authorized or empowered to transfer

more than 10 percent of the specific funds for any other purpose in national defense."

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Have we reached that point in the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. We have.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I have an amendment on page 6, line 10.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair calls attention to the fact that this amendment is offered to page 6, line 2.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I beg the Chair's pardon; I thought the Clerk read line 12.

Mr. BURDICK. May I ask the gentleman if it is a similar amendment? If anybody wants this amendment they can have it.

The CHAIRMAN. So that the Members may understand, the Chair states that the gentleman has offered an amendment to page 6, line 2, and the gentleman from North Dakota is now recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, if the Congress really wants to take control of the money and keep it in their own control and follow out the purposes for which the appropriation was made, this amendment will do it.

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

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may again be read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

(The Clerk again read the amendment.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would be disturbed about that amendment because it would withdraw control of the Congress from the purse strings considerably. When Congress appropriates money under one of these items none of it can be transferred; but the gentleman by implication at least would let them transfer 10 percent. On a large item that might run into several million dollars. There is no transferability between these appropriation items now.

Mr. BURDICK. The gentleman from Texas is no more disturbed about that than I am. I know funds for specific purposes are being transferred right along and the gentleman's committee knows it.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman, I am afraid, is defeating the very purpose he is trying to achieve. Let us not have any transferability. We do not want any transferability.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly willing to have somebody strike it all out. I left 10 percent in there for emergency purposes, but you can strike it all out if you want to. I just got through listening to the gentleman and he said that where we are appropriating \$30,000,000 for a specific purpose and only \$6,000,000 have been used, the re-

mainder, the committee finds, has been transferred to some other purpose.

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman must have confused me with somebody else. What I am trying to say is that they do not have a 10-percent transferability now, but the gentleman would let them have that authority.

Mr. BURDICK. That statement was made this afternoon, by more than one of the supporters of this measure. They inquired where the other \$24,000,000 was and it was stated: "It was transferred to some other purpose."

I want to stop that and leave Congress in control of that fund. If you think 10 percent is too much of a leeway, take it all out. I am willing to do that. I do not think this amendment requires any argument.

Mr. MAHON. Why does not the gentleman just propose there be no transferability between the appropriation items in the bill, and I will have no objection to that.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I will modify it, if I may, right now to read:

No person shall be authorized to transfer any of the funds from one department to the other.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. It does not occur to me, unless it would be on the Democratic side, that any argument is necessary on the amendment; but if anyone thinks it is I will be glad to argue it. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] evidently thinks this amendment is unnecessary; but he also knows, or at least his committee does, that funds for specific purposes are being transferred to other purposes. What I want to do is to stop this practice.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURDICK: Page 6, line 2, strike out the period, insert a semicolon and the following: "and, *Provided further*, That where appropriation of funds is made for a specific purpose in the national defense, no person shall be authorized or empowered to transfer funds for any other purpose in the national defense."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Emergency fund*

For transfer by the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, to any appropriation for military functions under the Department of Defense available for research and development, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation to which transferred, \$40,000,000.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri: Page 6, line 10, strike out "\$40,000,000" and insert "\$20,000,000."

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this particular item might be com-

pletely stricken out of the bill. It is very difficult to run it down and find out what the details are; however, I can give the references to where this item appears in the various documents published by the committee.

The table on page 178, second volume of the hearings, Department of Defense, refers to it. On page 13 of the Explanatory Notes of this particular committee hearing is a discussion of the particular emergency fund. Further on page 5 of the committee hearings, top of the page, there is a table in which you will find the item.

Then finally, in volume 1 of the Department of Defense hearings, page 373, there is a little bit of discussion on this particular emergency fund. The gist of my amendment, of course, is to cut \$20,000,000 out of that fund, which would be a total cut of \$40,000,000 because the committee has already cut it \$20,000,000. The reason for it is this, and the reason I made the statement, that actually we could cut the entire amount out, is there is actually a balance of \$70,550,530 that still remains from last year and would be available. Actually, if the \$60,000,000 were appropriated it would be a total of \$130,000,000.

In reading the testimony on page 373, Mr. Garlock, the Deputy Comptroller for the Budget, is the only witness who testified in regard to this fund, and some of his testimony is particularly revealing and, I might state, an indication of all these hearings as far as giving us specific information about these items the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Department of Defense come in and ask us to spend money for.

On the bottom of page 374 the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] asked:

Do you think the \$60,000,000 you are asking for this year is a safe estimate, or more than you will actually require?

And Mr. Garlock answered:

I would not know.

On page 375 Mr. Garlock said, in answer to the question of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY]:

How much did I understand you to say you have spent already in the fiscal year?

Twelve million nine hundred and sixty-six thousand four hundred and seventy dollars.

Then the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY] said:

How much more will it take for the last 6 months?

Mind you, \$13,000,000 for the first 6 months. Mr. Garlock said:

The estimate is \$80,000,000.

Although they could only spend \$13,000,000 the first 6 months, the estimate is \$80,000,000 for the next 6 months. Then he said:

I really do not know because we make no effort to spend the \$90,000,000.

Then again, on the bottom of the page Mr. Garlock, in answer to another question about how much money might be turned back on this, said:

Unfortunately that does not happen to be the record. We have used it all.

He is the only witness who appears, and his testimony on details is practically worthless. Yet he makes the statement on page 374 that the unexpended amount of this particular fund would go back to the United States Treasury. Yet information furnished to the committee of unexpended funds that are available includes the carry-over sum of \$70,000,000.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I submit that the only way to treat this sort of a request is to cut it down. I submit the whole thing should be cut out, but from the standpoint of simply being a little safe, I am cutting it down only \$20,000,000.

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

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Would the gentleman mind telling us what the source of the information is that advised him that the unexpended portion does not revert to the Treasury?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes. Summary of amounts available for expenditure, and expenditures fiscal year 1953 estimate, which was furnished to the gentleman and the other gentlemen of the committee by the Defense Department, and you will find that item in there as \$70,000,000 unexpended balance.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am sorry, but the gentleman is looking at expenditures and obligations. He is not looking at that particular fund in that particular category.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I submit it is in there, and if the gentleman will look he will see it. At any rate, I again emphasize that only \$13,000,000 was spent in one 6-month period and it is obvious that they do not need \$40,000,000.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes, the time to be reserved for the committee.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the Members are not disturbed when they find that funds made available have not been spent, squandered, thrown away. We should be happy that only \$13,000,000,000 of the funds for the current fiscal year have been spent. It is fortunate that not all of the funds available have been spent, and we hope that they will not be expended. Apparently, officials have husbanded this fund with great jealousy.

I think that the cut already made was perhaps the most indefensible cut the Committee on Appropriations made in the entire military budget. The sum has already been reduced from \$60,000,000 to \$40,000,000.

What is the purpose of this money? It is all for research and development. If there is anything we have a phobia on, probably, it is our research and development. That is all this money is for. It is put in the Office of the Secretary of

Defense so he can transfer it to the Army or the Navy or the Air Force or the Marine Corps for research and development on something that gives special promise, like atomic artillery or some special thing of that sort. The Secretary through this fund can come in with additional help in an emergency and expedite development. Such a course might mean millions of lives and billions of dollars. If there is any money in this bill that can be defended, it is this. On a roll call vote I certainly would not want to be in the position of striking out funds that are so vital as these are here for research and development. We have been saying we are for research and development. If these funds are not spent during the current fiscal year on this program, they revert to the Treasury.

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

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

Mr. TABER. It would not show \$70,000,000 on the emergency fund if it had been transferred and not expended. It would show in the funds to which it was transferred on this sheet. That is the thing that appeals to me about it. It must be that this is an estimate that they would have \$70,000,000 left.

Mr. MAHON. I hope they have \$70,000,000 left. It will be in the Treasury and it will not be spent. But to let them have \$40,000,000 for this key purpose of placing it wherever it may be needed in any of the three services in research and development seems to be the smartest management that any portion of this bill contains. I cannot understand why we want to cut this sum. I am surprised the gentleman from Missouri has offered this amendment.

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

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

Mr. SHEPPARD. There was a certain amount, rather large, that was used out of this fund for the purpose of getting that special ammunition that was developed and used in Korea.

Mr. MAHON. That is right. It helped us very much in the Korean operations the year before last, and to some extent this year. If you are going to have fantastic weapons, this is one of the ways to get them.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Why is there not a little explanation in the hearings if all these statements are accurate, and why do you have a witness who knows so little about the subject on which he is testifying?

Mr. MAHON. He cannot tell in advance just what money may be required. Besides that, this was so simple and fundamental and elementary a matter, which has been developed and discussed in previous hearings, that it was more or less assumed by the committee.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. There are many other appropriations for research and development in this bill.

Mr. MAHON. That is right, but they are budgeted for particular projects.

This provides a special research and development fund.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. This is another cushion?

Mr. MAHON. This is another cushion, if you want to call it that, to use in an emergency in defense of this country. I hope the House will not be so near-sighted as to strike out these very vital sums. We have brought the sum way down 'n the committee. In my judgment it should have never been cut, anyway.

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

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

Mr. MEADER. I notice in the Air Force budget \$525,000,000 and in the Navy \$450,000,000.

Mr. MAHON. There is \$1,700,000,000 in this bill for research and development, and it is the best money in the bill.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri) there were—ayes 45, noes 50.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MAHON and Mr. CURTIS of Missouri.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 70, noes 58.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF PUBLIC INFORMATION  
For expenses necessary for the Office of Public Information, \$312,500.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUTTON: On page 6, line 11, strike out lines 11, 12, and 13.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, the reason I ask for this additional 5 minutes is to discuss another paragraph in this bill which I want to bring to the attention of the committee.

For the first few minutes I would like to refer to line 21 on page 6, which reads:

Title 3. Department of the Army: For pay, allowances, individual clothing, interest on deposits and permanent change of station travel, including transportation of dependents and household effects.

Mr. Chairman, this is something that has been bothering me for some time. We hear speeches on this floor about the grave condition in which we are today, the turmoil and strife throughout the world. We hear statements that we are in world war III now. We hear other statements that we are just about to get into world war III. It is rather disturbing to me to see the wives and children going overseas to Japan, Europe, and other places. I say that for this

reason: If we are in world war III or if we are fixing to go into world war III, why do we crucify these wives and children by sending them overseas? It is a great morale factor to the boys to have their families with them. That is one side of the question. But I would like to direct the attention of this committee to exactly what it is costing the taxpayers each year to send those families into those areas, so that you as a committee may investigate and find out whether we should send these families to foreign lands and take a chance on losing American citizens.

During World Wars I and II, dependents were not sent overseas. I can see why we would send dependents to Panama Canal or South America, the Hawaiian Islands, or some place like that, but it is debatable whether we should send them to Japan or Europe.

For your information, I would like to give you the cost that the Department of Defense admits it costs each year, to send dependents overseas together with their household effects. This cost does not include preparations necessary for their shipment.

For this purpose the Army each year spends \$11,566,000. The Navy and Marine Corps, jointly, spend \$21,940,039. The Air Corps spends \$18,429,773.

That makes a total appropriation for sending dependents overseas of \$51,935,812.

To send the household effects the Army spends each year \$31,205,880; the Marine Corps and Navy together spend \$14,151,289; and the Air Corps spends \$42,360,108, which makes a total for the household effects of dependents to go overseas \$87,717,277.

To send the dependents and household effects overseas costs the taxpayers of this country \$139,653,089, plus the additional expense of preparation.

I just wanted to put the question before the House whether it is good policy for us to continue to do that from a morale standpoint or whether we are sticking our neck out for those civilians we are sending abroad. I am not offering an amendment to stop the practice, but I am calling it to your attention for serious consideration.

Coming now to the amendment which I have offered, to delete \$312,000 for the Office of Public Information. Each and every member of the committee remembers that a few weeks ago the Washington newspapers carried stories about the scandal of the number of people in the Office of Public Information over at the Pentagon, and of the reporter who had such a job finding out how many people were employed there, and of our own colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], who was having trouble with officers of the Public Information Service, how they were evading him and circumventing him when he was seeking out waste in the Military Establishment.

Mr. Chairman, I have looked into this matter as well as I could for the time that I have had, and from the Department of Defense I found that there are in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Office of Secretary of Defense, 613 employees in the Office of Public Information.

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

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to my friend from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Is this public information or just sheer, downright propaganda?

Mr. SUTTON. Propaganda, I would say to the gentleman. This also includes, if I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, radio programs, with movie stars, and so forth on television at the taxpayers' expense.

Mr. SHORT. Newspapers and everything else.

Mr. SUTTON. Newspaper advertising; yes.

In the Military Establishment they have 1,653 personnel assigned to this informational service, and they are spending a very large sum of money. I call the attention of the committee to the fact that this \$312,500 is not all of the money involved, for the salary of these 1,653 employees in Public Information is \$9,807,856. That money is cached away in this appropriation bill. I asked one of the clerks, the chief clerk on the minority side of the committee, to point out where the appropriation was noted and he said this was so hidden in that you cannot find it; that is true, because I have looked through the bill myself and cannot find where that money is appropriated here.

I say this \$312,500 should be completely deleted, and then at the end of debate on this amendment, another amendment should be adopted limiting the funds that may be expended on public information. I intend to offer such an amendment.

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

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. DORN. I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, who is making a very great statement here both in regard to this Information Service and in the matter of dependents, that the one-hundred-and-thirty-million-odd dollars that he mentioned a moment ago for the transporting of dependents of service people overseas is only a beginning. If war started, these 50,000 dependents in Germany, I understand, become a first priority; their first duty would be to get them out of there. The roads over there would be clogged and military movement would be hamstrung just exactly like it was in France in 1940, and the cost of it then in lives and money we cannot even yet foretell.

I thank the gentleman for his fine statement.

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

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am wondering if the gentleman has taken cognizance of the fact that the original request for this requirement was \$1,250,000, and after thorough investigation it was cut 75 percent.

Mr. SUTTON. I realize that, and the committee realizes how useless this Office of Public Information was, or it would not have cut it so deeply.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We based our action on the testimony submitted.

Mr. SUTTON. The gentleman is well aware that this \$312,500 is not all that is to be expended by this Office. Will the gentleman support an amendment limiting the amount that can be spent for this Information Service?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The committee felt that the appropriation presently before the House was adequate, that they could get along very well through the exercise of good management practices.

Mr. SUTTON. I agree with the gentleman wholeheartedly. If the gentleman will offer an amendment that the Office of Public Information cannot expend more than \$312,500, I will withdraw my amendment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Let me say to the gentleman from Tennessee that we have already done that because we have said that that is all the money they are going to get in this bill.

Mr. SUTTON. But it is very plain that they are going to spend \$9,700,000 in salaries.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If the gentleman wants to cut out the entire public information of the entire service that is one thing; that can be reached in other sections of the bill, but if the gentleman wants to cut down the surplus he has referred to in this particular operation it can be done at this particular point.

Mr. SUTTON. That is the reason I say cut this part out and then put a limitation on the amount of money they can expend.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I cannot go along with the gentleman to take it all out because the evidence before the committee would not justify my supporting that. Very frankly, I thought when we took off 75 percent we had done a tough job on it, and the gentleman will agree on that.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for one additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This item was not even in this bill last year. There was no such appropriation in the bill last year.

Mr. SUTTON. To my knowledge there was not.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The gentleman is partially right and partially wrong. It was not in under the particular language here, but it was there in contributions from other sections of the services which contributed to this operation, including the Air Force and the others.

Mr. GROSS. It was not in the bill last year?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No. We changed it so we could take a single shot at the thing.

Mr. GROSS. This is something entirely new?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The money was in the bill, but we have control of it this year that we did not have before.

Mr. SUTTON. I hope my amendment will be agreed to because under this bill there is over \$11,000,000 to be expended for public information.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is a coincidence perhaps that many of us are thinking about the same thing. On the desk I had the same amendment that my good friend from Tennessee has just offered.

I want to bring out one very important fact and that is that this was not in the appropriation bill previously. It was placed there by the committee. Therefore, you are not taking away anything that they have not had previously. In other words, you are just putting them back to the status quo. You are taking away \$312,500, and they did not have that before.

Mr. Chairman, there is another thing we should consider about this matter. The gentlemen of the Appropriations Committee have told you that they have already reduced the amount for public information. I wish they would call this by its correct name. This is an amount for propaganda. After all, there is a certain amount of legitimate and effective information that is produced, but if you will read a portion of the hearings you will find they are paying \$45 a day for entertainers in the Department of Information, in the Army, the Air Force, the Engineers, and the Navy. That certainly is not the type of thing we are thinking about today.

After all, this is a separate unit. It is given to the Secretary of Defense. I would like to bring that out because it is important.

There is one other reason why this should be considered very carefully. I hope the pending amendment is agreed to because, after all, it is only a small amount. Three hundred and twelve thousand and five hundred dollars is such an insignificant amount when you are thinking in terms of billions of dollars; but if we can save a few hundreds of thousands of dollars here, it will not be very long perhaps until we can cut off something like a billion or the four or five billion dollars that have been referred to. Also this money that the gentleman mentioned, some 9 or 11 million dollars for information in the other three departments, is not the entire picture.

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

Mr. BEAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. In the Department of Defense alone they have one job which pays \$14,500, another which pays \$11,500; they have 613 civil employees in the Department of Defense alone the salaries of which amount to \$2,349,193.

Mr. BEAMER. In addition to that, there are many indirect costs. They will assign duties to some of the boys in the ranks. We have no record of that. The Armed Services Committee does not know what that cost is, either. It involves an assignment of work.

Mr. SUTTON. And in addition to the \$312,500 there are \$11,000,000 for the Office of Public Information.

Mr. BEAMER. I think we will both agree again that it is very definitely a matter of propaganda in many cases. I think we should remember back a few moments to the time the UMT bill was being considered, how much money and energy was spent by the three armed services trying to sell the idea of UMT to this country. I saw it on television and I heard it on radio, and I think you saw the same thing. I submit to you that it was propaganda and not information.

Mr. SUTTON. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Chairman, I would like to correct one statement that my friend from California made: It is public relations instead of information.

Mr. BEAMER. I do not know about that. You can call a rose by another name, but it still smells the same. I hope the amendment will pass.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to the expressions of doubts and confusion in regard to the appropriation bill now before us. I want to call the attention of the House to that part of my remarks on April 3, 1951, at which time I was opposing the Pentagon's proposed universal training bill and the centralized staff. That part of my remarks that I direct your attention to commence on page 3239, volume 97, part 3. I will not undertake to read them, nor will I ask to have them reincorporated here. I do want to point out, though, that in those remarks I included excerpts of statements from two studies made by the Army and the Pentagon relative to their own activities. Both studies, one by Col. S. L. A. Marshall, and the other by the well-known management relations staff of Cresap, McCormick & Paget, of New York and Chicago, in their reports, condemn the General Staff's centralization tactics from a military standpoint as well as from an economic standpoint. If you want something interesting in the light of this budget, read the excerpts which I incorporated, in which they recommended changes for the purpose of drawing the budget so that it could be understood not only by this Congress but by the Military Establishment. You will wonder why that proposed action has not been taken since 1949. The fact is that those studies and reports were so startling to those who do not desire those changes that they were marked "Confidential" and locked up.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

(Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted him to Mr. HÉBERT.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I think we should give a little consideration to part 3 of the committee hearings in connection with this bill. The gentleman

from Kansas (Mr. SCRIVNER), questioning General Devine, asked this question:

Mr. SCRIVNER. Why the increase of \$200,000 for increased radio programming cost? What kind of programs are we providing?

General DEVINE. We provide a certain number of radio programs primarily to overseas broadcasting stations. Some of these are originated and prepared in studios in Hollywood. The chief increase in cost is the salaries of actors. By an arrangement with the musicians' union and actors in Hollywood, we have in the past been able to get the services of those people for something like one-third of the current Hollywood rate. There was some advantage to the actors and musicians, but they have not liked the agreement, and gradually we have had to raise our price. The last agreement set the price at about \$45 per program hour for actors and musicians.

I wonder whether that includes \$45 an hour or more while these glamour boys and girls are being transported from one point to another to put on radio and television programs. Continuing his testimony, General Devine says:

Up to last year we were able to get them for about \$25. The current rate is much higher. It is about \$75. We felt their demands were just and, as a matter of fact, had little choice but to accept them.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Oh, you had another option; you could have cut them out?

General DEVINE. Yes, sir; that is always possible.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Of course, we hear about these people contributing their talents to the defense effort, and so forth, but this contribution does not sound like much of a contribution.

And it certainly does not.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will yield, this has to do with recruiting.

Mr. GROSS. That may be, but it is all part of the stupendous spending contained elsewhere in this bill, and it should be cut to the irreducible minimum. These so-called performers are paid \$75 an hour, when most of the people who watch television and listen to the radio programs think they are contributing their services.

Mr. SIKES. The committee did not allow that \$75 an hour.

Mr. GROSS. The testimony I have just read quotes General Devine as saying this:

Up to last year we were able to get them (actors) for about \$25 (an hour). The current rate is much higher. It is about \$75.

I find no limitation in the language of this bill which would prohibit any branch of the service from paying \$75 an hour or any other amount for the services of actors, singers, musicians, sports broadcasters, announcers, news commentators, or script writers who might be used in recruiting or for the purpose of disseminating alleged public information.

I also note in these hearings an inconclusive discussion as to whether Frankie Laine was paid \$3,000 or \$6,000 a week, apparently out of funds appropriated to the Military Establishment.

Altogether this is high-priced talent no matter whether it is for recruiting or for just plain propaganda purposes. It is a luxury the taxpayers cannot afford and I am cutting it out.

**The CHAIRMAN.** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT].

**Mr. HÉBERT.** Mr. Chairman, I want to address myself to the amendment offered to strike from the bill the \$312,500 for the Office of Public Information in the Department of Defense. I rise in opposition to that amendment. I do not think anybody who is familiar with my own activities in this House and particularly familiar with the activities of the committee I am privileged to head, the Subcommittee on Armed Services, can question for 1 minute my attitude toward propagandists and press agency in the Government, and my attitude particularly toward what I refer to as the "Potomac pitchmen" across the river in the Pentagon.

This is a problem that needs a great deal of examination, but it needs an examination with a realistic approach. I believe the whole matter should be gone into and thoroughly investigated and extensively explored, and my Subcommittee on Armed Services is prepared to do that within the next several weeks.

We are in the position of having a very sick patient on our hands. The Public Information Service of the Department of Defense is a very sick patient, in fact, in my opinion, there is every symptom of malignancy, but there is no cure for the patient by taking a cleaver and chopping his neck off. I do not think that a very realistic approach at all.

I think the manner in which the Appropriations Committee has gone about this problem is the proper approach. They have reduced in the particular instance the Department of Public Defense Information 75 percent of the appropriation and pin-pointed the amount allowed in order that they can keep their fingers on the pulse of the situation while this very sick patient is being treated. In the other fields of public information, in the Army, Navy, and Air Force, they have reduced it 50 percent.

There is a great deal of difference between a public information officer and a public relations officer and a press agent or a propagandist. There is a definite need for public information officers and public information personnel within our Defense Department. It facilitates matters, it expedites the handling of news in a legitimate and orderly manner. What I object to is press agency and propaganda in Government. But while those sharing that objection voice themselves, do not let us lose sight of the very necessary function of the legitimate public information officer.

I certainly urge upon the committee that it reject this amendment, except this minimum amount of money which is just a going function for the Department of Public Information in the Pentagon, and allow the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee the opportunity to go into this whole matter and explore it fully and survey it completely, and develop the proper answer in an orderly manner. But I urge you, do not go helter skelter today just throwing a meat cleaver hither, thither, and yon, thus removing all hope of ever restoring

health to a very sick patient, which needs treatment from understanding hands.

The manner in which the Public Information Office in the Defense Department has been directed leaves much to be desired. At times its direction has been in fields which should have never been invaded. Propaganda has been spread with little regard to its legitimate function. In my opinion much of the unpleasantness which now exists between some congressional committees and the Pentagon is the direct result of the inadequateness, ineptness, and lack of ability to understand the problem at hand on the part of the director.

Complaints about the manner in which the Department of Defense information office functions have been multiple. There is much going on, or perhaps not going on, which does not readily meet the eye. I know all this. I know what a farce the Defense Public Information Office is at the present time. I know of the abuses being practiced and of the overstaffed offices where loafing is the order of the day.

I readily admit all of this, but at the same time I insist that this amendment is not the way to correct these evils. We simply cannot just blow out the candle. We must keep a spark burning with which to rekindle the fire at the proper time. I assure you that my committee will do everything in its power to clean up the entire mess, but allow us the privilege of doing it in an orderly and constructive manner and not by means of a sudden death as here proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee.

**Mr. GROSS.** This item was not in last year's bill. We are not, in fact, using a meat ax on them.

**Mr. MAHON.** This item was in the bill last year, and was three or four times as much as is in the bill this year. It was in the bill in a different form last year through contributions from the Army, Navy, and Air Force to the Office of the Secretary of Defense to set this up. We changed the manner of putting it in the bill this year over last year, in order to pinpoint it and know exactly where all the money was. We cut them down 75 percent. There must be some kind of public information for the 150,000,000 Americans who are entitled to legitimate information so I think we ought to clarify the situation.

**Mr. BEAMER.** Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

**Mr. HÉBERT.** I yield.

**Mr. BEAMER.** I would like to know, then, if they succeeded very well without this last year, why is it so essential this year? This is simply a new item and, as the chairman of the subcommittee indicates, in previous years it was not in the bill.

**Mr. MAHON.** They had the money last year. They had four times more money. They had the office, they had the people, they had the directive. The gentleman just fails to understand.

**Mr. BEAMER.** I do not gather that from reading the report.

**Mr. MAHON.** The gentleman just does not understand the report.

**Mr. MEADER.** I understand it. When I read the report and it says there was nothing there, it means nothing.

**The CHAIRMAN.** The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

The amendment was rejected.

**Mr. CRAWFORD.** Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to add just a few comments to the debate earlier in the afternoon. I have enjoyed this debate tremendously because I feel I have some supporters and friends who think somewhat like I do. On August 9, 1951, when the \$56,000,000,000 military bill was before the House, I referred to the statements made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] on the bill then before us, and based on what those three gentlemen had said, I said the following:

I am just about convinced that the Congress of the United States has substantially lost control of the affairs of this country. When men of their type are forced to come into this well and tell us they are unable to get information from the military administrators, and that detailed information is not forthcoming or that satisfactory answers to questions are not available, that is something for us to be concerned about.

That is the debate here this afternoon. I was alone at that time. I was severely criticized by the newspapers of the country for making such an observation last August 1951. Now, it is the story before us. In the same debate on that bill, I raised the question with the gentleman as to how fast—that is, how many billions of dollars per month—they intended to spend of the \$56,000,000,000, because I knew that the rate of spending would determine the tempo of industry in this country, and the disposition of such funds as the Treasury might raise.

A few weeks ago I sat in on a conference with 35 of our large industrialists and I expect to meet with them again soon. They came to the conclusion that under no circumstances could the Treasury possibly put over the production line in excess of \$4,000,000,000 of military orders per month with the equipment we have in this country at the present time. Now, take that \$4,000,000,000 or \$48,000,000 per annum, and compare it with what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] said with respect to the \$52,000,000 per year; they are ticking along right together. There are reasons for many of these things. The third proposition I raised last August was the question of obsolescence, if you went ahead and built this equipment more quickly. Mr. MAHON, the gentleman from Texas, stated a while ago that we do not want equipment which will not work in combat. That has to do with obsolescence, and there are plenty of reasons why the military administrators are not furnishing the specifications for this equipment to the production managers of this country. There are many men in the military

who do not want this equipment yet because they are not too sure that we are going to use it. One other point is this question of the steel strike, which is now before us. Suppose this strike goes into effect, and the President backs up what the unions have said? What does that do? That serves notice on every industrial enterprise in this country that the United States Government, insofar as the present administration is concerned, has adopted a policy that profits shall be paid out in wages before arriving at taxable income. What does that do? That serves notice on the people of this country that the revenues of this country are to tremendously drop when that formula goes into operation. Then, if permit is granted to raise the price of steel to \$12 a ton, what do you think that does to this budget we are now considering? Talk about having control of our affairs. I propose to support the Coudert amendment as I have right along. You have heard me stand on this floor time and again and say that I would gladly support a \$14,000,000,000 cut in this over-all budget; that I would take care of my situation after we cut \$14,000,000,000 off. The Coudert amendment will still be in the right direction, but it does not necessarily do the job. I hope we can adopt it, and I shall certainly support it. I wish I had had a chance to support it a year ago so as to get a little sense into this program.

I have raised this question because I am not at all content with what is likely to come out of this steel strike.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Court of Military Appeals, \$250,000.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows.

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: Page 6, after line 16, insert a new paragraph:

"No part of any appropriation in this act shall be used to pay rent on space to be utilized for recruiting purposes; and no part of any appropriation in this act may be used for pay and allowances of military personnel assigned to recruiting duty in excess of 25 percent of the amount expended for such purpose during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I do not think this amendment properly comes at this point in the bill. I make the point of order against the amendment for that reason.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri desire to be heard?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I present this amendment at this point in the bill for several reasons. I know it is customary for such amendments to be considered at the conclusion of the bill. However, the point of order that has been raised cannot be supported

because the amendment does not restrict or prevent any other appropriation from being made. It simply states that no part of the appropriation to be made should be paid for rent. So that would not have any effect on any appropriation that we would make for over-all recruiting.

It also limits the amount of money which can be spent for recruiting purposes, and is a per centum of what was spent in the last year, and therefore would not have any effect on the other appropriations in this bill.

I am offering it at this point because it is in order and could apply to the entire bill, and I think it is a matter of policy which ought to be discussed at this time. For that reason I think the point of order should be overruled.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FORAND). The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] offers an amendment to the bill now under consideration, H. R. 7391. The amendment is offered at page 6, following the language at the end of title 2 of the bill. Since it relates to the entire bill, the Chair would suggest that the gentleman withhold the amendment until later.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take these few minutes not for the purpose of any quarrel with the Appropriations Committee. As a matter of fact, they have my deepest sympathy. They have tried as best they could to perform an impossible job. There is simply not any way for these gentlemen, and I think the House is now beginning to realize it, to handle a \$46,000,000,000 bill and inquire into every agency, branch, and department of the Armed Forces. Certainly they were not to blame for that situation; we are. We are cutting off money at times here when probably we are not quite sure of our position. I think, as a matter of fact, we had better take \$100,000 of this money we are cutting off and properly staff this committee and give the staff the authority to go into these figures before they come to the floor. I make that statement very sincerely and in all fairness to the committee. They of necessity must listen to the officers who come over for the specific purpose of justifying the appropriation, and then the committee has neither the staff nor the time to inquire into the accuracy of those statements. So again I say they have my sympathy.

Here is one matter that I want to bring to the attention of the House at this time, and that is the activities of the various governmental departments, and at this time especially the Department of Defense in the field of education. About a year and a half ago I decided to see if I could not find out something about the educational operations being carried on by the many, many governmental departments. After about a year and a half with a very fine research staff I found that in 1950 the Federal Government was spending in the field of education about \$4,000,000,000; it is probably more now. It might be interesting right at this point to say that the entire public school system of the entire ele-

mentary, grade, and high schools cost only \$4,600,000,000. That gives you some idea of how we have permitted the Federal Government's drift into the field of education.

Mr. BAILEY. Is it not true that the major part of that expenditure was to cover the GI-training program under the GI bill of rights.

Mr. BARDEN. Certainly; about 80 percent, I may say to the gentleman. But that still does not change the picture one iota; it simply explains up to that extent. That is to say, we know where it went but not how it was spent. Here is what we found: In the Department of Defense we found they reported expenditures in the various type schools approximately \$270,000,000—let me say right at this point that if there is anything in the world I think is unanimously objectionable to the American people it is that the Federal Government should have anything to do with the operating and the formation of policy and direction, and so forth, of our school system. In America we do not want that, yet may I say that these schools that are now being operated in France, Germany, and elsewhere around the world are being operated by the Armed Forces; their curriculum is being established, the Armed Forces say what courses they shall teach, how they shall be operated, the type of teachers that shall be employed, and the amount of salaries that shall be paid. Now, for the first time since this Government has been operating, has there been a thorough study of the Federal Government's activities in the field of education.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, in following up these appropriations, they accounted to us for approximately \$270,000,000 in various schools. When they reached that point they then gave me this statement, and here is the letter from the Department of Defense. I wish you would pay particular attention to the following paragraph:

It has not been possible to provide meaningful figures in some reports concerning obligations. Estimates were made, when possible, but the nature of some of the Army educational and training activities is such that even approximate estimates are not possible. At Army service schools, for example, the only available information concerns amounts obligated under "Army training" which cannot be furnished as representing the total cost of operating the schools since they do not include amounts required to furnish standard supplies and equipment issued through normal supply channels, such as travel in connection with the schools or numerous expenses provided for in other cost categories. In this same connection, it should be noted that the pay of personnel participating in Army educational programs is paid from other appropriations, and consequently is not included in obligations shown for educational activities.

Now, after showing specifically the expenditure of \$270,000,000, and quoting that paragraph, it could mean either \$270,000,000 more or a billion more because it covers the whole field.

I picked up the report and the hearings and I find this kind of explanation right down to minute detail. It is a very unusual thing that before the ink gets dry on what they have written me they are able to give a very detailed statement here. I wish you would listen to this one paragraph:

Trade school training in technical skills for reservists on an inactive duty status.

Instruction in such subjects as metalworking, welding, and instrument repair will be offered to reservists who have indicated a desire to improve their skills in those fields. One hundred and fifty thousand dollars, the same amount as that approved for fiscal year 1952, will be required to offer this training to 5,000 individuals at an average cost of \$30 per trainee.

What kind of a sensible vocational training program can you put on for \$30 per trainee? It is utterly absurd, and you might just as well throw that \$150,000 into the gutter; it would be just as sensible as using it in this way.

I have a subcommittee in operation of which I am chairman, and I expect to call in every department of the Government to not only justify these things but let us know what is going on. Why, I called the State Department, and I have gone over the picture with them. The Army will set up a high school in some town in Germany or France. Do you think they will let the State Department children go to it? No. The State Department fathers and mothers must pay to the Army approximately \$250 in tuition in order to go to the Army schools set up to operate as a high school comparable to the high schools in this country. It does not make sense. The State Department says there should be some school available to them, and I agree. If you are going to make schools available to the Marine Corps, the Navy, and Army, why not let the State Department or any other Government children go to the schools there, being operated by the Government? Yet the Army makes them pay \$250 in tuition in order for that child to go. There is that kind of a foolish set-up going on. I think the Defense Department should have made this known to the committee. But apparently they are not interested in saving the United States taxpayers' money. They would let us set up another system of schools for the State Department and another for any other branch of Government that might be operating in that same place. Duplication and waste seems to be the order of the day.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Does the gentleman mean to tell me, in relation to these schools being established both at home and abroad by the military, that we turn over to the military these lump sums for educational purposes, and they themselves determine the facilities, the supplies, the curriculum, the teaching personnel and all without any regulation or check by the Congress of the United States; that we grant them blanket authority?

Mr. BARDEN. I regret to state that that is the situation. I do not know that they are so much to blame. This is not so much a blame upon them as it is upon ourselves. That is just putting it frankly. Schools are necessary and we left it to them. They should have some place to file a report.

Mr. SHORT. I quite agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BARDEN. Certainly there ought to be some coordination between the Armed Forces or any other department that is operating in the school field in the Office of Education, or some place. Now here is exactly what my objective is in setting up the committee to hold hearings and making inquiry into this problem, and that is to require every single governmental agency or department that spends one dollar for education to file a detailed statement of its program, its cost, and the results obtained, with some central office, and I think the Office of Education is the proper department. Then any committee dealing with the appropriations for any department could call up the Office of Education and say, "Let us have this report with their comment." Then I think we could reach an intelligent conclusion on a matter of this kind.

