

Bromley Palamountain, a citizen of Massachusetts.

Martin Pearson, a citizen of Illinois.  
Robert H. Rea, a citizen of Pennsylvania.  
Parks H. Simpson, a citizen of Texas.  
Carl H. Smith, Jr., a citizen of Michigan.  
Robert E. Steed, a citizen of North Carolina.

Joseph M. Vosmik, a citizen of Ohio.  
David W. Walsh, a citizen of Massachusetts.  
John J. Walsh, a citizen of Massachusetts.

#### POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

#### ALABAMA

William S. McArthur, Ashford, Ala., in place of M. B. Wells, resigned.  
George W. Carroll, Ozark, Ala., in place of Dan Carroll, transferred.

#### ALASKA

Maurice L. Briggs, Kodiak, Alaska, in place of Alexander King, resigned.

#### ARIZONA

Edith C. Ryan, Fort Huachuca, Ariz., in place of P. D. Ryan, resigned.

#### ARKANSAS

Van Tyson, Atkins, Ark., in place of O. H. McCollum, deceased.  
Clarence N. Wood, Colt, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.  
George W. Henderson, Waldron, Ark., in place of Theo Money, resigned.

#### CALIFORNIA

Everett C. Ulrich, Livingston, Calif., in place of G. S. Butler, resigned.  
Nellie J. Stonebarger, Los Olivos, Calif., in place of R. P. Lansing, resigned.  
Joseph M. Queirolo, San Andreas, Calif., in place of G. H. Treat, retired.  
Margaret M. Hale, Snelling, Calif., in place of D. H. Stout, resigned.

#### DELAWARE

Albert Bradford Carter, Camden, Del., in place of B. C. Dunn, resigned.

#### FLORIDA

Hazen M. Benson, Bunnell, Fla., in place of A. M. McDaniel, resigned.  
Stanton M. Gideons, Webster, Fla., in place of P. A. Tompkins, resigned.

#### GEORGIA

Raymond T. Sills, Brookhaven, Ga., in place of L. D. Woodall, resigned.  
William C. Griffin, Tunnel Hill, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

#### ILLINOIS

Mabel H. Green, Alvin, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.  
Margaret Carlson, Bureau, Ill., in place of J. F. Fredrickson, transferred.  
James P. McGannon, Flora, Ill., in place of C. H. Greenwood, deceased.  
Ada J. Ulrich, Thomasboro, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

#### INDIANA

Cleophas F. Henderson, Bloomfield, Ind., in place of J. R. Byrd. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.  
Robert L. Williams, Daleville, Ind., in place of S. E. C. Stewart, retired.

#### IOWA

J. Edward McDermott, Jamaica, Iowa, in place of J. E. Garrity, retired.  
Frederick G. Nicklaus, Parkersburg, Iowa, in place of J. R. Strickland, retired.  
George B. Kook, Wilton Junction, Iowa, in place of O. A. Burrows, resigned.

#### KANSAS

Victor A. Zeckser, Alma, Kans., in place of Louie Haller, removed.

#### KENTUCKY

Harry Medlock, Annville, Ky., in place of E. A. Teague, retired.  
William S. T. Johnson, Lawrenceburg, Ky., in place of R. E. Johnson, resigned.

#### MARYLAND

Frank A. Beachley, Braddock Heights, Md., in place of V. B. Remsburg, resigned.  
E. Raymond Bounds, Ocean City, Md., in place of L. D. Lynch, resigned.

#### MASSACHUSETTS

Albert O. Bullard, Jr., Sterling Junction, Mass., in place of J. H. O'Toole, retired.

#### MICHIGAN

George A. Stahl, Dowagiac, Mich., in place of J. K. Torrey, resigned.  
Henry A. Torretti, Iron Mountain, Mich., in place of C. M. Dillon, retired.  
Aloise B. Cherven, Roscommon, Mich., in place of R. K. Bresnahan, removed.

#### MINNESOTA

Clarence T. Nelson, Geneva, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.  
Mayme W. Gustason, Winton, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

#### MISSOURI

Arthur G. Emmons, Grandin, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.  
Robert W. Rodgers, Hornersville, Mo., in place of C. C. Wilkins, deceased.

#### MONTANA

Clifford A. Brown, Dixon, Mont., in place of O. C. Clute, resigned.

#### NEBRASKA

Audrey Ida Babb, Broadwater, Nebr., in place of Bert Winters, retired.  
Adeline L. Breslin, Newcastle, Nebr., in place of J. A. Hoy, resigned.

#### NEW YORK

Frederick J. Phillips, Fairport, N. Y., in place of J. J. Finnegan, resigned.  
Arthur J. Walsh, Fishers Island, N. Y., in place of H. C. Hansen, retired.  
Euclid A. Ganson, Haverstraw, N. Y., in place of J. L. Stecz, deceased.  
Rodney G. Pownall, Pike, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

#### NORTH CAROLINA

Bascom W. Rutherford, Enka, N. C., in place of R. A. Crowell, resigned.  
Clarissa M. McDaniel, Garland, N. C., in place of T. L. Rich, transferred.  
Frank M. Hood, Selma, N. C., in place of H. E. Earp, resigned.  
Margaret A. Segroves, Varina, N. C., in place of J. B. Stephens, resigned.

#### NORTH DAKOTA

John J. Murray, Mandan, N. Dak., in place of F. S. Hudson, retired.

#### OHIO

Ella L. Clare, Richmond, Ohio, in place of J. R. Simpson, retired.  
Hobart E. Morehead, Rushville, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

#### OKLAHOMA

Glenn H. Newell, Nash, Okla., in place of Roy Rine, resigned.  
Edward P. Soulligny, Ponca City, Okla., in place of W. B. Lucas, resigned.

#### PENNSYLVANIA

William James Carey, Ardmore, Pa., in place of J. A. Barnes, deceased.  
George Wesley Fordney, Enola, Pa., in place of L. E. Rich, resigned.  
Lillie E. Armstrong, King of Prussia, Pa., in place of L. H. Morrison, resigned.  
James C. Smith, Pittsburgh, Pa., in place of S. A. Bodkin, retired.  
Benjamin F. Sherick, Washington Boro, Pa., in place of R. E. Funk, deceased.

#### TENNESSEE

Maude E. Pemberton, Lancing, Tenn., in place of R. B. Quinn, transferred.  
Gray D. Sands, Old Hickory, Tenn., in place of D. H. Ensley, removed.

#### TEXAS

Melvin E. Johnson, Cookville, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Volna Ogden, Lefors, Tex., in place of G. C. Wolfe, retired.

#### VIRGINIA

Minnie C. Banton, Colony, Va., in place of Muncie Hill, resigned.  
Clarence P. Noel, Jr., Mineral, Va., in place of F. J. Safley, retired.  
Richard T. Thompson, Verona, Va., in place of J. H. Craig, retired.

#### WEST VIRGINIA

Bernice B. Turley, Longacre, W. Va., in place of J. C. Keesey, resigned.

#### WISCONSIN

Florence E. Dexter, Trevor, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 13, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God, Thy testimonies are wonderful; therefore let our souls keep them; do Thou order our steps and let not iniquity have dominion over them. We pray for understanding hearts and discerning minds that by our endeavors all ranks of citizens may be advanced and that our whole duty may be revealed unto us. O spare our people from all false judgments and redeem our country from enmities at home and abroad, and teach us that the lasting treasure of life is the presence of Him who quiets alarms and stills the soul. We beseech Thee to substitute Thy power for our weakness, Thy righteousness for our sin, and Thy loyalty for our rebellion.

O bless and sanctify all homes and renew a right spirit within them; remember the little children who are growing into the years. We pray that Thy spirit may fan into a glowing flame the embers of purity and happiness on every hearthstone and make it a throne of whiteness and its life a temple of love.

In the name of Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### AID TO GREECE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, the debate in this House on H. R. 2616, the so-called Greek-Turkish aid bill, must have reminded the Members of some ancient history. History repeats itself, even though sometimes the characters are reversed. The incident to which I refer occurred at the siege of Troy, when the Greeks sought to capture the city by siege and failed to do so. So they resorted to a ruse. They built an enormous wooden horse outside the city. In the dead of night they filled it with soldiers and moved it to the city gates. Then the Greek Army withdraw out of sight of the city; as if permanently retreating. The Trojans argued about

whether they should bring the horse in or not. One Sinon, in lengthy and effective oratory, claimed that for the welfare of the Trojans the horse should be brought in, but Laocoön argued against it. Shortly after Laocoön and his two sons were killed by serpents. This was regarded as a great omen that the gates should be opened and the horse brought in. So the horse was brought in. The Greek soldiers rushed out, opened the gates of Troy, and the remainder of their army rushed in and conquered the city.

Remember how, during the argument on H. R. 2616, some Members claimed the enormous foreign-built horse known as the Truman doctrine must be adopted by us as a necessity to our own welfare, while others urged us to beware of it as dangerous?

Of what I particularly want to remind our Members, Mr. Speaker, is that famous line from the second book of Virgil's Aeneid, in which Aeneas tells Dido the sad story of the capture of Troy, and where Laocoön says, "Quicquid id est, timeo Danaos et dona ferentes." As you know, Mr. Speaker, a fair translation is: "Whatever it is, I fear the Greeks even bearing gifts."

If the United States energetically follows the policy announced by the State Department at the hearings and contained in the committee report on H. R. 2616, to attain the proclaimed objectives, the Greeks may invent a phrase for it, and some day in the future some patriotic Greek may rise and say, "Whatever it is, I fear the Americans even bearing gifts."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

#### SEIZED GERMAN ASSETS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, upon the outbreak of the war emergency, the Alien Property Custodian seized and now has in his possession alien-owned properties of a value ranging from \$600,000,000 to \$8,000,000,000, according to different estimates. Pursuant to other legislation, the Secretary of the Treasury has seized millions upon millions of dollars which he is holding in his possession and under his control. The victorious American troops while marching through Germany came upon, and thereupon seized, millions of dollars of gold and other valuable assets; war prizes, so they are called.

Mr. Speaker, hundreds upon hundreds of American citizens have suffered tremendous losses as a consequence of enemy war action, yet their claims up to this time have not been satisfied, and no steps have been taken by the Congress to provide a procedure by which they may be asserted. I have, therefore, introduced a resolution, the Government of the United States not yet having a declared policy in reference to the disposition of alien enemy property or the judgment of the claims of American citizens arising out of enemy war action, which would set

up a subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee and a subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which together would constitute a select committee of the Congress to ascertain the facts and, in the light of the facts, to recommend to this Congress legislation which will determine the policy of the United States in reference to this legislative subject matter.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this resolution to the favorable consideration of the Members.

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

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the committees in order on Wednesday this week be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make today in committee and to include certain charts, maps, and a report by investigators on the CAA.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement by Hon. Sam Pettingill, on the subject What Russia Got So Far.

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Minden Herald of May 9.

#### RESEARCH FOR COTTON

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I arise in the interest of an adequate appropriation to carry out the provisions of the agricultural research program enacted in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

I represent one of the largest cotton-producing districts in the United States. I come from the alluvial valley of Arkansas, which has continuously been at the top in cotton production for many years past. We are worried, and rightly so, about our cotton's future. You have but to look at the record of our cotton exports to appreciate the situation in which cotton finds itself.

In the years 1927-28, 9,000,000 bales of cotton were exported. In the years 1942-43, only 1,400,000 bales were shipped abroad. Not only is the cotton farmer losing his foreign markets, but he faces increased competition at home from paper, jute and, most especially, synthetics.

Synthetics have appeared in the American markets to such an extent that the competition from these sources equals 1,500,000 bales of cotton at the present time.

It is absolutely necessary that new uses be found for cotton. The cotton industry has done everything possible to expand into new fields of domestic consumption. The National Cotton Council is spending a goodly sum of money annually on research, but the small amount this organization has available for this purpose is infinitesimal. Research is needed in order to improve the fiber itself, and methods of ginning and handling, spinning, weaving, finishing, and, most important, the finding of new uses and new markets for this commodity.

More money is spent for research on rayon, alone, than on all agricultural commodities combined.

A cotton garment is whiter. It is easy to launder. It holds its shape better and is as hard to wear out, yet in spite of all these fine qualities, rayon and nylon are fast encroaching upon our domestic distribution outlets, and if research funds are not made available, the future for cotton is very dark indeed.

More people earn a livelihood in connection with the planting, cultivation, harvesting, processing, and distribution of cotton than on any other agricultural commodity. I trust that an adequate appropriation will be speedily made available for agricultural research.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, the resignation of Dean Acheson as Under Secretary of State represents more than the loss of a good public servant. It should dramatize the failure of Congress to make provision for adequate salaries for those in the top executive, scientific, and professional service of the Government. Since I see my dear friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] looking at me rather skeptically, may I say that I think we can get the money by saving millions of dollars through the policies of capable men in these responsible jobs. It would be good business for us, in my opinion, to pay the executives enough money to keep private industry from taking them out of the public service.

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

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I may say that I am willing to pay good men good salaries, but the thing I do not like about Dean Acheson is his trying to have these reciprocal trade agreements put over on the American people because he is thereby doing more for foreign countries than for America.

Mr. HAYS. I know the gentleman's convictions on that point, although I do not agree with him. We can agree, I



think, that we should not let good men be taken from the Government by private industry.

Mr. Acheson was an able public official. As understudy to several Secretaries of State, he brought to the State Department talent and ability that certainly could not be measured in terms of the salary paid to him. He resigned, as have so many other able men, because he could not afford to remain in the State Department, however challenging and interesting the job might be, at such a tremendous financial sacrifice.

He is returning to his old law firm in Washington and undoubtedly his unquestioned ability will enable him to earn several times the amount which he received with the Government. As much as we regret his resignation, we cannot fail to recognize that he was forced into taking such a step by a short-sighted policy that prevents us from making Federal service attractive to the type of men we need to run this gigantic governmental business of ours.

The truth of the matter is that Government salaries in the top brackets, where policy is made and executed, are much too low. We must recognize the fact that the Government is now competing with private industry in securing professional and executive brains and while the Government can never pay as much as private industry we can, at least, do a much better job than we have done in attracting able men to Government service and retaining them.

Jerry Klutts, in his column, the *Federal Diary*, emphasized this problem on May 4. He said:

A top Federal official confided in me recently that every single top executive in his department, with the exception of three chiefs, had sought to resign because they could no longer afford to pay for the privilege of working for Uncle Sam. But just as tragic, he thought, is the fact that young and able people are getting out of Federal service—they can't see government as a career. And one of these days we'll all pay through the nose for this let-'em-eat-cake attitude. We won't have trained executives to carry on.

As I have said, the resignation of Mr. Acheson is only the latest in a series of resignations of able Government executives because of the salary limitations we have placed on Government career jobs.

The late Harold D. Smith, former Director of the Budget, was another example. As Director of the Budget, he supervised the greatest fiscal operation in the history of the country. Private industry did not have a comparable job. And yet for directing this great activity on a 12-hour-a-day, 7-day-a-week basis, he received only \$10,000. Because of his love for Government service he remained as Budget Director, in face of many offers from private industry at salaries several times what he was earning, until he was forced to resign for personal reasons.

These are not isolated cases. During a 3-month period last year more than 250 officials of the \$5,000-and-up positions quit the Government, largely because they were underpaid.

The *Christian Science Monitor* recently called for a "fresh consideration of the whole question of Federal pay

scales in the higher brackets to enable the Government to get good men and to benefit the country with better administration. To accomplish this is not an extravagance, but an economy."

It is imperative that we adjust salaries in the higher brackets. The only group of Federal workers—and perhaps in private industry, too—whose salaries have not been raised since before the war are the Cabinet, sub-Cabinet, heads of agencies, members of the boards, commissions, and so forth. Some of these men are paid only \$9,000 a year, a pittance in comparison with equivalent positions in private business.

As far as rank-and-file employees are concerned, the recent 14-percent increase and the across-the-board raise for postal workers equalized many of the inequities in the Federal pay scale. It is time, I believe, for us to recognize the existence of even more apparent inequities in the pay scale for the higher-bracket employees and to take appropriate action.

In the first place, the \$10,000 limitation on Government salaries should be removed and a ceiling more in line with conditions of today and the demands of public service substituted. As I have said, we cannot hope or expect to bring top Federal salaries into line with those in private industry but we can certainly reduce the wide margin which separates them today.

This wide discrepancy was emphasized by Mr. Klutts in his column. He said the annual statement of a company operating a chain of 5-and-10-cent stores—and this is not an isolated case—revealed that six people last year were paid over \$100,000, ranging from \$113,000 to \$330,000. In the next highest pay group between \$50,000 and \$100,000, were 59 employees. In this third group, 233 employees made between \$20,000 and \$50,000.

How many people in Government service, outside the President, could be placed in any of those salary groups?

International organizations have recognized the fact that to obtain the caliber of men necessary to make those agencies function the salary must be made attractive. For instance, the United Nations has set up this salary scale: Secretary General, \$20,000; Assistant Secretary General—eight, \$13,500; director of department, \$10,000; section chief, \$6,000–\$8,400; intermediate officers, \$4,700–\$6,000.

In addition, each of the higher officials is granted a liberal expense account.

Another example is the World Bank as compared with the Export-Import Bank, a Government agency. The President and the Chairman of the Board of the Export-Import Bank receive \$15,000 a year while comparable officials of the World Bank receive \$30,000—tax exempt. Members of the Board of the Export-Import Bank receive \$12,000 a year while comparable officials of the World Bank receive \$17,000—tax exempt.

Shortly before his death, Mr. Smith spoke strongly in favor of lifting the \$10,000 ceiling on salaries, pointing out that President Truman had been unsuccessful in recruiting many able men to

Government service because of their sheer inability to accept posts under the ceiling. He declared:

Yet, it may be ventured, there has never been a time in the history of this Nation when it had greater need for managerial talent. When the wise management of a program involving the expenditures of billions of dollars is of paramount importance the compensation paid executives would not seem to be a material issue. The question is not whether the Federal Government can afford to bid against private enterprise for managerial ability, but whether it can afford to do so.

I was pleased to learn from the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] that the Committee on Civil Service will probably consider several proposals for correcting this situation. It was apparent in last year's debate over the salary adjustment bill that the salaries to be paid top executive and professional officials involved a basic governmental policy rather than an adjustment problem. It was generally recognized that this problem could not be considered in connection with a cost-of-living factor. This policy decision was, therefore, postponed, but it should now receive the earnest attention of the Congress.

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

#### APPROPRIATION FOR CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I arise at this time to announce for the information of Members, many of whom have made inquiry, that at the proper time in the consideration of the appropriation bill that will come up before the House today, I expect to offer an amendment to restore \$4,849,000 to the Commerce Department appropriation for the Civil Aeronautics Administration for the purpose of operating air-traffic control towers across the Nation.

A number of inquiries have been made and I expect to offer that amendment at the proper time.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include excerpts from a decision rendered by the Supreme Court on yesterday.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* and include a resolution adopted by the Illinois General Assembly.

Mr. MORRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* and include a report he made on

forestry before the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial appearing in the Washington News.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, pursuant to the order granted at the time of the death of Hon. CHARLES L. GERLACH, that I may be permitted to extend my remarks at the appropriate place in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record in two instances; to include in one a copy of a resolution adopted by the twenty-fifth national convention of the Disabled American Veterans, Portland, Oreg., on the 5th day of September 1946, relating to national defense, and in the other an article appearing in the publication known as Our Town, Minneapolis, Minn., April 19, by Joseph P. Polowsky, a very interesting recital of an incident occurring on the Elbe at the close of the war.

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

There was no objection.

#### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

#### COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit this afternoon notwithstanding the fact that the House is in session.

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

There was no objection.

#### COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit this afternoon during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

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

#### TURKISH LOAN

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, any doubt as to the character of the so-called loan to Turkey which this House recently voted has been dispelled by Turkish President İnönü's announcement of yesterday that the \$100,000,000 American loan would be used for strictly military purposes. Moreover, Turkish officials at Istanbul have brazenly announced their expectation that the so-called loan would be a grant, in the form of military materials.

Mr. Speaker, not only are we allying ourselves with the most reactionary and despotic governments in Europe, but we are granting them outright subsidies, pouring hard-earned American dollars down a drain from which we have no intention of ever retrieving them.

Mr. Speaker, this aid has been called a loan to deceive our own citizens, but the greedy Turks have stripped off the mask of deception from our aid bill and have shamelessly described it for what it is—a plain hand-out from American taxpayers who are indebted to Turkey for absolutely nothing.

Mr. Speaker, it is simple hypocrisy for the Turkish President to declare there is no Armenian problem in Turkey, where Christians are still deprived of elementary civil rights, where they live in fear, remembering the terrible slaughter of Greeks and Armenians after World War I, even if we have forgotten it. Let me read to you a cable from the Armenian National Council of Egypt to the Speaker of this House. I quote:

We wonder why American citizens should financially and morally support the country, which, under power of profitable neutrality, backed Nazi Germany during the war while Armenian soldiers together with Americans profusely shed their blood for freedom and democracy.

#### VETERANS' HOUSING

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency that he will report to the House this week a bill authorizing the appropriation and expenditure of \$35,000,000 to complete the suspended construction of housing facilities for veterans in the various university and school towns and cities of the country. This measure will be supported, in my opinion, by a unanimous vote of the House.

The University of Tennessee is bursting at the seams with GI students. The

housing facilities in the city of Knoxville are wholly inadequate to take care of them. Many of them are married and are living in trailers and other crowded quarters with their wives and children. This \$35,000,000 will afford them quick relief. They have more than earned the right to an education and to adequate and comfortable housing facilities. Along with my colleagues, I shall gladly support this measure.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Record and include a radio broadcast in which she participated.

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the Cumberland News.

#### STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1948

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3311) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill continue during the remainder of the day, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and myself.

Mr. ROONEY. That is agreeable to this side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3311, with Mr. CURTIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, before I proceed with my general statement I wish to take this opportunity to personally thank the members of this Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Federal judiciary, Mr. ROBERT JONES, of Ohio; Mr. WALT HORAN, of Washington; Mr. IVOR D. FENTON, of Pennsylvania; Mr. JOHN J. ROONEY, of New York; Mr. J. VAUGHAN GARY, of Virginia; Mr. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, of Illinois.

I wish to state I had unusual cooperation from these fine statesmen, who have given much of their valuable time in going into the many phases of this very important bill, which makes appropriations for four of the very important departments of our Government.

I cannot help but commend the work of our executive secretary, Mr. Orescan,



for the unusual and efficient work he performed both during the hearings and in writing the reports and for the assistance he rendered to each member of this committee.

The pending appropriation bill for the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments, and the Federal judiciary is in line with the record of this Congress to reduce the price of government.

The price of government has advanced by leaps and bounds during the last decade. Along with the necessary rise to win the war, there has been a steady expansion of nonwar projects entailing more personnel, more office space, more money from the taxpayers.

The mounting cost of bureaucracy is an inflation breeder no less than other factors in the private affairs of the people. It all adds to the cost of living. Passage of this bill will help reverse the unwholesome trend. That is what the country is demanding.

The Appropriations Committee, during the short time at its disposal, has been able to scratch only the surface of needless expenditures. But we have seen enough to leave no doubt that with continued careful scrutiny, greater reduction in the price of government can be made.

There has been no reckless swinging of a meat ax by the committee, as some of the vested interests in the executive branch of the Government would have the country believe. That would not be wise economy. We aim for efficiency at the lowest possible cost to the taxpayers for the necessary functions of government.

The pending State, Justice, Commerce, and judiciary appropriation bill for the fiscal year beginning next July 1 provides a total of \$535,728,008. That is \$162,893,515 less than President Truman recommended. It is 23.5 percent less than what he asked.

The President has said it would be false economy to cut his budget substantially. The committee, upon careful examination of his recommendation for the agencies covered by this bill, found places to lop off expenditures in the interest of less costly and better government.

The amount carried in the bill is a paper increase of \$26,948,330 over the \$508,779,678 that was appropriated for fiscal year 1947. I say "paper increase" because there is an item of \$50,000,000 for the State Department in connection with acquisition of diplomatic quarters abroad that will be reimbursed to the Federal Treasury when circuitous deals under lend-lease settlements are completed. Therefore, in reality, the pending measure provides \$23,051,670 less than was allowed for the present fiscal year.

I also want to point out that there are some new activities, such as projects connected with the United Nations, that had to be provided for in this bill. And there is the substantial item of \$32,500,000 for the Nation-wide airports program that Congress has authorized.

Although hostilities in the war are over and it is axiomatic that Government expenditures should drop tremendously, the Truman administration had the audacity to ask for funds that actually

would add to the present swollen Federal pay roll.

In the four departments covered by this bill there are now about 86,200 employees. Under the Budget Bureau estimates, that number of Government employees would be increased to about 98,550, or 12,350 more than they have now. Under the bill, there will be a substantial reduction in the present number of Government employees.

I want to direct the attention of the House and the country especially to the Departments of State and Commerce. These departments have strayed far from the path of true economy in Government. Sweeping reorganization and modernization are imperative. It is a job that cannot be done overnight. It should be started now.

The State Department has become an uncoordinated series of offices, divisions, and sundry offshoots. It has become the repository of a variety of functions with a variety of missions to perform.

The committee believes that it is getting into fields of Government far removed from the historic conception of the State Department as the diplomatic arm of the Government.

In recent years there have been frequent changes in the holder of the office of Secretary of State. The new Secretaries barely had time to familiarize themselves with major problems in international relations before they were succeeded by others.

Meanwhile, it is evident that the mass of subdivisions and offshoots in the Department went their separate ways without someone to coordinate the coordinators.

This is a situation we hope that Secretary Marshall will handle as soon as possible. It is a situation that makes for inefficiency and ultimately in a higher price for government.

When there is related to the total amount recommended in this bill for 1948 the urgent need for economy in government for the relief of the taxpayers and as a buttress against threatening inflation, it should become obvious that the four departments encompassed in this bill have been adequately provided for. I realize, as I am sure other thoughtful Members of Congress do also, that it is not always practicable in discussing appropriation bills to refer to a prewar level, just as it was not practicable to refer to a prewar level when appropriation bills for the fiscal years immediately following the First World War were discussed.

The world has traveled far since 1939, and this Nation, in order to retain its relative position in the world, also must travel. I am not too sure that one can always properly suggest a return to normalcy. It is merely a relative term connected with the various phases of our historical development.

The matter that seems to be giving the most concern to the Committee on Appropriations, however, and which has concerned me individually as chairman of the subcommittee responsible for providing funds for the four increasingly responsible agencies of the Government, is the extent to which some of these agencies have been reluctant to let go of war-

created functions. They cannot understand that the war is over, and even the United States cannot afford the debatable luxury of an overstuffed, sprawling bureaucracy.

Furthermore, none of the officials of these agencies who appeared before the committee has taken more than a casual interest in the fiscal situation of this Nation. The further impression received by individual members of the committee in the course of the hearings is that the various officials in control of the activities of the departments and of the bureaus of these departments have not, as yet, taken any cognizance of the existing wave of opposition that is sweeping the country to the existing high costs of running the Federal Government, together with the feeling that perhaps the Nation is being overgoverned.

The concept of the purpose of government has, as we all know, altered considerably in the last 13 or 14 years. The voters last November indicated definitely that they had enough of the concept of government that had developed in Washington over recent years. This Congress, I am sure, will do everything in its power to comply with the people's mandate.

Absolutely no assistance has been rendered this subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations by the officials of these departments in the attainment of this goal. Perhaps it is the fault of the budgetary system under which we operate, and, if so, I, for one, think it should be changed. The job of governing, and governing efficiently and economically, is the responsibility of both the legislative branch and the executive branch of our Government. These branches should work jointly in the interests of the people. Lack of cooperation results in inefficiency and poor government and waste in the expenditure of public funds.

Despite this lack of cooperation on the part of the officials in the executive departments that appeared before the committee, and despite their strong contentions, with the exception of Ambassador Austin, who appeared in behalf of the appropriation for our participation in United Nations and who voluntarily suggested a reduction, that every dollar requested was needed, the committee was enabled to effect some savings.

The majority of the committee is convinced that the reductions that have been made will in no way impair the necessary operations of the departments covered by this bill.

Now, I will go more into detail, first taking up the Department of State.

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

This Department has expanded from a total of 5,420 employees and \$17,000,000 in 1939, to 9,760 employees and \$53,000,000 in 1944, or at the peak of the war, and 24,560 and almost \$180,000,000 in the current year. The total request for 1948 is 25,760 regular employees and almost \$280,000,000. As is explained in the committee report, however, adjusting factors reduce the 1948 allowance to about \$62,000,000 for comparison with 1939. Even then the amount is nearly 400 percent of what it was before the war.

The Department has grown too rapidly. It is not sufficiently compact and co-

ordinated effectively to meet the needs of present-day problems. The Department is attempting to do too much outside the sphere of direct international relations.

The committee is recommending a little over \$219,000,000, a reduction of about \$60,400,000 under the budget estimates. This compares with an appropriation of about \$181,500,000 for the current fiscal year.

I have dealt with appropriations of the Department of State for many years. Through these years of association with the Department and its activities, I have arrived at certain conclusions concerning this important branch of our Federal establishment which, if the House will bear with me briefly, I should like to summarize at this time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is discussing a proposition to enable the Members to determine whether we are going to appropriate money to send abroad or for our own folks at home and I think the Members ought to hear it. I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-seven Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 56]

Allen, Calif.	Fellows	O'Hara
Barden	Flannagan	Pace
Bates, Ky.	Fletcher	Patterson
Bennett, Mo.	Fuller	Pfeiffer
Bland	Fulton	Philbin
Bloom	Gifford	Ploesser
Boggs, La.	Granger	Plumley
Boykin	Gregory	Potts
Bradley, Mich.	Hart	Powell
Buckley	Hendricks	Rabin
Buffett	Hollifield	Rains
Butler	Jarman	Rayfield
Byrne, N. Y.	Jones, N. C.	Redden
Canfield	Kearney	Riehlman
Celler	Kearns	Sabath
Chapman	Kelley	Scott, Hardie
Clements	Keogh	Scott,
Clippinger	Kilburn	Hugh D., Jr.
Coffin	King	Shafer
Combs	Klein	Smith, Maine
Cooley	Lane	Smith, Ohio
Coudert	Latham	Somers
D'Alesandro	LeFevre	Stigler
Davis, Tenn.	Lemke	Taylor
Dawson, Ill.	Lucas	Thomas, N. J.
Delaney	McDowell	Thomason
Dirksen	McGarvey	Vinson
Domeneaux	Mansfield, Tex.	Vorvy
Donohue	Marcantonio	Welchel
Ellis	Merrow	West
Elsaesser	Miller, Nebr.	Wolcott
Elston	Mitchell	Wolverton
Fallon	Nodar	
Feighan	Norton	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CURTIS, 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. 3311) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 328 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] will proceed.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman—

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield briefly.

Mr. GWINN of New York. I think the membership will be interested to know that the Senate has just passed the labor bill by a vote of 68 to 24. That is nearly 74 percent, about the same as the percentage in the House. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. Foreign Service representatives, in this country and in the embassies and consulates throughout the world, have a single criterion of action. They must get as much as they can honorably get for their own country. Our American ambassadors and their staffs hold their posts from the United States Government. They must be wholeheartedly for that Government. They must always put the interests of that Government first.

The Foreign Service officer may be of material assistance to the nationals of the country in which he serves the United States. The American diplomat may even be in a position to aid in world understanding. Yet, his first—his only—loyalty belongs to this Republic. Compared to this, all else is incidental.

This loyalty begins at home. It begins with honorable dealings between the Department and Congress. It entails the praiseworthy purpose of obtaining appropriations with full disclosure to Congress of the uses to which they are to be put. It involves the prompt, regular, and complete reports to Congress of financial transactions pertaining to claims, trade and transportation concessions, and cultural relations agreements, affecting this and other countries, entered into by the Department's representatives abroad.

A long and continuous record of honesty in these and similar transactions would, indeed, go far to facilitate swift and sympathetic consideration of matters in which the Department requires legislative approval.

Conversely, ignoring Congress or keeping Congress only partially aware of the over-all aims and the daily activities of the Department of State would have effect of thrusting a wedge between two branches of Government which should work together as a team. The importance of establishing a relationship between Congress and the Department of State in which each mutually respects the integrity of the other is not to be exaggerated.

In considering appropriations for the Department of State, a paucity of information on policies governing the various divisions and even the Department as a whole was apparent. Witness after witness from the Department, when asked the policy under which he was operating—information considered necessary in arriving at the necessary amount of funds—said that he did not know the policy. It seems that the policy changes in some fields from day to day. Plainly, there is need for action on this matter by the Secretary of State.

Before I refer to some of the individual items of appropriation for the Department, I would like to say a few words concerning the information and cultural program of the Department. As has already been reported in the press, and as many Members of Congress have been informed several days preceding the official reporting of this bill, the amount of \$31,381,220 requested for this program is denied by the committee. The reason I comment on this now is because the cost of this program is distributed among several items of appropriation and accordingly, must be treated as a specific project.

The reasons for the committee's action are several. In the first place, the activity is not authorized by the Congress. This is considerably more than a "technicality" as erroneously described by certain individuals, who apparently are not wholly informed on the legislative processes of their Government. The committee feels that such a radical departure in the methods of conducting our foreign relations should have the approval of the people through their Representatives in the Congress. Much less vital problems, both domestic and international, are almost daily receiving the consideration of the Congress.

Secondly, it is felt that a Government-sponsored program is out of tune with American precedents and American principles, and even though the news and other programs are as objective as represented, this committee, at least, does not feel that our Government should further remain in the news business.

In the third place, inquiry by the committee has shown that the program is not efficiently administered.

While some of the radio news broadcasts appear to some persons to be of some value, most of the remaining programs do not even come close to fulfilling the desire for information which may exist in the minds of the people abroad.

A list of books presented to the committee and headed "Books sent to the cultural centers in the other American Republics July 1, 1946—February 1, 1947," with the total list and net—after discount—cost indicated, and signed by the Acting Chief of the Division of Libraries and Institutes, contained at least one book unworthy of any public activity. Purchase of this book was denied by Mr. Benton.

With respect to the art program, I am not in a position to say whether the selection of modern art pictures being distributed abroad represent good or poor art. Mr. Benton, himself, had no opinion in the matter inasmuch as he could not even distinguish the subject matter of a half-dozen or so pictures included in the group that was purchased by the Department.

However, the committee could not remain unmindful of the many hundreds of letters received in protest to this program. If we are going abroad to impress people, we should try to impress the average individual rather than a certain segment of the art colony.

We have UNESCO, a United Nations undertaking in which much interest



is developing, and which, as established, will truly represent the views of the American people. Further, let us encourage private enterprise to a greater international activity through international efforts to eliminate the red tape presently involved in travel and exchange of commodities. Let us develop greater cooperation between the Department of State and private media of information for a proper presentation of American life abroad.

Our forebears planted on this soil the seed of liberty and freedom, which, if properly nurtured, should outgrow our boundaries and reach out into the rest of the world; not through a centralized disseminating agency but through the force of its own dynamics.

I feel that the dire results predicted for the future of this Nation if this program is eliminated are tremendously exaggerated. It was testified that prior to the war, there were six short-wave broadcasting stations beaming news and other programs to the rest of the world. I also want to quote from a statement issued recently by the World Wide Broadcasting Foundation:

"A false impression has been created in the last few days that if the State Department should lose its appropriation to continue Government-sponsored short-wave broadcasts, all radio voices from America to people abroad would be cut off. This is entirely misleading and erroneous," according to Walter S. Lemmon, president and founder of the World Wide Broadcasting Foundation, which built up daily broadcasts over the powerful short-wave radio station WRUL in Boston.

"The accurate dissemination of information and American culture to all parts of Europe and Latin America by radio was successfully carried on through widespread public support, long before the wartime OWI and its OIC successor in the State Department was set up," Mr. Lemmon added. "Our foundation, in active operation since 1935, was broadcasting in 24 different languages authentic information of American life and culture, in cooperation with Harvard University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Columbia, and other institutions. This work was temporarily suspended during the war and is now being resumed and expanded."

"Letters from listeners all over Europe and the Middle East now being received by the foundation attest that its nongovernmental programs are being eagerly received. We will continue to broadcast over WRUL and its associated transmitters, in 10 languages to all parts of Europe, during the best evening hours when people there can listen," Mr. Lemmon said today in a statement issued from the New York office of the World Wide Broadcasting Foundation, at 598 Madison Avenue.

"The work of this nonprofit organization in the fields of international education, and the fostering of world understanding by radio, was started 12 years ago with grants from the Rockefeller Foundation. Since that time, the basis of support has been broadened to include annual contributions from the several thousand public-spirited citizens and American corporations, eager to preserve and spread a knowledge of the American way of life with truly democratic freedom of expression."

"Last year WRUL conducted a successful fight before Congress to preserve freedom of radio, when Assistant Secretary of State William Benton tried to force the station to lease all of its radio time to the Government, without leaving any hours for nongovern-

mental programs from America. This action was forestalled by Senator BALL's amendment to the State Department appropriation bill which prevents such monopoly of broadcasting from being created by any Government bureau. . . .

"If any portion of the appropriation requested by Mr. Benton for the next fiscal year is finally approved by Congress," Mr. Lemmon stated, "we are convinced that if these funds were to be spent in leasing certain blocks of radio time, and assisting the foreign language program staffs of the existing American international radio stations, the effectiveness of the broadcasts furthering our foreign policy would be markedly increased, and considerable economy in the use of public funds would be achieved. I strongly recommend that such a procedure be followed. . . .

"Our Government is now fostering the reestablishment after the war of America's overseas aviation and transoceanic shipping, by helping to rebuild private enterprise in these fields, without trying to force them into Government monopoly controls. However, it seems to be Mr. Benton's purpose in radio to perpetuate and enlarge the wartime OWI type of bureau, and to stifle private initiative and enterprise, through monopoly measures, in this important field of disseminating ideas from America," Mr. Lemmon concluded.

In concluding my comments on this item, I should like to repeat what I told Assistant Secretary of State William Benton in answer to his statement in which he referred to our pending aid to Greece and Turkey:

All I know is that there is a bill in our Congress asking taxpayers of the United States to send \$400,000,000 as a starter to Greece and Turkey, because the British are no longer to stay there and that they are leaving, and in some way we are to take their place to help Greece and Turkey from the inroads being made by the Communists. But, I still feel that food is more important for Europe today than words of any kind. It is too late for words so far as hungry men, women, and children are concerned, and there are millions of them over there with hands outstretched asking for something to eat.