Mr. SHORT. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me it is not only good gospel, but sound psychology that as a man thinketh, so is he, and it is true also with a nation. Ideas are the most powerful weapons in this world, and I want to congratulate the gentleman from North Carolina, who is chairman of the Committee on Education, for the interest that he has taken in this problem and for setting up this committee to invite—not so much to investigate—but to invite all who are interested to appear before the committee and give us the benefit of their wisdom. It certainly needs guidance.

Mr. BARDEN. I thank the gentleman. I am not inclined to be an investigator and I am not after anyone, so to speak, but it did not take me so very long after being chairman of the Committee on Education to find that that particular field had just been ignored.

Mr. SHORT. That is right.

Mr. BARDEN. Fortunately, I do think we have an excellent administrator in the Office of Education, and I am as hard to please when it comes to administrators as anyone. I know he does not like to involve himself in any of the inside State matters, and it is obnoxious to him to even suggest that he do so. He has fired some men down there that did involve themselves and he is prob-

ably going to fire some more, I think, that have been tinkering around in the field of education. Recently he made this statement before a congressional committee and I would like to quote it:

Dr. McGRAH. We are very sensitive in the Office of Education about the use of any such word as "veto power" or domination or anything like that, and I will tell you why, Mr. Congressman.

We subscribe to the States' rights idea with regard to education. I think the American public, by and large, subscribes to that.

With that set-up I do think there is a field here where we can be of some help to the Committee on Appropriations, and I would not dare ask either one of the gentlemen to give me detailed information on the subject of schools, because they have just run them as they please. They have set up their own curriculum, and if they want to set up their own propaganda, that is all right, too; they do that, but the general is the head man. Some are good but some not quite so good, but certainly it is not very tasty to the American people to have as much money as is being spent in the field of education to be spent under the direct supervision and control of any particular Federal agency, bureau or administrator, and that is what we are facing.

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

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is it or is it not a fact that about a year ago the Congress placed the jurisdiction of this operation within the Office of Education, and that they are now directing the curriculum and the modus operandi on the continental United States? I am not speaking of outside the continental United States.

Mr. BARDEN. No. As a matter of fact, I expect the Commissioner of Education would resist even the authority of direction. I think his field is properly the field of consulting, and so forth. Recently they have started conferring with them, since the Quattlebaum reports came out. Probably the gentleman is speaking of Public Laws 815 and 874, which dealt with schools on bases, among other defense areas. But even with these schools the Office of Education has for all practical purposes passed all management and control over to the local authorities. Might I also say there is no trouble with the on-base public schools in the United States. We know about them. I am really addressing myself to the schools that are not covered by Public Laws 815 and 874.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as we are considering H. R. 7391, a bill providing appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies, I would like to submit some observations. The physical affairs of our country are in a very precarious position. We are facing an all-time high of peacetime appropriations and possible deficit.

During the time I have been privileged to serve in public office, I have endeavored to honestly portray to the people how much money is spent and

for what purpose. I am not in accord with the amount of spending as determined in the various appropriation bills. This spending, whatever the amount, must be paid for by the tax dollars of our people. In my judgment, the Congress has been appropriating and spending far too much money and I have been constantly endeavoring to help reduce every appropriation. I have likewise attempted to help bring about greater efficiency in government and thereby reduce our costs.

There is no apparent clearly defined program on the part of our defense officials providing for an orderly production of tools of war. For this reason, I believe the House should change its policy and not appropriate more money until we have an assurance from the defense officials that the money is needed and will be carefully spent.

We all want those in the service to have sufficient equipment to defend their lives and we want an adequate defense program for the Nation. However, with the known corruption and duplication of expenditures it is time we carefully analyze the military expenditures as it seems to me that some of our military leaders do not recognize that the money they are spending comes from taxes paid by all the people. I ask my colleagues here in Congress to join with me in making a survey to determine what is absolutely essential to maintain our freedoms. Any expenditure not under that category should be carefully studied before appropriations are made.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close immediately.

Mr. BAILEY. I object, Mr. Chairman, and move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to complete the educational picture that our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] has just presented to the House. There is another angle of this educational program that is and should be of interest to every Member of the Congress.

You will recall that in the Eighty-first Congress we approved Public Law 815, which carried a provision for a Nation-wide study of the needs for school facilities. This survey has practically been completed by the Federal Commissioner of Education. Through the wisdom or lack of wisdom of the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, he has assigned me the duty of conducting a special subcommittee investigation to make a study of this national survey.

This subcommittee is in session now and will remain in session through Friday of this week. It will resume hearings on the 23d of April for a period of four additional days. If any Members are interested in the question of the needs of your schools from the standpoint of added school facilities, we will be pleased to have you come over before the committee and give us the benefit of your views and tell us of the problems that exist within your particular States and school districts.

We have a real problem. Time will not permit me to attempt to give you the enormity of the problem that faces the American people beyond saying that we are 20 years behind in the matter of school buildings, that the country needs 600,000 additional classrooms, and that there are over 1,700,000 boys and girls that will not have a school roof over them on the first of September 1952. Those are some of the highlights of what this survey uncovered. Time will not permit me to explain them in detail, but if you will come before the committee we will try to give you the details of one of the most shocking problems imaginable in America today, the condition of our public schools.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III  
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, interest on deposits, and permanent change of station travel, including transportation of dependents and household effects, for members of the Army on active duty (except those undergoing reserve training); expenses incident to movement of troop detachments, including rental of camp sites and procurement of utility and other services; expenses of military courts, boards and commissions; expenses of apprehension and delivery of deserters, prisoners, and soldiers absent without leave, including payment of rewards (not to exceed \$25 in any one case), and costs of confinement of military prisoners in nonmilitary facilities; donations of not to exceed \$25 to each prisoner upon each release from confinement in an Army prison (other than a disciplinary barracks) and to each person discharged for fraudulent enlistment; welfare, recreation, and informational services, educational services for Army enlisted personnel; subsistence and clothing for resale, as authorized by law; authorized issues of articles to prisoners, other than those in disciplinary barracks; civilian clothing, not to exceed \$30 in cost, to be issued each person upon each release from an Army prison, other than a disciplinary barracks; medals and awards; subsistence of enlisted personnel, selective-service registrants called for induction and applicants for enlistment while held under observation, and prisoners (except those at disciplinary barracks), or reimbursement therefor while such personnel are sick in hospitals; subsistence of supernumeraries necessitated by emergent military circumstances; and chaplains' activities: \$4,393,000.000: *Provided*, That section 212 of the act of June 30, 1932 (5 U. S. C. 59a), shall not apply to retired military personnel on duty at the United States Soldiers' Home: *Provided further*, That the duties of the librarian at the United States Military Academy may be performed by a retired officer detailed on active duty.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Mississippi: On page 7, line 23, strike out "\$4,393,000,000" and insert "\$4,388,000,000, of which not to exceed \$197,000,000 shall be available for travel of the Army."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph, and on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to reduce by a small amount the allowance for travel for the Department of the Army personnel. The committee has seen fit to cut this allowance.

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

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I think you will find that when the Army subcommittee worked on this we cut travel \$12,800,000, and only leave \$189,200,000 for travel of the Army now.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. It is my understanding that \$203,000,000 was left for the Department of the Army.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I am just talking about the operation of the subcommittee as disclosed in some of our discussions. I can tell you right now exactly what was done.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I appreciate the clarification, but this is what the committee clerk informed me as to what it was.

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

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. SIKES. If there was any misunderstanding about this matter, the request for funds for this item in the 1953 bill was \$202,000,000, and the committee cut it \$12,800,000, down to \$189,200,000, and if a misunderstanding arose about the figures which the gentleman obtained at the desk I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to restate his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH], as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. On page 7, line 23, strike out the sum and insert "\$4,388,000,000, of which not to exceed \$192,000,000 shall be available for travel of the Army."

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I might be permitted to revise the amendment for the purpose of reducing the travel of the Army pay by \$5,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. SIKES. Then the gentleman's language, which I shall, of course, have to oppose, will be to limit the amount of money available for travel of the Army to \$184,200,000.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. That is correct, according to the language which the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] gave me—it should be reduced to \$184,200,000.

Mr. SIKES. And the gentleman's figure striking out the language "\$4,393,000" would be changed to "\$4,388,000"; would it not?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the amendment for purposes of clarification.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 7, line 23, strike out the sum and insert "\$4,388,000,000, of which not to exceed \$184,000,000 shall be available for travel of the Army."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the modification of the amendment as submitted by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to increase in a small degree the cut in the funds for the travel of the Army, which has already been made by the committee, and to emphasize the need for the change in some of the plans and regulations in regard to travel of the Army in an attempt to cut down the waste which has developed in this travel, which is a hang-over from policies followed during World War II. There has been some improvement on those policies in the Army from the time of this wasteful shifting around since World War II, but I think there is room for further improvement. If the Army gets specific instructions to cut this sum by this amount, I believe they will change their regulations and change some of their plans in reference to training of personnel, whereby they can accomplish it in a more economical manner and as a result achieve this saving.

You are all familiar with some of the costs that piled up in our training program in World War II. At a time when a man would be inducted on the west coast and shipped to the east coast and then shipped down South, all in a period of 10 days, without the possibility of any type of training in between. It is a waste of time on the part of the soldier as well as on the part of the Army. There has been some improvement along that line, but there has not been enough improvement in the present emergency that has resulted in a sharp increase in our Armed Forces. For instance, a large group of men were sent to the Hawaiian Islands for basic training. The Government is going to have to pay the expenses of shipping those men back at the conclusion of their training. If this amendment is adopted, I think a similar amendment should be adopted for each of the other services.

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

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, as much as I would like to concur in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH], I cannot in good conscience do so. Undoubtedly all of us here have been disturbed by what we consider abuses of travel by the Armed Forces, but I would like to point out that in 1952 there was available for this appropriation \$212,625,000. This is for travel of men in the Army. This is not for travel of dependents. This is not for transportation of things. This is only for travel of men in the Army. In 1952 they had \$212,625,000. They asked for less than that this year. They asked for \$202,000,000. The committee cut it down to \$189,200,000. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH] asks to cut

it \$5,000,000 more. The committee would like to have cut this item more, but I must point out that 700,000 enlistments expire this fiscal year. The enlistments of almost half of the total force of the Army expire during this coming year. Those men have to be sent home and new men have to be brought in in order to keep the Army at the necessary strength. They have to be trained and shipped overseas. You make it physically impossible to send men home and bring new men back to fill their places, and you can seriously jeopardize the orderly operation of the rotation program as it is now carried on in Korea. No one of us wants to take a chance on denying to the men in Korea their right to be rotated home. I feel, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment should be rejected.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I think all of us are sympathetic with the purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi. I happen to know of a particular soldier in World War II who went to school in Pennsylvania; then to Florida; then out to Idaho; then to Stockton, Calif.; then to Salt Lake City and back to Sioux City, Iowa—all over the country, at enormous expense to the taxpayers. But we must bear in mind, following the suggestion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] that this rotation must go on, and it is impossible to send a boy always to the place nearest his induction.

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: Page 8, line 3, before the period insert the following: "No part of any appropriation in this act shall be used to pay rent on space to be utilized for recruiting purposes; and no part of any appropriation in this act may be used for pay and allowances of military personnel assigned to recruiting duty in excess of 25 per centum of the amount expended for such purpose during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952."

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that everyone can understand; it is an amendment that will not affect the defenses of this country in any way; it is an amendment that will save some money.

I say it is an amendment you can understand, because I think all of us know that through the Selective Service Act the Armed Services have the opportunity of securing all of the men that are needed and that they can take care of, yet they continue to maintain recruiting offices in hundreds, perhaps thousands, of cities—I know hundreds of cities throughout the country. At many places we are paying rent in buildings in choice locations in towns where the Government itself owns buildings which could have been utilized. This

would cut out paying any rent on any space.

The second part of the amendment would restrict the personnel that is being used for recruiting purposes to 25 percent of that which has been used during the past year. We have in almost every town of any size at all at least one recruiting office; in some we have as many as three, contrary to what the gentleman from Florida said yesterday.

I say that any young man who wants to volunteer can do so without the recruiting service urging him. Most of the men who have been obtained by the recruiting service have been young men where the draft board has been breathing down their necks. This is an opportunity to save a few million dollars without doing any harm to the defense program.

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In order that my colleagues and myself may have the benefit of the information the gentleman has, would he be so kind as to enumerate the towns where the military service he refers to is renting space instead of using available Federal buildings? I would like to have that information.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I cannot give the gentleman the exact locations, but in every large town I have gone into recently I have seen on corners, not in Federal buildings, and I think every Member of the House has seen like instances, of recruiting stations. I am sorry I cannot give the gentleman the exact locations.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Let me ask this question, please—I am not trying to ask embarrassing questions, I really want to get information: Did the gentleman see advertising on the corner or in a building?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I saw it on the building on the corner: "Recruiting Offices inside." I have seen signs for the Army Air Force, recruiting for the Navy, recruiting for the Army. I do not suppose the owners of the buildings are contributing that space free. If they are this amendment would not affect that situation. If you are not paying rent for those buildings you can adopt this amendment, and it will not affect them. It will only stop rent that is being paid.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized.

Mr. TABER. The only thing I wanted to do was to tell the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] that recruiting expense comes from "Maintenance and operation" in the next paragraph.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. My amendment reads: "Any part of the appropriation."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

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

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, may I point out just what the physical picture of recruiting in the Army is? In 1952

we appropriated \$14,500,000. This year despite the fact, as I pointed out a little while ago, that the turnover in the Army is almost 50 percent, the services asked for \$12,500,000. We cut it by \$2,000,000. Mr. Chairman, that is a 16-percent cut. Undoubtedly there have been some wasteful procedures in recruiting. I would like to see them eliminated if possible. I would like to see strict unification in recruiting. Possibly we could go a little deeper in this bill, but when you cut out 75 percent of the money available you are going to require almost entirely that all men who enter the services be obtained by the draft. That can be done under the law of course, but when you do it you are going to limit the services largely to 2-year men, not career men. I submit that the Army needs career men, long-term enlistment men, for the training and the experience required to properly operate and maintain all the intricate and involved procedures of a modern army with its modern equipment, weapons, and machinery. The amendment is too severe and should be defeated.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Would it be necessary to give additional personnel to the draft boards to take care of this job?

Mr. MAHON. That is correct. It would be a very unwise thing, in my judgment, to make this reduction. It goes too far because we want people in the service to make it a career.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Does this \$10,500,000 the gentleman is talking about for the recruiting service include the pay and allowances of all the personnel that are assigned to recruiting, which covers several thousand men? It does not include that, does it?

Mr. MAHON. No, it does not include pay and allowances.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. All of those men are taken out of the Defense Department and are not available for combat duty.

Mr. MAHON. I understand the gentleman's position that he wants to stop recruitment, as he said on the floor yesterday, and bring in everybody through the draft.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The gentleman misunderstood me. I do not want to stop recruiting and this will not stop it. It still gives an opportunity to go and enlist for any term you want to, you can still maintain your larger recruiting centers.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES of Missouri) there were—ayes 48, noes 45.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MAHON and Mr. JONES of Missouri.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 72, noes 58.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS, ARMY

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the maintenance and operation of the Army, including administration and rentals at the seat of Government; medical and dental care of personnel entitled thereto by law or regulation (including charges of private facilities for care of military personnel on duty or leave, except elective private treatment), and other measures necessary to protect the health of the Army; disposition of remains, including those of all Army personnel who die while on active duty; information and educational services for the Armed Forces; recruiting expenses; subsistence of prisoners at disciplinary barracks, and of civilian employees as authorized by law; expenses of apprehension and delivery of prisoners escaped from disciplinary barracks, including payment of rewards not exceeding \$25 in any one case, and expenses of confinement of such prisoners in nonmilitary facilities; donations of not to exceed \$25 to each prisoner upon each release from confinement in a disciplinary barracks; authorized issues of articles for use of applicants for enlistment and persons in military custody; civilian clothing, not to exceed \$30 in cost, to be issued each person upon each release from a disciplinary barracks and to each soldier discharged otherwise than honorably, or sentenced by a civil court to confinement in a civil prison, or interned or discharged as an alien enemy; transportation services; communications services, including construction of communication systems; photographic services; maps and similar data for military purposes; military surveys and engineering planning; alteration, extension, and repair of structures and property; acquisition of lands (not exceeding \$5,000 for any one parcel), easements, rights-of-way, and similar interests in land, and, in administering the provisions of 43 U. S. C. 315q, rentals may be paid in advance; payment of deficiency judgments and interest thereon arising out of condemnation proceedings; utility services for buildings erected at private cost, as authorized by law (10 U. S. C. 1346), and buildings on military reservations authorized by Army regulations to be used for a similar purpose; purchase of ambulances; hire of passenger motor vehicles; contingencies for the Commandant of the National War College, to be expended in his discretion (not exceeding \$1,000); purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards at the National War College; tuition and fees incident to training of military and civilian personnel at civilian institutions; maintenance and operation of the United States Military Academy, including contingencies for the Superintendent (not exceeding \$5,200), the Commandant of Cadets (not exceeding \$1,200) and the Academic Board (not exceeding \$1,000), to be expended in their respective dispositions; expenses of the Board of Visitors, and liquidation of unpaid indebtedness of separated cadets to the treasurer of the Academy; field exercises and maneuvers, including payments in advance for rentals or options to rent land; expenses for the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and other units at educational institutions, as authorized by law (10 U. S. C. 381-390; 441-444; 1180-1182a); exchange fees, and losses in the accounts of disbursing officers or agents in accordance with law (31 U. S. C. 95a; 50 U. S. C. App. 1705-1707; 61 Stat. 493); expenses of inter-American cooperation, as authorized for the Navy by law (5 U. S. C. 421f) for Latin-American cooperation; not to exceed \$6,152,000 for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Army, and payments may be made

on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government; \$4,520,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the procurement of any article of food or clothing not grown or produced in the United States or its possessions, except to the extent that the Secretary of the Department concerned shall determine that a satisfactory quality and sufficient quantity of any articles of food or clothing grown or produced in the United States or its possessions cannot be procured as and when needed at United States market prices and except procurements by vessels in foreign waters and emergency procurements or procurements of perishable foods by establishments located outside the continental United States, except the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, for the personnel attached thereto: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall preclude the procurement of foods manufactured or processed in the United States or its possessions.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON: On page 10, line 21, strike out "\$4,520,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,384,400,000."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment not in any spirit of antagonism to the Army or to be supercritical, but I offer it largely for indirect reasons, many of which have been discussed here today.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would save \$126,000,000. That is about 1 percent of the total amount allocated to the Army in this bill. What has been going through my mind is this: When you read the report of this committee you find it makes this statement:

The Nation is confronted with maintaining a program capable of deterring aggression and at the same time a program that will not destroy our economy.

Mr. Chairman, if you will look back 8 or 10 years and see what has happened to the American dollar and its purchasing power, it will make you realize that we must find some way of balancing our budget. Since the end of the war the dollar has depreciated so much that the raise we gave the armed services has been entirely neutralized.

According to the Congressional Library research people, the American insurance policyholders have lost purchasing power to the extent of almost \$100,000,000,000, and the buyers of American bonds, who helped finance the war, have lost \$85,000,000,000 in purchasing power since 1940. So what I am thinking is that I want to try if I can to get the budget balanced this year. If we cannot balance it, I want to help close it up as close to a balance as possible. Unbalanced Federal budgets have fed the fires of inflation and unless our Federal expenditures are sharply curtailed we may progress to runaway inflation.

This cut is only one drop in the bucket that will help this situation. This is the place where I understand the fat of the Army is. You cannot tell me that with a budget of over \$4,000,000,000 the Army cannot squeeze out 1 percent of that with efficient and economical operation.

You men who have served in the Armed Forces know that every one of these little stations all over the country send in their requests for maintenance, for operation, to do this and do that, usually asking more than they need or expect to get. Many of the things which are requested, in fact, most of them, can be put off until another day, instead of squeezing the American taxpayer to death as you are doing at the present time.

So I say to you, here is one place where you can save a little bit over \$136,000,000 and do something that will not in the slightest degree injure or impede the development and efficiency of the United States Army.

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

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I certainly do not want to interfere with the gentleman's statement, for I know he is very sincere in what he is attempting to do, but since I am going to take the other side, I should like to have the gentleman tell me specifically where he would take off this \$136,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON. I cannot do it specifically. Maybe the gentleman can, because he heard the testimony at the hearings. But the gentleman knows there are hundreds of places, and probably if I had the time to read all the hearings I could pick them out, where you could save a little money. When you try to save only 1 percent of the over-all cost they are asking to operate this agency, you can readily appreciate that that is possible. The committee always asks for a specific place where we can do these things, knowing that it is hard to specify specific items. It is utterly fantastic to ask me that question, when there are a thousand Army installations scattered all over the United States and the world, to pick out particular places where money could be saved. I could tell you several in California, but I do not intend to do so, as it might get me into endless argument. The chairman yesterday admitted that 25 percent of Army personnel did not have enough to do. Why not drop those men and make the others do a day's work. I know from personal observation of some places that they can save money if there is a real effort to do so.

I hope you people will look at this situation seriously, as I am.

We are not trying to injure the Army, but look how dismal the picture was here today. It really shocked me. Some of these men that talked about this bill acted as though war were coming on us right away. We are acting in an atmosphere motivated by fear. They are throwing a scare into us, they are throwing fear at us by trying to make us believe that we are weak and helpless.

Why cannot America sit down and make its program, disregard the Soviets, and have a reasonable program that the American taxpayer can afford? We do not need to worry about the Soviet Union. They do not have the production lines America has, they do not have the skilled labor to turn out the production that America is capable of. They do not have the steel production, they do not have any of the things that make up an industrial nation.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for three additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON. We are legislating here because every time somebody opens his mouth in Moscow we think we have to change our policy, we have to build up a little higher. We are going up and up and up. We could build so large as to run the danger of provoking a war. We are in an armaments race whether you believe it or not. We do not have the control of it. We can control inflation ourselves, but you cannot control the size of your Armed Forces if you try to play hop, skip, and jump with the Soviets.

The other day they told us it would go up to a certain level by a certain year, when we would level off. I asked a general, "Suppose the Soviets go higher?" He said, "Then we may have to go higher also."

The point is that instead of deciding these matters in a quiet, dispassionate atmosphere, we are deciding them in an atmosphere of nervousness, hysteria, fear. That is the wrong way to decide these matters. That is why I want to see us do something to stabilize the purchasing power of the American dollar so we will know what we can buy next year for defense.

We do not know now whether the dollar will be cheaper next year than it is now, and unless we gradually approach the balance of the budget as well as take other measures that will enable us to get stability of the dollar, and its power to purchase equipment which is essential for a long-range sound military program, the country will be in trouble. I plead with you, do not be motivated by fear. Do not be afraid that America is a weak sister in the family of nations. Do not let some group that we can hardly deal with dominate our policy. Let us stand here as men and say that this can be cut out and that the American taxpayers can be saved roughly \$136,000,000 without impairing our military strength at all. I am for retaining reasonable military strength. I spent some time in the military. I have spent 10 years studying the problem. I tell you on my own responsibility that this slight reduction will not affect our military strength one iota. In fact, it may have the effect of indirectly increasing it by moving it in the direction of economic stability in the United States. I do hope you will vote for this amendment.

If we can hold steady and not let hysteria and fear warp our judgments we can then develop international confidence and legal mechanisms that will give us the peace we have been looking for since the end of World War II. The economic front is as essential as the military front. This amendment will help stabilize the economic front, and move in the direction of strengthening the dollar.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section, and all amendments thereto, close in 30 minutes.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object. Can the gentleman from Florida tell us whether there has been a determination as to when the Committee will rise?

Mr. SIKES. It is hoped that the Committee will rise as soon as we finish with this request to limit debate.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, could not this request be put over until tomorrow?

Mr. SIKES. We want to reach an agreement on the time, and then go over until tomorrow to complete debate. We want to rise as soon as agreement is reached on this, if it is agreeable to the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee has a list of those Members who were on their feet at the time the request was made, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON], the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. How much time will each Member have?

The CHAIRMAN. One and two-thirds minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7391) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related

Independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On March 31, 1952:

H. J. Res. 363. Joint resolution to provide for the presentation of the Merchant Marine Distinguished Service Medal to Henrik Kurt Carlsen, master, steamship *Flying Enterprise*.

On April 1, 1952:

H. R. 3347. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue to School District No. 28, Ronan, Mont., a patent in fee to certain Indian land; and

H. R. 4798. An act to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act relating to qualifications of jurors.

On April 3, 1952:

H. R. 748. An act for the relief of Basil Vasso Argyris and Mrs. Aline Argyris;

H. R. 1043. An act to provide for medical services to non-Indians in Indian hospitals, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1416. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Valdengo and Albertina Gioglio Valdengo;

H. R. 1446. An act for the relief of Calcedonio Tagliarini;

H. R. 1828. An act for the relief of Maria Szentygyergyi Mayer;

H. R. 1831. An act to admit Luigi Morelli to the United States for permanent residence;

H. R. 1857. An act for the relief of James Yao;

H. R. 2233. An act for the relief of Setsuko Yamashita, the Japanese fiancée of a United States citizen veteran of World War II, and her son Takashi Yamashita;

H. R. 2775. An act for the relief of Anneleise Barbara Vollrath and Mrs. Margarete Elise Vollrath;

H. R. 2833. An act for the relief of Rudolf Bing and Nina Bing;

H. R. 3954. An act to authorize the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association of Salt Lake City, Utah, to grant and convey to Salt Lake City, Utah, a portion of the lands heretofore granted to such association by the United States;

H. R. 4010. An act for the relief of William Grant Braden, Jr.;

H. R. 4268. An act for the relief of Elvira Zachmann;

H. R. 4467. An act to incorporate the Conference of State Societies, Washington, D. C.;

H. R. 5347. An act for the relief of Fusako Terao Scogin;

H. R. 5558. An act for the relief of Anna Maria Krause;

H. R. 5598. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey a parcel of land to the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association, Salt Lake City, Utah;

H. R. 5951. An act to add certain federally owned land to the Mound City Group National Monument, in the State of Ohio, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6065. An act for the relief of Patrick J. Logan;

H. R. 6242. An act to restore certain land to the Territory of Hawaii and to authorize said Territory to exchange the whole or a portion of the same; and

H. J. Res. 108. Joint resolution providing for recognition and endorsement of the International Trade Fair and Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in New Orleans, La.

On April 4, 1952:

H. R. 761. An act for the relief of Yuriko Tsutsumi;

H. R. 827. An act for the relief of Dr. Manuel J. Casas and Mrs. Julia Nakpil Casas;

H. R. 899. An act for the relief of Malka Dwojra Kron and Tauba Kron;

H. R. 1234. An act for the relief of Mrs. Selma Cecelia Gahl;

H. R. 2923. An act for the relief of Adelaida Reyes;

H. R. 3153. An act for the relief of Signa Angela Maino Cristallo;

H. R. 3374. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lourdes Augusta Pereira Ladeiro Rose;

H. R. 3668. An act for the relief of David Yeh; and

H. R. 5389. An act for the relief of Ching Wong Keau (Mrs. Ching Sen).

On April 5, 1952:

H. R. 648. An act to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of aliens Max Mayer Hirsch Winzelberg and Mrs. Jenny Fuss De Winzelberg.

On April 7, 1952:

H. R. 773. An act for the relief of Mering Bichara.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had ordered, that the Senator from Louisiana, Mr. LONG, be appointed a conferee on the part of the Senate on the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) entitled "Joint resolution to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources," in lieu of the Senator from Arizona, Mr. McFARLAND, excused, and that the above-entitled joint resolution, together with accompanying papers, be returned to the House.

#### HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 10 o'clock a. m.

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

There was no objection.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS FOR TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to make an announcement.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the first order of business tomorrow will be the contempt proceedings from the Ways and Means Committee. On that I wish to advise the Members there will be a roll-call vote, as a matter of policy, in connection with contempt proceedings.

#### HENRY W. GRUNEWALD

Mr. DOUGHTON, from the Committee on Ways and Means, submitted the following privileged report (No. 1748), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

#### PROCEEDINGS AGAINST HENRY W. GRUNEWALD

Mr. DOUGHTON, from the Committee on Ways and Means, submitted the following report:

#### CITING HENRY W. GRUNEWALD

The Committee on Ways and Means as created and authorized by the House of Representatives through the enactment of Public Law 601, section 121, subsection(s) of the Seventy-ninth Congress, House Resolution 7 of the Eighty-second Congress, and pursuant to the authority contained in House Resolution 78 of the Eighty-second Congress, through its Subcommittee on the Administration of the Internal Revenue Laws, created by it in an executive session on January 12, 1951, caused to be issued subpoenas to Henry W. Grunewald which are set forth in words and figures in the appendix hereof. Said appendix is made a part hereof as if fully set forth herein.

These subpoenas, as appears from the returns which are also contained in the appendix, were duly served on Henry W. Grunewald; and he did appear at the times and places specified in the subpoenas.

Said subcommittee, as directed by resolution of the House, was engaged in an investigation of the administration of the internal revenue laws. Testimony had been received to the effect that Henry W. Grunewald had intervened in tax cases, maintained close personal relations with several high officials of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and had lent money to and had other business dealings with officials of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

The record of the proceedings which ensued during the interrogation of Henry W. Grunewald by said subcommittee are set forth in the appendix.

Said records of proceedings indicates that said Grunewald failed and refused to answer pertinent questions propounded to him and failed, refused, and neglected to produce papers, books, and documents, the production of which was required by said subcommittee, all material to the subject matter concerning which said subcommittee was by resolution of the House required to, and did, conduct an inquiry.

On motion duly made that said subcommittee recommend to the Committee on Ways and Means that contempt proceedings be instituted against Henry W. Grunewald, there was a vote of six ayes, no nays, and one absent. The motion having carried, said subcommittee reported to the Committee on Ways and Means of January 30, 1952, the facts constituting the contumacious conduct of Henry W. Grunewald. After receiving the report, on the same day, the Committee on Ways and Means voted without dissent that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means be directed to report to the House of Representatives the facts concerning the conduct of Henry W. Grunewald as a witness before the Subcommittee on Administration of the Internal Revenue Laws, and that such order may be taken as the dignity and character of the House requires.

The transcript of the proceedings which the Speaker is requested to certify as contained in the appendix which is appended hereto which also include the subpoenas referred to above and the rules of procedure adopted for the investigation of the internal revenue laws and made a part hereof as if fully set forth herein.

## APPENDIX

## ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE LAWS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION  
OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE LAWS, OF  
THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,  
Washington, D. C., December 12, 1951.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

The subcommittee met at 2:15 p. m., pursuant to call, in room 517, Georgetown Hospital, Washington, D. C., Hon. Cecil R. King, chairman of the subcommittee, presiding.

Present: Representatives King (presiding), Keogh, and Kean.

Present also: Adrian W. DeWind, chief counsel to the subcommittee, and Charles S. Lyon, assistant counsel. (Note: Alfred Goldstein, stenographer, took proceedings for Mr. Maloney.)

Chairman KING. Proceed.

Mr. DEWIND. Henry W. Grunewald is the witness, and this is Mr. William P. Maloney.

Mr. MALONEY. With the permission of the chairman and the other members of the committee who are present, I would like to make a preliminary statement.

I represent Mr. Grunewald in this matter, and I would like to state for the record some of the facts in connection with his present physical condition.

Mr. Grunewald has been in Georgetown Hospital since last Thursday evening. He has been under continuous treatment during that time by Dr. John Curry, and part of the treatment has consisted of the administration of three grains of sodium amytal four times daily.

I think it is significant as to Mr. Grunewald's physical condition, and mental condition at this time, that yesterday when the committee doctors came here to examine him, his blood pressure rose to 210 and his pulse rate jumped to 120—all this despite the fact that he is under administration of an extremely heavy dose of a very potent sedative at this time.

Mr. DEWIND. Pardon me, Mr. Maloney. At this time may I ask: Are you suggesting some conclusions that are to be derived from these facts that you stated?

Mr. MALONEY. No, I am not suggesting. I am stating this for the record.

Mr. DEWIND. I wonder if it would not be more appropriate to have our doctors and Mr. Grunewald's doctors to make a statement for the record about Mr. Grunewald's medical condition.

Mr. MALONEY. I have about concluded.

Mr. DEWIND. I see.

Mr. MALONEY. There are only two other things I would like to state in connection with that.

One is that it was the very decided opinion of Dr. Curry, and concurred in by Dr. Terry, that Mr. Grunewald will require treatment for an indefinite time, and that treatment will require that he be kept under sedation for an indeterminate time.

The committee doctors advised against Mr. Grunewald's leaving the hospital to appear before this committee at this time.

As I said before, I am Mr. Grunewald's counsel, and I have told Mr. DeWind that Mr. Grunewald would appear before this committee to testify under oath in public.

Unfortunately, the present state of his health prevents his doing so today, and probably will for the next several days at least.

I am advised by his physician that he will probably be able to leave the hospital this week end, or possibly Monday or Tuesday, when they announced his condition.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Chairman, I would like to note for the record here, at this point, if I may, that Dr. Curry has made no statement to the committee, upon the request of Mr. Maloney. So we have had no expression of

Dr. Curry's opinion, because Mr. Maloney directed him not to give us any expression.

Mr. MALONEY. I may say this, gentlemen: I am somewhat at a loss to understand the desire of this committee to override all considerations of decency and regard for the health and welfare of this witness by this invasion of a sick room in a hospital, in an attempt to extract testimony from him at this time.

After all, this committee has been going on for some time in its investigation. I assume it will continue for some time. I can see no reason why his testimony cannot be taken next week.

The sole reason for the existence of this committee is to obtain facts upon which to base a recommendation for legislation. I understand this committee does not intend to file a report in the near future. It is obvious that whatever Mr. Grunewald knows today he will know just as well next week. It will in no way impede the legislative purpose of this committee to delay taking his testimony until that time.

I would like to quote the Vice President of the United States, from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 19, 1950. In this connection, about the investigative committees generally, the Vice President said: "The Senate is not a grand jury. None of its committees are grand juries."

I might observe that that statement applies with equal force and effect to committees of the House.

The Vice President said further: "The Senate cannot try anyone for any offense."

Again I say that applies with equal force to the committees of the House.

Yet, anyone who has heard or read of the proceedings before this committee can reach only one conclusion, and that is that this is a trial—a trial which, in my opinion—and I might say my opinion has been shared by many other people with whom I have discussed this, with members of the bar and the judiciary—a trial which has been conducted in flagrant violation of the rights of citizens and public officials, whose names have been wantonly bandied about; a trial conducted with what, in my opinion, is a shocking disregard for the rules of evidence and other procedures set up and time-tested for the protection of all citizens.

Indeed, I read in the press that a member of your own committee has publicly condemned, in very strong terms, tactics employed by trial counsel for the committee and the committee's procedure in making public the testimony, which is the rankest kind of hearsay.

At this point, I would like to call the attention of this committee to—

Chairman KING. How much more of this is there going to be, Mr. Maloney?

Mr. MALONEY. It is very brief.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest in some way this be brought to a conclusion. A statement of this kind from Mr. Maloney has not been invited by the committee and is inappropriate to the present purpose of the committee, which is to take testimony here.

Mr. MALONEY. I have asked for and obtained the consent of the committee. That is the basis of the statement.

Chairman KING. I had no idea that your request, Mr. Maloney, was for the purpose of castigating the committee and its past actions, and perhaps present behavior.

I would suggest at this point to entertain a motion that it be stricken and not be made a part of the proceeding here this afternoon.

Mr. MALONEY. May I say, sir, that that seems to me to be a most strange proceeding. I am here as counsel for this gentleman. I maintain I have a right to—this is a committee of the Congress of the United

States. I think I have every right to express on the record what I believe to be the facts in connection with this proceeding.

Chairman KING. Mr. Maloney, the committee set up, many months ago, rules, and one of them clearly sets forth the fact that this committee is under no obligation to take statements from counsel until their preparation is presented to the committee and meets with its approval or disapproval.

Mr. MALONEY. May I say, Mr. Chairman, I do not think this committee—most respectfully I say this—has the power to get itself out from under the common, ordinary rules of fair play and regard for the reputations and names of persons who have had no opportunity to protect themselves against this kind of a proceeding.

Chairman KING. This is perhaps unfortunate, but we are not here to discuss that, Mr. Maloney.

Mr. MALONEY. May I say, sir, I think you have used that phrase before in describing the result of some of this hearsay testimony.

I say it is more than unfortunate. This amounts to a condemnation of a great many innocent people in the public press, with no opportunity whatever to be heard.

I now say, and I urge upon this committee, that I be allowed to continue and—

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Chairman, is Mr. Maloney appearing here on behalf of other witnesses, or only on behalf of Mr. Grunewald? He seems to be making an argument here which has no relation whatsoever to Mr. Grunewald.

Chairman KING. I quite agree with counsel. I think we should get down to the purpose for which we came and make it as easy as possible on Mr. Grunewald.

If Mr. Grunewald is in the condition—and I daresay he is—I might say his condition would not be helped at all, Mr. Maloney, by prolonging such charges as you are making.

Mr. MALONEY. May I say, if the committee will bear with me and let me finish this very brief statement—

Mr. KEAN. Brief statement?

Mr. MALONEY. Well, I don't believe I have been talking for more than 2½ minutes.

Mr. DEWIND. May I say, Mr. Maloney, your statement consists of statements of your views as to this committee and matters unrelated to your client. Those views are unsolicited and inappropriate, and there is no point in the committee's arguing with you about your views.

Mr. MALONEY. May I say this: I think the committee would be interested in hearing what the Supreme Court had to say about the rights of witnesses.

Mr. DEWIND. If you wish to make a statement for the record and submit it with a request to be made a part of the record, that is the way you may proceed without having to make such a statement while your witness is here and in the condition you refer to.

Why do we not get on with the business of the meeting and then you may file a statement, if you wish?

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. DeWind, may I say I am here as an attorney, to advise my client.

Mr. DEWIND. A statement of your views is not relevant to that job.

Mr. MALONEY. I think it is part of my duty to advise this committee of what the Supreme Court has said, for their guidance, and I intend now to read a very brief excerpt from the case of Sinclair against the United States, in the Supreme Court, which is on this very point.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Chairman, let me say the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the United States against Sinclair is fully available to this committee, and if Mr. Maloney wants to refer this committee's attention to that case, we can certainly read it.

I would most respectfully suggest, Mr. Chairman, you should terminate this statement here, now.

Mr. MALONEY. I see no reason why this committee should refuse to permit the language of the Supreme Court to go into this record.

Chairman KING. It is not a matter of the language of the Supreme Court, Mr. Maloney. In fact, you have been in violation of our rules from the second sentence after you commenced this statement.

I want to be fair and proper and lenient in matters of this kind, but we did not come here to be told about our past, present, and perhaps future improprieties.

I suggest that we stop it right now and let us proceed with our business, both for the committee's convenience, your own, and the condition of your client.

Mr. MALONEY. I assure you that this statement here will not take more than another minute and a half to complete.

Chairman KING. You may read the Supreme Court decision.

Mr. MALONEY. The Supreme Court said, in the case of Sinclair against the United States, reported at 279 United States 263—and I am now quoting from page 291—

"The cases show that while the power of inquiry is an essential and appropriate auxiliary to the legislative function, it must be exerted with due regard for the rights of witnesses, and a witness may rightfully refuse to answer where the bounds of the power are exceeded, or the questions asked are not pertinent to the matter under inquiry."

Now, may I say this, I would like at this point to also call the committee's attention to the language of the fifth amendment to the Constitution, which is, as far as I know, still in full force and effect.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Chairman, I think it can be safely taken for granted that the committee and all the members are fully aware of the language of the fifth amendment, and Mr. Maloney is trespassing on the good will of the committee.

Chairman KING. I must rule you out of order, Mr. Maloney.

Mr. MALONEY. Perhaps the committee has not read this recently.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Chairman, I insist that Mr. Maloney is now being disrespectful to the committee, and I suggest you now take steps to stop it.

Chairman KING. I am going to rule in that fashion.

And I must warn you now, Mr. Maloney, that we are prepared to get on with our business. So you can proceed, Mr. DeWind.

Mr. MALONEY. May I say, Mr. Chairman, the remark was made that I am disrespectful to this committee. I wish to assure you that I am at no time in the habit of being disrespectful to this committee, or any other committee.

Mr. DEWIND. Your statement about the fifth amendment had no other implication, and perhaps you would like to withdraw that statement.

Mr. MALONEY. I will not withdraw it, and insist this committee should allow me to read the fifth amendment.

Chairman KING. No, Mr. Maloney, we must go ahead.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Chairman, will you caution Mr. Maloney to be still?

Chairman KING. Yes; I must, Mr. Maloney.

Mr. MALONEY. May I say one thing before you proceed?

Chairman KING. Very well.

Mr. MALONEY. I feel, in the interest of justice and the protection of my client, I must make a statement. If I cannot make it here, I will make it in public.

Chairman KING. Very well, you make it in public.

Now proceed, Mr. DeWind.

Mr. MALONEY. I prefer it be made here, so that the committee may hear it.

Chairman KING. The committee is not in closed session to listen to you, Mr. Maloney,

and I insist if the condition of your client is as has been represented to me by my counsel, that you are contributing to his further distress by bringing about this sort of a situation prior to his being questioned.

Mr. MALONEY. I don't believe I am.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Chairman, there is no need to deny Mr. Maloney the right to make a statement. It seems to me it is simply a matter of postponing it until we are through with this business.

Chairman KING. I thought he understood that.

I certainly do not want the record to show you are going to be forbidden or prohibited from making any statement you choose to make. I am simply saying this is not the time.

Mr. MALONEY. May I conclude that today I may make a statement for the record at the conclusion of this session?

Chairman KING. I do not say today.

Mr. MALONEY. At the conclusion of whatever proceedings there are, I take it I will then be permitted to make a statement for the record?

Mr. DEWIND. The matter can then be considered, but this is a wholly inappropriate way to consider making the statement.

Mr. MALONEY. Then I have no assurance I would be permitted to make such a statement.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Chairman, it seems Mr. Maloney will be permitted to make a statement. We will be glad to hear what he wishes to say and consider the whole statement and the whole question of his making the statement.

Mr. MALONEY. And include the statement in the record.

Chairman KING. I would not want that statement to be a part of our record, Mr. Maloney. It will be so far afield and so contrary to the wishes and demands of past counsel, a goodly number that have appeared before the committee, that it would appear that this session, the way it is being held, in a patient's room in a hospital, was really unusual; that you could not defend that statement before the committee in regular session.

Mr. MALONEY. I assure you, sir, I will be very happy to make it in regular session.

Chairman KING. Very well, then.

Mr. MALONEY. I think my statement is borne out by the facts in this case: I must, respectfully, say in my opinion, it is, if anything, an understatement.

Chairman KING. Very well.

Now, we can proceed, Mr. DeWind, with the purpose for which we came here?

Mr. DEWIND. Has the witness been sworn?

Chairman KING. No. I will swear him.

Will you raise your right hand, please, Mr. Grunewald?

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you will give to this committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. I do, sir.

TESTIMONY OF HENRY W. GRUNEWALD, ACCOMPANIED BY WILLIAM P. MALONEY

Mr. DEWIND. What is your full name, Mr. Grunewald?

Mr. MALONEY. At this point, I wish to state for the record an objection which I have, which I think I should present to the committee.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Maloney, may I acquaint you with the rules of this committee, that counsel can be present to advise the witness as to his rights with respect to any questions that are put to him by the committee. He can make statements only with the consent of the committee, and, apart from such consent, he is confined to advising his client and consulting with his client when the client wishes to consult with him concerning questions put to him in the session.

There is no other right to make a statement.

Mr. MALONEY. I think, Mr. DeWind, if you will permit me to make a statement, which is exactly two sentences long—

Mr. DEWIND. It is not up to me, Mr. Maloney.

Mr. MALONEY. You are in the committee familiar with the position which Mr. Grunewald is going to take in this inquiry at this time.

Mr. DEWIND. I think, Mr. Maloney, you had simply better consult with your client, and whatever position he wishes to take he may take following consultation.

There is now a question pending, and you have a right to consult with him, and he has a right to consult with you.

Mr. MALONEY. If you will bear with me for two sentences, then I will not make any further request.

Chairman KING. No. I insist, Mr. Maloney, in running the risk, in your opinion, of being unfair with you, I insist that this terminate your statement for the time being.

Mr. MALONEY. I now say, sir, that at this time, in view of the fact—

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Chairman, I would ask you to direct Mr. Maloney to remain silent.

Mr. MALONEY. I am going to direct the witness not to answer any questions.

Chairman KING. Very well. That is your right, sir.

Mr. MALONEY. And that is what I intended to make my statement about, sir.

Chairman KING. Very good.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, the pending question is: What is your full name?

Mr. MALONEY. I direct the witness not to answer any questions at this time.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, do you refuse to answer that question?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. On advice of counsel, I refuse.

Mr. DEWIND. On advice from counsel, you refuse to answer the question?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. Yes.

Mr. DEWIND. Do you refuse to state any ground for your refusal to answer?

Mr. MALONEY. Counsel has directed him, and I will state the ground right now.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Maloney, I believe the chairman has directed you to make no statement.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Grunewald is a sick man. He has been fully—

Chairman KING. This is not on the record. (Discussion off the record.)

Chairman KING. I will allow our counsel to proceed.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Maloney, you are, of course, well aware that it is the standard of this committee, as well as other congressional committees, to have closed sessions, taking testimony before witnesses are called in public sessions. That, too, is a perfectly proper and fair proceeding and one which should be encouraged, I believe.

I just want to say I do not want to argue with you, Mr. Maloney. In fact, I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Maloney make no further statements.

Mr. MALONEY. What is this? A one-way street? You make all the statements?

Chairman KING. Up to now, Mr. Maloney, it has been a one-way street. You were having both sides of it.

Mr. MALONEY. I might add right now counsel directed his remark to me, and I say this man will testify in an open, public hearing, fully, under oath, in the same forum in which these remarks and slanders have been passed about him. He will not, under my advice and direction, give any answers to any questions at this time.

Mr. DEWIND. In a closed session? Is that what you are saying?

Mr. MALONEY. He will have a public session. That is where the charges have been made, and he is entitled, as an American citizen, to a public hearing.

Mr. DEWIND. Of course, as you have been told, Mr. Maloney, the intention is to have

Mr. Grunewald in a public session. That is what he was called for. Nevertheless, a prior closed session does not impinge upon those rights in any way, as you are well aware.

Mr. MALONEY. I am aware of the charges that have been made in public, and he is entitled, as a citizen, to meet those charges without any star chamber or closed proceedings.

I am well aware of the fact that follows in many closed sessions, where, after a witness leaves the room, certain information is given to the press, and after that, his side is not given.

Furthermore, he has no assurance he will have a public hearing after a private hearing.

So I am saying now he will answer no questions except in a public hearing, in the same forum in which these charges were made against him.

Mr. DEWIND. What charges were made?

Mr. MALONEY. He has been vilified in the press as an "influence peddler," "mystery man," and an "unsavory character."

Mr. DEWIND. What papers are these? Have you got some clippings?

Mr. MALONEY. Haven't you read your press notices? I certainly do.

Mr. DEWIND. Has Mr. Grunewald's name been mentioned in any adverse way by any witness before the committee?

Mr. MALONEY. Well, I don't intend to argue that point with you, Mr. DeWind. I just call your attention to a headline—it is one of the largest I have ever seen—in the Daily News in New York, referring to the "Find tax shake mystery man."

If that isn't vilification and slander, I don't know what it is.

Chairman KING. What did the committee have to do with that, Mr. Maloney?

Mr. MALONEY. The newspaper did not dream that up. They got it from somewhere, either from counsel or as a result of the hearings.

Mr. DEWIND. You know that is not true. It is wholly untrue and a sheer fabrication on your part.

Now, Mr. Grunewald, do I understand that you refuse to answer the question that has been put to you, namely, what is your full name?

Mr. MALONEY. On the advice of counsel—

Mr. GRUNEWALD. On the advice of counsel. He told me not to.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Chairman, will you direct the witness to answer that question?

Chairman KING. I hereby direct you, Mr. Grunewald, to answer the question.

Mr. MALONEY. On the advice of counsel, he refuses to follow, very respectfully, the direction of the chairman.

Mr. DEWIND. Would you reply to the chairman's question, Mr. Grunewald?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. I hate to do that, but I will not, on the advice of counsel, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman KING. You will not answer on the advice of counsel?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. That is right.

Chairman KING. You refuse to answer, on the advice of your counsel?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. It is very simple, but, on the advice of counsel—

Mr. DEWIND. Now, Mr. Grunewald, do you know Charles Oliphant, former chief counsel of the Bureau of Internal Revenue?

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. DeWind, I have already stated I am advising him not to answer any questions at this time.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Chairman, would you direct Mr. Maloney not to make statements?

Chairman KING. Mr. Maloney, we must ask you to cease. Mr. Grunewald knows he can consider what the answer is, and he can answer for himself.

Mr. MALONEY. May I say, Mr. Chairman, I have already stated in, I think, quite clear language, that Mr. Grunewald would, on my direction, give no answers at this time.

Chairman KING. Is there an objection to having Mr. Grunewald state that, on the

advice of counsel, he refuses to answer the question?

Mr. MALONEY. Not at all.

Chairman KING. Very well.

Mr. MALONEY. Would you make such a statement, for the record?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. What is that?

Mr. DEWIND. This is not a statement made for the record. This is a statement of his position.

Mr. MALONEY. Yes.

Will you state for the record, in your own language, that, on the advice of counsel, you will not answer any questions at this time?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. Purely on the advice of counsel.

Mr. DEWIND. On the advice of counsel, what, Mr. Grunewald?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. Purely on the advice of counsel—

Mr. DEWIND. Yes.

Mr. GRUNEWALD. What was the question?

Mr. MALONEY. You will not answer any questions at this time.

Mr. GRUNEWALD. I will not answer any questions at this time. At an open hearing I will.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Chairman, may I observe at this time that we have had Mr. Grunewald examined by two doctors of the United States Public Health Service, who have expressed their opinion to us that Mr. Grunewald's physical condition does not prevent or require that there be any postponement in questioning him in his room here. We have had no expression of opinion from Mr. Grunewald's own doctor because, on Mr. Maloney's direction, he refused to make any statement.

Mr. Maloney was advised yesterday of the proposed meeting of this committee here and he did not at that time say that he would refuse to have his client answer questions here and has not advised us prior to our appearance here that he would advise his client not to answer questions.

Mr. MALONEY. I did strongly urge you—

Mr. DEWIND. Let me finish, Mr. Maloney. You have had the floor here ever since the meeting began. Now let me just say a word or two.

I think that the report of the doctors of the Public Health Service, that examined Mr. Grunewald, should be made a part of the record here at this point.

Mr. MALONEY. I certainly will have no objection to that.

Chairman KING. It is so ordered.

(Report of Public Health Service doctors relative to examination of Witness Grunewald is as follows:)

DECEMBER 11, 1951.

• REPORT OF THE EXAMINATION OF MR. HENRY GRUNEWALD

In accordance with instructions from the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, the undersigned proceeded to Georgetown University Hospital, Washington, D. C., and on the above date examined the complete medical records and the patient, Mr. Henry Grunewald. Prior to examining the records and the patient, Dr. G. Halsey Hunt, Chief of the Hospital Division of the Public Health Service, and the undersigned conferred with Mr. Taylor, assistant counsel for the King committee, and were informed of the general nature of the examination desired. Mr. Taylor informed Drs. Hunt and Terry that it was desired that we review the records and examine the patient in order to determine whether or not he could be brought before the committee for interrogation at this time without undue injury to his health.

Drs. Hunt and Terry then proceeded to the offices of Dr. John J. Curry, staff physician of the Georgetown University Hospital and private physician for Mr. Grunewald, and there conferred with Dr. Curry regarding Mr. Grunewald's condition. We were given the privilege at that time of reviewing the pre-

vious hospitalization on this patient in Georgetown Hospital in 1948, and, in addition, the hospital chart of the present hospital admission was also reviewed. Following a review of the hospital records, Drs. Hunt and Terry with Dr. Curry proceeded to the patient's room, where a complete medical history was elicited from Mr. Grunewald and where Mr. Grunewald was examined by Dr. Terry. Prior to eliciting the history and to the examination, Drs. Hunt and Terry asked Mr. Grunewald if he was willing to submit to this examination and he replied in the affirmative.

The information elicited from Mr. Grunewald and the hospital record indicated that he had been admitted to Georgetown University Hospital on December 6, 1951, at which time he was complaining of nausea, vomiting, and some discomfort in the lower abdomen. Mr. Grunewald stated that he had been quite well until the day prior to admission; namely, December 5, 1951. At that time he first experienced some mild nausea which later became more severe in severe nausea and vomiting. After he had vomited several times, Mr. Grunewald stated that he had severe retching and that on this occasion he brought up a small amount of blood on two or three occasions. He denies that there was any gross blood brought up or that he had vomited any coffee-ground material. He estimated that a total of not more than a teaspoonful of blood had been vomited. He denied any severe abdominal cramps or any diarrhea. He did say that during some of the retching he felt discomfort in the left lower abdomen and was fearful that this might herald the onset of a recurrence of previous attacks of diverticulitis, which he had experienced in recent years. Patient stated that by the time he reached the hospital he continued to be nauseated and vomiting, was extremely upset and nervous, and was worried about the possibility of a recurrent diverticulitis. On admission to the hospital the patient was started on sedation consisting of 3 grains of sodium amyta three times a day. However, on this medication he did not obtain adequate sedation and Dr. Curry, his physician, increased the dose to sodium amyta, grains 3, four times a day. The patient had been continued on this dosage up until the time he was seen by us. In spite of this moderately heavy sedation, the patient stated that he had had difficulty in sleeping and was extremely nervous and upset.

Physical examination revealed a tense, anxious male who appeared to be well-oriented and cooperative. Blood pressure in the right arm, taken at the beginning of the examination, was 210/110. The pulse rate was 120. Respirations were 22. Examination of the head and neck revealed no significant findings. The pupillary reflexes and cranial nerves were intact. The chest was well-developed and symmetrical. The lungs were clear and resonant. The heart was within normal limits on percussion and palpitation, and the sounds were normal except for tachycardia. The abdomen was slightly rounded and soft; the liver and spleen were not palpable. Careful palpation of the abdomen failed to reveal any masses or rigidity. The patient did complain of slight tenderness on moderate to deep pressure in the left lower quadrant, but in this area careful palpation allowed adequate exploration and at the same time did not reveal any palpable abnormalities. The external genitalia were that of a normal male with the exception of the fact that the right scrotum contained a large mass which was cystic in consistency and was rather typical of a hydrocele. Examination of the extremities revealed nothing of note. All reflexes were slightly hyperactive but no abnormal reflexes were elicited. During the entire examination the patient was affable and cooperative. There was no evidence at

any time during the examination of any abnormal content and the patient denied that he had experienced any such symptoms. He specifically denied any hallucinations or any dreams of significance.

From talking with the patient and reviewing his previous hospital records, the following facts were elicited with regard to his past history: He states that he has always been a high-strung, somewhat nervous type of individual. Approximately 5 years ago he had what he terms a nervous breakdown, at which time he had symptoms similar to the present episode and was treated by a physician, requiring the administration of sedatives. He recovered from this nervous condition to a certain extent but over the past several years has had a great many domestic difficulties which have added to his worries and caused him considerable nervousness and disturbance. In 1946 he had an attack of diverticulitis, at which time he had fever and pain in the abdomen. However, on treatment he recovered fairly promptly. In 1948 he was at Georgetown University Hospital with a recurrence of diverticulitis, at which time he had chills, a very high fever, severe pain in the abdomen, and was quite seriously ill. He was treated with penicillin and within a period of a few hours his temperature began to drop and he made a prompt and satisfactory recovery. Over the past few years the patient states that he has had some nervous tension and has had some difficulty in sleeping. He admits that he has required some sedation which has been of a mild type—namely seconal—3 or 4 nights a week in order to get the proper amount of rest. However, he denies any excessive use of barbiturates or any other type of drugs. He states that only in the past week has his condition been such that he needed moderately severe sedation such as he is taking at the present time.

In summary, we feel that Mr. Grunewald is suffering from a severe anxiety state that is under satisfactory control with sedation at the present time. We do not feel that the hydrocele plays any part in the present question of his health, nor is there any evidence of an active diverticulitis at this time. The entire question should rest upon the patient's emotional status. It is our opinion that Mr. Grunewald is not psychotic at this time nor is there any evidence that he has been psychotic at any time. There is no evidence of any abnormal thought content and we are of the opinion that he is mentally competent at this time. The fact that he has such a severe anxiety state which requires moderately heavy sedation at the present time in our opinion indicates that the patient is too ill to be asked to appear before either an open or closed hearing of the committee at this time. However, we have no hesitancy in saying that we believe the patient is in sufficiently good state that he could be interrogated at the hospital. Furthermore, we were assured by Dr. Curry that he anticipated that Mr. Grunewald would probably leave the hospital within the next week. If that is true, even though he may have to continue on sedation after leaving the hospital, it is our opinion that he should be available to testify before the committee at that time without any undue jeopardy to his health. On the other hand, if it is necessary for the patient to be kept in the hospital for a long period of time, it would probably be necessary to review the situation again within the next 2 weeks and to reevaluate the patient's status at that time.

G. HALSEY HUNT,  
Medical Director, USPHS, Chief,  
Division of Hospitals.

LUTHER L. TERRY,  
Medical Director, USPHS, Chief,  
Medical Service, USPHS Hospital,  
Baltimore, Md.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to address another question or two to Mr. Grunewald, if there is no objection.

Chairman KING. Go ahead; proceed.

Mr. MALONEY. May I say for the record, Mr. Chairman, I see no point in asking further questions. You will get the same answer. You are only upsetting the witness further.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, which officials of the Bureau of Internal Revenue are known to you?

Mr. MALONEY. I again direct the witness not to answer any questions at this time.

Mr. GRUNEWALD. I would like to answer, but my attorney instructs me not to do it.

Mr. DEWIND. Do you know any officers or officials employed by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, past or present?

Mr. MALONEY. I say now, Mr. DeWind, that you are asking these questions for the purpose of creating some kind of a record here in the face of a clear statement by me and by the witness that we insist that he will not answer any questions at this time, and that he insists upon his right to appear in a public hearing in the same forum in which the slanderous charges have been made against him and clear his name.

And he is going to insist on that.

And I tell you again, regardless of how many questions you ask, for whatever purpose you have in mind, this witness will not answer any questions today.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Maloney, you carry on at length about the slanderous charges that have been made against Mr. Grunewald in public sessions of our committee. I would suggest that perhaps you direct the committee's attention to the slanderous charges made against Mr. Grunewald in public session.

Mr. MALONEY. I suggest the committee read the clippings that appeared in every newspaper.

Mr. DEWIND. The clippings are not the record of public sessions of this committee.

Mr. MALONEY. They quote at length from public sessions of this committee.

I am sure that counsel has a complete set of clippings, and they would be available to the committee if they choose to read them.

Chairman KING. Mr. Maloney, I, as chairman of the committee, who has been present at every public session, have no recollection of any unkind, slanderous, or libelous statements being made about Mr. Grunewald.

To the contrary, I can recollect a few complimentary things having been said about him.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Chairman, I think it is simply a matter of directing Mr. Maloney, if he wishes to, to read the record rather than read the newspapers.

Mr. MALONEY. I don't for a minute think the newspapers incorrectly quoted the verbatim record of the committee.

Mr. DEWIND. Why do you not simply read the verbatim record? It is available to you, Mr. Maloney.

Mr. MALONEY. I so shall.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, have you ever discussed any tax cases pending before the Bureau of Internal Revenue, with any official or employee of the Bureau of Internal Revenue?

Mr. MALONEY. I make the same suggestion to the witness.

Mr. GRUNEWALD. If he makes the same direction, I got to follow what he says. I will appear in public hearings.

Mr. DEWIND. What is your answer, Mr. Grunewald?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. There is no answer.

Mr. DEWIND. You refuse to answer, on advice of your counsel?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. Until I appear in public hearings; yes, I will be glad to.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Chairman, I suggest you would direct the witness to answer.

Chairman KING. I must, Mr. Grunewald, direct you to answer the question, yes or no.

Mr. MALONEY. The witness will follow the advice of his counsel and refuse to answer, most respectfully, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DEWIND. What did you say, Mr. Grunewald? The chairman has directed you to answer the question.

Mr. GRUNEWALD. Mr. Chairman, listen to what counsel said.

Chairman KING. And you refuse to answer?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. On his advice.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, have you consulted with your counsel, or has your counsel advised you concerning the effects and the results that may flow from an improper refusal to answer questions of this committee?

Mr. MALONEY. Let me state for the record that I think that is an attempt to pry into the confidential relationship between an attorney and his client.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Maloney, you have not been questioned. Your client has been questioned.

Mr. MALONEY. I have no objection to your stating to Mr. Grunewald, and for the record, what you have in mind, as far as he is concerned, in the event that he refuses to answer, on the advice of counsel, and by direction of counsel.

I must object to any attempt to invade the right of privacy which exists between an attorney and his client.

Chairman KING. I take it, then, that you object to our having an understanding of what is in your client's mind when he refuses to answer a question put to him by counsel of this committee.

Mr. MALONEY. I do, sir. I am directing him to answer no questions at this time.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Chairman, of course, the clear purpose of my question was simply to try to make it clear, if it could be, to Mr. Grunewald that he has a right to be advised concerning the possibility of contempt of this committee. I did not want Mr. Grunewald to refuse to answer a question without having brought to his attention the possibility he might desire the advice of his counsel, if he has not already obtained it.

Mr. MALONEY. Why don't you make a statement for the record?

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. DeWind, by that statement, you do not mean to imply that this committee is under any obligation to apprise the witness of what his position might lead to; you know of no such obligation?

Mr. DEWIND. That, of course, is entirely correct. I was simply trying to be fair to Mr. Grunewald so that he would be apprised of the situation.

Mr. MALONEY. I would suggest you state to Mr. Grunewald, and for the record, what his position would be and then ask him if he still desires to follow the advice of his counsel.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions to ask at the present time.

Chairman KING. You are aware, Mr. Grunewald, that you have refused to answer questions, are you not?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. On advice of counsel, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman KING. And that by so doing, you are placing yourself in the position of the possible consequence of being in contempt of this committee?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. Mr. Chairman, may I—

Mr. MALONEY. I direct the witness not to answer.

Mr. GRUNEWALD. I would like to be given the opportunity to, as soon as I am well. That is all I ask for. Nothing else.

Chairman KING. Very well.

Mr. KEOGH. I move we recess, subject to the call of the chairman.

Chairman KING. If there is no objection, it is so ordered.

(Thereupon, at 2:55 p. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene subject to call of the Chair.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE ADMIN-  
ISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL  
REVENUE LAWS OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,  
Washington, D. C., Thursday, Dec. 20, 1951.  
EXECUTIVE SESSION

The subcommittee met at 2:30 p. m., pursuant to notice, in the main hearing room of the Committee on Ways and Means, New House Office Building, Hon. ROBERT W. KEAN, presiding.

Present: Representatives KEAN and CURTIS. Committee staff present: Adrian W. DeWind, chief counsel to the subcommittee; Charles S. Lyon, assistant counsel; James Q. Riordan, assistant counsel; and Walter C. Taylor, assistant counsel.

Mr. KEAN. The subcommittee will come to order.

Mr. Grunewald, what books and records have you brought?

STATEMENT OF HENRY GRUNEWALD, ACCOM-  
PANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, WILLIAM POWER  
MALONEY.

Mr. MALONEY. May I suggest at this time, Mr. Chairman, that I am appearing as Mr. Grunewald's attorney here today.

I would like to suggest at the outset a point of no quorum. I do not know if the committee would wish to rule on it at this time or consider making it a part of the record.

Mr. KEAN. Under the rules of the committee, Mr. Maloney, two members constitute a quorum.

Mr. MALONEY. Very good. That is the ruling of the committee, I take it?

Mr. KEAN. That is the ruling of the committee.

Mr. CURTIS. That is the written rule made up and published prior to the beginning of the investigation.

Mr. MALONEY. Very good, sir. I do not believe I have met you before, sir. My name is Maloney.

Mr. CURTIS. My name is CARL CURTIS.

Mr. KEAN. Those rules of the committee, of course, are available to you.

Mr. MALONEY. Thank you sir.

Mr. DEWIND. You have received a copy of our rules, have you not?

Mr. MALONEY. I have not up to this point.

Mr. DEWIND. I thought you had. We have discussed it before.

Mr. MALONEY. I do not know what you gentlemen prefer. If you can hear me quite clearly, I would just as soon talk without the aid of the microphone. It is a matter of my preference.

Mr. KEAN. I can hear.

Mr. MALONEY. Very good, sir.

May I say this, gentlemen, and as a preliminary statement to Mr. Grunewald's appearance here today, I would like to make a statement for the RECORD which will perhaps qualify for the RECORD what Mr. Grunewald's position is today.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Maloney, has your statement anything to do with that question of the papers that were subpoenaed?

Mr. MALONEY. Yes, sir; it does.

Mr. KEAN. Could you confine yourself to that at the moment?

Mr. MALONEY. I will do my best to obey your suggestion.

Mr. CURTIS. Would it be possible, before you start your statement, to enumerate and identify what records you have with you?

Mr. MALONEY. I will make this statement, sir, in response to your question. The witness has not produced here today any statements at all and I would like to state for the RECORD my reason for directing him not to produce the records here today.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Maloney, the other members of the committee who were very anxious to be here were unable to be here today. For that reason I think that we will postpone the continuation of this until tomorrow morning.

Mr. MALONEY. May I suggest this, sir. I came down from New York today to be here at this hearing to represent Mr. Grunewald. This is perhaps a plea in familius. My two sons have come home from school for the Christmas vacation. They arrived last night. We ordinarily spend that at our summer place at Bridgehampton, Long Island. It is my very earnest desire to spend as much time as I can with them. They are only here for a little over a week. It was rather unfortunate from my standpoint that this matter came on today. Frankly I made them a promise I would be home tonight. I know that that can carry very little weight with you gentlemen who have many important duties to attend to. But my reason for bringing it up at all is that I was going to ask if it is possible to defer this matter until after the Christmas holidays, if that would suit the convenience of the committee. After all, I have come here some 250 miles to be present today and this meeting was set at the request of the committee.

Mr. KEAN. We would not be able to complete it today, anyway.

Mr. MALONEY. May I suggest, Mr. Kean, that the position which I intend to take today is one which I think may well be the subject of review by the Congress and possibly by the courts.

I tell you quite frankly, if it will be of any guidance to you gentlemen in deciding whether you wish to put this matter over until tomorrow or not, that it is my intention to direct Mr. Grunewald to refuse to answer any questions at this time. I could do no more than give a similar direction tomorrow morning.

I did ask permission to make a statement for the record and my purpose in doing that was that I feel that out of a decent respect for the opinions of Congress I should state for the record the causes which impel me to direct Mr. Grunewald not to answer questions at this time. I will attempt to confine my statement to what I sincerely believe are valid reasons for his refusal to answer questions at this time. Such a statement would not take more than 10 or 15 minutes at the outside and I doubt if it would take even that.

With that in mind, perhaps, Mr. KEAN, you might wish to reconsider your decision to adjourn until tomorrow morning.

Mr. KEAN. All right, Mr. Maloney, you can make your statement, and then we will decide, after you have made it, whether we wish to go over until tomorrow morning.

Mr. MALONEY. Very good, sir.

Gentlemen, Mr. Grunewald has appeared before this closed session today in response to your subpoena. I am appearing with him as his attorney. I may say that the situation today is no different, so far as Mr. Grunewald is concerned than it was when this committee came to his sick room in the Georgetown Hospital on December 12 at which time I directed Mr. Grunewald to decline to answer any questions asked by the committee or its counsel at that time.

I then requested on his behalf that he be given the right to appear at an open hearing of this committee in the same forum in which his name and reputation have been slandered and vilified both in the record of this committee and in the public press and over the radio. I requested that he be given an opportunity to make whatever statement he desired to make at an open hearing, as I have said, in the same forum for all the public to hear.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Maloney, the committee has every intention of calling Mr. Grunewald in an open hearing. The thought is that it would be better all around, to avoid criticism, to get some of the information along the line that we are interested in in a closed hearing. You will remember the criticism of the committee on account of certain tes-

timony having come out which they say was not properly brought out in a closed hearing. That is the purpose of this executive session.

Mr. MALONEY. I quite understand your point, Mr. KEAN. I would like to say this, in response to it, that as far as Mr. Grunewald is concerned, the damage has already been done. I do not see how this committee has the power in anyway to undo what has been done.

The point which I wish to make is that as a result of what has already transpired, Mr. Grunewald has been deprived of the right guaranteed to him by the Constitution to have his name protected—and a good name is a property right just as well as anything else and the Constitution has always said that no man can be deprived of his property without due process.

As I said the other day at the hospital when you gentlemen were there, and I was quoting the words of the Vice President of the United States, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 19, 1950, at which time he was presiding, the Vice President said at that time, of congressional committees of inquiry generally:

"The Senate is not a grand jury. None of its committees are grand juries. The Senate cannot try anyone for any offense."

Of course, I then pointed out the Vice President's words apply with equal effect to any committee of the distinguished House of Representatives. Yet anyone who has read or heard of the proceedings which have been had before this committee can reach only one conclusion and that is that this proceeding is a trial.

Mr. KEAN. I would deny that as completely untrue.

Mr. MALONEY. I am stating for the record what is my reason for directing Mr. Grunewald not to answer. Perhaps you gentlemen will not agree with me when I get through; perhaps you will.

Mr. CURTIS. You do not agree with that yourself.

Mr. MALONEY. I beg your pardon, I most sincerely do.

Mr. CURTIS. A trial is a proceeding where a tribunal has authority to enter a judgment compelling people to do something or not to do something or inflicting punishment or pronouncing punishment. You, of course, know that a committee of Congress investigating, conducts no such proceeding.

Mr. MALONEY. That is just the very thing I was about to object to, sir, the attempt by this committee to conduct a trial.

Mr. CURTIS. The distinguished Vice President is entitled to his opinion. What you are quoting is an opinion of an individual. Certainly it is not binding upon the House of Representatives.

Mr. MALONEY. I believe I quoted him correctly, sir.

Mr. CURTIS. I have no question as to the quotation, but even if the quotation is true, it is not binding upon the House of Representatives.

Mr. MALONEY. I would say it is not binding, but I should say it would carry a great deal of weight as a suggestion coming from a man of his stature, sir.

May I say this? I am not desirous of getting into a discussion with you, Mr. CURTIS, about the technical distinctions of a trial. My objection here is based upon the attempt by a congressional committee to conduct a trial in public of persons who have been accused in the public press and in the record of these proceedings of the commission of crimes and to judge and condemn them in the public press, if you please, sir, before they have had an opportunity to present their side of the case without the right guaranteed by the Constitution, to be confronted by the witnesses against them and to cross-examine them, without the right to be present at the time such accusations are made, with no protection,

sir, by the rules of evidence which have been time-tested for the protection of all accused. All of these rights I maintain, sir, most respectfully, have been violated by this committed in the proceedings which have been had up to now. It is for that reason, sir, that I allude to the proceedings which have been had as a public trial.

I may say, sir, that it is a public trial which, in my opinion—and believe me, I am being very serious about this, and I think it is a very serious point—which has been conducted in flagrant disregard of the fundamental rights of witnesses and other persons, the rights which have been guaranteed to witnesses and persons by the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Maloney, will you try to specify how this has affected your client specifically?

Mr. MALONEY. I am coming to that.