The bill includes \$23,400,000 for so-called domestic activities of the Department, of which amount \$2,650,000 is for surplus property disposal to which I will refer a little later. The amount of \$20,000,000 is included for departmental salaries and expenses.

When it is recalled that all items included in the item "Salaries and expenses," totaled \$2,728,347 in 1940, \$3,453,000 in 1941, \$4,377,105 in 1942, \$5,986,800 in 1943, and even up to something over \$13,000,000 in 1946, it was extremely difficult for this committee, during this period of need for economy, to reconcile itself to a need in excess of \$18,000,000 for the regular activities. There is no doubt but what if world conditions were somewhat less disturbing than at present a greater reduction in funds would have been made.

#### SURPLUS PROPERTY DISPOSAL

The disposition of surplus property abroad imposed on the State Department by the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, and for which \$2,650,000 is included in the bill is really not a function of the Department of State. This activity appears to be conducted rather efficiently under the direction of Gen. Donald H. Connolly.

It is reported that as of March 1, 1947, approximately \$7,790,000,000 in surplus property had been disposed of during the 18 months in which declarations were made by the owning agencies. The remaining inventory balance is estimated at \$1,386,000,000 with \$1,850,000,000 of declarations definitely in view, or a total of approximately \$2,500,000,000 worth of property to be disposed of during fiscal year 1948. The total in cash, credit, and local currencies realized on the property disposed of as of March 1, 1947, is \$1,691,000,000, or 23.3 percent of the original cost. Of this total, \$400,000,000 is in cash.

Credits and local currencies are used for the sending of American students abroad under the Fulbright Act, and the purchase of property under the Foreign Service Buildings Act. The largest portion of the assets—over and above the cash—represents long-term credits to, as of February 28, 1947, 30 countries and 5 private entities.

#### THE FOREIGN SERVICE

For the Foreign Service, the bill includes \$119,670,000. This item also has grown tremendously since 1939—from 3,730 employees to almost 12,000 in 1947, and a requested 14,540 in 1948. The elimination of the information program eliminates something over 2,000 from the total requested. The same comments I just made to the Department as a whole also apply to this service—that is, that it still might be too large for efficient performance. I hope that Secretary Marshall will soon make an analysis of the entire Department with the idea of pulling in the loose ends and making it a more compact and harder-hitting organization.

During this time, when we are carefully scrutinizing every item of expenditure, and are intent on cutting to the bone all unnecessary governmental waste, it is not proposed that we do without adequate official representation abroad. What we are trying to do is to get the most for the American taxpayers' money—and the best.

In these comments on the Foreign Service, it would be impossible not to consider the relationship of our diplomacy and our diplomats to the newly formed United Nations. To have men dealing with the representatives of the United Nations who are not completely American in their point of view would be to invite disaster to our country and to the United Nations.

Nowadays, the diplomat is beset at every turn by propaganda perils. He must not fail in keeping his Government informed as to all trends in order that it may not be taken in by a surprise move. For this, we need men on the spot well versed in diplomatic methods and language, who know what sort of information to look for, where to find it, and how to appraise its value when he does get it.

What we have come to call diplomacy in the last several years has failed to achieve beneficial results and has led us into all too many disasters. But, what we have had to call diplomacy was not the real diplomacy. It was the assumption of responsible diplomatic functions

by star-gazers and inexperienced amateurs. It was evidenced in the method of having the negotiation of infinitely complicated world problems by tyros and adventurers. It was the forcing on the world in critical times of new and untried methods. It has often consisted of mere publicity stunts. The result has contributed to world-wide chaos.

It is my considered opinion that through embarking on a continuing campaign of close cooperation and frank interchange of ideas with Congress, with establishing as the paramount ideal of the service, the devotion to this country and this country alone, and by the proper choice and payment of personnel, that real diplomacy can be restored to this Republic.

The aims, purposes, and activities of this restored American diplomacy must and shall be directed toward making this country strong at home and understood and respected abroad. Restored diplomacy is, indeed, our first line of defense, our major bulwark against war in this atomic age.

#### REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCES

I want to say a word about the representation allowances for which the committee has recommended \$500,000, a reduction of \$618,000 under the budget estimates and \$300,000 under the current year's appropriation.

This appropriation has climbed steadily from \$125,000 in 1938 to the requested \$1,118,000 for 1948. The average allotment per chief of mission has increased from approximately \$2,000 in 1938 to \$5,130 in 1947 and \$5,627 proposed for 1948. In this connection, I point out that under Public Law 724 each chief of mission is also entitled to a maintenance-of-residence allowance ranging, as proposed in the estimates, from \$2,500 to \$20,000 annually. Representation allowances for ranking subordinates and other officers of the Foreign Service have likewise increased tremendously since 1938.

A review of copies of vouchers on file in the State Department very definitely indicates that there is too much entertaining for other than absolutely necessary purposes. In one instance, the same individual gave a reception each day for approximately 3 weeks.

These vouchers further disclosed the fact that the Foreign Service officers are spending considerable sums of money in entertaining each other.

This is not the purpose for which this type of allowance was originated. The committee felt that it has been more than liberal in providing the sum recommended in the bill and wishes to inform the State Department that a continued review of these expenditures will be made by the committee for its information in connection with future requests.

#### FOREIGN-PROPERTY PURCHASES

It should be explained that the \$50,000,000 item appearing in appropriations for the Department of State Foreign Building Office is not an appropriation of new funds.

The properties which this sum is intended to cover are, as you know, being secured through the operations of Public Law 547, which authorizes the Department to secure needed properties in re-

turn for credits due on obligations from foreign governments. Most of the properties we are coming into possession of are through lend-lease settlements, or sales of surplus materials all over the world, or as credits on account of reparations.

Public Law 547 is the authorizing legislation under which advantage can be taken of these foreign obligations, but, nevertheless, all amounts involved should follow regular appropriation channels. It is merely a bookkeeping transaction.

When a piece of property valuable for this Government is located, the Foreign Building Office negotiates with the owner, and when an equitable valuation is reached the property is deeded to this Government, and the amount involved is credited to the foreign government on any obligations it may have running to the United States. The sum requested is not new money to be expended, but merely an appropriation into the Treasury for accounting purposes.

For the several items under the heading "International obligations," the committee has included in the bill the amount of \$76,000,000. Of this amount, \$45,000,000 is recommended for the Philippine rehabilitation program, for which activity there was appropriated, during the current year, almost \$48,000,000. However, it was disclosed in the hearings that the total amount of the current appropriation that remained unobligated as of February 28 of this year was nearly \$40,000,000. This amount will be available for expenditure and obligation in the fiscal year 1948.

Another item under this general heading is the International Boundary and Water Commission, for which nearly \$5,000,000 is recommended. The situation here, as with the Philippine rehabilitation program, is that large unencumbered balances which will be available in the ensuing fiscal year made it unnecessary for the committee to appropriate the full amount of the request. It was testified that approximately \$6,250,000 is estimated to be unobligated as of June 30 of this year, which, together with what has been appropriated, will give this activity approximately \$1,000,000 more than it presently has available.

With respect to the cooperation program with the other American republics, the committee allowed \$3,000,000, which is \$2,375,000 under the current year's appropriation and \$2,820,000 below the budget estimates. It was the thought of the committee in making this reduction that while this program has, in the past, contributed somewhat to a better understanding among the peoples of this hemisphere, much of the money previously appropriated has not been wisely spent. I am sure that our South American neighbors, realizing that this Congress is economy-minded, will go along with us in our attempt to reduce expenses and thus strengthen the position of this Nation for its increasingly important role in the Western Hemisphere.

The full amounts for our participation in United Nations and UNESCO were allowed, approximately \$12,580,000 for the former and \$3,700,000 for the latter

activity. It was felt that on both of these organizations lies the major responsibility for the maintenance of peace in the world, and the committee wishes to give them every opportunity for success.

#### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

For the Department of Justice, the bill includes something over \$108,000,000 and represents a reduction of over \$1,000,000 under the current appropriations. This department is, by its very nature, primarily a service organization and, with but few exceptions, renders services either imposed upon it by other agencies of the Government or specifically outlined for it by statute.

The total number of employees has not varied to any appreciable extent in this Department during the past 6 or 7 years. In 1941, it had something over 19,600 with a wartime high in 1944 of almost 29,000 employees. Appropriations recommended will permit the average employment of approximately 23,000 employees in 1948.

The greatest increase that has taken place in employment in this department during the last few years has been in the Federal Bureau of Investigation and, to some extent, in the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

With respect to the legal activities and general administration, or the law offices of the Department, the committee made no appreciable deductions in the budget estimates except in a few instances where it was thought that additional economies could be effected.

The largest single increase over the current year allowed was for the Antitrust Division. However, of the \$280,900 increase allowed, \$250,000 is for railroad reparations cases. This division was recently requested by the Army, the Navy, and the Bureau of the Budget to attempt to recapture for the Government money paid the railroads for the hauling of freight during the war period, alleged to be in excess of the fair and proper rates.

The Lands Division, for which approximately \$2,500,000 is included in the bill, continues to be weighted down with cases resulting from the Government's acquisition of land for war purposes. The disturbing feature of the activities of this division is that both the Army and the Navy, as well as other agencies of the Government, are, on the one hand, continuing to acquire through condemnation, purchase, or otherwise, many tracts of land throughout the United States, whereas, on the other hand, they are declaring a great number of tracts as surplus.

I believe that this is costing the taxpayers of this Nation a tremendous amount of money and I am of the definite opinion that someone in the Bureau of the Budget, or elsewhere in the executive branch of the Government, should take hold of this matter with the idea of restricting the further acquisition of land in this country, unless it is determined to be absolutely vital to the needs of the agencies involved.

#### THE FBI

Turning to the Federal Bureau of Investigation we, of course, all know the



record of accomplishments of this agency under the leadership of its Director, John Edgar Hoover. I believe that the committee was unanimous in granting Mr. Hoover the full amount of his request, or \$35,000,000.

This agency carried a heavy burden during the war period. However, it continues to carry heavy responsibility during this critical period in our history when the situation throughout the world is not as we should like to have it. Director Hoover testified before the committee that the investigative work of his bureau continues to be exceedingly heavy.

The printed testimony shows that the Federal Bureau of Investigation had more than 63,000 investigative matters pending on January 1, of this year, as compared with approximately 58,000 cases as of January 1, last year.

We must remember that during the last decade we have placed many additional responsibilities on this agency. For example, during the last seven fiscal years the Congress has placed on the statute books no less than 50 additional statutes increasing the work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. A number of bills have been introduced in the present Congress which will further increase the work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation if they are favorably acted upon.

In addition, as we all know, crime has increased throughout the country. I earnestly recommend that all of my colleagues carefully read Mr. Hoover's testimony given before the committee concerning the present crime problem facing our country today. Mr. Hoover reported that during the calendar year 1946 major crimes committed throughout the country increased 7 percent over 1945.

The regular criminal work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation reflects a dangerous increase—kidnaping and bank robbery are increasing. There is an increase in auto thefts and thefts from interstate shipments involving dangerous hijacking gangs.

The criminal element must be served with notice that we, the Members of Congress, intended to insure a continued virile law enforcement to control their activities. It is in this way, and in this way only, that we can give to our children and our children's children the birthright of a free and unfettered life.

The committee allowed the Immigration and Naturalization Service approximately \$27,500,000, a reduction of \$1,500,000 under the budget estimates. The cost of this service has increased steadily from approximately \$9,690,000 in 1938 to the \$28,945,000 requested for 1948. In reviewing the activities of this organization, the committee received the impression that this service was doing more detailed work in connection with immigration and naturalization than would seem to be implied in the laws under which it is operating. Otherwise, there is no accounting for the tremendous increase in the cost of operating this organization.

Some additional work has been imposed on the service through the dis-

placed persons program. Also, there has been additional work through the increase in the number of visitors that have been arriving since the war period, together with an increase of nonimmigrant aliens which, however, has been partially offset by the decline in the number of quota aliens that have been admitted during the war and immediately following the war.

Even then, it seems to me, and it was the thought of most of the members of the committee, that the increased operating costs are somewhat out of proportion to the increased workload as reflected in the statistics furnished the committee.

With respect to the Federal Prison System under this Department, the committee is advised that the prison population is expected to remain about the same as the current year or approximately 19,000 inmates. Food and other costs have gone up somewhat and a slight increase has been allowed penal and correctional institutions. Reductions were made in requests for major plant additions and extensions of capital equipment. In general, the total of all appropriations allowed for this service approximates that allowed for the current year.

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Now we come to the Department of Commerce. The greatest reduction effected by the committee is in this Department. I strongly believe in an efficient and well operated Department to serve the Nation's economy, but I do not believe in continuing war-born activities nor in the expenditure of public funds in nursing American business and supplying it information not altogether vital to its needs, either through the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, the Bureau of Standards, or the Census Bureau.

It also was rather evident to the committee that especially since the days of Henry Wallace, layer upon layer of additional authority seems to have been created both at the Bureau level and at the top or secretary level. This Department, if it is to serve business and industry, should be operated on a more business-like basis.

In the fiscal year 1941, this Department, including the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation, since transferred out of the Department, was operated with a total personnel of 14,030. The total employment as of February, 28, 1947, was 36,270 employees of which about 5,800 are part-time employees. The request for 1948 is for 41,637 employees of which about 4,700 would be of a temporary or part-time nature.

When there is excluded from this comparison the personnel from the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Bureau of Marine Inspection, which is no longer in the Department, the 1941 personnel is 7,300, as compared with a proposed personnel for 1948 of approximately 13,700.

Further, excluding these items from the total appropriations, the comparison is about \$41,500,000 in the fiscal year 1941 as compared with \$97,000,000 requested for 1948.

A good illustration of what has been going on is the Office of Technical Services under the Office of the Secretary. This activity is an outgrowth of the National Inventor's Council created during the war for the purpose of screening inventions that might prove useful in the war effort. This organization as such was created immediately following the war for the purpose of acquiring German technological information for dissemination to American industry. Some useful work was done.

However, the Department now desires to continue this unit and expand its activities to the extent that it would become just another scientific and research organization in the Federal Government.

The committee is recommending that the unfinished portion of the work of this unit be transferred to the Bureau of Standards or the Patent Office, or both, and that the activity as such be abolished.

For the Census Bureau, the bill includes \$10,500,000, a reduction of \$8,705,000 under the estimates.

The feeling of the committee in this matter is that many of the continuing censuses are neither authorized or necessary, and I, for one, feel that the economy of the country will not be any worse off for the lack of some of these statistics.

For instance, the amount of \$130,000 was requested for the census of electrical industries covering, among other things, telephone, telegraph, and local transit industries.

I am informed that nearly all of this information is available in the Interstate Commerce Commission and in the industries themselves. As a matter of fact, I was informed that most of the information is secured from the industries.

It seems ridiculous to me to go to the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. for information as to the number of existing or needed telephones, and then hand it back to the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. in the form of a Government report.

The committee felt that the item of census of manufactures is justified. However, it reduced the amount from \$5,000,000 to \$4,000,000 on information that much of the information was already available through the taking of current census statistics.

I personally am unable to visualize the eventual annual cost of maintaining and operating our Federal airways system. The appropriations for this activity have climbed from \$10,878,500 in 1938 to a budget estimate for 1948 of almost \$190,000,000. Excluding from this budget estimate the amount of \$65,000,000 proposed for the Federal aid airport program, the balance of \$125,000,000, as will be seen, is still approximately 1,200 percent of the 1938 appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska has consumed 1 hour.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, what concerns me most in this matter of cost,

however, is the predictions made almost daily by individuals connected with the air industry that this is only the beginning, and that great increases in the number of airplanes and in personnel in the air industry generally are ahead of us.

As an indication of how this industry has grown, I might point out that the number of domestic civil aircraft produced in 1941 was a little over 8,000. It is estimated at 50,000 in 1948. The total registered aircraft in 1941 was 22,500 and estimated at 171,000 in 1948. The number of certificated pilots and student pilots' certificates issued yearly have increased proportionately.

The total revenue passenger-miles was 1,300,000,000 in 1938 and estimated at 7,500,000,000 in 1948. It seems obvious to me that the Federal Government cannot afford to continue to increase appropriations to the Civil Aeronautics Administration in proportion to the increased air activity.

The administration is requesting a total of 19,324 positions for 1948 for the discharging of the Government's responsibilities under the various laws enacted by the Congress. Think of it, almost 20,000 persons to operate and maintain a Federal airways system, for an estimated 1,200 scheduled air-carrier aircraft and an estimated 8,000 nonscheduled air-carrier operators.

I refer to these two types of operations because it is for them primarily that the Federal airways system exists. Very little, if any, use can be made of our Federal airways system by the private flier.

It has been contended and it is, of course, true, that these carriers pay into the United States Treasury in the form of taxes, a portion of the cost of the Federal airways system. Other industries pay taxes, also, and I am wondering how far we should go and can go in subsidizing a particular industry so that we may be able to say, "Well we do get a certain portion of it back."

To make matters worse, the administration has interpreted much too liberally the general laws under which it operates. It has for years done things for the industry which the industry would prefer to do for itself. I believe that the perspective, insofar as Federal participation in the aviation industry is concerned, either has been warped by the war or lost completely. We just must stop long enough to analyze our position and to determine the direction in which we are heading.

The committee is recommending \$119,507,000 for this activity including the Washington National Airport. Of the reduction of something over \$70,000,000 approximately \$18,000,000 is in the item "Salaries and expenses" and is based on factual information in the hands of the committee as a result of an investigation it made of the Civil Aeronautics Administration operations. The details of this reduction are explained in the report in greater detail.

However, I might say here that the reduction includes the amount of \$4,849,000 for air-traffic-control towers. This committee eliminated fund for control towers when it reported out the fiscal year 1947 bill.

It is now more than ever convinced that these towers should be operated by the cities and municipalities in which the airports are located and who derive the benefit from the traffic of the airports. Last year, the funds for these towers were restored on the floor of the House on the pretext that safety was involved.

I can say unequivocally that with the transfer of the cost of operating these towers the safety factor is in no way affected. The towers would continue to be operated by Civil Aeronautics Administration personnel and under CAA standards, and the cities and municipalities would merely reimburse the \$25,000 or \$35,000 each annually for the operation of the towers.

The actual maintenance of these towers, that is, installing equipment and keeping it in first-class condition, would continue to be a responsibility of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and funds are provided for that purpose.

With regard to the establishment of air navigation facilities, the committee is recommending \$17,638,000, which, together with \$9,050,000 estimated to be carried over from the current year's appropriation, will give the Civil Aeronautics Administration approximately \$26,700,000 for this purpose. There are so many new types of equipment presently being developed that the committee in its report has strongly urged the Civil Aeronautics Administration to have the entire airways system studied by a board of disinterested radio and electronics experts.

I want to say here that this committee has been very favorable to the development of aviation in this country. It is as much concerned with safety in aviation as, perhaps, any group connected with aviation. Our safety record for 1946 stands as the best in the history of aviation. Of the accidents that have been reported during the years that statistics have been maintained, it is estimated that approximately 70 percent of the accidents have been the result of human errors. Devices alone cannot insure safety. Sound and far-sighted administration is more important.

With respect to the Federal aid airport program, the bill includes \$32,500,000 or one-half of the total requested. The House membership should be informed that the Civil Aeronautics Administration will carry over into the succeeding fiscal year approximately \$41,000,000 of the current appropriation of \$45,000,000 for this purpose. The committee does not feel that the program as a whole will be in any way endangered by this reduction.

I want to comment just briefly on the operation of the Washington National Airport, for which the amount of \$1,236,000 is included in the bill. The yearly passenger traffic at this airport exceeded 1,250,000 in the calendar year 1946. The indications are that this total will be exceeded in 1947. This activity is nearly self-sustaining, with revenues expected to exceed \$1,000,000 in the fiscal year 1948. This revenue will be further increased following the expiration of some of the long-term agreements with con-

cessionaires made by former officials of the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

The bill includes \$2,535,000 for the Civil Aeronautics Board. As with other activities connected with aviation, the work of this organization has also increased. As of the end of 1941, the Board had certificated 107,300 miles. At the end of 1946 there were 207,400 miles. It is estimated that at the end of 1948 there will be nearly 300,000 certificated route-miles.

The committee has included in the bill the amount of \$9,550,000 for the Coast and Geodetic Survey. This organization is doing important work in the promotion of safe navigation on the sea and in the air, as well as establishing geodetic controls necessary for public construction, especially dams, flood-control work, and airports.

Among other things that this organization does is prepare air maps for distribution to the Federal Government and private industry. It is hoped that the making of maps for the use of the private air industry can be disposed of, and that private air map makers be given an opportunity to reestablish themselves in the business which seems to have been concentrated in the Federal Government during the war.

With respect to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, the committee has included in the bill the amount of \$7,000,000. I want to inform the membership, however, that the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce exists in theory only, its work having been divided into five separate offices, the head of each responsible to the Under Secretary. This Bureau was operated as a bureau and rendered efficient service economically—that is, until the advent of Mr. Henry Wallace.

The year after he became Secretary of Commerce, appropriations jumped from about \$2,838,000 to \$10,550,000, which is the appropriation for the current fiscal year. It is very doubtful that the country has been in any way benefited by the expenditure of this increased amount of money.

The present organizational structure of the Bureau is, to my mind, not only costly but impractical. The committee has recommended in its report that the Bureau be reestablished on the former basis until such time as the Congress sees fit to amend the enabling legislation.

I do not know that I can tell you too much about the Patent Office, except that it is daily accumulating a greater backlog in the issuance of patents, designs, and trademarks. While I admit that patents have, perhaps, increased in complexity and require more detailed research in the processing of applications, there still seems to be great room for improvement in the operation of that office.

I also realize that the efficiency of this office was impaired during the war because of the lack of qualified personnel and because of split operations. However, looking to the future, the estimated productivity, as detailed in the hearings, is somewhat alarming. This office has always had available more funds than it could spend. Still, it is daily getting behind in its work.



It is not amiss to suggest that the management and planning groups in this office, and in the Department generally, might step aside long enough to have the patent situation studied by a group of disinterested experts. It is obviously very detrimental to the economy of the country for a patent applicant to wait anywhere from 26 to 34 months to receive final action on his patent.

The committee was quite concerned with what seems to be a continuation into the postwar period, of work that was both initiated by and imposed on the Bureau of Standards during the war. There is in this organization, as in one or two other bureaus in the Department of Commerce, a tendency to compete with industry in research, and a reluctance to dispense with some of the activities that were initiated in the interest of the war effort.

Of course, many of the research and testing projects have a definite postwar value, but I do not think that the Bureau of Standards should be embarking on many of these projects before it is definitely determined what private industry itself is doing along the same lines.

It seems to me that there is plenty of room for improvement in the development of greater cooperation between this Bureau and private research and testing organizations. Accordingly, the committee allowed for this item \$7,415,000, a reduction of \$3,205,000 in the budget estimates. Of the amount allowed \$6,000,000 is for research and testing, which is more than three times the prewar appropriation.

The price of weather predictions, in line with other commodities, has increased within the last few years. The cost is high, regardless of the type—good weather or bad weather.

This, of course, is a vital service to the economy of this country and should be developed to better serve the Nation, but this organization, as other Federal institutions, must retrench and eliminate some of the less vital functions in which it has been engaged. It was felt that an allowance of \$21,000,000, which is almost three times the prewar appropriation, should be more than adequate to enable the Bureau to continue to render efficient service.

#### FEDERAL JUDICIARY

For the entire Federal judiciary system, including the Supreme Court, the committee is recommending almost \$17,200,000. The personnel of the Supreme Court remains about the same as in preceding years. Included in the amount recommended is approximately \$1,270,000, which represents salary increases for judges, provided by the act of July 31, 1946.

I should like to call to the attention of the membership the action of the committee with respect to two items which were considered. The first is the item of "Miscellaneous salaries," which covers the compensation of law clerks and secretaries to the Federal judges. The language, as proposed by the judiciary, was not authorized by the Congress, and for that reason the item is eliminated from the bill.

The officials of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, and

the judges themselves, have been aware for some time that legislation was needed. While legislation exists for the employment of law clerks, at a maximum salary of \$2,750 for district judges and \$3,000 for circuit judges, none exists for the employment of secretaries. Legislation should be sought immediately to provide for the services of these employees at salaries determined to be necessary.

The committee allowed the amount of \$700,000 of \$1,430,000 requested to reduce the number of existing referees in bankruptcy, all of whom are on a fee basis at the present time, and to place 117 referees on a salary basis ranging from \$7,000 to \$10,000 per annum.

This item was included in the bill in conformity with the provisions of Public Law 464, approved June 28, 1946. It was testified that it would take approximately 20,000 bankruptcy cases per year to make this service self-sustaining. The total of bankruptcy cases filed in the year 1946 was 10,196. The 40-year average is something over 38,000 cases per year, indicating a substantial yearly return to the Federal Government over a period of years, and at the same time improving the administration of our bankruptcy laws.

If there are questions, I shall be very happy to answer them at this time.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I have listened with great interest to the gentleman. May I ask him if he has any specific information on the proposed construction of new airports?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; I have.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I have in mind my own home county, Broome County, N. Y., the board of supervisors of which has authorized an appropriation to be matched with Federal Government funds. I wonder if the gentleman can tell me about that.

Mr. STEFAN. The Congress last year under an authorization appropriated \$45,000,000 as a start for a Federal airport program to aid the States. Most of that money was to be used for class 1, 2, and 3 airports and much has already been allocated to the various States. The allocation made to the States will not be lost to them. The 1948 money was to be used for class 4 or larger airports.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I thank the gentleman. In connection with the gentleman's remarks about the foreign radio broadcasting conducted under the auspices of the State Department, has the gentleman any information as to what benefits there have been thus far by that program?

Mr. STEFAN. We recently started a station in Munich in Bavaria which is being heard in Russia.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I have read considerably about it. I wonder what the gentleman's opinion is and whether he feels that this type of broadcasting has been of any use in furthering the republican form of government such as we have here in America and just what the effect of it is in foreign countries.

Mr. STEFAN. I think it is too early to really discuss the results or effects at this time for the reason that we have only recently started broadcasting in Russian to Russia from Munich.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. One further question regarding the item of entertainment of foreign diplomats and so forth. As I understand it, there has been a considerable cut in that appropriation of nearly one-half. Perhaps the gentleman covered it in his remarks, but it occurs to me that with the high degree of intelligence of our men in the State Department certainly it is not necessary to ply the other foreign diplomats with spirituous beverages. It seems to me that in view of their ability they do not need such great amounts of money for entertainment in order to accomplish the purposes and objectives that they are sent out to accomplish.

Mr. STEFAN. As long as we have had foreign missions we have had representation allowances or prestige allowances. This committee is not opposed to that, if the funds are modest and used for purposes originally intended.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I will be very glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Can the gentleman give the committee some picture of the way these representation allowances have been used?

Mr. STEFAN. I think I covered that in my general statement.

Mr. TABER. Do they entertain the Foreign Service itself or rather do they entertain foreigners?

Mr. STEFAN. The reason the committee cut the appropriations is that we felt the entire funds should be reviewed because we found in some cases there was some misuse of the funds.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STEFAN. I am very glad to yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. How many cases of misuse were found?

Mr. STEFAN. A large number of them.

Mrs. BOLTON. What ratio?

Mr. STEFAN. Do you want the percentages? I have not gone over the vouchers for every mission in the world. I do not know the ratio.

Mrs. BOLTON. May I ask concerning the principle upon which the cuts were made? Were they made on the basis of misuse or on the basis of the need for adequate funds for proper representation?

Mr. STEFAN. They were made on the basis of need and misuse both. We think the amount requested is too high.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. May I say in conclusion I agree entirely with the gentleman in the position that he has taken. I think our State Department with the bright, intelligent men who are supposed to be working in it could certainly do their work and accomplish their objectives without the use of some of these spirituous beverages we hear so much talk about.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I would like to return, if I may, to the airport-control-tower provision of this bill. As I understand it, the committee saw fit to

strike out all Federal control of the control towers throughout the entire United States.

Mr. STEFAN. Oh, no. Safety matters are not concerned at all. All we struck out was the salaries of the tower employees. The cities and States are not busted. Certainly, when the Government builds airports for them, can they not pay the salaries of a few men who are up in those towers? We furnish the equipment and the safety aids and the Federal airways. Why can they not participate a little in the payment of this huge expense? We have 134 of these operated by the Government. We have several hundred that want the same service and we cannot give it. There is no extent to the amount the Government would have to pay if you paid the salaries of control-tower operators at all the airports now requesting this subsidy.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I am one of those Representatives who is interested in a field that is not receiving Federal funds.

Mr. STEFAN. Of course not. St. Joseph, Mo., is paying their own control operations. A town close by is being paid for out of the Federal Treasury. All we are asking you to do is to pay for your own operators to operate the towers. The entire program should be reviewed by the legislative committee.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. There are funds in this bill to replace equipment as it becomes necessary to replace it? All except the payment of salaries?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Does not the gentleman think if you have uniform control throughout the United States it would be a big safety factor?

Mr. STEFAN. It does not enter the question at all. Uniformity remains.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Coming back to the Voice of America, I only know what I have read in the papers about it, but it brings up a situation that has developed every year since I have been a Member of this House. I am willing to vote "yes" or "no" on legislation that comes from the Foreign Affairs Committee. I would not want to state at this moment how I would vote because I have not heard the story. But in case the committee brings in an unfavorable report or does not offer any legislation, it has always been the practice that after bills leave the House they go to another body and then they come back and they have money tacked on them for things that are not authorized by law. I would like to have the gentleman explain that.

Mr. STEFAN. The committee left this item out because it is not authorized by law. General Marshall and Gen. Bedell Smith, who is Ambassador to Russia, made quite an impression on some of us. They both think we need some counterpropaganda. Russia and some of the satellite countries are saying things about the United States that are not absolutely true. They think some modest and effective counterpropaganda should be continued. But the people's representatives in Congress should have something to say about it. There should

be some law. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] knows that in his town of Boston, Mass., the Voice of America has never been stilled. Fifty percent of the broadcasting being done now is being done by private industry, including the station in the home of the gentleman from Massachusetts. Perhaps private industry can do more of it.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. My purpose in asking the gentleman to yield is that I was interested in his observation that it was not authorized by law. The gentleman is of the opinion that proper propaganda work should be engaged in?

Mr. STEFAN. A certain amount more effective and less expensive. Some of the informational work that has been done does not meet the approval of the American people.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is in agreement with that?

Mr. STEFAN. Certainly.

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

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. PRIEST. Just one question. I appreciate the splendid statement of the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee. In response to a question asked by the gentleman from Missouri in reference to whether the safety factor was involved in the operation of air-traffic controls, the report of the committee states that they feel these powers should be operated by CAA personnel. There is nothing in the bill, however, that would require that the towers be operated by CAA personnel.

Mr. STEFAN. There are towers right now being operated by CAA personnel paid by local municipalities.

Mr. PRIEST. But there is nothing that requires that it should be done uniformly throughout the country. There is no law requiring it.

Mr. STEFAN. No law that I know of.

Mr. PRIEST. It appears to me that the question of safety is a very vital factor.

Mr. STEFAN. I do not think the gentleman will have cause for worry, for Congress is anxious to have CAA supervision in order that they may have a uniform operation of control towers. We are for safety.

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the House subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments authorized to investigate publicity and propaganda in the executive agencies intends to scrutinize the activities of the Interior Department employees on the west coast.

Information now before my committee indicates that employees of the Bureau of Reclamation have been attending public meetings, urging that appropriation slashes be restored to carry out programs of public power projects sponsored by the Interior Department, and asking that new items be included.

The committee will check to determine whether or not Federal laws prohibiting the use of public funds for propaganda purposes to influence Congress have been violated. I refer particularly to section 201 of title 18 of the Federal statutes.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FOLGER. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and two Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is recognized.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, at the outset and before this House I wish to pay my sincere respects to the chairman of the subcommittee which handled this important appropriation bill, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]. The hearings on this appropriation bill began the first part of February, and through the many, many weeks that followed in the course of the hearings the gentleman from Nebraska was most patient and tolerant of the other members of the committee and their ideas, and was eminently fair and just in each of the decisions he was called upon to make. I say on behalf of the minority members of the committee that it was a genuine pleasure to have served under the chairmanship of such a fine gentleman as the gentleman from Nebraska. The same applies to my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN], to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], and to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN]. They are all fine hard-working intelligent gentlemen.

However, I do not want you to gain the impression that we agreed on all the items in this appropriation bill, because once again the minority Appropriations Committee members found themselves confronted with a situation where the reduction of amounts by the majority was the usual meat-ax slashing that has been so familiar since we first started on the appropriation bills for the coming fiscal year.

In a number of instances the majority members of the Appropriations Committee have hidden behind points of order. They always raise points of order except when they apply to certain items in which they are politically interested. The opposite prevails on other occasions. Barely 2 weeks ago when we had before the House the Interior Department appropriation bill the House Committee on Appropriations under strict command of the majority went to the Rules Committee and obtained a rule waiving



a point of order with regard to the location of an anthracite research laboratory so as to effectuate a transfer of the plans of the Interior Department to build it at Hazleton, Pa., to a cross-roads town I never heard of before, called Schuylkill Haven. It was all right in that instance for the majority to go to the Rules Committee and obtain a rule waiving the point of order. But why did not the majority in the Committee on Appropriations go to the Rules Committee on this bill and obtain a rule waiving points of order with reference to the foreign information and cultural program of the State Department, which the chairman of this committee says he is in favor of? Why did they not go to the Rules Committee and obtain a rule which would have permitted an item in this bill entitled "Miscellaneous salaries"—the judiciary—which they took out of the bill in the entire amount of \$1,833,500? Do you know what that item means? That item supplies the law secretaries and law clerks and certain librarians, even some building custodians, for the Federal judiciary throughout this Nation. It has been in this appropriation bill for years. The majority at no time heretofore raised the question on this appropriation or sought to reduce the amount of it.

I say that insofar as this particular appropriation bill is concerned, the committee like the mountain labored and brought forth an economy mouse.

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

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to my distinguished friend the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the RECORD ought to be clear on this point-of-order proposition. We know that the majority of the Appropriations Committee could have included an appropriation for the Voice of America and for our radio activities abroad; they could have gone to the Rules Committee and got a rule waiving the point of order.

Mr. ROONEY. Certainly.

Mr. McCORMACK. That has been done very frequently and, as the gentleman said, it was done recently when there was an attempt by one group of Republicans to take a project from another Member of the House. These were Republican Members of the House. They put it in the bill, went to the Rules Committee and got a rule waiving the point of order. So this idea they cannot include an item in this appropriation bill because it is not authorized by law, of course, is not correct, because they could have done it, then got a rule from the Rules Committee waiving the point of order.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman from Massachusetts is absolutely correct.

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

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. Of course, the gentleman knows there was an authorization for that anthracite laboratory.

Mr. ROONEY. Yes; there was an authorization for the anthracite laboratory

but I do not think the gentleman from Pennsylvania ever saw an appropriation bill previously which directed the department to locate a project, such as the building of a laboratory, in a particular cross-roads town of a particular State.

Mr. FENTON. The gentleman from Pennsylvania only did that when it was a gross violation of the enacting legislation that made the laboratory possible.

Mr. ROONEY. Well, I appreciate what the gentleman says, but I cannot agree with him.

Mr. FENTON. I just wanted to point out to the gentleman that there is no comparison in the two instances that he just quoted.

Mr. ROONEY. Of course, that is only the contention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. It is not my idea. I think the situations are thoroughly analogous.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield, with the hope that shortly thereafter I may be permitted to continue with my remarks.

Mr. McCORMACK. Absolutely it is the same situation. In that case there was no authority in law for the Committee on Appropriations to take the action it did. The majority put it in the bill and they went to the Rules Committee, waiving points of order, and the same thing here. If the majority of the committee wanted to put in an appropriation for the Voice of America, it could have been done. They could have gone to the Committee on Rules waiving points of order and a majority of the House, adopting that rule, no Member could have raised the point of order.

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

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I am a little surprised at the distinguished majority whip taking the position he does today. He advises this committee to violate the rules of the House, which he has always sacredly respected, on the floor at least. He well knows that under the rules of the House the Committee on Appropriations does not have jurisdiction to report legislation, and that every time the Committee on Rules, since I have been in the House, brought in a rule violating the rules of the House that they apologized for so doing, and they invariably said that they would not do it again. Yet the gentleman now advises the House to pay no attention to the Committee on Appropriations, to pay no attention to the rules of the House, to pay no attention to the law, because it is not only law it is a rule of the House under the Reorganization Act, and I am shocked and surprised, and last, but not least, grieved that the political exigencies of the occasion are such that my distinguished and sincere friend will advocate such disregard and such disrespect for law.

Mr. ROONEY. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman is shocked, but I yielded for a question rather than a speech. As long as the gentleman from Michigan has brought up this particular subject about points of order and legislation on appropriation bills, I refer him

to page 9 of this bill, lines 21, 22, and 23, where the language is subject to a point of order because it is legislation on an appropriation bill. This was written into this bill in the meeting of the full Appropriations Committee by the majority members of that committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is amazing to hear the remarks made by my distinguished friend from Michigan. Why, he brought in rules repeatedly waiving points of order, and he has voted for them; at least, he voted for them in the Committee on Rules, and the Committee on Rules only the other day brought in a rule waiving a point of order. You did that on the school-luncheon program, and the gentleman's own observation, having in mind what his own committee did only a few days ago, is the best answer for him. Furthermore, you have a rule up there now trying to waive a point of order on this wool legislation, on this 50-percent import fee, and it will be very interesting to see what the Republican members of the Committee on Rules do on that.

Mr. ROONEY. I have a grave suspicion about what they will do.

Let me say this: After virtually wrecking our State and Commerce Departments at the most critical time in our Nation's history; after abolishing in toto and with one fell swoop our propaganda program and Radio Voice of America, so vitally necessary to present our superior way of life and just doctrines to the peoples of the world, including, particularly, the slave population of Communist Russia; after destroying our Census Bureau, so important to the American businessman, both large and small; after ruining our aeronautics administration, the Federal-aid airport program, technical development of aviation, and preventing establishment of air-navigation facilities; after demolishing the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce and precluding the proper functioning of our Federal courts, the total cut made by the majority members of this committee covering the entire bill now before us, is \$25,000,000, less than one-half of 1 percent of President Truman's total budget estimate of \$37,500,000,000 for the coming fiscal year.

After their devastating destruction of these vital departments of our Government, the total cut of \$162,893,515 is not much more than 2½ percent of the billions they assured the American people they would cut from the budget.