Mr. KEAN. You have made a very general statement.

Mr. MALONEY. I wish merely to say this, sir. The Supreme Court has said, speaking of congressional committees, and I refer to the case of *Sinclair v. United States* (279 U. S. 263), quoting from page 291:

"The cases show that while the power of inquiry is an essential and appropriate auxiliary to the legislative function, it must be exerted with due regard for the rights of witnesses, and a witness may rightfully refuse to answer where the bound of the power are exceeded or where the questions asked are not pertinent to the matter under inquiry."

I submit, sir, that in conducting these proceedings as they have been conducted up to now, this committee has exceeded the powers, any powers which it could derive as a result of being a committee of Congress.

Mr. KEAN. Where does this get to your client? You are talking about all sorts of people who are not your client. Your client has not been asked any questions yet except, the other day, what was his name.

Mr. MALONEY. Very good, sir. If you will bear with me, I will conclude very shortly.

I may say this, sir, that although I cannot claim to speak for the bar of the United States, nor for any of our courts, nevertheless I am sure that the bar of the United States and the courts of the United States must be gravely disturbed by this spectacle of a congressional committee conducting which, with due deference to Mr. CURTIS, I maintain is a public trial of persons who have not been informed of the nature of the accusation against them and in derogation of every right guaranteed to them by the fifth and sixth amendments to the Constitution.

Now I am sure you gentlemen are all familiar with the fifth amendment to the Constitution. I would like to read just one or two lines of it for the record. It reads as follows:

"No person shall be held to answer for a capital or other infamous crime unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury \* \* \* nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law. \* \* \*"

I submit, sir, that from what has gone on before my client and other persons are being held to answer in the public gaze, in the public estimation, they are being tried in the newspapers by reason of the reports which have emanated from these proceedings without any indictment, without ever being informed what they are accused of except some surmise. As a matter of fact, I was shocked to read that Mr. Caudle was permitted to state for the record that it was his surmise that it was my client who made the extortion telephone call to Mr. Teitelbaum.

Sir, I know of no court in the English-speaking world, certainly not in the United States of America, where such a thing would be permitted; and yet who can say that such a statement broadcast in the press and on

the radio can ever be eradicated from the mind of the public, the very public out of which a jury some day may have to be drawn to try my client for that very offense.

Mr. KEAN. Excuse me for interrupting but you are arguing entirely against your own case. You are arguing that you do not like the public hearings and you are appearing here today to say that you want public hearings. Now what is the answer? What we are trying to do in the private hearings is to meet the only criticism I have heard by any members of the bar and that was that we had not had the private hearings before we had the public hearings. You are talking about public hearings. Now you have stated already that if we have public hearings, you are willing to recommend to your client that he come and be heard.

Mr. MALONEY. Sir, I am very glad that you brought that point up at this time and my answer is this: I cannot accept with any assurance, as a reasonable man, that in the event his testimony was taken in executive session, as we are now sitting in here, that such testimony would not be made available or parts of it to the press. I am sorry to say that I have observed statements in the press in connection with these hearings which could only have emanated from testimony taken in executive session.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Maloney, are you surprised about that?

Mr. MALONEY. No, sir, I am not. I make that statement advisedly.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Chairman, I would ask Mr. Maloney to specify instances where such testimony has been released by the committee.

Mr. MALONEY. If you wish me to take the time to get all the clippings together of the proceedings which have been had before this committee, I shall be happy to do it. I have read them, and I might say I have followed them quite closely.

Mr. KEAN. Will you give one or two instances where testimony taken in executive session has appeared in the public press?

Mr. MALONEY. I do not have the clippings with me, sir. There is no doubt in my mind, if I can get the clippings, I will point out such instances. If you wish me to take the time and the clippings are made available, I am certain that such instances do exist.

Mr. DEWIND. I feel that you should not make any statements that executive session testimony has been released by this committee to the press unless you are prepared to back them up.

Mr. MALONEY. I am certainly prepared to back them up.

Mr. DEWIND. Not at the moment, though.

Mr. MALONEY. I am rather shocked to find that you dispute it, Mr. DeWind.

Mr. DEWIND. Of course I dispute it. You are not prepared to back it up.

Mr. MALONEY. I certainly do not feel I am making an irresponsible statement in making that statement. If anything it is an understatement.

Mr. DEWIND. Why don't you produce what you are basing it on?

Mr. MALONEY. As I said, I will not take the time of this committee to dig through all the clippings. If the clippings are available here, I will find them for you. I shall be happy to point them out.

Mr. DEWIND. I would suggest if you make that statement you should come equipped with that evidence.

Mr. MALONEY. That is your opinion, Mr. DeWind. I did not expect you to dispute it. I think it is an obvious fact. Anybody who has read those newspaper clippings could arrive at no other conclusion.

Mr. DEWIND. It seems to me you are engaging in wild surmise.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. DeWind, I am sure you are entitled to your opinion. I am entitled to mine. I think I have not engaged in any wild surmise. I think any person, any un-

biased person, who has followed the proceedings in the press would be inclined to agree with me.

Mr. KEAN. We have found, Mr. Maloney, that when we do have closed hearings the witnesses bring in the names of a lot of other people and very often it would seem better for their own protection not to bring their names in the open hearings which would automatically come out when a certain question was asked. That is one of the reasons why it seems a better practice for the protection of everybody and for the constitutional rights of people to have the closed hearings before we have the open hearings.

Mr. MALONEY. Sir, if that has been the practice of this committee from the outset a great deal of the criticism which has been leveled at the practice and procedure of this committee could well have been avoided. It might have been eliminated altogether.

Mr. KEAN. That has been what the desire of the committee was.

Mr. MALONEY. I quite agree with you, sir, that would have been a salutary thing. Unfortunately, sir, that has not been done, has not been followed, and I say that citing as an example offhand the testimony of Mr. Teitelbaum, a man of ill repute, a man apparently about to be indicted for violation of the law, the idea of his being allowed to give the rankest kind of hearsay testimony in public is something which I think has shocked the conscience of every member of the bar.

I am here, sir, for what I maintain is a valid reason, and that is to protect the rights of my client. I feel I can no longer, as a reasonable man, accept an assurance that whatever he says here will remain secret, nor can I accept assurance that he will ever be given an opportunity to appear in public at or near the times when these accusations have been made.

I submit, sir, it is not going to do my client any good to have him appear in public 2 or 3 months from now when this poison has been seeping through the system of every member of the public from whom a jury may some day be drawn to try him. It is not going to do him any good to then appear and enter his denials on the record, sir.

I maintain that in the interest of justice in an open hearing a witness whose name has been mentioned should be permitted to be present. He should be permitted to have counsel there and he should have the right to cross-examine the witness who has testified against him. I think in all fairness that is the only way in which a man's reputation can be protected adequately.

As we all know as practical men, and I am sure Mr. CURTIS will agree with me, a denial 6 months later in a public hearing is of very little force and effect and can do little to eradicate the damage done or restore a man's reputation and good name.

Mr. KEAN. Would you be willing to have Mr. Grunewald appear and testify in a private hearing if it was a day or two before a public hearing?

Mr. MALONEY. No, sir. I say this, sir, very respectfully. Mr. Grunewald should be given an opportunity to appear in a public hearing without any further delay to make such statement as he wishes there.

Continuing on with my statement, I would like to call the attention of this committee, and through this committee the attention of the Congress of the United States, to the sixth amendment to the Constitution. I am sure you are familiar with it, but I would like to state parts of it for the record:

"In all criminal proceedings, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed. \* \* \* and to be informed of the nature and the cause of the accusation; to be confronted"—and that is a very valuable right—"with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtain-

ing witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense."

Mr. KEAN. You do not consider this as a criminal trial?

Mr. MALONEY. This in my opinion is a trial of persons accused of crime. There have been accusations here of an extortion attempt. A story has been told and widely circulated that some person made a telephone call to a man named Teitelbaum and threatened him with dire consequences unless he acceded to the demand for \$500,000. My client's name has been broadcast in connection with that testimony.

May I say, sir, as I said, that Mr. Caudle has been permitted to surmise at least, and I use the word he used, "surmise," that it was my client who made that telephone call. I state right now for the record that nothing could be further from the truth than that. But nevertheless the damage as far as my client is concerned has been done.

Let us assume that some day there may be an indictment brought in the orderly process of law against the persons accused of attempting to shake down or extort that money from Teitelbaum. As a result of what has already appeared in the Nation's press and over the radio, it has been made impossible for my client or any other person who may be indicted to obtain a trial by an impartial jury, to obtain a trial by persons whose minds have not already been impregnated and poisoned with this rankest kind of hearsay testimony.

Now I say this, that the law in its wisdom has always had a provision called change of venue, under which any man who has been unfairly condemned in the press may apply for a change of venue to a district where he has not been unfairly attacked. I say, sir, that unfortunately, as a result of the Nation-wide coverage given to these proceedings, it is now impossible for anyone who may be accused of a crime by a grand jury to find an impartial jury.

This is a very serious threat to the orderly administration of justice in this country. I think it is one that should well merit great consideration by the Congress.

Far be it from me, sir, to appear here before you gentlemen and suggest what remedy or what should be done to prevent such things happening again. I am confident that the Members of Congress are cognizant of the problem and I feel confident also that if it is brought to their attention, and that is the purpose of my statement here, they will do something to protect the rights of witnesses which have been guaranteed to all citizens by the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. KEAN. I will say that the committee did make an attempt and tried to give Mr. Grunewald an opportunity to appear in a public session. Mr. Grunewald unfortunately went to the hospital so he could not be here.

Mr. MALONEY. Of the ways of mice and men and physical illnesses, unfortunately that is something no one has any control over. The committee's own doctors did examine him and said he was too ill to leave the hospital at that time. He is here today in response to your subpoena.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Maloney, you have not as yet gotten down to the facts as to how this actually affects your man here and also you have not said anything about that justification for refusal to produce documents which you are going to do later.

Mr. MALONEY. Yes, sir, I say his refusal to produce documents is based on exactly the same premise as his refusal to testify before the committee.

Mr. KEAN. Will the documents be produced at a public hearing?

Mr. MALONEY. Sir, he will obey whatever subpoena is served upon him to appear at a public hearing.

Mr. KEAN. Including documents?

Mr. MALONEY. Yes.

That about concludes my statement, Mr. Kean. Thank you for the privilege.

Mr. CURTIS. I may ask a question or two. Do you anticipate making any objections to the answering of questions by your client on any day subsequent to this?

Mr. MALONEY. Sir, I think that is something that as his attorney I will have to decide at the time the point arises. There is a great deal going on in the interim here, and what may transpire in the meantime will have some effect upon it.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it your intention to object to the answering of questions by your client if this hearing is continued until tomorrow in executive session?

Mr. MALONEY. If the hearing is continued in executive session, sir, I shall.

Mr. CURTIS. What are your intentions if we interrogate your client in public hearings?

Mr. MALONEY. Sir, at that time I shall advise him to make such statement as I think proper at that time.

Mr. CURTIS. You expect to advise him not to answer our questions?

Mr. MALONEY. May I respectfully reserve the right to answer that question, Congressman CURTIS, until such time as the open hearing is set?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Maloney, it may be that the acting chairman will adjourn this meeting. I think that in fairness to the committee and to you and everybody else it should be stated that that is the procedure that we agreed on earlier today by reason of a commitment to other members of this committee. Everyone is busy, I realize that, but the committee members have had duties in Washington and elsewhere, official duties, and we have made the commitment that we would not proceed with this hearing until other members of the committee could be here, and any continuation or decision not to proceed with questioning of Mr. Grunewald today is not an admission on the part of the committee that the contentions that you have made are granted or acceded to in any way.

Mr. KEAN. The committee will stand adjourned until 10:30 tomorrow morning. I direct the service of the subpoenas to be sure they will be here.

Mr. MALONEY. There is no question of my client appearing at such time as they direct him to be there, or you may serve the subpoena.

(Thereupon, at 3:15 p. m., a recess was taken until Friday, December 21, 1951, at 10:30 a. m.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE ADMINISTRATION  
OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE LAWS OF  
THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,  
Washington, D. C., December 21, 1951.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The subcommittee met at 10:50 a. m., pursuant to recess, in the main hearing room of the Committee on Ways and Means, New House Office Building, Hon. EUGENE J. KEOGH presiding.

Present: Representatives KEOGH, KEAN, and CURTIS.

Present also: Representatives WOODRUFF and MASON.

Committee staff present: Adrian W. DeWind, chief counsel to the subcommittee; Charles S. Lyon, assistant counsel; John E. Tobin, assistant counsel; James Q. Riordan, assistant counsel; and Walter C. Taylor, assistant counsel.

Mr. KEOGH. The subcommittee will come to order.

I would like to have the record note that pursuant to the rules of the subcommittee we have consented to the presence during this executive session of Representatives WOODRUFF, of Michigan, and MASON, of Illinois, both members of the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Grunewald, would you be good enough to stand and take the oath?

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you will give in this proceeding will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. I do, sir.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. DeWind.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, will you state your full name, please?

TESTIMONY OF HENRY W. GRUNEWALD, WASHINGTON, D. C., ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, WILLIAM POWER MALONEY

Mr. GRUNEWALD. Henry W. Grunewald.

Mr. DEWIND. What is your residence, Mr. Grunewald?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. Westchester Apartments.

Mr. DEWIND. Do you have a business office, place of business?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. Gentlemen, I am following the advice of my counsel and for the reasons which he stated I most respectfully decline to answer any questions at this time.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, on what are you basing your refusal to answer questions?

Mr. MALONEY. I would like to state for the information of the gentlemen who were not here yesterday that I made quite a lengthy—

Mr. KEOGH. Excuse me, Mr. Maloney, you are under no obligation or duty to advise the members who are sitting here with the consent of the subcommittee as to anything that has been said. I think you have been reminded previously of the rules of this subcommittee with respect to the position of counsel for any person called to testify.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Keough, I am quite aware of that. In the interest of saving time I merely wish to say that I stated on the record yesterday the reasons why I would so direct Mr. Grunewald not to answer any questions at this time. He has stated now that for the reasons stated by counsel he most respectfully declines to answer any question at this time.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, on what basis are you basing your refusal to answer questions.

Mr. GRUNEWALD. On the advice of my counsel which says, as I read before, gentlemen—if you want me to repeat it?

Mr. DEWIND. No, I do not wish you to repeat that statement. You merely said on advice of counsel you would not answer questions.

Mr. GRUNEWALD. And for the reasons which he has stated.

Mr. DEWIND. Perhaps I might say, Mr. Grunewald, that except for the possibility that you might decline to answer questions on the ground of possible self-incrimination under the fifth amendment, it is not my view that you have any proper basis on which to refuse to answer questions here. I wish to direct your attention to the fact that in my view your refusal to answer, except possibly on the grounds I have stated, would place you in contempt of the Congress of the United States.

Then, Mr. Chairman, I suggest it might be advisable for the chairman to put the question to the witness.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Reporter, will you repeat the question that is pending?

(The pending question was read by the reporter as follows:)

"Do you have a business office, place of business?"

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Grunewald, I direct you to answer the question which is pending for you to answer.

Mr. GRUNEWALD. I am following the advice of my counsel, sir, and for the reasons which he has stated I most respectfully decline to answer any questions at this time.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. DeWind.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, when did you first learn of the tax investigation being conducted by the Bureau of Internal Revenue involving Abraham Teitelbaum, Chicago?

MR. GRUNEWALD. Sir, do you mind my referring to the same statement I made before? I stand on that.

MR. KEOGH. Mr. Grunewald, I direct that you answer the question put to you by the counsel of the subcommittee.

MR. GRUNEWALD. I still stand on my statement, sir.

MR. KEOGH. Mr. DeWind.

MR. DEWIND. When did you first discuss the Teitelbaum case with Mr. Oliphant, who was then Chief Counsel of the Bureau of Internal Revenue?

MR. MALONEY. May I at this time point out for the record, sir, that the position which the witness has taken and intends to maintain as to all questions has been quite clearly stated for the record. I can see no point at this time in plying him with further questions which can only elicit the same statement from the witness.

MR. KEOGH. Mr. Maloney, that is a question which the subcommittee can and will decide.

MR. GRUNEWALD, I direct you to answer the last question put to you by counsel of the subcommittee.

MR. GRUNEWALD. I only have to go back and read you the same story. Gentlemen, I am following the advice of my counsel. That is what I am paying him for and his advice is my advice to me. For that reason which he has stated I most respectfully decline to answer any questions.

MR. KEOGH. Mr. DeWind.

MR. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, is your refusal to answer this question and the prior question based in whole or to any extent upon a claim of possible self-incrimination?

MR. GRUNEWALD. I am sorry, Mr. DeWind, but I must answer in the same fashion.

MR. DEWIND. Do you wish to consult with your counsel before making the answer to that question?

MR. GRUNEWALD. No; I do not.

MR. DEWIND. Now the question I am asking, Mr. Grunewald, is this: Whether in refusing to answer questions placed to you by this subcommittee you are to any extent basing your refusal upon a plea of possible self-incrimination under the fifth amendment?

MR. GRUNEWALD. I have got to refer back to the same statement I made to you before. Do you want me to read it again?

MR. DEWIND. You make any answer you wish to make to the question.

MR. GRUNEWALD. Well, gentlemen, I am following the advice of my counsel and for the reasons which he has stated I most respectfully decline to answer any questions at this time.

MR. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, how old are you?

MR. GRUNEWALD. Fifty-nine.

MR. DEWIND. Where were you born, Mr. Grunewald?

MR. GRUNEWALD. I have to give you the same answer. I am following the advice of my counsel and for that reason which he has stated I most respectfully decline to answer any questions at this point.

MR. DEWIND. How long have you lived at the Westchester apartments?

MR. GRUNEWALD. The same answer, sir.

MR. DEWIND. Mr. Chairman, do you wish to direct the witness to answer that question?

MR. KEOGH. Mr. Witness, I direct you to answer the last question put to you by the counsel of the subcommittee.

MR. GRUNEWALD. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to you I stand on my last statement.

MR. DEWIND. Mr. Chairman, would you care to direct the witness to answer the question as to where he was born?

MR. KEOGH. I direct you, Mr. Witness, to answer the question as to where you were born.

MR. GRUNEWALD. I didn't get the chairman's question. Would you mind repeating your question, sir?

MR. KEOGH. Mr. Stenographer, will you repeat the last statement by direction of the acting chairman?

(The statement referred to was read back by the reporter.)

MR. GRUNEWALD. With great respect to you, Mr. Chairman, I decline to answer on the grounds of the advice of my attorney, as I have read before.

MR. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, I would like to direct your attention that to my knowledge your counsel has not stated that your refusal to answer questions would be based in any part upon any claim that your answer might tend to incriminate you under the fifth amendment of the United States Constitution. Are you aware of that?

MR. MALONEY. Mr. DeWind, you were here yesterday when I made the statement. I was here and my client was here. I think the record will speak for itself as to what was said. My client was here and heard it and I think the record speaks for itself in that regard.

MR. DEWIND. Mr. Maloney, it seems to me appropriate to make that point entirely clear, and perhaps it could be made clearer by having your views stated for the record that you have not on behalf of your client claimed any privilege based upon possible self-incrimination.

MR. MALONEY. With the gracious permission of Mr. Kean and Mr. Curtis yesterday, I made a rather lengthy statement of the reasons why I intended to direct Mr. Grunewald to decline to answer any question which might be asked of him in an executive session. I made that statement in order that the Congress might have before it a complete statement of what I believe to be the valid reasons for his declining to answer questions at this time. I see no point in my now adding to that statement.

MR. DEWIND. I was simply undertaking an effort to be entirely fair to your client, that his refusal to answer questions very clearly has not been based upon a claim of possible self-incrimination. I want to give you every opportunity to correct that situation if you wish to do so or to claim it if you wish to claim it.

MR. MALONEY. I wish to remind you, Mr. DeWind, that my client has stated he will decline to answer any questions today for the reasons which I set forth in my statement yesterday. I think the record will speak for itself on that subject.

MR. KEOGH. Mr. Grunewald, pursuant to the direction of the subcommittee present I am advising you now that it is the present opinion of the subcommittee that it has no knowledge that your refusal to answer any of the questions put to you is predicated upon the belief that the answering of them would tend to incriminate you. The subcommittee has directed me to call your attention to that.

I have also been directed by the subcommittee to inform you that the claim of such privilege must be made by the witness personally and cannot be made by anyone on his behalf.

MR. DEWIND. In the light of what has been said, Mr. Grunewald, I repeat the question I put to you earlier: Where were you born?

MR. GRUNEWALD. Mr. DeWind, as I stated before—it is only a repetition of what I have told you before—I am following the advice of my counsel and for the reasons which he has stated I most respectfully decline to answer any questions at this time.

MR. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, pursuant to the subpoena of this committee, have you produced the books, records, and documents called for by the subpoena served upon you?

MR. GRUNEWALD. I am following the advice of my counsel and for the reasons which he has stated, to answer your question, I most respectfully decline to answer any questions at this time.

MR. DEWIND. Mr. Chairman, would you wish to direct the witness to produce the books,

records, and documents called for by the subpoena served upon him?

MR. GRUNEWALD. I am following the advice of my counsel and for the reasons which he has stated, to answer your question, I most respectfully decline to answer any questions at this time.

MR. DEWIND. Mr. Chairman, would you wish to direct the witness to produce the books, records, and documents called for by the subpoena served upon him at this time?

MR. KEOGH. Mr. Witness, pursuant to the decision of the subcommittee I direct you to produce the books, records, and documents called for by the subpoena served upon you.

MR. MALONEY. May I advise the witness as to the form of the answer which, in my opinion, he may make to that, sir?

MR. KEOGH. Yes.

MR. GRUNEWALD. On the advice of my counsel and for the reasons which he has stated, I most respectfully decline to do so at this time. I emphasize that.

MR. DEWIND. Mr. Chairman, it would seem appropriate at this point to make a part of the record here copies of all the subpoenas that have been served upon Mr. Grunewald.

MR. KEOGH. Without objection that will be done, together with the proof of service thereof on the witness.

(See infra in appendix A for these and other subpoenas.)

MR. KEOGH. Mr. Maloney, I am informed that the first subpoena duces tecum issued by the subcommittee to Mr. Grunewald was handed to you and you stated that you waived any question of the effective service.

MR. MALONEY. That is correct.

MR. KEOGH. Mr. Grunewald, you just heard my last question and Mr. Maloney's answer?

MR. GRUNEWALD. Yes, Mr. Chairman; I did hear that.

MR. KEOGH. The subcommittee will resolve itself into an executive session and has directed me to suggest to you, Mr. Grunewald, that you step aside and remain available to the subcommittee.

MR. GRUNEWALD. You mean I should go out in the building?

MR. KEOGH. Yes.

MR. MALONEY. May I inquire, does that mean the witness should leave the building or be subject—

MR. KEOGH. It is best not to have him leave the building. We will communicate with you shortly.

MR. MALONEY. In other words, you want him to be available immediately.

May I ask the chairman, if it would be permissible, if the Chair could give me any indication of how long we will be kept here today, because I would like to make plans, if possible.

MR. KEOGH. Just as soon as we have any information on that subject, we will communicate it to you, Mr. Maloney.

MR. MALONEY. Very good. I shall appreciate that.

Before we leave, I did make a statement yesterday and in view of the questions which have been asked today may I now again ask for permission to elaborate somewhat on the statement which I made yesterday? My reason for making that request, sir, is a very serious one. It is obvious to me, I think, that this matter may well go before the Congress, may ultimately wind up in our courts. I think that it is important in the interest of my client that I should state fully, perhaps more fully than I did yesterday, the reasons which have impelled me to advise him as I have.

MR. KEOGH. Now will you let the acting chairman consult with the other members of the subcommittee in deciding on that?

MR. MALONEY. Very good.

(A short recess.)

MR. KEOGH. Mr. Maloney, I have been directed by the subcommittee to inform you that it will be pleased to receive from you any statement that you might now want to

make, that statement to be submitted to the subcommittee in writing, at which time we will then decide and let you know whether it will be made a part of the record.

Mr. MALONEY. Yes, sir.

May I say, sir, in response to that that I most seriously urge the necessity of including my statement in the record because it is certainly my very serious intention to test in the courts the validity of any proceedings which may be taken against Mr. Grunewald. I think that this matter is a very serious matter and one which we should have some law on at the earliest possible moment for the protection of the rights of all citizens.

Mr. KEOGH. I think I can assure you, Mr. Maloney, that the subcommittee will have in mind and take under consideration what you have just said.

Mr. MALONEY. Very good.

Mr. KEOGH. The subcommittee will now stand in recess until 11:35, at which time I have been instructed to direct you to produce the witness under subpoena, and at which time we will hold a public hearing.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE  
ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL  
REVENUE LAWS OF THE COMMIT-  
TEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,  
Washington, D. C.,  
Friday, December 21, 1951.

PUBLIC HEARING

The subcommittee met at 11:35 a. m., pursuant to notice, in the main hearing room of the Committee on Ways and Means, New House Office Building, Hon. EUGENE J. KEOGH presiding.

Present: Representatives KEOGH, KEAN, and CURTIS.

Present also: Representative MASON.

Committee staff present: Adrian W. DeWind, chief counsel to the subcommittee; Charles S. Lyon, assistant counsel; John E. Tobin, assistant counsel; Charles W. Davis, clerk of Ways and Means Committee; James Q. Riordan, assistant counsel; and Walter C. Taylor, assistant counsel.

Mr. KEOGH. The subcommittee will come to order.

Mr. Henry W. Grunewald has been sworn and is called as a witness.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, may I make a request that at the outset of this hearing, this public hearing, the use of flash cameras be discontinued during the testimony or the statements which are to be made? I think that flash bulbs going off in a person's face certainly are not conducive to calm and collected reflective thinking. I do not wish to deprive the news cameramen of their opportunity to take whatever pictures they wish of my client, but I do wish that during the actual proceedings the flash cameras be dispensed with.

Mr. KEOGH. The subcommittee has uniformly sought to accommodate the convenience of all witnesses in the manner to which you refer. We can say to you that we have had the cooperation of the press photographers. I am sure they will continue to cooperate with us. If it is agreeable with your client, we will suggest that the photographers take as many shots now as they think they ought to have and thereafter give the witness the usual consideration that they have extended heretofore.

Mr. MALONEY. Very good; that is agreeable.

TESTIMONY OF HENRY W. GRUNEWALD, WASH-  
INGTON, D. C., ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL,  
WILLIAM POWER MALONEY

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, you have already told the subcommittee that your name is Henry W. Grunewald, that you are 59 years of age, and live in Westchester Apartments. Is that correct?

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, at this time I most respectfully ask the permission of

the Chair to make a statement and to lay upon the record of this proceeding, this public proceeding, the reasons and the basis for certain advice which I am going to give Mr. Grunewald at this time as his attorney.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Maloney, the subcommittee will take under consideration your request.

Mr. Maloney, I am advised by the subcommittee present here this morning to inform you that the subcommittee will not at this time receive any statement from you as counsel for the witness.

Mr. MALONEY. May I say, sir, that I am appearing here as attorney, and I must as his attorney insist upon my right to represent this man.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Maloney, you are appearing here as an attorney, and you are here with the consent and permission of this subcommittee. You must abide by the rules adopted by the subcommittee, and which rules have been heretofore uniformly applied to all who have appeared before this subcommittee.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, may I respectfully say that the Constitution of the United States far antedates any rules of the subcommittee.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Maloney, you are out of order.

Mr. MALONEY. If it is out of order for an attorney to appear and protect the rights of a witness before a committee, that is the first time I have heard of it. I do not intend to be disrespectful at all, sir, but I do insist that this man is a citizen of the United States, and he has certain constitutional rights.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Maloney, you heard the ruling of the subcommittee. I admonish you to respect that ruling and abide by it.

Mr. MALONEY. I have no choice but to adhere to the ruling of the Chair. I say it is most unfair for the Chair to rule that way.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Maloney, the subcommittee is not listening to you.

Mr. MALONEY. I don't see how they can fail to hear me, sir, and I insist on my rights now as attorney to appear and state the reasons why I am going to direct my client to refuse to answer any questions. I intend to lay the foundation to take this matter to the Supreme Court, if necessary.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Maloney, I warn you that a continuation of this conduct will necessarily force us to remove you from this hearing.

Mr. MALONEY. Sir, you may remove me, but I doubt your capacity or the capacity of anyone to stop me from representing my client to the best of my ability. I say, sir, I wish to lay the foundation and make a record which will be the subject of review by every court in this country.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, I will proceed with the questioning, stating to you first that you have the right to consult with your counsel prior to answering any question that is put to you.

Now what is your business address, Mr. Grunewald?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. Gentlemen, I am following the advice of my counsel and for reasons which he has stated I most respectfully decline to answer any questions at this time.

Mr. MALONEY. And for the reasons which I was not permitted to state for the record but which I will insist—

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, if you wish to state for the record the basis on which you refuse to answer questions and if you wish to consult with your counsel before making any such statement, you are at liberty to do so.

Mr. GRUNEWALD. Gentlemen, I request to read the statement prepared by my counsel.

Mr. MALONEY. In answer to a question asked by Mr. DeWind.

Go ahead and read it.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, if the answer turns out to be unresponsive, of course

I will have to interrupt you and ask the chairman to direct you to answer the question.

Mr. KEOGH. May I ask the stenographer to repeat the question put to the witness?

(The question referred to was read back by the reporter as follows: "Now what is your business address, Mr. Grunewald?")

Mr. MALONEY. Would you read the colloquy following after that, please?

Mr. DEWIND. It is simply the pending question.

Mr. MALONEY. I would like to have the colloquy read.

Mr. KEOGH. The colloquy is not a part of the record.

Mr. MALONEY. I suggest, sir, that out of the colloquy arose another question, but my recollection may be wrong. I do request in the interest of clarity of the record that the colloquy be read back on that point.

Mr. DEWIND. I simply advised Mr. Grunewald prior to answering that question if he wished to consult you he was at liberty to do so. The question is: What is your business address?

Mr. MALONEY. May I ask that the record be read back?

Mr. KEOGH. The request is denied.

Mr. MALONEY. Then my client at this time wishes to state for the record his reason for declining to answer questions at this time. He will now proceed to read the statement.

Mr. GRUNEWALD (reading): "Mr. Henry W. Grunewald has appeared here today in response to a subpoena of this committee. I am appearing with him as his counsel.

"As this committee already knows, Mr. Grunewald was recently confined to Georgetown Hospital as a patient from December 6 until December 17. Your own doctors examined him and reported that his physical and mental condition was such that he could not with safety leave the hospital and appear before this committee. Although he has been released from the hospital, he is ill and very sick, and both the committee doctors and Mr. Grunewald's physician are in agreement that he still requires medical attention for an indeterminate time. I have advised Mr. Grunewald as fully as I can to consider his present mental and physical condition, of his rights and duties as a witness before this committee, and as his counsel I here and now publicly advise and direct him not to answer any question which may be asked of him today by this committee or by its counsel.

"It is my respect for the Congress of the United States which requires me to declare the reasons which impel me to so advise him. Furthermore, it is necessary for the protection of my client's rights that a record be made at this time setting forth what I believe to be valid reasons for his refusal to testify, so that in the event this matter is reviewed by Congress and the courts, Congress and the courts shall have before them a record of what transpired here and the reasons advanced in support of Mr. Grunewald's rightful refusal to testify.

"The Supreme Court of the United States has said in the case of *Sinclair v. The United States* (279 U. S. 263), and I quote from page 291:

"While the power of inquiry is an essential and appropriate auxiliary to the legislative functions, it must be exerted with due regard for the rights of witnesses, and a witness may rightfully refuse to answer where the bounds of the power are exceeded."

"I would not for one moment dispute the right of a congressional committee to conduct a legitimate inquiry for the purpose of ascertaining facts upon which to base recommendations for legislation. I do not do so now.

"I do say, however, that the procedure followed by the present inquiry has gone far astray of any legitimate purpose or power possessed by the Congress of the United States. Any one who has read the newspaper

accounts of the proceedings before this committee or listened to the news broadcasts cannot fail to arrive at a conclusion that these proceedings are in effect a public trial of persons whose names have been bandied about with utter disregard of the fundamental rights guaranteed to all citizens by the Constitution, a trial conducted in flagrant disregard of the rules of evidence which have been established and time-tested for the protection of the rights of all citizens. Among these rights are the right to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation and to be confronted with the witnesses against him, the right to cross-examine witnesses produced against him, the right to be present at the trial and be represented by counsel of his own choosing, and the right to a verdict at the hands of an impartial jury.

"These are basic fundamental rights guaranteed to all citizens by the Constitution of the United States. I cannot stand idly by and permit an attack upon the fundamental law of our country, a law which, by the way, far antedates and supersedes any rules or rights of this committee.

"While I do not claim to speak for them, I feel that the entire bar of the United States, the courts of our country, the Congress, and every thinking citizen must be deeply disturbed by the spectacle of a congressional committee under the guise of obtaining legislative facts conducting a trial by association and surmise in which the accused are neither informed of the nature of the charge against them or granted any of the rights guaranteed by the Constitution. If in the course of a proper inquiry it should be revealed that public officials are dishonest or incompetent, the law provides that they may be removed by impeachment. This is not an impeachment proceeding. In fact, the House has no power to try an impeachment proceeding.

"Speaking of a senatorial investigation committee, the Vice President of the United States was presiding in the Senate on June 19, 1950, and said:

"The Senate is not a grand jury. None of its committees are grand juries. The Senate cannot try anyone for any offense."

"I submit the words of the Vice President apply with equal force to any committee of this distinguished House of Representatives. Yet in this unprecedented trial—and I insist that this is a trial—this committee is usurping the power and functions of the grand jury and of the Constitution of the United States. This committee has cast itself in the role of prosecutor, grand jury, trial court, witnesses, and jury in derogation of the rights guaranteed to all citizens by the Constitution.

"My client has been depicted in the press and over the radio as an influence peddler, a generally unsavory character, as a fixer, as a party to a criminal attempt to extort money.

"All of the foregoing are the basis of the rankest kind of hearsay testimony and surmises which this committee has permitted to be spread on the public record in complete and utter disregard of the rights of my client and in violation of the express provision of the Constitution.

"Nor do I stand alone in my condemnation of the methods of this committee and the practice pursued by its counsel in this respect. A member of this very committee has publicly expressed his disapproval in strongest terms of the tactics employed by counsel for the committee and the procedure followed by this committee.

"I say it is not less the duty of the Congress and its committees to protect the rights of our citizens than it is the duty of the courts to do so, and it surely was within the power and province of the committee to have prevented this grave miscarriage of justice, had it desired to do so.

"Only yesterday the press of New York carried a report of a committee of the New

York State Bar Association on the subject of congressional inquiries condemning such practices and recommending the adoption of a code of procedure for the protection of witnesses. Among other things this committee said, and I quote:

"It is often asserted that Congress has the job of enlightening and educating the public so as to create an intelligent public opinion. This may be an incidental and often valuable byproduct of the legislative process, but it is questionable whether education is a constitutional function of the legislature sufficient to sustain procedures of doubtful value in eliciting facts, especially when weighed against the danger to individual rights. Nor do we find any sound constitutional basis for the assertion sometimes made that television, newsreels, radio, or the camera have rights guaranteed by the first amendment to record proceedings which are a part of official governmental investigations. Equally doubtful is the existence of any rights in the public to hear the legislative or executive proceedings while they are in progress.

"On the score of fairness and justice to witnesses appearing before the committee, the fact that these media are, as a matter of experience, selective in their coverage, raises serious questions of due process. Only those moods of the witness or the committee which appeal to the current popular fancy are caught and reproduced, particularly in the case of newsreel and camera. But even as to radio and television there is great pressure on the members of the committee to telescope and compress the hearings, selecting for their public sessions the most sensational witnesses and the most spectacular part of their testimony, in a measure staging the hearing to accommodate the media over which it is carried.