No wonder the Republican legislative budget has disappeared. Where is it? Does anyone know? It must have evaporated into thin air. We have not heard a word about this legislative budget since the 15th of February, when it was supposed to have been completed.

I shall now address myself to one of the items mentioned near the conclusion of his address by my distinguished friend from Nebraska, the chairman of the committee [Mr. STEFAN], and that is the

subject of air traffic control towers. I say to the House now that I am prepared to offer an amendment when the bill is read for amendment tomorrow to restore the money for these vitally necessary air traffic control towers.

The proposed cut of \$4,849,000 for air traffic-control towers means that air safety in the United States will be deliberately jeopardized.

I think the Members of the House ought to realize, before they vote on this bill, the importance of the airport traffic-control tower. Because this is a human service rendered to pilots in times of emergency, mostly brought on by bad weather conditions, it is probably the most fundamental and important of the aids which the Nation has created to promote safety in the air. Just as these towers stand out physically at every airport—and all of us have seen hundreds of them—so the service which they render in bringing in air travelers to safe landing, stands out among the aids provided by the CAA.

Foremost in our consideration must be the question of the uniformity in tower operation and the high quality of the personnel employed. We must have the same sort of control all over the airways, and that means that the same organization which trains and supervises the man who operates the tower at Pocatello, Idaho, must be in charge of the operators at Chicago.

Let me say here too, that the airport traffic tower at Pocatello is just about as important as that at Chicago, or Cleveland, or Detroit. It is an integral part of the safety aids of our airway system.

Yet, the majority of this committee recommends that these traffic-control towers should be financed by the municipalities and States. On the face of it, this is a preposterous and unworkable condition and threatens to close down all of the 148 airport traffic-control towers with the exception of the one in Washington.

Among these 148 cities, there would be five possible actions, four of them highly disruptive of the present smooth-working system which daily saves lives.

Some cities, undoubtedly, will stand up and provide the funds to operate their towers under CAA supervision. These will be the larger cities, like New York, Chicago, Atlanta, New Orleans, and Kansas City where the importance of air travel already is established, and where a large volume of air traffic flows through their ports. Local needs, added to national needs, will influence them.

Others will arbitrarily refuse to provide the money and the towers will be closed. Some local officials will be unimpressed with the necessity for continued operation of their tower in the whole Federal airways scheme of things.

Other communities, and there are many of them all over the country, are unable to bear this expense. Minimum cost for operation of a tower averages about \$30,000 a year. Put this item into the budget of such towns as Burlington, Vt., Cheyenne, Wyo., Albuquerque, N. Mex., Lynchburg, Va., Great Falls, Mont., San Juan, P. R., and all the relatively small towns in Alaska, and

consider the results. In these and many other towns also, this may be an impossible financial burden. It means the towers at those places will be closed. And that means adding hazards to flying.

There will be a fourth category of towns among these 148 who will agree to operate the towers, but with strings attached. This, from the point of view of uniformity on the airways, is unthinkable.

Even with complete agreement among these 148 cities to take over the expense of operating the towers, there would be a period of confusion and neglect while the action is processed through the 148 city councils and local governments.

We have a duty to look closely at the consequences of this kind of economy, gentlemen. The lack of traffic control towers can mean death to air travelers. At Columbus, Ga., recently two planes were approaching the airport. One carried 8 pilots and officials of one of our important air lines. The other was flown by a private pilot, flying for pleasure around the field. Due, all experts agree, to the absence of a control tower at that field, the small plane clipped the tail surfaces from the air-line plane and 9 men burned to death on the runway before the very eyes of the spectators, tragically unable to be of any help. This sort of thing can happen anywhere, under similar conditions, but with control operators on duty they can be avoided.

I say that we are tempting fate through this effort to save the amount of less than \$5,000,000 which comparatively is a mere pittance to what is expended on less important projects. We are denying to our people who buy tickets on the air lines, and to our nonschedule fliers carrying passengers and freight, and even to our private fliers, the benefits of a Federal service which never yet has failed them, and the absence of which we can be morally certain will lead to new and horrifying air accidents.

I shall insert a list of airport traffic control towers and Aeronautical Administration communication stations which will be entirely eliminated under the provisions of this present appropriation bill. I shall also insert a list of 39 field offices for businessmen of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce and a list of 48 field offices of the Bureau of the Census which will be eliminated because of the cuts made by the committee which reported this bill. I am going to insert, with the permission of the House, a list of the cities in this Nation which will be affected by curtailment of the retail and service trades census, as well as of the very high frequency radio ranges, instrument landing systems, high intensity approach light lanes and ground controlled approach radar systems, which will not be established as the result of the actions of the majority of this committee; also a statement or list of the places affected by the proposed budget reductions on aviation weather stations.

Permit me to call your attention to the list of Federal airport projects which will be affected by the provisions of this bill

as written by the Republican members of the committee. In Arizona it will be necessary to cut out the projects shown in the list of class 4 and larger airports submitted to the Congress on February 28, 1947, for Kingman, Douglas, Winslow, Prescott, and Nogales. In addition, it will be necessary to reduce the Phoenix project by \$346,000.

Arkansas: They will have to drop Little Rock, Texarkana, and El Dorado projects, and reduce Fort Smith by \$71,000.

In California it will be necessary to drop completely the Federal airport projects at Palmdale, Hawthorne, Visalia, Palm Springs, Porterville, Oxnard, Ontario, Marysville, Concord, Little River, Bakersfield, Crescent City, Montague, Banning, Hayward, Napa, Bishop, Santa Rosa, Santa Monica, Oakland, and San Diego, and to reduce the Los Angeles project by \$759,000.

In the State of Colorado it will be necessary to drop completely the airport projects proposed for La Junta and Colorado Springs, and reduce Denver airport by \$568,000.

In Connecticut—and I trust the gentlemen from Connecticut will listen to me—it will be necessary to drop the proposed Federal airport projects at Groton and Windsor Locks, and to reduce Bridgeport airport project by \$76,000.

In Florida it will be necessary to drop Gainesville and Jacksonville No. 1, and reduce Lakeland by \$20,000.

In Georgia it will be necessary to drop Macon and Valdosta, and reduce Atlanta airport by \$567,000.

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

Mr. ROONEY. In just a moment. I will get to Washington as soon as I can.

In Idaho—and I trust the gentlemen from Idaho will hear me when I say it will be necessary to reduce the proposed airport project at Coeur d'Alene by \$85,000.

In Illinois it will be necessary to eliminate completely the projects at Champaign, Decatur, Springfield, and Quincy, and to reduce the Chicago airport project by \$1,030,000.

In Indiana it will be necessary to eliminate completely Seymour, Evansville, Fort Wayne, Terre Haute, and Richmond, and reduce Indianapolis airport by \$186,000.

In Iowa it becomes necessary to eliminate completely the projects at Sioux City, Waterloo, Ottumwa, and Dubuque, and to reduce the Davenport-Moline airport project by \$580,000.

In Kansas, eliminate completely Great Bend, Hays-Walker, Herington, Pratt, Liberal, Dodge City, Garden City, Jetmore, Kansas City, Winfield, Arkansas City, Coffeyville and Hutchinson airport project, and to reduce the Wichita airport project by \$101,000.

In Kentucky, eliminate the project at Covington and reduce the Louisville project by \$32,000.

In Louisiana, drop Lafayette, Alexandria, Mansfield, Opelousas, Baton Rouge, New Orleans (Alvin Callender) and Monroe projects, and reduces the New Orleans (Moisant International) airport by \$104,000.



Over here in Maryland it becomes necessary to reduce the moneys which this Congress voted in the last session; we authorized these projects only in June of last year—

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

Mr. ROONEY. Not at this time. I am sorry.

Mr. HORAN. But this is the very point at which I wish the gentleman to yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not yield at this time.

In Maryland they reduce the Baltimore airport project by almost half a million dollars.

In the State of Massachusetts it will be necessary to eliminate the proposals for Beverly and Orange, and to reduce the Boston airport project by \$606,000.

In the State of Michigan, this bill eliminates completely the projects at Muskegon, Traverse City, Lansing, Flint, Battle Creek, and Saginaw—Tri-City—and reduces the Grand Rapids airport project by \$326,000.

In Minnesota, it eliminates completely Alexandria, Bemidji, Duluth, Rochester, and reduces the Minneapolis project by \$375,000.

In Missouri it eliminates Malden, Kansas City, Springfield and St. Joseph; and reduces the St. Louis airport project by almost a million dollars.

In Montana, it eliminates Glasgow, Missoula, Miles City, Great Falls, Lewistown, and Cut Bank; and reduces Billings Airport by \$161,000.

In Nebraska, it eliminates completely the projects at McCook, Harvard, Scribner, Fairmont, Bruning, Norfolk, Alliance, Ainsworth, Grand Island, Scottsbluff, and North Platte; and reduces the Omaha Airport by \$206,000.

In New Jersey, this bill takes \$498,000 away from the Newark Airport, one of the most important in the country.

In New Mexico, they reduce the Albuquerque Airport by \$24,000.

In my State of New York the majority of this committee eliminates completely airports in a number of up-State towns and cities, including Schenectady, Watertown, Plattsburg, Islip—that is on Long Island—White Plains, Syracuse, and Rochester; and reduces the LaGuardia Field project by \$630,000.

In North Dakota, they eliminated Jamestown, Grand Forks, and Minot projects; and reduce Bismarck Airport by \$83,000.

In Ohio, they eliminate completely Zanesville, Springfield, Mansfield, and Columbus; and reduce the Youngstown Airport by \$142,000.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. Not at this time.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I would like to make an observation at this point.

Mr. ROONEY. I will yield after I have finished my list, but I cannot yield now.

In Oklahoma, they eliminate completely Hobart, Cushing, Stillwater, Woodward, Ada, Enid, Tulsa, and Oklahoma City projects, and reduce the Ponca City Airport project by \$29,000.

In the State of Oregon, they eliminate completely proposed projects at

Denmark, Tillamook, Pendleton, Astoria, Eugene, Newport, The Dalles, North Bend, Medford, Troutdale, and Corvallis; and reduce the Portland Airport, one of the most important in the Northwest, by \$57,000.

In Pennsylvania, they eliminate the projects for Reading, Wilkes-Barre, Scranton; and reduce the Pittsburgh Airport project by \$525,000.

In Rhode Island \$115,000 is taken away from the Providence Airport.

In South Dakota \$28,000 is taken from the Sioux Falls Airport.

In Tennessee, the bill eliminates Knoxville, Nashville, and Memphis projects, and reduces the Chattanooga Airport by \$408,000.

In Texas it eliminates El Paso, Olney, San Antonio, Palacios, College Station, Temple, Alice, Tyler, Sweetwater, Waco, Brownwood, Brownsville, San Antonio—Alamo Field, San Angelo, Corpus Christi, and Austin, and reduces the Fort Worth Airport, a very important airport, by \$183,000.

In Vermont, \$75,000 is taken away from the airport at Burlington.

In Virginia, this bill reduces the Norfolk Airport by \$231,000 and eliminates entirely the project at Danville.

In the State of Washington it eliminates completely Port Angeles, Bremerton, Renton, Ellensburg, Olympia, Yakima, Everett, Bellingham, Aberdeen-Hoquiam, and Pullman, and reduces the Seattle Airport project by \$335,000.

In the State of West Virginia it eliminates Martinsburg and Wheeling, and reduces the Charleston Airport by \$261,000.

In the State of Wisconsin the majority of this committee eliminated completely the airport projects at Oshkosh, Madison, Janesville-Beloit, and La Crosse, and reduced the Milwaukee Airport by \$155,000.

So much for the devastating damage that has been done to the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

A while ago I mentioned an item that has been cut out of this bill, an item that has been carried in it for years, an item that the present majority members of this committee voted for last year, the year before and the year before that. I refer to the item regarding miscellaneous salaries for the judiciary. This is for the employment of law clerks, judges' secretaries, certain librarians, and building custodians. Last year the Congress voted \$1,750,000 for this item. Add to this the money under Public Law 390, which is mandatory, in the amount of \$83,500. You have a total amount of \$1,833,500. There was not a nickel requested beyond the amount received last year by the Federal judges throughout this Nation for their secretaries and for their clerks. If you ever heard of the headless horsemen of economy continuing to ride, they sure did on this item.

There are 113 Federal judges who have law clerks. The Federal judges' clerk system is patterned after a system such as we have here for clerk hire for Members of Congress. They have a \$6,500 allowance for running their offices. There are a few exceptions in the cases of senior circuit court and senior district court judges who are allowed \$7,500 per annum for this purpose. We all

know how much each Member of Congress is allowed for his office. These Federal judges in places such as New York, Brooklyn, Chicago, and the other large cities of the country, where they work and work hard, have a greater volume of work to perform. I do not say they work any harder or are any better lawyers than in any other part of the country, but there is a larger volume of work in these large cities. It is absolutely imperative that they have a law clerk and a law secretary. This item, after having been in this bill for years, is now being cut out completely. Why? To make up the \$6,000,000,000 that has been proposed to be cut from the budget? Why, it is only like a 5-cent piece, this item, when compared with \$6,000,000,000. But as the result of its elimination you cripple the functioning of 113 Federal courts throughout the Nation.

Now, I would like to discuss the matter of referees in bankruptcy, another item in this bill which had been completely eliminated in the subcommittee, but inserted in the full Committee on Appropriations to the extent of approximately half of the amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget for referees in bankruptcy.

It was only on the 28th of June 1946—last June, less than a year ago—that this Congress voted and the members of the subcommittee and the full committee who were here in the Seventy-ninth Congress voted for Public Law 465, which was introduced by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hobbs]. It proposed to change a vicious system which has existed for many years, wherein referees in bankruptcy are paid by the litigants out of the proceeds of the litigation; wherein referees in bankruptcy were remunerated very handsomely by the amount of increased litigation which came before them. So a system was devised by the gentleman from Alabama, Judge Hobbs, wherein the litigants would pay into the Federal court and thence into the Federal Treasury certain fees which would be sufficient to pay the salaries of these referees in bankruptcy. It was provided that if it was found that there was not sufficient money to pay the salaries fixed, that the fees to be paid by the litigants would be increased, so that there would be no moneys drawn from the Federal Treasury for this item.

Pursuant to the decision of this Congress, the mandate, if you please, of this Congress, issued as recently as the 28th of June 1946, they are now ready to inaugurate the new sensible system. They ask for the amount \$755,000 to pay for 49 full-time and 117 part-time referees in bankruptcy and the amount \$675,000 to pay for 137 full-time and 78 part-time clerks. These amounts which I have just mentioned, requested by the Bureau of the Budget, provide for approximately half of the number of referees that you now have operating or officiating as referees in bankruptcy.

As of January 1, 1947, we had 330 referees in bankruptcy. Under the new system, which is sensible economy, not penny-wise and pound-foolish economy such as this appropriation bill contains,

the number of referees will be reduced to 166. Each referee then becomes an impartial judge. He is not beholden to either of the litigants or any of the litigants or their attorneys. He operates fairly and impartially and it will not make any difference to him whether the bankrupt estate is \$500 or \$5,000,000, yet the Republican majority destroy this plan before it can be started.

I now want to discuss a cut made to the extent of \$1,500,000 in the Immigration and Naturalization Service. The amount of \$342,000, covering 131 positions, was voluntarily deducted by this bureau before the matter came to the Subcommittee on Appropriations.

There are in the course of a year 75,000,000 border crossings. There are 702,620 applications pending for citizenship. In 1946 it became necessary to deport 116,330 people, as compared with the insignificant number of 17,792 in 1939. In the first 6 months of the present fiscal year, that is, beginning July 1, 1946, there were 73,372 people deported. Also, in the first 6 months of the present fiscal year 249,039 alien seamen entered the United States. Is it sensible economy to cut viciously a bureau which protects the citizens of this country, and which will see that those alien seamen return to their ships as they should not enter the country illegally? Is it not necessary to deport the people convicted of serious crimes, dope peddlers, sex offenders, counterfeiters, and others who have no regard at all for our Government, who have been convicted of serious crimes, and who are not citizens of this country? Or do you want those people to stay here? I cannot for the life of me see why the majority of this committee slashes a bureau which gives a real service to the American people in keeping our homes and our country inviolate.

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

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

Mr. LYNCH. Does the gentleman suppose the cut made by the Committee on Appropriations insofar as referees in bankruptcy are concerned was made because the Republicans realized that we are going into a period of unprecedented business prosperity and they think, therefore, we do not need referees in bankruptcy?

Mr. ROONEY. I am at a loss to figure them out, I may say to the gentleman.

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

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. FARRINGTON. In the list of airports the gentleman read I noted the gentleman did not include the Territories. Have they been covered in the deliberations of the committee?

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman will find the particulars in the matter which I will cause to be inserted in the RECORD.

#### LIST OF AIRPORT TRAFFIC CONTROL TOWERS AND AERONAUTICAL COMMUNICATION STATIONS ELIMINATED

##### AIRPORT TRAFFIC CONTROL TOWERS, 148

Abilene, Tex.; Akron, Ohio; Albany, N. Y.; Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Amarillo, Tex.; Anchorage, Alaska; Annette, Alaska; Atlanta, Ga.; Augusta, Ga.; Austin, Tex.; Bakersfield,

Calif.; Baltimore, Md.; Bangor, Maine; Baton Rouge, La.; Battle Creek, Mich.; Big Spring, Tex.; Bismarck, N. Dak.; Billings, Mont.; Birmingham, Ala.; Boise, Idaho; Boston, Mass.; Bridgeport, Conn.; Bristol, Tenn.; Brownsville, Tex.; Buffalo, N. Y.; Burbank, Calif.; Burlington, Vt.; Charleston, S. C.; Charlotte, N. C.; Cheyenne, Wyo.; Chattanooga, Tenn.; Chicago (Douglas), Ill.; Chicago (Municipal), Ill.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Cleveland, Ohio; Columbia, S. C.; Columbus, Ohio; Corpus Christi, Tex.; Covington, Ky.; Dallas, Tex.; Dayton, Ohio; Daytona Beach, Fla.; Des Moines, Iowa; Denver, Colo.; Detroit, Mich.; Duluth, Minn.; El Paso, Tex.; Erie, Pa.; Evansville, Ind.; Fairbanks, Alaska; Fargo, N. Dak.; Flint, Mich.; Fort Wayne, Ind.; Fort Worth, Tex.; Fresno, Calif.; Grand Rapids, Mich.; Great Falls, Mont.; Greensboro, N. C.; Greenville, S. C.; Harrisburg, Pa.; Hartford, Conn.; Helena, Mont.; Honolulu, T. H.; Houston, Tex.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Jackson, Miss.; Jacksonville, Fla.; Juneau, Alaska; Kansas City, Mo.; Kansas City, Kans.; Knoxville, Tenn.; Lansing, Mich.; Las Vegas, Nev.; Little Rock, Ark.; Long Beach, Calif.; Louisville, Ky.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Lynchburg, Va.; Medford, Oreg.; Memphis, Tenn.; Miami, Fla.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Minneapolis, Minn.; Mobile, Ala.; Montgomery, Ala.; Nashville, Tenn.; Newark, N. J.; New Orleans, La.; New York (Floyd Bennett), N. Y.; New York (LaGuardia), N. Y.; Niagara Falls, N. Y.; Norfolk, Va.; Oakland, Calif.; Ogden, Utah; Oklahoma City, Okla.; Omaha, Neb.; Orlando, Fla.; Palm Springs, Calif.; Pendleton, Oreg.; Peoria, Ill.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Phoenix, Ariz.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; Pocatello, Idaho; Portland, Maine; Portland, Oreg.; Presque Isle, Maine; Providence, R. I.; Raleigh, N. C.; Reading, Pa.; Red Bluff, Calif.; Reno, Nev.; Richmond, Va.; Roanoke, Va.; Rochester, Minn.; Rochester, N. Y.; Sacramento, Calif.; San Antonio, Tex.; Salt Lake City, Utah; San Diego, Calif.; San Francisco, Calif.; San Juan, P. R.; Santa Barbara, Calif.; Savannah, Ga.; Seattle, Wash.; Shreveport, La.; Sioux City, Iowa; South Bend, Ind.; Spokane, Wash.; St. Louis, Mo.; Spartanburg, S. C.; Syracuse, N. Y.; Tallahassee, Fla.; Tampa, Fla.; Texarkana, Tex.; Toledo, Ohio; Topeka, Kans.; Tucson, Ariz.; Tulsa, Okla.; West Palm Beach, Fla.; Wichita, Kans.; Wichita Falls, Tex.; Williamsport, Pa.; Winslow, Ariz.; Winston-Salem, N. C.; Yakima, Wash.; Yakutat, Alaska; Youngstown, Ohio.

#### AERONAUTICAL COMMUNICATIONS STATIONS, 59

Aberdeen, S. Dak.; Alice, Tex.; Anderson, S. C.; Anniston, Ala.; Anthony, Kans.; Anton Chico, N. Mex.; Ardmore, Okla.; Arlington, Oreg.; Ashley, N. Dak.; Atlantic, Iowa; Brookville, Pa.; Cadillac, Mich.; Cherry Fork, Ohio; Chillicothe, Mo.; Clarendon, Tex.; Crestview, Fla.; Custer, Mont.; Dansville, N. Y.; Dunkirk, N. Y.; Easton, Wash.; Evergreen, Ala.; Fallon, Nev.; Findlay, Ohio; Flint, Mich.; Gabbs, Nev.; Gladwin, Mich.; Glens Falls, N. Y.; Golva, N. Dak.; Gooding, Idaho; Greenville, S. C.; Houlton, Maine; Iowa City, Iowa; La Grange, Oreg.; Lebanon, N. H.; Malad City, Idaho; Milroy, Ind.; Montpelier, Vt.; New Florence, Mo.; Oceanside, Calif.; Ontario, Oreg.; Overton, Neb.; Palacios, Tex.; Perry, Ohio; Phillip, S. Dak.; Providence, R. I.; Saginaw, Mich.; Santa Fe, N. Mex.; Sidney, Neb.; Socorro, N. Mex.; Strevell, Idaho; Sulphur Springs, Tex.; Sunbury, Pa.; Tonopah, Nev.; Trona, Calif.; Tuscaloosa, Ala.; Tyler, Miss.; Vicksburg, Miss.; Yoakum, Tex.; Zanesville, Ohio.

#### FIELD OFFICES—BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

The proposed reduction in appropriations for fiscal 1948 will require the abandonment of Department of Commerce Field Offices in the following cities:

Alabama: Birmingham; Arizona: Phoenix; Arkansas: Little Rock; California: San Diego; Connecticut: New Haven; Idaho: Boise; Illinois: Peoria; Indiana: Evansville; Iowa: Des Moines; Kansas: Wichita; Maine: Portland;

Massachusetts: Worcester; Michigan: Grand Rapids; Minnesota: Duluth; Mississippi: Jackson; Montana: Butte; Nebraska: Fremont; Nevada: Reno; New Hampshire: Manchester; New Mexico: Albuquerque; New York: Albany, Rochester, Syracuse; North Dakota: Fargo; Ohio: Columbus, Toledo; Pennsylvania: Erie, Scranton; South Dakota: Sioux Falls; Tennessee: Chattanooga, Nashville; Texas: San Antonio, Texarkana; Utah: Salt Lake City; Vermont: Burlington; Virginia: Norfolk; Washington: Spokane; West Virginia: Charleston; Wyoming: Cheyenne.

#### FIELD OFFICES—BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

The field offices of the Bureau of the Census are used for direct canvass of population and establishments to insure efficient, prompt, and reliable census returns. A reduction in appropriation requires that the following 48 Bureau of the Census field offices be eliminated:

Alabama: Clanton, Montgomery; Arkansas: El Dorado, Jonesboro; California: Madera; Connecticut: New Haven; Georgia: Cochran; Illinois: Pittsfield, Taylorville; Indiana: Bloomfield; Kentucky: Hopkinsville, Louisville; Louisiana: New Iberia, New Orleans; Maine: Presque Isle; Michigan: Boyne City; Minnesota: Duluth, St. Paul; Missouri: Fredericktown, Maryville; Nebraska: Scottsbluff; New York: Elmira; North Carolina: Charlotte, Rocky Mount; North Dakota: Fargo; Ohio: Chillicothe, Eaton, Lima, Portsmouth, Youngstown; Oklahoma: Poteau, Tulsa; Oregon: La Grande, Portland; Pennsylvania: Altoona, Erie; South Dakota: Wessington Springs; Tennessee: Johnson City; Texas: Gilmer, Houston, Livingston; Vermont: Barre; Virginia: Hopewell; Washington: Yakima; West Virginia: Lewisburg, Welch, Wheeling; Wisconsin: Fond du Lac.

#### RETAIL AND SERVICE TRADES CENSUS

Under the proposed appropriation cuts, it will be impossible to extend the present current retail and service-trade reports program to the 24 cities having 100,000 or more inhabitants which are not now covered by the program. Consequently, there will be no reports for these cities for the retail and service trades showing the trend in business as measured by percentage change in sales or receipts from the preceding month and the preceding year by individual kinds of business. The following cities are affected by this elimination of proposed program:

Bridgeport, Conn.; Miami, Fla.; Tampa, Fla.; Peoria, Ill.; South Bend, Ind.; Des Moines, Iowa; Fall River, Mass.; Lowell, Mass.; New Bedford, Mass.; Flint, Mich.; Duluth, Minn.; Omaha, Neb.; Trenton, N. J.; Albany, N. Y.; Utica, N. Y.; Canton, Ohio; Dayton, Ohio; Oklahoma City, Okla.; Reading, Pa.; Chattanooga, Tenn.; Nashville, Tenn.; Knoxville, Tenn.; Spokane, Wash.; Tacoma, Wash.

#### LIST OF VERY HIGH FREQUENCY RADIO RANGES, INSTRUMENT LANDING SYSTEMS, HIGH-INTENSITY APPROACH LIGHT LANES, AND GROUND-CONTROLLED APPROACH RADAR SYSTEMS WHICH WILL NOT BE ESTABLISHED

##### VEHF RADIO RANGES, 42

Arlee, Tex.; Augusta, Maine; Bangor, Maine; Barre-Montpelier, Vt.; Bowie, Tex.; Burlington, Vt.; Concord, N. H.; Cross City, Fla.; Dawson, N. Mex.; Dodge City, Kans.; Dunnellon, Fla.; Engle, N. Mex.; Garden City, Kans.; Glens Falls, N. Y.; Greenville, Ky.; Holly, Colo.; Houlton, Maine; Hutchinson, Kans.; La Junta, Colo.; Las Cruces, N. Mex.; Las Vegas, N. Mex.; Lawrence, Mass.; Lewistown, Maine; Luray, Mo.; Manchester, N. H.; Millinocket, Maine; Mt. Vernon, Ill.; New Hackensack, N. Y.; New York, N. Y.; Ottumwa, Iowa; Portland, Maine; Presque Isle, Maine; Quincy, Ill.; Santa Fe, N. Mex.; Socorro, N. Mex.; Stafford, Kans.; St. Croix, Ind.; Trinidad, Colo.; Vernon, Tex.; Waterville, Maine; White River Junction, Vt.; Wichita, Falls, Tex.



## INSTRUMENT LANDING SYSTEMS, 38

Abilene, Tex.; Albany, N. Y.; Augusta, Ga.; Austin, Tex.; Burlington, Vt.; Chicago (Park Ridge), Ill.; Columbia, S. C.; Deming, N. Mex.; Elkins, W. Va.; Evansville, Ind.; Florence, S. C.; Fort Smith, Ark.; Garden City, Kans.; Huntington, W. Va.; Hutchinson, Kans.; Lancaster, Pa.; Laredo, Tex.; Las Vegas, N. Mex.; Lewiston, Mont.; Lubbock, Tex.; Macon, Ga.; Miles City, Mont.; Missoula, Mont.; Montgomery, Ala.; Ottumwa, Iowa; Pocatello, Idaho; Pueblo, Colo.; Quincy, Ill.; Roanoke, Va.; Salem, Oreg.; Scranton, Pa.; Sioux City, Iowa; Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; Tallahassee, Fla.; Texarkana, Ark.; Tri-City, Tenn.; Watertown, S. Dak.; Wenatchee, Wash.

## HIGH INTENSITY APPROACH LIGHT LANES, 38

Akron, Ohio; Albany, N. Y.; Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Amarillo, Tex.; Baltimore, Md.; Billings, Mont.; Brownsville, Tex.; Charleston, S. C.; Charlotte, N. C.; Cheyenne, Wyo.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Columbus, Ohio; El Paso, Tex.; Eugene, Oreg.; Fargo, N. Dak.; Fort Wayne, Ind.; Grand Junction, Colo.; Knoxville, Tenn.; Las Vegas, Nev.; Louisville, Ky.; Memphis, Tenn.; Meridian, Miss.; Miami, Fla.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Norfolk, Va.; Oklahoma City, Okla.; Omaha, Neb.; Raleigh, N. C.; Richmond, Va.; Rochester, Minn.; Rochester, N. Y.; San Antonio, Tex.; St. Joseph, Mo.; Tallahassee, Fla.; Tucson, Ariz.; White Plains, N. Y.; Wichita, Kans.; Windsor Locks, Conn.

## SURVEILLANCE RADAR UNITS AND GROUND CONTROLLED APPROACH LADAR INSTALLATIONS, 16

Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Atlanta, Ga.; Cincinnati, Ohio (Covington); Cleveland, Ohio; Denver, Colo.; Kansas City, Mo.; Memphis, Tenn.; Minneapolis, Minn.; Newark, N. J.; New Orleans, La.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; Portland, Oreg.; Salt Lake City, Utah; San Francisco, Calif.; St. Louis, Mo.

## EFFECT OF PROPOSED BUDGET REDUCTIONS ON AVIATION WEATHER STATIONS

1. International aviation weather service stations in Central America and the Caribbean which cannot be established:

Balboa, C. Z.; Benedict Field, V. I.; Bluefield, Nicaragua; Ciudad Trujillo, Dominican Republic; Mana ua, Nicaragua; Parrita, Costa Rica; Rey Island, Panama; Roseau, Dominica; San Jose, Guatemala; St. Vincent, St. Thomas.

2. Airport weather service stations in the United States which cannot be established:

Aspermont, Tex.; Clarksburg, W. Va.; Clewiston, Fla.; Colorado Springs, Colo.; East Portal, Colo.; El Dorado, Ark.; Fayetteville, Ark.; Greenfield, Tenn.; Gurdon, Ark.; Huntsville, Ala.; Kerrville, Tex.; Logan, Utah; Lubbock, Tex.; Midland, Tex.; Moffat, Colo.; Monroeville, Ala.; Nogales, Ariz.; Payson, Ariz.; Pine Bluff, Ark.; Rifle, Colo.; Roanoke, Va.; Sarasota, Fla.; Suffolk, Long Island, N. Y.

3. Aviation weather service in Alaska which cannot be established:

Big Delta, Alaska; Gustavus, Alaska; Kokrines, Alaska; Moses Point, Alaska; Naknek, Alaska; Nulato, Alaska; Nunivak, Alaska; Unalakleet, Alaska.

4. International aviation weather service stations which can only be partially implemented:

Honolulu, T. H.; Houston, Tex.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Newark, N. J.; New Orleans, La.; San Francisco, Calif.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 35 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, before discussing the merits or rather the demerits of this bill I desire to pay my respects to the able and distinguished chairman of our subcommittee the gentleman from

Nebraska, Mr. KARL STEFAN, who has labored without ceasing for months in its preparation. His experience acquired during the many years he has served as a member of the committee was invaluable in our deliberations. He showed familiarity with the innermost workings of the various departments and withal he presided with absolute fairness, exhibiting at all times the utmost impartiality and courtesy to the minority members of his committee.

I also desire to express my appreciation of the services of Mr. Orescan, the highly efficient clerk of the committee, who worked with patience, diligence, and understanding at all times, and who has contributed immeasurably to the accomplishments of the committee.

I appeared before the House several weeks ago advocating the passage of the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, which was framed by a subcommittee of which I also had the privilege of being a member. Our committee agreed unanimously on the provisions of that bill, and I fought with the majority Members in resisting amendments offered on the floor of the House. I would that the same situation prevailed with reference to this bill, as I would much prefer to cooperate with the majority in support of the measure. I campaigned for office last fall on a platform of reducing governmental expenditures and it is a little awkward for me to be placed in the role of opposing reductions in the budget at this time. I shall redeem my pledge to the people by voting for all decreases which, in my judgment, will not interfere with the proper functioning of our Government, but I cannot sit idly by and see the foreign program of our State Department sabotaged and small business crucified on a cross of false economy without lifting my voice in protest.

Frankness compels me to say that I believe the subcommittee might have agreed on the bill but for the remote control which was exercised over the majority members. At the very beginning of our hearings, before any witnesses from the Departments of State and Commerce had testified, the chairman of the full committee announced in the public press that the appropriations of the State Department would be severely slashed and that the Department of Commerce would be cut \$100,000,000. My colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] suggested to the chairman of our subcommittee that he thought it was useless for us to waste our time by proceeding with the hearings if the Republican leadership had already determined the final action on the bill. We did proceed, however, for weeks and went very minutely into every detail of the operation of the four departments covered by the bill.

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE AND THE JUDICIARY

We substantially agreed on the appropriations for the Department of Justice and the Judiciary. There are several items in each with which the minority members are not in complete accord. For example, it appears to us that we might have appropriated the

full amount requested for the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, because it is a known fact that we purposely suspended to some extent the operations of that Division during the war, whereas in the postwar era vigilance is needed to prevent operations in restraint of trade which will seriously affect our national economy. The reduction, however, made by the committee was only \$100,000 which is relatively small, and will be accepted, but with reluctance on our part.

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Department of State appropriations, on the other hand, have been slashed beyond all reason and unless a substantial portion of the funds are restored, I fear that much which has been accomplished toward the establishment of international cooperation and world peace will be lost. We are facing the most critical period of international relations in all history. The State Department is the arm of the Government charged with the duty of handling our foreign affairs and of representing our interests in the epoch-making world conferences which are in almost continuous session.

The recent appointment of General Marshall as Secretary of State was received with great satisfaction throughout the Nation. He assumed his new duties with the support of both political parties and the confidence of the people. It is unthinkable that we will now tie his hands and subject him to embarrassment in the delicate negotiations in which he is engaged by denying him sufficient funds to finance an adequate program.

There are some duplications of services in the Department of State, but one of General Marshall's first official acts as Secretary was the appointment of a special assistant to study the organization of the Department, and this assistant has been given full authority to reorganize the Department and to make such changes in personnel as efficiency and economy may demand. This survey is in progress, and it has already accomplished gratifying results.

## INADEQUATE PERSONNEL

General Marshall pointed out in his testimony before our committee that the activities of the Department had necessarily expanded greatly, because of the tremendous international problems which we now face. He stated that one of the greatest handicaps which confronted him in China was the lack of adequate personnel in that field and that the State Department had been able to remedy the situation only by the transfer of personnel from other fields where they were greatly needed. He asked for increased personnel in the Foreign Service to meet the pressing demands on the Department. In this bill his force is materially reduced. He asked for bread, the committee gave him a stone.

Let us glance briefly at the figures for the entire State Department. The appropriations for the fiscal year 1947 were \$181,535,706. The budget estimates for the fiscal year 1948 were \$279,537,623. The committee recommended \$219,128,-

058, which is ostensibly an increase of \$37,592,352 over 1947. Actually, however, included in the recommendations for 1948 is an item of \$50,000,000 which will revert to the Treasury to the credit of surplus property and lend-lease accounts and represents merely a bookkeeping transaction resulting from the acquisition of Properties for our foreign missions and consulates in exchange for surplus property and in settling our lend-lease accounts. Eliminating this item, the Department, notwithstanding its steadily increasing activities, will receive \$12,400,000 less in 1948 than it had available in 1947.

The salaries and expenses of the Secretary's office and the other activities within the United States have been reduced from \$47,000,000 to \$20,000,000, a decrease of almost 60 percent, whereas the salaries and expenses of the Foreign Service have been decreased from \$58,670,000 to \$46,830,000, a decrease of approximately \$12,000,000.

#### INFORMATION AND CULTURAL PROGRAM

Included in these reductions are appropriations for the information and cultural program which have been entirely eliminated. This program is the lone Voice of America in the babble of tongues which are spreading propaganda throughout the world today. The conflict of arms has at least temporarily ended, but we are now engaged in a conflict of ideologies. In that conflict between democracy and totalitarianism words and ideas are as vitally important as were bullets and bombs in the former conflict.

We believe in the American way of life and we have fought for it on numerous fields of battle. It may not be perfect, but under it our Nation has made faster and greater progress than any nation in all history. We are a peace-loving people, but there are certain things that we hold dearer than peace. Nearly two centuries ago the patriot, Patrick Henry, from the pew of a small church in my native city, sounded the keynote of this Republic with the immortal words, "Give me liberty or give me death." The spirit portrayed by that expression has become the heritage of our people and we will defend our liberties with our lives whenever and wherever they are in jeopardy. Let no one within the confines of the United States or outside of it doubt that fact.

But, Mr. Chairman, war is an unsatisfactory and horrible way to settle controversies and in this atomic age it is a constant threat to civilization. Other means of settling our international disputes can and must be found. When he appeared before our committee, Secretary Marshall testified that he was continuing to advocate measures to remove conditions which lead to war and he was asked by our chairman to enumerate some of those conditions.

Of course—

Said the Secretary—

the two primary conditions, I would say, are a combination of complete mistrust on all sides of the motives that are behind each proposition, and then the uncertainty as to

what the aspirations are of the nations concerned.

He then stated:

It is amazing the degree of misrepresentation and misunderstanding and misconception that is had of the United States, its people, and the purposes of this country.

We know that this misunderstanding is due largely to false propaganda circulated by other countries. Our entire information and cultural program is designed to counteract this propaganda and to create a better understanding abroad. It utilizes every available means of communication to disseminate to all parts of the world the true facts about the United States, our people, our policies, and our purposes. Information staffs attached to United States missions are maintained in 76 countries. The Office of OIC assembles accurate news and other factual material for publication in available foreign newspapers and periodicals and for the information of our foreign personnel. It distributes widely foreign-language magazines published by it in countries where other circulation facilities are not available. It prepares and exhibits documentary and informative motion pictures. It sponsors a program providing for the exchange of students, scholars, and technical experts with other countries. It maintains information libraries at strategic points abroad and has promoted several art exhibits.