"The importance of time is magnified by the practice schedules of radio and television. Only a portion of the hearings can be broadcast or else the whole proceedings must be shortened to accommodate the stations and to sustain the public interest. And the danger that legislators may use the tremendous national audience for personal advantage at the cost of a dignified and fair proceeding cannot be ignored."

"On the basis of what has transpired so far in these hearings one cannot help but conjecture whether the real purpose of counsel for this committee is to use the widespread publicity as a political springboard, as was done in the case of another counsel for a very recent senatorial committee.

"I would like to remind this committee that 'no person shall be held to answer for a political or otherwise infamous crime unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, nor be deprived of life or liberty or property without due process of law' and that is the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"This committee has not once but repeatedly in the course of its public hearings permitted statements to be made by witnesses testifying under oath under cloak of immunity from slander, accusing my client, among other persons, of infamous crimes, including an attempt to extort \$500,000 from Teitelbaum as the price of quashing criminal proceedings against him.

"As an example of the extreme to which this committee has gone in an attempt to condemn my client in the eyes of the public, the same public from whom some day may be drawn a jury to try him for that very offense, is the following:

"Teitelbaum offered as his testimony here that a man speaking with a deep, guttural German accent—"

Mr. KEOGH. The witness will suspend. I am instructed by the subcommittee to remind you that the statement you have been offering us is intended to be the reasons for your refusal to answer the pending question.

We must ask you to restrict your statement to those reasons.

Mr. MALONEY. May I say, Mr. Chairman, that the witness is reading a statement which I had prepared and which I intended to give myself to the committee. It is not a very clear copy; it is a third carbon copy. For that reason he has had a little difficulty reading it.

However and further, he is about to conclude, and the matter to which he is about to allude has a very definite bearing upon his declining at this time to answer questions. I assure the committee of that; and, if you will permit him to continue, it will be obvious.

Mr. GRUNEWALD (continuing reading): "Speaking with a deep, guttural German accent, telephoned him threatening dire consequences and mentioning the names of public officials as being members of a clique, unless he paid the extortioner's price.

"Three members of this committee invaded the privacy of my client's sickroom in Georgetown Hospital on December 12, 1951, and upon leaving the sickroom one of the members of this committee is reported in the press as saying he found my client 'sitting in bed looking like a Prussian drill sergeant.' And that same member of this committee, in response to a question by a reporter as to whether my client spoke with a deep guttural German accent, replied 'Absolutely.' No other conclusion can be reached by them than this was a deliberate calculated attempt to create in the public mind the indelible impression that my client was in fact the man who made the extortion phone call.

"What assurance can he have that any denial which he might enter here would ever reach the eyes and ears of the persons who read that damning statement by a member of this committee? What point is served by his appearing here now and entering his denial on the record days after he has been convicted in the public mind as the result of this unquestionably improper remark by a committee member?

"The law has always recognized that a man's right to his good name and reputation is a property right just as tangible as his right to own real estate or have money in the bank. My client has in fact been deprived of his good name and reputation without due process of law.

"I would like to call the attention of the entire bar, the judiciary, the Congress, and the public to an even more serious consequence of the wanton abuse of power by this committee and its counsel. I refer to the very grave threat which the practice and procedure adopted by this committee and other recent congressional investigating committees poses to the orderly administration of justice in this country and to the right of every accused to a trial by an impartial jury.

"Since the adoption of the Bill of Rights, the right of every citizen to a trial by an impartial jury has been most zealously guarded and protected. This committee must now bear the responsibility for depriving citizens of that right. There is no blinking the fact that as a result of the irresponsible hearsay testimony which this committee has permitted to be spread upon the record in public, knowing and intending that it would be published in press and radio, well-nigh every man and woman in the city of Washington, nay, in the entire Nation, has come to a conclusion as to the guilt of those accused.

"This committee has already made it impossible for my client, or any other person who may be accused of a crime in connection with the matters which have been inquired into here, to obtain a trial by an impartial jury not alone in Washington but anywhere in the Nation. The law in its wisdom has provided for a change of venue to

protect persons who have been unfairly tried in the press. This wise provision of the law has been nullified by this committee on a Nation-wide basis.

"I would like to call the attention of this committee to the sixth amendment to the Constitution and remind this committee that the sixth amendment is still in full force and effect. It reads as follows:

"In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed \* \* \* and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor; and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense."

"My client has been deprived of not one but every one of the rights guaranteed to him by the sixth amendment as the result of this trial by association and surmise, and I use the word 'surmise' advisedly, because I read in the record that one witness, Mr. Caudle, was permitted to testify in public that he 'surmised' that it was my client who made the extortion telephone call to Teitelbaum.

"Over the entire judicial history of this country, the courts have enforced strictly those rules of evidence which have been time-tested for the protection of all citizens to see to it that no accused shall be convicted except upon proper legal evidence. The proceedings here have the ring of a people's court conducted behind the iron curtain. I know of no court in this country, nor indeed anywhere in the English-speaking world, where Mr. Caudle would have been permitted to testify as he did, and it is no excuse nor does it in any way repair the damage for the chairman of this committee now plausibly to assert that such testimony and other testimony like it is 'unfortunate.' This committee, as a committee of Congress, has the very clear duty to protect the rights of all citizens against the type of slanderous accusations and vilifications with which this record is replete. If the committee sincerely thought such hearsay testimony was of any value to it in its legitimate purpose, such testimony could have been taken in secret in executive session. It would be violating every rule of reason to suppose that the committee did not know in advance or have reasonable opportunity to acquaint itself with the nature of such obviously improper testimony and take proper action to protect the rights of those whose names were mentioned."

Gentlemen, after this conclusion, after I have read this article, after I have read this—

Mr. MALONEY. Statement.

Mr. GRUNEWALD (continuing). Statement, I have followed the advice of my counsel, and for the reasons which he has stated I most respectfully decline to answer any questions at this time.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Witness, pursuant to the instructions of the subcommittee, I direct you to answer the question pending, namely: What is your place of business?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. Mr. Chairman, you bring me back to the same answer.

Mr. CURTIS. What is that answer?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. The answer is that I have followed the advice of my counsel, for the reasons which he has stated, and I must respectfully decline to answer any questions at this time.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, was it the advice of your counsel that you should answer questions only in public session?

Mr. MALONEY. I object to that question as an invasion of the right of privacy existing between counsel and his client. I direct the witness not to answer.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, your counsel, Mr. Maloney, has stated to this commit-

tee that he has advised you not to answer questions except in public session.

Now, is that a fact?

Mr. MALONEY. I have made no such statement to this committee. Are you referring now to the hearing at the hospital? I will state for the record now that at the hospital—

Mr. DEWIND. No, Mr. Maloney; don't state anything for the record. You haven't been asked to make a statement for the record.

Mr. MALONEY. Since that hearing, something has happened which has made me change my mind and my advice. And I made no such statement to the committee in executive session yesterday or this morning.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, isn't it a fact that you asked Mr. Oliphant, formerly chief counsel to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, not to advise this committee of the questions that you had asked him concerning the Teitelbaum tax case?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. I am following the advice of my counsel; the same story. By advice of counsel and for the reasons that he has stated, I most respectfully decline to answer any questions at this time, sir.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Witness, pursuant to the instructions of the subcommittee, I direct you to answer the pending question.

Mr. GRUNEWALD. Mr. Chairman, with due respect to you, I must answer the same question to you.

Mr. MALONEY. Make the same answer.

Mr. GRUNEWALD. Make the same answer.

Mr. KEOGH. What is that answer, Mr. Witness?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. I am following the advice of my counsel.

Mr. MALONEY. And for the reasons—

Mr. GRUNEWALD. And for the reasons which he has stated, I most respectfully decline to answer any questions at this time.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. DeWind?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Witness, what do you mean by refusing to answer questions at this time?

Mr. MALONEY. I am sorry. I will have to direct the witness—

Mr. CURTIS. No; I am asking the witness that. Please keep still.

Mr. GRUNEWALD. I am following the advice of my counsel, and for that reason, which he has stated before, I most respectfully decline to answer any question at this time, sir.

Mr. CURTIS. My question is: What do you mean by "this time"?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. I will stand on my statement, sir.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, have you ever made any loans to persons employed by the Federal Government at the time you made the loans to them?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. With all due respect to you, Mr. DeWind, I must refer back to that—I am following the advice of my counsel, and for reasons which he has stated, I most respectfully decline to answer any question at this time.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Witness, pursuant to the instructions of the subcommittee, I direct you to answer the pending question.

Mr. GRUNEWALD. With all due respect to you, Mr. Chairman, I make the same answer.

Mr. KEOGH. What is that answer?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. That answer is that I am following the advice of my counsel; and for the reasons which he has stated, I most respectfully decline to answer any questions at this time.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. DeWind?

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, you were served with a subpoena of this committee to produce here certain books, records, and documents described in that subpoena. Will you now kindly produce them for the subcommittee?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. On the advice of my counsel and for the reasons which he has stated, I respectfully decline to do so at this time.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Witness, pursuant to the instructions of the subcommittee, I direct you to answer the pending question and pro-

duce the books, records, and documents called for by the subpoena duces tecum here-tofore served on you.

Mr. GRUNEWALD. On the advice of my counsel, sir, and for the reason which he has stated, I respectfully decline to do so at this time.

Mr. DEWIND. Now, isn't it a fact, Mr. Grunewald, that your counsel stated here yesterday that in a public hearing you would produce the documents called for by the subpoena?

Mr. MALONEY. I submit we will let the record speak for itself on that. If you want to read the record, you can.

Mr. KEOGH. This is from the hearing of the Subcommittee on Administration of the Internal Revenue Laws of the Committee on Ways and Means, Washington, December 20, 1951:

Question, by Mr. KEAN: "Will the documents be produced at the public hearing?"

Answer, by Mr. Maloney: "Sir, he will obey whatever subpoena is served upon him to appear at a public hearing."

Question, by Mr. KEAN: "Including documents?"

Answer, by Mr. Maloney: "Yes."

Mr. MALONEY. And it is perfectly obvious by that exchange, Mr. Chairman, that I was referring to the fact that this witness would appear at a public hearing and obey a subpoena requiring him to appear at a public hearing, but not to produce documents. I have never yet made any agreement with this committee to have him produce documents.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, are you admitted to practice before the Treasury Department of the United States?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. I am following the advice of my counsel; and, for this reason which he has stated, I most respectfully decline to answer any questions at this time.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Witness, pursuant to the instruction of the subcommittee, I direct you to answer the pending question, as to whether you have been admitted to practice before the Treasury Department of the United States.

Mr. GRUNEWALD. Mr. Chairman, I will only have to repeat the same answer to you. I am following the advice of my counsel, and for the reasons which he has stated, I most respectfully decline to answer any questions at this time.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. DeWind?

Mr. MALONEY. Now, I would like to have that removed, if you don't mind.

(The reference is to the flash of a photographer's bulb.)

Mr. MALONEY. I think that is a direct violation of the agreement which I had with the photographers, and I don't approve or appreciate that for 1 minute. I wish the gentleman who is leaving with the picture would be requested to bring it back. I think that is in violation, clearly in violation, of the committee's agreement with me. I wish that plate would be destroyed, if you don't mind.

PHOTOGRAPHER. I have no power to destroy it.

Mr. MALONEY. I wish the committee would impound it.

Mr. KEOGH. I have been instructed by the subcommittee to inform the photographer who took that last picture that it is the subcommittee's opinion that that picture should not be used. And I have further been instructed by the subcommittee to remind the press photographers of our gentlemen's agreement with respect to such pictures.

Mr. MALONEY. Now, that's just the type of picture to which I took exception.

Mr. KEOGH. The matter has been disposed of, Mr. Maloney.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, what steps have you taken to comply with the subpoena of the subcommittee to produce here the books, records, and documents set forth in the subpoena?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. Mr. DeWind, I am following the advice of my counsel, and for the reason which he has stated, I most respectfully decline to answer any questions at this time.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Witness, pursuant to the instructions of the subcommittee, I direct you to answer the pending question.

Mr. GRUNEWALD. Mr. Chairman, respectfully to you, I am following the advice of my counsel, and for the reasons which he has stated, I most respectfully decline to answer any questions at this time, sir.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. DeWind?

Mr. DEWIND. Are you now refusing, Mr. Grunewald, to produce any of the books, records, and documents called for by that subpoena?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. Mr. DeWind, I refer you back to the same answer. I am following the advice of my counsel, and for the reason which he has stated, most respectfully decline to answer any questions at this time.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Witness, pursuant to the instructions of the subcommittee, I direct you to answer the pending question.

Mr. MALONEY (to Mr. Grunewald). Read the same answer.

Mr. GRUNEWALD. With respect to you, Mr. Chairman, I am following the advice of my counsel, and for the reasons which he has stated, I most respectfully decline to answer any questions at this time.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, what is your age?

Mr. MALONEY. He said 59 in the executive session. Do you want to ask him again?

Mr. DEWIND. What is your age, Mr. Grunewald?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. I was born in 1892.

Mr. DEWIND. What was the place of your birth?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. Mr. DeWind, you are bringing me back to the same answer. I am following the advice of my counsel, and for the reason which he has stated, I most respectfully decline to answer any questions at this time.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Witness, pursuant to the instructions of the subcommittee, I direct you to answer the pending question.

Mr. GRUNEWALD. Again with due respect to you, Mr. Chairman, my answer is I have followed the advice of my counsel, and for the reasons which he has stated, I most respectfully decline to answer any question at this time.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, did you testify correctly when you testified before the Senate District Committee in 1950 that you were born in South Africa?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. Again, Mr. DeWind, I am sorry. I will have to refer you back to—I am following the advice of my counsel, and for the reasons which he has stated I most respectfully decline to answer any questions at this time.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Witness, pursuant to the instructions of the subcommittee, I direct you to answer the pending question.

Mr. GRUNEWALD. Mr. Chairman, again with due respect to you, I am following the advice of my counsel, and for the reason which he has stated, I most respectfully decline to answer any questions at this time, sir.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, would you please give the subcommittee the names of any officials of the Federal Government who, while serving as officials of the Federal Government, have visited in your hotel suite at the Hotel Washington?

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, may I respectfully suggest at this time that the position which the witness has taken up to now and intends to take without changing throughout these hearings is that he will decline to answer any questions asked of him at this time.

I submit with that statement on the record, that it is improper for Mr. DeWind now to play him with other questions solely

for the purpose of making a record, and then having it appear in the paper that Mr. Grunewald refused to answer a question about this or a question about that.

Mr. Chairman, as you and I both know, that is an old trick, and I object to it right now, and I suggest that Mr. DeWind be asked to desist from any more of his tricks.

Mr. KEOGH. I have been instructed by the subcommittee to remind you, Mr. Maloney, that the question as to the propriety of any question put is one for the subcommittee to decide.

But am I to take it from your last statement that you are making the concession and admission on the record that with respect to any questions that might be put to the witness by the counsel for the subcommittee the answers he has previously made to those already put would be the same answer as he would give?

Mr. MALONEY. That is the statement and the position which the witness takes, and I think it is quite clear from the statements which he has been making.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Grunewald, in your answer to a previous question, you referred to a Mr. Teitelbaum. What Mr. Teitelbaum is it that you referred to?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. Mr. Congressman, I am following the advice of my counsel, and for the reasons which he has stated, I most respectfully decline to answer any questions at this time.

Mr. CURTIS. But you did, in an answer, refer to a Mr. Teitelbaum, and I wanted to have you identify him. Who is he?

Mr. MALONEY. Just a minute, Mr. CURTIS.

Mr. CURTIS. No, no. I want the witness to answer.

Mr. MALONEY. But, sir, that is not an accurate statement of the record. The witness was not asked that question.

Mr. CURTIS. In response to a question, he referred to a Mr. Teitelbaum.

Mr. MALONEY. That is the same Teitelbaum who has been in the newspaper.

Mr. CURTIS. I am asking him to identify Mr. Teitelbaum. Who is he, and where does he live?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. Mr. Congressman, I would have to refer back to the same answer. I am following the advice of my counsel, and for the reasons which he has stated, I most respectfully decline to answer any question at this time.

Mr. KEOGH. I have been instructed by the subcommittee to make the following statement:

This subcommittee is vested with the power and duty to investigate the administration of the internal-revenue laws. Among the questions that have been brought to the attention of this subcommittee are whether persons having no official position have in fact been able to affect the administration of the internal-revenue laws, and, if so, whether appropriate legislation is needed or desired to meet such situations. There can, of course, be no doubt that these inquiries fall squarely within the jurisdiction of this subcommittee. There is equally no doubt that the subcommittee is authorized to call witnesses, including Mr. Grunewald, to further such an investigation, or the investigation of any other matter within the subcommittee's jurisdiction. All this goes to the essence of the nature and purpose of hearings conducted by the subcommittee.

Our hearings are not, as Mr. Grunewald and his counsel seem to assume, grand jury proceedings, nor are they trials, either civil or criminal.

Mr. MALONEY. I know they are not trials or grand jury proceedings, Mr. Chairman, but they certainly look like it. They certainly have all the ring of it.

Mr. KEOGH. You may step aside, Mr. Grunewald.

Mr. MALONEY. Do I understand that the committee no longer desires Mr. Grunewald's presence before it?

Mr. KEOGH. The subcommittee will go into executive session now, and we will be pleased to convey to you the decision of the subcommittee just as soon as it is made.

Mr. MALONEY. Very good, sir.

Mr. KEOGH. The public hearing stands in recess to the call of the Chair.

(Whereupon, at 12:40 p. m., Friday, December 21, 1951, the hearing was recessed to the call of the Chair and the executive session was resumed at 12:40 p. m.)

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KEOGH. The subcommittee will come to order.

Mr. Grunewald, will you take the stand, please?

Mr. Grunewald, I have been instructed by the subcommittee to inquire from you as to whether your refusal to answer the questions that have heretofore been put to you is predicated upon the ground of your privilege to decline to answer such questions for the reason that so answer might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that my client will stand—

Mr. KEOGH. I will have to ask you to observe the rules of the subcommittee, of which you have been reminded now several times.

Mr. MALONEY. But, Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to say, here—

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Grunewald?

Mr. MALONEY. All right. I will write it out for him [writing].

Mr. GRUNEWALD. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to you, I will stand on my statement which I have made.

Mr. KEOGH. What is that statement, Mr. Grunewald?

Mr. MALONEY. The statement which the witness read into the record earlier, where he said, "Gentlemen, I am"—

Mr. KEOGH. My question is put to the witness.

Mr. GRUNEWALD. Yes, sir. The statement was: "Gentlemen"—Mr. Chairman first and gentlemen, I am following the advice of my counsel, and for the reason that he has stated, I most respectfully decline to answer any questions at this time, sir.

Mr. KEOGH. I have been instructed by the subcommittee, Mr. Grunewald, to inform you that it is the opinion of the subcommittee that the only basis for refusal to answer a question that might be asserted is the privilege that so answer might tend to incriminate. And it is further the opinion of the subcommittee that that privilege must be asserted by the witness in response to the question put to him.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, may I state that the subcommittee is at odds with the Supreme Court on that point?

Mr. KEOGH. The subcommittee has decided to hear no further statements from counsel at this time. The witness is excused, and the subcommittee will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

(Whereupon, at 1 p. m., Friday, December 21, 1951, the hearing was recessed, subject to the call of the Chair.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON  
ADMINISTRATION OF THE  
INTERNAL REVENUE LAWS OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,  
Washington, D. C., January 29, 1952.

#### PUBLIC HEARINGS

The subcommittee, met pursuant to call, at 10:20 a. m., in the main hearing room of the Committee on Ways and Means, New House Office Building, Hon. CECIL R. KING (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives KING (presiding), O'BRIEN, KEOGH, KEAN, CURTIS, and BYRNES.

Present also: Adrian W. DeWind, chief counsel; Bruno Schachner, special counsel; and Charles S. Lyon, assistant counsel.

Chairman KING. The subcommittee will be in order.

(At this point in the proceedings Mr. O'BRIEN made a statement concerning another and unrelated matter which is not relevant to this report.)

Chairman KING. Mr. Grunewald.

You may proceed [addressing the photographers].

For the benefit of the photographers who have not been previously informed, there will be no pictures taken of the witness during the testimony. Is that understood? That is any and all.

Will you rise and be sworn, Mr. Grunewald, please?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. I will, sir.

Chairman KING. Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. So help me God.

TESTIMONY OF HENRY W. GRUNEWALD, WASHINGTON, D. C.; ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, WILLIAM POWER MALONEY, NEW YORK, N. Y.

Chairman KING. Mr. Grunewald, this is not the first time you have been subpoenaed to appear before this subcommittee and requested to bring with you your records. Prior to the formal taking of testimony, I should like to say a few words to you which I hope you will accept in the nature of impartial and sincere advice.

You previously refused to answer any questions put to you by members of the committee and its counsel. In explanation of your refusal, your counsel had you read a statement prepared by him of the asserted legal grounds upon which he based his advice to you not to answer. Several weeks have passed since that time. I hope you have had occasion to reconsider carefully your decision. I am informed by our counsel that the legal grounds you stated before would be insufficient to protect you in a trial for contempt if your conduct should otherwise be adjudged contemptuous of the Congress of the United States. I can only say from a reading of the record of the hearing that, in my opinion, your refusal to answer the simplest questions can only be viewed as contempt of Congress.

It seems to me that it will be regrettable for everyone concerned if our meeting today leaves us in a position where we must seek your punishment for contempt. I, for one, am unwilling to believe ill of any man unless by his conduct he leaves me no other choice. You have not claimed that to answer our questions might tend to incriminate you. Such a claim would receive such recognition by this subcommittee as would be proper. Lacking its assertion, I must assume there is no ground to assert it or that you do not care to claim such protection.

As a nation we need an honest Government in which the citizens who believe in the country stand together and work to control and eliminate forces which would seek to take advantage of decent people in the country. My task has been to play my part in improving the administration of the revenue laws by serving as the chairman of this subcommittee, which has been assigned the task of conducting this investigation by the House of Representatives. In the past months the work has often not been pleasant.

Perhaps your refusal to answer our questions is based on the fact that answers would involve you in unpleasantness. I must remind you that there are times when it is necessary to undertake what may be unpleasant in order to serve the community as a whole. Do not let either petty or distorted arguments, or any misguided sense of loyalty to persons who deserve no loyalty, or any narrow views as to possible personal gain blind you to your larger duties as a citizen. We have had many people before this committee from many walks of life. You are

aware of the identity of many of them. Whatever may be said against any of these witnesses, not a single one of them has felt so little regard for the elected representatives of the people that he refused to answer questions.

Upon reflection, I hope you will cooperate to tell us everything you know which might aid us in our study of the revenue administration. We have already received testimony which has mentioned you in connection with at least two tax cases. We have information that you have had transactions with persons, in their official capacities, who were entrusted with high positions in that administration and appear to have failed in their trust. Every indication is that you could help us in our work if you were of a mind to be helpful. Much of what you could say would be directly relevant to matters which have already been before the committee. I therefore urge upon you most strongly that you answer the proper questions this subcommittee is going to direct to you.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I would like the record to note that while I am in agreement with the laudable and the purposeful objectives of this subcommittee as set forth in the chairman's statement, I question the advisability of his having made it at this point in the proceeding.

Chairman KING. I wish it understood in connection with your statement, Mr. KEOGH, that this is my statement and my statement alone, and any member of the committee has a perfect right to object to any part of its content.

If there is no objection—

Mr. KEOGH. Your statement that any member of the committee has the right to object to any part of its contents does not delimit any member from objecting to the making of the statement, does it?

Chairman KING. Not at all.

Now, Mr. Maloney, I would like to direct your attention once more to the procedure which it has been our custom to follow in these hearings, and which is set forth in our adopted rules, a copy of which you have received. Questions will be put to Mr. Grunewald. He may ask your advice at any time in answering those questions. You may proffer him your advice whenever you feel that it would be helpful to him. We will, however, receive no testimony or oral statements from you. If you feel that the record as constituted by this procedure needs any elucidation, we will be glad to consider any statements in writing you may wish to propose for addition to our record.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, may I say in this response to your remarks, I would like at this time to add to the record on behalf of—

Chairman KING. Just a moment, now—

Mr. MALONEY. An objection to the statement you made, and I certainly subscribe to Mr. KEOGH's remarks in that regard.

Chairman KING. If you persist, I will have the sergeant at arms remove you from the room.

Mr. MALONEY. That, sir, is your privilege, but I still say I object to it.

Chairman KING. Very well, you have objected and now what are you going to do?

Mr. MALONEY. I have made my objection.

Chairman KING. Very good.

Mr. MALONEY. And I said I object to this sermonizing and prejudging people.

Chairman KING. Just a moment, Mr. Maloney, just a moment, please. You have heard the rules, you have read the rules. You are well aware of them. You will abide by them or be removed from the room.

Mr. MALONEY. I have also read the Constitution of the United States, sir, which far antedates the rules of this committee. I am appearing here as this man's counsel.

Chairman KING. Just a moment.

Mr. Counsel, proceed.

Mr. MALONEY. Do I understand that I am proscribed from any further remarks on behalf of my client? I wish to note an objection to that.

Chairman KING. You understand the English language, sir, and I am well aware of that.

Mr. MALONEY. I wish it to appear on the record that I am objecting to the ruling of the Chair at this time.

Chairman KING. Very well.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, this committee has served you with a subpoena to produce here today certain books and records called for by that subpoena. Have you those books and records with you?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. I appeared before this committee on December 21, 1951, and at that time I made a statement as to the position I would take with regard to any questions this committee or counsel might ask. I believe I made my position clear.

Mr. DEWIND. Pardon my interrupting you. I simply asked—

Mr. MALONEY. I object to your interrupting him. He is answering your question and making a statement which is due—

Mr. DEWIND. I simply asked him, "Have you those books and records with you?" and that does not call for any statement.

Mr. MALONEY. He is making a statement as to his position and I insist he be given the right to continue it.

Chairman KING. He has been asked a question.

Mr. MALONEY. And he is making a statement in response to that which will cover the position he will take.

Chairman KING. We are quite aware of the fact that he is making a statement.

Mr. MALONEY. I insist he be given an opportunity to complete the reading of the statement.

Mr. DEWIND. I am simply asking you, have you produced the books and records, and the answer to that can be brief. Now then, if you have a reason for failure to produce the books and records, the committee may wish to hear it. In the first place, have you produced the books and records?

Mr. MALONEY (to the witness). Read the statement.

Mr. GRUNEWALD. I appeared before this committee on December 21, 1951—

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, excuse me. Would you simply state first of all whether you have produced the books and records called for by the subpoena?

Mr. MALONEY. His statement will cover your question, if you will let him complete reading it.

Mr. DEWIND. I want the answer to cover only the question.

Mr. MALONEY. I am sorry, I am not interested in what you want. This man has rights before this committee, and I insist he be given an opportunity to make his statement.

Chairman KING. Ask the question again, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Reporter, could you repeat the question that is pending?

(Whereupon, the reporter read the pending question as follows: "Mr. Grunewald, this committee has served you with a subpoena to produce here today certain books and records called for by that subpoena. Have you those books and records with you?")

Chairman KING. I hereby direct you, Mr. Grunewald, to answer the question.

Mr. MALONEY (to the witness). Read the statement.

Mr. GRUNEWALD. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, I appeared before this committee on December 21, 1951, and at that time I made a statement as to the position I will take with regard to any question the committee or its counsel might ask. I believe I made my position clear. In calling me

back today, this committee can only be motivated—

Chairman KING. Just a moment. Mr. Grunewald, cease reading the statement.

I again direct you to answer the question put to you by counsel, "Yes" or "No."

Mr. MALONEY. Again I say the Chair has no right to make such a ruling, nor to make such a requirement.

Chairman KING. I don't want—

Mr. MALONEY. He has a right to make his statement as to his position and he is going to tell you what his position is if you are going to give him an opportunity to do it, and you won't let me make a statement for you—

Chairman KING. For obvious reasons.

Mr. MALONEY. What his position is going to be.

Chairman KING. Very well.

Mr. MALONEY. I am trying to appear for this man as his attorney, in spite of the efforts of the Chair to shut me off.

Chairman KING. I order you to remove Mr. Maloney from this room.

Mr. MALONEY. If you are so interested in ascertaining the facts, I would like to know why this committee hasn't sent the Teitelbaum testimony over to the Department of Justice; and I say that Mr. DeWind is guilty of misprision of a felony right now, and the law requires that that material be turned over to the Department of Justice, and this committee hasn't done it, and I would like to know why they haven't done it.

Chairman KING. I will direct the reporter to cease making this a part of the record, and the sergeant—

(At this point in the proceedings, 10:55 a. m., Mr. Maloney was removed from the hearing room by Lt. William P. Reed, of the Capitol Police.)

Chairman KING. Mr. Witness, I hereby direct you to answer the question put to you by counsel to this committee.

Mr. GRUNEWALD. In the absence of my counsel, sir, I feel that I am provided that privilege.

Chairman KING. I will give you, Mr. Grunewald, until 12 o'clock to secure the services of another counsel.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, may I, off the record, remind you that the Committee on Committees will meet at 11:30.

Chairman KING. The Committee on Committees certainly wouldn't interfere with the proceedings here today. I can only repeat to you, Mr. Grunewald, that you will return here at noon today prepared to answer questions.

The committee will be in recess until the hour of 12 o'clock.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken at 10:58 a. m.)

(Whereupon, the subcommittee reconvened at 12:10 p. m.)

(Present: Representatives KING, O'BRIEN, KEOGH, KEAN, CURTIS, and BYRNES.)

Chairman KING. The subcommittee will be in order.

Mr. Grunewald, you have been previously sworn. Be seated, Mr. Grunewald.

TESTIMONY OF HENRY W. GRUNEWALD, WASHINGTON, D. C.—RESUMED

Mr. DEWIND. What is your present residence address?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. In view of the fact that this committee has deprived me of the right to be represented here by counsel of my own choosing, I will make no further statement to this committee.

Chairman KING. Have you made any effort, Mr. Grunewald, to secure counsel other than Mr. Maloney?

(No answer from the witness.)

Chairman KING. Do you understand the question put to you, Mr. Grunewald?

(No answer from the witness.)

Chairman KING. Have you or have you not made any effort since the recess of this committee to secure counsel?

(No answer from the witness.)

Chairman KING. All right, the photographers will stand in recess.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Grunewald, why don't you tell us whether or not you have made any attempts to get counsel?

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. CURTIS. Don't you have any desire to be cooperative to this hearing at all?

(No answer from the witness.)

Chairman KING. I direct the reporter to note in the record that Mr. Grunewald remains mute or silent upon being asked questions by members of the committee.

Mr. BYRNES. Could I direct this question to the witness: Is it my understanding from the statement that you read, that you are going to remain mute to any question this committee asks you, no matter what its nature?

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. BYRNES. In other words, you can't even explain the meaning of the statement that you made to us, so that we can start out on a firm footing, at least understanding the purport of the statement you read? You won't even answer questions as to the meaning of that?

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. BYRNES. Do I understand we can go on asking you questions all day, and we will receive not even a grunt from you, no answer whatever?

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. BYRNES. Will you even acknowledge that a question has been asked of you?

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. CURTIS. Are you able to hear what is being said, Mr. Grunewald?

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. CURTIS. I say, are you able to hear what is being said to you?

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. CURTIS. What effort have you made to get a lawyer in this last hour?

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. BYRNES. Would you answer our questions if Mr. Maloney, your counsel that you appeared with this morning, was here with you?

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. BYRNES. If this committee were to permit at this time Mr. Maloney to accompany you and advise you, would you still remain mute?

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Grunewald, this is a rather serious situation, and I would like to know whether or not anyone has advised you to refuse to answer such simple questions as to whether or not you have a counsel?

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. CURTIS. Do you have an attorney now?

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. CURTIS. Are you assuming this responsibility yourself, to refuse to answer the simplest question, or is it your own personal decision to defy this committee and totally ignore the questions put to you?

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. CURTIS. Just why is it you wouldn't tell the chairman whether or not you have been successful in getting a lawyer, if you want one?

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. CURTIS. Do you want a lawyer; is that the reason you are waiting?

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee vote to instruct Mr. Grunewald to answer questions, in spite of Mr. Maloney's absence, and in spite of the fact that he has appeared without counsel.

Chairman KING. The committee has heard the motion of Mr. Kean. Is there any objection?

If there is no objection, it is so ordered.

Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, have you brought with you today the books and records that were called for by the subpoena served upon you?

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Reporter, will you note in each case where no answer is given, that that is the case; no answer was given.

Mr. BYRNES. And that a sufficient lapse of time, Mr. Counsel, has been granted to the witness in each case to make answer.

Chairman KING. Read back the question, Mr. Reporter.

(The question was read by the reporter as follows:)

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, have you brought with you today the books and records that were called for by the subpoena served upon you?

(No answer from the witness.)

Chairman KING. Mr. Grunewald, I hereby direct you to answer the question.

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, this committee has received testimony in connection with a tax case involving Hyman Harvey Klein, of Baltimore, that you appeared in a conference with officials of the Bureau of Internal Revenue concerning that case; and I ask you now, what was your connection with the Hyman Harvey Klein case, and in what capacity did you appear in conferences with the officials of the Bureau of Internal Revenue?

(No answer from the witness.)

Chairman KING. Mr. Grunewald, I hereby direct you to answer the question.

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, this committee has also held hearings and received testimony concerning the tax liabilities of a company known as Patullo Modes, Inc., and certain of its stockholders; and the committee has also received testimony that you discussed that case with an official of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the former Chief Counsel, Mr. Oliphant. Will you please tell the committee the manner in which you became associated in that case, and upon what basis you discussed the case with Mr. Oliphant?

(No answer from the witness.)

Chairman KING. Mr. Grunewald, I hereby direct you to answer that question.

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, this committee has also heard testimony that you conferred with the former Chief Counsel of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, Mr. Oliphant, concerning the tax case of one Abraham Teitelbaum. Will you please tell the committee in what capacity you discussed that case with Mr. Oliphant, and what your connection was or interest was in the case?

(No answer from the witness.)

Chairman KING. Mr. Grunewald, I hereby direct you to answer the question.

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, this committee has received testimony that you have on occasion recommended persons for appointment to positions in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Would you please tell the committee what persons you have recommended for appointments to positions in the Internal Revenue Bureau?

(No answer from the witness.)

Chairman KING. Mr. Grunewald, I hereby direct you to answer the question.

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, are you admitted to practice before the Treasury Department?

(No answer from the witness.)

Chairman KING. Mr. Grunewald, I hereby direct you to answer the question.

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Chairman, may the record indicate at this point that a check of the records of the Bureau of Internal Revenue has not revealed that Mr. Grunewald has been admitted to practice before the Treasury Department.

Chairman KING. It is so ordered.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, have you made any loans or had any other financial

transactions with employees of the Bureau of Internal Revenue?

(No answer from the witness.)

Chairman KING. Mr. Grunewald, I hereby instruct you to answer the question.

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald, have you made any loans to employees of the Treasury Department or the Department of Justice?

(No answer from the witness.)

Chairman KING. Mr. Grunewald, I hereby instruct you to answer the question.

(The witness took a drink of water.)

Mr. DEWIND. Have you engaged in any business or other financial transactions other than loans, with employees of the Treasury Department or the Department of Justice?

(No answer from the witness.)

Chairman KING. Mr. Grunewald, I hereby instruct you to answer the question.

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

Chairman KING. Mr. CURTIS.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Grunewald, you understand that you are the individual who has been subpoenaed here, that the responsibility to answer questions is yours and not anyone else's, and you understand that; don't you?

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. CURTIS. You understand that this is a duly constituted committee of the United States Congress, and you have been subpoenaed here to give answers to questions, and, now, you understand that, don't you?

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. CURTIS. Were you ever employed by the Government of the United States?

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. CURTIS. And if you were so employed, did you ever make an official visit to the city of Omaha?

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. CURTIS. What was the purpose of that visit when you went out there?