#### ART EXHIBITS

The art exhibits were arranged in response to criticism frequently made of the United States abroad that our people are materialistic and devoid of culture. They are also used as window dressing to attract visitors to American centers where they are given other information. I fully realize that there has been criticism of some of the modernistic paintings contained in the exhibits. Some of the paintings have been lent to the Government by private owners; some have been purchased by the Government. I certainly would not select some of these paintings as works of art, but I profess complete ignorance in the field of modern art, and I must admit that they do not differ in characteristics from some that I have seen in our best museums. Moreover, immediately following our exhibit in Prague, the Soviet Government hurried a Russian exhibit of 86 paintings to Prague to counteract the favorable impression which had been created. A Russian plane flew over the city dropping free tickets and advertising the exhibit. It does not appear, therefore, that the program is entirely ineffective.

#### VOICE OF AMERICA

Last, but by no means least, is the short-wave-broadcast program which beams the Voice of America in 25 languages to all corners of the earth in various programs totaling 58 hours each day. This voice overleaps the barriers of censorship and carries the truth about America to remote places where it would be impossible for it to penetrate otherwise. The International Board of Control recognizes the rights of the United States to certain frequencies on the

short-wave-broadcast band for international broadcasting. These frequencies are in great demand and if our broadcasting program is discontinued other nations would ask for and receive these frequencies so that we would be unable to reclaim them if in the future we should desire to resume the program. This in itself would be a serious loss which we cannot afford to hazard.

In our recent discussions on relief measures, the Members of this House have insisted that wide publicity accompany the distribution of our bounty so that the recipients may know whence it comes and the motives which prompt our generosity. The only means at our disposal of disseminating this information is the OIC.

I fully recognize that I am in no sense an expert on international affairs, but on this question I have sought information from those who, in my judgment, were best qualified to provide it. When Secretary of State Marshall appeared before our committee, he told us:

One effective way to promote peace is to dispel misunderstanding, fear, and ignorance. Foreign peoples should know the nature and objectives of our foreign policy. They should have a true understanding of American life. This is the purpose of the information and cultural-relations program. \* \* \* I regard this program as an integral and essential part of the conduct of foreign relations. In China I observed at first-hand the consequences of misrepresentation and lack of understanding of the facts about the United States and its policies.

Secretary of Commerce Harriman appeared before our committee to testify on another subject, but realizing that he had represented this Nation as Ambassador in Moscow and in London, where he had an opportunity to observe this program, I asked him for his opinion of its effectiveness. I wish that every Member of this House would read his reply on page 1063 of the Department of State hearings. Time does not permit me to quote him at length, but he said in part:

In our national interest, I know of no single service that I place higher, in importance to our country, than the development of the State Department Information Service. And I want to talk about it from both the positive and the negative side. Every other country—substantial country—has this type of service. Some of them are spending very large amounts of money and energy in spreading misinformation about us, attempting to break down our prestige and our reputation. I don't want to repeat what has been told this committee before, but I know the character of the propaganda that is being indulged in. Unless that is monitored and we know what is being said about us and unless steps are taken, not to answer the misstatements, but to get out real facts about American life, objectives, and policies, it is sure to have a very deep effect on our relations with other countries of the world.

At another point in his discussion, Secretary Harriman stated:

My observation is that the service is so directed that there is virtually no competition. I am ready to stand back of that statement from my own observation. \* \* \* I am frank to say that I couldn't have functioned properly in either post without having that information about America.



He concluded his testimony with these remarks:

To me it is the most profitable investment that we can make in terms of protecting our interests, commercial, as well as political, and if it is abandoned I feel so deeply about it that I don't think there would be anything more fatal, a more fatal blow to the prestige of the United States in general world opinion. I don't see any other means by which the true American story can be gotten over and I do sincerely and earnestly hope that you will find it possible to support this program with the funds that have been requested.

Hon. Arthur Bliss Lane, who had resigned as Ambassador to Poland and had just returned to this country, appeared before our committee and reported on the conditions in Poland. I asked his opinion of the information and cultural program, and while it is to be regretted that practically his entire testimony was off the record and does not appear in the report of the hearings, I can say to you that he was lavish in his praise and expressed the view that it was an essential and important part of our foreign-relations program.

This view is shared by the leaders connected with the radio industry. I personally have heard a number of them express the opinion that the broadcasting program is essential, that it should be continued, that it cannot be financed by private funds and, therefore, must be financed by the Federal Government. Numerous organizations, including the American Legion, have endorsed the program.

Mr. Chairman, how we could even contemplate for one moment the abandonment of the information and cultural program of the State Department at this particular time is beyond my comprehension.

#### INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM

The bill appropriates \$2,490,000 for the intelligence program of the State Department, which is a reduction of \$2,313,000 under the budget estimates and \$1,240,456 below the 1947 appropriation. It will be necessary, therefore, to seriously curtail this program. In this connection, I merely quote the statement of Secretary Marshall which appears on page 9 of the record:

For our day-to-day as well as long-range decisions on the conduct of foreign affairs we must have complete, timely, and objective knowledge of facts. The intelligence program provides a centralized service within the Department to acquire and analyze objectively all foreign political and economic information. We cannot afford to be without full and accurate intelligence. \* \* \* Only when we are fully informed of the acts and intentions of others can we avoid fatal miscalculation of their future policies and objectives.

#### COOPERATION WITH THE AMERICAN REPUBLICS

Even the good-neighbor policy which has been so successfully conducted by the State Department during the last decade and a half is threatened by this bill. We appropriated \$5,375,000 for cooperation with the American Republics in 1947. The budget carried approximately one-half million dollars more for 1948. This bill provides an appropriation of \$3,000,000, which is \$2,375,000 less than the 1947

appropriation and nearly \$3,000,000 less than the budget request.

The fact that during World War II the Americas presented an almost solid front against the aggression of fascism shows that our program has not been in vain. Moreover, our neighbors to the south are lending their cooperation to our present efforts to promote world peace. We recently had a demonstration of beneficial results of the good-neighbor policy in the exchange of visits by President Truman and President Aleman, of Mexico.

We cannot afford to take the chance of losing the good will which our program of cooperation with the American Republics has created. When this matter was discussed in the full committee, I was asked the question if I thought that you could buy good will. I do not think that good will is subject to purchase. Neither can you buy a wife in this enlightened era. Every sophisticated swain knows, however, that the resistance of a prospective consort may be weakened by gifts of flowers and candy and the bestowal of other well-directed attentions.

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The slashes in the appropriations for the Department of Commerce have been even more severe and equally as indiscriminate as in the Department of State. At the conclusion of World War II, we viewed with great apprehension the problem of absorbing in our peacetime program the millions of boys who were being released from the armed forces. There were few of us who did not anticipate a period of recession and unemployment. The Department of Commerce undertook the task of providing aids to stimulate business so as to minimize this condition. The work has been decentralized by the establishment of field offices throughout the United States to provide information and assistance to veterans and business, both large and small.

Large business is more able to provide research and to acquire information than small enterprises, which rely almost entirely upon the information and assistance of the Department of Commerce. Frankly, I must confess that I think there has been some overexpansion in the Department of Commerce and that some reductions can properly be made in its appropriations. I regard it as extremely dangerous, however, to cut the appropriations as drastically as has been done in this bill. Experts are predicting a rescission of business activities within a short time. In view of our present postwar fiscal condition and our staggering Federal debt, a depression would be disastrous to our national economy.

The total appropriations for the Department of Commerce for 1947 were approximately \$200,000,000. The budget estimates for 1948 were \$287,000,000. The bill recommends \$191,000,000, which is \$9,000,000 less than the appropriations for 1947, and \$96,000,000 less than the budget estimates.

The appropriations for the Secretary's Office have been cut \$2,250,000 below the appropriations for 1947, and over \$3,000,000 below the budget esti-

mates. This reduction will substantially curtail the administrative activities of the Department.

#### OFFICE OF TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC SERVICES

Included in the Secretary's Office is the Office of Technical and Scientific Services. For the first time in history we are attempting to collect reparations in scientific knowledge. Our investigators traveled with the vanguard of the Army of Occupation in Germany for the purpose of acquiring all scientific information available. The Office of Technical and Scientific Services has expended approximately \$1,500,000 in the collection of German industrial technology. American business concerns cooperating with the Office have furnished 600 investigators whose travel, salaries, and expenses in acquiring the scientific discoveries of Germany were paid by their private employers. This industry cooperation has been conservatively estimated at \$3,000,000, which is twice the Government contribution. The collections are approaching termination, but the distribution to American science and industry has hardly begun. If funds are withheld, the industrial knowledge which Government and industry have striven so hard to collect will gather dust in Government files and never reach the business community. The funds which have already been expended will, therefore, be largely wasted.

The Office of Technical and Scientific Services does not engage in research, but it contracts for research in competent university and private laboratories, which is a striking reversal of the trend to centralize research in Federal laboratories and with Federal personnel. We are striving to avoid expansion of the Government structure. Here is a program consistent with our philosophy which arranges research in nongovernmental laboratories selected by industry and upon projects which the industry has specifically endorsed. This type of Government-industry cooperation insures that there is no duplication of research effort between Government and industry. Let me stress a vital aspect. The research is carried on in State universities and private laboratories most competent to do the work. Industry has advanced approximately \$250,000 in funds and facilities to supplement the Government's contribution of \$750,000 to date. This is sound evidence that industry wants the program and wants it done under the Office of Technical Services' research program. This is one of the few offices that asked for less for 1948 than it had available in 1947. The committee, however, recommends only \$1,700,000 for the Office, which is a 50-percent cut in the budget estimate and 52 percent less than the appropriations for 1947.

#### THE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

The House Appropriations Committee has recommended a total decrease of 45 percent in the amount requested for the Bureau of the Census. The appropriation for current census statistics has been chopped from \$11,500,000 to \$5,000,-

000—a reduction of over 56 percent. Secretary Harriman has stated that—

The proposed cut would result in a dim-out of the light that business and Government require to make sound decisions. It would be a return to the dark ages of business knowledge at a time when more enlightenment is certainly needed to deal intelligently with the critical problems of today.

#### BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

The Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, which includes the field office service, and the office recently established for the aid of small business, has been allowed only \$7,000,000, which is \$4,500,000 less than the budget estimates and \$3,500,000 less than the appropriation for 1947. This will necessitate the closing of a number of the field offices in various parts of the United States and will be a severe blow to small business and those veterans who are attempting to establish themselves in business enterprises.

#### CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, as I have already stated, I am thoroughly in sympathy with the program to reduce expenditures to the greatest extent consistent with sound governmental policies. I am constrained to believe, however, that in this bill, insofar as the Departments of State and Commerce are concerned, the committee has adopted a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy, which would cripple the work of those Departments and seriously affect our foreign relations and our domestic prosperity. I cannot, therefore, support the bill without substantial modifications.

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

Mr. GARY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has indicated, and I listened very carefully to the address which he has just concluded, both at the beginning and the close of his address that he is a firm believer in economy in government and stated that he was elected on that platform last fall.

Mr. GARY. That is absolutely correct and I make no apologies for it.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman indicate whether or not there is any reduction in this bill that he approves of, and, if so, what?

Mr. GARY. Yes, sir, there is, and I doubt very seriously whether the gentleman will support it. I approve of eliminating from the bill the control towers of the CAA. I wonder if the gentleman will support me in that. It will eliminate \$5,000,000 from the bill, and in addition to that it will save this Government an expense of at least \$100,000,000 annually in my opinion in the years to come.

Mr. KEEFE. Then, the gentleman is in disagreement with the ranking minority member of the committee on that item?

Mr. GARY. I do disagree with the ranking minority member of the committee on that item.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman agree with any other cuts made by the committee, may I ask?

Mr. GARY. I think I covered that in my remarks when I said I thought some

cuts could be made but I do not think there should be slashes which will interfere with the workings of these Departments.

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Was not the gentleman from Virginia also in favor of a substantial reduction in the representation allowances?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. ROONEY. And there were any number of other items, were there not?

Mr. GARY. There were a number of items. We agreed to most of the cuts in the Department of Justice and in the Judiciary. I thought they were reasonable. But when it came to the State Department and to the Department of Commerce, I thought we had slashed the appropriation for those departments to the point where we were destroying the effectiveness of their work. I am not willing to do that in the present state of affairs, particularly with reference to our foreign relations.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not a fact that there were possibly 40 items in this bill in which all members of the committee were unanimous?

Mr. GARY. I think that is correct, and all of those items carried cuts in the appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] has again expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand the sum and substance of the gentleman's argument is that he is arguing against false economy as distinguished from real economy.

Mr. GARY. Exactly. False economy that will destroy the very foundations of our Government.

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

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, as I have listened to the debate on appropriations bills that have come to the House so far this year, it occurs to me that my friends on the right of the aisle all start their addresses by saying they are for economy, and they close them with the same expression of hope for economy but they apparently are going to let the Republicans vote the economy.

I have a very high regard for the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee and the committee that has reported this bill to us. I do not think any Member of the House has done more for civil

aviation in this country than has the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], but my high regard for the majority members of that committee rose rapidly this afternoon as I heard the gentleman from New York read the long list of airports whose construction had either been postponed or eliminated. I could hardly believe that any subcommittee could strike so much "pork" out of one appropriation bill in such a short period of time.

The gentleman from Brooklyn [Mr. ROONEY] for some reason particularly expressed the hope that the Members from Connecticut would note that two airports in that State would not receive any further funds for their completion. The taxpayers of the State of Connecticut are well aware that they could much better afford to build their own airports than they can to carry on the airport-building program as it has been passed by previous Congresses.

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

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I might also say that the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] took particular delight in stating, and laid emphasis on the fact, that this bill will deprive the Oshkosh Airport; completely obliterate it. Now, that indicates the character of the argument made by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], because he knows not whereof he speaks. The fact of the matter is it is the Winnebago County Airport. It is fully completed except the installation of lighting, and the amount of Federal funds involved is \$20,000. The County of Winnebago, may I say to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], who is out for spending every dollar he can see in sight, is perfectly able to spend \$40,000 to put lighting on an airport that has cost nearly \$1,000,000, and is completed, and will not be obliterated, regardless of the action that has been taken.

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

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield briefly. I have only 10 minutes, but I want to be fair.

Mr. ROONEY. Those remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin remind me of a quotation from the Merchant of Venice.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Well, I do not have time to yield for Shakespeare. We can take him up some other time.

I want to make clear that I agree absolutely with the objectives of this subcommittee to turn over to the owners of airports and to the municipalities, the staffing of control towers. I believe that this Congress is faced with a serious problem to determine just how much of the airway equipment should be paid for out of the Federal Treasury. I do, however, disagree with the action of the committee in striking out the appropriation for control-tower staffs at this particular time, or until such time as a legislative committee can bring us legislation dealing with this whole subject of providing equipment for our airways and staffing the control towers.



Four years ago an effort was made to create in this House a special committee to deal with legislation relating to civil aviation. In the wisdom of the House that suggestion was turned down, although I felt strongly then and feel more strongly now that there is enough important legislation awaiting consideration and enactment by this House dealing with the subject of aviation to take the full time of one of our standing committees. The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee very early in this session started to conduct hearings on air line safety here in the United States. Contrary to the impression one might get from reading the newspapers, we have here in the United States the finest system of airways found anywhere in the world.

In 1946, notwithstanding the unfortunate crashes that occurred near the end of the year, we had the best year in our history as far as airplane crashes were concerned. But that committee wanted to find out if there was anything further that Congress could do to make the airways safer, and a great deal of interesting testimony was presented to the committee on the subject of the equipment of our air lines. There was a good deal of testimony as to whether the CAA erred in installing ILS instead of the Army-Navy-approved equipment known as GCA, but it seemed to be the consensus of opinion that they should supply perhaps both ILS and GCA operated from airport control towers. It was thought that may be the real answer. That committee has not completed its investigation and until such time as they can complete that study and bring legislation to the floor I think it would be the better part of wisdom for the Congress to provide funds to operate these control towers under a uniform system such as the gentleman from Tennessee, I believe it was, pointed out this afternoon.

There is nothing in this bill—we cannot put anything in the bill—that would make it mandatory for the owners of these separate airports to accept the expense and obligation and responsibility of staffing the control towers. After all, our municipalities have budgets to think of, and here just in the middle of May we are passing this bill, which is the first notice cities have had that they are going to have to add to their budget about \$30,000 per control tower. I believe they are entitled to more notice than that and I think we will work out a much better system if the House will reinsert the item of slightly less than \$5,000,000 and permit control towers to be operated as they are with the definite understanding that Congress will give attention in the next year and before the Eightieth Congress adjourns not only to determine who will finance the cost of operating control towers but also who is going to pay for the cost of so-called airway equipment.

I believe that every possible safety device should be put on our airways, but I do not believe it is the responsibility of the American taxpayers to put it on all of our airways. As I see it, it is the responsibility of the Government to have

a sound system of airways across and throughout our Nation with necessary safety equipment, but when we add additional equipment to make it possible for the air lines to fly at 300-, 400-, and 500-foot ceilings instead of the old 800- and 1,000-foot ceilings, what we are doing is simply increasing the revenues of the air lines. The fewer the cancellations the greater their revenues. I believe that either through a system of landing fees or increased rentals they should buy this additional equipment, a lot of which although referred to as safety equipment is not actually necessary to the safe operation of aircraft. A private flier cannot land at LaGuardia Field unless he has engine trouble or some emergency condition. The more we set aside these large airports equipped and paid for with taxpayers' money and turn them over to the commercial air lines, the more we increase their revenues. They are not made available for private fliers although the private fliers are taxpayers, too. The result is that if this program is not modified to make the commercial air lines bear more of the cost the result will be a splendid system of tax-supported airports for the special use of the commercial air lines, and the private fliers will have to make their landings in cow pastures as they did 25 years ago.

I agree fully with the committee that it is time the Congress assumed its full responsibility, but until we get some basic legislation I feel that the best possible solution to the problem of air safety is a continuation of the operation as it has been carried out until our legislative committee acts on it, because only in that way can we call to the attention of the House the seriousness of this proposition. I wish I had time to go into some of the testimony that has been presented to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on ILS and GCA and other equipment of that kind.

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

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. On behalf of the committee I want to tell the gentleman how deeply we appreciate his remarks and his approval of our action.

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

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman four additional minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. It was because the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was making an exhaustive study of all phases of that proposition following the recent accidents that the committee, in taking action on the CAA appropriations, left everything in the bill so far as safety devices are concerned, including GCA, ILS, and many other things. I know what the gentleman means when he says there is some question whether ILS, so favored by the CAA, is going to be effective and whether or not GCA will take over ILS or whether something else has been found whereby air safety will be almost certain. ILS, in my opinion, has to be continued until GCA proves itself or until this other ra-

dar equipment proves itself, or some of the other things the gentleman has seen himself.

The gentleman is a famous flier, he is a pilot, he wants safety in the air. He knows more about safety and aid to aviation than many of those who pretend to talk about aviation. I thank him very much for his approval because we did not come to a decision on these funds, Mr. Chairman, just because one or two of us knew something about flying. We had expert investigators go into the offices of CAA. I merely rise to thank the gentleman for his commendation of the committee because we have been working on this thing ever since last December. We are following the hearings and the reports of the gentleman's committee in order to guide us in making our decision for the fiscal year 1949.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I hope the gentleman does not misunderstand me. I said I approved wholeheartedly the objective of the committee, but I make the plea that for this year you permit this appropriation to be reinserted in the bill for the operation of the control towers for the very reason the gentleman has himself enunciated.

Mr. STEFAN. I thought the gentleman's committee would make an exhaustive, thorough study.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. We are; and I may say to the gentleman that study is still going on. It was interrupted to make possible hearings on the American-flag ship proposition, but we are getting testimony day after day on aviation. This matter of control towers ties right in with the operation of GCA. It is the hope of the CAA that they can put this in the control tower and that it can be operated with not more than a two-man crew instead of the six-man crew used by the Army.

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

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I have heard from my area and everything I have heard corroborates what the gentleman said today. For this reason I want to ask the gentleman from Nebraska whether or not, in view of what has been said here, he thinks the cut at this time may be premature? I have heard from the city of Denver. We do not have an opportunity to adjust our budget at this time.

Mr. STEFAN. The same action was taken last year. We thought 1 year's time would be plenty notice to give these people. We cannot afford to pay out any more. Too many are asking for the same thing.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The difficulty is there has been no legislation on our statute books to guide the cities.

Mr. STEFAN. We have control towers being operated by CAA and by municipalities.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. In emergency cases.

Mr. STEFAN. We have many of them now being paid for by the Federal Government. We have applications ahead and we cannot meet all of them.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. If the CAA is not able to do it, it will result in considerable confusion.

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

Mr. LYLE. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

#### AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL TOWERS

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, it is regrettable, if not alarming, that the committee has seen fit to deduct the amount of \$4,800,000, the estimated cost of operating the air traffic control towers in 1948. The committee did this, I am sure, in a sincere desire to cut down Federal expenditures which is generally a very laudable desire, but I fear, in this instance, not well founded.

Last year I discussed with the city council of the largest city in my district, Corpus Christi, both the advisability and possibility of assuming the expense of operating the traffic-control tower of the municipal airport. We considered the Federal expenditures, the universal desire to decrease them, and the advantages accruing from municipal operation. We found it quite impossible for the city at that time to assume this expense.

I feel sure that when the air industry grows up we may look forward to the time when such expenses will be borne by the air lines themselves, or, perhaps, a joint operation of cities and air lines, and certainly with such control towers operated by CAA personnel and under CAA standards, safety factors would be in no way involved. But we are dealing with an industry which is unquestionably in its infancy, and with municipalities that are being more than pressed to finance their police protection, sanitation, and public works.

For example, my home city has grown by such leaps and bounds that it is accommodating a population from three to four times that which was anticipated with its public works. I assure you that insofar as I speak for my people, we are not inclined to ask from the Federal Government that which we could provide for ourselves.

The commercial air lines of America are a strong link in our national defense. There is no other medium through which we could better serve our people than the operation of air traffic control towers with the ensuing safety that they provide.

Cutting off Federal funds at this time for the operation of such control towers would mean, in an alarming number of cases, the loss of that vital service. Surely all of you agree with me that this would be most unfortunate and is certainly not the intention of this body.

I have helped you and will continue to help you reduce the expenses of this Government, but I cannot in a case which involves so very much, such as this. I sincerely trust that the membership will favor an amendment to restore these funds for the ensuing year. You may do so with the knowledge that they will be well spent in the interest of our people and our country.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at this point for a brief comment?

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

Mr. ROONEY. In answer to my most gracious and kind colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], and his statement a few minutes ago about being for spending and spending and spending, I say to him that he knows that that is not so; he knows that I have been one of the leading advocates of economy on the Committee on Appropriations. But I stand for sensible economy, not the penny-wise pound-foolish kind of false economy. I am not a self-confessed piddler. I had in mind a while ago when he made one of his usual wild statements about me a quotation from the Merchant of Venice:

Gratiano talks an infinite deal of nothing, more so than any man in Venice. His reasons are like 2 grains of wheat in 2 bushels of chaff; you search all day until you find them, and when you find them they're not worth the search.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I arise to speak today to call to the attention of the membership of this body the fact that the Appropriations Committee has eliminated the funds for the operation of the air-control towers at the airports throughout the Nation.

This is not the first time effort has been made to eliminate this vital appropriation.

I have been one of the critics of the air lines when, in my opinion, they were operating negligently and when it appeared to me unnecessary and needless risks were being taken in the operation of flights during dangerous weather conditions. I likewise criticized the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Civil Aeronautics Administration for their passive attitude in strictly enforcing the rules and regulations pursuant to the law of the land.

I now come to the criticism of my own body in eliminating funds for the operation of control towers at airports where both private and commercial ships land and take off. This borders onto criminal negligence.

Last year, in my address to the House on this vital matter, I called attention to the fact that the control tower is the nerve, heart, and sinew between the airplane and the ground. The control tower is the traffic policeman controlling the safety of all planes operating at an air base. The control tower flashes air conditions and weather conditions to the pilot groping in rain, sleet, snow, and darkness, as well as in sunshine.

Within the air control tower must sit a man well schooled and well experienced in the job of guiding planes in their landing and in their take-off, a responsible man who is directly under the control of the Civil Aeronautics Administration which is charged with the responsibility of insuring the performance of regulations and mandates issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

It has been said that the municipalities and other public bodies owning and operating air bases should maintain the control towers. I say to you that it is not the function of the local people to maintain a facility so vital as this. Its operation transcends and goes far beyond a locality—its operation required the closest direction of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. Its operation is interstate commerce in its essence and in its fullest.

The cost of the operation of air lines is astronomically expensive. The weight of one four-motored air liner loaded is \$20,000 pounds. The cost of such a liner exceeds a half million dollars. The cargo of such a liner is precious and beyond the scope of pecuniary evaluation.

Unlike trains and busses, air-line crashes generally wipe out the entire passenger list, as well as the pilots and other necessary personnel. So expensive is the operation of air lines the American taxpayer is compelled to expend heavy subsidies to keep their wings aloft and their ships in operation.

It follows necessarily, therefore, that safely guiding these precious treasures to and from the ground is our business and our function.

If we fail to provide the funds to maintain the control towers, countless cities of this Nation will be black-outs. Countless precious lives will be endangered. The blood of some helpless person will be on our hands.

We have just authorized over \$400,000,000 to protect, assist, and rehabilitate the Greeks and Turks. We have loaned Britain, France, and many other nations billions for their own people. How frugal we will be indeed to cast a sympathetic and friendly eye to our own people in maintaining an economy never approximated by any civilization since the beginning of the world.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Am I correct in interpreting the gentleman's remarks as indicating that he believes the Federal Government at all times should finance the control towers?

Mr. RIVERS. I believe the gentleman is exactly right, and I favor legislation to that effect. So long as we have the Civil Aeronautics Board telling the communities who can come in and who can take off, they cannot maintain these bases. Big cities like New York, Los Angeles, and Chicago, where countless thousands of planes come in, might be able to operate them, but a little city is at the mercy of a cold-blooded board such as the Civil Aeronautics Board. If the Federal Government does not help them, God help them.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Would the gentleman further advocate that the maintenance of all safety equipment, for instance, on a railroad, which carries as many people, possibly, is a proper function of the Federal Government?

Mr. RIVERS. Would the gentleman compare the subsidy of railroads to that of air lines?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I think we will eventually have to face that question.



Mr. RIVERS. Unless you maintain the air lines of today, we will not have any tomorrow.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy we have had this discussion of our air pattern this afternoon, because it is not news to anybody that we are on the threshold, we are in fact into the program of a very extensive air pattern for the United States. We on the Committee on Appropriations who have watched that appropriation grow through the years are aware of the fact that we are at the place where we have to make certain fundamental distinctions in allocations of funds and revenues therefrom. We have to find out how far the responsibility of the Federal Government goes, and we have to know what are the responsibilities of municipalities. Just where are the air-line companies in this picture?

It is high time we took a look at the sun. We on the Committee on Appropriations have been reluctant to go ahead with the program that appeared to be going no place and otherwise did not have any guidance.

There was a great deal said about appropriations for Federal aid to airports. Last fall the House adjourned after appropriating \$45,000,000 for Federal aid to airports on a 7-year program. The President of the United States soon after we adjourned, froze about \$41,000,000 of those funds.

I direct your attention to page 27 of the committee report. Quoting from the report:

It should also be called to the attention of the House that the President through a recent order has frozen approximately \$41,000,000 of the current appropriation of \$45,000,000.

That is, for the fiscal year 1947 on which we are operating. The report reads further:

While most of this \$41,000,000 has been allocated on paper for specific projects, it has actually not been obligated through written agreements and contracts. This money will remain available for expenditure during the year 1948.

By simple arithmetic, if you add \$32,500,000 to \$41,000,000 you will get \$73,500,000 for Federal aid to airports. I trust you will be fair with the committee who are trying to do a fundamental job in this appropriation bill.

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

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. The Congress appropriated this \$45,000,000 last year and the President froze \$41,000,000 of those funds so that they were not available for expenditure.

Mr. HORAN. That is right; and the funds are still frozen.

Mr. KEEFE. The funds are still frozen, are they not? The President has it within his power to accelerate the airport program by releasing the funds and permitting them to be extended as Congress intended when it appropriated the money.

Mr. HORAN. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. KEEFE. The amount you have appropriated in this bill for the same purpose will make the total amount available for expenditure, if the \$41,000,000 is allowed to be expended by the President, of \$73,500,000, and that will take care of the present allocations; will it not?

Mr. HORAN. It will unless somebody stirs up the pork barrel some more.

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

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. On what date will this money become available?

Mr. HORAN. I refer the gentleman to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. STEFAN. On June 30, 1947.

Mr. HARRIS. That means about 6 weeks from now. Is it not true that all but approximately \$3,005,000 of the apportionment to the States has been allocated?

Mr. HORAN. It has been allocated on paper, but not actually obligated.

Mr. STEFAN. How much did the gentleman say?

Mr. HORAN. All but \$3,000,000 of the amount apportioned to the States.

Mr. STEFAN. No definite contracts have been made—not one cent has been paid out. No definite contract was made. But about \$35,000,000 has been allocated. About \$41,000,000 of 1947 funds will go to class 1, 2, and 3 airports.

Mr. HARRIS. I understand that; but is it not true that the allocation of this amount of money made available to the States has been made for class 1, 2, and 3 airports?

Mr. STEFAN. It has been earmarked for each State.

Mr. HARRIS. That is, for class 1, 2, and 3 airports, and thus far there has been no allocation made at all for class 4 and larger airports. Is that not true?

Mr. STEFAN. That is right; because all of your 1948 money was originally earmarked and specified to be spent for class 4 airports and airports higher than that. Here is your story on your airports. Will the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] yield so that I might answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. STEFAN. We have a 7-year program on Federal-aid airports of \$500,000,000. The CAA started out to set up plans and specifications. The municipalities objected to the original plans so they destroyed those. Then they set up new plans. They are working under the new plans now, but policies changed. They originally decided to earmark the \$45,000,000 for the 1947 fiscal year for the smaller airports. The idea was to help the small airports. The President froze \$41,000,000 of that 1947 money. The CAA has about \$4,000,000 in a discretionary fund which they are using, some of it, for administration purposes. They asked for \$65,000,000 to implement the 7-year program for the fiscal year 1948. They wanted \$65,000,000. This was to be used for larger airports. We sent experts into the CAA, people who knew something about budgets and aviation. We had the advice of private fliers, commercial people. We had the advice of the private industry. So we cut one-half of the \$65,000,000 asked for airports

for 1948, and asked the CAA to review the program, because they decided themselves to study it for fiscal 1949. But before the committee brought this bill to the floor, when they found the committee had recommended a cut of one-half of the \$65,000,000 for 1948, they sent out word to the country that they could start using the 1947 money beginning on June 30 for class 4 or larger airports. They changed their policy before they knew what Congress would do with this appropriation bill. They are now causing confusion all over the country. Yet they will have about \$75,000,000 or \$100,000,000 on hand, and not one cent has yet been spent. They have plenty of funds on hand. Much of this money cannot be matched for a long time, if ever.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, this is a big bill, and I am happy we are discussing at length this air problem that is before Congress, because the chairman of this subcommittee is absolutely right. There is a fundamental job to be done, and one that should not be relegated to the Appropriations Committee. We need the cooperation of this House in doing our work. This House has to face this tremendous air pattern problem that is before us, and get down to brass tacks and find out who is going to pay for what.

But this bill covers other things than air transportation in the Department of Commerce. One of the things that has been mentioned quite often this afternoon is the Cultural and Information Service, which presumes to represent America in its true phase to the people of other countries.

Mr. Chairman, since I made the point of order against the Office of Information and Cultural Affairs in the State Department that has brought that program squarely into focus, I am happy to have this opportunity to talk with you about that program and in that connection of that particular problem before our Nation.

One of our weekly magazines has said that the OIC program was "waving the bull at the red flag." I make no comment. I merely state that there is a job to be done, and to be financed. That is our problem, and you and I as representatives of 140,000,000 productive and progressive Americans have a duty to perform.

My first reason for objecting to the inclusion of this \$31,000,000 item in the present appropriation bill is the very simple and wholly American one that there is no legal authorization for the activity in question. I am sure the Members fully realize that our committee is enjoined by the rules of this House from approving appropriations for any activity or agency of the Government that has not been specifically provided for by legislation in the proper committees and both Houses of the Congress. This rule, I might add, was properly restated and reaffirmed in the reorganization bill. But there was a second reason that was more compelling to me than the first (and yet it is closely associated with the first reason), for the very wise reasoning behind that rule is that the administration should not be given sums of money amounting to as much as \$30,000,000 to spend for activities which have not

been reviewed by the representatives of the people serving on the appropriate committees of this body which is directly answerable to those who have to foot the bill. To some people, Mr. Chairman, that may be a mere technicality, but to me and to the vast majority of you, I am sure, it is a sacred duty we owe to our constituents and to our country. It comes with poor grace, I hold, for avowed advocates of our American representative Republic to suggest the continuation of this bypassing of Congress. It has indeed gone on too long already.

Mr. Chairman, there are at the present time at least two bills pending before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs dealing with this subject. They would provide for the establishment of an authorized program to carry out the mission of the present OIC. They may not be perfect, but that is unimportant since they are, of course, subject to modification and amendment by the committee and the Congress. I sincerely hope that the Foreign Affairs Committee will give due attention to these proposals, will conduct full hearings to bring out all the several approaches which have been suggested for this problem and will come forth into this Chamber with a unified proposal which will fully reflect the desires of all of the American people and will mobilize the total cultural talents of this great country in the work ahead. The Foreign Affairs Committee of the Eightieth Congress is an exceptionally able committee with splendid leadership. How fortunate we are. How natural to suggest that they be about the consideration of this problem now.

It appears that I must take this purely elementary approach to the question, Mr. Chairman, because it has been quite evident that many of the critics of our subcommittee's action either have been ignorant of the proper legislative procedure in such matters or have become so thoroughly accustomed to the wartime policy of acting upon expediency that they are impatient with waiting for an expression of the people's will before carrying out the plans they have so enthusiastically devised for the people's benefit. If the Voice of America is to prevail, certainly it should reflect the best attitudes of all of our people, acting through their regularly elected representatives. There is indeed grave danger when our foreign policy is subject to design and origin by a small group in a department or bureau. We cannot hide behind any assumed indifference on the part of our constituencies. There is not any indifference. Our people are alert. They cry for a leadership to help them act wisely and effectively.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that we owe this to the whole of our American people because the hearings on this activity held before our subcommittee brought out very emphatically that the designers and planners of the OIC program have not paid sufficient attention to the fundamentals of the way in which American government has traditionally operated and the way in which American people do things.

The leaders of the propaganda program under discussion were directed to carry out two objectives, according to the statement in hearings made by its director, Assistant Secretary Benton. The program was intended, first, to present a full and fair picture of the American people and the life of the American people.

The second objective, in the words of Mr. Benton, was to present the aims and objectives of United States policy.

Mr. Chairman, after many weeks of studying this program and questioning its directors, I have come to the conclusion that the program itself belies the first of those objectives because it is questionable that it was constituted in a manner reflective of the American people or their traditional way of doing things. I have also been forced to conclude that it cannot possibly carry out the second objective because no one connected with the program, from the Secretary of State on down, who appeared before our subcommittee, could or would give us a satisfactory explanation of just what United States foreign policy is. Despite much breast beating during the Greek debates, it was not announced or defined recently by any Member of Congress. May I here refer you particularly to pages 25, 27, 416, and 608 of the hearings to illustrate how vague and nebulous these folks' concept of our foreign policy is. Yet we directly need an expressed policy. How are we going to prove the grandeur of our foreign policy to the distraught peoples of the world if we cannot define them ourselves? I feel that they can—and should be expressed.

In this connection, I liked Walter Lippmann's column this morning, and I would like to read to you the opening and closing paragraphs of his column:

Though money for radio broadcasts and printing is needed so that the voice of America may be heard in foreign lands, our greatest need is to have something definite, clear, and convincing for that voice to say. There would be little opposition in Congress to an appropriation if it were not for the feeling that the men who conduct our propaganda have little to do with the making of our policy, and that the sales department of the Government is, so to speak, writing advertisements about goods for which the production engineers have just begun to make the first blueprints.

And, his closing paragraph:

A program of this kind, proposing a concrete settlement, would, if it were persistently, patiently, and thoroughly expounded and advocated by the United States Government, be very hard to misrepresent, and very hard to reject. The voice of America would begin to speak a language that the weary, the hungry, and the frightened are longing to hear.

What went in the middle in Mr. Lippmann's column this morning is his own idea. I do not know whether I agree with it or not, but I do suggest that it is entirely worth while for it is a constructive suggestion. The point is that certainly I should not say what the American policy is; not even such a student as Walter Lippmann should dictate the American policy. But it is entirely worth while to consider an approach that would enable you and I, Mr. Lippmann, and every other constructive

American a chance to add his voice to the sum total of the Voice of America.

In order to properly present Mr. Lippmann's voice, I shall, when the Committee rises and we go back into the House, ask permission for his complete column to be added to the RECORD, following my remarks here.

Mr. Chairman, I consider it high time that this entire subject be fully explored by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Specifically, a complete study is most necessary so that the best possible information program may be devised. It should be in complete accordance with the terms of the foreign policy which those two committees are charged with the responsibility for formulating. I have a feeling that the best program need not be the most expensive program and that, thus, we may by group action on a national basis meet our strenuous fiscal problem at home and the challenges of an ideological warfare abroad with wisdom plus economy.

Now I have said that the program at present is not constituted in a manner reflective of the American people or their traditional way of doing things. By that statement I mean that we have been confronted with the paradox of a Government bureau entering into a field which always has been predominantly the domain of private enterprise—a bureau telling the world about the glories of the private-enterprise system which it has replaced. Nor is there evidence to prove that this costly substitute is justified.

My reaction to this fact is best expressed in the words used in the subcommittee report on the bill, page 7:

Our forebears planted on this soil the seed of liberty and social freedom which, if properly nurtured, should outgrow our boundaries and radiate its influence to the rest of the world, not through a centralized disseminating agency but through the force of its own dynamics.

"Nebulous," you say? All dreams, all hopes, all worthy objectives can be called "nebulous." That makes their eventual achievement all the more worthy.

That statement is a credit to its author, Mr. Corhal Orescan, clerk of our subcommittee. It is all the more creditable because it expresses an American hope that individual liberty and the resultant social freedom may by the mere force of its example transform a state of global chaos into an atmosphere of interdependent purpose wherein all men may become important each to the other and, through a full and restraining realization of that interdependence, work together peacefully, that perhaps the sweat of purposeful work in peace might achieve the same unities that have been effected by the tears of war. That is the American hope. It breaks like a sunrise—to whom? To the thoughtful immigrant who emerges from the shackles of social tradition abroad and is welcomed in this land so uniquely founded by the genius of Washington, Franklin, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Jay, and that host of immortals who founded this country. These immigrants see it. They see it with a clearer vision than we of more ancient migration.



Mr. Chairman, there is a job to do. I insist that it be done in the best tradition of our America. To better understand our present position, let me review the basic steps that find us where we are. Then let me suggest the materials we possess for a constructive solution.

The days of the shooting war are over. Looking back we can see now that, although they were days of hectic hurry, violence, despair, tragedy, and triumph, they were not, in some ways, too difficult.

They were days of total effort. Everyone was out to win the war, win it quickly. We cast aside many of our individual privileges. Top secret, and national security, and national purpose beclouded, for the duration, our clear rights to freedom of choice, of speech, and of redress in the courts of public opinion.

In the tangled realms of fiscal policy, too, we placed achievement first and the saner values as dictated by the competitive market second.

We won the war at all costs. And it was at all costs. Costs in lives, costs in the draining away of our natural resources, costs in actual money. It was expedient and expensive.

But, looking back, we can see the powers that accrue to a people who are convinced and dedicated to a singleness of purpose.

The record of the final overpowering of the total governments of the Axis, the presumed triumph of the Allies and ourselves over a form of government incompatible with our own, was worth, we thought, the digressions we ourselves had been forced to make.

Even a representative republic must detour from its broad avenues of purpose in war times. Its goal of destiny demands that certain decisions be made by small and trusted groups. To do this, we passed war powers and gave them to the President. When expediency required that quick decisions be made, we accepted them in the form of directives. Yet we knew, and we now know, that government by directives approaches the executive form of government and that the distrusted total form of government is but a step beyond.

America's sons and daughters, her resources and her riches, all were made available to be used and be spent for just one purpose, victory.

The enemy, with his cannons and his planned blitzkrieg, is vanquished.

We can be both thankful and, I hope, humble in that fact.

We can be united in a determination that our total effort must now be bent to keep the scourge of war from returning to our world. This purpose we owe to the white crosses that punctuate the sentences of recent history. Our debt is to the lives they might otherwise have lived.

The days of shooting war, I have said, are over. But the challenge to our capitalistic western civilization looms just as large as ever. Certainly, now, if our freedoms were worth fighting for at Dunkirk, El Alamein, Normandy, across the broad Pacific, and all over the world, then those same freedoms are worth fighting for now. And the responsibility should not be delegated, without authorization,

to a small group in a department or bureau.

I believe with fervent firmness that our total talent can and should be mobilized—openly and with announced purpose—to fight America's battles in the ideological warfare that, today, menaces our present hard-won peace.

That this assembling of ability can be achieved without conscription, on a voluntary basis, is all the more in its favor.

Our total talent? Does anyone here today know what a tremendous wealth of talent we have which could be utilized in telling our story to the world?

Mr. Chairman, the popular conception of the so-called Voice of America is that it consists solely of a few radio stations, built by the Government, and a handful of men in the State Department putting out a campaign of propaganda as a countermeasure to an ever stronger campaign of propaganda being put out by other countries.

In my conception, Mr. Chairman, the real Voice of America is sounded in 140,000,000 throats and is a blending of many different tones.

I would like to refer this Committee to pages 422-436, inclusive, of the subcommittee hearings on this bill. I made a sincere attempt to discover in full what the sum total of talents available in this campaign might be. The answers to my questions found there are not too acceptable—but they do give some idea of the extent of our total talent resources which might be used in this ideological conflict.

Reference is made in those hearings to our greatest single power for good will in the field of international relations—the free, Christian church and its missionaries. Nothing we do, governmentally, should undermine nor dilute the clear glory of their work.

There are references made to our American educational institutions—both at home and abroad. There are hundreds of schools in far-off countries maintained by American wealth and thousands of foreign students brought here annually to receive the benefits of our own universities. Also, we send vast numbers of our educators across the seas—to learn for themselves and to spread their own knowledge to others. I would suggest to the State Department that much better use could be made of these educators and students than is now being done.

Our newspapers and periodical journals have correspondents in nearly every foreign country, and their product in this postwar year is more widely distributed in foreign markets than ever before. Some of them publish in English, with great success; others in the languages of their distribution area. Certainly we can encourage and make greater use of these media.

We can also do much to encourage a wider circulation of American music and musical talent through extension of private publishing firms and concert agencies and facilitating of copyright clearances.

My questioning in those hearings revealed that no exact information has

been gathered to determine how many American firms there are which have representation abroad. It was admitted in the hearings that some 22,000 American firms are engaged in export-import trade. It also was brought out that, so far, no full-scale attempt has been made to use these advance guards of individualistic America as local demonstrators of what American capitalism is and should be.

But I need not further review the total of our talent. You know them—our missionaries, our journalists, our educators, our philanthropists, our businessmen—our ordinary individual Americans—all fired with a desire to help in the problem before us.

Our talent for Americanism is tremendous.

We have a duty. We have a responsibility. We must cease "waving the bull at the red flag." We must use our every facility to present America. That is our job.

The future will record our success.

I submit that it is not a job for a small group of bureaucrats.

It is a job for all who believe in America and America's future. Every American who goes abroad should feel a personal responsibility as to our relations with other countries, where one thoughtless individual by a reckless word or act could, and has, undone the patient work of legions of laborers in the vineyards of good will. And all 140,000,000 of us have a right and a duty to participate in performing that task.

Without necessarily agreeing with Mr. Lippmann's suggestions herein made, I do feel that the column below is thoughtful and analytical. It has a definite place in any search for the "voice" and the "words" in America's foreign policy.

TODAY AND TOMORROW  
(By Walter Lippmann)  
THE VOICE OF AMERICA

Though money for radio broadcasts and printing is needed so that the Voice of America may be heard in foreign lands, our greatest need is to have something definite, clear, and convincing for that voice to say. There would be little opposition in Congress to an appropriation if it were not for the feeling that the men who conduct our propaganda have little to do with the making of our policy, and that the sales department of the Government is, so to speak, writing advertisements about goods for which the production engineers have just begun to make the first blueprints.

As for the customers abroad, they are undoubtedly confused and suspicious, partly no doubt because the rival firm misrepresents us, but chiefly because we sound so hot and bothered when, as a great power, they expect us to be cool and definite. Mr. Benton's difficulties with Congress and with the opposition abroad will diminish when his Chief, Secretary Marshall, has had time to form and to organize a concrete American program for the settlement of the war.

The elements of such a program have, I believe, gradually emerged from the vast and intricate debates, and can be formulated now as the basis for further discussion. They could, I think, be stated in some such way as this:

1. The division of the world into two great coalitions—one with its center in Moscow and the other with its center in Washington—is only apparent. The world cannot be divided

in this way. The coalitions cannot be organized. The nations of Europe will resist the idea that they are the satellites of the two non-European great powers, and that their continent is the predestined theater of a Soviet-American conflict. Insofar as the Truman doctrine consciously or unconsciously treats Europe in this fashion, it is an obstacle to the making of peace and is destructive of American influence on the making of peace.

2. The revival of Europe under the leadership of Great Britain and France, now the principal European powers, is necessary. There can be no German settlement except within the framework of a European settlement. The political and economic unification of Germany is neither possible nor safe except within the framework of a European economic union, and of enough European political union to provide the primary guaranties of the German settlement. The Russian and American guaranties of German good behavior will have to be secondary to the European guaranty.

3. Though in the end the unity of Europe must comprehend the whole of Europe, a partial unity is better than none at all. The unity of western Europe alone cannot be self-supporting and solvent. It will require official support from the Western Hemisphere, principally from the United States. But if the support is given on conditions which promote and induce unification, the partial union of western Europe will exert immense attraction upon eastern Europe.

4. These considerations enable us to state the definite terms upon which we could propose to settle the Soviet-American conflict. Our object is the revival of Europe as an independent power in the world. To attain this object we shall have to provide the equivalent of lend-lease for a term of years as the necessary working capital, obtainable nowhere else, for a European economic union.

The Russian contribution will have to be the military evacuation, simultaneously with a British, French, and American military evacuation, of the Continent. The armies must go home, leaving behind them only token forces in Germany and at sensitive and unsettled points such as Trieste and the Greek frontier. The military evacuation of Europe would have to be followed by agreement that all European states may enter the European economic union.

In return for that, we could afford to finance some German reparation payments, and to provide some credit, to the Soviets.

5. In the middle east we should propose a new treaty covering the Dardanelles, the borders of Greece and Turkey, the port of Saloniki, and the oil concessions of Iran.

Such a settlement is, I believe, ultimately attainable because it reflects the actual balance of power, which neither can alter radically, between the Soviet Union and the United States. The Red Army is deep into Europe. The settlement calls for its withdrawal to the frontiers of the Soviet Union. We cannot compel it to withdraw. On the other hand, we can prevent it from advancing farther because of our ability to strike at the vital centers of Russia. The settlement would recognize the military deadlock.

To this settlement the United States would contribute financial support, large by peacetime standards but insignificant by wartime standards. This assistance would ransom Europe from the armies of occupation, would revive the most highly civilized continent in the world, would enable Russia to obtain help in her own reconstruction which she can obtain in no other way, would enable this country to avoid a chronic depression caused by unsalable surpluses of goods.

A program of this kind, proposing a concrete settlement, would, if it were persistently, patiently, and thoroughly expounded

and advocated by the United States Government, be very hard to misrepresent, and very hard to reject.

The Voice of America would begin to speak a language that the weary, the hungry, and the frightened are longing to hear.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, in the debate on the Greek-Turkish loan bill last week I said that this \$400,000,000 was only the beginning. I said that the Truman doctrine was a doctrine of pouring American dollars into every reactionary government in the world in an attempt to keep them in power. I said that the attempt by the Truman administration to sell this bill to the people of the United States as a relief measure was the rankest kind of hypocrisy.

Mr. Chairman, it is not often that what one says is confirmed so immediately and so conclusively. I want to call the attention of the House to the three-column headline on the front page of the Washington Post of this morning. It reads, and I quote:

Turks to use United States loan for military purposes; to ask bank aid also.

A dispatch by the United Press announces, and I quote:

President Gen. Ismet İnönü, of Turkey, announced today that Turkey will use the \$100,000,000 American loan for military purposes and will seek a loan from the International Bank for economic development.

In a direct answer to the question: "Can you say now how you would use the money which the United States proposes to advance, that is, whether for economic or military development?" İnönü replied: "The aid to be given by the United States will be used for military purposes. For the purpose of economic development a loan will be requested from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development."

There, Mr. Chairman, is the blunt answer to those who said that this was a relief measure. We are pouring a first installment of \$100,000,000 into Turkey to keep a repressive dictatorship in power.

I notice also, Mr. Chairman, that even the supporters of this measure are already beginning to get a little restive about it. In an editorial on Greek amnesty in this morning's Washington Post the editors say:

The Greek Government is acting as if the sole purpose of our aid were to enable it to stay in power.

I include the entire editorial in the RECORD:

#### GREEK AMNESTY

It is clear that there can be no peace in Greece until there is a fairly general political amnesty. It is becoming equally clear that such an amnesty is not likely to be offered by the present Greek Government on its own initiative. For the Greek leaders seem to have interpreted the promise of American aid as a mandate to continue the status quo. Not only has nothing been done to bring about the amnesty that was promised the Republican generals a year ago, but George Patandrecous, the Minister of the Interior, has come out publicly against an amnesty on the ground that it would offend

Greek pride and infringe on Greek sovereignty. In other words, the Greek Government is acting as if the sole purpose of our aid were to enable it to stay in power.

This is not a point on which diplomatic niceties need be involved. The talk about an amnesty offending Greek pride is just so much balderdash. The only pride that would be injured would be that of the semi-Fascists who hope to use the aid program for their own corrupt purposes. Since the Greek Government applied for the aid, we, as the donor, have an unquestioned right to insist in this minimum assurance that our help will be used for the aims intended. As we embark on a new phase of foreign policy, we ought to make it abundantly evident that the policy is designed to protect independent governments from outside aggression, and not merely to shore up reaction.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the task that has confronted the Committee on Appropriations. Sometimes it seems rather unkind when a committee has worked as diligently and as sincerely as the Committee on Appropriations has to criticize some of their efforts. But I am sure they realize that the criticisms are directed with a view to bringing about improvements rather than for any other reason. I might say I am not wholly in discord with the bill because there is certainly one feature of the bill which I thoroughly approve. I might say I not only approve of it but am quite sure that all the Members of the House from New York City approve that portion of it which provides in connection with the census statistics section that on and after October 1, 1947, all functions necessary to the compilation of foreign-trade statistics shall be performed in New York and of the foregoing amount \$1,200,000 shall be available exclusively for this purpose.

I might say that the thanks of the people working in customs statistics in New York are due and are given to the chairman of the committee, Mr. TABER, and to Mr. ROONEY, of Brooklyn, for their efforts in endeavoring to retain and for retaining the Customs Statistics Service in New York City. It had been there for many years but some effort was made on the part of the Department to remove it to Washington for no apparent purpose. Those who are working in that section in New York were able to bring to the attention of Mr. ROONEY and Mr. TABER the fact that by remaining in New York there would be a saving to the Government of approximately \$200,000. Needless to say, both Mr. ROONEY and Mr. TABER were anxious to save that money for the Government and have thus provided in this bill for the retention of Customs Statistics Service in New York. Again I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] for their efforts in that behalf.

I desire to speak, however, particularly in connection with the establishment of air-navigation facilities.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, in order that conferees may be named on the Greek-Turkish loan legislation, 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. CURTIS, 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. 3311, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 938, an act to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, with a House amendment, insist on the amendment of the House and request a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. EATON, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. JONKMAN, Mr. BLOOM, and Mr. KEE.

#### THE SCANDALOUS TURKISH-GREEK DEAL

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the scandalous Turkish-Greek deal at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, apparently President Truman and the State Department have paid some little attention to what the Senate and the House had to say about the scandalous Turkish-Greek deal because our Government has suggested a general amnesty for the Greek rebels. In the news report of May 10, the United Press states the following—and I quote:

The Minister of Public Order, Gen. Napoleon Zervas, and Deputy Prime Minister Stylianos Gonatas, rightists, were extremely angry at American intervention, according to another Cabinet Minister who attended last night's meeting of the political council.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the text of this article appear in my remarks at this point.

#### ATHENS NEGOTIATES ON AMNESTY PLAN—NOTE TO UNITED STATES ENVOY ACCEPTS IN EFFECT OUTSIDE SUPERVISION BUT BARS UN PROPOSAL

ATHENS, May 10.—The Greek Government agreed tonight in substance to the American suggestion of an internationally supervised general amnesty for Greece's estimated 15,000 guerrillas.

But the agreement, contained a note to the United States Ambassador Lincoln MacVeagh, was based on the condition that a pending recommendation of the United Nations Balkans Investigating Commission for United Nations supervision of the amnesty be withdrawn.

The note followed a 1½-hour meeting this morning between Mr. MacVeagh and Constantin Tsaldaris, Deputy Premier and Foreign Minister, who sought clarification of the American proposal for a genuine amnesty. The American reply is expected early next week.

It was understood that the American proposal, presented as a suggestion and backed by an implied threat to withhold American assistance to Greece, is that the Greek Government move faster than the United Nations Balkans Commission and request several smaller states to supervise the amnesty.

#### TSALDARIS' QUESTIONS CITED

Mr. Tsaldaris was understood to have asked Mr. MacVeagh just who precisely would benefit by the amnesty, what should be done to men accused of common law crimes and what the United States would suggest for the methods and qualifications for the supervisory mission.

Meanwhile, the extreme right and the extreme left here reacted alike to the American proposals for foreign supervision of the amnesty and a broadening of the Government.

Both sides accused the United States of intervening in Greece's internal affairs. The Minister of Public Order, Gen. Napoleon Zervas, and Deputy Prime Minister Stylianos Gonatas, rightists, were extremely angry at American intervention, according to another Cabinet Minister who attended last night's meeting of the political council.

The Communist newspaper Rizopastis expressed a similar feeling and carried blaring headlines on "American Intervention."

The government of Premier Demetrios Maximos has an amnesty program, but it is not trusted by the guerrillas. The plan provides that only those accused of major crimes such as murder will be punished severely. Yet, 10 men and 1 woman were shot at Lamia in central Thessaly yesterday for collaborating with or enlisting recruits for the guerrillas.

Mr. Speaker, obviously, when the United Nations proposes amnesty to the present Greek Government, the Nazi collaborationist, General Zervas, who today is in charge of the Greek Army and the Greek policy, became extremely angry. This is a perfect illustration as to why the Greek Government needs to be reorganized. It is a perfect illustration to the point that political democracy is the only basis on which economic rehabilitation and an end to the civil war in Greece can be obtained.

I wish to call the attention of the House to a Washington Post article of Monday, May 12, which states the following:

Actually, this Government has not moved a finger in any constructive direction since President Truman's speech 2 months ago.

The vicious reactionary monarchial government existing in Greece assumes that we are going to pour out money to maintain them in office by force of American arms. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the article in the Washington Post appear in my remarks at this point:

#### UNITED STATES AMNESTY PLAN HELD UNAUTHORIZED—RECALCITRANT GREEK GOVERNMENT SEEKS TO PROVE MACVEAGH, ETHRIDGE ACTED ON OWN

(By Seymour Friedin)

ATHENS, GREECE, May 11.—The recalcitrant Greek Government, more unwilling than ever to accept a plan of an internationally supervised amnesty, sought today to prove that a chasm of difference existed between Washington and United States representatives in Athens and Geneva.

Employing a State Department denial in Washington that Ambassador Lincoln MacVeagh had been instructed to enter the negotiations, Government officials blithely accepted their own interpretation of the statement. They suggested strongly that neither MacVeagh, here, nor Mark Ethridge, in Geneva, had official American blessings to make suggestions of any kind.

Government quarters even suggested that MacVeagh might be recalled because, according to their version, he acted on his own initiative in proffering suggestions. Some American representatives may have been staggered

by the Government's eager search for loopholes to avoid responsibility, but this is just the beginning.

George Patandreou today became the first minister to place himself on record publicly against the amnesty proposals. The Minister of the Interior asserted in his newspaper today that acceptance of the amnesty proposal would offend Greek pride and infringe on Greek sovereignty.

This was the same attitude taken without attribution by most of the members of the Government. Opposition Center Party sources, however, insist the real reason for the Cabinet's refusal to accept the amnesty suggestion is the fear that it means recognition of the Royalists' failure to ameliorate conditions.

Actually, this Government has not moved a finger in any constructive direction since President Truman's speech 2 months ago. The attitude is simply to wait for the American mission to arrive. This Government apparently will not make a definite move unless it can give the appearance of being ordered by an interested power.

Nevertheless the Government persists in launching new offensives which so far have done little more than increase the guerrillas' activities. It was learned today that another campaign has been initiated in northwest Thebes and Lavadia. The operation indicates that the guerrillas apparently have been moving slowly south toward the capital. Communist leadership among the rebels is known to seek a bold feat, like appearing near Athens, to prove the strength of their movement.

Political discussions toward the new complexion of the Government are expected to be important this week.

The aged Themistocles Sofoulis, Liberal Party leader, again today reiterated that he will not enter the Government unless he becomes Premier and his party can undertake the responsibility alone of restoring peace in Greece.

Mr. Speaker, I think that our State Department and Mr. Truman should understand that at least some of us in the Congress intend to follow with the closest attention the development of the Greek-Turkish policy and to call the attention of the House and of the country to any failures that occur.

Mr. Speaker, for my part, and I believe I can speak for a number of other Congressmen, the State Department and the President of the United States can consider that the bipartisan foreign policy is at an end. We are at peace; the President of the United States has proposed a policy which stabs the United Nations in the back; he has proposed a policy which puts military power first; economic reconstruction second, and political stability last. Obviously, the policy is a complete error; obviously, we should establish political stability first, economic reconstruction second, and thereby eliminate the need for military coercion. Obviously, the policy, instead of being decided by us and paid for by us alone, should begin with the United Nations, and should be decided by the United Nations.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the entire Truman doctrine is an abortive, ill-conceived policy of military aggrandizement which isolates America from the world, guarantees its own defeat because it begins at the wrong place.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that the bipartisan foreign policy is at an end and because the Truman policy does not represent a

policy to maintain the national security of America, it violates our commitments to the United Nations and begins to work for war instead of peace. The bipartisan policy therefore is dead, and deserves to be dead.

The foreign policy has become, Mr. Speaker, an issue in the 1948 campaign. Whether we like it or not, Mr. Truman has decided to run for President on a basis of the Truman doctrine, and thereby in my opinion has guaranteed his own defeat.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out that as we move along through the year the vast and endless ramifications of the Truman doctrine will be brought home to the Congress. The Washington Post of Monday had an article from which I wish to quote from London. This article states: "The Conservative Party published today an election program accepting substantially all objectives of the Socialist program, with some differences in method and asking for a new, bigger, and more generous loan from the United States."

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this article appear in my remarks at this point.

**TORIES SEEK BIGGER UNITED STATES LOAN,  
ENDORSE SOCIALIST OBJECTIVES**

LONDON, May 11.—The Conservative Party published today an election platform accepting substantially all objectives of the Socialist program, with some differences in method, and asking for a new, bigger, and more generous loan from the United States.

The statement said in effect that if elected the Tories will carry out practically the whole Socialist program, with more efficiency, more individual freedom, and less red tape.

The Tories predicted an economic crisis for Britain in 1948, saying the American and Canadian loans would be exhausted by the middle of that year. They said Britain could not scale down its empire-preference tariff structure—as required in the current loan agreement with the United States—unless "other countries" offered adequate reductions in their own trade barriers.

"Concessions hedged around with escape clauses," the statement added, referring to the same loan agreement, "are of no use to us."

For the next few years the volume of world trade will depend on the amount of help the United States gives to war-stricken countries like Britain, which cannot afford to pay for their imports, the statement continued. If the United States is willing to lend money to other countries and accept their goods in payment of interest, world trade will expand and Britain will secure a large enough share of it to pay for her own vital imports, the statement said.

"If the United States is not willing to follow this policy, we shall have to make the best of the avenues of trade at our disposal," the Tories wrote.

The statement accepts all the Socialists' main ideas. The Tories agree that Britain's economic life should be planned by the government for the benefit of the nation. They agree that government planning should insure full employment at all times; allocate materials and manpower to the industries where they are most needed; give top priority to the capital re-equipment of industry, the export drive, power, transport, and housing; continue rationing and price controls as long as the necessities of life are scarce; and guarantee the farmers' market and prices.

The Tories accept the nationalization of the coal mines, railroads, and the Bank of England without protest, and most of their

fiscal policy is identical with that of Hugh Dalton, Socialist Chancellor of the Exchequer. But they promise to free part of the road-trucking and civil aviation industries from national ownership, and they oppose the nationalization of iron and steel. They also contend that the Government is spending too much money and encouraging inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that the Members of the House will note that the Conservative Party is asking for a bigger and more generous loan from the United States. In this connection, Mr. Stewart Alsop, who writes the very interesting and able column entitled "Matter of Fact," in the first of three articles summarizing his experiences in England argues that the Greek crisis in retrospect will look like a teapot tempest. He points out that the British are facing an enormous world-wide crisis from which the United States alone can rescue them. Mr. Speaker, I request that Mr. Alsop's column on British-American partnership be included in my remarks at this point:

**MATTER OF FACT  
(By Stewart Alsop)**

**CAN WE DO THE JOB?—THE BRITISH PARTNERSHIP**

The infinite boredom in a little room which trans-Atlantic plane travel provides leaves the returning traveler little alternative to thought. To one who has seen, however briefly, something of the contest between the Soviet Union and the West now in progress throughout the Near and Middle East, the likeliest subject with which to while away the long hours is simply this: Can we do the job?

Certainly the effort which has already started to checkmate Soviet expansion by promoting political and economic stability in the Middle East and elsewhere in the world, will not be an easy job. Yet given certain conditions, it can be done.

One condition is painfully obvious. That is that Great Britain remain a major world power. American policy in the Middle East is based squarely on the assumption that Great Britain remain a good long-term bet. This is so, simply because a total British economic collapse, or a wholesale withdrawal of British influence (or what is more likely, both together) would leave a vast vacuum far more easily filled by the Soviet Union than by the United States. The question is therefore pertinent: "How good a bet is Great Britain?"

To that question you can find in England an infinite variety of answers. "You can write us off," one prominent Tory remarked to this reporter, with that intense pleasure in the lugubrious sometimes attributed to the unadmirable English weather.

Glance at the coal cuts for this summer, glance at the export figures, and stop fooling yourselves. England will never make it. A dwindling number of enthusiastic Socialists see the Socialist millennium ushered in within a couple of years or so, with plenty for all and dancing on the village green. What appear to be the most sensible and informed observers place the answer somewhere between these extremes. Their mood is one of guarded optimism. They are betting on England, but they have their fingers crossed.

There are all sorts of reasons why no sensible man would dare to uncross his fingers in the near future. Coal is one. Coal is at the heart of the British economic crisis; if coal production were suddenly and miraculously to equal prewar, the whole country would be out of the woods tomorrow. Yet, this month the hours of work at the coal face have been reduced to 35, and

played-out Welsh mines, their seams almost run out, are still being worked, while rich, new, unexploited mines in Yorkshire are badly undermanned. The problem is partly human and partly political. The miners exhibit the same curious lethargy which characterizes many workers in many industries in postwar Britain. The Government has no carrot in the form of consumption goods to offer them, and since it is politically dependent on their good will, it dares not use a stick. Yet there are signs that the meaning of the terrible coal crisis of the winter has struck home, and that nationalization has provided a morale boost. Despite wild-cat strikes, the production curve is gently up.

Another symptom of the reason why fingers remain crossed may be found in the simple fact that during the recent Easter recess of Parliament most of the members of the Cabinet took to their beds in utter exhaustion. They were on the verge of total collapse simply because of the desperate shortage of efficient personnel to manage the immense business of transforming Britain into a semisocialist state. One high Labor Party official remarked to this reporter that before the war he and his friends had always imagined that the greatest obstacle to successful socialism would be the bitter intransigence of the ruling class, but they had found that the real trouble was not barricades in the streets but getting good men to run the show. The transfer of the basic economic power into the hands of the state presupposes men with the technical training to manage this vast power. Such men have too often been lacking, and the result has not infrequently been something close to total administrative break-down, but here, too, are signs of improvement.

Yet the plain fact is that whatever government were in power—and the Tory leaders in private conversation thank their lucky stars that they were beaten in 1945—Great Britain would inevitably be sailing perilously close to the wind in these postwar years. British economists, when they go to bed at night, must pray for the return of the world buyers' market in food. When that time comes, not only will Britain be able to buy the food at lower prices to keep 49,000,000 people alive, but the strength of the British economic position as the world's great market will again be restored. But until that time comes the British economy will drop along from crisis to crisis, now showing signs of recovery, now seemingly about to sink without trace.

If and when it becomes clear that the British economy is in fact faced with total collapse, the United States will be confronted with a crisis of foreign policy which will make the Greek crisis seem in retrospect a mere teapot tempest. It is the certainty that an economic collapse is on the way, and that such a collapse will force the Labor government to cut its world commitments, to divorce its policy from that of the United States, and to appease the Soviet Union; that gives the Labor rebels their perfect confidence that they will win in the end.

In this prospect, the United States can do more than cross its fingers. Among both American and British policy makers there is a growing conviction that some sort of overall agreement on the parts both nations must play in the coming few years is essential. Such an agreement would be specifically designed to take some of the heavy and disproportionate load off British shoulders while Britain fights for her economic life. For Britain, it would be a form of life insurance against the economic storms looming visibly on the British horizon. For the United States, such an agreement would also be life insurance; insurance against the unthinkable catastrophe of the loss of the only dependable ally in the effort to contain Soviet expansion and reach a true world settlement.



Of course, Mr. Speaker, when we consider that the French Government is now depending on us, and when we examine the economic situation in France and Japan and discover that we will be asked to rebuild these economies, we began to understand the enormous commitments to which the Truman doctrine has bound us.

Japan alone will take one hundred or one hundred and fifty millions of dollars. Mr. Alfred Friendly, writing for the Washington Post of this past Sunday, states, and I quote:

A large segment of the Japanese Nation has relaxed into complacent dependency on American largesse.

Our State Department is demanding seventy-five or one hundred and seventy-five millions for Korea. Now we discover that we are going to have to carry Japan on our backs for another three or four hundred millions each year. Mr. Speaker, I ask that Mr. Friendly's article on Japan appear in my remarks at this point.

REPARATIONS - OUT - OF - PRODUCTION IDEA  
STUDIED—UNITED STATES PLANS "HYPO" FOR  
LAGGING JAPAN

(By Alfred Friendly)

Wary of pouring American money down a bottomless pit, State Department experts are deliberating a new plan involving a "cranking up" of the Japanese economy, the Washington Post learned last week.

It involves rehabilitation of Japanese trade and industry to the point where it can support itself and pay its war reparations out of its current production.

The plan is still only in the discussion and exploratory stages. Its general outlines, however, have been talked over with persons high on the staff of General MacArthur, Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers.

The United States is pumping \$225,000,000 a year into Japan in the form of food and supplies. This is a minimum "antidisease and unrest" necessity. This relief payment is supposed to end after 1948, but unless the Japanese economy improves materially the need for continuing payments will still be compelling.

But the Japanese economy shows no signs of improvement. On the contrary, it has deteriorated notably ever since November.

A second necessity, intimately connected with the first, is that of helping solve the economic difficulties of the countries of the Far East which fought Japan. As long as Japan continues to live only by virtue of an economic oxygen tent provided by the United States, its neighboring countries—China, the Philippines, Korea, the Netherlands East Indies, French Indochina, etc.—have no hope of obtaining reparations from her to help restore their own economies.

#### OWN BOOTSTRAPS POLICY

Accordingly, the State Department has about reached the conclusion that two basic policies which we have followed since VJ-day must be subjected to a considerable overhauling.

The first policy relates to Japanese economic recovery. The directives on this matter have said, in effect, "You got yourself into this jam; now it's up to you to get yourself out as best you can, by your own efforts."

The second policy calls for the Japanese payment of reparations out of its capital, in the form of plant, equipment, reserves, and other physical and financial assets. Though the Potsdam Declaration did not close the door to a system of reparations out of current production, it did not direct that method to be undertaken.

These two policies, certain State Department officials believe, are not working out. In the first place, Japan shows no signs of getting herself out of the jam. It is on the brink of starvation. Mass unrest, particularly in the urban centers, provides a sterile field in which to plant the seeds of democracy.

In the second place, it is becoming increasingly clear that transferring Japanese industrial equipment, placement or en gross, to its neighbors as reparations is not very successful.

Much of Japan's industrial equipment is obsolescent, was undermaintained during the war, and has deteriorated since. It is difficult and uneconomical to move (it's pretty hard and fairly futile to pick up and move a blast furnace, for example). Besides, it takes much technical skill for a neighboring nation to absorb the equipment into its own economy.

It is questionable whether China, for instance, would have the technical ability to take over a large part of Japan's steel plant, or whether the Philippines could absorb the erstwhile Japanese aluminum industry.

There are, however, many items which Japan could produce with its present equipment which would be inordinately useful to the countries ravaged by war. China needs coastal and river vessels which could be produced in Japanese shipyards. Railroad equipment, textile and food-processing machinery and plants could also be turned out in Japan to fill urgent needs of nearby lands.

Is it possible, then, to modify the policies we have followed as regards Japan, and reorient Japanese industry? Can it be made to develop surplus as well as maintain its own economic life?

#### CAN'T BOOST SUBSIDY

State Department groups worrying about the problem hope that the answers to both questions will be in the affirmative. But they admit the presence of several extremely difficult problems and conditioning factors:

1. No additional financing of the new plan can be counted on from the American Government. As a practical matter, it is felt that Congress would not agree to a subsidy larger than the present annual two hundred and twenty-five million.

2. The countries of the Far East are not going to be particularly happy to see us help build up the Japanese economy while their own economies are in such a sad state. Yet these countries must cooperate in the plan if it is to be a success.

Accordingly, the United States must be able to demonstrate that the plan will be to their benefit. It is at this point that the scheme of reparations out of current production comes into the picture. The prospect of reparations payments may serve to make the rehabilitation plan palatable to Japan's neighbors and to enlist their tangible help in the form of financing.

3. A large segment of the Japanese nation has relaxed into complacent dependency on American largesse. It will be difficult to reorganize its industry, and its psychology, to produce on a higher level and to export the surplus. Much pressure will be needed to force Japan to produce under a rational system. Up to this point the pressure that MacArthur has exerted has been less than successful.

4. Success of the plan depends on securing a much larger supply of imported raw materials than Japan has been receiving. Although production facilities are ample for a much higher rate of industrial activity—enough to produce large exports of finished goods—Japan stands desperately in need of coal, raw cotton, and many other commodities.

5. To obtain these raw materials, and for other purposes, considerable financing is needed, over and above the \$225,000,000 a year supplied by the United States. The

hope is that some of this financing can be done by private industry, interested in imports from Japan, and some by neighboring countries, in the hope that initial outlays will produce ultimate reparations.

#### TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FIVE MILLION GAP

State Department economists calculate that some \$800,000,000 will be needed to do the job in 1948. Of this, Japan is assured the two hundred and twenty-five million and can make up about three hundred million from the sale of her increased exports. This leaves a deficit of about two hundred and seventy-five million.

To make this up, there is some one hundred and fifty million in gold and silver owned by Japan. The remaining one hundred and twenty-five million, it is hoped, can be provided by trade credits, by nearby countries and by private business interests.

Far Eastern experts admit the enormous difficulties in the proposed program, and concede that their plans are still tentative, far from adoption. But, they insist, this plan or some other must replace a present system which holds in it precisely the same promise as does pouring sand down a rat hole.

Mr. Speaker, I have said that in my opinion the bipartisan foreign policy is at an end. I believe that the Truman administration will argue for heavier and heavier expenditures, for universal military conscription on the basis of the Truman doctrine. Mr. Speaker, I wish to serve notice that the kind of naval diplomatic thinking which characterizes the Greek-Turkish business will come in for rough sledding whenever it raises its head in the future. Admirals seem to have a fascination for islands and for peninsulas and for straits. They love to hang around the perimeters of great continental masses with their warships. They love to have long lines of communications. They love to mess in Greece when the main fight is in the heart of Europe in Germany. For three centuries the British naval diplomacy and naval thinking has built up island bases and dependencies and lines of naval communication throughout the world. It is a wonderful thing for admirals to have battleships and islands and bases and little peninsulas and long lines of communication, but 90 percent of it is waste; 90 percent is useless and 90 percent is a handicap rather than a help in actual warfare. Perhaps if the Navy could be excused from participating in the formulation of policy, when the Truman doctrine is to be expanded there would be less discussion and less trouble about the whole business.

I believe that the Truman administration will be well advised to understand now that the bipartisan foreign policy, so far as the large group of Republicans in the House is concerned, is a dead duck, and we intend to fight for a genuine American peace policy based solidly on the UN.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a newspaper article with reference to a meeting of eight western governors in the city of Seattle on May 7 of this year.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS  
AT THIS POINT

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point two telegrams, one from the mayor of San Francisco, Mr. Roger D. Lapham, and one from Mr. Mike Doolin, manager, San Francisco Airport, with reference to the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

The telegrams referred to are as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., May 9, 1947.

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.:

Advised House Appropriations Committee has eliminated from Commerce Department appropriation bill funds for operation of San Francisco Airport air traffic control tower.

While we naturally protest imposition of this financial burden on our local government, we are more principally concerned because of firm feeling that all traffic control tower men should be hired and controlled by one agency, necessarily Federal, in interests of uniform control in all airports and resulting standardization of safety for benefit of all pilots as well as passengers. It is unthinkable that national and international air commerce and lives of countless thousands of passengers should be jeopardized.

I personally oppose centralization of government in Federal hands as matter of broad principle but feel that air commerce which knows no State boundaries and few international ones is type of operation so fast moving and broad that centralization in Federal agency of safety control and supervision is only answer in this particular case.

San Francisco now spending twenty millions to make airport one of world's finest. Many other cities also modernizing airports for safety and convenience. All this would be undermined if uniform safety standards of air traffic control tower men sidetracked by Federal Government.

ROGER D. LAPHAM,  
Mayor.

CHICAGO, ILL., May 12, 1947.

RICHARD J. WELCH,  
Member of Congress,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

The American Association of Airport Executives in annual convention at Chicago and as a special first order of business request that you present to the Congress immediately its unanimous and urgent protest against the elimination from CAA appropriations of funds for the operation of air traffic control towers. This association composed of airport managers and executives of wide experience in aviation, and from localities with the heaviest volume of air traffic, are amazed at the elimination of funds for this key agency on which is dependent the safety of air commerce and the life of every pilot and air passenger on air-line or any other aircraft.

Congress must reinstate funds for the Federal operations of air traffic control towers or take the responsibility for the complete break-down of a system of flight control which has been proven the safest in the world.

MIKE DOOLIN,  
Manager, San Francisco Airport.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LYLE (at the request of Mr. PRICE of Illinois) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and

include a resolution adopted by the Rivers and Harbors Congress relative to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. RICHARDS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain quotations.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend the remarks that I made today while the House was in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and include a number of tables and statistics.

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

There was no objection.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE  
JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, FIS-  
CAL YEAR 1948

Mr. STEFAN. 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. 3311) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce and the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3311, the State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary appropriation bill, fiscal year 1948, with Mr. CURTIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH] has 2 minutes remaining.

The gentleman from New York is recognized.

ESTABLISHMENT OF AIR NAVIGATION FACILITIES

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask the membership of this House whether we must purchase Government economy with the lives of our citizens—men, women, and children who are entrusting their safety to the air lines of America.

Do you remember the black headlines in December and January, when it seemed as if each day brought another terrible airplane accident? Did you read the casualty lists, fearing that a friend, or even a beloved relative, might have perished?

The Congress, shocked at the air accidents, began independent investigations into air safety. The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, held long hearings into the causes of these accidents.

And what did both these committees find? Both committees, investigating independently, recommended that the Civil Aeronautics Administration install modern navigation aids along the airways to save the lives of our citizens.