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. CURTIS. I think, Mr. Grunewald, that you ought to tell this committee why you are not responding to the questions, and what effort you have made to secure a lawyer. You have had quite a while to think about this thing, and don't you think you ought to do that, because it is you that is responsible, and the subpoena has been served on you; you are aware of that; aren't you?

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. BYRNES. Who is the counsel of your choice, Mr. Grunewald?

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. BYRNES. Do you have a counsel?

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. BYRNES. Would you repeat the statement that you made when you first appeared?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. At your request?

Mr. BYRNES. Would you repeat the statement that you read when you appeared shortly after 12 o'clock?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. In view of the fact that this committee has deprived me of the right to be represented here by my counsel, by counsel of my own choosing, I will make no further statement to this committee.

Mr. BYRNES. Who is the counsel of your own choosing that you refer to?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. Mr. Maloney.

Mr. BYRNES. Did Mr. Maloney advise you to make that statement to the committee?

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. BYRNES. Did Mr. Maloney advise you to read this statement to the committee?

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. BYRNES. If Mr. Maloney was here with you now, would you answer the questions put to you by the committee?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. I suggest you ask Mr. Maloney. He is my attorney. You just threw him out.

Mr. BYRNES. I did not get that last answer.

Mr. GRUNEWALD. I say he is my attorney, and you threw him out.

Mr. BYRNES. I did not get the last.

Mr. GRUNEWALD. So I am without counsel.

Mr. BYRNES. Do you understand why Mr. Maloney is not here with you?

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. BYRNES. Do you understand the question I am asking you?

Mr. GRUNEWALD. Yes, I do fully.

Mr. BYRNES. Can you answer it?

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. BYRNES. Can you answer it?

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. BYRNES. You ought to know whether you can answer it or not.

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. BYRNES. Do you know why Mr. Maloney is not here with you?

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. BYRNES. I have difficulty in determining whether you either hear the questions or whether you understand the questions, and I would be very glad to simplify them if I can in any way, so that you do understand them, if that is your trouble.

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. BYRNES. You say the committee has deprived you of having your counsel to advise with. What do you mean by that?

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. BYRNES. You say you have been deprived of counsel of your own choosing, and what do you mean by being deprived of counsel of your own choosing?

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. BYRNES. Do you understand that question?

(No answer from the witness.)

Mr. BYRNES. You insist on remaining mute even to that question?

(No answer from the witness.)

Chairman KING. Mr. Grunewald, this committee by its rules and its policy, affords witnesses an opportunity to be represented by counsel. Counsel must comport themselves with very reasonable rules governing their conduct. Your counsel, Mr. Maloney, failed repeatedly to observe these rules. You were given an opportunity to get new counsel. Having failed to do this within the time given to you, you have no longer any claim to the indulgence of this committee. Your conduct, in my opinion, constitutes a shocking affront to the dignity of the Congress.

As a consequence, this committee will have to take under consideration such steps as the law permits to remove this obstruction to our inquiry.

You are now excused, and you will reappear on the morning of March 1, 1952, at 10:30 a. m. You are excused, sir.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman KING. Mr. KEAN is recognized.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that this committee recommend to the full Committee on Ways and Means that contempt proceedings be instituted against Henry W. Grunewald.

Chairman KING. You have heard the motion. We will call the roll.

The CLERK. Congressman KING.

Chairman KING. Aye.

The CLERK. Congressman O'BRIEN.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Aye.

The CLERK. Congressman KEOGH.

Mr. KEOGH. Aye.

The CLERK. Congressman KEAN.

Mr. KEAN. Aye.

The CLERK. Congressman CURTIS.

Mr. CURTIS. Aye.

The CLERK. Congressman BYRNES.

Mr. BYRNES. Aye.

The CLERK. Congressman COMBS.

(Absent.)

The CLERK. The vote is six ayes.

Chairman KING. The vote is six ayes; and the motion is carried.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman KING. Mr. BYRNES.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Chairman, I move that this committee recommend to the full Committee on Ways and Means that contempt proceedings be instituted against William Power Maloney.

Chairman KING. You have heard the motion. The clerk will call the roll.

The CLERK. Congressman KING.

Chairman KING. Aye.

The CLERK. Congressman O'BRIEN.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Aye.

The CLERK. Congressman KEOGH.

Mr. KEOGH. No.

The CLERK. Congressman KEAN.

Mr. KEAN. Aye.

The CLERK. Congressman CURTIS.

Mr. CURTIS. Aye.

The CLERK. Congressman BYRNES.

Mr. BYRNES. Aye.

The CLERK. Congressman COMBS.

(Absent.)

The CLERK. The vote is five ayes and one nay, and one absent.

Chairman KING. The motion is carried.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the chairman of this subcommittee seek the calling of the full Committee on Ways and Means at the earliest possible hour today.

Chairman KING. You have heard the motion. Is there any objection? If not, it is so ordered.

I wish to note for the record the following members of the subcommittee have been present at all times throughout today's proceedings: Members KEAN, of New Jersey; Mr. CURTIS; Mr. BYRNES, of Wisconsin; myself; and Mr. O'BRIEN, and Mr. KEOGH.

The committee is adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.

(Whereupon, the subcommittee adjourned at 12:45 p. m.)

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To Whom It May Concern:

You are hereby commanded to summon Henry Grunewald, Westchester Apartments, 4000 Cathedral Avenue NW, Washington, D. C., to be and appear before the Subcommittee on the Administration of the Internal Revenue Laws of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Honorable CECIL R. KING is chairman, in their chamber in the Ways and Means Committee hearing room in the New House Office Building in the city of Washington, forthwith, then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 5th day of December 1951.

[SEAL] CECIL R. KING, Chairman.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS, Clerk.

Please report at room 1039, New House Office Building, at the time aforesaid.

[Endorsement]

Subpoena for Henry Grunewald, Westchester Apartments, 4000 Cathedral Avenue NW, Washington, D. C., before the Subcommittee on the Administration of the Internal Revenue Laws of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, served on the above-named subject at the Georgetown Hospital, personally at the hour of 4:40 p. m., by exhibiting the original subpoena to him and leaving with him a true copy thereof, this 7th day of December 1951.

W. BRUCE MATTHEWS,

United States Marshal in and for the District of Columbia.

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To Whom It May Concern:

You are hereby commanded to summon Henry W. Grunewald to be and appear be-

fore the Subcommittee on Administration of the Internal Revenue Laws of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Honorable CECIL R. KING is chairman, in their chamber in room 1039, New House Office Building, in the city of Washington, on December 20, 1951, at the hour of 2 p. m., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 15th day of December 1951.

[SEAL] CECIL R. KING, Chairman.  
Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS, Clerk.  
[Endorsement]

Subpna for Henry W. Grunewald before the Subcommittee on the Administration of the Internal Revenue Laws of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, served on the above-named subject personally at room 622, Georgetown Hospital, at the hour of 3:41 p. m. by exhibiting to him the original subpna and leaving with him a true copy thereof this 15th day of December 1951.

Lt. W. P. REED,  
United States Capitol Police.

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To Whom It May Concern:

You are hereby commanded to summon Henry W. Grunewald to be and appear before the Subcommittee on Administration of the Internal Laws of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Honorable CECIL R. KING is chairman, and bring with him—

(1) all of your books, records, accounts, ledgers, bills, and diaries, including but not limited to retained copies of all tax returns, work sheets of yourself or your agents in connection with preparation of tax returns, bank books, bank records, bank statements, bank deposit books, canceled checks, telephone bills, telephone toll slips, and other records of local and long-distance calls, for the period January 1, 1945, to date; and

(2) all correspondence between you and any one or more of the following persons: Daniel A. Bolich, Harry T. Woodring, Charles Oliphant, George Schoeneman, T. Lamar Caudle, Frank Nathan, Bert K. Naster, Edward Martin, Eugene Ditto, Charles R. Burke, Abraham Teitelbaum, and all records or documents of any kind pertaining to any one or more of the above-mentioned people or to any dealings or transactions in which any one or more of them were involved, for the period January 1, 1945, to date; and

(3) all correspondence or other records or documents of any kind passing between you and any other person or persons relating to any tax case, prosecution, or investigation, or other tax matter or proceeding, for the period January 1, 1945, to date.

In their chamber in room 1039, New House Office Building, in the city of Washington, on December 20, 1951, at the hour of 2 p. m., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at

the city of Washington, this 15th day of December 1951.

[SEAL] CECIL R. KING, Chairman.  
Attest:  
RALPH R. ROBERTS, Clerk.  
[Endorsement]

Subpna for Henry W. Grunewald before the Subcommittee on the Administration of the Internal Revenue Laws of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, served on the above-named subject personally at room 622, Georgetown Hospital, at the hour of 3:41 p. m. by exhibiting to him the original subpna and leaving with him a true copy thereof this 15th day of December 1951.

Lt. W. P. REED,  
United States Capitol Police.

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To Whom It May Concern:

You are hereby commanded to summon Henry W. Grunewald to be and appear before the Subcommittee on Administration of the Internal Revenue Laws of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Honorable CECIL R. KING is chairman, in their chamber in room 1039, New House Office Building, in the city of Washington, on December 21, 1951, at the hour of 10:30 a. m., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 21st day of December 1951.

[SEAL] CECIL R. KING, Chairman.  
Attest:  
RALPH R. ROBERTS, Clerk.  
[Endorsement]

Subpna for Henry W. Grunewald before the Subcommittee on the Administration of the Internal Revenue Laws of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, served on the above-named subject personally at New House Office Building, at the hour of 3:30 p. m. by exhibiting to him the original subpna and leaving with him a true copy thereof this 20th day of December 1951.

JAMES Q. RIORDAN,  
House of Representatives.

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To Whom It May Concern:

You are hereby commanded to summon Henry W. Grunewald to be and appear before the Subcommittee on Administration of the Internal Revenue Laws of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Honorable CECIL R. KING is chairman, and bring with you—

(1) all of your books, records, accounts, ledgers, bills, and diaries, including but not limited to retained copies of all tax returns, work sheets of yourself or your agents in connection with preparation of tax returns, bank books, bank records, bank statements, bank deposit books, canceled checks, telephone bills, telephone toll slips, and other records of local and long-distance calls, for the period January 1, 1945, to date; and

(2) all correspondence between you and any one or more of the following persons: Daniel A. Bolich, Harry T. Woodring, Charles Oliphant, George Schoeneman, T. Lamar Caudle, Frank Nathan, Bert K. Naster, Ed-

ward Martin, Eugene Ditto, Charles R. Burke, Abraham Teitelbaum, and all records or documents of any kind pertaining to any one or more of the above-mentioned people or to any dealings or transactions in which any one or more of them were involved, for the period January 1, 1945, to date; and

(3) all correspondence or other records or documents of any kind passing between you and any other person or persons relating to any tax case, prosecution, or investigation, or other tax matter or proceeding, for the period January 1, 1945, to date.

In their chamber in room 1039, New House Office Building, in the city of Washington, on December 21, 1951, at the hour of 10:30 a. m., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 21st day of December 1951.

[SEAL] CECIL R. KING, Chairman.  
Attest:  
RALPH R. ROBERTS, Clerk.  
[Endorsement]

Subpna for Henry W. Grunewald before the Subcommittee on the Administration of the Internal Revenue Laws of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, served on the above-named subject personally at New House Office Building, December 20, 1951, at the hour of 3:30 p. m., by exhibiting the same to him and leaving with him a true copy hereof, this day of December 21, 1951.

JAMES Q. RIORDAN,  
House of Representatives.

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To Whom It May Concern:

You are hereby commanded to summon Henry W. Grunewald to be and appear before the Subcommittee on Administration of the Internal Revenue Laws of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Honorable CECIL R. KING is chairman, in their chamber in room 1039 in the New House Office Building, in the city of Washington, on January 29, 1952, at the hour of 10:30 a. m., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 19th day of January 1952.

[SEAL] CECIL R. KING, Chairman.  
Attest:  
RALPH R. ROBERTS, Clerk.  
[Endorsement]

Subpna for Henry W. Grunewald before the Subcommittee on the Administration of the Internal Revenue Laws of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, served on the above-named subject personally at the Carroll Arms Hotel at the hour of 9:57 p. m., by exhibiting to him the original subpna and leaving with him a true copy thereof this 24th day of January 1952.

Lt. W. P. REED,  
United States Capitol Police.

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To Whom It May Concern:

You are hereby commanded to summon Henry W. Grunewald to be and appear before the Subcommittee on Administration of the Internal Revenue Laws of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Honorable CECIL R. KING is chairman, and to bring with him—

(1) all of your books, records, accounts, ledgers, bills, and diaries, including but not limited to retained copies of all tax returns, work sheets of yourself or your agents in connection with preparation of tax returns, bank books, bank records, bank statements, bank deposit books, canceled checks, telephone bills, telephone toll slips, and other records of local and long-distance calls, for the period January 1, 1945, to date; and

(2) all correspondence between you and any one or more of the following persons: Daniel A. Bolich, Harry T. Woodring, Charles Oliphant, George Schoeneman, T. Lamar Caudle, Frank Nathan, Bert K. Naster, Edward Martin, Eugene Ditto, Charles R. Burke, Abraham Teitelbaum, and all records or documents of any kind pertaining to any one or more of the above-mentioned people or to any dealings or transactions in which any one or more of them were involved, for the period January 1, 1945, to date; and

(3) all correspondence or other records or documents of any kind passing between you and any other person or persons relating to any tax case, prosecution, or investigation, or other tax matter or proceeding, for the period January 1, 1945, to date.

In their chamber, room 1039, New House Office Building, in the city of Washington, on January 29, 1952, at the hour of 10:30 a. m., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said committee.

Herein fail not and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 19th day of January 1952.

[SEAL] CECIL R. KING, Chairman.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS, Clerk.

[Endorsement]

Subpna for Henry W. Grunewald before the Subcommittee on the Administration of the Internal Revenue Laws of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, served on the above-named subject personally at the Carroll Arms Hotel at the hour of 9:58 p. m. by exhibiting to him the original subpna and leaving with him a true copy thereof this 24th day of January 1952.

Lt. W. P. REED,  
United States Capitol Police.

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE LAWS

RULES OF PROCEDURE

1. No major investigation shall be initiated without approval of a majority of the subcommittee. A preliminary report upon any case based upon information from available sources not requiring assignment of investigative staff to field inquiry shall be made upon the request of any two members of the subcommittee.

2. Public hearings shall be held only with the approval of a majority of the subcommittee. Executive sessions shall be held at the call of the chairman.

3. Attendance at executive sessions shall be limited to members of the subcommittee

and of the staff and such other persons whose presence is requested or consented to by the subcommittee.

4. An accurate stenographic record shall be kept of the testimony of all witnesses in public and executive hearings. Any witness may have a stenographic transcript of his testimony at cost.

5. All evidence received in executive hearings shall be secret. It shall not be released without the approval of a majority of the subcommittee, except as provided in rule 9.

6. Any witness summoned at a public or executive hearing, unless the subcommittee by a majority vote determines otherwise, may be accompanied by counsel who shall be permitted while the witness is testifying to advise him of his rights. Counsel shall not testify or make any statement without consent of a majority of the subcommittee present.

7. In a public hearing any person who is the subject of an investigation may at such hearings cross-examine witnesses giving testimony relating to him by submitting questions in writing to the chairman. Such of these question as may be consented to by a majority of the subcommittee present will be put to the witness by a member of the subcommittee or by a member of counsel to the subcommittee.

8. Any person who believes that testimony or other evidence given in a public hearing tends to defame him or otherwise adversely affect his reputation may file with the subcommittee his sworn statement, concerning such testimony or other evidence, which shall be made a part of the record of such hearings. Such person may testify in person before the subcommittee with the consent of a majority of the subcommittee.

9. No subcommittee report shall be made without the approval of a majority of the subcommittee; provided, however, that at the time any such report is made, one or more members of the subcommittee may make reports supplementary to or dissenting from the majority report. Evidence received in executive hearings may be included in any such report.

10. No summary of a subcommittee report, prediction of the contents of such report, or statement of conclusions concerning any investigation prior to a subcommittee report thereon shall be released by a member of the subcommittee or of the staff prior to the issuance of the report of the subcommittee. Any member of the subcommittee, however, may, at any time make statements concerning the subcommittee or its activities to the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives sitting in executive session.

11. No member of the subcommittee or of the staff shall publish or release any report or statement alleging misconduct by any person in any matter under investigation by the subcommittee unless and until such person has been advised of the alleged misconduct and has been given a reasonable opportunity to present to the subcommittee his sworn statement with respect thereto.

12. No member of the subcommittee or the staff shall, for compensation, publish any article or deliver any speech or lecture concerning the subcommittee or its activities while such person is a member of the subcommittee or the staff.

13. For the purpose of taking sworn testimony at public or executive hearings two members of the subcommittee shall constitute a quorum under the provisions of House Resolution 78, Eighty-second Congress, first session. However, if the chairman and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee so agree, one member of the subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for such purpose at any particular hearing.

14. All witnesses at public or executive hearings shall be sworn.

15. Subpoenas may be issued by the chairman of the subcommittee or by any other member of the subcommittee specifically authorized by the chairman.

August 17, 1951.

INTERVENTION IN CERTAIN TAX CASES IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a report from the Committee on Ways and Means on an investigation made of rumors of intervention in certain tax cases arising in southern California.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is there a minority report?

Mr. DOUGHTON. No. There is not. The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTION 32 (a) (2) OF THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 302) to amend section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this bill?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I shall be glad to explain the bill. This is a very simple bill. Its provisions are very easily understood. It passed the Senate unanimously and was reported by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce without objection.

About 2 or 3 years ago the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce brought to the floor of the House a bill designed to permit some 150 dual citizens, that implies and means that they are American citizens, to recover property that had been invested by our Alien Property Custodian during World War II. At the time the bill was brought up we placed a ceiling of \$5,000,000 on the amount that these 150 citizens might recover. The purpose of the ceiling in my opinion was to be sure that we knew about how much money we were taking from the enemy property funds. It was determined at that time that the \$5,000,000 would be adequate. However, since the authorities in the office of Alien Property have studied this matter further, they have determined that the \$5,000,000 is inadequate, and that instead it will require under \$8,000,000. For that reason, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, believing that these dual citizens have merit and that these dual citizens should be awarded in fact their property, have recommended this bill to raise the ceiling to \$8,000,000.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is a unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. BECKWORTH. It is.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And it does not take any money out of the American Treasury?

Mr. BECKWORTH. It does not take any money out of the American Treasury. Instead, it takes money from the fund which the Alien Property Custodian has.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. Does that relate to the bill which was passed a few years ago?

Mr. BECKWORTH. The bill of which the gentleman was the author did something somewhat similar to what we are proposing to do here. As I recall, the gentleman's bill related primarily to claims that arose during World War I.

Mr. REED of New York. That is right. The bill was for the purpose of giving certain preference to American claims.

Mr. BECKWORTH. We feel this bill with reference to people who lost their property in World War II is designed to give justice to dual citizens.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That subdivision (D) of paragraph (2) of section 32 (a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, is amended by striking out everything beginning with the colon following the word "marriage" down to and including "\$5,000,000" where it last appears therein.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the third proviso in subdivision (D) of paragraph (2) of section 32 (a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, is amended by striking out '\$5,000,000' wherever it appears in such proviso and by inserting in lieu thereof '\$8,000,000'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

**SUN RIVER IRRIGATION PROJECT, MONTANA, GREENFIELDS DIVISION—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 420)**

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States which was read by the Clerk:

*To the House of Representatives:*

I am returning, without my approval, H. R. 3144 relating to certain construction cost adjustments in connection with the Greenfields division of the Sun River irrigation project, Montana.

This bill would empower and direct the Secretary of the Interior to make certain cost adjustments on the Green-

fields division of the Sun River irrigation project. Specifically, there would be deducted from the obligation of the Greenfields Irrigation District the amount of \$297,752 representing certain construction costs on an abandoned section of the original irrigation canal.

The facts in this case are as follows: Construction of the Greenfields division of the Sun River irrigation project was undertaken in 1913. Irrigation water was first made available in 1920. After some years of unsuccessful attempts to prevent seepage in one section of the canal, a new by-pass canal (the Spring Valley canal) was completed in 1930, and part of the old canal was abandoned.

The Greenfields irrigation district contracted to reimburse the United States for the cost of the irrigation works, including the cost of the Spring Valley canal. The amount of the repayment contract was set at not to exceed \$9,500,000. Responsibility for operating and maintaining the irrigation facilities was transferred by the United States to the district on January 1, 1931. To date, about \$740,000 has been returned on the repayment contract.

The argument presented for now reducing the amount of the repayment contract has a surface plausibility. The argument is that the district should not have to pay for a section of the canal which was abandoned because of faulty engineering—a section, moreover, which some of the local people had predicted would fall when the original canal was being built.

However, the fact is that the original engineering designs and construction plans were approved, after examination by a special board of consultants which took into account local objections, as in accord with the then accepted engineering standards for irrigation projects. If this bill were enacted into law, it would establish the principle that the Government is obliged to give a complete guaranty as to the engineering adequacy of all construction work on irrigation projects—and to include in the guaranty any advances in technology that may be later devised. I believe this would be an unsound principle. The Government's proper obligation is to make sure in any case that the design and construction work on any project is done well and competently, in accordance with the best engineering standards of the time. That obligation was fully met in this case.

As a matter of fact, the building of the Spring Valley canal in 1930 resulted in substantially improving the irrigation facilities from the district's standpoint. Abandonment of the old section of the canal did not result in elimination of irrigation water delivery to lands previously served. On the contrary, the new Spring Valley canal brought water to an additional 4,400 acres of land not previously served. The building of the new canal, therefore, resulted in a betterment of the district's existing irrigation facilities. Under legislation enacted by the Eighty-first Congress, the cost of such rehabilitation and betterment work is added to the repayment obligation of the irrigation district involved, without any write-off of the costs

of the original facilities. I see no reason for different treatment in the case of the Greenfields district.

It is true that the Federal Government has a policy of writing off reimbursable construction costs on irrigation projects where it is found that project acreage is not susceptible to irrigation, either because of soil conditions or because of a deficiency of water supply; neither condition holds in this case. As pointed out above, the building of the new canal resulted in enlarging, not diminishing, the project acreage.

In reaching the decision to veto this bill, I have considered the repayment problems that face the farmers in the district. The maximum amount of \$9,500,000, to be repaid without interest will come from assessments made against all the irrigable lands in the district. The district's per acre construction-cost obligation was not increased by reason of the partial abandonment of the Greenfields canal and by the cost of construction of the Spring Valley canal. The 4,400 acres of additional lands, which were brought into the district's service area by reason of the change in plan, enlarged the repayment base, and actually enhanced the district's ability to meet its annual obligations under its contract with the United States. The total repayment contract of the Greenfields district amounts to a construction-cost obligation of about \$115 per acre, and this amount is repayable under the contract over a long period of years. I believe that these arrangements are fair and equitable, and that they are consistent with the Federal policy of not placing undue financial burdens on the water users.

For these reasons, I have concluded that the present repayment contract is not unfair, and that this bill would establish an unfortunate precedent by reducing the repayment obligation of the Greenfields district on insufficient grounds. Accordingly, I am returning the bill without my approval.

**HARRY S. TRUMAN,  
THE WHITE HOUSE, April 8, 1952.**

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill and message be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

**EXTENSION OF WAR POWERS**

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 423, to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until July 1, 1952.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the reason for the bill at this time?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, this is an interim resolution which seeks to keep in effect and operation 59 emergency powers which are in effect either in time of war or during the proclamation of a national emergency until July 1 of this year. The reason for this interim resolution is that by its enactment the United States will be able to deposit the Japanese Peace Treaty and thereby make it effective, and at the same time, the 59 emergency powers that would terminate when the Japanese Peace Treaty becomes effective, will remain in operation until July 1 of this year. The governments which are participants in the Japanese Peace Treaty have made plans to make it effective in mid-April. There is a provision in the treaty that it will not become effective until ratified by the United States. Other participating nations have ratified the treaty. It is important that the United States ratification be completed so that any delay will not seriously interfere with Japan's orderly transition from the status of an occupied country to that of a free and independent country. This interim resolution will not extend any of the 59 statutes beyond July 1. In the meantime, the Committee on the Judiciary may be able to complete its hearings on these 59 statutes and present to the House those statutes which it feels should be extended beyond July 1. The House will have an opportunity to decide whether or not to extend any of the 59 statutes beyond July 1, 1952.

Only one or two of these 59 statutes originated in the Committee on the Judiciary. The remaining statutes were considered by other House committees and we would prefer that the committees that handled each statute would consider whether or not the statute should be made permanent legislation, whether it should be extended temporarily or whether it should expire. It is the hope of our committee that before July 1 the respective committees of original jurisdiction will consider the merits of each statute and make a determination whether they should let it expire or present it to the House as permanent or temporary legislation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If you do not get this bill as is you will probably accomplish the same purpose by not promulgating the Japanese Treaty, is that right?

Mr. FEIGHAN. That is correct. Without the treaty, not only these 59 statutes, but about 95 others would continue to be effective. This resolution will enable our Government to make effective the treaty, and it will keep in effect only 59 statutes until July 1. Before July 1, Congress can decide to extend any of the 59 statutes that it considers necessary.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask a question of the gentleman. Do I understand this is an extension of war powers that the President now has under the old War Powers Act?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Some of them. They are either emergency powers that the President has or some of the agencies have.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I introduced a bill in 1946 to repeal the War Powers Act. I thought they ought to all go out of the window at once. In 1947 there were 229 laws at that time tied up with the ending of the war. The gentleman say there are 59 laws that need to be looked at and may be extended in some form or another?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I would like to advise the gentleman from Nebraska that our committee recommended to Congress that many of the statutes under the war powers acts should be terminated and the Congress passed favorably on our recommendations. At the present time there are effective about 155 emergency statutes. All but 59 will expire if this resolution is adopted.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am glad to see we are making some progress, but I think the Members of the House ought to know that this is an extension of the War Powers Act. There may be a difference of opinion as to what the President can do under the War Powers Act. I think he got us into the Korean war without coming to the Congress, he got us to sending troops over to Europe before he came to the Senate for approval, he got us into the Atlantic pact; and I am wondering if he intends to continue this so that he might seize the steel mills during this emergency? Is that part of the picture to continue the War Powers Act so that it will be possible to step in and take over a great industry?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I do not know what the President has in mind or whether it would be possible under the continuation of any of these particular statutes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The very thing that the gentleman has said about repealing or getting rid of these War Powers Act was said in 1947 when they had the bill up on the floor of the House. The war with Japan has been over since September 2, 1945, and here it is almost 7 years that we are continuing a lot of War Powers Acts so that we can have a lot of emergencies. This Administration thrives on emergencies or they could not survive, but it seems to me this Congress should see that these War Powers Acts should be done away with. I am convinced that many of them are not needed. We have spent a lot of blood and money to kill the very thing that we are trying to extend in this country.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I am trying to make this clear. Our committee has been considering and holding hearings on these 59 statutes. We have not completed the hearings, and this interim legislation is introduced only so that the effectiveness of the Japanese Treaty will not be impeded. This is a request for extension until July 1. In the meantime our committee is going to scrutinize each of these 59 statutes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Then may I ask this? Will your committee go over these statutes with a fine-tooth comb and eliminate every single War Powers Act that the President now has that is not needed in peacetime?

Mr. FEIGHAN. We certainly have been doing that and shall continue to do so.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am not going to object to considering the reso-

lution, but I think it is important that the Japanese Peace Treaty be consummated and take that forward step. But I think it is rather unusual legislative maneuvering to sort of tie the Japanese Peace Treaty to it; that you cannot have the treaty unless you extend the War Powers Act. I would like to see a clear-cut issue on this thing. However, on the word of the gentleman that between now and the 1st of July we will have a review of these things, and perhaps cut most of them out, I will not object. So far as having the power to take over steel mills, sending troops to Europe and all over the world, that power should not be in the hands of any President, be he Republican or Democrat.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Our committee is working very diligently. We shall not recommend the extension of any statute which we feel is not necessary.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I am certainly not going to object, and I hope no one does, because we have been confronted with a practical situation. As has been pointed out, within the next 60 days, or whatever time this extension is for, this matter can be gone into. However, one question has arisen, and I would like to have the assurance of the gentleman from Ohio in respect to it. We have been informed that it is likely that the steel mills of the country will be seized by the Federal Government tonight. Is the gentleman of the opinion that there is any provision in any of these war powers that could possibly be asserted as authority for any such seizure?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I think not. The only statute which, to my knowledge, gives seizure powers, is that which gives the President power to seize the transportation systems of this country.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, steel mills would not be in that category. I am glad the gentleman clarified that as far as I am concerned. I have examined the statutes of the Federal Government and the Constitution and I do not believe there is any authority in any existing law or any authority under the Constitution for the seizure of the steel mills, but I certainly want, in view of the fact that we are permitting this matter to go through at this time, to have it clearly understood that it is not asserted so far as the committee is concerned that there is anything in this extension that would lend any substance to this alleged strike to seize the steel mills.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Absolutely not, and I think I speak for the full committee on that score.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. What are some of the principal powers that are needed that call for such action?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Many of them refer to the operation of the Department of Defense.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. What does the gentleman mean by that?

Mr. FEIGHAN. The Reserve officers may be appointed without peacetime limitation. There is authority to inspect plants and audit books of war contractors. The Navy may acquire and operate buildings that are necessary due to the present expansion of its building program. Priority for transportation of troops and matériels of war. Some statutes deal with preference for veterans.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. There are not many of those that could not wait for the Congress to take affirmative action; are there?

Mr. FEIGHAN. There are at present 155 statutes. If the Japanese treaty is not effective, they will remain, unless Congress takes affirmative action to repeal them. The Japanese treaty will repeal all of them. This resolution provides that upon the adoption of the Japanese treaty 96 will be repealed and 59 will be operative until July 1. Congress may determine before July 1, whether or not to extend any of the remaining 59 which will expire July 1.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Are there any other powers, other than relating to the Armed Forces, where an emergency exists that requires that these powers continue, and not wait for the Congress to take affirmative action to grant the powers?

Mr. FEIGHAN. One of them would be the power to control the operation of all transportation. This is one section on which we have concluded hearings and, in my opinion, the necessity of its continuance is highly questionable.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. And that is all?

Mr. FEIGHAN. That is one.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. What others are there?

Mr. FEIGHAN. There is one with reference to missing persons who are in the service. This would permit the payment of benefits to their beneficiaries, and also, provide pay and allowances to missing personnel, return to this country of the dependents, and household goods of missing, injured, or dead personnel.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am through, but I fail to see the need for such action tonight.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. May I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], when he first knew that this bill was coming out on the floor of the House tonight?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I heard about it at about 2 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. BUSBEY. What harm could possibly be done by having this go over until tomorrow, so that we may know what it is all about? I do not think the Members of the House know what all the provisions are in here so that they can vote intelligently on them tonight.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] to answer that question.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. There are 59 different provisions here affecting veterans, the Armed Forces, housing, trans-

portation, and many other technical items. Our subcommittee has been holding hearings as carefully and as long as we possibly could, for the past month, anyway, mornings and afternoons. We have not covered all these items yet. We do not have all the testimony. We cannot say actually whether each individual item should be continued as requested or not. But we do believe that this 60-day period will give the committee and the Congress the chance to work its will affirmatively on each one of these items. We do recognize that under our present circumstances, because of the Korean situation there may be an injustice, a wrong, a damage done if we without careful consideration fail to continue some of these authorities. It is an unfortunate situation, but under all the circumstances, I think it is the only rational approach we can make to the problem at this time.

Mr. BUSBEY. I might say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the only reason I raised the question is because I am going to speak tomorrow on a situation where we let a bill slip by last year on the Consent Calendar which took away the right from the FBI to investigate the Bureau of Internal Revenue without any explanation or anything else on the floor, or the membership knowing what they were doing.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I might say to the gentleman from Illinois that he could have objected to that, if he had wanted to. He was here at the time.

Mr. BUSBEY. There was no explanation of the bill.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana with regard to the power of the President to take over the steel industry. I cannot help but feel that that is involved in the consideration of this subject tonight. I just want to tell the House that when we had hearings in a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor last year, we had before us representatives of the various labor agencies and price control agencies of the Government. They took the position that there is inherent power in any government to take over any industry that is necessary to be operated in the interest of the security of the country, and that that power vests in the President of the United States. Some of their membership took the position, however, that there was statutory power to do that in the present act under consideration. If we admit that that power exists in government in the nature of things, still I for one, do not admit it exists in connection with the Executive in our Government, and I am a bit concerned inasmuch as they make those contentions in regard to the War Powers Act by legislative authority that they will take the position if we pass this tonight that we have extended that power, and that, therefore, there is statutory authority by virtue of those claims and by virtue of our passing this matter tonight.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] to answer that question.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. There are 59 different provisions here affecting veterans, the Armed Forces, housing, trans-

portation, and many other technical items. Our subcommittee has been holding hearings as carefully and as long as we possibly could, for the past month, anyway, mornings and afternoons. We have not covered all these items yet. We do not have all the testimony. We cannot say actually whether each individual item should be continued as requested or not. But we do believe that this 60-day period will give the committee and the Congress the chance to work its will affirmatively on each one of these items. We do recognize that under our present circumstances, because of the Korean situation there may be an injustice, a wrong, a damage done if we without careful consideration fail to continue some of these authorities. It is an unfortunate situation, but under all the circumstances, I think it is the only rational approach we can make to the problem at this time.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the gentleman from Ohio can tell us what effect this extension will have on the Reserve officers bill which was passed by the House, and which will probably be considered by the other body next week, and, I hope, passed? In the event that the bill passes, does the gentleman know what effect it will have on the Reserve

bill?

Mr. FEIGHAN. It would have no effect.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas the existing state of war with Japan is the last declared state of war to which the United States is a party and the termination thereof and of the national emergencies proclaimed in 1939 and 1941 would render certain statutory provisions inoperative; and

Whereas some of these statutory provisions are needed to insure the national security and the capacity of the United States to support the United Nations in its efforts to establish and maintain world peace; and

Whereas, in view of the impending termination of this state of war, it is desirable to extend these needed statutory provisions immediately until July 1, 1952, to permit further consideration of a more extended continuation: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved, etc.*, That notwithstanding the termination hereafter of the war with Japan declared December 8, 1941 (55 Stat. 795), and of the national emergencies proclaimed by the President on September 8, 1939 (Proc. 2352, 54 Stat. 2643), and on May 27, 1941 (Proc. 2487, 55 Stat. 1647), and notwithstanding any proclamation of peace with respect to such war—

(a) Except insofar as they otherwise have further effectiveness the following statutory provisions and the authorizations conferred and liabilities imposed thereby shall remain in full force and effect to and including July 1, 1952, notwithstanding any other terminal date or provision of law with respect to such statutory provisions and notwithstanding any limitation, by reference to war or national emergency, of the time during or for which authorizations or liabilities thereunder may be exercised or imposed; and acts or events of the kind giving rise to legal consequences, under any of those provisions when performed or occurring during the existing state of war shall give rise to the same legal consequences when they are performed or occur during the period above provided for.

(1) Act of December 17, 1942 (ch. 739, sec. 1, 56, Stat. 1053), as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 1201).

(2) That portion of section 5 (m) of the act of May 18, 1933 (ch. 32, 48 Stat. 62; 16 U. S. C. 831d (m)), authorizing the sale of products of the Tennessee Valley Authority to allies of the United States; and the term "allies," as used therein, shall include nations associated with the United States in defense activities.

(3) Act of March 27, 1942 (ch. 199, secs. 1301-1304, 56 Stat. 185-186; 50 U. S. C. App. 643, 643a, 643b, 643c).

(4) Act of July 7, 1943 (ch. 192, sec. 11, 57 Stat. 382; 44 U. S. C. 376).

(5) Act of June 22, 1944 (ch. 268, sec. 102, 58 Stat. 285), as amended (38 U. S. C. 693b).