Let me quote from the preliminary report of our own Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, dated February 19, 1947:

It appears, however, that there has been a certain number of accidents recently which might have been prevented had certain facilities been available. \* \* \* It

is the committee's opinion that the Federal Government should provide certain facilities to increase air safety as soon as possible. \* \* \* Your committee is encouraged to note the development of air aids to navigation, including aids to landing and take-offs that have been advanced in development during the war, but is concerned by the delay in installation of such equipment caused by the war, and urges acceleration in the provision of the necessary funds so that these aids may be made fully available as soon as possible.

Now let me quote from the interim report of the Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, investigating air safety:

The members of the subcommittee stress the urgency of the installation of all possible navigational aids as far as feasible before the winter of 1947-48. It is recommended that the Civil Aeronautics Administration plan this present program for completion within a period not exceeding 18 months.

In accordance with these recommendations by committees of both the House and Senate, the Civil Aeronautics Administration has asked for \$36,308,000 to buy and install the equipment needed to assure the safety of American air passengers through the storms and bad weather of the coming winter.

Instead of providing for this emergency need as recommended by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees of both Houses—instead of providing the funds so that our air passengers can ride in safety and security—the House Appropriations Committee proposes that we slash this request by more than 50 percent.

If this cut is made, it will mean elimination of 42 very high-frequency radio ranges, 38 instrument-landing systems, 38 high-intensity approach lights, and all the low-frequency high-powered omnidirectional radio ranges planned for the continental United States. In addition, it will mean a drastic reduction in the program for installing ground-controlled approach radar necessary to bring our planes in safely through fog and rain. And it will mean a sharp reduction in surveillance radar equipment needed to prevent collisions in midair over our airports.

Last year 12,500,000 Americans rode on our domestic air lines. This year the number may well be 15,000,000 people whose lives depend on adequate facilities for bad-weather travel.

Can we tell the people of the United States that their lives, and the lives of their families, mean so little to us that we will not appropriate the funds necessary to make air travel safe? Is this the economy which the people of the United States are seeking?

Let me say, insofar as New York is concerned, the tower controls will cost the city, I am told, something between \$250,000 and \$500,000 per annum for LaGuardia and Floyd Bennett Fields if their maintenance of operation are not continued by the Federal Government as in the past.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].



Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH], I fully realize the difficult tasks of the hard-working subcommittee in trying to effect economies so much desired by all of us. I dislike to be in disagreement with the committee, but I am also interested in air safety and in effective foreign relations. At this point I shall speak only of the latter.

Mr. Chairman, I am gravely disturbed by the proposed cut in the budget of the Foreign Service of the United States.

The account which General Marshall brought us of the Moscow Conference should convince that last doubter that we are living in a dangerous world. We are not at war, but we are not at peace. After the end of the fighting, no man can say how or when the peace treaties with our principal enemies will ever be signed. We cannot make the peace because relations between the principal allies in the struggle are not peaceful.

Two years ago, with high hopes, we drew the plan and raised the walls of what was to be the citadel of peace. No more comprehensive well-balanced international organization has ever been created than the United Nations, and none gave greater promise or faced a more crucial destiny; none has faced graver troubles so soon after its beginning. Ten times the will of the majority has been brought to nothing by the veto of the Soviet Union. The armed forces which were to enforce the collective will are now seen to be limited to the size needed to browbeat small nations, and over all hangs the vast insecurity caused by the failure to agree on any plan to harness the terrors of the atom bomb.

If the United Nations is to be saved all nations must come before its bar as "sovereign equals." If the United States is to be saved it must not allow the sovereign equality of its brother democracies to go down before pressures from without and Communists boring from within.

The Nation must save itself by its own exertions. This is what the Truman doctrine means. It means that the United States must go into the field to fight a campaign for peace.

At the same time that this decision to take the field was being considered, another decision was being made here in Washington. It was decided to inaugurate this campaign by cutting down on supplies and equipment of our first field force—the Foreign Service of the United States.

When General Marshall asked us for tens of billions of dollars to prosecute the war we had full and complete confidence in him, and I am certain that I speak for every Member of this House in saying that not one of us begrudge a single penny of the funds we thus placed at his disposal.

Today the United States is indeed fortunate in having General Marshall as Secretary of State and as the President's principal assistant in leading the battle for peace. If we deny him the funds which he in his considered judgment is asking for the Foreign Service of the United States we will not only be hampering him in his campaign for peace but also be showing a surprising lack

of confidence in the judgment of a man to whom we entrusted without question tens of billions of dollars and who more than justified the trust we placed in him.

I am certain that we will find it most difficult to satisfy our consciences that we have done everything possible to protect the interests of the United States if we hamper the efforts of our Secretary of State to secure peace by refusing him the tools he needs for this task.

The United States was formerly in a most advantageous strategic position. Its frontiers were protected by two broad oceans. The events of Hiroshima and Nagasaki show clearly that oceans or other geographic or man-made lines of defense have become practically useless.

The Foreign Service has often been called our first line of defense and with the new methods of warfare and the resultant decrease in the protection which our geographic position affords us, the importance of this first line looms even greater.

Secretary Marshall has explained in great detail why he requests these appropriations for the Foreign Service. As we all have this material I do not wish to take your time to go over the same ground.

My earnest plea to you is to give the Secretary in toto the comparatively small sum he judges indispensable for the Foreign Service, both as a direct means of assisting him in his labor for peace and to strengthen the first line of defense of the United States.

During the hearings the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] asked General Marshall if he felt he needed to have the full amount requested for major activities of the State Department. General Marshall replied very emphatically that the requests were conservative and he told the subcommittee that it is very important that there be no cut in Foreign Service personnel.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MEADE].

Mr. MEADE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I wish to protest most vigorously the action of the committee in eliminating Federal funds for the operation of control towers in important airfields. As the Members of Congress are no doubt aware, Baltimore is one of the largest aviation centers in this country and we are vitally interested in doing everything possible to promote aviation with the greatest possible amount of safety. In my opinion the elimination at this time of Federal funds for the operation of control towers would vitally affect my district and would have a tremendous effect upon the safe operation of airplanes throughout the country. I think that the committee in their consideration of aviation has forgotten the tremendous advances which are being made and which must continue to be made in this country so that we may have in America the most modern airplanes and airports in the entire world.

I find it impossible to condone the recommended cut by our Appropriations Committee whereby half of the large airports scheduled for improvement under the Federal aid airport program would

have to be scrapped. I ask you gentlemen how can we maintain our present eminent position in the field of world aviation if this reduction of funds from \$65,000,000 to \$32,500,000 is made?

Airports are not only the very foundation of our aviation industry but the hope of our aviation future. Without continuous development our country will find itself in the unenviable position of falling behind in the march of aviation progress. You and I cannot afford, at the price of so-called economy, to wreck a program designed not only to keep abreast of the rapid pace set by civilian aviation since the war but as insurance for national defense itself.

I strongly believe that economy of this kind is false economy. Let there be economy where we can afford it but let us not plunge blindly into a situation that will have dire effects on our newest and fastest growing industry—aviation. It was largely through this industry that we were able to defeat our recent enemies—let us not strangle it now that peace has come. We must let it expand. We must go even further than that—we must give it a helping hand.

Think of the drastic effect these contemplated cuts would have on the Nation. Over 300 of our great cities have been singled out on a strict priority basis for airport improvement during the fiscal year 1948. The \$65,000,000 recommended by the Bureau of the Budget would have taken care of these necessary improvements. Now we find that figure chopped in half. That means that perhaps 150 of our important cities may be unable to proceed with the necessary improvements on their airport facilities—and at a time when air commerce has reached an all-time high—and furthermore at a time when other nations are leaving no stone unturned to take over our leading place in aviation.

A year ago the Congress of the United States recognized the urgent need for airport development and authorized the expenditure of \$500,000,000 in Federal funds over a 7-year period to assure us of a well balanced system of airports. The cities and towns were led to believe that they would have true Federal aid in constructing or improving their airports. We will be breaking faith if we withdraw with one hand that which we have already offered with the other. Sharp cuts like those recommended by our Appropriations Committee report will throw our whole airport-building program completely out of balance. We must not let this happen. The appropriation of but half of the requested \$65,000,000 may damage for some time to come the air service of our scheduled airlines, which are willing and anxious to schedule flights into cities that do not now have adequate airport facilities, but which would have if the full \$65,000,000 is appropriated.

There is great need of speed in this airport-building program. The life of the act which makes it possible is but for 7 years. Any delay by us at this time in meeting our obligations to the people of the country means time lost—time that it will not be possible to make up in the 7 years of the bill. At the rate recommended for this 1948 airport building,

less than 50 percent of the proposed program will be accomplished by 1953. That may mean large expenditures at a later date while the great aviation industry stands still.

Can we afford such a situation in these unsettled times? I for one am convinced that we cannot and I sincerely hope that you gentlemen will join me in seeing to it that the original request is restored.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN].

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, within the time allotted to me, I could not cover this entire bill. However, I should like to discuss the effects of the proposed reductions upon small business.

Within the past few months we have heard much about reducing Government expenditures and almost in every instance it has been contended by those advocating the cuts that essential Government services were not to be disturbed. It is not working out this way.

When a department does not have sufficient funds to function, it cannot operate effectively and in many instances if the proposed reductions are made they will result in discontinuance of many essential Government services entirely. I believe we will find this to be true in the pending bill.

The cuts proposed by the Appropriations Committee in the Department of Commerce budget are a blow to American business in general. More specifically, they constitute a severe injury to small business.

All of us believe that competition is the blood and bone of the free-enterprise system. And all of us know that competition is threatened by the rapidly increasing concentration of wealth and industrial power. One way to check the growth of monopoly and to encourage competition is to provide the small businessman with the tools he needs.

To compete successfully with larger firms, the small businessman must have business facts. He must know the markets for his product in his area. He must know about the growth of other businesses in his own field. And he must have access to technical information to help him solve his production problems. The proposed cuts for the Department of Commerce will hamper the Department in its attempts to raise the standards of management in small business.

The big businessman can pay for this kind of assistance. He can hire a private expert or firm to analyze his market and keep him informed of production trends in his own industry. He can hire efficiency experts and engineers to break his production bottlenecks. But the small businessman cannot afford these services. He must depend in large part on his Government.

If the proposed cuts are approved by this Congress, the small businessman is going to discover that his Government cannot give him the kind of service he got in the past. In many cities the businessman who will have occasion to go to a Commerce Department field office for help next July will find an out-of-business sign on the door. He will have to go to Washington for assistance.

When this same small businessman finally makes contact with the Department of Commerce he will find that many of the services that were once available are no longer to be had. Take the Census Bureau statistics as an example. During the past year the Census Bureau has been working to set up a modern reporting service to keep retailers and other kinds of small businessmen informed about the buying habits of their customers. A reporting panel has been set up to include about 175,000 firms in all important types of retail, service, and related businesses. The statistics based on reports from these firms enable businessmen to tell how their firms are doing in comparison with other firms. The proposed cuts will make it necessary for the Census Bureau to eliminate about one-third of the information now available for certain types of retail and service businesses. In addition, it will be impossible for the Bureau to go ahead with its plans to extend this service to 24 additional cities with populations over 100,000. In other words, these proposed reductions will take away from grocers, druggists, lumber dealers, filling-station operators, and other types of small businessmen in many parts of the country the information they need to plan their businesses and operate successfully.

The small importer or exporter relies more heavily on the Department of Commerce than on any other single source of information. He needs lists of foreign dealers and distributors. He needs to know the facts about business conditions in foreign countries—and he needs to know about foreign tariffs and controls of all kinds. Already the Department is far behind in answering requests or this kind of information. The cuts proposed by the Appropriations Committee would make it even harder for the small exporter and importer to do business, and in some cases the delays might be so serious as to put him out of business entirely.

The committee also proposes to cut the budget of the Office of Technical Services by 50 percent. To the small businessman this means that the Department of Commerce can no longer encourage research to open up new industrial opportunities for small producers in various parts of the United States. It means, too, that when a small manufacturer writes to the Department of Commerce for an answer to a technical problem, he will find that the answer does not come back to him as fast as it once did. If this Congress approves a 50-percent cut in the budget of the Office of Technical Services it will mean that we are shutting our eyes to the needs of the small producer. This is an age of science and technology, and we cannot rob the small manufacturer of his chance to get the know-how he needs to survive.

I have spoken of only a few of the ways in which the proposed budget cuts will affect the small businessman. I could go on and mention many others. My main point is that these cuts will affect the welfare of all business, but they will hurt small business most. For the sake of our competitive, free-enterprise system we cannot afford to take

away from the small businessman any of the weapons he needs in his fight for survival.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, it is apparent to me that the committee has not given full consideration to the consequences which will result from their untimely and unwarranted efforts to economize with regard to the maintenance and operation of Federal airways.

This is not a partisan question. It is one which concerns the safety of our people. There is no justification for shifting financial responsibility in the operation of airport traffic control towers upon such short notice. Neither municipalities nor private airlines have included this item in their budgetary planning. This action comes as a distinct shock to both of them. No; this is not political for I have before me three telegrams, one from a leading journalist, another from the mayor of the city and County of Denver, and the third from a representative of the aviation industry. Let me read to you what each has to say:

DENVER, COLO., May 12, 1947.

Hon. JOHN CARROLL,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you investigate elimination of funds for control towers in CAA 1948 budget. This seems a tragic blunder.

Regards,

PALMER HOYT,  
The Denver Post.

DENVER, COLO., May 7, 1947.

Hon. JOHN A. CARROLL,  
Member of Congress,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Just informed by House of Representatives of the elimination of the expenses attached to the control tower at the Municipal Airport. This city is contributing more than many times in promotion of aviation than the Federal Government does here. Please take this up with the other Members of Congress from Colorado, also hope you can and will use your best efforts to see that the appropriation for municipal airports is not reduced.

BEN F. STAPLETON,  
Mayor.

DENVER, COLO., May 9, 1947.

Representative JOHN A. CARROLL,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Operation of airport traffic control towers essential to safety. Neither cities nor airlines in financial position to take over operation. Request passage of Bakewell amendment to reinstate \$4,830,801 in appropriation bill so that CAA will continue operation of 148 control towers.

R. F. SIX,  
President, Continental Airlines, Inc.

When you take away from the Federal airways system, as is proposed, one-fourth of its funds for operation, you do two things: You cripple the organization which must operate these airways, in this case the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and you put United States aviation in an unfavorable competing position in world aviation by forcing the curtailment of our Nation's airline operations.



These are two results entirely aside from the danger which you will add to all operations over the airways. I do not think this Congress wants to have it said that it decreased the chances for safety along the airways, and that is exactly what you do when we slash arbitrarily the funds to maintain airway safety aids in condition for proper functioning.

Let us consider the detailed services which this cut in the CAA's Federal airways appropriation of 24 percent or \$15,225,000 of the \$60,000,000 requested will eliminate:

Operation of 147 airport traffic-control towers must now be paid for by the cities or be inactivated.

Fifty-nine communications stations and their associated aids will be permanently discontinued.

Modernization of the airways system will be stopped in its tracks, with facilities constructed during the current—1947—fiscal year uncommissioned and deteriorating from disuse.

The modernization is the very lifeblood of the safety aids which we supply to our airmen. The CAA is in the midst of a program to change the whole communications and signals system from low frequency to very high frequency, which would provide static-free communications for greater efficiency. It has been forced by many conditions, one of which is limited funds, and the other lack of equipment, to pursue this program very slowly.

Now, when supply matters are loosening up a little, when the first rays of daylight are visible to those who have planned this modernization for many years, we are forced to stop the whole program through failure to provide funds to operate and maintain adequately already constructed facilities and abandon the completion of the planned system.

Piled on top of the committee's recommended slash there is the already added burden of increased costs for operating the airways. There has been criticism of the mounting cost of airway operation per mile, but that is hardly a satisfactory method of estimating the value of the service. It is more fair to consider these aids on the basis of what they cost in proportion to the passengers who used them. On that basis, the cost of airways has gone down steadily since 1935. The cost that year was 1.4 cents per passenger-mile. In 1944, this had dropped to 1 cent, and for 1948, the estimated cost will be eight-tenths of 1 cent.

This despite the growing costs of operating more and more airway aids, some of them of much more expensive nature than any ever used before. Radar aids, for example, require more personnel than radio aids which can be made automatic, and you know that kind of personnel is worthy of fair pay.

In all, this cut will mean that 920 air-navigation facilities, now under construction throughout the country cannot be commissioned, because there will be no funds for operating them during 1948. Included among these are instrument landing aids which were so heartily recommended by our own committee investigating safety on the air lines. It

also will be impossible to install radar landing aids just now being applied to civilian air operations, and the light lanes which aid the pilot in the last few seconds of his landing will not be turned on.

This is trifling with certain disaster, I believe. Shocked by the air-line accidents of last winter the whole country heard us urge that the CAA be directed to buy the best safety aids and install them immediately. Now, instead of providing money for purchase and installation of these aids, we take away even that money requested by the CAA for maintaining those already installed. This most obviously is illogical waste—not economy.

I say to you that civilian lives are not expendable. If we want safety on the airways, we must appropriate the money to pay for it.

This is further and conclusive evidence that the mistake made several months ago of attempting a \$6,000,000,000 slash in the budget without the proper planning therefor was a most serious one. Every reasonable person recognizes that we must practice economy to the best of our ability, but we cannot do so at the expense of crippling certain programs which are vital to the necessary functioning of our Government. The items mentioned here must be restored. Public interest and safety demand it.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. It seems to me it would be a good thing to have in the Record the answer to one of the questions that has bothered me a good deal in this discussion, that is, whether in connection with the cuts that were made in the CAA appropriations the question of the development of the Air Corps in relation to national defense entered the picture at all, or whether on the other hand it was a matter merely of the ability of various other organizations to carry forward financially.

Mr. STEFAN. We have nothing to do with the Army Air Corps in this bill; all we do is with civil aviation. To clarify what is in the mind of the gentleman may I say that because we did take into consideration national defense we left in the appropriation all the safety aids required by the CAA. We know there is something new coming as far as radar is concerned, something better than ILS, perhaps some improvement on the ground control approach. We also took into consideration the disposal of about 400 Army and Navy airports which are now being acquired by States and municipalities, leaving their disposal so as to be available in case of emergency. Yes, we did take into consideration the question of national defense.

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

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

Mr. ROONEY. I do not agree with the gentleman. I feel that the answer to the question propounded by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is to the con-

trary, that the denial of money for Federal aid to the airport program and for the air safety control towers has quite an effect upon national defense.

Mr. STEFAN. Of course the gentleman believes in restoring the funds for control towers. We certainly did take into consideration all arguments as far as the national safety and defense is concerned. The disposal of millions upon millions of dollars invested in Army and Navy airports now being declared surplus certainly was taken into consideration by this committee when we followed closely how they are going to be disposed of, in order that the Army and Navy will have priority rights on them when and if an emergency arises. We guarded safety and national defense.

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

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], who as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been conducting hearings on the very subject about which we are now talking. I think the gentleman from California knows as much about aviation, if not more, than most Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman is very kind.

Mr. Chairman, it is true that the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been holding hearings beginning on the 15th of January, approximately, and proceeding then for 6 weeks, and at intervals since then, on the subject of safety in air navigation. We have been giving very careful attention to that subject because of the rash of air accidents that occurred last year, trying to find the reason for those accidents insofar as the Government might relate to those reasons, and also to discover what steps were being taken to improve the systems of air navigation in order that such accidents might be avoided.

It is a very happy note that since the committee commenced its investigations no serious accidents have occurred on the domestic air lines in the United States in passenger operations. There have been certain other accidents which occurred but they were not in scheduled operation of the air lines.

I would like to speak for a moment on the subject of aids to air navigation because I note a considerable decrease in the President's 1948 budget. Personally, I will have to give almost entire approval to that decrease and suggest that for this year there might even be further decreases in the budget, because the industry is not prepared at the present time to offer a system of air navigation different from what we have had which can yet be finally agreed upon.

In the report from our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce we urged the immediate installation of a certain number of types of equipment and perhaps we urged that a little too soon. Additional information has come to some of the members of the committee, and to me among them, concerning certain of these aids to navigation. I will direct my attention for a moment

to the system known as the ILS or the instrument landing system, a system upon which the Civil Aeronautics Administration has been working and developing for a period of some 15 years. They are, of course, to be complimented for their diligence in studying this particular matter and bringing its development to its present high state. But unfortunately there are certain qualities of that system which are not satisfactory which have been discovered by flight tests and which indicate that in all possibility that system is already obsolete and that no further installations of it should be made. I say that because of the obvious electronic facts that are connected with it.

As an aid to increasing the traffic into airports under adverse weather conditions, of course, it is an improvement upon the present range system, but it is not able to measure up to the needs of heavy traffic centers such as the Washington National Airport or the LaGuardia Airport, the Chicago Airport, or any other of the heavily traveled centers. It would appear that it is limited in the number of landings that can be made per hour in bad weather.

As the chairman of the subcommittee has said, there are developments proceeding in the GCA—the ground-controlled approach system, a radar system which not only bids fair to increase the possibility of landings to the rate of one per minute under bad weather conditions in the future but which will also provide a degree of traffic control which is not now possible.

I would like to remark for the record at this point that I think the Civil Aeronautics Administration was kidding somebody in your committee on page 814 where Mr. Kline gave information concerning air navigation facilities, service, communication, and maintenance, in connection with the Washington Airport for the fiscal year 1948.

I note there that under item 1, ground controlled approach system, \$69,068, he has included in all probability a very large number of personnel.

I would like to bring that to the attention of the committee because I think they are being kidded and badly kidded. As a matter of fact, the ground-controlled approach system installed in the Washington National Airport and a number of other airports now, I understand, has a console containing two radar scopes—one of them for monitoring an area of 28,000 square miles around the airport, and the other one for aiding and bringing in to a safe landing the aircraft that will come in over the path provided. As a matter of fact, there need be no additional tower operators where this GCA equipment is used. That equipment should be used by the tower controllers themselves and not by anyone else. There is no need whatsoever for any additional operating personnel in any of these towers for GCA equipment and such maintenance as may be required can be done by anyone who is properly trained in the use and maintenance of such electronic equipment. Consequently, this item of \$69,000 set up here for the Washington National Airport GCA system is, I think, very much out of line. I am surprised

that the CAA would give you that kind of information.

If it went to \$2,000 it would be a large amount. The same thing is true of any other airport where GCA is installed and where a console is provided for use in the airport tower by the airport controller. Insofar as the airport towers are concerned, I think it wise to mention at this point the fact that while the committee has not given direct study as to the proper allocation of cost of operation of control towers, that being a matter which has been brought to the attention of the committee by the proposed reduction to be made of over \$4,000,000 which would strike out the airport-control program from CAA, I note that the committee seems to feel that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee was put on notice last year by the fact that the committee in that year struck the item from the bill. You indicate that my committee thereby being put on notice that we should devise some legislative system for supporting this undertaking by CAA, I would like to say as one member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee—just as one member of the committee—I believe that the indications made by the House to the subcommittee last year when the House promptly and overwhelmingly reinstated that item in the bill was notice to the subcommittee itself that the House wanted control towers to be supported by CAA. The committee differs with us on that matter, and I would say for myself, and I think for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, that we all will be interested in a study which we will make at our first opportunity of the subject of the further participation by the users of the airways and their facilities, to the support of those facilities financially. However, that cannot be done between now and the 30th of June. Therefore, if no one else does, I intend to offer an amendment tomorrow to reinstate in this bill the amount required for the operation of the control towers by CAA. Not to do so would be a very serious hazard to all types of aviation, and I include in that private flyers, civil air lines, and nonscheduled operators, as well as the Army and Navy.

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

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to compliment the gentleman for that statement, which substantiates the view taken by at least two of the minority members of the committee. It is my intention tomorrow, when the bill is read for amendment, to offer such an amendment as the gentleman proposes.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman.

I notice on page 25 of the committee report certain language which I am unable to understand, which says:

Towers should be operated with CAA personnel under CAA standards but the cities, States, and municipalities would merely reimburse CAA for the cost of the personnel required to operate the towers.

I would like to know how you are going to call upon the cities and towns of this country, where airports are located, to force them to reimburse CAA for cost

of the operators in the control towers. As a matter of fact, most of those city budgets have already been made up. They have been made up on an entirely different time schedule than they are in the Congress of the United States. They have not included these items in their budgets for this year, because they were not notified that they would be called upon to do so. It would create chaos in the aviation of this country if these airport control towers were now to be thrown out. If the committee insist in their effort and succeed, I am sure it will be put back elsewhere, a thing which I do not like to see occur to the House of Representatives, because, after all, they in the other body then get the credit and we get the discredit. I think it is a mistake.

We have in the United States what is known as the inland waterways system. It includes certain channels that are dug around the outside of the United States, and improvements of certain rivers within the area. Nearly \$3,000,000,000 are invested in the inland waterways of the United States, and the annual appropriations therefor have averaged about \$116,000,000 in the last 20 years.

Nobody has asked the users of the inland waterways to reimburse the Government for the expenditure that it has made. Nobody has suggested that the users of the lighthouse service and the Coast Guard should reimburse the Government. That is a service performed by the United States for the benefit of shipping.

Nobody has suggested that we go out and make a direct tax upon the users of the highways except for licenses and gasoline taxes, yet there are hundreds of thousands of miles of highways in the United States. Neither is it done in the States and cities for traffic lights, traffic policemen, and that sort of thing.

I do not see why a special mark is being made of the civilian aviation industry. I cannot understand it, particularly when the fact is well known that the system of civil airways is built, of course, for the benefit of anyone who wants to use them; but in time of war they are to be used practically 100 percent by the United States Government and they are there for that purpose. If the airways were to be used only by commercial flyers then the commercial aviation industry, the nonscheduled and the scheduled operators should determine how they should be operated, what the equipment should consist of and what the pay rolls were going to be; but you do not give them that consideration at all, you do not permit them to have anything to say about it except in the matter of advice.

I suggest that if you are going to make a charge against them that you give them a direct voice in stating what sort of equipment shall be installed. I am sure that if the airways and airports were to be used solely by the air lines and the nonscheduled operators the cost of a set-up for that purpose would be very much lower than it is today. As a matter of fact they probably would not need any particular system of airways because there would not be many other aircraft in the air if it were not for these airways.



So I hope that the House will consider the airways and the air-traffic-control centers and the traffic-control towers at airports as being part and parcel of one and the same thing, a system of aids to air navigation in the country just as much as the inland waterways. The aids to navigation in the coastal waterways, the streets and highways of the United States, are parts of integrated transportation systems. These aids to air navigation are provided for the use of those who are engaged in aviation whether they be civil air pilots, that is, private pilots, scheduled and nonscheduled fliers, Army, Navy, or Coast Guard, or even the Civil Aeronautics Administration itself.

In respect to the Civil Aeronautics Administration, Mr. Chairman of the subcommittee, let me call your attention to a few figures I think you might take a good look at in the near future. There are approximately 46,000 miles of civil airways. Their set-up, that is, the budget for the Civil Aeronautics Administration, shows 230 planes and they will fly over the 46,230 miles of civil airways making inspections. You will find you have one Civil Aeronautics Administration plane for approximately every 200 miles of civil airways.

According to my figures the Civil Aeronautics Administration wants these planes to fly about 61,200 hours. Now divide the 61,200 hours by 230 and you get a result of 262 hours per year for the operation of each of these aircraft. That is an average of 23 or 24 hours per month, I should say, or about an hour a day. That is a ridiculous situation that you ought to go into if you really want to save some money.

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

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to reply to the gentleman from California regarding the cost of operation and maintenance of our air navigation facilities.

Every time one of these commercial airliners leaves the ground it costs the taxpayers of the United States plenty of money. In the case of 50 passengers on a 200-mile flight, 10,000 passenger-miles, it costs the taxpayers \$60 every time the plane moves. Forty passengers on an 800-mile flight or 32,000 passenger-miles costs the taxpayers of the United States \$192. At the present time it is costing \$240.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that statement?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield briefly.

Mr. HINSHAW. I merely wish to ask whether in those figures the entire operation of the civil airways is charged in?

Mr. STEFAN. No, no; that is a very small percentage. That is the percentage cost that the taxpayer bears.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned over the appropriations proposed for the Department of Commerce, and especially with respect to funds for the operation of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. In my opinion

to follow the recommendations of the committee concerning the establishment, maintenance, and operation of air navigation facilities, would effect complete stagnation of our entire aviation industry for the present and future. A brief résumé of the situation in Norfolk, Va., the largest city in my district, will give the Members of the House a glaring illustration.

Prior to the war no control tower was operated in Norfolk. I understand that during the war the Army and Navy assumed the cost of operating our present control towers by reimbursing the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The operation was carried on by CAA personnel.

This airfield controls all instrument flying for a radius of 25 miles, including the control of the planes of the Army, Navy, Marine, and Coast Guard, as well as all civilian aircraft.

On Saturday, May 3, 1947, at this airport, there were 1,393 operations executed at this one field alone. Commercial flights accounted for only 40 of these operations. I have heard the argument that municipalities should operate control towers.

In view of the above figures, I believe you can readily understand the utter absurdity of such a proposal. It is unthinkable that employees of the city of Norfolk should attempt to establish a pattern of flying in and around that airport by giving orders to the pilots of Army, Navy, Marine, and Coast Guard planes. Federal control is essential if we would avoid chaos and confusion, and would promote safety not only for commercial flying but also for the fliers of private craft and of the various governmental agencies.

Not long ago commercial aviation had a series of serious accidents which were at least partially the result of inadequate safety aids. In connection with these accidents a committee of this House said the Federal Government should provide certain facilities to increase air safety as soon as possible.

It must be recognized that, if municipalities all over this Nation undertake the operation of airport traffic control, there will be no standardization of personnel requirements. People entrusted with such essential duties should be carefully selected by standard Civil Service procedure. Otherwise we shall place in jeopardy the safety of all aircraft. It is vital that airport traffic control be exercised by an authoritative Federal agency.

The regulation of interstate commerce is vested in the Federal Government. The operation of aircraft is not only interstate but international in its significance. Norfolk, in my district, is designated as an alternate overseas airport, and this year, when airports to the north were closed, many foreign aircraft landed at and used the Norfolk Airport.

The number of passengers handled out of our airport in 1946 by scheduled carriers alone reached the amazing figure of almost 250,000. It is inconceivable that we should jeopardize the lives of so many people by demoralizing airport traffic

control and removing those safety measures which have been promoted by our Government. Rather it should be our policy to promote and develop the growth of safe and sane passenger and freight air transportation.

Consider what confusion would result if 48 States, plus the municipalities in each, attempted to construct a pattern of taxation designed to support the operation of the safety devices inherently necessary for safe flying. Think about the conflicting regulations and controls within two urban areas closely allied geographically, but separated politically. Throw in the mandatory orders of the Army and Navy, Marine Corps and Coast Guard, then we may expect rapid increase in the accident ratio. Misunderstanding of orders, may cause such a mounting death toll that the aviation industry of this country will be so handicapped as to set its development back many years. Municipalities will of necessity have to seek the cheapest and not the best and the lives of all air travelers will be prejudiced to save \$15,000,000 for maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities and \$18,670,000 for the establishment of air navigation facilities.

The municipalities which I have contacted, suffering now from lack of revenue, will in many instances be unable, even though it were rational, to install and support the navigational aids necessary to make flying safe.

Not only are the lives of those who travel by air involved, but the safety and homes of those who remain on the ground. People asleep in their beds may be crushed, their homes destroyed, that the Federal Government may save these two sums in a budget so constricted that if aviation attempts to bear the burden, this industry in its youth will be destroyed.

America should be the most air-minded Nation upon the globe. This can be accomplished only by aggressive research, and the establishment of essential safety factors. Has this House forgotten the pitiful experience that the ill-equipped Army fliers had, when, at the order of their Commander in Chief, they attempted to fly the mail?

Let us not place so low a price on the lives of those who fly. Let us restore to this bill the necessary funds to make air transport safe.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ALMOND].

Mr. ALMOND. Mr. Chairman, I am firmly convinced that we must practice frugality in Federal expenditures whenever and whenever such a course is consistent with the national welfare. However, in the name of economy, we should never throttle or destroy an essential and indispensable public service related to the field of Federal functions and dedicated to the economic and industrial development of our country.

Such a course is far removed from any rational concept of economy. It stifles progress, hinders development, and retards those composite factors which blend in their operation to produce a stable and sound economy.

The almost prodigious industrial evolution of this Nation to its place of pre-eminence in the arena of achievement has been the result of its foresight and vision in investing of the substance of its people to enhance the growth and development of the mighty potential of its fabulous resources.

If we should weigh and evaluate every segment or phase of the potentialities of our industrial and economic future, in an honest effort to select that which will contribute the most to our growth, prosperity and security in war and peace, then with unequivocal unanimity we would choose the aviation industry.

This great industry, yet in its infancy, if its growth and development in the public interest is to keep abreast of the times, must be sanely regulated and promoted by the Federal Government.

More than 9,000,000 people rode the airways of this country in 1946. Their safety should be a matter of deep, abiding and constructive concern on the part of the Federal Government. To abandon essential support of aerial traffic control towers, instrument landing facilities and full weather reporting would be tantamount to criminal negligence. Members will say that this is a matter of State and local concern, and that the Federal Government should be relieved of this burden. The fact remains that some municipalities are not financially able to assume the burden and some will not assume it whether able or not. The result will be to create serious bottlenecks in air transportation at vital points to the detriment of the air mail service, air travel and air commerce. The elimination of safety factors with the consequent increase of air tragedies will place the blood of innocent victims upon the hands of this Congress. I, for one, will not by my vote accept any such terrible responsibility.

In 1916 the first Federal appropriation of \$25,000,000 for public roads was up for passage. A minority report warned that this was a policy which would lead to enormous expenditures in the future with but little benefit to the Nation as a whole. Where would this country be today but for the greatest and most elaborate network of highways of any country in the world?

We hear the same cry today relative to civil aviation.

In the last 27 years we have invested about \$1,000,000,000 in this newest form of transportation, compared to more than \$10,000,000,000 which we have invested in railroads, waterways, and roads, all of which have paid dividends immeasurable.

Civil aviation is rapidly developing into a great industry and is a vital factor in expanding and speeding up our entire economic system.

With sound development and sane supervision it will augment a direct return to the Government in taxes on aviation enterprises.

In 1945, air-line industry operations produced \$21,000,000 in transportation taxes and \$17,500,000 in income taxes. In 1946, transportation taxes amounted to \$35,500,000. Income taxes were negligible as the industry as a whole lost \$3,000,000. There is little doubt that

Government assistance now is an investment in the future of a great industry which will return far more than the Government outlay.

What is more vital than safe aerial navigation in good weather or bad? It is something which we cannot afford to trifle with. Air travel is synonymous with speed, it knows no State boundaries, it is essentially interstate commerce personified. Supervision, control, and administration of uniform safety measures and devices is a Federal matter. Delay in technological advancement and the installation and improvement of facilities, for short-sighted reasons of economy, will not only result in tragic loss of human lives, undermining public confidence in air travel, but will postpone the day when the industry itself can be self-supporting.

There is no more vital and integral part of the airways system than airport traffic control towers. The operation requires technical knowledge and the operators must of necessity be under the control and surveillance of the Government. Without traffic control, airplanes cannot fly onto an airport under instrument weather conditions. In this matter we cannot afford to be penny-wise and pound-foolish.

In 1946 the revenue to the Post Office Department from domestic air mail was \$68,427,924. Expenditures were \$49,011,932. The excess of revenue over expenditures was \$19,415,992. We cannot afford to retard the expansion of this service.

I can conceive of no action more steeped in folly nor one calculated to render a greater disservice to our people than to fail to provide a sufficient appropriation for the protection of an indispensable service and the safeguarding of the precious lives of American citizens.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the time has come to put a stop to the so-called Voice of America broadcasts to foreign countries as at present conducted.

The House Appropriations Committee refused to vote funds for this activity for a very good reason.

These broadcasts are doing more harm than good. They are not checking the spread of communism. Propaganda that ostensibly is intended to build new respect for the United States is being used instead to criticize private enterprise, to express partisan opinions, and to distort the picture of life in the United States.

There is little in these outpourings to make the listeners believe more firmly in our form of government. I do not believe that Mr. Benton can produce one broadcast that, on its face, was deliberately framed to support the American foreign policy of blocking the spread of communism; not only that, so far as I can determine, no serious attempt is being made to answer the constant attacks that Communists are making on the United States.

At best the broadcasts are confusing. In instance after instance they detail events in the United States about which even our own citizens lack information. Foreigners cannot possibly understand

what the voice is talking about in these cases. Many of the broadcasts deal with trivialities and at times the programs are downright silly.

They are on a par with the other activities carried on by the Office of Information and Cultural Program of the State Department, for which \$31,000,000 of the heavily burdened taxpayers' money is requested.

In this connection, let me refer to the pictures bought for foreign exhibition as a sample of American art. One gem in that collection is called *Circus Lady Resting*. A copy of this picture appeared on the front page of the *Washington Post* of May 6. The *Post* described this masterpiece as looking like "something between Primo Carnera taking an enforced siesta and the product of an early Easter Islander after a bad night."

It is obvious that Secretary Marshall involved as he is in diplomatic negotiations, has not had time to read these broadcasts. He must rely on the information given by subordinates, who obviously are misleading him. If the Secretary could take an afternoon off and read these broadcasts carefully with his trained military eye, I think he would clean house without waiting for the Congress to do it.

There are three groups that are carrying on the propaganda for continuation of these costly and useless broadcasts.

One is the group that owes its allegiance to communism and not to this country.

Another group are the persons who are benefiting financially by the programs, through jobs and otherwise.

A third group are the uninformed persons who have not investigated the situation and who have been misled. With them I have no quarrel. I simply ask them to get the facts.

I urge the press and radio commentators to actually read these broadcasts. I have copies or reviews of a good many of them in my office. They can be examined there.

To illustrate what I am talking about, let me quote excerpts from a few of these broadcasts.

Broadcast to Germany, April 21, 1947:

In the year 1946 industrial profits have reached a record high. The chief responsibility for the shaping of prices lies in the hands of management. Government price control was abolished against the wish of President Truman. It is the task of management to see to it that upward move of prices is reversed into a downward trend.

From the week-end report on radio output for April 19-20:

Broadcast in English:

Sheehan discussed two different versions of the omnibus labor bill which have been launched in the two different Houses and are now headed for a debate and a probable compromise. \* \* \* Sheehan stressed that, of the two versions, that proposed by the House of Representatives is by far the more stringent; it drastically changes the position of labor unions on the industrial scene, limits their rights, regulates their organization, and prohibits absolutely certain practices which in many cases have been traditional for decades.

Broadcast in German:

As promised last week, the ace III labor commentator, Williams, discussed the recent



strike in our coal mines. \* \* \* Williams said that many people believe that John L. Lewis used the Centuria disaster only as a pretext to attack the Department of the Interior.

#### Broadcast to Austria:

"I Would Like to Know" answered listeners' inquiries regarding the nursing profession in the United States and the gum-chewing habit.

#### Week-end report on radio output for March 21:

##### Broadcast to Germany:

Anna Buerger said that Senator ROBERT TAFT, one of the leading men in the Republican Party, and reputed to be one of its most conservative members, made a series of statements a few days ago before the Senate Finance Committee. These statements, on strictly domestic issues are particularly interesting because of their progressive attitude, she continued. The fact, however, that they came from the same politician who in the past represented the so-called isolationist point of view in many foreign political questions, must make us think about this man.

##### Broadcast to France:

A Vos Ordres brought to its listeners a brief biography of Carl Sandburg and excerpts of one of his poems. Musical highlights, inter alia, had a recording of Margaret Truman's singing of the Last Rose of Summer and a song by Jean Sablon.

This is the U. S. A. carried features on American railroads (translation of Blaufarb commentary) and on Republican Progressives of Sons of Wild Jackass.

##### Broadcast in Spanish:

Libros y Autores spoke of Steinbeck's The Wayward Bus.

#### Weekend report on radio output for March 14-16.

##### Broadcast in Spanish:

A second story told of a student who was arrested in a park in Portland because he was reading Shelley poetry sitting on the grass, and of the protests of his fellow students which brought him freedom.

##### Broadcast to Korea:

Liberty Bell was devoted to an obituary of Carrie Chapman Catt.

#### Daily report on radio output for March 26.

##### Broadcast in French:

Ace II: featured a review of the book, Modern Woman: the Lost Sex and a comparison of it with Wylie's Generation of Vipers.

##### Broadcast to Brazil:

Revista Literaria: Our literary commentator spoke of the special poetry issue of the SRL. The speaker recalled that, already in an earlier broadcast, he had regretted the fact that the aesthetic thinking of the artists of the written words was not on a par with the cultural differentiation of our time. The phenomenon does not seem to be limited to any one country; much rather does it appear to reflect the mental lag that can be observed, as regards the progress of poetry, in all countries, including the most advanced ones. Progress of poetry is, indubitably, a highly relative term, since poetic expression has developed very little through the ages. Accepting the thesis of Remy de Gourmont that there exists a law of intellectual continuity for every animal species, we must logically conclude (although the French writer abstained from drawing that conclusion) that only superman, a species that is to succeed homo sapiens, will have a superior intellectual capacity able to realize works

more complex and more profound than our limited mentality can produce. The evolution of poetry, then, shows a limited curve, and has generally remained unnoticed by literary critics, by the aesthetes of the word and even by the philosophers. The commentator promised more along these lines for a future broadcast, and then turned to discuss a few of the recent poetry publications mentioned in the SRL issue.

#### Daily report on radio output for March 19.

##### English broadcast:

The United States in the World of Art brought an on-the-spot description of the presentation of the Motion Picture Academy awards for 1946.

##### Italian broadcast:

In answer to questions from listeners, the "request show" touched on the following topics: Housing project for paralyzed veterans, the philosophy of American advertising, the number of red-haired Americans.

#### Report on radio output for March 26:

Perfil De Da Semana told the story of Paul Porter.

#### Report on radio output for April 20. Broadcast to China:

Part 3 of the American Hour (10 minutes) described Chaplin's latest film venture, Monsieur Verdoux.

#### Report on radio output for April 21.

Broadcast to Latin America, quoting Raymond Gram Swing on the House labor bill:

The House bill was loaded with a good deal more punishment for labor than the Senate is expected to accept; but the more it was loaded the more the Senate would probably leave in. And the more that was left in, the greater the chance for a Truman veto. The whole strategy of including all labor changes in an omnibus bill is aimed to put the President on the spot. \* \* \*

A bill that cracks down on labor more severely than any measure passed in modern American history. \* \* \*

The House seeks to make sure that organized labor will be seriously crippled in future negotiations with management.

##### English broadcast:

A more critical book about American cities is Our Fair City, an anthology edited by Robert S. Allen. Mr. Allen, a Washington correspondent, served during the war as a colonel on Gen. George Patton's staff. Several reviewers believe he has shown considerable courage in putting together this new anthology, which is a lively and blistering collection of sketches.

These quotations indicate that the Department is not broadcasting the Voice of America but that all the way through there is a deliberate trend to the left; a taking sides on political issues, which is contrary to all concepts of American Government.

If we must have Government broadcasts the filler and the tripe must be cut out and the news broadcast must be accurate and fair.

The American people pay \$31,000,000 for this activity. For a small fraction of that sum a real Voice of America could be broadcast.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the people of the country have had less than 10 days' notice of the intention on the part of the subcommittee this

year to eliminate the item for payment of salaries of the control-tower operators at the airports. I wish to address myself to that item and to the action of the subcommittee in eliminating that item from the bill.

Many Members have paid tribute to the ability and the good work of the chairman and the members of the subcommittee. I join them in expressing appreciation for that good work. What I shall have to say about it is in no sense a criticism of the action which they have taken.

Since this bill was reported out by the committee on May 5, the fact that they have eliminated the item for payment of salaries of operators in the control towers has caused quite a bit of consternation throughout the governing authorities of cities all over the country. I have had telegrams from the mayor of the city of Atlanta, wherein is located one of the finer airports of the country, from the chamber of commerce of the city of Atlanta and from various other solid, substantial people in Atlanta, urging that this item be placed back in the bill. I have talked with the chairman of the subcommittee, who favors the elimination of this item, and I have talked with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] on the minority side of the committee, who has made a talk here already urging that the item be kept out. These gentlemen and those who favor eliminating this item have said that the municipalities and the aviation companies have had notice since last year that the subcommittee in charge of the appropriations for the Department of Commerce intended to eliminate this item, that is, to place the burden of paying the salaries of the control tower operators on the municipalities. However, as was so ably pointed out by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] a few moments ago, I feel that the companies and the governing authorities of the municipalities are justified in relying upon the proposition that the Government of the United States itself is not committed to that policy. While it is true that the subcommittee had indicated its intention to do that, nevertheless there are three departments of the Government that have indicated positively a contrary intention: First, the Members of this House; second, the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration; and third, the Budget Bureau, which submitted the budget here for the appropriation for the year 1948. The House last year properly overrode the action of the subcommittee. The Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration had this to say about it in the hearings before that subcommittee this year on page 626 of the hearings. The chairman of the subcommittee asked this question:

This committee at one time eliminated funds for the operation of air traffic control towers. Money for these towers was, however, restored on the floor of the House on a safety argument. What do you think about having the cost of this item transferred to the municipalities now?

Mr. Wright—

I think Mr. T. P. Wright, who is the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics

Administration, is a man whom the public, including the aviation companies and the mayors of the municipalities, is entitled to look upon as a proper person to state the policy of the Government.

He said:

We feel that the airport traffic-control towers are a vital and integral part of the Federal airways system, and it would be absolutely inappropriate. With the increasing traffic that there is it would possibly be disastrous to have those operated by local communities.

You have to fix traffic-control patterns, and you have to have control in the same agency that is operating the rest of the Federal airways system, involving the electronic devices, which you are being asked to approve, and the radar equipment, which is located right in the traffic-control tower.

It is such a vital part of the whole Federal airways system that it must be operated by people under Government surveillance and control.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I think the gentleman is making a very fine statement along that line. Certainly he voices my views. I think the argument is just as important today as it was at that time, in view of the events of the last few days, and numerous airplane accidents indicate that fact only too clearly.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Surely this elimination, if it should be adopted, is a change of policy—a policy which, for the past 7 years has been followed. That is, during the past 7 years the Federal Government has paid the salaries of the operators of these airport control towers.

Another argument which was advanced to me by these gentlemen who now favor the elimination of this item was that if the Government stands the entire expense of operation of airports it is likely to cause requests to come in from crossroads communities all over the country that do not need airports and that the cost of these would bankrupt the Government.

With reference to that, I want to point out there are roughly 6,000 airports throughout the United States and that up to the last year only 129 of those airports had these control towers and that during the time since the item was placed back last year and today, if that argument were good, there would have been a deluge of requests for the construction of airports. However, I am informed that only 20 applications for control towers have been received by the Civil Aeronautics Administration since this item was placed back. So that is, in fact, no argument for the elimination of this item.

I am informed that the cost of operating one of the airport control towers insofar as the salary item is concerned might range from \$36,000 to \$50,000 and the entire item which is asked to be put back amounts to \$4,849,000, which is estimated to be the cost of 1948 operation of these airport control towers.

That is not an item that threatens the budget of the United States nor the welfare of the taxpayers. That is an item which as so many have pointed

out here before me, and it would simply be repetitious to say it again, will not affect the tax structure of the United States and will not in any sense threaten the Government with bankruptcy.

It has been pointed out by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], that just recently within the last 3 weeks there has been a tragic accident in the State of Georgia in which were involved a plane belonging to Delta Air Lines and a plane flown by a private operator. Both were destroyed and nine people lost their lives because there was no control tower there. There is no way to isolate a field so as to confine it to commercial use. All these fields are used not only by commercial companies, but also by private planes and by Army and Navy planes. Aviation is a subject which is not only interstate, but international, and is a proper subject for Federal aid, particularly the item under discussion. I sincerely hope the House again this year will place this item back into the appropriation bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention particularly to one item in this bill. It is the item of \$500,000 to be spent for so-called entertainment. I do it now so that the committee will be on notice that I expect to offer an amendment to strike when the bill is read for amendments under the 5-minute rule. The item is also described as "Representative allowances, Foreign Service."

Of course those words as they stand do not explain very much but if you will read the hearings you will find out a little more about what they mean, and if you had had some experience in dealing with this problem you would know particularly what they mean, because, after all, practically the entire item of representation allowances goes for entertainment, and the entertainment consists mainly in buying all kinds of liquor for the entertainment of representatives abroad.

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

Mr. REES. As soon as I get through with my statement I will yield to the gentleman from New York, a hard-working member of the committee. I shall be glad to yield when I get through with my statement. I hope he will agree with me that the amount of half a million dollars is a considerable amount to allow for this sort of thing.

I want to give you a little review of this to show you how these expenditures grow on the Congress and on the country. In 1938, \$125,000 was determined as the amount to be allocated for buying liquor and paying for such entertainment, and in 1939 Congress allowed a similar amount. In 1940 it was decided \$140,000 should be spent for this purpose. In 1941 it went up to \$150,000. In 1942 it was increased to \$163,000. In 1943 this Congress allowed an expendi-

ture of \$150,000, but they ran short. They ran out of entertainment expense, or whatever it was, so they had to have \$35,000 more to replenish the supply.

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

Mr. REES. The gentleman from Brooklyn was not here at that time and, of course, was not quite so familiar with it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind the gentleman that it is not proper to refer to another Member of the House as the gentleman from any certain city.

Mr. REES. With due apologies to the gentleman. I should have said "the gentleman from New York."

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to assure the gentleman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas does not yield.

Mr. REES. I decline to yield at this time. I will do so later. I do withdraw my statement about the gentleman being from a particular city. The gentleman from Kansas means well in addressing him as being from a certain city.

Mr. ROONEY. I just wanted to say to the gentleman that I have no objection to it.

Mr. REES. I thank the gentleman from New York. In 1945 the House approved an expenditure to which I objected in the sum of \$300,000 and then Congress replenished the supply again and let them have \$129,000 more. Then, in 1946, to cap the whole thing, this Congress allowed \$585,000, and they ran short again. So the House allowed another \$23,000, making a total of \$608,000.

Now, I read from the hearings and I quote the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska, chairman of the committee wherein he says "Now we turn to this representation allowance."

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

Mr. REES. Not at this time, but will be glad to do so later.

Calling attention to representation allowance, Foreign Service, the gentleman from Nebraska called attention to the fact that the request in 1948 is for \$1,118,000. He says we spent \$891,216 the year before. So we have got up to over a million dollars to take care of this supply of entertainment for representatives abroad. If you will read the hearings you will find the question is asked whether these supplies cost more money.

The witness for the State Department agrees that it costs more money to buy these supplies than it did before. It is also stated more funds are needed because we have a greater number of personnel. In all seriousness, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that our diplomacy, our getting along with representatives of foreign countries, falls to a rather low ebb—and I have said this before—when it becomes necessary to spend the taxpayers' money not by the thousands but by the hundreds of thousands for the purpose of entertaining foreigners abroad and, incidentally, for entertaining themselves as well. It seems to me that somewhere we ought to draw the line. I know \$500,000 is a comparatively small item, but it is half a million dollars, and even that much money being



charged against the Federal Treasury at this time for these purposes seems to me to be out of line.

I will be glad now to yield to the distinguished gentleman from the State of New York who is one of the valued members of this great Committee on Appropriations, and one of the industrious Members of the House.

Mr. ROONEY. I merely wish to say to the gentleman from Kansas that while I realize that the rules of the House require one Member to address another as being from his State, I make no objection whatever to being called the gentleman from Brooklyn.

Mr. REES. I was very sure the gentleman would not.

Mr. ROONEY. And I am sure the gentleman from Kansas knows that; because I have respected him ever since I have known him.

Mr. REES. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. He certainly has at all times commanded my respect, although we differ on this particular subject matter.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to say however that it seems that the gentleman from Kansas assumes something which is not in the evidence. It seems that he assumes that the entire amount for representation allowances is used for the purchase of liquor. Is that not so?

Mr. REES. I not only assume, but I believe that practically all of it goes for liquor. There is a small part that goes to buy flowers, and there is a small part that goes to pay for some of the expensive dinners that are given; but if the gentleman will investigate the expenditure of the money I believe he will find that most of it goes for liquid refreshments. I will appreciate it if on tomorrow he will bring to the floor an itemized account of the \$585,000 plus the \$23,000, and indicate to the Committee where the money was spent. I think he will find that practically all of it is for liquor. It may be that the items are not available.

Mr. ROONEY. That is a pretty big order, but I venture the assertion that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Nebraska, can very easily answer the gentleman's question. I believe the gentleman will find that the liquor purchase in this item is infinitely small. I personally see no objection if one is going to sit down to dinner to having a glass of beer or a cocktail, I do not see anything wrong with that; and if we have representatives in foreign countries and are going to furnish a \$5 dinner I see no reason why we should not give them a 50-cent cocktail.

Mr. REES. The point I make with respect to that is that I just do not believe it is necessary, with all the allowances that are made to these representatives, with everything that is provided—we pay them good salaries, we provide a place for them to live, we provide all expenses and take them wherever they have to go, to all parts of the world. That is all right and proper where necessary. We pay them a lot of extra incidental expenses, as the gentleman well knows. I think, however, it is carrying the thing a little bit far when, as the gentleman has just suggested, you spend this money

not only by the hundreds, not only by the thousands, but by the hundreds of thousands and, according to their request, a million dollars for this sort of thing. I disagree with the gentleman that that amount is infinitesimal, because a million dollars is a considerable amount of money and \$500,000 is a considerable amount of money when it goes for purposes of this kind.

Mr. ROONEY. I originally thought the gentleman was going to commend the committee because of the substantial cut that was made. If I remember correctly they submitted a request for \$1,118,000 and it was cut to \$500,000.

Mr. REES. The gentleman is right.

Mr. ROONEY. The entire committee was very, very much interested in vouchers that were submitted by these people in foreign countries who were representing us but were attending luncheons and dinners day after day and night after night. We saw no reason for it. We thought that they were eating their meals, which they should pay for themselves, with the Government's money. I thought the gentleman would commend the committee for the action taken.

Mr. REES. I do commend the distinguished chairman and the members of the subcommittee as well as the entire committee, including the able member from New York for saving \$600,000 that would have been spent from the Federal Treasury if it had not been for the action of this committee. I think the whole thing should be stricken out, but I trust the gentleman from New York and other members will go along with me and cut the thing down to a quarter of a million dollars. That is a further compromise, but it will save \$250,000. Perhaps the gentleman will go along with us in saving that much money. That would be a considerable help. It compares with the 1944 figures. Even those who favor this kind of expenditure should go along on an amendment to cut it \$250,000.

Mr. ROONEY. You might take three or four courses away from an eight-course dinner. We have a certain number of people representing us at diplomatic functions and I think it reflects on all of us if we do not have the proper set-up for them. We should afford them the dignity they should have in the eyes of those with whom they are doing business in our behalf. Let us take the situation in Russia. I understand that our representatives in Russia, before they can talk a bit of business at all, have to drink innumerable glasses of vodka. I am not in favor of that. I do not believe a man with too many drinks of vodka under his belt can properly represent us.

Mr. REES. That brings me to the subject matter I want to discuss briefly. The gentleman has just suggested that we might use this money to buy vodka for the foreigners in order to get them to talk a bit of business. If there is any good reason in that sort of thing I would like to find out what it is.

Mr. ROONEY. That is not what I said.

Mr. REES. If you have to use this liquor to loosen up the tongues of these

foreign diplomats in order to get things done, then I go back to the thing I said before: Our diplomacy is not on the high plane it should be. I am expressing my own opinion of course. If it is going to be used to get these people in Russia or any other foreign country to loosen up their tongues in order to get along with them, we are getting to a low ebb. I believe I trust the gentleman from New York and other members may go along with us tomorrow when I shall submit an amendment to cut this appropriation \$250,000 which will be still as much as it was a few years ago.

Again I want to compliment the distinguished chairman and his committee in saving at least \$600,000 that might have been spent if those who proposed this particular item had their own way. This committee knew it was too much money. This committee thought a million dollars was too much money. They have cut it in half. Evidently it was a sort of a compromise. Let us compromise once more and cut it down to a quarter of a million dollars. No harm can be done in cutting the supply of liquor for these representatives abroad. It will be a good thing to do. It will save the Federal Treasury a quarter of a million dollars.

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I am terribly sorry to say that I cannot go along with my distinguished and kind friend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]. I feel that the committee has cut this item just about as much as it can possibly be cut. I am sure that if he consults the gentleman from Nebraska he will find that the committee spent a good deal of time going through vouchers on entertainment items which we required to be sent up from the State Department, which showed, in one instance, where a lady was entertaining at luncheon and dinner day after day, for weeks and weeks. However, nowhere in those vouchers was there any indication of any of the money being used for liquor. I say that, although I have no objection to some small part of the money being used for liquor at proper diplomatic functions. I will say one further thing to the gentleman from Kansas, that I did not suggest to him that we use vodka to open the lips of the Russians. I do not like vodka.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, the so-called art exhibit that was sent abroad by the State Department is a disgrace to the United States.

President Truman belatedly has taken cognizance of what some of us have been saying for years, namely, that his administration is infected by Communists.

I urge the President to match his very late words with action and to set about cleaning out the Communists and their New Deal fellow travelers.

The alleged art exhibition has sinister aspects. The Circus Girl Resting and

other trashy paintings sent on tour by the State Department, with the taxpayers footing the bill, have done our country harm abroad. Foreigners must be wondering what kind of crackpots assembled such a jumble of paintings.

That painting, *Circus Girl Resting*, which has shocked the American people, was typical of the amazing group of paintings that the State Department sent abroad as beautiful examples of American art.

The State Department's catalog on its painting monstrosities says that *Circus Girl Resting* was painted by Yasuo Kuniyoshi. Kuniyoshi was born in Okayama, Japan, in 1893 and came to the United States in 1906.

The catalog further enlightens us that "his art is directed toward a fusion of the East and West."

I do not profess to be an authority on painting. Secretary Marshall frankly admitted to the House Appropriations Subcommittee that he did not consider himself such an authority. But he has shown the good judgment to call a halt on the so-called art exhibition by his subordinates. Now, I hope he will go on and clean up the art division. He inherited a bad situation when he became Secretary, for which he was in no way responsible.

I have been investigating the art activities of the State Department's Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs. Much to my amazement, I learned that instead of the pictures being selected by a committee of outstanding American artists, every picture was selected and purchased by one individual. He is J. Leroy Davidson, who is no longer with the Department.

Davidson was born at Cambridge, Mass., March 16, 1908. He attended Harvard University and other schools. He reads and speaks French and German as well as English. He also reads Chinese.

During 1944 and 1945 he was an art director in the Army Service Forces in the Pentagon, having had something to do with selecting illustrations for training manuals. I do not pass upon Davidson's knowledge as an artist, but I do contend that no one person has all the knowledge necessary to tell the world what is American art.

It is my opinion that Mr. Davidson in acting as the art arbiter for the United States, has been moving with very fast company in the new dealers' world—that radical band who would uproot all that we have cherished as sacred in the American way of life. Regardless of his patriotism, I say that Mr. Davidson has been taken in by a lot of extremists, who have method in their planning.

When I questioned Mr. Davidson on why such an art exhibit was assembled and sent abroad, he told me that it was done in response to demands from abroad, principally through our various embassies.

In connection with this demand, I was presented several sheets of paper with the heading, "Samples of Requests from Abroad." It struck me as peculiar that most of the requests were dated the first part of October 1946, when, as a matter of fact, practically all of the pictures

were bought during the first few days of May 1946.

It was only natural that I should make inquiry on why most of these requests came at approximately the same date. Mr. Davidson informed me that he did not know unless it was in response to what is known as an "artcast" sent out in the so-called Weekly Roundup of the Press and Publications Division, OIC.

I looked over these so-called requests from abroad for the art exhibit, and it was quite obvious to me that what the State Department did was to drum up requests from abroad.

Mrs. Hannah Goldman, author of the *Artcast*, told me she got her material from Mr. Davidson. Mrs. Goldman is in the Press and Publications Division, OIC. In other words, Mr. Davidson was responsible for creating the demand under which the program was developed to exhibit these pictures abroad.

The 79 paintings which comprised the two exhibits were the works of 45 artists. I have seen pictures of the paintings. Some of them are so weird that one cannot tell without prompting which side should be up. I believe that the background of some of the artists who painted them will throw considerable light upon the reasons why such strenuous objections were raised against the pictures.

I asked the House Committee on Un-American Activities to give me a report on the artists. The records of more than 20 of the 45 artists are definitely New Deal in various shades of communism. Some were found to be definitely connected with revolutionary organizations.

The exhibition is billed by its promoters as "Advancing American Art." Mr. Davidson defended the pictures as being what he termed modernistic. From my discussions with Mr. Davidson, I came to these conclusions:

The pictures of those artists who have been recognized down through the years as old masters are too drab, uninteresting, and too natural.

The movement of modern art is a revolution against the conventional and natural things of life as expressed in art.

The artists of the radical school ridicule all that has been held dear in art. Institutions that have been venerated through the ages are ridiculed.

Without exception, the paintings in the State Department group that portray a person, make him or her unnatural. The skin is not reproduced as it would be naturally, but as a sullen, ashen gray. Features of the face are always depressed and melancholy.

That is what the Communists and other extremists want to portray. They want to tell the foreigners that the American people are despondent, broken down or of hideous shape—thoroughly dissatisfied with their lot and eager for a change of government.

The Communists and their New Deal fellow-travelers have selected art as one of their avenues of propaganda. Their game is to use every field of information and entertainment in an effort to shatter all that conflicts with despotic communism.

When the taxpayers' money is used to buy pictures painted by Communist artists we not only distribute their propa-

ganda, we also put money in their pockets and thereby enable them to influence their efforts to make America Red Communist.

I believe there should be in the State Department an Office of Information and Cultural Affairs, but it should be free of communistic, fascistic, and other alien influences.

There is need for facilities to answer lies against our country by propagandists of other countries, notably the Moscow radio. However, I submit that the State Department art exhibit does not represent American culture and is as foreign to the American way as is the Moscow radio.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
Washington, March 24, 1947.  
HON. FRED E. BUSHEY,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BUSHEY: In response to your letter of March 18, we are enclosing herewith a report which contains information from the files and publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT E. STRIPLING,  
Chief Investigator.

INFORMATION FROM THE FILES OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 22, 1947.

FOR HON. FRED E. BUSHEY.

Subject: Milton Avery, William Bazilotes, Romare Beardon, Ben-Zion, Cameron Booth, Louis Bouche, Raymond Breinin, Bryon Browne, Paul Burlin, George Constant, Ralston, Crawford, Stuart Davis, Julio De Diego, Arthur Dove, Werner Drewes, Philip Evergood, Adolph Gottlieb, William Gropper, O. Louis Guglielmi, Philip Guston, Robert Gwathmey, Marsden Hartley, Morris Kantor, Frank Kleinholz, Walt Kuhn, Yasuo Kuniyoshi, Julian Levi, Jack Levine, Loren MacIver, John Marin, Reginald Marsh, George L. K. Morris, Georgia O'Keeffe, I. Rice Perella, Gregoric Prestopino, Abraham Rattner, Anton Refregier, Ben Shahn, Charles Sheeler, Everett Spruce, Nahum Tschabosow, Franklin Watkin, Max Weber, Sol Wilson, and Karl Zerbe.

#### MILTON AVERY

Milton Avery was one of the exhibitors at the United American Artists' exhibition which was held on September 18-30, 1939 at the ACA galleries, New York City. The American Artists was a pro-Communist artists organization.

#### BEN-ZION

Ben-Zion was also an exhibitor at the United American Artists' exhibition, September 18-30, 1939, ACA galleries, New York City, at which his painting, the *Prophet and the Crowd*, was shown.

Ben-Zion was one of the signers of a letter sent to President Roosevelt by the United American Artist which urged help to the U. S. S. R. and Britain, after Hitler attacked Russia. (See *Daily Worker*, New York, Tuesday, September 16, 1941.)

#### BRYON BROWNE

Bryon Browne's painting entitled "Figure" was one of those exhibited at the United American Artists' exhibition, September 18-30, 1939, ACA galleries, New York City.

#### PAUL BURLIN

The program, *Artists' Front To Win the War*, October 16, 1942, page 5, discloses that Paul Burlin was a sponsor of this organization, which consisted of a group of pro-Communist artists who became violently pro-war after Hitler attacked Russia.



Mr. Burlin is associated with the Communist publication, *New Masses*, as an artist (*New Masses*, April 26, 1938, p. 17), and as an exhibitor at the first annual *New Masses* art exhibition held on November 13-27, 1938. (*New Masses*, October 25, 1938, p. 2.)

#### GEORGE CONSTANT

A. G. Constant, of Cleveland, Ohio, sent May Day greetings to the Young Worker, the publication of the Young Communist League. (See *Young Worker*, May 1, 1930.)

#### STUART DAVIS

Stuart Davis, according to the program of Artists' Front to Win the War, October 16, 1942, page 5, was a sponsor of this organization.

The February 14, 1936 issue of the *Daily Worker*, page 5, reveals that Stuart Davis was a member of the advisory board of the John Reed Club School. John Reed was one of the founders of the Communist Party, United States of America.

Stuart Davis has contributed, as both an artist and cartoonist, to the publication of the pro-Communist League of Struggle for Negro Rights entitled "The Liberator." (See the *Liberator*, June 1922, p. 14; April 1921, p. 15; February 1919, p. 39; September 1922, p. 30; June 1921, p. 21; July 1920, p. 36.)

Stuart Davis has been associated with the publication, the *Masses*, as the owner (the *Masses*, June 1917, p. 50), and with *New Masses* as a contributing editor (*New Masses*, October 1927, p. 3). *New Masses*, October 25, 1938, page 2, also discloses that he was an exhibitor at the first annual *New Masses* art exhibition, November 13-27, 1938. Both the *Masses* and the *New Masses* have always been avowed Communist magazines.

#### JULIO DE DIEGO

Julio De Diego has been associated with the Communist publication, *New Masses*, as an artist and illustrator. (See *New Masses*, August 23, 1938, p. 19 and June 8, 1937, p. 18.)

#### PHILIP EVERGOOD

Philip Evergood was affiliated with the American Peace Mobilization as the signer of the Call to the American People's Meeting, page 2, New York City, April 5-6, 1941. The American Peace Mobilization picketed the White House during the Stalin-Hitler Pact.

The program, Artists' Front to Win the War, October 16, 1942, page 5, shows he was one of the sponsors of this organization.

Philip Evergood has also contributed to the *Daily Worker*. (See *Daily Worker*, November 2, 1942, p. 7.)

His affiliation with the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties is shown by the *Daily Worker*, March 18, 1945, page 2, which discloses that he was a signer of a statement sponsored by this organization hailing the War Department order on commissions for the Communists.

Philip Evergood was an artist, contributor, and contributing editor of *New Masses*. (See *New Masses*, May 30, 1944, p. 9; March 28, 1944, p. 29; April 26, 1938, p. 18 and p. 21; and April 30, 1946, p. 2.)

He was a contributing artist to the second annual art auction of *New Masses*, (see *New Masses*, April 1, 1941, p. 25) and to the *New Masses* third annual art auction (see *New Masses*, April 7, 1942, p. 27 and April 28, 1942, p. 2). He was also a member of the committee for the auction for the *New Masses* fifth annual art auction and a member of the same committee for the *New Masses* fourth annual art auction as shown by *New Masses*, February 8, 1944, page 31, and February 23, 1943, page 27.

An undated letterhead discloses that Philip Evergood was a sponsor of the Public Use of Arts Committee, a Communist front organization during the WPA arts projects.

He has been affiliated with the Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee as a signer of the declaration honoring Dimitroff, former head of the Communist International. (See *New York Times*, December 22, 1943, p. 40.)

According to a letterhead, dated February 26, 1946, Mr. Evergood was a national sponsor of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee. The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee was cited for contempt by Congress.

Mr. Evergood has been associated with the United American Artists as a member and exhibitor. (See *Daily Worker*, October 11, 1940, p. 7.)

#### PHILIP GUSTON

Robert Gwathney has been associated with the publication of the American League for Peace and Democracy, which was cited as a Communist front by Attorney General Biddle. (See *Fight*, February 1937, p. 13.)

#### ROBERT GWATHNEY

Robert Gwathney has been associated with *New Masses* as a contributing editor. (See *New Masses*, April 30, 1946, p. 2.)

#### MORRIS KANTOR

Morris Kantor was a sponsor of Artists' Front to Win the War as shown by the program, Artists' Front to Win the War, October 16, 1942, p. 5.

#### FRANK KLEINHOLZ

The April 25, 1944, issue of *New Masses* discloses the association of Frank Kleinholz with that publication as an artist.

#### YASUO KUNIYOSHI

Yasuo Kuniyoshi was one of the signers of a statement on the International Situation which was sponsored by the American League for Peace and Democracy as shown by *New Masses*, March 15, 1938, page 19.

The program, Artists' Front to Win the War, October 16, 1942, page 5, reveals that he was a sponsor of this organization.

Yasuo Kuniyoshi was an auctioneer at the *New Masses* Art Exhibit. (See *New Masses*, November 29, 1938, p. 2.)

A letterhead, dated August 3, 1939, reveals that Mr. Kuniyoshi was also a sponsor of the Refugee Scholarship and Peace campaign, another Communist-front organization.

#### JACK LEVINE

Jack Levine was a contributing artist to the *New Masses* Second Annual Art Auction. (See *New Masses*, April 8, 1941, p. 24.)

#### WILLIAM GROPPER

A person named Gropper has been associated with *New Masses* as an artist and cartoonist, with the *Sunday Worker* as a cartoonist, and with the *New Pioneer* as a cartoonist, cover artist, and illustrator. (See *New Masses*, March 14, 1944, p. 15; April 14, 1942, p. 15; February 24, 1942, p. 5; February 17, 1942, p. 13; July 9, 1946, p. 10; July 2, 1946, p. 13; June 25, 1946, p. 9; June 18, 1946, p. 13; January 25, 1938, p. 8; and January 11, 1938, p. 8. *Sunday Worker*, September 1, 1940, sec. 2. *New Pioneer*, Communist Children's magazine, March 1936, p. 23; December 1935, p. 1; March 1934; June 1937, p. 13; February 1937, p. 10; and March 1932, pp. 9-10.)

A Bill Gropper was a speaker for the American Friends of the Chinese people, which consistently supported the Communist Party of China, as revealed by the *Daily Worker*, June 8, 1938, page 7.

Bill Gropper is also associated with the Communist Party as a cartoonist and speaker. (See *Daily Worker*, February 13, 1930, p. 2.)

An article in the *Daily Worker*, February 16, 1939, page 7, tells of a mural which was done for the Department of the Interior by Bill Gropper.

Bill Gropper was a contributor to the *New Masses*, December 16, 1941, page 15, and an illustrator for the *New Pioneer*. (See *New Pioneer*, December 1934, p. 6; January 1934, p. 204; June 1933, p. 33; May 1932, p. 3; and June 1932, p. 10.) He was also a member of the organizing committee of *New Pioneer*, according to the *Daily Worker*, May 7, 1936, page 5.

The program, Artists' Front to Win the War, October 16, 1942, page 5, reveals that William Gropper sponsored this organization.

William Gropper has been affiliated with the American League Against War and Fascism as an artist and illustrator for the magazine *Fight*. This organization has been cited as a Communist front by Attorney General Biddle. (See *Fight*, November 1933, p. 7, and March 1937, p. 13.)

William Gropper's affiliation with the American League for Peace and Democracy is also shown by *Fight*, for which he was an artist, cartoonist, and illustrator. (See *Fight*, March 1939, p. 13; April 1938, p. 53; March 1938, p. 13; May 1934, p. 5; and November 1937, p. 5.) Mr. Gropper also sponsored and supported the Boycott Japanese Goods Conference, held at the New School for Social Research, under the sponsorship of the American League for Peace and Democracy. (See *Daily Worker*, January 11, 1938, p. 2, and January 25, 1938, p. 2.)

William Gropper was a cartoonist for *Challenge*, the official publication of the Communist Party in Los Angeles County. (See *Challenge*, July 14, 1940, p. 2.)

The *Champion* of June 1936, page 4, reveals that William Gropper was an artist for that publication. The *Champion* was the official organ of the Young Communist League and also of the International Workers Order.

A letterhead, dated September 22, 1936, and the *Daily Worker*, September 2, 1936, page 2, discloses that William Gropper was a member of the Committee of Professional Groups for Browder and Ford, Communist candidates in 1936.

William Gropper's association with the Communist Party is shown as a cartoonist for the following Communist publications: Party Organizer (Party Organizer, May 1937, p. 5); as a cartoonist for *Workers Monthly* (*Workers Monthly*, December 1925, p. 87; November 1925, p. 13; and January 1925, p. 102); and as a cover artist for *Jewish Life*, March 1938, and February 1938). According to the *Daily Worker*, January 21, 1939, page 7, column 5, he was also a delegate to the Communist Party's celebration, tenth anniversary of October revolution, U. S. S. R.

A booklet, *Those Americans Say*, page 10, lists William Gropper as a representative individual of the Coordinating Committee To Lift the Embargo, a Communist-front organization.

William Gropper was an artist for the *Daily Worker* and the *Sunday Worker*. (See *Daily Worker*, October 1, 1942, p. 6; January 1, 1930, p. 2, and December 21, 1935, p. 3; the *Worker* (magazine section), October 4, 1942, p. 7.) His biography appears in the *Daily Worker* of December 5, 1944, page 4.

Mr. Gropper, as an artist for Soviet Russia Today, was affiliated with the Friends of the Soviet Union. (See *Soviet Russia Today*, November 1935, p. 46.) This same publication reveals that William Gropper was a signer of the Golden Book of American Friendship with the Soviet Union, a project sponsored by the Friends of the Soviet Union. (See *Soviet Russia Today*, November 1937, p. 79.)

According to *Equal Justice*, June 1939, page 7, Mr. Gropper was a sponsor of the Summer Milk Drive (1939) of the International Labor Defense, cited by Attorney General Biddle as the legal arm of the Communist Party.

Mr. Gropper's affiliation with the International Workers Order is shown by *Fraternal Outlook* for which he was a cover artist, cartoonist, and lithographer of a picture offered as a premium by that publication. (See *Fraternal Outlook*, March 1940; November 1939, p. 5; and July 1939, p. 19.) Attorney General Biddle has cited the International Workers Order as one of the most powerful Communist organizations.

The *Daily Worker* of February 14, 1936, page 5, reveals that William Gropper was a

member of the advisory board of the John Reed Club School.

New Masses, June 17, 1941, page 10, discloses that Mr. Cropper attended the Fourth American Writers Congress, New York City, June 6-8, 1941, of the League of American Writers.

William Cropper is affiliated with the Liberator, an early Communist magazine, as an artist, cartoonist, special contributor, contributing editor, associate editor and editor, and with New Masses as an illustrator, artist, cartoonist, contributor, associate editor, contributing editor and cover artist. (See the Liberator, December 1922, page 18; June 1922, page 19; May 1922 (cover); April 1922, page 17; January 1922, page 14; July 1921 (cover); October 1921, page 41; March 1924, page 14; August 1923, page 17; August 1923; May 1923, page 38; March 1923, page 4; February 1923, page 13; October 1922, page 19; October 1922, page 7; August 1922, page 26; August 1922, page 13; September 1922, page 28; July 1922, page 26; June 1922, page 10; April 1922, page 7; March 1922, page 23 and page 16; March 1922, page 10; February 1922, page 12; December 1921, page 15; November 1921, page 17; October 1921, page 26; August 1921, page 27, page 20, and page 16; July 1921, page 29, page 14, page 27, and page 10; May 1921, page 25; April 1921, page 14; March 1921, page 25; February 1921, page 8; January 1921, page 26; October 1920, page 24; June 20, page 26; April 1920, page 39 and page 16; March 1920, page 8 and page 6; December 1922, page 30; January 1921, page 24; April 1921, page 6; February 1924, page 20; May 1923, page 14; and January 1922, page 9. New Masses, May 1932, page 3; April 1932, page 13; January 1932, page 17; September 1931, page 11; September 26, 1944, page 5; June 13, 1944, page 7; June 6, 1944, page 6; May 23, 1944, page 8; May 16, 1944, page 10; May 9, 1944, page 11; May 2, 1944, page 11; April 25, 1944, page 11; April 18, 1944, page 17; April 3, 1944, page 3; November 23, 1943, page 2; August 24, 1943, page 2; August 17, 1943, page 13; August 10, 1943, page 9; August 3, 1943, page 2; July 27, 1943, page 13; July 20, 1943, page 2; July 13, 1943, page 6; June 29, 1943, page 2; June 22, 1943, page 7; March 9, 1943, page 15; February 23, 1943, page 15; October 14, 1941, page 14; July 8, 1941, page 17; December 6, 1937, page 8; November 16, 1937, page 12; November 2, 1937, page 12; June 8, 1937, page 12; May 25, 1937, page 8; May 11, 1937, page 8; May 4, 1937, page 10; March 30, 1937, page 8; March 16, 1937, page 16; March 9, 1937, page 17; August 20, 1935, page 26; March 24, 1942, pages 16 and 17; March 17, 1942, pages 8 and 9; March 10, 1942, page 13; March 3, 1942, page 5; February 24, 1942, page 2; June 24, 1941, page 15; June 10, 1941, page 16; April 8, 1941, page 11; February 18, 1941, page 35; October 29, 1940, page 18; October 8, 1940, page 5; August 27, 1940, page 11; August 20, 1940, page 14; August 13, 1940, page 14; July 30, 1940, page 11; July 2, 1940, page 12; May 28, 1940, page 7; November 14, 1939, page 4; November 15, 1938, page 5; November 8, 1938, pages 16 and 17; November 1, 1938, page 10; October 25, 1938, page 10; October 18, 1938, page 10; October 4, 1938, page 9; July 5, 1938, page 9; June 21, 1938, page 5; June 7, 1938, page 8; April 12, 1938, page 9; March 22, 1938, page 7; March 15, 1938, page 16; March 8, 1938, page 10; February 22, 1938, page 12; February 8, 1938, page 12; April 20, 1937, page 10; November 1932, page 16; July 1932, page 10; June 1932, page 17; February 1932, page 15; January 1932, page 4; November 1931, page 19; March 1931, page 10; January 1931, page 11; December 1930, page 15; November 1930, page 7; September 1930, page 10; August 1929, page 5; February 1929, page 2; December 1928, page 5; February 1928, page 18; October 1927, page 32; October 1927, page 4; September 1927, page 21; September 1927, page 16; February 1, 1944, page 25; April 30, 1946, page 2; October 1927, page 3; March 14, 1944, page 2; September 7, 1943, page 2; June 22, 1943, page 2; November 15, 1938, page 10; October 11, 1938, page 8;

September 20, 1938, page 14; June 1928, page 3; January 2, 1934, page 1; May 1932, page 3; and April 1931 (cover).

William Gropper was the owner of New Masses (New Masses, June 1923, p. 23), a member of the executive board (New Masses, Dec. 1930, p. 3 and Oct. 27, p. 3), a member of the board and contributing editors (Daily Worker, Nov. 18, 1942, p. 6), a guest of honor at the New Masses spring ball (Daily Worker, Mar. 30, 1938, p. 8), a member of the reception committee of the thirty-second annual artists and writers ball (New Masses, Nov. 30, 1943, p. 31), an exhibitor at the first annual New Masses art exhibition, November 13-27, 1938 (New Masses, Oct. 25, 1938, p. 2), and a speaker at the anniversary celebration at Manhattan Center, New York City, February 16, 1941, of the New Masses thirtieth anniversary (New Masses, Jan. 28, 1941, p. 2). Mr. Gropper also attended the defense rally of the New Masses (Daily Worker, Feb. 26, 1940, p. 4), and was a signer of the New Masses letter to the President (New Masses, Apr. 2, 1940, p. 21). In addition to the affiliations already listed, William Gropper was a member of the committee for the auction of the New Masses fourth annual art auction and a member of the same committee for their fifth annual art auction. (See, New Masses Feb. 23, 1943; p. 27 and Feb. 8, 1944, p. 41). Mr. Gropper also was a contributing artist to the second annual art auction of New Masses (New Masses, Apr. 1, 1941, p. 25), as well as the New Masses third annual art auction (New Masses, Apr. 23, 1942, p. 2; Apr. 7, 1942; p. 27; Mar. 31, 1942, p. 27; and Mar. 24, 1942, p. 25).

William Gropper has been associated with the Communist publication, New Pioneer, as a member of the editorial board (New Pioneer, Feb. 1933, p. 2; Dec. 1932, p. 2; and Aug. 1931, p. 2), and as an illustrator (New Pioneer, Mar. 1935, p. 3, Oct. 1931, p. 3; and Sept. 1931, pp. 10, 11, and 14). He was also mentioned in the New Pioneer of September 1935, page 2.

Mr. Gropper has been affiliated with the Communist-supported medical bureau, North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy as a guest at a benefit (Daily Worker, May 6, 1937, p. 7), and with the writers' and artists' committee of that organization (letterhead, July 6, 1938).

William Gropper's association with the New Theater League and Workers Dance League has been shown by the New Theater of March 1935, page 19 and April 1935 (cover), for which he was an artist. Both have been Communist organizations operating in the theater field.

The Daily Worker of January 11, 1937, page 2, discloses that William Gropper was a sponsor of the Communist-sponsored New York City conference against war and fascism.

Soviet Russia Today, September 1939, page 25, reveals that William Gropper was one of the signers of the Open Letter for Closer Cooperation with the Soviet Union.

William Gropper's affiliation with the Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee is shown by the New York Times of December 22, 1943, page 40, which reveals that he was a signer of a declaration honoring Dimitroff, former head of the Communist International.

According to New Masses, May 26, 1942, page 31, William Gropper was a lecturer at the School for Democracy, formerly the Workers School, an official Communist Party school.

William Gropper was an artist and cartoonist for the Communist publication, Soviet Russia Today. (See Soviet Russia Today, May 1938, cover; August 1935, p. 5; and March 1935, p. 3.)

According to a letterhead, dated February 26, 1946, Mr. Gropper was a national sponsor of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, which was cited for contempt by Congress.

Mr. Gropper's association with the United American Artists is shown by the Daily Worker, October 7, 1940, page 7, which reveals he was an exhibitor with that organization and by New Masses, May 20, 1941, page 27, which names him as a sponsor and participant in the testimonial to Rockwell Kent, New York City, May 17, 1941.

The Daily Worker of July 23, 1940, page 3, column 3, reveals that William Gropper was a signer of the statement to Assistant Secretary of State to save anti-Fascist refugees in France which was sponsored by the United American Spanish Aid Committee. An undated form letter also reveals he was a sponsor of this organization, which was Communist supported.

Mr. Gropper was also an artist for the Working Woman, a Communist magazine. (See the Working Woman, May 1933, p. 9.)

#### REGINALD MARSH

Reginald Marsh has been affiliated with the Liberator and New Masses as an artist and cartoonist. (See the Liberator, August 1922, p. 24; August 1922, p. 15; June 1922, p. 13; October 1921, p. 24; September 1921, p. 29; October 1922, p. 14; and July 1922, p. 25; New Masses, January 1928, p. 18.)

Mr. Marsh was also a contributing artist to the second and third New Masses art auctions. (See New Masses, April 1, 1941, p. 25, and April 28, 1942, p. 2.)

#### GEORGE L. K. MORRIS

According to News You Don't Get, November 15, 1938, George L. K. Morris was a member of National Committee for People's Rights, which defended Communist cases.

#### I. RICE PEREIRA

I. Rice Pereira was a contributing artist to the Third New Masses Art Auction. (See New Masses, April 28, 1942, p. 2.)

#### GREGORIO PRESTOPINO

A person named Prestopino was a contributing artist to the Third New Masses Art Auction according to New Masses of April 28, 1942, page 2.

Gregorio Prestopino has been associated with New Masses as an artist. (See New Masses, August 1, 1939, p. 5.)

#### ANTON REFREGIER

A person named Refregier was a contributing artist to the Third Annual Art Auction of New Masses. (See New Masses, March 24, 1942, p. 25; April 7, 1942, p. 27; and March 31, 1942, p. 27.)

The Daily Worker of March 21, 1932, page 2, column 2, discloses that an A. Refregier was a pamphlet artist for the League of Struggle for Negro Rights. A Refregier was also a contributor to New Masses of September 1931, page 22, as well as a contributing artist to the New Masses Second Annual Art Auction. (See New Masses, April 1, 1941, page 25.)

The program, Artists' Front to Win the War, October 16, 1942, page 5, reveals Anton Refregier to be a sponsor of that organization.

The affiliation of Anton Refregier with the American League Against War and Fascism is shown by the publication, Fight, for which he was an illustrator. (See Fight, August 1937, p. 46.)

New Masses of March 15, 1938, page 19, discloses that Anton Refregier was a signer of a statement on the International Situation which was issued by the American League for Peace and Democracy.

As an artist, Anton Refregier contributed to the Champion of June 1936, page 11, and to the Daily Worker of April 2, 1936, page 5.

Mr. Refregier was associated with the John Reed Clubs as an artist of revolutionary themes (Daily Worker, March 21, 1934, p. 7, c. 3), and also as an instructor in the John Reed Club School (Daily Worker, Feb. 14, 1936, p. 5).

The Call to the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, November 6-8, 1934, page 4 (pamphlet), and a memorandum issued by the council, dated March 18, 1946, both serve to show that Anton Refregier was a sponsor



of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

A booklet entitled "Six Hundred Prominent Americans," page 27, discloses that Anton Refregier was a signer of an open letter sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, an organization specializing in the defense of Communist cases.

Mr. Refregier was an artist and cartoonist for New Masses. (See New Masses June 14, 1938, p. 7; Jan. 11, 1938, p. 16; Jan. 4, 1938, p. 19; Apr. 13, 1937, p. 15; May 11, 1937, p. 20; Mar. 9, 1937, p. 11; Sept. 29, 1936, p. 18; Jan. 1931, p. 19; Feb. 18, 1941, p. 38; Mar. 1, 1938, p. 21; Feb. 1, 1938, p. 13; Jan. 5, 1937, p. 11; and Dec. 1930, p. 13.)

In addition to the above listed contributions, Mr. Refregier was a contributing artist to the New Masses Third Art Auction (New Masses, Apr. 28, 1942, p. 2), a contributor to the New Masses, issue of April 30, 1946, page 2, and as an illustrator to the New Masses, January 26, 1937, page 8, and October 1931, page 10. Anton Refregier was a member of the committees for the auction for the fourth and fifth annual art auctions of New Masses. (See New Masses, Feb. 23, 1943, p. 27, and Feb. 8, 1944, p. 31.) He was also a signer of the New Masses letter to the President according to the New Masses of April 2, 1940, page 21.

The October 1933 issue of New Pioneer, page 142, mentions Anton Refregier.

Anton Refregier has been associated with the New Theatre League and New Dance League as an artist for the publication New Theatre. (See New Theatre, Aug. 1935, p. 10, and Sept. 1935, p. 11.)

The Daily Worker of July 19, 1942, page 4, reveals that Anton Refregier was a signer of the open letter in defense of Harry Bridges.

According to a letterhead, dated February 26, 1946, Anton Refregier was a national sponsor of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.

#### BEN SHAHN

Ben Shahn was a contributing artist to New Masses third annual art auction. (See New Masses, Mar. 24, 1942, p. 25; Mar. 31, 1942, p. 27; Apr. 7, 1942, p. 27; and Apr. 28, 1942, p. 2.)

#### NAHUM TSCHACBASOV

A person named Tschacbasov was the donor of a painting to the Abraham Lincoln Branch, Fourth Assembly District, Brooklyn, N. Y. (Communist Party). This information was obtained from the Daily Worker of May 14, 1936, page 5.

Tschacbasov was an artist and cartoonist for New Masses. (See New Masses, February 1, 1938, p. 16; April 20, 1937, p. 22; and January 26, 1937, p. 30.) He was also a contributing artist to the second and third annual art auctions of New Masses. (See New Masses, April 1, 1941, p. 25; March 31, 1942, p. 27; and April 7, 1942, p. 27.)

Nahum Tschacbasov was a cartoonist for New Masses of February 18, 1941, page 51.

#### MAX WEBER

An undated letterhead which summarizes 1946 work and a letterhead, dated September 11, 1941, both reveal that Max Weber was a sponsor of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.

New Masses of March 16, 1937, page 26, discloses that Max Weber was a guest of honor and sponsor of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy, Medical Bureau.

Max Weber was a member of the Committee of Professional Groups for Browder and Ford, Communist candidates, according to a letterhead of September 22, 1936, and the Daily Worker of September 2, 1936, page 2.

Max Weber was a signer of the Golden Book of American Friendship. This information was obtained from Soviet Russia Today, November 1937, page 79.

Max Weber has been associated with the International Workers' Order in the capacity of a judge for the American Artists School

Competition according to New Masses of March 9, 1937, page 2.

Mr. Weber was a member of the advisory board of the John Reed Club School. (See Daily Worker, February 14, 1936, page 5.)

A memorandum issued by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, dated March 18, 1946, discloses that Max Weber was a sponsor of this organization.

Max Weber's affiliation with the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties is revealed in that he was a signer of an appeal on behalf of Darcy, a Communist (Daily Worker, December 19, 1940, p. 5), a signer of a statement hailing the War Department order on commission for the Communists (Daily Worker, March 18, 1945, p. 3), a signer of a message to the House of Representatives (leaflet attached to an undated letterhead), and a signer of an open letter (booklet, Six Hundred Prominent Americans, p. 31). All of these were sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.

Max Weber was a speaker and sponsor of the New Masses' anti-Cliveden rally. See New Masses, April 7, 1942, p. 27, and April 14, 1942, p. 255.) He was also an artist and contributor for New Masses. See New Masses, May 16, 1944, p. 17; February 22, 1944, p. 23; November 9, 1943, p. 13; and August 12, 1941, p. 10.)

Max Weber was an exhibitor at the First Annual New Masses Art Exhibition, November 13-27, 1938 (New Masses, October 25, 1938, p. 2), and a member of the committee for the auction of the New Masses' Fifth Annual Art Auction (New Masses, February 8, 1944, p. 31).

New Masses of September 26, 1944, page 32, reveals that Max Weber answered their query, "What Presidential ticket are you supporting, and why?"

Max Weber was a signer of the Open Letter for Closer Cooperation With the Soviet Union (Soviet Russia Today, September 1939, p. 28), Open Letter in Defense of Harry Bridges (Daily Worker, July 19, 1942, p. 4), and the Open Letter to American Liberals (Daily Worker, February 9, 1937, p. 2, and Soviet Russia Today, March 1937, pp. 14-15).

An undated letterhead reveals that Max Weber was a sponsor of the Public Use of Arts Committee.

Mr. Weber, according to the New York Times, December 22, 1943, page 40, was a signer of the declaration honoring Dimitroff, former head of the Communist International.

Mr. Weber was also a contributor to the July-August 1939 issue of Soviet Russia Today, page 10.

A letterhead of February 26, 1946, discloses that Max Weber was a national sponsor of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint-Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.

Max Weber's affiliation with the United American Artists is shown by New Masses of May 20, 1941, page 27, which names him as a sponsor and participant in the testimonial to Rockwell Kent, New York City, May 17, 1941.

#### SOL WILSON

Sol Wilson was a contributing artist to the New Masses Third Annual Art Auction, according to New Masses of April 28, 1942, page 2.

Listed below you will find the citations of the organizations with which the above-mentioned persons have been affiliated:

American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944.

American Friends of the Chinese People. Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

American Friends of Spanish Democracy. Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

American League Against War and Fascism. Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on January 3, 1940, and March 29, 1944. This was also cited as a Communist-front organization by Attorney General Francis Biddle, in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, page 10. The Attorney General also said it was "established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union." (Attorney General Francis Biddle, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7442.)

American League for Peace and Democracy. Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944. Attorney General Francis Biddle also said it was "established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7442), and that "the American League for Peace and Democracy . . . was designed to conceal Communist control, in accordance with the new tactics of the Communist International." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7443.)

American Peace Mobilization. Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944. This was said to be by Attorney General Francis Biddle "established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7442), and further, "The most conspicuous activity of American Peace Mobilization was the picketing of the White House, which began in April 1941, in protest against lend-lease and the entire national-defense program. . . . On the afternoon of June 21, 1941, he (Frederick V. Field, national secretary) suddenly called off the picket line around the White House." (Attorney General Francis Biddle, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7444.)

Artists' Front To Win the War: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

Champion: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944. The House report of June 25, 1942, page 17, cites the Champion as the official organ of the Young Communist League and also of the International Workers Order.

Committee of Professional Groups for Browder and Ford: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

Coordinating Committee To Lift the Embargo: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

Friends of the Soviet Union: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944.

Fight magazine: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944. This was the publication of the American League for Peace and Democracy.

Golden Book of American Friendship: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

International Labor Defense: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944. It was called the legal arm of the Communist Party by Attorney General Francis Biddle. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7446.)

International Workers Order: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on January 3, 1940, and June 25, 1942. Attorney General

Francis Biddle called it one of the strongest Communist organizations. (Attorney General Francis Biddle, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7447.)

John Reed Clubs of the United States: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

League of American Writers: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 25, 1942, March 29, 1944, and January 3, 1940. The Attorney General said of it, "The League of American Writers, founded under Communist auspices in 1935. . . . The overt activities of the League of American Writers in the last 2 years leave little doubt of its Communist control." (Attorney General Francis Biddle, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7445.)

League of Struggle for Negro Rights: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944. The publication of this organization is entitled "The Liberator."

Medical Bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

National Committee for People's Rights: Cited as a Communist front on March 29, 1944, and June 25, 1942, by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities. Attorney General Francis Biddle said of it, "In January 1938 its name (National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners) was changed to the National Committee for People's Rights" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7446), and also, "A former Kansas Communist State official testified before the Dies committee that the extensive correspondence between himself and various governmental agencies on silicosis in those States . . . had been prepared by the Communist Party headquarters in New York City and dispatched by him on behalf of the NCPR." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7446.)

National Council of American-Soviet Friendship: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

National Federation for Constitutional Liberties: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944. It was called, by Attorney General Francis Biddle, "Part of what Lenin called the solar system or organization, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7446.)

New Masses: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 24, 1942, and March 29, 1944.

New Pioneer: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

New Theatre League and New Theatre magazine: Cited as Communist fronts by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

New York City Conference Against War and Fascism: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

Open letter in defense of Harry Bridges: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

Open letter for closer cooperation with U. S. S. R.: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944.

Open letter to American liberals: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 25, 1942.

Public Use of Arts Committee: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

Refugee scholarship and peace campaign: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

School for Democracy: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

Soviet Russia Today: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944.

United American Artists: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

United American Spanish Aid Committee: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

Working Woman: Cited as a Communist publication by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

There is no record of Communist-front affiliations of the following persons: William Bazlotes, Romare Bearden, Cameron Booth, Louis Bouche, Raymond Breinin, Ralston Crawford, Arthur Dove, Warner Dawes, Adolph Gottlieb, O. Louis Guglielmi, Marsden Hartley, Walt Kuhn, Julian Levi, Loren MacIver, John Marin, Georgia O'Keeffe, Abraham Rattner, Charles Sheeler, Everett Spruce, Franklin Watkin, and Karl Zerbe.

#### Advancing American art—list of oil paintings

Artist	Painting	Price	Order date <sup>1</sup>
1. Avery, Milton.	Fish Basket.	\$500	1946 May 4
2. Bazlotes, William.	Flower Head.	550	Do.
3. Bearden, Romare.	At Five in the Afternoon.	300	Do.
4. Ben Zion.	Perpetual Destructor.	600	Do.
5. Ben Zion.	The Strangled Tree.	400	Do.
6. Ben Zion.	End of Don Quixote.	500	Do.
7. Booth, Cameron.	Clown.	300	May 7
8. Bouche, Louis.	Maspeeth, Queens.	300	May 4
9. Bouche, Louis.	Gallery K.	500	Do.
10. Breinin, Raymond.	Her Lover's Return.	550	May 3
11. Browne, Byron.	Still Life in Red, Yellow, and Green.	350	May 4
12. Burlin, Paul.	News from Home.	1,000	May 3
13. Constant, George.	Rock Crabs.	250	May 4
14. Crawford, Ralston.	Wing Fabrication.	500	May 3
15. Crawford, Ralston.	Plane Production.	500	Do.
16. Davis, Stuart.	Tree and El.	600	Do.
17. Davis, Stuart.	Still Life with Flowers.	1,000	Do.
18. De Diego, Julio.	Nocturnal Family.	500	June 5
19. De Diego, Julio.	Under Still Rearguard Action.	500	Do.
20. De Martini, Joseph.	The Ravine.	625	May 4
21. Dove, Arthur.	Another Arrangement.	600	May 3
22. Dove, Arthur.	Grey Greens.	400	Do.
23. Drewes, Werner.	Balcony.	400	May 4
24. Drewes, Werner.	A Dark Thought.	250	Do.
25. Drewes, Werner.	Gaiety in Times of Distress.	350	Do.
26. Evergood, Philip.	Fascist Leader.	650	May 4
27. Evergood, Philip.	Girl and Cock.	400	Do.
28. Gottlieb, Adolph.	The Couple.	400	May 4
29. Gropper, William.	Home.	375	May 3
30. Gropper, William.	They Fought to the Last Man.	1,125	Do.
31. Guglielmi, O. Louis.	Subway Exit.	700	Oct. 2
32. Guglielmi, O. Louis.	Tenements.	500	Aug. 7
33. Guston, Philip.	Portrait of Shannah.	700	June 6
34. Gwathmey, Robert.	Workers on the Land.	800	May 3
35. Gwathmey, Robert.	Worksong.	800	June 6
36. Hartley, Marsden.	Wild Sea Rose.	250	May 4
37. Hartley, Marsden.	Roses.	300	Do.
38. Hartley, Marsden.	Whale's Jaw, Dogtown.	600	Aug. 1
39. Howard, Charles.	The Medusa.	360	June 5
40. Kantor, Morris.	Afternoon.	450	Aug. 1
41. Kleinholtz, Frank.	Floral.	450	June 6
42. Kleinholtz, Frank.	Bank Night.	450	May 4
43. Kuhn, Walt.	Pine at Five O'clock.	1,334	June 6
44. Kuhn, Walt.	Still Life with Bananas.	1,333	Do.
45. Kuniyoshi, Yasuo.	Deserted Brickyard.	900	May 3
46. Kuniyoshi, Yasuo.	Circus Girl Resting.	700	Do.
47. Levi, Julian.	Still Life.	800	Aug. 7
48. Lewis, Julian.	Waste and Images.	500	Do.
49. Levine, Jack.	White Horse.	1,500	Aug. 1
50. MacIver, Loren.	Blue Landscape.	450	Do.
51. Marin, John.	Sea and Boat.	2,500	May 3
52. Marin, John.	Seascape.	1,200	Do.
53. Marsh, Reginald.	Lifeguard.	600	Do.
54. Morris, George L. K.	Shipbuilding Composition.	200	Do.
55. Morris, George L. K.	New England Church.	550	Oct. 2
56. O'Keeffe, Georgia.	Small Hill Near Alcade.	1,000	May 3
57. O'Keeffe, Georgia.	Cos Cob.	1,000	Do.
58. Pereira, I. Rice.	Abstraction.	450	Do.
59. Prestopino, Gregorio.	Newspaper.	800	Oct. 2
60. Prestopino, Gregorio.	Trolley Car.	900	May 3
61. Rattner, Abraham.	Yellow Table.	800	May 4
62. Refregier, Anton.	End of the Conference.	300	June 6
63. Shahn, Ben.	Hunger.	875	Oct. 2
64. Shahn, Ben.	Renascence.	750	Aug. 7
65. Sheeler, Charles.	Boneyard.	750	May 3
66. Spruce, Everett.	Owl on Rocks.	195	May 7
67. Spruce, Everett.	Turkey.	220	Do.
68. Spruce, Everett.	Canyon at Night.	220	Do.
69. Tschachasov, Nahum.	Choir Boys.	300	May 4
70. Tschachasov, Nahum.	Mother and Child.	300	Do.
71. Tschachasov, Nahum.	Fish.	300	Do.
72. Watkins, Franklin.	Portrait of Old Woman.	500	May 3
73. Weber, Max.	Fruit and Wine.	1,200	May 4
74. Weber, Max.	Conversation.	1,600	Do.
75. Weber, Max.	Two Vases.	1,200	Do.
76. Wilson, Sol.	Fisherman on Wharf.	300	Do.
77. Zerbe, Karl.	Clown and Ass.	850	Aug. 7
78. Zerbe, Karl.	The Owls.	300	May 3
79. Zerbe, Karl.	Around the Lighthouse.	500	Do.

<sup>1</sup> Date of DS-12, departmental request for supplies, equipment, or services, preceded by negotiations of various lengths.



PRESS AND PUBLICATIONS DIVISION, OIC  
WEEKLY ROUND-UP ARTCAST, SEPTEMBER 20, 1946  
(Please note date of exhibition)

*Column mail*

WASHINGTON (undated).—An exhibition of Advancing American Art, prepared by the United States Department of State and designed to show the scope and progress of contemporary experimental and creative painting in the United States, is scheduled to open on October 4 at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City. In response to requests from United States missions abroad for a showing of the newest trends in American paintings, the Department has chosen these 79 paintings by 45 artists as representative of fine quality, originality, artistic breadth, distinction, and variety of style.

After a sojourn at the Metropolitan in New York, the exhibit will be divided into two parts: 30 paintings will tour the other American Republics; while 49 will go to Europe on a similar tour, beginning in Paris in November (UNESCO month) then moving through the other large cities of Europe. Less extensive but fully self-contained and representative units of the exhibition later will circulate through the smaller European cities.

The exhibit is planned to acquaint the world with recent developments in American paintings, and presents therefore a national cross-section of the work of the most active and forward-looking of contemporary artists. Included are canvases by well-known and established painters like John Marin, Max Weber, Stuart Davis, Marsden Hartley, and Georgia O'Keeffe, as well as those of such comparatively new arrivals in the field as Jack Levine, Robert Gwathmey, Gregorio Prestopino, and Ben Shahn.

The initiate in art may trace in these paintings important social and cultural influences and traditions, fresh ideas and techniques. Art amateurs will find interest and pleasure in the broad range and variety of subject, style, and approach—the classic precision of Charles Sheeler; the brooding moods and memories of Loren MacIvor; the fantasy of Julio de Diego; the abstractions of Stuart Davis; the somber intensity of Ben Shahn; the social commentary of William Gropper; the biting analysis of Jack Levine and Robert Gwathmey.

Paintings designated to tour the Eastern Hemisphere include Still Life With Flowers, by Stuart Davis; Fascist Leader, by Philip Evergood; They Fought To The Last Man, by William Gropper; Tenements, by Louis Gugheim; Horse, by Jack Levine; Seascape, by John Marin; Trolley Car, by Gregorio Prestopino; Small Hill Near Alcade, by Georgia O'Keeffe; Boneyard, by Charles Sheeler; and Circus Girl Resting by Yasuo Kuniishi.

A parallel selection of artists and paintings for the exhibit in the other American Republics include Robert Gwathmey's Workers on the Land, Yasuo Kuniishi's Deserted Brickyard, Ben Shahn's Hunger, Max Weber's Fruit and Wine, and Reginald Marsh's Life-guard.

While this is the most ambitious project of this type yet undertaken by the State Department as part of its world-wide cultural activities program, other smaller exhibits of original prints, water colors, and photographs already have circulated abroad, and are reported to have met with cordial response. This exhibit and others now being planned are part of a widespread program of peacetime cultural interchange between the United States and the rest of the world.

HANNAH GOLDMAN.

Sources: United States State Department advance release, interview, photographs, art periodicals.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN].

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make two very brief observations. As a result of the debate which we have had on the floor of the House the past 2 weeks, I think all of us are well aware of the dangers that lie in the path of legislating a foreign policy in a piecemeal fashion.

It was my opportunity during the war to observe propaganda being manufactured. I know something of its effectiveness. I recognize the definite need for a pro-American propaganda program at the present time. I recognize the power and possible effectiveness of such a program. A weapon of this type can be made so all-powerful that I feel it might be well to have a program of this type more directly under the control of the Congress.

If we are not careful, the tail may wag the dog.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, this concludes the general debate on the bill, and I suggest that the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read down to and including line 6 on page 1.

Mr. STEFAN. 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. CURTIS, 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. 3311) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce and the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### SENATE BILL 938—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill, S. 938.

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

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT (at the request of Mr. HORAN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri and Mr. DIRKSEN (at the request of Mr. HORAN) were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include some extraneous matter.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a list of the artists I mentioned along with the amount paid for each painting and the date of purchase and in addition a copy of the Artcast dated September 20, 1946, which created the so-called demand for this exhibition of art, as well as a report from the House Committee on Un-American Activities on 24 of the artists from whom the paintings were purchased.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include certain excerpts from broadcasts and digests of broadcasts furnished him by the State Department.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BULWINKLE, for 10 days, on account of official business.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 64. An act granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a dam across Dan River in North Carolina;

S. 132. An act to relieve collectors of customs of liability for failure to collect certain special tonnage duties and light money, and for other purposes;

S. 214. An act to change the name of the Lugert-Altus irrigation project in the State of Oklahoma to the W. C. Austin project;

S. 273. An act to limit the time within which the General Accounting Office shall make final settlement of the monthly or quarterly accounts of fiscal officers, and for other purposes;

S. 460. An act to amend section 327 (h) of the Nationality Act of 1940; and

S. 534. An act to authorize additional allowances of good time and the payment of compensation to prison inmates performing exceptionally meritorious or outstanding services.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LeCOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 12, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 450. An act providing for the conveyance to the town of Marblehead, in the State of Massachusetts, of Marblehead Military Reservation, for public use; and

H. R. 1098. An act to authorize the segregation and expenditure of trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 14, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

675. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the seventh judicial circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

676. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on the cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

677. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 involving an increase of \$8,850,000 for the Navy Department (H. Doc. No. 246); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 1610. A bill to amend the act of June 14, 1938, so as to authorize the Cairo Bridge Commission to issue its refunding bonds for the purpose of refunding the outstanding bonds issued by the commission to pay the cost of a certain toll bridge at or near Cairo, Ill.; without amendment (Rept. No. 362). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 1628. A bill relinquishing to the State of Illinois certain right, title, or interest of the United States of America, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 363). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2097. A bill to declare the ownership of the timber on the allotments on the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, and to authorize the sale thereof; without amendment (Rept. No. 364). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2693. A bill for the relief of Public Utility District No. 1 of Cowlitz County, Wash.; without amendment (Rept. No. 365). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1555. A bill to promote uniformity of geographic nomenclature in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 366). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 577. A bill to preserve historic graveyards in abandoned military posts; with amendment (Rept. No. 367). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 981. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of January 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 21), relating to the refund of taxes illegally paid by Indian citizens; without amendment (Rept. No. 368). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1831. A bill to authorize the exchange of lands acquired by the United States for the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project, Oregon, for the purpose of consolidating holdings therein, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 369). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2938. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 497, 5 U. S. C., sec. 488), fixing the price of copies of records furnished by the Department of the Interior; without amendment (Rept. No. 370). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3143. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Paonia Federal reclamation project, Colorado; with amendment (Rept. No. 371). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1379. A bill to establish the United States Naval Postgraduate School, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 372). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1882. A bill for expenditure of funds for cooperating with the public-school board at Walker, Minn., for the extension of public-school facilities to be available to all Indian children in the district; without amendment (Rept. No. 373). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2207. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands within the Shiloh National Military Park, Tenn., and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 374). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2545. A bill to provide funds for cooperation with the school board of the Moclips-Aloha District for the construction and equipment of a new school building in the town of Moclips, Grays Harbor County, Wash., to be available to both Indian and non-Indian children; with amendment (Rept. No. 375). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2655. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant to the mayor and City Council of Baltimore, State of Maryland, a permanent easement for the purpose of installing, maintaining, and servicing two subterranean water mains in, on, and across the land of Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Shrine, Md.; without amendment (Rept. No. 376). 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. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 408. A bill for the relief of Lawson Ashby; Mrs. Ora Ashby; and Lawson Ashby, the legal guardian of Betty Mae Ashby, a minor; Darrel Ashby, a minor; Kenneth Ashby, a minor; and Vernon Ashby, a minor; with amendments (Rept. No. 348). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 651. A bill for the relief of the estate of Rubert W. Alexander; with amendment (Rept. 349). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 836. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Augusta McCall; with amendments (Rept. No. 350). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 888. A bill for the relief of certain owners of land who suffered loss by fire in Lake Landing Township, Hyde County, N. C.; without amendment (Rept. No. 351). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 893. A bill for the relief of Myron R. Leard; with amendments (Rept. No. 352). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 905. A bill for the relief of Y. S. Hu; with amendment (Rept. No. 353). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 984. A bill for the relief of A. J. Crozat, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 354). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 989. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mathew C. Cowley, deceased, and the estate of Louisa Cowley, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 355). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1152. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Inga Patterson, widow of F. X. Patterson; without amendment (Rept. No. 356). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1408. A bill for the relief of August W. Dietz; with amendments (Rept. No. 357). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1513. A bill for the relief of John C. Garrett; without amendment (Rept. No. 358). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1523. A bill for the relief of the estate of Marion S. Griggs, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 359). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1586. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Leslie Price, Philip C. Price, Mrs. Louise Keyton, Annie Curry and James Curry; with amendments (Rept. No. 360). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 261. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the district court of the United States for the northern district of California, northern division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, Yuba County, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 361). 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. BARRETT:

H. R. 3429. A bill to amend section 10 of the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1273), as amended June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1978; 43 U. S. C. sec. 3151); to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 3430. A bill to provide for the payment of revenues from certain lands into the tribal funds of the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 3431. A bill to remove restrictions on the property and moneys belonging to the individual enrolled members of the Klamath Indian Reservation in Oregon, to provide for the liquidation of tribal property and distribution of the proceeds thereof, to confer complete citizenship upon such Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 3432. A bill making certain changes in the organization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 3433. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to classify the officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1906, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.



By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 3434. A bill to grant retirement with pay to certain emergency officers of World War I seriously disabled from gunshot wounds incurred in combat; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 3435. A bill to provide that automatic national service life insurance as to deceased veterans of World War II shall be payable, in turn, to their widows, children, and parents, if any, without any requirement, as at present, as to their dependency; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3436. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide that payments be made to survivors for unused leave accumulated by members of the armed forces before their death in service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3437. A bill relating to the compensation of those veterans of World War I and World War II who suffer from tuberculosis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3438. A bill to provide for the payment of direct Federal assistance to permanently and totally disabled individuals, blind individuals, and certain individuals 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3439. A bill to raise the limit on the amount of annual income from other sources which may be received by the widow or child of a veteran of World War I or II without disqualifying such widow or child for a pension for the non-service-connected death of such veteran; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3440. A bill to provide that automatic national service life insurance as to deceased veterans of World War II shall be payable, in turn, to their widows, children, and parents, if any, without any requirement, as at present, as to their dependency; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3441. A bill to provide that disabled veterans of World War II who elect to receive the educational benefits granted by part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) shall receive the entire subsistence allowance provided by such part; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3442. A bill to provide that retired enlisted personnel of the Army who served as commissioned officers during World War II shall receive the pay of retired warrant officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3443. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of March 20, 1933, so as to eliminate financial inability to defray expenses of hospital treatment or domiciliary care as a prerequisite to obtaining such treatment or care in a Veterans' Administration facility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 3444. A bill to amend section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 3445. A bill to exempt from the immigration quota certain persons who served in the armed forces of governments allied with the United States during World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE (by request):

H. R. 3446. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, title IV of the National Housing Act, the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3447. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3448. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 3449. A bill to provide for equalization of flight pay for Navy and Marine Corps officers and former officers who did not receive flight pay equal to that paid to Army officers engaged in regular and frequent aerial flights; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3450. A bill to authorize the acquisition of a site for a national cemetery in northwest Louisiana for the burial of members of the armed forces of the United States dying in the service, of former members whose last discharge therefrom was honorable, and certain other persons as provided for in United States Code, title 24, section 281, as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 202. Joint resolution to provide emergency relief for victims of the tornado at Worth, Worth County, Mo., and for the restoration and reconstruction of the devastated areas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. J. Res. 203. Joint resolution to study and inspect the operations of the United States Post Office Department; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. Res. 209. Resolution creating a select committee to make an investigation with respect to alien property, private war losses, foreign loans, and related matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri:

H. Res. 210. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives to investigate the causes of and feasible methods of preventing railroad accidents; 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. CELLER:

H. R. 3451. A bill for the relief of Szoszana Sierdzka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 3452. A bill for the relief of James R. Walsh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3453. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Louise A. Ellison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3454. A bill for the relief of Emile G. Feltier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3455. A bill to authorize the presentation to Edward R. Egan of a Distinguished Service Cross; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 3456. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Andrew Johnson, Alexander H. Tongue, James F. Sirlouis, James W. Dixon, J. Frank Tongue, Thomas E. Wroten, Halvor H. Hellen, George J. Carey, Robert C. O'Berry, Norman C. Carey, James W. Hungerford, Sarah E. Webster, Nathaniel M. Dare, and Richard J. Johnson; 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:

500. By Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa: Petition of Mrs. C. A. Turbett, and others, Le Grand, Iowa, re S. 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in in-

terstate commerce, and so forth; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

501. Also, petition of members of Osage Lutheran Church, Osage, Iowa, re S. 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and so forth; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

502. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of the members of the Nazarene Church of Chariton, Iowa, in the interest of S. 265, S. 623, H. R. 111, and H. R. 2408; to the Committee on Armed Services.

503. Also, petition of Mrs. May Miller King and members of the American Legion Auxiliary, Corydon, Iowa, in the interest of H. R. 142, S. 265, and S. 623; to the Committee on Armed Services.

504. By Mr. PRICE of Illinois: Petition of the Honorable Martin H. Kennelly, mayor of the city of Chicago, Ill., urging that the Congress continue program of Federal aid to local communities in the operation of control towers at terminal airports and its program of assistance in the construction of new airport facilities in order that this Nation may keep abreast of the international development of air transportation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

505. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of Lowell Hebrew Community Center, Lowell, Mass., concerning Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

506. Also, petition of Lowell Ministerial Association, of Lowell, Mass., concerning Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

507. By Mr. TALLE: Petition of Mrs. Theodore Bassett and 41 other citizens of Edgewood, Iowa, endorsing S. 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

508. By the SPEAKER: Petition of membership of the Pasadena Townsend Club, No. 1, Pasadena, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

509. Also, petition of members of the Valdosta Townsend Club, No. 1, Valdosta, Ga., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

510. Also, petition of the Newark Archdiocesan Federation of Holy Name Societies, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to combating atheistic communism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Forbid it, Lord, that we should walk through Thy beautiful world with unseeing eyes. Forgive us, our Father, for taking our good things for granted, so that we are in danger of losing the fine art of appreciation. With such dire need in every other part of the world, make us so grateful for the bounties we enjoy that we shall try, by Thy help, to deserve them more.

Where we are wrong, make us willing to change, and where we are right, make us easy to live with.

For Jesus' sake. Amen.