(6) Act of June 24, 1948 (ch. 625, sec. 4 (d), 62 Stat. 607), as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 454 (d)).

(7) Act of July 2, 1940 (ch. 508, sec. 1 (a) and 1 (b), 54 Stat. 712, 713), as extended by sections 13 and 16 of the act of June 5, 1942 (ch. 340, 56 Stat. 317; 50 U. S. C. App. 773, 1171 (a), 1171 (b); and the authority thereby granted to the Secretary of the Army is hereby conferred on the Secretary of the Navy, to be exercised by him on behalf of the Department of the Navy, using naval appropriations for the purpose.

(8) Act of June 5, 1942 (ch. 340, secs. 1, 7, and 11, 56 Stat. 314, 316, 317; 50 U. S. C. App. 761, 767, 771).

(9) Act of July 1, 1944 (ch. 373, secs. 212, 213, and 216, 58 Stat. 689-691; 42 U. S. C. 213, 214, and 217).

(10) Act of January 2, 1942 (ch. 645, sec. 7), as added by the act of April 22, 1943 (ch. 67, sec. 7, 57 Stat. 67; 31 U. S. C. 224i).

(11) Act of March 7, 1942 (ch. 166, secs. 1-12, 14, 15, 56 Stat. 143-147), as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 1001-1012, 1014, 1015), and as extended by section 4 (e) of the act of June 24, 1948 (ch. 625, 62 Stat. 608; 50 U. S. C. App. 454 (e)). Said act of March 7, 1942, as amended, is hereby further amended as follows and as so amended is extended in accordance with said section 4 (e) of the act of June 24, 1948: Section 2 (50 U. S. C. App. 1002) is amended by deleting "interned in a neutral country, captured by an enemy" and inserting in lieu thereof "interned for reasons arising out of any armed conflict in which Armed Forces of the United States are engaged, captured as a result of any such armed conflict." Section 6 (50 U. S. C. App. 1006) is amended by deleting "an enemy or is interned in a neutral country" and inserting in lieu thereof "a hostile force or interned for reasons arising out of any armed conflict in which Armed Forces of the United States are engaged." Section 9 (50 U. S. C. App. 1009) is amended by deleting "in the lands of an enemy" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the hands of a hostile force." Section 12 (50 U. S. C. App. 1012) is amended by deleting "interned in a neutral country, or captured by the enemy" and inserting in lieu thereof "interned for reasons arising out of such operations, or captured as a result of such operations." Section 14 (50 U. S. C. App. 1014) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 14. The provisions of this act, applicable to persons captured by armed forces against which Armed Forces of the United States are engaged in armed conflict, shall also apply to any person beleaguered or besieged by hostile armed forces."

(12) Act of December 4, 1942 (ch. 674, secs. 2, 3, and 4, 56 Stat. 1039; 10 U. S. C. 904b, 904c, 904d).

(13) Act of October 26, 1942 (ch. 624, 56 Stat. 987; 50 U. S. C. App. 836).

(14) Act of December 18, 1942 (ch. 765, 56 Stat. 1057; 10 U. S. C. 906 and note, 907 and note).

(15) Act of September 16, 1942 (ch. 561, secs. 1-3, 56 Stat. 753), as amended (50 U. S. C. 301-303).

(16) Act of June 25, 1942 (ch. 447, 56 Stat. 390-391; 50 U. S. C. App. 781-785).

(17) Act of October 14, 1940 (ch. 862, 54 Stat. 1125), as amended, secs. 1, 202, 301, 401, 402, and 501 (42 U. S. C. 1521, 1532, 1541, 1561, 1562, 1571). In view of the continuing existence of acute housing needs occasioned by World War II, the emergency declared by the President on September 8, 1939, shall, for the purpose of continuing the use of property held under said act of October 14, 1940, continue to exist until and including July 1, 1952.

(18) Act of December 2, 1942 (ch. 668, titles I and II, 56 Stat. 1028), as amended (42 U. S. C. 1701-1706, 1711-1717). The fol-

lowing terms, as used therein, and the terms "allies" and "war effort," as used in the statutory provisions referred to in section 101 (a) (1) thereof (42 U. S. C. 1701 (a) (1)), shall be construed as follows: The term "enemy" shall include any nation, government, or force engaged in armed conflict with (1) the armed forces of the United States or any ally or (ii) persons covered by said titles I and II. The term "allies" shall include any nation, government, or force associated with the United States in defense activities. The terms "national war effort" and "war effort" shall include national defense. The term "war activities" shall include activities directly related to military operations.

(19) The paragraph designated "(2)" which was inserted into the act of March 3, 1909 (ch. 255, 35 Stat. 753), by the act of April 9, 1943 (ch. 39, 57 Stat. 60; 34 U. S. C. 533).

(20) Act of October 25, 1943 (ch. 276, 57 Stat. 575), as amended by section 2 of the act of April 9, 1946 (ch. 121, 60 Stat. 87; 38 U. S. C. 11a note).

(21) Act of December 23, 1944 (ch. 716, 58 Stat. 921; 50 U. S. C. App. 1705 and note, 1706, 1707).

(22) Act of July 28, 1945 (ch. 328, sec. 5 (b), 59 Stat. 505; 5 U. S. C. 801); and the term "enemy" as used therein shall include any nation, government, or force engaged in armed conflict with (1) the Armed Forces of the United States or of any nation, government, or force associated with the United States in defense activities or (ii) persons covered by said statutory provision.

(23) Act of June 27, 1942 (ch. 453, 56 Stat. 461; 50 U. S. C. App. 801, 802).

(24) Act of December 22, 1942 (ch. 803, 56 Stat. 1071; 48 U. S. C. 510 note).

(25) Act of October 17, 1942 (ch. 615, secs. 1-4, 56 Stat. 796; 36 U. S. C. 179-182).

(26) Act of October 17, 1940 (ch. 888, sec. 512, 54 Stat. 1190), as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 572); and this provision shall be applicable also to citizens of the United States who serve on or before July 1, 1952, with the forces of any nation that is participating with the United States in any armed conflict in which the United States may be engaged.

(27) Act of July 15, 1949 (ch. 338, title V, sec. 507, 63 Stat. 438; 42 U. S. C. 1477).

(28) Act of October 14, 1940 (ch. 862, title V, sec. 503), as added by the act of June 23, 1945 (ch. 192, 59 Stat. 260, 42 U. S. C. 1573).

(29) Act of September 27, 1944 (ch. 421, 58 Stat. 747), as amended (43 U. S. C. 279-284).

(30) Act of December 21, 1928 (ch. 42, sec. 9, 45 Stat. 1063), as amended (43 U. S. C. 617h).

(31) Act of July 22, 1937 (ch. 517, sec. 1, 50 Stat. 522), as amended (7 U. S. C. 1001).

(32) Act of April 24, 1912 (ch. 90, secs. 1 and 2, 37 Stat. 90, 91), as amended (36 U. S. C. 10, 11).

(33) The eighth paragraph (designated "Military traffic in time of war") of section 6 of the act of February 4, 1887, chapter 104, as that section was amended by section 2 of the act of June 29, 1906 (ch. 3591, 34 Stat. 586; 10 U. S. C. 1362 and 49 U. S. C. 6 (8)).

(34) The first complete sentence (designated "Transportation of troops, and so forth, exclusive control of systems in time of war") at the top of page 645 of Thirty-ninth Statute in the act of August 29, 1916 (ch. 418, sec. 1; 10 U. S. C. 1361); and the President may exercise his authority thereunder through such officers or agencies as he may designate.

(35) Act of February 4, 1887 (ch. 104, sec. 1 (15)), as enacted by act of February 28, 1920 (ch. 91, sec. 402, 41 Stat. 456, 476; 49 U. S. C. 1 (15)).

(36) Act of February 4, 1887 (ch. 104, sec. 420), as added by act of May 16, 1942 (ch. 318, sec. 1, 56 Stat. 284, 298; 49 U. S. C. 1020).

(37) Act of June 6, 1941 (ch. 174, 55 Stat. 242-245), as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 1271-1275).

(38) Act of December 3, 1942 (ch. 670, sec. 2, 56 Stat. 1038; 33 U. S. C. 855a).

(39) Title 18, United States Code, sections 794, 2153, 2154, and 2388.

(40) Act of May 22, 1918 (ch. 81, 40 Stat. 559), as amended by the act of June 21, 1941 (ch. 210, 55 Stat. 252, 253; 22 U. S. C. 223-226b).

(41) Act of October 31, 1942 (ch. 634, 56 Stat. 1018; 35 U. S. C. 89 and note and 90-96); and the terms "prosecution of the war" and "conditions of wartime production," as used therein, shall include, respectively, prosecution of defense activities and conditions of production during the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950.

(42) Title 28, United States Code, section 2680 (j).

(43) Act of July 1, 1944 (ch. 373, sec. 211 (c), 58 Stat. 668), as amended (42 U. S. C. 212 (c)).

(b) The following statutory provisions which are normally operative in time of peace shall not become operative upon the termination of the state of war with Japan but rather (in addition to being inoperative, in accordance with their terms, in time of war) shall continue to be inoperative until and including July 1, 1952, any other provision of law with respect thereto to the contrary notwithstanding:

(1) Those portions of section 37 of the act of June 3, 1916 (ch. 134, 39 Stat. 189), as amended (10 U. S. C. 353), which restrict the appointment of Reserve officers in time of peace.

(2) The second sentence of section 40b of the act of June 3, 1916, as added by section 33 of the act of June 4, 1920 (ch. 227, 41 Stat. 777), as amended (10 U. S. C. 386).

(3) Act of August 4, 1942 (ch. 547, sec. 10, 56 Stat. 738; 34 U. S. C. 8501).

(4) Act of June 28, 1944 (ch. 306, sec. 2, 58 Stat. 624), as amended (10 U. S. C. 1214; 34 U. S. C. 555b).

(5) Act of March 3, 1893 (ch. 212, 27 Stat. 717; 34 U. S. C. 196).

(6) Act of June 16, 1890 (ch. 426, sec. 4, 26 Stat. 158; 10 U. S. C. 651).

(7) Joint resolution of November 4, 1939 (ch. 2, sec. 7, 54 Stat. 8; 22 U. S. C. 447 (a)-(d)).

(c) The President is hereby authorized to continue in effect until and including July 1, 1952, all appointments under the provision of sections 37 and 38 of the act of June 3, 1916 (ch. 134, 39 Stat. 189, 190), and section 127a of said act as added by the act of June 4, 1920 (ch. 227 (41 Stat. 785)), as amended (10 U. S. C. 358, 32 U. S. C. 19, 10 U. S. C. 513); section 515 (e) of the act of August 7, 1947 (ch. 512, 61 Stat. 907; 10 U. S. C. 506d (e)); and section 3 of the act of August 21, 1941 (ch. 384, 55 Stat. 652), as amended (10 U. S. C. 591a), which are in effect on the date of the approval of this act as officers and warrant officers of the Army of the United States and as officers and warrant officers of the United States Air Force, including appointments as officers and warrant officers in the Organized Reserve Corps, the Air Force Reserve, the National Guard of the United States, and the Air National Guard of the United States, any other provision of law to the contrary notwithstanding.

(d) For the purpose of section 1 of the act of May 29, 1945 (ch. 135, 59 Stat. 225), as amended (31 U. S. C. 222c), and for the purpose of section 2 of the act of December 28, 1945 (ch. 597, 59 Stat. 662; 31 U. S. C. 222e), the date of the termination of a time of war and the establishment of peace shall be July 1, 1952, notwithstanding any other termination of war or establishment of peace.

(e) For the purpose of section 1 of the act of July 3, 1943 (ch. 189, 57 Stat. 372), as

amended (31 U. S. C. 223b), and for the purpose of section 1 of the act of December 28, 1945 (ch. 597, 59 Stat. 662; 31 U. S. C. 223d), the date of the termination of a time of war and the establishment of peace shall, with respect to accidents or incidents occurring after June 23, 1950, be July 1, 1952, notwithstanding any other termination of war or establishment of peace.

Sec. 2. Authority now conferred upon the Secretary of the Air Force under the statutory provisions cited in this act is hereby extended to the same extent as the authority of the Secretary of the Army thereunder.

Sec. 3. Nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal or modify section 601 of Public Law 155, Eighty-second Congress, first session, relative to coming into agreement with the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives with respect to real-estate actions by or for the use of the military departments or the Federal Civil Defense Administration.

Sec. 4. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remaining provisions of this act, or the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

Sec. 5. This act may be cited as the "Emergency Powers Interim Continuation Act."

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

#### SUBMARGINAL LANDS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, with an amendment of the House thereto, insist on the House amendment and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CELLER, WALTER, WILSON of Texas, GRAHAM, and CASE.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.

[Mr. VAN ZANDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House today for 5 minutes, following any other special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to address the House tomorrow for 15 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

#### NATIONAL EMERGENCY SEIZURE ACT OF 1952

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, since I first proposed amendments to the Taft-Hartley law in 1947 I have carried on a campaign to urge the Congress to make provision for the kind of ultimate situation which we seem to be facing in the steel industry. I have urged that Congress deal realistically with a situation in which the operation of plants and facilities are so vital to the national security or health that it must be continued. Particularly is this true in a national emergency of defense mobilization like the present.

The Congress has not dealt with the problem and we again face a situation today in which the Government may move with its own interpretation of its powers in this area and with an arduous controversy either publicly or in the courts, or both, to determine the rights of the parties affected and of the Government and without help from Congress on a fundamental national policy which is exactly within the province of Congress.

It is significant that Massachusetts has a law providing for seizure by the governor of privately owned business engaged in the distribution of food, fuel, water, electric light, power, gas, and hospital and medical services threatened by shutdown to the extent necessary to safeguard health and safety.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I am raising the subject again today by introducing a bill to establish authority in the President for the seizure, use, and operation of plants essential to the national security and health in which shutdowns of production due to labor-management difficulties are threatened. I believe that the impending steel shutdown with its direct threat to the defense production of the country brings forward again the urgent need for this kind of legislation. Under the present statutory authority contained in the Selective Service Act of 1948—Public Law 759, Eightieth Congress—section 18 and under any general constitutional powers of the President, there are no ground rules for such seizure of plants which are made, as they ought to be, by the Congress. It is my belief that Congress must deal with this problem in respect of the impending situation and any similar situation. At a time of national emergency like the present, I believe that the people of the country would not feel that this administration ought to be entrusted with complete power in a situation like seizure of the steel plants without the Congress having set up the ground rules. Accordingly my bill makes the following major points:

First. That the United States may seize plants where a labor-management dispute has resulted in or imminently threatens a shut-down in an industry, operation of which is essential to the national security or health and where seizure is essential to continued operation;

Second. That the plants are to be operated by the Government only to the minimum extent required by the national security or health—in this way avoiding any implication of strikebreaking;

Third. That employees—those who remain on the job—are to be paid not less than the prevailing wages in the particular industry in the area and that a special wage board is to consider wage rates and other conditions of employment;

Fourth. That the special wage board is to be composed of nine members, three chosen by the President from a panel nominated by the principal national labor organizations to represent labor, three members from a panel nominated by the principal national employer organizations to represent employers, and three members to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate to represent the public;

Fifth. That the Government is to pay only just compensation for its use of the seized property, is to operate it for the account of the United States, and is not to operate it for the account of the employer as if it were a going concern; and

Sixth. That the property is to be restored to its owners within 30 days after the restoration of such labor relations as would permit production required for the national security or health.

I wish to emphasize again that the situation with which my bill proposes to deal is not confined to the steel situation but that it is intended to deal with any national emergency in defense mobilization involving continued necessary production.

Having carried on this effort to establish a national policy for seizure and operation of critical industrial facilities since 1947, I feel that the injunction provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act on this subject have shown themselves to be negative and inadequate to the problem. The provisions of section 18 of the Selective Service Act are so general as to be inadequate. None of these regulates an absolute exercise of power on the part of the Executive which is the responsibility of the Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BECKWORTH). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

#### THE COMMUNISTS AND HOLLYWOOD

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, Howard Hughes, production manager of RKO Studio in Los Angeles, Calif., has gone on the offensive against some of the Communists and fellow travelers who have infested a great and productive industry for many years. So successful have the Red termites been in their operations within the moving-picture industry that they have succeeded, out of all proportion to their numbers, in convincing many millions of Americans that Hollywood is the seat of the American Kremlin. This activity on the part of Communists and fellow travelers in the entertainment field has created new and additional problems for the makers of pictures, and has brought down upon some of the recent products

of Hollywood the wrath of veterans' organizations and other groups throughout the Nation. It is not unusual today to see picket lines around moving-picture theatres with pickets carrying placards indicating that a star, a writer, a producer, or some other individual associated with the production of the picture has been publicly identified as a member of the Communist Party, or as a prominent fellow traveler. This public outcry has hurt business in Hollywood.

As in any other controversy of this kind, the interested parties have chosen up sides and have belabored each other in the process. Some in Hollywood who should know better contend that the Communist bug-a-boo is a mare's nest, and that the few Communists in Hollywood have not been able to make a serious dent in the operations of the industry or upon the finished product of the movie capital, while the other side is equally vehement in its declarations that the town is infested with Communists and fellow travelers.

The moving-picture industry operates under a code of ethics, designed and adopted by the industry not only to insure against objectionable material in film content but also to discourage and censor those guilty of personal moral turpitude and conduct generally considered offensive to public decency. All contracts drawn between studios and artists contain the morals clause, and it is within this frame of reference that I should like to relate communism and membership in Communist-front organizations to present-day concepts of public decency and public morality.

Communism is offensive to the American people today. That fact can brook no denial. Courts and juries have found that the Communist Party in the United States teaches and advocates the use of force and violence in the overthrow of constitutional government in this country, and the leaders of the party have been jailed on these findings. The American people concur in these decisions and so plain has public displeasure become with respect to Communists in this country that suspect witnesses before congressional committees now refuse to answer any questions concerning their participation in the Communist Party or within Communist-front organizations for fear of public condemnation. Although refusal of noncooperative witnesses to answer questions bearing upon their membership in the Communist conspiracy is based on a professed fear of criminal prosecution, in almost all instances today the provisions of the fifth amendment to the Constitution are invoked, not by reason of possible self-incrimination, but because an identity established with the conspiracy will render unlikely the future employment of the witnesses. This is particularly true in the field of entertainment, where tenure is, at best, precarious and uncertain, and where the artist is successful only so long as he or she is acceptable to the public. The picket lines about the theaters are ample evidence to Communists and fellow travelers that their public identification as Communists will inevitably result in the one black list they fear the most—that at the box office.

But notwithstanding the obvious fact of public displeasure and a universal demand that Communists and fellow travelers be disclosed for what they are, some of those associated with the moving-picture industry contend that the refusal of a witness to discuss with cognizant committees of the Congress his documented and detailed associations within the orbit of the Communist Party is in no way a violation of the morals clause contained in contracts, and that participation in Communist and Communist-front organizations is a matter outside the proper scope of congressional investigation. They further contend that employing studios have no right to discharge from their employment those who refuse to discuss alleged party membership before the duly constituted committees of the Congress.

The spirit and the letter of the morals clause go to the point that any action generally viewed by the American people as reprehensible in and of itself tends to degrade and damage the moving-picture industry and the product of that industry. If a picket line outside a theater protesting the appearance in a picture of a writer who refuses to state whether or not he was or is a member of the Communist Party tends to undermine public confidence in the studio producing the picture, the producers contend that the public actions of the individual do in fact constitute a violation of the morals clause.

A fight between two moving-picture personalities in a Hollywood night club may be considered reprehensible and public drunkenness on the part of a performer unquestionably constitutes a violation of the morals clause. But how much greater is the offense, as viewed by the public, committed by a performer who refuses to state whether or not he or she belongs to an organization which, by definition, seeks to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence. The night-clubbing inebriate may be guilty of disturbing the peace, but in the view of the American public the present-day Communist is guilty of the offense of treason at a time when Americans by the thousands are laying down their lives in an all-out global war against communism. It is quite natural that the parents whose sons are engaged in the conflict will resent the appearance of a performer who is allied with the forces which seek the life of their son.

Treason is a harsh word, but it is the only word the dictionary provides to cover the membership of a Communist today. The acts of one who fails to give his government all of the information within his possession regarding communism is, in fact, high treason as defined in the New Century Dictionary, to wit: "in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort."

The Communist who, having in his possession information relating to the membership and the activities of the Communist Party, fails to disclose those facts to his government is in fact and in truth adhering to the enemies of the United States and giving them aid and comfort.

The morals clause was never intended to give authority for treason or shelter to those who commit it.

In taking strong action against Paul Jarrico, a screen writer, Mr. Howard Hughes, production manager of RKO pictures, is moving against those who claim that while murder of an individual may be wrong, it is entirely legal to murder a way of life—in this instance the American way. Mr. Hughes is a businessman but he is also a good American. I have never met the gentleman, but I should like to do so and I shall take the first opportunity to talk with him for the purpose of congratulating him on his initial move against the activities of those to whom communism means more than does the economic welfare of any industry or the political stability of any constitutional form opposed to that of the Soviet Union.

Hughes fired Jarrico for the latter's refusal to answer questions put to him by the Committee on Un-American Activities. In a counter legal action Jarrico has sued Hughes for \$350,000, alleging that portions of Jarrico's work were included by RKO studio in the film, *The Las Vegas Story*. This allegation has been denied by the studio. Whether or not any portion of the Jarrico script was used by RKO is a matter upon which I am not qualified to rule, but whether Paul Jarrico has lent aid and comfort to the enemies of this country is quite another matter, and one upon which I can speak with considerable authority.

Before documenting the Jarrico record let me say, Mr. Speaker, that in my 6 years in the Congress and my year and a half on the Committee on Un-American Activities, I have never been charged with smearing the character of any man. I have been extremely cautious in making charges, and in every instance I have required the fullest documentation before taking either the floor of the House or any public platform. Mr. Jarrico was subpoenaed before the House Committee on Un-American Activities on April 13, 1951. He was not summoned in a capricious manner, but his appearance was required because of the serious nature of documented evidence in possession of the Committee. In brief, Mr. Speaker, the committee had every valid reason to summon Mr. Jarrico before it for an explanation of his long and continued affiliation in, and his activities on behalf of, the Communist Party and its front organizations.

In order that the record may be clear regarding the pertinent testimony of Mr. Jarrico, I include herewith portions of the transcript covering his appearance before the committee:

Mr. TAVENNER. You are Mr. Paul Jarrico?  
Mr. JARRICO. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are represented by counsel?

Mr. JARRICO. Yes; I am. By Mr. Margolis and by Mr. Kenny.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you please state your full name, place of birth, and your age?

Mr. JARRICO. Well, my full name is Israel Paul Jarrico, though I am known personally and professionally and legally as Paul Jarrico. I was born in Los Angeles, Calif., on January 12, 1915, and I reside at 320 South Sherbourne Drive, Los Angeles 48, Calif.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give the committee a brief statement of your educational background?

Mr. JARRICO. I was educated in the public schools of Los Angeles. I attended the University of California at Los Angeles, the University of California at Berkeley. I graduated from the University of Southern California in 1936 with a degree of bachelor of arts.

Mr. TAVENNER. How are you now employed?

Mr. JARRICO. Well, until 2 weeks ago I was a screen writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your last employment?

Mr. JARRICO. I was employed by RKO Radio Pictures until the day I received a subpoena from this committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give the committee a statement of your employment record, please?

Mr. JARRICO. Well, it is a rather long one.

Mr. TAVENNER. Briefly.

Mr. JARRICO. I will try to summarize it. I first obtained employment in the motion-picture industry in 1937, and have been employed more or less continuously since by practically every studio in Hollywood, except for a brief time I spent in the merchant marine and a short time I spent in the United States Navy.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the last screen play on which you were employed?

Mr. JARRICO. The last screen play on which I was employed was *The Las Vegas Story*, which is currently shooting in Hollywood, with Jane Russell and Victor Mature. I urge you all to see it.

Mr. TAVENNER. By what company were you employed?

Mr. JARRICO. RKO Radio Pictures.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who employed you?

Mr. JARRICO. I was employed by the studio.

Mr. TAVENNER. The studio must have had an official representative of course, in making the employment. Who was he?

Mr. JARRICO. Well, my immediate producer was Mr. Robert Sparks. However, I must protest at this point. It seems to me an attempt to create the basis for a blacklist in Hollywood, on the basis of guilt by employment, guilt by the mere fact that you employ a man. Mr. Sparks, a conservative gentleman, I am sure, employed me because he thought I was the best man to do that particular job, and not because of my politics.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you engaged in screen-play writing along with Richard Collins?

Mr. JARRICO. Yes. He was my collaborator for several years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over what period of time was he a collaborator with you?

Mr. JARRICO. From the fall of 1941 until the summer of 1943.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were present, I believe, at this hearing room during the giving of his testimony yesterday?

Mr. JARRICO. Yes; I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. I suppose you heard his testimony, in which he stated that you were a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. JARRICO. I heard his testimony in regard to a great many things. I heard him attempting to purge himself before this committee and perjuring himself before this committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he perjure himself in regard to his statement that you were a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. JARRICO. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then what did you mean by stating that he perjured himself in his testimony here?

Mr. JARRICO. I refuse to answer that question, also, on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. And what is that ground?

Mr. JARRICO. That it may tend to incriminate me. That doesn't mean that it would

incriminate me. It just means that it might tend to; that it might subject me to prosecution, not to conviction.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, for you to answer the question would put you in fear that you might be prosecuted for some criminal offense?

Mr. JARRICO. It might place me in jeopardy; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you receive your subpoena to appear before this committee?

Mr. JARRICO. I believe the date was March 23. I am not completely certain. I believe that is the correct date.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you confer with Mr. Collins about his appearance, Mr. Richard Collins, about his appearance before this committee after you were served your subpoena to appear here?

Mr. JARRICO. I refuse to answer that question on the same ground.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you referred to Mr. Richard Collins perjuring himself before this committee, were you referring in any way to his testimony as to the occasion when you visited him with regard to his testimony before this committee?

Mr. JARRICO. I have already refused to answer the same question, phrased rather differently. I believe it is the same question. At any rate, to make it clear, I refuse to answer this question also, on the same ground.

Mr. TAVENNER. You refuse to answer in what particular? You have in mind with regard to Mr. Collins' testimony when you said that he perjured himself before this committee?

Mr. JARRICO. That's correct.

Mr. VELDE. Counsel, is the word "perjured" or "purged"?

Mr. JARRICO. I used both words. I used "purge" and "perjury." I think the line between them is very thin.

I wonder if I might at this point introduce a statement, Mr. Chairman. I have sat here all day yesterday and heard my patriotism maligned, my loyalty impugned. I wonder whether I might read a fairly short statement, which states quite concisely my attitude toward my country and toward this committee.

Mr. WOOD. We are giving you the opportunity to answer whatever questions are asked you here, which are intended to reflect on that very subject matter. At the conclusion of your testimony, we will be happy to have you file for the record here any statement that you desire to make.

Mr. JARRICO. I can only answer the questions that are presented to me when I am being cross-examined. However, in my statement I am able to make a more considered statement of my position.

Mr. WOOD. Following the custom and practice of the committee, you will be given the privilege of filing that statement with the committee for the record when you have finished your testimony.

Mr. JARRICO. I would like to reply publicly.

Mr. WOOD. In this connection, sir, I would like to, if I may, Mr. Counsel, interpose at this point this observation: Perjury is a rather grave offense, not only under our law but under every moral code that I know anything about. Now you have leveled a charge against a man that you say was your collaborator for several years in the same industry that you are in; that he has deliberately committed that offense here before this committee yesterday. Don't you think, when you make that charge yourself, that you owe it to yourself; you owe it to Mr. Collins; you owe it to the American people, and particularly the people in your industry, to inform this committee as to just how and in what manner you contend that he swore falsely before this committee yesterday? Don't you think, in fairness to every conception of decency and common justice and honesty, that you owe it to the people of America, and particularly in your industry,

to let them know in what particular you claim he swore falsely?

Mr. JARRICO. I shall issue a statement and otherwise communicate.

Mr. WOOD. You are under oath now. Under your oath you have sworn that he committed perjury. One or the other of you is swearing falsely. He has pin-pointed his testimony. Don't you think you ought to pin-point yours?

Mr. JARRICO. This is not my forum, Mr. Chairman, and this is not the place for me to discuss my differences with Mr. Collins. I don't choose to do it here.

Mr. DOYLE. May I suggest this: I think, Mr. Jarrico, you were not being questioned by our counsel or by anyone else as to whether or not it was your opinion that Mr. Collins had perjured himself. You volunteered the statement to this committee. We were not asking you whether or not he perjured himself. You yourself volunteered the charge that he perjured himself.

Mr. JARRICO. I was asked a question based on an assertion that Mr. Collins made here yesterday. I answered that question by saying that I refused to answer that question, and that I refuse to consider Mr. Collin's testimony here as truthful. Now, that is my position. I don't intend to discuss with you wherein it was untruthful or wherein it was truthful.

Mr. DOYLE. The only reason I brought it to your attention is that you volunteered the charge that he had perjured himself. We had not asked you whether or not he perjured himself or testified falsely. I just wanted to make that suggestion to you.

Mr. JARRICO. My answer stands, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Continue the questioning.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. JARRICO. I refuse to answer that question on the ground that it might tend to incriminate me, as I shall refuse to answer any questions regarding my political affiliations or activities.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.

It will be noted, Mr. Speaker, that early in his testimony, Mr. Jarrico served notice on the committee that he had no intention of cooperating in the hearing, or of giving any information which might be of service to the committee in carrying out the obligations which had been laid upon it by the Congress to investigate the nature and extent of Communist activity and propaganda. Although Mr. Jarrico undoubtedly had considerable knowledge of the membership, finances, and activities of the Communist branches to which he had been assigned, he chose to take his stand on the provisions of the Constitution relating to possible self-incrimination, thus depriving the committee and the Congress of pertinent and essential information respecting the infiltration of the moving-picture industry. Further, he chose to deny to his colleagues in the Screen Writers' Guild, his employers, and the American public any information as to the part he played in the life of the Communist Party in Los Angeles. In short, and in spite of testimony naming Jarrico as a Communist Party member, he contented himself with reviling the committee and its motives and left the stand contending that his failure to cooperate should not be assumed to be any admission of complicity in the Communist conspiracy.

His employers at RKO chose to assume otherwise, and in this assumption they have been joined by members of

the committee and the press and public. Typical of press comment is the following editorial from the Santa Monica (Calif.) Evening Outlook of March 31, 1952:

**MR. HUGHES TILTS A LANCE**

Howard Hughes of RKO, who has tangled with everything from jet planes to Uncle Sam, is not to be bulldozed by the Screen Writers Guild. He has served notice in a letter to the union that he would never accept the decision of arbitrators in the Paul Jarrico dispute, and demanded: "Are you going to strike or aren't you?"

The background of this dispute is enlightening. Some time ago screen writer Jarrico refused to tell the House Un-American Activities Committee whether he was a Communist—on grounds of self-incrimination. Howard Hughes thereupon decided he did not want such a man writing his screen plays, and fired him. He also discarded Jarrico's manuscripts on the Las Vegas Story and made the picture with another writer. This did not please the Screen Writers Guild; reports reached Hughes' office that the guild meant to champion Jarrico to the bitter end. But since it did not act, the irrepressible Hughes has sought to end the cold war with his classic letter.

The key to his action is his insistence that he would never submit to compromise or negotiation on the Jarrico issue because his stand "is based on principle, belief, and conscience." These things, he explained, "are not subject to arbitration." We have no cynical feeling in saying that such a reliance on principle is a refreshing sound, coming out of Hollywood.

In particular, it may be hoped that the Hughes stand on communism will stiffen the backs of other movie producers who have hedged and hesitated on the issue. Since the 10 Hollywood Reds were fired, some of them have regained positions in the industry, while other notorious Commie sympathizers among screen writers have never been challenged. For lack of bold leadership, an entertainment medium which has a strong hold on the public mind is still being used as a vehicle for Red propaganda.

Howard Hughes believes that people who refuse to affirm their American loyalty should not be allowed to control what is said and done in a motion picture. It is a matter of principle with him, and from all indications, he is going to make that principle stick. Mr. Hughes is rather foreign to the role of a crusader, but in this case he may be able to provide the moral leadership that Hollywood needs.

In spite of Jarrico's professed regard for this Government and for American institutions in general, it will be noted, Mr. Speaker, that he assiduously avoided questions relating to his Communist Party affiliations and activities. It remained for other witnesses to give positive and unqualified identifications which to this time have not been refuted by Mr. Jarrico.

The first witness to identify Jarrico as a member of the Communist Party was screen writer Richard Collins, who collaborated with Jarrico on the screen play, Song of Russia. Mr. Collins testified before the committee on April 12, 1951, or the day before Mr. Jarrico appeared, and said, in part—page 236, Communism in the Motion Picture Industry, part 1:

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you identify Paul Jarrico more definitely for us? How long had you known him?

Mr. COLLINS. About 5 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. How closely had he been associated with you in your work during that period of 5 years?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, we first started working together I think in 1940, and we sold a story to M-G-M and then one to Universal.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many screen plays did he work on with you?

Mr. COLLINS. Three.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Jarrico was followed to the stand by Meta Reis Rosenberg, story editor and agent in Hollywood, who testified that she joined the Communist Party in 1938. She was assigned to a party branch, and testified as to the membership of the group as follows:

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, now, will you tell us the names of the persons in the group of Communist Party members to which you were assigned when you first joined the party?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. As I remember it, there was a Frank Tuttle—Frank and Tania Tuttle, who was married to her at that time; he isn't now. Waldo Salt; Jarrico.

Mr. TAVENNER. Paul Jarrico?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Yes.

Evidence that meetings of a Communist Party cell or branch were held at Jarrico's apartment was placed in the record during the testimony of Budd Schulberg, who testified on May 23, 1951. During the course of questioning by committee counsel, the following testimony was given—Communist Infiltration of Hollywood Motion Picture Industry, page 604:

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give us the names of other persons who from time to time became affiliated with that group—that is, the group in the Communist Party to which you belonged?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Besides the ones I remember definitely in 1937, there was Waldo Salt.

Mr. TAVENNER. Waldo Salt?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes. I don't believe he was in the original group, but came in at some later time. I couldn't place the time. It seems to me early in 1938, but I am not too clear on these dates.

Mr. TAVENNER. In whose homes were meetings held?

Mr. SCHULBERG. They would be held at the various homes of the people in the group. As far as I recall, it would rotate. Once in a while, mine, sometimes at Jarrico's or Collins' apartment, at the house of Lardner.

Leo Townsend, Hollywood screen writer, added additional identification of Paul Jarrico as a member of the Communist Party during his testimony before the committee on September 18, 1951. The following exchange of questions and answers took place—Communism in Motion Picture Industry, part 4, page 1513:

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me ask you to identify those people a little more fully with regard to their Communist Party membership and activity.

Mr. Townsend then listed a number of individuals with whom he had been associated during his membership in the Communist Party:

Mr. TOWNSEND. \* \* \* There was Abe and Sylvia Polonsky. That is spelled P-o-l-o-n-s-k-y, I believe. There was John Weber, W-e-b-e-r, who was a writer's agent at that time. \* \* \* There was Paul and Sylvia Jarrico, J-a-r-r-i-c-o; there was Joseph Losey, L-o-s-e-y.

The next to drive an identification nail in Jarrico's Communist Party membership was Martin Berkeley, a screen writer. Testifying before the committee on September 19, 1951, Berkeley positively identified Jarrico as a Communist who had attended a number of groups with him—Communist Infiltration of Hollywood Motion Picture Industry, part 4, page 1594. Berkeley testified, in part, as follows:

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to ask you at this time to give the committee the names of any other persons known to you personally to have been members of the Communist Party during the time that you were a member, which you have not already given us, and in so doing to tell us as nearly as you can the circumstances under which you knew them to be members of the Communist Party.

Mr. BERKELEY. Well, that is rather difficult, Mr. Tavenner. I have an enormous list here. I am afraid we would be here all day if I started to talk in terms of how I met them and where I met them. These people that I will name as having been in my group may have come into the group and stayed for one meeting and then shuttled out into another group or have come into the group and left town, may have stayed in the group for a year after I left that particular group. All I will say is that I knew them then as party members.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well, sir.

Mr. BERKELEY. A man named Lou Amster, A-m-s-t-e-r, a writer; a Miss Isobel Lennart, L-e-n-n-a-r-t, who was a reader. I originally knew Isobel as a reader, as a member of the Screen Readers' Guild. Later she became a very, very successful screen writer at Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer. Paul Jarrico was in a number of groups with me. That is J-a-r-r-i-c-o. A young actress named Frances Sage. There was a gentleman in the group with me for—well, a number of groups, named Bob Roberts, R-o-b-e-r-t-s. Bob Roberts is a partner of John Garfield's and his (Robert Roberts') wife, Catherine O'Neal. I don't know which way she spells O'Neal. Dr. Leo Bigelman, I think it is B-i-g-e-l-m-a-n. I don't know how he spells his name. Bigelman. I saw his picture in the paper this morning.

On September 21, 1951, Elizabeth Wilson, a screen writer, identified Paul and Sylvia Jarrico as members of the Young Communist League, during the year 1937—Communist Infiltration of Hollywood Motion Picture Industry, part 5, pages 1725-26:

Mr. TAVENNER. \* \* \* will you give us the names of those who were members of the Young Communist League?

Mrs. WILSON. The names that I recall, the faces I recall as being present there rather than at Browder meetings which I was then attending of the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League, were Paul and Sylvia Jarrico, J-a-r-r-i-c-o.

Additional identification of Jarrico as a member of the Communist Party of the Communist Political Association was read into the record by Mrs. Anne Ray Frank, a free lance radio writer, who testified in executive session in Los Angeles, Calif., on September 10, 1951. Mrs. Frank's testimony—Communist Infiltration of Hollywood Motion Picture Industry, part 6, page 2073—is as follows:

Mr. WHEELER. Do you recall the names of the individuals who attended these meetings?

Mrs. FRANK. Yes. But since at about this time the Communist Party was dissolved and became instead an organization known as the Communist Political Association, and since the meetings of the association were open, and for purposes of recruiting it was impossible then, and it is impossible now, to know just which of these people were party members and which were guests. However, there did seem to be a small group who were at all the meetings that I was at. I assumed then, and I assume now, that they were at that time members of the Communist Party or Communist Political Association.

Mr. WHEELER. Would you identify these individuals?

Mrs. FRANK. Well, in addition to Mr. Trumbo and Mr. Lardner I would say this group consisted of Richard Collins, Paul Jarrico, Gordon Kahn, Harold Buchman, and Robert Rossen. I also remember being impressed with the eloquence of two guest speakers, Albert Maltz and John Howard Lawson.

There can be no question, Mr. Speaker, in light of the tremendous weight of sworn testimony, that Paul Jarrico has been a member of the Communist Party, and a most effective and active member at that. Whether he remains a member to this day only Jarrico and a small coterie of active Communists in Hollywood can state. He has refused to divulge any information as to his present activities as they may relate to communism. In light of his long record as a member of the Communist conspiracy, there is little reason for doubt in my mind as to his continuing activity on behalf of the party and its fronts.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the continued employment of such individuals as Mr. Jarrico by the motion-picture industry will continue to bring discredit upon the industry and upon the thousands of loyal Americans who make their living in that industry. For the Screen Writers Guild to continue in membership those who refuse to disclose the nature of their association with the Communist Party is to invite the active opposition of the American people to the activities of that guild. The majority of the members of the SWG are men and women of integrity and loyalty. It is difficult to rationalize the position taken by the guild as indicated in the following news story, featuring an exchange of letters between Howard Hughes and the Screen Writers Guild. The story is from the March 31 issue of the Hollywood Reporter, moving-picture trade publication:

**SWG BOARD DUCKS RKO STRIKE—JARRICO ISSUE TO BE PUT TO MEMBERSHIP—HUGHES HURLS A NEW CHALLENGE**

The Screen Writers Guild executive board has sidestepped a direct answer on the RKO strike issue, stating that the question of a strike is one for the guild's membership to decide. The board met in an emergency session late Friday for the purpose of drafting a reply to Howard Hughes' letter, which bluntly asked the guild whether or not it intended to strike against the studio on behalf of Paul Jarrico.

Two documents were drafted at Friday night's meeting—a personal reply to Hughes, signed by Mary C. McCall, Jr., SWG president, and a history of the events in the dispute for the benefit of the membership, both of which were sent yesterday. The board's reply to Hughes read:

"This will reply to your letter of March 27. The minimum basic agreement between the

Screen Writers Guild and RKO Radio, signed early last year, stipulates that a writer must receive screen credit for his work, and provides the machinery by which these credits are determined. In flat contradiction of your published statements, it was established last September by an authorized panel that Paul Jarrico was entitled to screen credit on the film in question. By refusing to grant this credit, RKO Radio has breached its signed contract with the Screen Writers Guild. This is clearly a labor dispute. It does not involve the political beliefs of Mr. Jarrico, however repugnant they might be to you or us. By terms of our corporation character, by terms of our agreement with RKO Radio and all major motion-picture studios, we are obligated to extend guild membership to, and protect the rights of, any writer you choose to employ. You chose to employ Mr. Jarrico. We have no choice but to protect his professional rights. In reply to your direct question regarding a strike: We grant that such action at this time might suit your purpose, since it is a well-known fact that production at RKO now is at a virtual standstill. However, this question is one for the membership of the Screen Writers Guild to decide. Under no circumstances will a strike be called at your suggestion or for your convenience."

**NEW CHALLENGE BY HUGHES**

On receiving the guild's reply to his letter, Hughes made the following statement:

"This is addressed, not to the entire membership of the Screen Writers Guild, but to that segment which met and drafted the letter (that was delivered to the press and to RKO on Sunday with such clever strategy in the hope it would reach the public before anyone at RKO could have knowledge of it or the opportunity to reply).

"Gentlemen, you are paid writers of fiction and the strongest portions of your letter are fiction in its most brilliant form. I challenge you to make public the answers to the following questions:

"1. Please give the names of all your members who fall in the classification described in your letter by the words: 'Political beliefs of Mr. Jarrico, however repugnant they might be to you or us.' How many of these members have been connected with one or more of the officially designated 'Communist-front organizations'? How many of these members are on your executive board?

"2. How long is it since these people (whom you still honor with membership in your guild) were employed by a studio in Hollywood thereby forcing you to protect them?

"3. Why did you notify certain members of your guild to stand by for a meeting of the membership Friday night, and then call them and tell them not to come, thereby confining the meeting to your executive board?

"4. In your letter, why didn't you tell the public that the 'authorized credit panel' which decided that Jarrico was entitled to screen credit was composed solely of members of the Screen Writers Guild, and that RKO was not represented and not even permitted to present its case to this credit panel?

"5. Is it true that this credit panel was composed of three men and that one of these men voted against Jarrico and two voted in favor of Jarrico?

"Please give the names of the two who voted in favor of Jarrico."

The SWG board did not disclose what steps will be taken to give the membership an opportunity to decide on the strike question.

Five members of the 21-man SWG board did not attend the emergency session—Walter Reisch and Robert Carson, who were out of town, and Robert Pirosh, Carl Foreman, and Marvin Borowsky. It was a hot session with much discussion to the effect that Hughes had had all of the advantage on publicity thus far, and the guild should declare its position. The meeting also laid plans to enlist the aid of outside labor

groups should a strike become necessary. On this point, several members expressed doubt that local motion-picture labor groups would support their position. It was also revealed that, earlier, the Association of Motion Picture Producers had attempted to intercede in the dispute and that Charles Boren, vice president in charge of industrial relations for the AMPP, had requested a conciliation meeting but had been refused by Hughes.

**JARRICO FILES SUIT**

Jarrico, on Friday, filed a \$350,000 suit in Superior Court against Hughes and RKO. The action was a counterclaim asking \$100,000 plus \$250,000 in punitive damages, to the studio's March 17 suit asking for declaratory relief on Jarrico's \$5,000 claim and screen credit on *The Las Vegas Story*. Jarrico's brief denies he violated the morals clause in his contract by refusing to tell a congressional committee whether or not he was a Communist. The suit also attacked Hughes and unnamed RKO stars for past moral conduct. Jarrico stated, "Mr. Hughes had better get it straight. The issue before the court is not whether I have a right to my political opinions, but whether he has a right to set himself above the law." In a statement replying to the suit, Hughes said: "I address this to you, Mr. Jarrico: According to press reports, in your statement to the court you say that your refusal to answer the question put to you by the Un-American Activities Committee does not entitle anyone to draw the inference of guilt against you. Mr. Jarrico, these are times of national emergency. I do not think it is important what the public is legally entitled to believe from your refusal to answer the committee's question. I do not think the public should be forced to guess or conjecture as to whether a man is a Communist. I think the public is entitled to know. If the public made a mistake in its interpretation of your refusal to answer the committee's question, then that is truly regrettable and it should by all means be corrected. I should think you would be more anxious than anyone else to have this mistake corrected. If you refused to answer the committee because of some reason which we do not understand, won't you please tell the public now, so that we may all know the truth? Therefore I ask you the question: Are you, or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party? If you have been misjudged, there is a simple way to correct the matter. Just answer the question."

It is almost anticlimactic to insert at this point the Communist-front record of Mr. Jarrico, but in order that the record may be complete and the necessary documentation as comprehensive as possible, I feel that these activities should be spread upon the record. It should be remembered that a number of activities participated in by Mr. Jarrico and set forth in the following citations and listings, occurred after the groups and organizations had been declared subversive in nature by the Attorney General of the United States or by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. For instance, the listing of Jarrico as a candidate for the executive board of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions Council in January 1951 followed by months the citation of the ASP Council as a Communist-front organization by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The files, records, and publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities contain the following information

concerning the Communist-front affiliations of Paul Jarrico:

1. The Daily People's World, west-coast Communist newspaper, announced in its issue of October 22, 1941, page 2, that Paul Jarrico, then a scenarist for MGM, had agreed to support the candidacy of Communist LaRue McCormick for California State senator in the November 3 elections. The newspaper quoted a personal statement by Mr. Jarrico in support of Mrs. McCormick. Paul Jarrico also supported the candidacy of LaRue McCormick for State senator in 1942, according to a story in the Daily People's World of October 31, 1942, page 3, and an advertisement in the Daily People's World of October 24, 1942, page 5.

2. A letterhead of the Citizens Committee for Harry Bridges, 1265 Broadway, New York, N. Y., dated September 11, 1941, listed Paul Jarrico, screen writer, as being among the "committee members and sponsors." The Citizens Committee for Harry Bridges was cited as a Communist organization by Attorney General Tom Clark in a letter to the Loyalty Review Board released April 27, 1949. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in a report dated March 29, 1944, cited the same organization as a Communist front formed to oppose the deportation of Harry Bridges, Communist Party member and leader of the disastrous San Francisco general strike of 1934 which was planned by the Communist Party.

3. Paul Jarrico was one of the signers of a public statement sponsored by the Civil Rights Congress, 307 South Hill, Los Angeles, Calif., and inserted as a paid advertisement in the Independent Long Beach, Calif., on November 22, 1948, page 29. The statement protested against contempt citations for witnesses refusing to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities and protested the existence of a grand jury dealing with Communists. The Daily People's World, on November 6, 1948, page 3, announced that Paul Jarrico was also among the signers of a statement which would be run in a full-page advertisement in the Los Angeles Daily News. This statement, according to the People's World, would urge dismissal of contempt citations and dismissal of a "witch-hunt" grand jury, and would urge attendance at a Civil Rights Congress protest rally on November 7, 1948, at the Embassy Auditorium in Los Angeles. The Civil Rights Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in a report dated September 2, 1947, cited the organization as a Communist front which was dedicated "specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party" and "Controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it."

4. Paul Jarrico was among the signers of a public statement sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties and inserted as an advertisement in the Washington Post dated February 8, 1943. The statement called for the abolition of the Committee on Un-American Activities "as a step toward victory in 1943." The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties was cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark in letters to the Loyalty Review Board released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. It was also cited as a Communist front by Attorney General Francis Biddle (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446) and by the Committee on Un-American Activities (report dated September 2, 1947).

5. A paper on film economics was presented by Paul Jarrico at a film panel of a peace conference held by the Arts, Sciences, and Professions Council on April 10, 1949, at the El Patio Theater in Hollywood, accord-

ing to the Daily People's World, dated April 14, 1949, page 5. The issue of Alert, dated February 1, 1951, stated that Paul Jarrico was listed as a candidate for the executive board of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions Council, on an official ballot of the organization dated January 27, 1951. Alert stated that the names of the candidates had been proposed by a nominating committee and that the election was then being held by printed ballot. The National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions was cited as a Communist front by the Committee on Un-American Activities in a report dated April 26, 1950.

6. Paul Jarrico was among the initial signers of the Call to the Fourth Congress of the League of American Writers, which was held in New York City, June 6-8, 1941, according to the Daily Worker, dated April 5, 1941, page 7. A leaflet announcing courses for the 1942 summer session of the School for Writers, conducted by the Hollywood Chapter, League of American Writers, listed Paul Jarrico as one of the instructors in a course titled "Writing for Film." Mr. Jarrico was scheduled to lecture on July 9, 1942, on the specific subject of comedy. The League of American Writers was cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released June 1, 1948, and September 21, 1948. The league was also cited as a Communist front by Attorney General Francis Biddle (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7445) and the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (reports dated January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944).

7. Ceremonies held at Carnegie Hall in New York City on October 16, 1942, under the auspices of the Artists' Front To Win the War were sponsored by Paul Jarrico among other individuals, according to the printed program of the affair. The Artists' Front To Win the War was cited as a Communist front by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in a report dated March 29, 1944.

8. Paul Jarrico was named as a supporter in a brief filed in the Supreme Court of the United States, October term 1949, in behalf of John Howard Lawson and Dalton Trumbo. Mr. Lawson and Mr. Trumbo had been convicted of contempt of Congress by refusing to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities regarding their membership in the Communist Party. The afore-mentioned brief was filed in the name of "Alexander Maiklejohn, of Cultural Workers in Motion Pictures and Other Arts, and of Members of the Professions, as Amici Curiae." Paul Jarrico was also the signer of a petition submitted to the Screen Writers Guild on December 16, 1947, by 50 guild members. The petition, which the executive board of the guild opposed, asked that the guild fight to protect the movie-industry jobs of 10 individuals who had refused to answer questions regarding their Communist Party membership before the Committee on Un-American Activities. The issue of Alert, dated November 14, 1949, page 386, stated that, in connection with a recent election within the Screen Writers Guild, Paul Jarrico had signed a petition nominating Albert Maltz for membership on the guild's executive board. Mr. Maltz, who failed to win election, was one of the witnesses convicted of contempt of Congress for refusing to answer questions regarding membership in the Communist Party before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

9. The New York Times of September 26, 1948, section 2, page 5, announced that Paul Jarrico had just returned from a tour of Europe with a contract to make a motion picture in Hungary. The article stated that the project would be financed by the Hungarian National Film Trust, and that Mr. Jarrico would return to Hungary that November to begin work on the movie. The contract allegedly provided that Paul Jarrico

would contribute to the Hungarian film trust the screen rights to a novel, *Temptation*, which would form the basis for the movie. Mr. Jarrico was also reported to have agreed to provide his own services as an adapter and production executive, and to obtain in the United States certain raw film stock and other technical equipment which were needed to make the film in Hungary, as well as to raise about \$75,000 in American capital. The contract promises Mr. Jarrico 80 percent of the profits of the film's distribution in the Western Hemisphere.

10. On October 13, 1948, Hanns Eisler and his wife, Louise, attended a gathering in the home of Paul Jarrico, 727 Linda Flora Drive, Los Angeles, which was addressed by Joseph North, former editor of the *New Masses*. This was testified to by Louis J. Russell, senior investigator for the Committee on Un-American Activities, during committee hearings on October 30, 1947. Hanns Eisler headed the International Music Bureau, with headquarters in Moscow, and is the brother of the Communist International agent Gerhart Eisler. Mr. Hanns Eisler since left the United States, under threat of deportation.

Mr. Russell further testified that Paul Jarrico attended a meeting on May 3, 1942, at the home of Herbert Biberman—a meeting also attended by Morton Grant, Robert Rosen, and Hynan Kraft. Mr. Russell pointed out that earlier that same day, another meeting had been held at the home of Mr. Biberman at which Mr. Biberman met with Waldo Salt and Alexander Stevens, alias J. Peters. It should be noted that J. Peters was identified as the one-time head of the Communist Party's underground apparatus in the United States, in the testimony of former Communist Paul Crouch before the Committee on Un-American Activities on May 6, 1949.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] is recognized for 10 minutes.

#### THE HUNGARIAN MINISTER TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, human dignity has been outraged by the despotic Communist rulers of Eastern Europe. The fundamental rights of American citizens in those countries have been trampled. However, in an effort to keep open the few remaining windows in the iron curtain, the United States has continued diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and its satellites.

We have limited our reprisals for the violations of international law and human decency to diplomatic notes, the closing of legations, and minor retaliatory restrictions. We have not broken relations because the State Department has felt that it is more to the advantage of the United States to keep representatives behind the iron curtain than to impose upon the satellite countries the treatment they so richly deserve.

Leading the satellite states in this wholesale violation of moral law and international decency have been the Communist tyrants in Hungary. Time and again they have violated the human-rights provisions of the Hungarian peace treaty. Time and again they have insulted the United States by the mistreatment of American citizens.

The most recent example is the case of the four American fliers whose plane was forced down in Hungary last November. American diplomatic officers were

denied the right even to see these airmen. Although the fliers had merely lost their way, they were accused of spying, given a mock trial and sentenced to jail. The supreme affront, however, was to demand \$120,000 ransom from the United States. This act alone warrants complete severance of United States relations with Hungary but it is not an isolated incident.

Two years before, in 1949, an American businessman Robert Vogeler, was arrested by Hungarian security police and held incommunicado in violation of the most universally accepted rules of international law. His trial also made a mockery of justice and ended in a decision that Mr. Vogeler was guilty of espionage and sabotage. Seventeen months of negotiation and several concessions to the Hungarian government constituted the price of Vogeler's release.

The Hungarian Communist Government in seeking to destroy the ways of the Christian world has stopped at nothing. Indicative of the treatment accorded the worshippers of God and those who believe in following Christianity is the incident described by Dr. Bela Varga, President of the Hungarian National Council and former President of the Parliament of Hungary, now in exile:

In conclusion, may I relate to you a symbolic event. In the city of Budapest stood a great church commemorating the thousand-year-old history of Christianity in my country. This church had much more than religious significance. It symbolized the devotion of Hungarians to the faith which saved them in their interminable struggles against Eastern barbarians.

This symbolic church has been destroyed by the Bolsheviks and a statue of Stalin erected in its place. The new symbol of Hungary will be the 65-foot statue of the Red Caesar.

However, probably the most heinous deed of the Hungarian Communists concerns their treatment of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, Roman Catholic primate of Hungary. A man of the church, Mindszenty was widely respected and loved. On December 26, 1948, Mindszenty was arrested on "suspicion of treason, attempting to overthrow the democratic regime, espionage, and foreign-currency abuses." The Cardinal was known to be a strong, brave man with a will of iron, but when he came to his trial he appeared broken, weak, and dazed. He confessed to the charges against him. It seemed apparent then that some drug had been used to force his confession and break his spirit.

Cardinal Mindszenty is now in prison, serving a life sentence. The thought of his suffering arouses a sense of indignation that the rights of any individual, especially a man of God can be so abused.

A new consideration has now come to light in regard to this unhappy case which has a direct bearing on this country. I am speaking of the allegations that the man who injected the drug which reduced Cardinal Mindszenty from a pillar of strength to a broken shadow of a man is now the Hungarian Minister to the United States, Dr. Emil Weil.

Dr. Weil was one of the first to join the Communist Party in Hungary back in the 1930's. Consequently, when the

Communists took over Hungary after the war, Dr. Weil found himself in a position of great power. He was called in on the Mindszenty trial, it is believed, both because he was trusted by the party and was a personal friend of Prime Minister Rakosi. The cardinal had been cross-examined for 82 hours, during which time he remained firm and unyielding. Being forced to view his secretary, hysterical and covered with blood, however, was the last straw. The cardinal fainted and, it is alleged, that was when this man Emil Weil directed the administration of the drug aktedron to the prelate. The drug broke the cardinal's spirit. Subsequently he answered questions at his trial in words put in his mouth by his tormentors.

If, as it is alleged, Dr. Weil did play a part in the brutal mistreatment of Cardinal Mindszenty, he is not welcome in Washington. The administration of a drug such as aktedron for political purposes violates every code of human morality and the universally accepted ethics of the medical profession. If there is a grain of truth in these allegations, Dr. Weil should be declared persona non grata and his recall demanded immediately by the State Department. The United States may find it necessary to maintain diplomatic relations with unfriendly governments, but it does not have to play host to an individual who has gone so far beyond the concepts of national duty as to behave in this depraved fashion.

There appears to be a further reason why Dr. Weil should not be allowed to stay in the United States and why his presence is dangerous to us. According to expert observers and underground reports, Dr. Weil's mission to the United States is not in accord with the usual purpose of diplomatic missions—this is to promote good relations between two nations. Instead, his aim is to organize the spurious Communist peace movement, to stir up disunity among Americans of Hungarian descent, and to organize a group which will give allegiance to the Hungarian Communist government organized in 1948. After he has accomplished these purposes, it is believed, Dr. Weil is to denounce openly his Communist allegiance, and declare himself a non-Communist. Then he would be in a position, as an exile, to continue working underground for the Communists.

If this is the Hungarian Minister's aim in the United States, he should be deported immediately under the Internal Security Act of 1950.

A man who played such a monstrous role in the tragedy of Cardinal Mindszenty should not be permitted to utilize the privileges and the protection of the United States which diplomatic representatives enjoy here to undermine our democracy.

Ferenc Nagy, former Prime Minister of Hungary and in exile in the United States, expressed the underlying reaction of the Hungarian people to the Communist-dominated government when he said, "The Hungarian people know that the present government represents neither the people nor the interest of Hungary; it is merely an executive agent

of Moscow's intentions. It is a government which persecutes the tradition and the patriotism of the Hungarian people, and its creation violated international agreements. The Hungarian people do not rejoice in the fact that the Western Powers deem its present government worthy of maintaining diplomatic relations."

The Hungarian people won their fight for independence in 1848 under the leadership of Louis Kossuth. Their freedom has been temporarily eclipsed by Communist domination, and until that domination is cast off, no Hungarian Minister will be truly representative of the Hungarian people. In the meantime, however, international custom does not require that he be of a caliber so loathsome as to pervert medical science to degrade fellow human beings and to abuse his office for the purpose of destroying the American way of life.

No reason need be given for declaring a diplomat persona non grata. However, authoritative reports of former Hungarian leaders now living in exile here in the United States, stories trickling in from the underground, and the observations of refugees are deserving of the greatest consideration by our State Department. It is impossible because of the secrecy surrounding iron curtain countries and the fear of reprisal which hangs over the heads of refugees who talk, to reduce any related incident to proof. Nonetheless, I would like to suggest that our State Department should check the reports on Dr. Weil to determine whether he should be given his walking papers as a persona non grata. It is not my intention to presume to prejudge the facts but, if Dr. Weil had anything to do with the Mindszenty case and if he is the head of Hungarian Communist subversion in the United States, we should not only tell the Hungarian Communist government why he is not welcome here but we should tell the whole world. In this manner we will show that acts of tyranny which violate human rights do not go unnoticed, that the individual perpetrators of these acts are known and must answer for their deeds. And most important, in this manner we will safeguard our democracy from the ruthless tactics of professional Communist saboteurs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FURCOLO). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

#### THE NEWARK AIRPORT

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to report briefly on the activities of the Aviation Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee which has been engaged in investigating aviation safety with particular emphasis on the series of accidents at Elizabeth, N. J. The subcommittee has held nine public hearings and seven executive hearings where testimony was taken. It also has met five times in what might be called work sessions, the latter being either visits to

sites of accidents or committee discussions concerning testimony or agenda.

While the subcommittee first directed its attention to the circumstances surrounding the accidents at Elizabeth, with their attendant heavy losses of life to both passengers and people on the ground, its main objective is to promote increased safety in air by seeking out and identifying the causes of aircraft accidents wherever they may have occurred and then endeavoring to find ways and means of preventing them in the future. I am most happy to report that considerable progress has been made toward identifying certain specific hazards to safe flying, and the subcommittee is in process of ascertaining any and all information on these items with the hope that remedies will be found and early action taken to apply them.

We have been very pleased with the constructive attitude of industry, interested citizens as well as of Government agencies in regard to our investigation. We have had their helpful cooperation and apparently they are pleased to have a congressional committee inquiring into these matters at this time. The visits of the subcommittee to the sites of the accidents at Elizabeth, N. J., and the hearings held in connection therewith have offered an opportunity to the people in that area to register their objections to the operations of the Newark airport. Incidentally, our subcommittee had scheduled a hearing in Elizabeth on Monday, February 11, at 10 a. m.; we were in New York City the preceding Sunday night; we, therefore, were in the area when the third accident occurred in Elizabeth. The subcommittee participated in numerous discussions by telephone and otherwise in the early Monday morning hours immediately after the accident. These discussions contributed to the conclusion that the closing of Newark airport at 3 a. m., February 11, 2 hours and 40 minutes after the third accident, was necessary. This action, as well as the sympathetic attitude shown by the subcommittee during its several visits to Elizabeth, N. J., has done much to reassure the residents of that city and vicinity. The very dangerous and hysterical atmosphere that prevailed in that area following these accidents has become less pronounced and many people in those localities are cooperating with the various committees that are seeking to find a solution to the problems connected with the low flying of planes over residential areas.

Representative KLEIN, a member of our subcommittee, is now in New York. Immediately after the tragic accident in New York last Saturday morning, I talked with Representative KLEIN over the phone and we agreed that he would go to the scene of the accident as soon as possible. I understand he has done this; I expect to get a report from him soon. Indeed, our committee desires to contribute everything possible to help prevent these very tragic airplane accidents.

I shall report our progress from time to time, and I am hopeful that a very real contribution to safety in air will result from the work of our subcommittee.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. SUTTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MAHON and to include certain extraneous matter and excerpts in the remarks he expects to make today.

Mr. LANE in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois and to include an article by Mr. Drew Pearson.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include an article by David Lawrence in last night's Evening Star.

Mr. BEAMER to include an editorial from Our Sunday Visitor.

Mr. LOVRE and to include an article.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make in Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article notwithstanding that it is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$336.

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

Mr. HÉBERT and to include a statement from the New Orleans Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. MILLER of New York in three instances.

Mr. RADWAN and to include an editorial.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan in two instances and to include two newspaper articles.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado and to include a statement by Mrs. Gracie Pfost before the Insular Affairs Committee.

Mr. REED of New York in four instances and in each case to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENSEN and to include a report.

Mr. HORAN and to include a letter.

Mr. SCUDDER and to include a resolution.

Mr. POTTER and to include an editorial.

Mr. KEARNEY and to include an article.

Mr. CANNON (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include an address delivered by Secretary of Agriculture Brannan before the Women's National Democratic Club.

Mr. MCGUIRE (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include an article from the Army Times.

Mr. STANLEY and to include a report of the committee headed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REGAN] appointed by the Committee on House Administration to check into the service of the folding room.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania and to include a press release from Pittsburgh on the Bureau of Mines, showing the violence of mine explosions.

Mr. ADDONIZIO (at the request of Mr. RODINO) and to include certain resolutions.

Mr. FURCOLO and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WHARTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VURSELL.

Mr. GWINN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GAMBLE and to include an editorial.

Mr. FEIGHAN to revise and extend the remarks he made in the House.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas.

Mr. SABATH (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK).

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA and to include some newspaper articles.

Mr. BUSBEY in two instances, in one to include a portion of a radio broadcast made by Paul Harvey, and in the other to include an address made by the Lithuanian Consul in Chicago.

Mr. HALE and to include a letter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include an editorial.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MACHROWICZ from April 9 to May 2, 1952, inclusive, on account of absence from the country on business of Congressional Katyn Massacre Committee.

Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. PRIEST), for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

#### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION

##### SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution designating April 9, 1952, as Bataan Day.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 9, 1952, at 10 o'clock a. m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1324. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting recommendations to extend for a period of 60 days emergency powers which otherwise will terminate when the treaty of peace with Japan becomes effective (H. Doc. No. 416); to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

1325. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to amend the act of December 23, 1944, authorizing certain transactions by disbursing offices of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1326. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization dated October 20, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States, for shore leave purposes only, of alien seamen found to be excludable as persons within one of the classes enumerated in section 1 (2) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1327. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Jesus Pelayo-Lopez or Juan Garcia-Loera, file No. A-7270927 CR 38077, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; 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. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1729, report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BUCKLEY: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 7340. A bill 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; without amendment (Rept. No. 1730). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 6922. A bill to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the act of June 29, 1935, so as to extend the benefits of such section to certain colleges in the Territory of Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 1746). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 423. Joint resolution, to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until July 1, 1952, without amendment (Rept. No. 1747). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. Report on proceedings against Henry W. Grunewald; without amendment (Rept. No. 1748). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. Report pursuant to House Resolution 78, Eighty-second Congress. A report on the investigation of rumors of intervention in certain tax cases arising in southern California; without amendment (Rept. No. 1749). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 658. An act to further amend the Communications Act of 1934; with amendment (Rept. No. 1750). 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. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 707. A bill to record the lawful admis-

sion for permanent residence of alien John Michael Ancker Rasmussen; with amendment (Rept. No. 1731). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 728. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Lewis Morgan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1732). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 765. A bill for the relief of John George Papailias; with amendment (Rept. No. 1733). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 954. A bill for the relief of Elvira Suzanne Osterwyk; without amendment (Rept. No. 1734). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1448. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Fuxman and their two daughters; without amendment (Rept. No. 1735). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1477. A bill for the relief of Linda Azar Karam Batrouny; without amendment (Rept. No. 1736). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1699. A bill to adjust the status of a displaced person in the United States who does not meet the requirements of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 1737). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1710. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Weir; without amendment (Rept. No. 1738). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1718. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tomiko Munakata Millhollin; without amendment (Rept. No. 1739). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1723. A bill for the relief of George Economos; without amendment (Rept. No. 1740). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1814. A bill to authorize the admission of Flora Fung Wah Miu Wong to the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1741). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1838. A bill for the relief of Fong Bat Woon and Fong Get Nan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1742). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1843. A bill for the relief of Nahan Abdo Haj Moussa; without amendment (Rept. No. 1743). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1849. A bill for the relief of the alien Malke Kresel Mohrer; with amendment (Rept. No. 1744). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2113. A bill for the relief of Yee Kee Lam; without amendment (Rept. No. 1745). 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. KEOGH:

H. R. 7443. A bill to amend section 3469 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 7444. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1941, to include Public Health Service officers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 7445. A bill to amend subdivision (b) of section 61 of the National Defense Act to extend its provisions until December 31, 1954, and to permit the States at any time during that period to organize and maintain military forces at cadre strengths in addition to the National Guard, even if no part of the National Guard is in active Federal services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 7446. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to increase the additional rates of compensation provided for specific service-incurred disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 7447. A bill to amend section 22 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREENWOOD:

H. R. 7448. A bill to require inspection of motor vessels carrying passengers from a port in the United States or upon the navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 7449. A bill to establish authority relating to the seizure, use, and operation by the United States of certain plants, mines, and facilities in the event of a national emergency due to strikes, lock-outs, and stoppages of production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. J. Res. 425. Joint resolution declaring the 14th day of June in each year to be a legal holiday, and requesting the President to issue a special proclamation commemorating the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. Res. 601. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct an investigation and study of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to the need for congressional action to restore the taxing power of the States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to the need for materials for construction of additional school and college buildings in California; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to their assembly joint resolutions Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, adopted during the 1952 budget session, and assembly joint resolutions Nos. 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 15, adopted during the 1952 first extraordinary session of the California Legislature; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 7450. A bill for the relief of Pietro Dentice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKEWELL:

H. R. 7451. A bill for the relief of Akinori Nakayama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 7452. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosina Biola and daughter, Paula Biola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 7453. A bill for the relief of Julia N. Emmanuel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 7454. A bill for the relief of the estate of William B. Rice, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 7455. A bill for the relief of Willard Chester Cauley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 7456. A bill for the relief of Nasser Espahianian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 7457. A bill for the relief of Mihai Patrichi and Victoria Vlorica Patrichi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TACKETT:

H. R. 7458. A bill for the relief of Sakae Tomiyama Rapier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VORYS:

H. R. 7459. A bill for the relief of Antonio Mollicone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

669. By the SPEAKER: Petition of W. C. Thomas, city clerk, Seattle, Wash., relative to requesting the adoption of legislation confirming and establishing the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

670. Also, petition of Mrs. B. Wegman, and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

671. Also, petition of Byelorussian Community in Buenos Aires, Argentina, requesting that the Byelorussian language be included in the broadcasting programs of the Voice of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 9, 1952

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 2, 1952)

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:

Gracious God our Father, whose still, small voice invites us to turn aside from

the feverish ways of the world and whose tender love bids us find our rest in Thee: We are conscious, as we bow at this noon-tide altar, that if we live a life of prayer Thou art present everywhere. Amid the draining duties of these demanding days, may Thy rest flow around our restlessness, may our jaded spirits be refreshed and our souls restored. With contrition we acknowledge that we have fallen short of our high calling. When we glimpse the opulent riches that Thou dost offer we stand ashamed at our spiritual poverty.

As public servants, make us worthy of the Nation's trust, in these days so fraught with destiny. On the stepping stones of our dead selves may we mount to newness of life and to the singing Easter of the soul. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 8, 1952, was dispensed with.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION  
PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 9, 1952, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 147) designating April 9, 1952, as Bataan Day.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—  
APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT  
RESOLUTION

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 and joint resolution:

On April 4, 1952:

S. 2667. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District.

On April 5, 1952:

S. 2077. An act to provide for certain investigations by the Civil Service Commission in lieu of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes.

On April 8, 1952:

S. 690. An act to permit certain lands heretofore conveyed to the city of Canton, S. Dak., for park, recreation, airport, or other public purposes, to be leased by it so long as the income therefrom is used for such purposes;

S. 1184. An act to extend the Youth Corrections Act to the District of Columbia;

S. 1212. An act to amend section 2113 of title 18 of the United States Code;

S. 1949. An act for the relief of Hattie Truax Graham, formerly Hattie Truax;

S. 2408. An act to amend the act authorizing the negotiation and ratification of certain contracts with certain Indians of the Sioux Tribe in order to extend the time for negotiation and approval of such contracts.

On April 9, 1952:

S. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution designating April 9, 1952, as Bataan Day.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its

reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 302) to amend section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 745) for the relief of Thomas A. Trulove, postmaster, and Nolen J. Salyards, assistant postmaster, at Inglewood, Calif.

The message further announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CELLER, Mr. WALTER, Mr. WILSON of Texas, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. CASE had been appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

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

H. J. Res. 423. Joint resolution to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until July 1, 1952; and

H. J. Res. 426. Joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 745) for the relief of Thomas A. Trulove, postmaster, and Nolen J. Salyards, assistant postmaster, at Inglewood, Calif., and it was signed by the Vice President.

## LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. Ives was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate beginning at 3 o'clock this afternoon to and through Tuesday, April 15, 1952.

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, Mr. McCARRAN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the next 2 weeks after today.

GOVERNMENT OPERATION OF  
STEEL MILLS—MESSAGE FROM  
THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 422)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, relating to Government operation of the steel mills, which was read and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(For President's message, see House proceedings of today.)

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE  
BUSINESS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted